

# Discovering stakeholder capabilities in the local tourism industry

Master's thesis



Name	A.J. (Allard) Jonker
Student number	4550838
Institution	Radboud University, Nijmegen School of Management
Trajectory	Business Administration, Innovation and Entrepreneurship
Supervisor	Prof. B. Hillebrand
Second examiner	Dr. A. De Beuckelaer
Academic year	2019-2020
Submission date:	February 22, 2021

# Preface

Ever since I was young, I have been interested in innovation and in being an entrepreneurial spirit. Over the years this has developed into a strong urge to guide myself in the direction of a career in innovation and entrepreneurship. This meant that after obtaining the Bachelor of Dutch Law at the Radboud University, I began to explore my options to pursue a degree in Business Administration. After learning about the master specialization of Innovation & Entrepreneurship, the switch from Dutch Law to Business Administration was an easy decision.

During difficult times in 2020 with the COVID-19 crisis, I am thankful to still have been able to graduate my master degree, albeit with a slight delay. First of all, I would like to thank my supervisor Prof. B. Hillebrand for helping me with my research and always being able to provide me with feedback that I can work with. Furthermore, I would like to express my gratitude to the Driving Force for providing me with respondents for my research. I am also thankful for all the respondents in general who could make time in these difficult times to conduct an interview with me. Lastly, I would like to thank my girlfriend and my family, for their continued support and willingness to provide me with feedback in times of uncertainty.

It was not an easy decision to choose not to get a master's degree in Dutch Law, but instead focus on something that I am more passionate about. However, I think I have made the right choice and hope that it will lead me toward a career that I can sincerely enjoy. I am excited to find out what the future holds for me when it comes to either innovations or entrepreneurship.

# Abstract

In order to tackle the complex network of interrelated stakeholders, stakeholder marketing has been introduced as a concept which might facilitate firms to define their most important stakeholders, and address them accordingly with specific organizational capabilities that are focused on managing stakeholders. Three specific stakeholder marketing capabilities have been proposed to do so, namely systems thinking, paradoxical thinking, and democratic thinking. However, this is mainly a theoretical concept up until now, it is now yet known how these capabilities look like and how they work in practice. Therefore, this research aimed to answer this explorative research question by doing a case study within the two stakeholder networks of Texel and Vinkeveen. This was done by conducting data via a total of seven semi-structured interviews with organizations from within both stakeholder networks, as well as by observations made for three full days at the company the Driving Force, which aims to implement a network innovation in both stakeholder networks. The development of the three stakeholder capabilities within the local tourism industry was analysed by focusing on the four dimensions of an organizational capability, namely employee knowledge and skills, technical systems, managerial systems, and norms and values. The results show that a different level of development across the capabilities as well as across the different companies was found. The theoretical and practical implications of the results are discussed in the final chapter.

*Key words: organizational capabilities, stakeholder capabilities*

## Table of contents

Preface	1
Abstract	2
Chapter 1: Introduction	4
§1.1 - Introduction	4
§1.2. - Problem statement	7
§1.2.1 - Research question	9
§1.3 - Structure of the research	9
Chapter 2: Literature review	10
§2.1 - Background Stakeholder theory	10
§2.2 - Organizational capabilities	11
§2.3 - Organizational learning	14
§2.4 - Stakeholder marketing	15
Chapter 3: Methods	21
Chapter 4: Results	27
§4.1 – Systems thinking	27
§4.2 – Paradoxical thinking	33
§4.3 – Democratic thinking	37
Chapter 5: Discussion	41
§5.1 – Conclusions and implications	41
§5.2 – Limitations	46
§5.3 – Research suggestions	48
References	53
Appendix	61

# Chapter 1: Introduction

## §1.1 - Introduction

The tourism industry has undergone a thorough metamorphosis in the past decade. The increase in foreigners' income, the reduced prices of transportation, and the emergence of online platforms has led to a situation where travel agencies, tour operators, and organisations active within the local tourism industry have to make sure that their services are in accordance with the ever-changing consumer preferences (Schubert & Brida, 2009). For instance, the emergence of platforms such as Booking and AirBnB has had enormous implications for the operation of hotel chains. Additionally, the growing supply and the reduced prices have made the competition for customers bigger than ever. Companies are required to innovate and stay up to date in order to preserve a competitive advantage. These developments have led to an increase in tourism worldwide, which is also the case for the Netherlands with an increasing number of overnight stays for many years in a row (Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek, 2018). This brings a considerable amount of opportunities and economic development to regions which are attractive for tourism. However, it also means that companies that operate in the tourism industry need to take into consideration these new developments. Changes within the industry require businesses to be able to work effectively and cooperatively. Companies that used to recognize their customer as their most important stakeholder and neglected the rest of their stakeholder network cannot adequately keep up with a world that relies on networking and cooperation. Stakeholder is defined as "any group or individual who can affect or is affected by the achievement of the organization's objectives" (Freeman 1984, p. 46). From this definition it is clear that the term goes way beyond the customer and gives importance to employees, suppliers, fellow entrepreneurs and policy makers. According to stakeholder theory, a firm can maintain or develop a competitive advantage by involving its stakeholders more closely into the decision-making processes of the firm (Jones, 1995). It is essential to know who the stakeholders of the firm are in order to be able to address their needs accordingly, because stakeholders can influence whether a firm can reach its financial objectives (Pajunen, 2006). A multitude of perspectives are available to argue for the importance of stakeholders for the performance of a firm, one of these perspectives is Resource Dependence Theory.

Resource Dependence Theory advocates that resources are heterogeneously distributed across firms, meaning that not all firms have equal access to the most valuable resources which leads to competitive advantages for firms that are able to get access to these resources (Conner & Prahalad, 1996; Grant, 1991; Wernerfelt, 1984). According to the Resource Dependence Theory, companies are dependent on their business surroundings in order to be provided with resources that are the most important to the firm. Therefore these resources are called the vital resources (Gioia, 1999; Jawahar & McLaughlin, 2001). Stakeholders are a part of these business surroundings. Hence firms should attempt to become intimately involved with their stakeholders to avoid missing out on any vital resources (Gioia, 1999; Jawahar & McLaughlin, 2001). Some examples of stakeholders include shareholders, investors, employees, customers, suppliers, and other firms active in the same industry (Clarkson, 1995). The potential effects of stakeholders on the firm's business dealings have been thoroughly investigated, emphasizing that stakeholders should be managed adequately (Pajunen, 2006). However, not every company that has the intention to involve other stakeholders more closely, has the capabilities to do this successfully.

Successfully managing the stakeholders requires specific capabilities to be developed by the firms. One issue with determining which capabilities are required to effectively manage stakeholders is that previous research has primarily focused on relationships between firms and customers, thereby overlooking other potentially critical stakeholders. By focusing excessively on customers, the interests of other stakeholders could suffer. Moreover, this previous research has mainly considered stakeholders as being independent of each other (Neville & Menguc, 2006).

In order to tackle the complex network of interrelated stakeholders, stakeholder marketing has been introduced as a concept which might facilitate firms to define their most important stakeholders, and address them accordingly with specific organizational capabilities that are focused on managing stakeholders (Bhattacharya & Korschun, 2008). Stakeholder marketing can be defined as “activities within a system of social institutions and processes for facilitating and maintaining value through exchange relationships with multiple stakeholders” (Hult, Mena, Ferrell, & Ferrell, 2011, p. 57). Stakeholder marketing acknowledges that a firm has more stakeholders than only its customers, that these stakeholders might not be independent of each other but are interrelated, and that this network of stakeholders can influence the perceived customer value. However, the definition

of stakeholder marketing and the focus itself does not readily allow companies to actually achieve a satisfactory cooperation with a multitude of stakeholders. To achieve this, certain specific stakeholder marketing capabilities are required.

Hillebrand, Driessen, and Koll (2015) propose three organizational capabilities that might be beneficial for stakeholder marketing (hereafter: stakeholder capabilities), namely systems, paradoxical, and democratic thinking. These stakeholder capabilities will be the main focus of this research. Systems thinking is defined as: “understanding the whole stakeholder value system”, paradoxical thinking is defined as: “accepting and learning from tension between stakeholder interests”, and democratic thinking refers to: “sharing control over marketing decisions with a multitude of stakeholders” (Hillebrand et al., 2015, p. 415). Systems thinking facilitates firms in getting a thorough understanding of the network of stakeholders that surrounds the firm, which is the essential requirement for strengthening the relationship with its stakeholders. Paradoxical thinking can facilitate firms in adequately assessing and responding to the oftentimes conflicting interests that the stakeholders have. Democratic thinking is focused on involving stakeholders in the decision making processes in order to boost the relationships with stakeholders, leading to an increase in the achieved support from the firm’s stakeholders.

The focus of this research will be to investigate the extent to which the three proposed stakeholder capabilities have been developed within companies in the local tourism industry. The research will investigate what these capabilities look like, how they work, and how they contribute to successfully managing stakeholders. To put this information into context, this research will investigate specific stakeholder networks within the tourism industry. More specifically, the research will use the example of a network innovation of a start-up called The Driving Force. This innovation will serve as a specific example of cooperation between stakeholders in a stakeholder network. The Driving Force aims to find a solution to a specific issue related to tourism, namely overcrowding, by assisting different businesses to work together. Their goal is to spread tourism more evenly across various tourist attractions by using its product, The Linda, and therefore create a satisfactory tourism experience for all stakeholders involved. The Linda is a phone application, that can also be used via an internet website, which actively checks the concentration of tourists at tourist locations. This is being done by following the users via their phone application in the local area. The Linda can then automatically see the concentration of users at particular locations. The Linda application can

then guide tourists from busy locations to alternative locations where there is still room for more tourists by using a reward system for the tourists that make use of the application. Examples of rewards are a parking ticket for the car for the next visit to Texel, or a surprise box with local products. By adopting such an application, local tourism organisations can work together to spread tourism more evenly and avoid overcrowding. In order to make the application attractive for users there must be a sufficient amount of offered activities for tourists to choose from. This means that multiple tourist organisations from the same stakeholder network need to be willing to implement the application. Therefore, from the perspective of an organization interested in taking part in the Linda, other companies which are also considering the implementation of the application form a relevant group of stakeholders. Using the Linda as a specific example makes it clearer and less vague for the interviewees to discuss concepts such as stakeholder collaboration. The Linda is in its essence an application for which cooperating with stakeholders is a central element, and therefore provides a good context for the investigation of stakeholder capabilities. Therefore, the interview protocol which will be used for this research can be made more concrete by linking the implementation of the Linda network innovation to the specific dimensions of stakeholder capabilities.

## §1.2. - Problem statement

The three stakeholder capabilities of systems thinking, paradoxical thinking, and democratic thinking have been proposed in the literature. However, it is not yet investigated what they look like and how they work in practice. Therefore, it is necessary to explore them more in depth. Gathering more knowledge about the specific stakeholder capabilities that help the investigated organizations in managing their stakeholders, as well as more insight in what these stakeholder capabilities look like and how they work in practice, will allow managers to get an overview of where they might come short in managing their own stakeholders. Managers can then work on those shortcomings and find out what stakeholder capabilities look like in other organizations, and make changes to how their organizations manage stakeholders. So far the literature on organizational capabilities has taken a hub-and-spokes perspective. Such a perspective focuses solely on dyadic relationships, assumes stakeholders to be independent of each other, and neglects complex network relationships (Neville et al., 2006). Kraaijenbrink, Spender and Groen (2010) argue that the currently



identified capabilities in the literature remain abstract and vague, and do not offer deeper understanding of what the capabilities entail. They urge for a clarification of the building blocks of these capabilities (e.g. necessary individual skills).

A thorough investigation of the acquired stakeholder capabilities in the local tourism industry and what these stakeholder capabilities look like and how they work in practice, also has the potential of benefitting managers in other industries. This research aims to provide a clear overview in which various specific capabilities will be linked to efficiently cooperating with stakeholders in a stakeholder network. Outlining specific capabilities that are required to be able to work together with stakeholders, shows managers from the same industry which capabilities have been found to work best and how to put them to use, and thus allows these managers to extract the most value from their stakeholders as well. The new findings could enrich the practical value of stakeholder marketing theory, which has been a mostly theoretical concept until today.

Not just managers will benefit from these insights. Even though the emerging research on stakeholder marketing clearly points out the importance of a multitude of stakeholders, the marketing discipline has remained overly focused on customers as the primary stakeholders (Hillebrand et al., 2015). This could be the result of the fact that stakeholder marketing as a currently developing field can sometimes be vague and difficult to implement in practice. In order to clarify the working mechanisms of stakeholder marketing, Hillebrand et al. (2015) discussed why focusing solely on customers and neglecting other stakeholders (a dyadic approach) can be less beneficial for a company, provided a view of a new “revised theoretical perspective”, and proposed a set of potentially relevant organizational capabilities for the practical level of the implementation of stakeholder marketing. Additionally, deeper insights into how these capabilities work will also allow for follow-up investigations with the use of statistical procedures on what the exact effects are of stakeholder marketing when it comes to extracting value from the stakeholder network. All these insights could greatly benefit marketing theory because if stakeholder marketing proves to be beneficial for firms, this could help the marketing practice in the shift from focusing merely on customers, to focusing on all relevant stakeholders (Webster & Lusch, 2013).

### §1.2.1 - Research question

The research question that is going to guide this study is the following:

*“What do stakeholder marketing capabilities look like in practice and how do they work in the local tourism industry?”*

### §1.3 - Structure of the research

This research will consist of 5 chapters, the introductory chapter included. After this introduction, the literature review will be provided. The literature review aims to provide a deeper understanding of the various relevant theories. Therefore, it will first discuss how stakeholder theory has originated, and how it has developed until the present. This overview will be followed by explaining more about organizational capabilities, the basis for stakeholder capabilities. Hereafter, the concept of stakeholder marketing will be introduced. The primary purpose of this paper is to research how the stakeholder capabilities look like in practice. Therefore it is essential to address stakeholder capabilities in the literature overview. All this theory together concludes the theoretical framework. After the literature review, in chapter 3, a proper choice will be made about the gathering of the data. In chapter 4, the gathered data will be analysed, and the results will be discussed. Chapter 5 will consist of the discussion, aimed at providing an overview of the research, deriving at an appropriate conclusion, and addressing the limitations of the study as well as suggesting further research that can be conducted on this subject.

## Chapter 2: Literature review

### §2.1 - Background Stakeholder theory

In the literature, R. Edward Freeman is seen as the founding father of stakeholder theory (Bowie, 2012; Freeman, 2009). In his book, *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*, Freeman dove deeper into the relevance of stakeholders, and how stakeholders can influence the performance of firms (Freeman, 1984). This work was one of the first to highlight that it is not only shareholders that can affect a firm's performance, but that there are more stakeholders which should not be overlooked. According to Freeman, it was essential for the management of firms to stop addressing only the shareholders of a firm, which was the dominant perspective at that time, and to start involving other stakeholders as well. This would ultimately lead firms to take the focus away from only focusing on maximizing the firm's short term profits.

From a stakeholder theory perspective, when analysing a firm, the network of stakeholders cannot be excluded from the analysis and should thus also be included besides the shareholders (Preston & Donaldson, 1999). Stakeholder theory addresses the firm not as exclusively a firm that is in a one-way relationship with its shareholders, but actively takes into account that a firm is also affected by other stakeholders that also desire to fulfil their own targets and purposes, which are not necessarily aligned with other stakeholders' targets all the time (Donaldson & Preston, 1995). This naturally leads to a situation where, even if a firm intends to satisfy its entire network of stakeholders, this is just not always achievable, and firms will sometimes have to make choices which will hurt the firm's relationship with one or more stakeholders (Jawahar & McLaughlin, 2001). Therefore, a primary intention of stakeholder theory is for a firm to get a thorough overview of its stakeholders, so that it can find out which stakeholders are more important than others and should be treated as such (Mitchell, Agle, & Wood, 1997). The stakeholder marketing capability systems thinking can facilitate in this process. However, merely identifying the most critical stakeholders and the less critical stakeholders is too limited. To be able as a firm to use the network of stakeholders to its full potential and extract the most value from it, the firm needs to learn from the competing interests (Hillebrand et al., 2015). Although not plentiful, there is some

empirical work that highlights this proposition of stakeholder theory that focusing on numerous stakeholders, can positively affect the business performance of the firm (e.g. Homburg, Stierl, & Bornemann, 2013; Koll, Woodside, & Mühlbacher, 2005; Luo & Bhattacharya, 2009; Sisodia, Wolfe, & Sheth, 2007).

During the advancement of stakeholder theory, some concerns have been expressed relating to how stakeholder theory should be applied (Donaldson & Preston, 1995). Donaldson and Preston (1995) propose that stakeholder theory has numerous applications, that call for different guidelines of assessment, different evidence to support claims, as well as distinctive approaches for using stakeholder theory. The following functions are distinguished: descriptive/empirical, instrumental, and normative. Descriptive is “used to describe, and sometimes to explain, specific corporate characteristics and behaviours” (Donaldson & Preston, 1995, p. 70). Instrumental is related to disclosing the link between managing separate stakeholders and corporate targets, highlighting that by following a stakeholder theory approach, equally positive or even better performance targets could be achieved. From a normative approach “the theory is used to interpret the function of the corporation, including the identification of moral or philosophical guidelines for the operation and management of corporations” (Donaldson & Preston, 1995, p. 71). According to Donaldson and Preston (1995) however, these three following functions of stakeholder theory are intertwined with each other: only when they are used together can the desired results that can be achieved by taking a multiple stakeholder approach, actually be achieved. Therefore, when looking at a multitude of stakeholders, as is the case in this research, all three functions of stakeholder theory should be used simultaneously.

## §2.2 - Organizational capabilities

Before diving deeper into what stakeholder marketing is and what role stakeholder capabilities can play in extracting all of the potential benefits of stakeholder marketing, it is crucial to have an understanding of what organizational capabilities entail. One of the earliest works on organizational capabilities can be traced back to Selznick (1957), where he used the term *distinctive competencies* to discuss the underlying processes and things which caused an organization to stand out in something particular (Selznick, 1957). Teece and Pisano (1994) further elaborated on this term to make it less abstract and added that a distinctive

competence is a competence/capability of a firm that is not easily imitated or replicated, emphasizing the firm-specific element of distinctive competencies.

The notion of distinctive competencies has been further conceptualized throughout the years. In 1990 the term *core competencies* has been described as being a unified combination of multiple resources and skills that make a firm stand out in the business environment (Prahalad and Hamel, 2001). This combination could lead to a competitive advantage. However, in order for this to happen, three different conditions should first be met. In essence, it should be difficult or even close to impossible for competitors to imitate this combination, customers must feel positive about the potential benefits that the combination might provide to them, and the combination should not only be used for one single market, but a variety of markets should be able to be accessed with the combination.

From a knowledge-based perspective of an organization, a core capability can be defined as “the knowledge set that distinguishes and provides a competitive advantage” (Leonard-Barton, 1992, p. 113). This knowledge set consists of four different dimensions, the dimensions of an organizational capability: 1) employee knowledge and skills, 2) technical systems, and 3) managerial systems (Leonard-Barton, 1992). The fourth dimension is often not included in the literature or handled as separate from the other three dimensions. However, this dimension is the 4) values and norms and it is integrated within the other four dimensions. It has to do with the values and norms that a company associates with knowledge, how do they create, control and share it. For instance, if a company values the creation of new knowledge, it will facilitate this creation by educating its employees (employee knowledge and skills), providing the necessary technology to store and codify this knowledge (technical systems), and it will facilitate the necessary structures for knowledge control and creation (managerial systems). Therefore, norms and values constitutes the basis of an organizational capability. The knowledge and skills of employees are most often mentioned when discussing core capabilities (Leonard-Barton, 1992).

Specific techniques developed within the organization as well as scientific understanding both play a role in the first dimension of knowledge and skills in core capabilities. The second dimension, the expertise exhibited in technical systems, is the consequence of a long period in which an individual’s knowledge is made more concrete and is codified for the entire organization. This knowledge is both related to information as well

as to procedures that have been developed in the firm (Leonard-Barton, 1992). Argote and Darr (2000) argue that people, instruments and resources, and processes are the central elements of organizational capabilities. Many years of experience will influence these people, instruments and resources. These years of experience can help firms to translate organizational learning into more concrete elements which can be adjusted and managed more accordingly if a situation requires this. The role of organizational learning in developing organizational capabilities will be discussed more thoroughly in the next paragraph. Managerial systems, the third dimension, is mostly focused on creating and controlling knowledge within the organization (Leonard-Barton, 1992). The three dimensions are influenced by the fourth one – norms and values (Leonard-Barton, 1992). Therefore, to accurately find out what stakeholder capabilities look like in practice and how they are put to work, the focus should be on knowledge and skills of employees and how this is exhibited in technical systems, which are managed by managerial systems, and which norms and values play a role in creating and capturing this knowledge. All these four dimensions together form the organizational capabilities that are under investigation.

An organizational capability allows the organization to perform specific vital tasks for the organization over and over in a productive manner by translating the internal knowledge into outputs (Nelson & Winter, 1985; Teece & Pisano, 1994). These organizational capabilities can be developed by combining certain specific knowledge that individuals possess, and translating this in organizational competences and routines (Grant, 1991; Teece & Pisano, 1994). Routines are certain recurring events that regulate the employee as well as the organization's behaviour in specific situations that repeatedly occur (Teece & Pisano, 1994). Competences are firm-specific business actions that require specific knowledge, and the organization is primarily accomplished in these business actions (Teece, Pisano, & Shuen, 1997). These organizational competences and routines together form organizational capabilities. In an ideal situation, these organizational capabilities are dynamic so that they can be adjusted to a changing business environment. This can be done by using strategic management for “adapting, integrating and reconfiguring internal and external organizational skills, resources and functional competencies” (Teece & Pisano, 1994, p. 1).

## §2.3 - Organizational learning

In discussing the various dimensions of organizational capabilities, it has become clear that knowledge and learning play a big role in developing organizational capabilities. Especially in the second dimension, where the expertise exhibited in technical systems is the consequence of a long period in which an individual's knowledge is made more concrete and codified for the entire organization, organizational learning plays a considerable role. Therefore, it is essential to investigate organizational learning to find out how an organization learns, acquires knowledge, and codifies this for future use to gain a better understanding of these technical systems. Organizational learning can be seen as a change in the knowledge of an organization which occurs because of experience (Fiol & Lyles, 1985). This knowledge that is gathered throughout the years, can become noticeable by, for example, modifications in behaviours, routines, or cognitions (Fiol & Lyles, 1985). Organizational learning has been focused on developing the organizational capabilities that are in line with the objectives of an organization (Klein, 2009). The term individual learning is sometimes used to contrast with organizational learning, but in order to understand the latter, we must begin by exploring the former. The idea of an existing link between the two types of learning is that primarily an organization is comprised of individuals. Therefore the learning of these individual employees affects the learning of an entire organization. This is why, within the scope of this research, it could be assumed that organizations acquire and implement various capabilities through the individuals within their firm, and later on through the use of organizational capabilities, learn as an organization.

However, if only individuals in an organization learn from their experiences, organizational learning does not take place because the organization as a whole does not learn (Argote, 2011). The knowledge gathered by individuals within a firm should be stored by the firm so that other employees also have access to this knowledge, only then can the experiences of individuals in the firm result in organizational learning and technical systems can be formed. This knowledge can be stored in a diversity of knowledge depositories, for example in tools, routines, social networks and transactive memory systems (Argote & Ingram, 2000; Walsh & Ungson, 1991). Three different sub-processes can be distinguished within the overall process of organizational learning, creating, retaining and transferring knowledge. When, due to experience, the individuals within an organization learn something

new, this creates new knowledge for the organization; therefore this is the creation of knowledge. This knowledge can then be saved so that it can endure over time; this is retaining the knowledge. When this knowledge has been acquired by experience, and the organization has managed to store this knowledge, it can also be sent from one part of an organization to another part; this is the transferring of knowledge. Transferring knowledge means that one department of an organization is influenced by the experiences of other departments, which allows departments to learn from each other (Argote & Ingram, 2000). When looking at the technical systems dimension that is part of an organizational capability, it is thus not enough to merely look at how the knowledge and learning is retained in the organization, but how this knowledge is created and transferred should also be addressed in this research in order to get an accurate overview of acquiring and implementing organizational capabilities.

## §2.4 - Stakeholder marketing

Hult et al. (2011) show that the majority of marketing research in the period between 1985 and 2009 had focused primarily on a single stakeholder, instead of taking a multi-stakeholder approach. The articles that were investigated by Hult et al. (2011) showed a pattern of confirmation that involving customers in the decision making processes of a firm could have positive influences for the firm's financial performance (e.g. Deshpandé, Farley, & Webster, 1993; Han, Kim & Srivastava, 1998; Slater & Narver, 1994). The considerable focus on the customers, however, could lead to missing out on other relevant stakeholders that can also have a tremendous impact on the performance of the business. In order to avoid that a firm places itself at a disadvantage compared to its competitors by only focusing on customers, the concept of stakeholder marketing has been introduced (Hult et al., 2011).

As previously mentioned, the definition of stakeholder marketing is “activities within a system of social institutions and processes for facilitating and maintaining value through exchange relationships with multiple stakeholders” (Hult et al., 2011, p. 57). The definition of stakeholder marketing already suggests that for firms to optimally engage in stakeholder marketing, it is required to develop relationships and shared values with multiple other stakeholders besides only the customers. A firm takes part in a system of social exchanges with other firms, requiring firms to focus on creating value so they can reach their



performance objectives (Hult et al., 2011). The other stakeholders in this system of interdependent stakeholders could be positively influenced by this diverse network of stakeholders (Gummesson, 2007). However, they are themselves also involved in the co-creation of value (Sheth & Usley, 2007; Lusch & Vargo, 2006). As previously mentioned, research on stakeholder importance up until now has primarily viewed a firm as maintaining relationships with each stakeholder separately. This is why a new perspective on managing stakeholders, transitioning from traditional marketing to stakeholder marketing, was required.

Firstly, traditional marketing views the interests of stakeholders as independent of other stakeholders' interests (Hillebrand et al., 2015). For stakeholder marketing this is no longer the case, since it addresses the interests of various stakeholders to be interrelated. This also means that stakeholders have more interactions, both directly and indirectly, with each other than assumed by the traditional marketing practice (Rowley, 1997; Neville & Menguc, 2006). Therefore, actions related to one specific stakeholder could also have an influence on the relationship with other stakeholders. Secondly, the traditional marketing practice has assumed that various stakeholders differ in their importance to the firm, with customers taking the role of most important stakeholder, sort of a "customer-is-king" perspective. Stakeholder marketing practice takes the perspective that it is not always customers' interests that should be addressed to generate the most income, but that other stakeholders, and the combination of other stakeholders, also plays an important role. Finally, the traditional marketing practice argued that "value is created by the firm offering something of value to the customer" (Hillebrand et al., 2015, p. 414). Stakeholder marketing, on the other hand, argues that the cocreation of value happens with more stakeholders besides the customers. The entire system of stakeholders is involved in creating value, and should thus be the focus of research.

A central premise from stakeholder marketing is that it is necessary to try to align the various interests and purposes in the web of stakeholders, even when these interests may be conflicting with each other. In case that conflicts arise, the firm should aim for resolution and make sure that potential clashes in stakeholder interests are appropriately dealt with. In order to achieve this, a firm might need a very distinct set of organizational capabilities, namely stakeholder marketing capabilities.

## **Stakeholder marketing capabilities**

Currently, it is still unknown which organizational capabilities are required to engage in stakeholder marketing properly, how these stakeholder capabilities look like and how they can be put to use, given that it is a relatively new development in the academic environment. However, Hillebrand et al. (2015) have proposed three stakeholder marketing capabilities which might potentially have been acquired by firms that seem to do well when it comes to stakeholder marketing. These three stakeholder marketing capabilities are systems thinking, paradoxical thinking, and democratic thinking (Hillebrand et al., 2015).

Systems thinking has originated from the identified transition in the marketing practice, namely from traditional marketing to stakeholder marketing, from one way relationships between a firm and a stakeholder to exchange relationships where the complexity of value creation is higher (Hillebrand et al., 2015). Complex exchange has been one of the key elements of social network theory and is particularly involved with how the different participants in a stakeholder network are interrelated (Emerson, 1981; Granovetter, 1985). The complexity of value exchange is influenced by the role that other stakeholder play in the value exchange relationship. If more other stakeholders are required in order to achieve a certain balance in the overall stakeholder network, this means that the complexity of value exchange is higher. If this complexity of value exchange is high, looking at the exchange relationship between only two stakeholders at a time, which was and still is the case in the traditional marketing practice, is too limiting. This is where stakeholder marketing and systems thinking as a stakeholder capability come into place.

Systems thinking facilitates firms in getting a thorough understanding of these complex exchange relationships within a network of stakeholders that surrounds the firm, which is the essential requirement for strengthening the relationship with its stakeholders (Hillebrand et al., 2015). More and more organizations find themselves in a value exchange with a high complexity. However, these connections with other stakeholders in the stakeholder network are required to co-create value with stakeholders. Therefore, firms in the case of a more complex exchange for value creation, need to understand that value is created more indirectly. This process can be supported if a firm is able to take into account all of the stakeholders that affect the firm and realize that these stakeholders are related to each other (Bhattacharya & Korschun, 2008). This is the primary purpose of systems thinking, understanding the whole stakeholder value system. Stakeholder capabilities cannot be useful

before all the stakeholders that play a role have been identified. Therefore this should be the start of systems thinking (Hillebrand et al., 2015). The stakeholder power grid can facilitate in identifying the stakeholders of a firm. This model identifies stakeholders in the categories of urgency, influence, and authority (Mitchell, Agle, & Wood, 1997). However, systems thinking does not stop at merely identifying the stakeholders, how various stakeholders are related to each other also plays a role in systems thinking (Hillebrand et al., 2015).

The second proposed stakeholder capability, paradoxical thinking, originated from the identified transition in the marketing practice that tension within a network of stakeholders is increasingly explicit instead of implicit (Hillebrand et al., 2015). Each stakeholder in a stakeholder network has different norms and values, culture, and ways of doing business. This in return will create tension in a network (Oliver, 1991; Neville & Menguc, 2006). Whether this tension is implicit or explicit depends on the extent to which the stakeholders in a stakeholder network make their conflicting interests known to other stakeholders in the network. In the current, digital age companies have more possibilities to express their interests than in the past, making the tensions more explicit (Laszlo, Sherman, Whalen, & Ellison, 2005). Focusing on only one stakeholder at a time, as is the case in traditional marketing, does not allow firms to deal with the described explicit tension. In order to manage the tension between various stakeholders, paradoxical thinking has been proposed as a stakeholder marketing capability.

Paradoxical thinking can facilitate firms in adequately assessing the interests that the other stakeholders in the network of stakeholders have, and being able to respond accordingly to these interests, even when they are not aligned with other stakeholders' interests and thus cause tension (Hillebrand et al., 2015). The fact that these stakeholder interests are not aligned at all times may lead to conflicts between various stakeholders. Hillebrand et al. (2015) discuss two different approaches when it comes to firms dealing with conflicts. The first one is for firms to use logical thinking, the purpose of which is to arrive at a single result to resolve the conflict (Westenholz, 1993). However, this approach has its limitations because it is assumed that there is one ideal solution, which leads in many cases of traditional marketing to the voice of the customer as being favoured (Hillebrand et al., 2015). Another option is paradox theory. Paradox theory suggests that conflicts may be resolved more efficiently by addressing multiple interests at the same time (Smith & Lewis, 2011). Paradox theory accepts that there might not be one superior solution to resolve a conflict, contrary to

the assumption of logical thinking. These various tensions might provide opportunities to learn from conflicts between stakeholders.

Paradoxical thinking could facilitate in the process of learning from conflicts between stakeholders because this capability is focused on competing stakeholder interests and learning from the conflicts that these competing interests bring (Hillebrand et al., 2015). Hillebrand et al. (2015) suggest that “by embracing stakeholder tension, firms become more receptive to new ideas, obtain a deeper understanding of opposing viewpoints, and question long-held assumptions, which results in better decisions that are understood and accepted by stakeholders” (Hillebrand et al., 2015, p. 418). This does require firms to reflect on the conflict together and negotiate a solution in which all stakeholders perceive some benefit. However, for a firm to accept and learn from tension with other stakeholders, paradoxical thinking requires the firm to have the practices, constructions, and mechanisms in place to be able to find out and process this conflicting information (Smith & Lewis, 2011). For paradoxical thinking, it is required that a firm is able to remain calm when tension arises and avoid negative emotional responses toward the tension (Huy, 1999). Hillebrand et al. (2015) argue that in doing so, firms will be more open to new ideas, gain more understanding for stakeholders’ views in the stakeholder network, and allows them to reflect on their own long held presumptions. In taking this approach the main purpose of paradoxical thinking can be accomplished, having all the stakeholders in a stakeholder network understand and recognize the interests of other stakeholders in the network, and turning conflict in a situation where every stakeholders advances at least a little bit compared to the situation of conflict.

The third and final transition in the marketing practice that Hillebrand et al. (2015) identified and lead to proposing the three stakeholder marketing capabilities, is the transition from centralized to dispersed control. Centralized control is the situation in which the firm on its own controls the marketing decisions entirely. However, with an increased understanding of the influence of multiple stakeholders in the process of value creation, came the realisation that a multiplicity of stakeholders often need to work together to co-create value (Adner, 2012). Control over marketing decisions becomes more dispersed when other stakeholders in the system of stakeholders can exert more influence on marketing decisions. If the amount of dispersion in a network of stakeholders is high, this leads to a situation where it becomes increasingly less clear where the boundaries between different stakeholders can be drawn (Ashkenas, 1999). Firms that find themselves in a stakeholder network with a high dispersion

of control, need to understand that they might no longer have full control over marketing decisions being made and that they need to engage other stakeholders in this process. This is where democratic thinking comes into place.

Democratic thinking is a stakeholder marketing capability that could help firms in managing a stakeholder network with a higher dispersion of control. Democratic thinking is focused on involving stakeholders in the decision making processes in order to boost the relationships with stakeholders, leading to an increase in the achieved support from the firm's stakeholders (Hillebrand et al., 2015). In recent years, more stakeholders have been able to influence the marketing decisions of other organizations (Chakravorti, 2010; Day, 2011). The capability of democratic thinking refers to the sharing of marketing choices with multiple other stakeholders. Sharing control over important marketing decisions might not come naturally to some firms; democracy theory could facilitate in smoothening this transition (Dahl, 1989). Democratic thinking could primarily facilitate in distinguishing which subjects should be decided democratically. Therefore, a firm should know which stakeholders have a genuine interest and should be included in the decision making process. In order for stakeholders to participate in marketing decisions, they should also have access to relevant information (Dahl, 1989). However, this does not mean that all information should be shared without prior thought, only information that allows stakeholders to co-create value (Hillebrand et al., 2015). Firms need to find out themselves which level of democracy is required in a specific situation and develop their own systems to assess the required level of democracy for certain decisions (Hillebrand et al., 2015).

In this paragraph, an overview have been provided in the transitions that have been identified in the marketing practice and the proposed stakeholder capabilities to deal with and benefit from these transitions. However, these stakeholder capabilities have been a theoretical concept up until now. Hence, many questions relating to stakeholder capabilities remain and should be explored thoroughly. Therefore, this research aims to investigate how these stakeholder capabilities look like and how do they work in the local tourism industry.

## Chapter 3: Methods

This research set out to investigate stakeholder capabilities in practice empirically, to explore what these capabilities look like and how these capabilities work in the local tourism industry. This research took an exploratory approach (Stebbins, 2001). Given the explorative nature of the research question, it would not have been possible to come up with standardized procedures and specific variables used in quantitative research since not enough was known about stakeholder capabilities yet. Therefore, a qualitative methodology was a better fit for the current study (Strauss & Corbin, 1990).

In order to obtain a deeper insight into a complex social issue that is managing stakeholders, a case study in cooperation with the Driving Force was conducted (Yin, 2014). The Driving Force provided the researcher with a list of organizations that could be interviewed and facilitated the scheduling of interviews with employees of these organizations. The two stakeholder networks from which the organizations were chosen were Vinkeveen and Texel, both of which were targeted by the Driving Force to implement the Linda. This meant that the Driving Force was indeed able to provide the researcher with a list of organizations for interviews since they were already in contact with the organizations of both stakeholder networks. Because stakeholder capabilities were relatively new in the academic literature, interviews were used to discover how and why specific decisions related to managing stakeholders are taken and in which context this takes place (Noor, 2008). Interviews allow for the researcher to analyse participants thoroughly. Investigating stakeholder capabilities via in-depth interviews can provide a basis for future theory testing (Saunders & Thornhill, 2009).

Qualitative research allows for gathering in-depth knowledge about a specific topic (Mayring, 2010). A qualitative approach is appropriate when investigating smaller samples and focusing on newer topics, about which less data and knowledge is available (Hammarberg, Kirkman & de Lacey, 2016). This method was therefore well applicable to the topic of this research. Interviewing individual employees from the organizations allowed for the gathering of insight into the stakeholder capabilities that can be found within the investigated organizations. The inductive nature of qualitative research leads to studies that are driven by the data, instead of by theory (Taylor & Bogdan, 1998). Allowing this research

to be mainly driven by data, made it a good fit with the explorative research question at hand. However, a theoretical framework still had to be provided, as has been done in the previous chapter of this paper. This theoretical framework could then be translated into an interview protocol to make sure that the relevant subjects were discussed during the interviews.

### **Respondent selection**

The focus of this research was on organizations within the local tourism industry. Some criteria for the respondents was required beforehand to make sure that adequate data was gathered. The organizations in the cases had to be geographically close to each other, so that they were part of the same stakeholder network. This created the possibility for a stakeholder network to benefit from a network innovation such as the Linda, to spread tourism more evenly throughout the local stakeholder network and prevent mass tourism. Moreover, the local tourism stakeholder network where the interviews were conducted, had to consist of at least 4-5 actors so that an adequate amount of data could be gathered. Furthermore, it was important that not all organizations were part of the same branch of business. In a local stakeholder network a variety of organizations can be found such as museums, restaurants, activity planners etc. If all organizations had been for example restaurants, the focus of the research could have switched from a local stakeholder network, to a restaurant environment. This could have implications for the research since the Linda is a product for all organizations within an entire stakeholder network, not just for restaurants.

In order to investigate the stakeholder marketing capabilities, interviews were conducted with managers/directors/other employees of the organisations within the two stakeholder networks of Vinkeveen and Texel. These interviews had to be conducted with employees with sufficient knowledge about the stakeholder capabilities used within the companies, employees who had experience with interacting with and managing stakeholders. By taking this condition into account, it improved the likelihood that the interviewee had enough knowledge about the organizational capabilities within the company when it comes to stakeholder marketing.

## **Data collection**

This research gathered data via interviews with organisations that are active in the local tourism industry in one of the two stakeholder networks. Due to the COVID-19 crisis, these interviews had to be conducted via Skype or Zoom. Additionally, secondary data was gathered by making observations within the Driving Force, listening in on phone calls of the Driving Force with members of the stakeholder network, and by receiving e-mails of members of the stakeholder networks. This secondary data concerned additional information about cooperating with stakeholders. Gathering data from multiple sources about the same subject, allowed for triangulation of the data, both insights from the interviews as well as from the secondary data can be combined (Flick, 2009).

To support the explorative nature of the research question and to make the voices of the organizations heard with thorough qualitative data, interviews were an adequate way to get insight into the stakeholder capabilities that have been developed within the organizations. In-depth interviews have taken place with employees, board members, and owners of organizations within the two stakeholder networks. In total, five interviews were conducted with organizations in Texel, and two with organizations in Vinkeveen. To prevent overlooking specific stakeholders and eventually stakeholder capabilities, it was essential to get rich and in-depth data (Bryman, 2012). Since the research question is explorative, the interview protocol had to be flexible (Silverman, 2006). Therefore, completely determining the questions and possible answers in advance could have been too limiting, calling for an unstructured or semi-structured interview protocol. This research required an interview approach which sets some predetermined subjects that necessarily needed to be discussed together with some leading questions, but also required an approach which was still flexible enough to allow the interviewer to go more in-depth in certain aspects of the interview and allowed for follow up questions to clarify answers. Therefore, a semi-structured interview approach seemed to be the most appropriate interview style (Lampard, 2001). Following a semi-structured interview allowed the researcher to define guiding questions beforehand, but still provided the flexibility that was required to acquire in-depth data about a relatively new concept. The interview protocol can be found in Appendix 1.

The interview protocol facilitated in the above-mentioned guiding of the interview. Focusing on the specific network innovation, the Linda, brought focus to the interview protocol, it made the questions more concrete for the respondents. The interview protocol



aimed to get sufficient insight into the employee knowledge and skills, the technical systems, the managerial systems, and the norms and value that constitute an organizational capability. These four dimensions of an organizational capability were investigated by focusing on the identification of stakeholders by an organisation, managing these identified stakeholders, and involving the stakeholders in the decision making processes. The interview protocol started with a general introduction to understand the position of the employee within the organization. After the introduction, each of the four dimensions of an organizational capability were discussed separately. By focusing on these four dimensions the organizational capabilities could be thoroughly investigated. For example to find out more about systems thinking, which is the understanding of the stakeholder value system, a starting question was asked about the awareness of the organization about which other stakeholders played a role in the decision of the organization to implement the Linda or not. If the organization showed to have an understanding of other stakeholders that played a role in this decision, follow up sub-questions would be asked about how this particular knowledge was created, retained, and transferred within the organization. This process took place for all dimensions of an organizational capability and for all three stakeholder capabilities. In total, seven interviews were conducted with organizations from the stakeholder networks of Texel and Vinkeveen. This amount of interviews is lower than originally set out for this research. Unfortunately the Covid-19 pandemic of 2020 negatively impacted the possibility to gather data via interviews in both of the stakeholder networks. The data-gathering process of the research directly coincided with the busiest period for the organizations within both stakeholder networks after having been forced to close down for an extensive period due to Covid-19. Therefore, it took a lot of time and effort to find organizations that were willing and had the time to participate in an interview.

Additionally, secondary data in the form of e-mails, observations at the Driving Force, and phone calls between the Driving Force and members of the stakeholder networks were gathered (see Table 2). The e-mails that were gathered in the process of data gathering were related to reasons why actors within the stakeholder network were not willing to implement the Linda. Insight from these e-mails helped the researcher in understanding the underlying dynamics within the stakeholder network and what reasons might also have played a role in the decision to implement the network innovation or not. Observations were gathered by the researcher himself. The researcher spent a total of three and a half days at the office of the Driving Force, in which he made observations for three whole days and the other

half day was purely for interviews with employees. The observations were made by spending three entire days at the same desks as three employees of the Driving Force that were responsible for bringing the network innovation into the stakeholder networks. This meant that the researcher could get close to people that were very involved in both stakeholder networks and stood in regular contact with actors in these stakeholder networks. The researcher made notes of almost everything that was discussed during the day, and asked additional questions about certain interesting things to the employees in an informal manner. During the period in which the observations were gathered, the researcher also had the chance to listen in on phone calls between employees of the Driving Force and actors of the stakeholder networks. Transcripts of these phone calls are also provided.

The following data were collected:

Primary data:

<b>Respondent ID</b>	<b>Vinkeveen/ Texel</b>	<b>Name organisation</b>	<b>Name interviewee</b>	<b>Length of the interview (in minutes)</b>	<b>Currently participating in app</b>
D1	Texel	Ecomare	Anneke Schrama	48	Yes
D2	Texel	Beachclub Texel	Koen Witte	32	Yes
D3	Texel	Café De Slock	Sita Mijwaard	23	Yes
D4	Texel	VVV Texel	Frank Spooren	58	Yes
D5	Texel	Walvisvaardershuisje	Erwin Capitain	32	No
D6	Vinkeveen	Scuba Academie	Cees den Toom	29	Yes
D7	Vinkeveen	Eetcafé De Schans	Peter Otten	55	No
D8	Texel	The Driving Force	Maarten de Haas &	32	-

			Stijn Sprenkels		
D9	Vinkeveen	The Driving Force	Maarten de Haas & Stijn Sprenkels	24	-
D10	Vinkeveen	The Driving Force	Oscar van Dormalen	57	-

*Table 1: Overview of the direct data gathered during the research.*

Secondary data:

<b>Respondent ID</b>	<b>Vinkeveen/Texel</b>	<b>Type of data</b>	<b>Data provided by</b>	<b>Length of data</b>
I1	Texel	E-mail	VVV Texel	1 page
I2	Texel	E-mail	Zeilschool de Eilander	1 page
I3	Both	Observations	Researcher	5 pages
I4	Texel	Phone call	Oscar	14 minutes
I5	Vinkeveen	Phone call	Oscar	23 minutes

*Table 2: Overview of the indirect data gathered during the research.*

## **Data analysis**

All the interviews were recorded and fully transcribed for which the permission of the respondents was asked beforehand. To analyse the transcribed interviews the qualitative data analysis software Atlas.ti was used. Assigning codes to the transcribed interviews was done manually. Coding was based upon the literature about organizational capabilities, organizational learning, and stakeholder marketing capabilities. The purpose was to give all relevant information a useful code. However, if this was not possible, a memo was assigned to this particular piece of information so that this could later still be assigned to a code or translated into a new code. The coding procedure was an iterative process, going back and forth various times to make sure that all relevant information was extracted from the data and that the categories of codes were exhaustive and mutually exclusive (Bailey, 1994). The emerging theoretical concepts were then linked and compared to the proposed stakeholder marketing capabilities. An overview of all the open codes can be found in Appendix 2.

## Chapter 4: Results

In the upcoming chapter the results that follow from the gathered data will be discussed. For each capability a table will be provided in which the constructs per dimension of the stakeholder capabilities can be found. For all of these constructs it will be discussed after the table how these constructs are defined, how they look like in practice and were possible, an example will be given.

### §4.1 – Systems thinking

<b>Employee knowledge &amp; skills</b>	<b>Technical systems</b>	<b>Managerial systems</b>	<b>Norms &amp; values</b>
Knowledge about identifying stakeholders (D1, D3, D4, D5)	Online stakeholder platform (D1, D3, D4)	Membership in stakeholder networks/associations (D1, D2, D3, D4, D7)	Social responsibility (D1)
Networking skills (D1, D7)			Importance of stakeholder engagement (D1)
			Customer-friendliness (D1)
			Importance of networking and collaborating with stakeholders (D6)
			Importance of the big picture (D4, D7)

*Table 3: Identified constructs related to each of the dimensions of an organizational capability for systems thinking.*

## Employee knowledge and skills

- Knowledge about identifying stakeholders

This construct refers to the employees' knowledge in the area of stakeholder identification. It is used by employees when deciding which stakeholders are relevant for the organization. This knowledge has been developed through years of experience in the local tourism industry and through examining the different areas for which stakeholders can be relevant (e.g. cooperation). In turn, this helps the employees with identifying stakeholders. A clarification of this construct was provided by organization D4:

*“What is nice about Texel is that it is easy to have a clear overview. Most people know each other relatively well. In general, I know who I am dealing with. Depending on the subject I can make an estimation which organizations will have trouble with something. The communication lines are very short. We have developed a lot of experience with this.”* (D4, p. 108)

- Networking skills

Another employee knowledge and skill for systems thinking that was identified was a networking skill. This meant that the employees possess the right skills to network with stakeholders in the stakeholder network, which provides the organization with relevant knowledge about developments related to stakeholders within the network, which in turn is relevant for the identification of stakeholders. A specific example of this is the maintaining of a close connection with the municipality. By being able to keep in close touch with the municipality, employees within organization D7 were able to profit from knowledge about stakeholders that was acquired by the municipality. This skill meant that a lot of the work of identifying stakeholders was taken care of purely by having the skill to acquire this knowledge from the municipality. Therefore, being able to approach the municipality and extract this information was useful for systems thinking.

## Technical systems

- Online stakeholder platform

An online stakeholder platform refers to a technical system which facilitates storing and codifying knowledge about stakeholders where employees of the organizations can find information which facilitates the identification of relevant stakeholders. Via this online system, organizations are able to acquire knowledge about new and existing stakeholders in the stakeholder network. One way in which an organization such as organization D1 had

access to relevant information about stakeholders in the stakeholder network, is via an online system. In this particular case this online system was from the TOP, which is the Texel entrepreneur association. So even though this system was not necessarily owned by organization D1 themselves, D1 had access to it and was provided with a lot of relevant knowledge about stakeholders in this way. This platform provided information about stakeholders from various business branches. Another example of an online stakeholder platform which an organization such as D3 made use of to gather insight into stakeholders in the stakeholder network is the Linda application of the Driving Force itself. This is also a codified system in which it is easy to gain insight in which organization joins the application and therefore could be a relevant new stakeholder. However, this is a bit more limited than the previously discussed system since the application consists of far less stakeholders than the online system of the TOP. Therefore, the online system of the TOP seems to be a more thorough technical system to gain insight in stakeholders.

#### Managerial systems

- Membership in stakeholder networks/associations

Membership in different stakeholder networks and associations is a central managerial system for reaching stakeholders. Being active in these various associations allows the organizations to easily gather new knowledge about stakeholders in the local stakeholder network. A lot of the organizations that have been interviewed indicated to be in some form involved in networking organizations. This varied from entrepreneurial associations to local networking organizations. Membership in such organizations helped with the identification of stakeholders via regular one on one meetings with members of such association as is the case for example for organization D4, or simply attending networking events that are organized for the local stakeholder network. During such events the organizations focus on identifying new stakeholders by means of networking and information exchange.

#### Norms and values

- Social responsibility

Being socially responsible is a value that was related to providing a service in which society's interests were taken into account. That includes providing information with a societally and scientifically relevant content to customers. In order to acquire this information, the employees are expected to identify and connect with various stakeholders that could facilitate

obtaining this information, which in turn is relevant for systems thinking because it encourages employees to identify new stakeholders.

- Importance of stakeholder engagement

The importance of stakeholder engagement refers to keeping close and active contact with stakeholders. This is useful for systems thinking because organizations which have this value are better able to understand that stakeholders need to be included, which can lead to the identification of new stakeholders. For instance, organization D1 had been able to identify multiple relevant stakeholders and for them it was important to keep a close contact with them on topics relevant for the organization's day to day business. More specifically, the organization realized that for them it was important to have information about tourism numbers on the island (e.g. how many visitors were expected on a given day). This led them to seek contact with relevant stakeholders, in this case the VVV and Teso, who could provide them with the necessary knowledge. This collaboration developed in an exchange relationship where the parties were able to benefit from each other's knowledge. Therefore, the value of stakeholder engagement facilitated their ability to identify stakeholders.

- Customer-friendliness

Being customer-friendly refers to assuring that the customers are getting the most satisfactory experience that the company can provide. The organizations which scored high on this norm, wanted to make sure that their tourists were getting the most of their services and in order to achieve that, the companies concluded that collaboration with other stakeholders is essential. These organizations were able to understand that value creation for customers requires a collaboration with a multitude of stakeholders. Therefore, it was important to be able to identify relevant stakeholders with whom they could collaborate in order to improve the touristic experience of their clients. This meant that they were able to consider both their own as well as the needs of their clients in order to make the decision with which companies on the island a collaboration could be developed. In turn, the need of creating connections for collaboration created the need for identification of new stakeholders. This is how the norm client-friendliness aided the companies with the identification of stakeholders.

- Importance of networking and collaborating with stakeholders

The importance of networking and collaborating with stakeholders refers to a company's philosophy that creating a good network and opportunities for a collaboration is essential for

a successful business. This central value stimulates the companies to identify relevant stakeholders with whom they are able to build meaningful collaborative relationships. For instance, organization D6 placed the importance of networking and collaborating with stakeholders as central to their company's value system. In order to meet this norm, they expanded their search for relevant stakeholders beyond the borders of the local stakeholder network, and included nationally positioned organizations. Organization D6 emphasized the importance of networking and collaborating as follows:

*“It is important. Without the help of other organizations you will need to build a very extensive network by yourself and you can horribly overestimate yourself in this.”* (D6, p. 130)

- Importance of the big picture

The importance of the big picture means that the companies are focused on value creation for the whole region and not only for their own business. These companies are able to realize that if the region thrives as a touristic attraction, this will bring their own business more customers. This value is related to the realization that the whole is bigger than the sum of its parts and therefore if the whole region does well, this will bring more profit to the independent businesses. This led the companies which recognized this value to realize that there was another stakeholder that needed to be included, which they had previously overlooked, namely the locals on the island. Due to the organizations' focus on the big picture, they were able to identify Texel's inhabitants as a new stakeholder. Similar to D4, organization D7 was also able to look beyond merely their own interests and recognized the importance of improving the stakeholder network as a whole. This helped them with identifying other parties within the stakeholder network as a relevant stakeholder, with whom they aim to achieve this collective goal.



<b>Organization</b>	<b>Employee knowledge &amp; skills</b>	<b>Technical systems</b>	<b>Managerial systems</b>	<b>Norms &amp; values</b>	<b>Overall score</b>
D1	High	Medium	Medium	High	High
D2	-	-	Medium	-	Low
D3	Medium	Medium	Medium	-	Medium
D4	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium
D5	Medium	-	-	-	Low
D6	-	-	-	Low	Low
D7	Low	-	Medium	Medium	Medium

*Table 4: The extent to which a specific dimension of an organizational capability has been identified within an organization for the capability of systems thinking.*

For the capability of systems thinking, it can be concluded that it was formed by all four dimensions of an organizational capability. However, the technical systems in which knowledge about this capability could be stored, were not particularly well developed within the investigated organizations. Only a few of the organizations had a certain technical system which was used by employees to store knowledge about the capability of systems thinking. Moreover, only in one of these cases was a system developed and maintained by the organization itself. In the other cases the organizations had access to the system of another organization, namely the TOP. Therefore, even though the relevant knowledge might be found within the organization for now, most of the organizations are not involved with storing this knowledge in technical systems for future use.

## §4.2 – Paradoxical thinking

Employee knowledge & skills	Technical systems	Managerial systems	Norms & values
Knowledge about identifying tensions within the stakeholder network (D1, D3, D4, D5, D6, D7)		Stakeholder meetings (D1, D2, D4)	Importance of a harmonic relationship with stakeholders (D2, D3, D5, D6)
Tension-resolution skills (D1)		Advisory role within the stakeholder network (D4)	
			Employee autonomy (D4)

*Table 5: Identified constructs related to each of the dimensions of an organizational capability for paradoxical thinking.*

### Employee Knowledge and Skills

- Knowledge about identifying tensions within the stakeholder network

Knowledge about tensions within the stakeholder network refers to the knowledge that employees have acquired with regards to the identification of tensions. In order to be able to identify potential tensions within the stakeholder network, the employees require insight into the problems the stakeholder network has to deal with. Almost every company in the stakeholder network of Texel was able to identify a source of tension that concerned most of their important stakeholders (e.g. shareholders, employees, other entrepreneurs, the locals on the island). They all identified over-tourism as a source of tension and an existing paradox. On one hand, tourists were essential for the thriving economy of the island, on the other hand too much tourism led to discontent within the locals and reduced the satisfaction of clients.

- Tension-resolution skills

This refers to the employees' abilities to deal with the tension. The employees are flexible and creative in their solutions and are able to make good use of the company's resources in order to achieve efficient and efficacious tension-resolution. For instance, in the case of D1

the employees were able to take the perspective of the local people on the island (previously identified as an important stakeholder) in order to understand their point of view on the issue of over-tourism. Additionally, they made use of negotiation in order to agree on a strategy to tackle the tension. Moreover, their good communication capabilities led them to strategically use their connections within the municipality in order to achieve tension resolution.

*“We have good contacts with the councillor and the mayor, for us these are the parties where we need to lobby. They need to say that this is enough and we have enough houses on Texel. For us this will be the way to achieve it, via the politics”.* (D1, p. 86).

#### Technical systems

- No technical systems were found related to paradoxical thinking

#### Managerial systems

- Stakeholders meetings

Stakeholder meetings refer to regular meetings held with stakeholders as a way to manage information about tensions within the stakeholder network. Organizing regular meetings with stakeholders helps organizations in their paradoxical thinking by gaining information about tensions and it offers an opportunity to explain to others how the organization feels about the tension and thus to manage the tension at least to some degree. The exchange of visions on the tension provides a tool for learning about the tension. For example, D1 had regular meetings with the policy makers on the island, the mayor and councillors, which helped D1 to identify the tension that played a considerable role on the island and allowed D1 to voice its own perspective on the tension.

- Advisory role within the stakeholder network

An advisory role within the stakeholder network refers to an organization assuming a central position within the stakeholder network, which involves providing other companies with information and knowledge about existing tensions and giving useful advice on how to deal with and learn from tensions. Through this managerial system the organization is able to keep a close contact with stakeholders within the network, which in turn enhances the process of forming knowledge about the tension and learning from the opposing points of view that cause it. For instance, organization D4 took on a sort of advisory role within the stakeholder network which greatly influenced the way in which knowledge about the tension of over-tourism on the island and the resolving of the tension was formed. Moreover, this knowledge

that was formed was used to share with other stakeholders in the stakeholder network which were not yet aware of the tension. This advisory role not only helped with developing and sharing knowledge about the tension, but also allowed the organization to exert influence on other stakeholders to take certain actions to resolve the tension.

#### Norms & values

- Importance of a harmonic relationship with stakeholders

The importance of a harmonic relationship with stakeholders refers to appreciating the significance of keeping a good relationship with stakeholders within the network. This comes from a belief that in order to improve the stakeholder network, it is necessary to cooperate with fellow entrepreneurs. This norm in turn influences how organizations accept and learn from tensions. For instance, organizations which associated with this norm found it important to keep a good atmosphere between the different stakeholders on the island. This meant that in order to achieve this, it was important to take their interests in account. For instance, organization D5 had deliberately chosen for a policy of always hiring local Texel entrepreneurs if they needed something within the company done (e.g. reconstruction) and provided a free pass for locals to their museum. In this way they contribute to a harmonic relationship between locals and entrepreneurs which sometimes suffers under the pressure of over tourism. This norm and value is similar to the importance of the bigger picture, but differs in the way that the bigger picture is more concerned about improving the stakeholder network to give tourists a better experience and the importance of a harmonic stakeholder network is more concerned with the fact that the whole stakeholder network should be able to live with each other. This norm and value led organization D3 to take concrete action to resolve the tension of over tourism for example by cooperating in the application to help spreading tourists more evenly.

- Employee autonomy

Providing employees with autonomy consists of giving employees freedom and responsibility about decisions. Giving freedom to employees in the area of tension identification means that the employees are stimulated to autonomously gather knowledge about tensions within the stakeholder network that were not previously identified by the company. For instance, within organization D4 employees were given a maximum amount of freedom to be the manager of their own project. This also was the case when it came to identifying tensions within the stakeholder network, which resulted in employees being able to identify new sources of

tension. Therefore, this norm and value of employee autonomy greatly influenced the process of tension identification by the organization. This was also discussed in the following quote: “*Absolutely, you force them a little bit in a position that if they do not have this knowledge yet, they will focus more on it. That works very well.*” (D4, p. 113)

Organization	Employee knowledge & skills	Technical systems	Managerial systems	Norms & values	Overall score
D1	High	-	Medium	-	Medium
D2	-	-	Medium	High	Medium
D3	Medium	-	-	Medium	Low
D4	High	-	High	Low	Medium
D5	High	-	-	Medium	Medium
D6	Medium	-	-	Medium	Low
D7	Medium	-	-	-	Low

*Table 6: The extent to which a specific dimension of an organizational capability has been identified within an organization for the capability of paradoxical thinking.*

As for the capability of paradoxical thinking, it cannot be said that all dimensions of an organizational capability could be observed. Not a single technical system was found within the organization when it came to the capability of paradoxical thinking. Moreover, for this capability, the managerial systems that were put in place in order for the organizations to develop knowledge related to paradoxical thinking, were also less established. For paradoxical thinking, it was clear that the dominant dimensions of an organizational capability were both employee knowledge and skills as well as the norms and values. These dimensions both allowed organizations to identify tensions in the stakeholder network (via knowledge and skills), and assess their own position in this tension (via norms and values).

## §4.3 – Democratic thinking

Employee knowledge & skills	Technical systems	Managerial systems	Norms & values
Knowledge about the impact of stakeholders (D1, D3, D4, D6)		Stakeholder council (D4)	Importance of aligned principles (D2, D4, D5)
Knowledge about which information to share with whom (D4)			Transparency (D4)

Table 7: Identified constructs related to each of the dimensions of an organizational capability for democratic thinking.

### Employee knowledge & skills

- Knowledge about the impact of stakeholders

This knowledge refers to the employees considering the impact of different stakeholders on various marketing decisions. This in turn can be helpful when deciding to include a particular stakeholder in a marketing decision. For instance, employees within organization D4 were well aware of the more important stakeholders in the stakeholder network. Employees within this organization knew that in this case the VVV, the municipality and TOP were important stakeholders. Because this knowledge existed within the organization, they were able to decide whether or not these more important stakeholders should have an influence on the marketing decisions of the organizations, in this case the introduction of the Linda application of the Driving Force. Therefore, the knowledge of which stakeholders were more important to the organization, allowed the organization to determine who should have an influence on its marketing decisions. This was similar within organizations D3, D4 and D6. For organization D1, this became clear from the following statement:

*“The TOP is of course also participating, we found this important and also the municipality itself. Because it was put forward by the municipality, we found it more trustworthy. VVV, municipality and TOP were decisive for us to participate.” (D1, p. 84)*

- Knowledge about which information to share with whom

This knowledge refers to the employees comprehension of which information is relevant to share with a specific stakeholder. This means that when marketing decisions are to be made, which could affect the entire stakeholder network or certain specific stakeholders, this organization has the knowledge to determine which stakeholders should be made aware and should be involved in this decision. This knowledge has been gathered by employees through experience in working with the different stakeholders, getting to know them and their areas of expertise, and understanding how to make the decision whether certain information is relevant for them. For example, in the case of D4, information about the upcoming marketing decision by organization D4 was shared with these stakeholders, but, in return, insights of these stakeholders were also gathered by the organization so that organization D4 could use the insights of these stakeholders.

*“Often we test new ideas with our supervisory board, but sometimes I also call an entrepreneur from who I know that he will have his own opinion and also has an opinion about it. That kind of input we take with us in our own plan of action.” (D4, p. 112)*

#### Technical systems

- No technical systems were found related to democratic thinking.

#### Managerial systems

- Stakeholder council

A stakeholder council is a managerial system that refers to a council comprised of important stakeholders for the organization. This council allows for information and knowledge exchange about upcoming marketing decisions between the organization and its most important stakeholders. For instance, organization D1 had formed such council with whom they not only shared important information about marketing decisions but also included them when making the decisions. For instance, the municipality and the VVV formed an essential part of this council. Therefore, when it came to making marketing decisions like for example implementing a network innovation, the municipality was able to exert influence on the decision whether or not to do so. Additionally, the director of the VVV was consulted for his opinion on the matter before taking the final decision. Another example is the stakeholder council of organization D4 which was comprised of their three most important stakeholders - the municipality, TOP (the island’s entrepreneurial platform) and TESO (a transportation company). These stakeholders from different branches were involved in the making of

different decisions. They fulfilled an essential supervisory function for D4 and their insights were vital when making decisions about the stakeholder network, such as implementing a network innovation. Additionally, D4 shared important information with them which could impact the marketing decisions of the company. This was summed up in the following quote: *“These three stakeholders are involved in everything that we do as VVV. These organizations are also represented in the Supervisory Board to which I periodically report.”* (D4, p. 108)

#### Norms and values

- Importance of aligned principles

This value refers to the fact that when making the decision about sharing control with third parties, an organization finds it essential to have their principles aligned with the principles of these third parties. This means that when deciding on whether or not to include a third party into a marketing decision, the company will first consider whether the principles of the external party are in accordance with the company’s principles. If this is the case, the company is more likely to include the party into the marketing decision, and this is how this value facilitates democratic thinking. For instance, company D2 mentioned that having people with too many different principles and interests deciding on something would make it too difficult to reach a harmonious and unanimous decision. Therefore, it is important that external parties share values similar to these of the company.

- Transparency

Transparency refers to being open and straightforward with stakeholders of an organization. This value stimulated the organizations to share important information with the stakeholders and to be open to receiving feedback and to including them in making decisions.

Transparency should however not be blind, so this core value is also directly related to the ability of employees to decide with whom and how much information should be disclosed. Organization D4 indicated that being transparent about marketing decisions to its stakeholders was of the utmost importance.



<b>Organization</b>	<b>Employee knowledge &amp; skills</b>	<b>Technical systems</b>	<b>Managerial systems</b>	<b>Norms &amp; values</b>	<b>Overall score</b>
D1	Medium	-	-	-	Low
D2	-	-	-	Low	Low
D3	Medium	-	-	-	Low
D4	High	-	Medium	High	Medium
D5	-	-	-	Low	Low
D6	Medium	-	-	-	Low
D7	-	-	-	-	-

*Table 8: The extent to which a specific dimension of an organizational capability has been identified within an organization for the capability of democratic thinking.*

For the capability of democratic thinking it can be concluded that it was the least developed stakeholder marketing capability out of all three. Not only were there no technical systems to store knowledge about sharing control over marketing decisions, also the other three dimensions were not as prominent as was the case for the other two capabilities. Additionally there was less employee knowledge and skills related to democratic thinking and also less managerial systems put in place to gain this knowledge. Moreover, the norms and values that influenced the organizations in democratic thinking were more focused on why not to share control over marketing decisions, as opposed to sharing control over such decisions. For instance, some of the smaller companies feared that this could lead to them losing their independence to external parties.

## Chapter 5: Discussion

In the final chapter of this research, conclusions will be drawn and their implications for the field will be elaborated on. Thereafter, the limitations of the research will be discussed. The research will finish with providing some future research suggestions.

### §5.1 – Conclusions and implications

The research question of this thesis was:

*“What do stakeholder marketing capabilities look like in practice and how do they work in the local tourism industry?”*

The research focused on investigating the four dimensions of an organizational capability, namely employee knowledge and skills, technical systems, managerial systems and norms and values. These dimensions were researched for all three proposed organizational capabilities – systems thinking, paradoxical thinking and democratic thinking.

A central problem for this research was the fact that the three capabilities have represented a theoretical concept but not a lot was known about how they look and how they work in practice. By empirically investigating the capabilities in a real-life context, the present study provides more clarity with regards to what the capabilities look like. Focusing on the different dimensions of a capability provided a wholesome insight into their formation and working mechanisms. In the following paragraphs, the conclusions and implications per capability will be presented.

#### **Systems thinking**

As for systems thinking it can be concluded that most of the companies were able to identify relevant stakeholders and the influence that they exhibited on their company, which is the first stage of the capability. Different aspects of the capability dimensions were relevant for this process. For instance, most of the organizations had gathered relevant knowledge about essential stakeholders. This knowledge could for instance be cooperation-focused (e.g. examining the possibilities of creating meaningful cooperation opportunities with stakeholders). When it came to technical systems, few of the companies had access to a shared online system which provided them with information about relevant stakeholders.

When it comes to managerial systems, quite a few of the organizations were taking part in various stakeholder networks and associations. Finally, there were various norms and values relevant for the organizations which formed the basis of the other dimensions. Systems thinking was the only capability where all four dimensions of an organizational capability were observed. The findings suggest that it is possible that systems thinking may serve as the basic first capability that needs to be developed before the organizations can develop paradoxical and democratic thinking. Such pattern could be logical because systems thinking is concerned with identifying and linking stakeholders. Before companies can learn how to identify and learn from tensions or decide whether to include stakeholders in marketing decisions, it is necessary for them to first identify these stakeholders and learn how they are interrelated. Developing systems thinking to an extent may be a necessary first step for forming the basis for the other two capabilities. A possible chronological order in the development of the capabilities could have theoretical and practical implications. It could for instance be meaningful for managers interested in these concepts and their implementation in their own business. Meticulously investigating these relationships was however beyond the scope of this study.

### **Paradoxical thinking**

The paradoxical thinking capability is concerned with identifying and solving tensions within the stakeholder network. Many of the companies on Texel possessed relevant knowledge and skills related to paradoxical thinking. A central paradox for the island was over-tourism. Attracting visitors to the island was vital for the industry's survival but it was also a source of discontent for locals. Therefore, the companies that had acquired various knowledge and skills related to managing this tension, were more accepting to this tension and were better able to learn from it. When it comes to technical systems however, none were identified for any of the companies. Managerial systems were better developed across respondents. Finally, all organizations had identified central norms and values related to paradoxical thinking. For instance, the companies found it important to build and preserve harmonic relationships with other stakeholders. These norms and values stimulated the entrepreneurs to work towards fulfilling them which in turn stimulated the development of the other dimensions. Smith and Lewis (2011) argued that more efficient conflict resolution can be achieved by addressing multiple interests at the same time. This idea was confirmed when investigating the paradoxical thinking capability. More specifically, when considering the issue with overcrowding, the interviewed entrepreneurs addressed the interests of

customers, locals and shareholders. Additionally, by investigating the tensions within the stakeholder networks, it became clear that companies with a better developed paradoxical thinking capability were also more receptive to different viewpoints, which could in turn make them more accepting of innovative ideas, which according to Hillebrand et al. (2015) is an essential function of paradoxical thinking.

The results point to the idea that certain norms and values are strongly associated with the other elements of the capability. It became clear that companies which valued harmonic relationships with stakeholders, also had developed employee knowledge and skills or managerial systems related to these values. These findings suggest that there may be certain values that are more strongly associated with the development of the paradoxical thinking capability than other values. This would be a logical pattern which however requires further investigation in order to draw specific and practically and theoretically relevant conclusions. The concepts that were more strongly associated with the capability are the ones that are also directly drawn from its definition. For instance, valuing a harmonious network is related to the idea that in order for harmony to be achieved, different viewpoints may coexist and the actors need to learn to accept them and learn from them. Other concepts however such as employee autonomy, are more open to interpretation and their relation to paradoxical thinking is not as clear-cut.

### **Democratic thinking**

Finally, the democratic thinking capability was investigated. This capability is concerned with the decision-making process of whether stakeholders should be included in making marketing decisions and provided with knowledge about such decisions. Shortly, what factors are taken into account when considering whether or not to include external parties in marketing decisions by for example giving them voting rights. From the analysis it was concluded that this was the least developed capability across the interviewed organizations. Possible reasons for this were briefly mentioned in the results section, and included the fear of companies to lose their independence to external parties. Another less explicit explanation could be that, as discussed by Hillebrand et al. (2015), democratic thinking is less relevant for some contexts. The companies that were interviewed were generally small, with centralized control, little staff, and strong involvement of the owners in the day-to-day business. It is possible that for companies of this scope developing democratic thinking could be too complex and not necessarily advantageous. On the other hand, it is possible that because the people in charge had their hands full with managing day-to-day

tasks and activities, they simply had no time and resources to spend on the development of the capability of democratic thinking.

### **Dimensions of an organizational capability**

An important conclusion can be drawn about the development and employment of technical systems across capabilities. It became clear that this was the least well developed dimension. Only one technical system was uncovered when examining the systems thinking capability. One possible explanation for this finding is that companies first develop the other three dimensions, starting with norms and values, and leave the technical systems for last. Norms and values can be a logical starting point because if a company does not see something as significant and of core importance in the first place, it would not make sense to invest time and resources into the development of knowledge, skills and systems for it. Technical systems may come last because companies first want to gather the knowledge and assess its value and utility before making the decision to codify and store it for further use. This explanation also relates to the results for the systems thinking capability. This was the only capability where development of all four dimensions was identified. However, for the other capabilities most companies had developed a maximum of two dimensions, none of which was technical systems. This brings us to the conclusion that technical systems is indeed the last dimension to be developed across the examined companies.

Moreover, the literature suggests that the different dimensions may be reflected in various proportions in the different capabilities (Leonard-Barton, 1992). This means that for some companies the technical systems dimension may be more important/better developed than for other companies that rely more on, for example, employee knowledge and have a better developed skills and knowledge dimension (Leonard-Barton, 1992). The results of this study do reflect a similar pattern. While the technical systems dimension was relatively underdeveloped, the examination of the knowledge and skills dimension showed that it was better developed. Which elements of a capability are prioritized by a company depends on the industry, the needs and the goals of the company. For instance, a better developed employee knowledge and skills dimension may be more important than the technical systems dimension for companies that have a lot of personal contact with customers and other stakeholders, because such companies use their employees as a central tool. This is also reflected in some of the central values that were identified for the different capabilities, such as the importance of harmonic relationships and the importance of networking and collaborating with stakeholders. The employee knowledge and skills dimension seems to be more related to

these values than the technical systems dimension, which is relevant for the idea of Leonard-Barton (1992) that the norms and values dimension is manifested through the other dimensions. Therefore, giving priority to the development of employee knowledge and skills may be beneficial for companies that have a lot of personal contact with customers, such as companies from the tourism industry. However, developing a strong technical system may be essential for organizations within the technology sector that rely on properly stored and codified knowledge. Being able to distinguish which dimension to prioritize or develop first may be important for companies because it means that they have a clear insight into the needs of their business. This however does not mean that dimensions can be omitted nor neglected because a fully developed capability requires all four dimensions.

Finally, when investigating small companies it is sometimes difficult to disentangle capabilities from the competencies of individuals. This could also partially explain why it was easier to identify knowledge and skills, as well as norms and values, but more difficult to find systems.

### **General insights into stakeholder theory**

When relating the results of this study to stakeholder theory, it is important to note that it is a relatively abstract theory, which gives little practical and concrete insights to managers in how to implement it in practice. The current study provides better understanding of the building blocks of the capabilities and gives a starting point and basis for further studies.

Hult et al, 2011 claim that going beyond the dyadic firm-customer relationship can prove beneficial in the long-term. While supporting or denying this stance goes beyond the scope of this research, companies that showed an awareness for the importance of stakeholders other than clients, for instance companies that identified the value of the importance of the bigger picture, were also successful in finding collaboration partners and satisfying local people interests, as stated in the results.

According to Donaldson and Preston (1995) stakeholder theory serves three functions, namely a descriptive/empirical, an instrumental and a normative function. The current research served a descriptive/empirical function by investigating relevant stakeholders and how they were identified by the organizations. Additionally, this research showed that norms and values form the basis of a capability and are directly related to the other three dimensions, and therefore these capabilities are in their essence normative. The research lacks

information on the relationship and performance and therefore cannot conclude that the capabilities serve an instrumental function.

In conclusion, this study formed a starting point for the further investigating of stakeholder marketing's theoretical and practical implications in general and for the concretization for the three proposed capabilities formed by the four dimensions.

## §5.2 – Limitations

Although this research has been conducted as thoroughly as possible, it still has various limitations.

First of all, prior to conducting the research, the aim was to have interviews with more respondents from the local stakeholder networks, and therefore to be able to gather more direct data. However, given the fact that the research was of a qualitative nature, the 2020 coronavirus crisis has had a severe impact on the process of data collection. A lot of potential respondents were too busy with managing their business during the crisis and they were not able to provide an interview. Ideally, more direct data would have been gathered from more respondents and that would have increased the reliability and validity of the results. More data could have led to even more insights into what the capabilities look like, and how the organizations that were now not available for an interview made use of the capabilities that they had developed. Additionally, the period in which the data was gathered could have influenced the results. More specifically, if more companies and employees had been available for an interview, this could have uncovered more constructs relevant for the different capabilities, and could have revealed better developed constructs of the capabilities. For instance, analysing the results for the norms and values dimension of systems thinking uncovered a wide variety of different constructs, therefore additional interviews with more companies could have supplemented this knowledge and provided further insights into these constructs.

Secondly, knowledge about the particular ways in which the capabilities can benefit the relationship with stakeholders is still lacking. This refers to insights regarding the working mechanisms of the capabilities once they have been fully developed within a specific company. As most of the companies scored low or medium on the three capabilities,

it was not possible for the researcher to investigate how a fully developed capability could particularly contribute to the management of stakeholders. Therefore, even though it has been made clear what the capabilities look like, their precise contribution did not always become clear.

Thirdly, a limitation is also the fact that only one respondent per company could be interviewed. Employees may be biased and have different perspectives on as well as varying degrees of knowledge of a particular issue. Gathering insights from a single employee could potentially bias the results of the study.

Moreover, the size and structure of the organisations that were interviewed might be a limitation for the research. Almost all of the interviewed organisations were very small and local touristic organisations, being led by one individual who makes all the decisions. In these cases it became apparent that the extent to which a capability was developed or not, was dependent on whether the owner/director of the organization decided that it would be helpful to consider stakeholders when making decisions. Investigating how these processes look like within bigger multinationals with perhaps various teams that are responsible for managing certain specific stakeholders might provide further knowledge to supplement the knowledge gathered about stakeholder capabilities in this research. It is likely that bigger organizations have more opportunities for codifying and storing knowledge, which would mean that better developed technical systems could be found. Additionally, companies with more employees and departments could profit from better established managerial systems. Finally, such companies may have better opportunities for providing courses and trainings for their employees, which could in turn positively impact the employee knowledge and skills dimension.

Lastly, due to the Covid-19 pandemic all of the interviews were conducted online. Therefore, even though there was a well-prepared and clear interview protocol, the online interviews hindered the non-verbal communication and made it more difficult for the interviewer to interrupt the interviewee or ask spontaneous relevant questions.



## §5.3 – Research suggestions

The present study uncovers some interesting findings, which have implications for future research. Firstly, during the research it became clear that respondents believe that there is a unique culture within the stakeholder network of Texel, that uncovered itself in the organizations being more used to working together with stakeholders. This unique character of the local stakeholder network of Texel might be very interesting to research further. For example a quantitative research that investigates whether a variable such as “perceived bond with the local stakeholder network” has a significant correlation with developing stakeholder capabilities. It could also be interested to study which comes first, a strong bond or the developed capabilities. It is possible that being used to working together with stakeholders for many years could easily influence the development of stakeholder capabilities of an organization. Such a unique culture was not uncovered in the interviewed companies in Vinkeveen, which could either be due to the small sample or due to the actual absence of such working culture in this context. It could therefore be interesting to look at what the meaning of this absence is for the development of the capabilities. In the tables below some of the constructs from the results section that could be interesting for further investigation are presented with potential operationalization methods. The criteria for including constructs in the tables was that the construct had to be recognized by two or more of the organizations. This guideline was used because some constructs were only present in a single company, which could mean that they are less universal and only relevant to the specific organization, and therefore their further investigation could bring little generalizable insights. When a construct is recognized by multiple organizations this suggests that exploration could be especially relevant for providing deeper insight into the three capabilities. Moreover, further suggestions are provided about subjects that came forward during the interviews but were not related to a specific capability.

## Systems thinking

Main concept	Definition	Potential operationalization
Membership in stakeholder networks/associations	The degree of involvement in stakeholder networks/association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Questionnaires distributed among employees investigating their membership status (e.g. “Are you a member of a specific stakeholder network/association”)</li> <li>- 5-point Likert scale: <i>“How helpful has your membership in the association been for finding collaboration partners?”</i></li> </ul>
Knowledge about identifying stakeholders	The degree to which employees possess knowledge in the area of stakeholder identification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Quantitative survey investigating the possessed knowledge on a 7-point Likert scale. Examples of items: <i>“My knowledge in the area of stakeholder identification is extensive”</i>)</li> </ul>
Networking skills	The extent to which employees possess essential skills to network within the stakeholder network	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Quantitatively investigating the different types of skills on a 5-point Likert scale (e.g. <i>“I am able to develop beneficial connections with stakeholders”</i>)</li> </ul>
Online stakeholder platform	Technical system which facilitates storing and codifying knowledge relevant for stakeholder identification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A quantitative research, focused on investigating the specific knowledge stored within this system and the degree to which an organization makes use of this knowledge;</li> </ul>
Importance of the big picture	The extent to which companies are focused on value creation for the whole region	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A quantitative survey (5-point Likert scale) investigating the presence of this value within a specific company and what it entails. (e.g. <i>“In order for my business to thrive, the whole region needs to do well”</i>; <i>“It is of the utmost important to do our part in supporting the region”</i>)</li> </ul>

Table 9: Operationalisation suggestions for the capability of systems thinking.

## Paradoxical Thinking

Main Concept	Definition	Potential Operationalization
Importance of a harmonic relationship with stakeholders	The extent to which a company values a good relationship with stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Questionnaires investigating the specific definition of a harmonic relationship as it may differ per company, whether such a relationship is important and how is it built and preserved; (e.g. 5-point Likert scale: “<i>We are willing to compromise in order to preserve a good relationship with a stakeholder</i>);</li> <li>-</li> </ul>
Stakeholder meetings	Scheduling and attending meetings with important stakeholders (e.g. policy makers) on a regular basis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Questionnaires investigating how managers make the decision with which stakeholders they would like to establish such a managerial system;</li> <li>- Questionnaires investigating the focus points and goals of these meetings;</li> </ul>
Knowledge about identifying tensions within the stakeholder network	The extent to which employees have acquired knowledge with regards to the identification of tensions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Questionnaires about manners of creating such knowledge;</li> <li>- How the company encourages and supports the creation of such knowledge and what does this knowledge specifically entail</li> </ul>

Table 10: Operationalizations for the capability of paradoxical thinking.

## Democratic thinking

Main concept	Definition	Potential operationalization
Importance of aligned principles	The extent to which a company finds it important for the principles of third parties to be in accordance with its own principles	- A 5-point Likert scale survey investigating the extent to which a company identifies with this value. (e.g. “ <i>We would never allow influence over a marketing decision from a third party if we do not recognize ourselves in their core principles</i> ”)
Knowledge about the impact of stakeholders	The extent to which employees understand the impact of stakeholder on marketing decisions	- Questionnaire investigating the knowledge of employees about the influence that stakeholders can exhibit on marketing decisions;

Table 11: Operationalizations for the capability of democratic thinking.

One of the limitations of this research was the fact that the research was not able to conduct as many interviews as originally planned. Therefore, it could be interesting to conduct the same research within the same context when the crisis is over and more respondents could be gathered. This could lead to even more insights about what the capabilities look like and how they are put to. Having more respondents could broaden the scope of the research and present different perspectives and methods employed by the companies when it comes to managing their stakeholders.

A direct relationship between performance of the companies and the capabilities was not uncovered, nor was it the focus of this study, however the existence of such a relationship could be the focus of future quantitative analysis. Additionally, further research could focus on quantitatively investigating the extent to which the fore-mentioned constructs are relevant for the development of the capabilities and whether some constructs have a stronger association and are more important for the capabilities than others.

Moreover, the focus of the local tourism industry can be quite limiting. Therefore, it could be interesting to conduct the research in a different industry. For example an industry with bigger, more established multinationals that deal with more stakeholders than is the case for the local tourism industry. This would also mean that the decision to implement a network

innovation is not an individual decision, but more likely a collective decision which could mean that there are more capabilities in place to make such decisions. Additionally, in such organizations it is likely that they are more used to working together with a variety of stakeholders for which they have developed specific stakeholder capabilities, and have very specific structures and procedures when it comes to every individual dimension for each specific stakeholder capability, which has not been the case in the context of the local tourism industry.

Additionally, further research could quantitatively investigate whether there is a relationship between the development of the different capabilities. This could for instance focus on the question whether companies that have developed the systems thinking capability are more likely to develop the paradoxical thinking capability as well. Such studies could disentangle potential interactions between the capabilities and research whether there is a specific order of development.

Finally, this research has made it more clear what the stakeholder capabilities entail in the local tourism industry and what they look like. However, it is not yet clear how the organisations have actually developed these stakeholder capabilities and put them in place. Therefore, research investigating how to develop these stakeholder marketing capabilities could further benefit both the managerial practice as well as the academic debate. It would be interesting to gather more in-depth insights about specific methods and practices employed by managers in order to stimulate the development of the capabilities.

## References

- Adner, R. (2012). *The wide lens : a new strategy for innovation*. Portfolio Penguin.
- Argote, L. (2011). Organizational learning research: Past, present and future. *Management Learning*, 42(4), 439–446. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350507611408217>
- Argote, L., & Darr, E. (2001). Repositories of Knowledge in Franchise Organizations: Individual, Structural, and Technological. *The Nature and Dynamics of Organizational Capabilities*, 51–68. <https://doi.org/10.1093/0199248540.003.0003>
- Argote, L., & Ingram, P. (2000). Knowledge Transfer: A Basis for Competitive Advantage in Firms. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 82(1), 150–169. <https://doi.org/10.1006/obhd.2000.2893>
- Ashkenas, R. (1999). Creating the boundaryless organization. *Business Horizons*, 42(5), 510. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0007-6813\(99\)80069-x](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0007-6813(99)80069-x)
- Bailey, K. D. (1994). *Typologies and Taxonomies: An Introduction to Classification Techniques (Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences)* (1ste editie). SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Bhattacharya, C. B., & Korschun, D. (2008). Stakeholder Marketing: Beyond the Four Ps and the Customer. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 27(1), 113–116. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jppm.27.1.113>
- Bleijenbergh, I. (2015). *Kwalitatief onderzoek in organisaties* (2de editie). Boom Lemma.
- Bowie, N. E. (2012). Stakeholder Theory: The State of the Art, R. Edward Freeman, Jeffrey S. Harrison, Andrew C. Wicks, Bidhan L. Parmar, and Simone de Colle (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010). *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 22(1), 179–185. <https://doi.org/10.5840/beq20122219>

- Bryman, A. (2012). *Social Research Methods*. Oxford University Press.
- Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek. (2018, april 4). *Grootste groei toerisme in ruim tien jaar*.  
<https://www.cbs.nl/nl-nl/nieuws/2018/14/grootste-groei-toerisme-in-ruim-tien-jaar>
- Chakravorti, B. (2010). Stakeholder Marketing 2.0. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 29(1), 97–102. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jppm.29.1.97>
- Clarkson, M. B. E. (1995). A Stakeholder Framework for Analyzing and Evaluating Corporate Social Performance. *The Academy of Management Review*, 20(1), 92. <https://doi.org/10.2307/258888>
- Conner, K. R., & Prahalad, C. K. (1996). A Resource-Based Theory of the Firm: Knowledge Versus Opportunism. *Organization Science*, 7(5), 477–501. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.7.5.477>
- Dahl, R. A. (1989). *Democracy and its critics*. Yale University Press.
- Day, G. S. (2011). Closing the Marketing Capabilities Gap. *Journal of Marketing*, 75(4), 183–195. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.75.4.183>
- Deshpande, R., Farley, J. U., & Webster, F. E. (1993). Corporate Culture, Customer Orientation, and Innovativeness in Japanese Firms: A Quadrant Analysis. *Journal of Marketing*, 57(1), 23. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1252055>
- Donaldson, T., & Preston, L. E. (1995). The Stakeholder Theory of the Corporation: Concepts, Evidence, and Implications. *The Academy of Management Review*, 20(1), 65. <https://doi.org/10.2307/258887>
- Emerson, R. M. (1981). Social exchange theory. in M. Rosenberg & R. Turner (Eds.), *Social psychology: Sociological perspectives* (pp. 30-65). Basic Books.
- Fiol, C. M., & Lyles, M. A. (1985). Organizational Learning. *The Academy of Management Review*, 10(4), 803. <https://doi.org/10.2307/258048>

- Flick, U. (2009). *An Introduction to Qualitative Research*. SAGE Publications.
- Freeman, E. R. (1984). *Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach (Pitman Series in Business and Public Policy)* (First editie). Harpercollins College Div.
- Freeman, R. E. (2009). Stakeholder Theory. *Philosophy of Management*, 8(3), 97–107.  
<https://doi.org/10.5840/pom20098310>
- Gioia, D. A. (1999). Gioia's Reply to Jones and Wicks. *Academy of Management Review*, 24(4), 624–625. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1999.12600949>
- Granovetter, M. (1985). Economic action and social structure: the problem of embeddedness. *American Journal of Sociology*, 91(3), 481-510. Retrieved from:  
[https://www.jstor.org/stable/2780199?seq=1#metadata\\_info\\_tab\\_contents](https://www.jstor.org/stable/2780199?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents)
- Grant, R. M. (1991). The Resource-Based Theory of Competitive Advantage: Implications for Strategy Formulation. *California Management Review*, 33(3), 114–135.  
<https://doi.org/10.2307/41166664>
- Gummesson, E. (2007). Extending the service-dominant logic: from customer centricity to balanced centricity. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 36(1), 15–17.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-007-0065-x>
- Hammarberg, K., Kirkman, M., & de, L. S. (2016). Qualitative research methods: when to use them and how to judge them. *Human Reproduction (Oxford, England)*, 31(3), 498–501.  
<https://doi-org.ru.idm.oclc.org/10.1093/humrep/dev334>
- Han, J. K., Kim, N., & Srivastava, R. K. (1998). Market Orientation and Organizational Performance: Is Innovation a Missing Link? *Journal of Marketing*, 62(4), 30–45.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/002224299806200403>



- Hillebrand, B., Driessen, P. H., & Koll, O. (2015). Stakeholder marketing: theoretical foundations and required capabilities. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 43(4), 411–428. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-015-0424-y>
- Homburg, C., Stierl, M., & Bornemann, T. (2013). Corporate Social Responsibility in Business-to-Business Markets: How Organizational Customers Account for Supplier Corporate Social Responsibility Engagement. *Journal of Marketing*, 77(6), 54–72. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jm.12.0089>
- Hult, G. T. M., Mena, J. A., Ferrell, O. C., & Ferrell, L. (2011). Stakeholder marketing: a definition and conceptual framework. *AMS Review*, 1(1), 44–65. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13162-011-0002-5>
- Huy, Q. N. (1999). Emotional Capability, Emotional Intelligence, and Radical Change. *The Academy of Management Review*, 24(2), 325. <https://doi.org/10.2307/259085>
- Jawahar, I. M., & McLaughlin, G. L. (2001). Toward a Descriptive Stakeholder Theory: An Organizational Life Cycle Approach. *The Academy of Management Review*, 26(3), 397. <https://doi.org/10.2307/259184>
- Jones, T. M. (1995). Instrumental Stakeholder Theory: A Synthesis of Ethics and Economics. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(2), 404–437. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1995.9507312924>
- Klein, D. A. (2009). *The Strategic Management of Intellectual Capital*. Taylor & Francis.
- Koll, O., Woodside, A. G., & Mühlbacher, H. (2005). Balanced versus focused responsiveness to core constituencies and organizational effectiveness. *European Journal of Marketing*, 39(9/10), 1166–1183. <https://doi.org/10.1108/03090560510610789>

- Kraaijenbrink J., Spender J-C., Groen A.J. (2010). The Resource-Based View: A Review and assessment of its critiques. *Journal of Management*. 36(1), 349-372.  
doi:[10.1177/0149206309350775](https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206309350775)
- Laszlo, C., Sherman, D., Whalen, J., & Ellison, J. (2005). Expanding the Value Horizon. *Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, 2005(20), 65–76.  
<https://doi.org/10.9774/gleaf.4700.2005.wi.00009>
- Leonard-Barton, D. (1992). Core capabilities and core rigidities: A paradox in managing new product development. *Strategic Management Journal*, 13(S1), 111–125.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.4250131009>
- Luo, X., & Bhattacharya, C. B. (2009). The Debate over Doing Good: Corporate Social Performance, Strategic Marketing Levers, and Firm-Idiosyncratic Risk. *Journal of Marketing*, 73(6), 198–213. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.73.6.198>
- Lusch, R. F., & Vargo, S. L. (2006). Service-dominant logic: reactions, reflections and refinements. *Marketing Theory*, 6(3), 281–288.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1470593106066781>
- Mayring, P. (2010). Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse. *Handbuch Qualitative Forschung in der Psychologie*, 601–613. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-531-92052-8\\_42](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-531-92052-8_42)
- Mitchell, R. K., Agle, B. R., & Wood, D. J. (1997). Toward a Theory of Stakeholder Identification and Salience: Defining the Principle of Who and What Really Counts. *The Academy of Management Review*, 22(4), 853. <https://doi.org/10.2307/259247>
- Moore, J. F. (1996). *The Death of Competition: Leadership & Strategy in the Age of Business Ecosystems*. HarperBusiness.
- Nelson, R. R., & Winter, S. G. (1985). *An Evolutionary Theory of Economic Change (Belknap Press)*. Belknap Press: An Imprint of Harvard University Press.

- Neville, B. A., & Menguc, B. (2006). Stakeholder Multiplicity: Toward an Understanding of the Interactions between Stakeholders. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 66(4), 377–391. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-006-0015-4>
- Noor, K. B. M. (2008). Case Study: A Strategic Research Methodology. *American Journal of Applied Sciences*, 5(11), 1602–1604. <https://doi.org/10.3844/ajassp.2008.1602.1604>
- Oliver, C. (1991). Strategic Responses to Institutional Processes. *The Academy of Management Review*, 16(1), 145. <https://doi.org/10.2307/258610>
- Pajunen, K. (2006). Stakeholder Influences in Organizational Survival. *Journal of Management Studies*, 43(6), 1261–1288. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.14676486.2006.00624.x>
- Lampard, R. (2001). *Practical Social Investigation: Qualitative and Quantitative Methods in Social Research* (1ste editie). Routledge.
- Prahalad, C. K., Hamel, G., Harvard University. Harvard Business Review, & Harvard University. Harvard Business Review. (2001). *The Core Competence of the Corporation*. Reed Business Education.
- Preston, L. E., & Donaldson, T. (1999). Dialogue. *Academy of Management Review*, 24(4), 619–620. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1999.12600806>
- Rowley, T. J. (1997). Moving beyond Dyadic Ties: A Network Theory of Stakeholder Influences. *The Academy of Management Review*, 22(4), 887. <https://doi.org/10.2307/259248>
- Saunders, M., & Thornhill, A. (2009). *Research Methods For Business Students* (5th Revised edition). Pearson Education Limited.
- Schubert, S. F., & Brida, J. G. (2009). Macroeconomic Effects of Changes in Tourism Demand: A Simple Dynamic Model. *Tourism Economics*, 15(3), 591–613. <https://doi.org/10.5367/000000009789036549>

- Selznick, P. (1957). *Leadership in administration : A sociological interpretation*. Row, Peterson.
- Sheth, J. N., & Uslay, C. (2007). Implications of the Revised Definition of Marketing: From Exchange to Value Creation. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 26(2), 302–307. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jppm.26.2.302>
- Silverman, D. (2006). *Interpreting qualitative data : methods for analyzing talk, text and interaction* (3rd [rev. and upd.]). Sage.
- Stebbins, R. A., & Sage Publications, I. N. C. (2001). *Exploratory Research in the Social Sciences*. SAGE Publications.
- Sisodia, R. S., Wolfe, D. B., & Sheth, J. N. (2007). *Firms of Endearment: How World-Class Companies Profit from Passion and Purpose* (1ste editie). Ft Pr.
- Slater, S. F., & Narver, J. C. (1994). Does Competitive Environment Moderate the Market Orientation-Performance Relationship? *Journal of Marketing*, 58(1), 46. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1252250>
- Smith, W. K., & Lewis, M. W. (2011). Toward a Theory of Paradox: A Dynamic equilibrium Model of Organizing. *Academy of Management Review*, 36(2), 381–403. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2009.0223>
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques* (Second editie). SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Taylor, S. J., & Bogdan, R. (1998), *Introduction to Qualitative Research Methods – A Guidebook and Resource*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Teece, D. & Pisano, G. (1994) The dynamic capabilities of firms: an introduction. *Industrial and Corporate Change* 3(3): 537–556. <https://doi.org/10.1093/icc/3.3.537-a>

- Teece, D., Pisano, G. & Shuen, A. (1997) Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal* 18(7): 509–533. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1097-0266\(199708\)18:7<509::AID-SMJ882>3.0.CO;2-Z](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-0266(199708)18:7<509::AID-SMJ882>3.0.CO;2-Z)
- Walsh, J. P., & Ungson, G. R. (1991). Organizational Memory. *The Academy of Management Review*, 16(1), 57. <https://doi.org/10.2307/258607>
- Webster, F. E., & Lusch, R. F. (2013). Elevating marketing: marketing is dead! Long live marketing! *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 41(4), 389–399. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-013-0331-z>
- Wernerfelt, B. (1984). A resource-based view of the firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, 5(2), 171–180. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.4250050207>
- Westenholz, A. (1993). Paradoxical Thinking and Change in the Frames of Reference. *Organization Studies*, 14(1), 37–58. <https://doi.org/10.1177/017084069301400104>
- Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case study research : design and methods* (5th ed.). SAGE.

# Appendix

## 1. Interview protocol

1. **Allereerst bedankt dat ik een interview met u kan afnemen, mag dit gesprek worden opgenomen?**
2. **Kunt u mij kort beschrijven welke functie u binnen uw organisatie bekleedt?**
3. **Bent u bekend met de innovatie, de Linda, van The Driving Force? (Een innovatie die door middel van samenwerking tussen actoren in een lokaal toerisme ecosysteem massatoerisme probeert te voorkomen door toeristen te spreiden)**
  - Wat vindt u als organisatie van de innovatie, in hoeverre is uw organisatie bereid om aan zoiets mee te werken?
  - Welke actoren spelen bij de invoering van de Linda een rol voor uw organisatie?
  - Hoe zorgt u ervoor dat uw organisatie een duidelijk beeld heeft van welke actoren bij de invoering van de Linda een rol spelen?

Een succesvolle implementatie van Linda vereist dat meerdere actoren hieraan mee willen doen. Vandaar dat mijn volgende vragen gaan over hoe uw organisatie omgaat met samenwerking binnen netwerken van verschillende actoren.

4. **Wat voor problemen heeft u gezien of ziet u bij uw organisatie bij het invoeren van de Linda?**
  - Hoe worden deze soort problemen opgelost door uw organisatie/denkt u dit soort problemen te kunnen oplossen met uw organisatie?
5. **Heeft u inzicht in welke actoren voor uw organisatie betrokken zijn bij het invoeren van de Linda?**
  - Hoe zorgt uw organisatie ervoor dat dit inzichtelijk is? Wat voor methoden worden hiervoor gebruikt?

- Wat voor problemen komt u tegen bij puur het identificeren van de actoren die van belang zijn voor de invoering van de Linda en hoe worden deze opgelost door de organisatie? (Bv. moeilijk te bepalen wie nou van belang is, constante verandering, überhaupt geen zicht op anderen)
- Hoe wordt er binnen de organisatie voor gezorgd of zou u ervoor zorgen dat werknemers over de kennis beschikken die nodig is om te kunnen bepalen welke andere actoren van belang zijn bij de implementatie van de Linda?
- Hoe wordt er binnen de organisatie voor gezorgd of zou u ervoor zorgen dat werknemers over de vaardigheden beschikken die nodig is om te kunnen bepalen welke andere actoren van belang zijn bij de implementatie van de Linda?
- Hoe wordt ervoor gezorgd dat deze kennis/vaardigheden niet verloren gaat in de organisatie? Zijn hier bepaalde systemen/structuren voor?
- Hoe wordt ervoor gezorgd dat deze kennis/vaardigheden wordt overgedragen op andere werknemers binnen de organisatie?
- Welke rol speelt het management in het identificeren van de andere actoren die een rol spelen bij de implementatie van de Linda?

**6. Merkt u of voorziet u dat er bij de actoren die een rol spelen bij de invoering van de Linda spanning ontstaat/zal ontstaan omdat zij tegengestelde belangen hebben? Hoe probeert uw organisatie dit op te lossen?**

- Wat voor spanningen voorziet uw organisatie tussen de externe actoren?
- Hoe probeert uw organisatie deze spanningen in kaart te brengen?
- Is uw organisatie erg gefocust op deze spanningen tussen actoren? Is dit ook een reden om negatief tegenover de Linda te staan?
- Heeft de organisatie te maken gehad met vorige initiatieven om met andere actoren samen te werken en hoe is dit door uw organisatie aangepakt?
- Hoe zorgt u ervoor of zou u ervoor zorgen dat uw werknemers de kennis hebben om met deze spanningen tussen andere actoren om kunnen gaan? Zorgt u ervoor dat werknemers in uw organisatie nieuwe kennis vergaren om met deze spanningen om te kunnen gaan?
- Hoe zorgt u ervoor of zou u ervoor zorgen dat uw werknemers over de vaardigheden beschikken om met deze spanningen om te kunnen gaan?

- Hoe wordt ervoor gezorgd dat deze kennis/vaardigheden niet verloren gaat in de organisatie? Zijn hier bepaalde systemen/structuren voor?
- Hoe wordt ervoor gezorgd dat deze kennis/vaardigheden wordt overgedragen op andere werknemers binnen de organisatie?
- Welke rol speelt het management in het omgaan met deze tegengestelde belangen van andere actoren binnen het netwerk van actoren waarin de Linda zou komen?

**7. Betreft uw organisatie externe actoren bij de beslissing tot het invoeren van de Linda, zo ja hoe gebeurt dit?**

- Wat voor problemen ziet u hierbij voor uw organisatie?
- Hoe zorgt u ervoor of zou u ervoor zorgen dat uw werknemers over voldoende kennis beslissen om deze actoren te betrekken in de beslissing om de Linda te implementeren?
- Hoe zorgt u ervoor of zou u ervoor zorgen dat werknemers in uw organisatie over de skills/vaardigheden beschikken om externe actoren in de beslissing om de Linda al dan niet te implementeren mee te nemen?
- Hoe wordt ervoor gezorgd dat deze kennis/vaardigheden niet verloren gaat in de organisatie? Zijn hier bepaalde systemen/structuren voor?
- Hoe wordt ervoor gezorgd dat deze kennis/vaardigheden wordt overgedragen op andere werknemers binnen de organisatie?
- Welke rol speelt het management in het betrekken van andere actoren in een beslissing om de Linda al dan niet te implementeren?

**8. Wat voor plaats neemt het samenwerken met andere actoren in binnen de organisatie?**

- Hoe wordt er gedacht over korte termijn resultaten ten opzichte van het vergaren van kennis voor de lange termijn en welke rol spelen netwerk innovaties hierin?
- In wat is uw organisatie volgens uzelf bovengemiddeld goed? (bv marketing, klantvriendelijkheid, efficiëntie van processen) (Leonard-Barton, 1992)
- Hoe kijkt de organisatie aan tegen kennis, wordt er meer waarde geacht aan diploma's of aan ervaring?



- Waar ligt de nadruk binnen de organisatie? Op individuele ontwikkeling of op goed georganiseerde manager hiërarchieën?

## 2. Code book

Aangesloten bij de app	Aangesloten bij Vinkeveen for You
Aanpak reviews binnen de app	Aanpak richting potentiële partner
Aanpassingsvermogen tegenover de ondernemers voor unieke situaties	Aantal bedrijven benaderd app
Aantal partijen hoeven ook niet meer klanten	Achterliggende gedachte om andere partijen inzichtelijk te krijgen
Achterliggende gedachte participatie Texelmap	Actief proberen ingang te vinden
Afhankelijkheid Texel van toerisme	Afhankelijkheid van toerisme factor
Afwachtende houding hoe app ontwikkelt	Afwachtende houding hoe de app ontwikkelt
Algemeen voorwaarden, geen contract	Algemene spanning op het eiland
Alle spanningen op een rijtje	Allereerst de grote gebieden benaderd
Alles in het kader van ontwikkeling van de organisatie	Als deze spanning nadeel oplevert dan andere focus
Alternatief voor kleinere partijen	Altijd besluit voor lange termijn
Ambassadeurs aantrekken aan gebruikerskant	Andere factoren die leiden tot drukte op Texel
Andere initiatieven om Vinkeveen op de kaart te zetten	Andere partij die rol speelde bij introductie app
Andere partij die rol speelt bij invoering Texelmap	Andere partijen binnen Vinkeveen totaal niet interessant
Andere partijen die een rol spelen bij introductie	Andere partijen die rol speelden bij invoering Texelmap
Andere partijen duidelijk inzichtelijk binnen Texel	Andere partijen fundamenteel voor functioneren van organisatie
Andere partijen toch inzichtelijker door zo'n project	Angst bij ondernemer, regelen drukte zelf

Angst voor concurrentie factor om het niet te doen	Angst voor concurrentie is nog een spanning
Angst voor langzame besluitvorming indien externe partijen worden betrokken bij beslissing	App juist prettig als het te druk wordt
App nog te erg in ontwikkeling	App werkt nog niet optimaal
Argument potentiële gebruikers over kostenmodel	Argumenten voor betrouwbaarheid
Baat het niet schaadt het niet constructie	Bang dat klanten wegblijven bij drukte
Belang van samenwerking met andere partijen	Belang van toerisme wordt begrepen
Belang voor partner	Belangrijk om te snappen waarom mensen niet aansluiten
Belangrijke rol voor ervaring	Benadering richting VVV Texel
Bent onderdeel van een ecosysteem	Beperkt bezig met andere partijen in het ecosysteem
Besloten tot aansluiting vanuit coulance	Besluit vooral door corona
Bestaande klanten bedienen en nieuwe klanten werven	Bestaande samenwerking met andere partijen
Bestellingen via app	Bestuur brengt spanning in kaart
Betere match met afhankelijke locaties met community	Bezoeker mogelijkheden bieden op basis van behoeften
Bezoekers one stop shop bieden	Bij Texel binnengekomen door corona
Bij Vinkeveen zelf initiator van platform	Bijna 300 partijen benaderd voor deelname
Bijvoorbeeld bootjesverhuur ziet het nut minder	Binnen Texel samenwerking noodzakelijk om gebied te laten functioneren
Binnen Vinkeveen iedereen bezig met eigen ding	Botsing met eigen activiteiten

Codificatie van kennis normaal gesproken	Combinatie van diploma's en ervaring
Combinatie van kennis en ervaring	Combinatie van lokale kennis met techniek van grotere partijen
Combinatie van redenen in een voorbeeld	Communicatie via VVV naar partners
Concrete actie ondernomen voor lange termijn visie	Conflict individueel belang met netwerkbelang
Conflict met al bestaand crm systeem	Conservatieve samenleving, zullen anders tegen zo'n app kijken
Contact met andere partijen vanuit oogpunt van concurrentie	Contacten zoeken binnen dit ecosysteem
Continuïteit van de onderneming	Corona laatste zetje in de rug
Counterargument dat ondernemers al te vinden zijn	Creëren kennis indien niet aanwezig
Criteria benaderen ondernemers voor app	Criteria opgesteld voor geschiktheid locatie
Criteria voor geschiktheid	Criteria voor potentiële ambassadeur
Criterium geschiktheid product	De vele mogelijkheden is de kracht
Delen kennis met betrekking tot de app	Dialogoog met gebruikers opstarten
Dingen met elkaar doen	Directeur neemt eindverantwoordelijkheid maar geeft werknemers verantwoordelijkheid
Doel achter strandondernemersvereniging	Doelgroep organisatie gebruikt het waarschijnlijk niet
Doelgroep Texel	Doen mee uit coulance, ziet wel nut voor andere organisaties
Dominante positie van de grote partijen	Druk van gemeente voor het spreiden met corona
Duidelijke sturing vanuit management	Eerdere benadering door bedrijven

Eerst kijken wat potentiële partner nodig heeft voor aanbod	Eerste initiatief met samenwerking op deze schaal
Eigen beslissing om mee te doen	Eigen beslissing om de Texelmap te implementeren
Eigen boekingssysteem sluit niet aan	Eigen initiatief regulatie klantenstroom
Eigen initiatieven vanuit de driving force	Eigen rol bij spanning omtrent overtoerisme
Elke dinsdag uitbetaalt	Enthousiasme bij Duitse toerist Texel
Ervaring op dit gebied	Expertise voor spreiden elders inzetten
Externe partij die een rol speelde bij introductie	Externe partijen doorslaggevend om mee te doen
Extra functionaliteit voor VVV Texel	Extra mensen ingezet om meer actoren te bereiken
Factor tijd reden om niet mee te doen	Factor tijd speelt een rol
Factor tijd speelt rol bij invoering app	Financieel niet primaire reden, kan zinvol zijn voor Texel
Financieel plaatje voornaamste reden om niet mee te doen	Financiële compensatie nog een reden tot spanning
Flexibel in betaling om partners te werven	Flexibel in mogelijkheden richting partners
Flexibiliteit in kostenmodel, aanpassen aan de ondernemer	Focus meer verplaatst naar het geheel, alle partijen en stakeholders
Focus ontwikkelingen minder op toerisme	Focus op lange termijn
Focus op stabiliteit	Focus van ontwikkelingen binnen omgeving
Focus van de driving force	Focus vooral op het dorp
Functie binnen Ecomare	Functie binnen organisatie
Functieomschrijving	Gebruiksgemak bij gebruik app

Geen andere partijen betrokken bij beslissing	Geen andere partijen betrokken bij beslissing tot invoering
Geen andere partijen betrokken bij introductie tot invoering app	Geen andere partijen betrokken ivm zelfstandigheid
Geen doorslaggevende beslissing andere partijen bij invoering Texelmap	Geen doorslaggevende stem, alleen overleg
Geen eigen initiatief om hoger toerisme te bewerkstelligen	Geen externe partijen betrokken
Geen inzicht in andere partijen die rol spelen	Geen methoden om andere partijen inzichtelijk te krijgen
Geen spanning ontstaan, juist samenwerking	Geen specifieke methoden om andere partijen in kaart te brengen
Geen specifieke methoden om partijen inzichtelijk te krijgen	Geen vast contract, meer een overeenkomst
Geen vorige vergelijkbare initiatieven	Geïdentificeerd probleem boeken via VVV
Gemeente dichter op toerisme bij Texel	Gemeente Vinkeveen actiever bezig met samenwerking
Gemeente zowel bezig met individuele onderneming als collectief	Generiek platform
Gepositioneerd als lokaal initiatief	Goed contact met bepaalde andere partijen belangrijk
Goede begeleiding vanuit the driving force	Goede trainingen, gastvrijheid
Graag in eigen hand houden	Graag in eigen hand houden wanneer open
Grootste uitdaging VVV de inwoners	Grote bookingsites niet geïnteresseerd in andere belangen
Grotere afhankelijkheid van toerisme	Haast maken om op te starten
Hoe actief VVV is ook factor	Hoe iemand te begeleiden om weerstanden weg te nemen
Hoog niveau trainingen	Horeca dichtbij jouw concept nauw in de gaten houden, concurrentie

Huidige samenwerking werkt niet voor het hele ecosysteem	Identificatie Texel als relevant ecosysteem
Identificeerde drukke periodes, rol VVV om dit terug te dringen	Iedereen moet zich kunnen profileren op platform
Imago dat the Driving Force wenst	In eerste instantie welwillend tegenover aansluiting
Incidentiele samenwerkingen met andere partijen	Indien spanning verandert wel actieve handelingen
Indirect contact met bijeenkomsten en overkoepelende organen	Indirect op de hoogte van ontwikkelingen
Individuele ontwikkeling	Individuele ontwikkeling basis organisatie
Individuele ontwikkeling heel belangrijk	Informatie delen met andere partijen belangrijk
Informatie verschaffen aan toeristen	Initiatief om meer toeristen naar de organisatie te krijgen
Innovatie zinloos zonder marketing	Innovatief karakter van de onderneming
Innovatieve karakter innovatie is een spanning	Input partners bij onderdeel app
Intensief bezig met de omgeving en ontwikkelingen hierin	Introductie app besluit vanuit de korte termijn visie
Introductie app echt vanuit korte termijn	Introductie app vanuit lange termijn visie
Inzichtelijk wie de andere partijen zijn	Juiste communicatie richting partners
Kan als partner zelf je profiel bijhouden	Kennis over het algemeen belangrijker
Kennis over omgeving wordt gedeeld, niet gecodificeerd	Kennis over spanning niet vastgelegd
Kennisoverdracht binnen organisatie	Kijken wat werkt voor de ondernemer

Klachten over werking van de app	Korte lijstjes met the driving force voelen oke
Korte termijn introductie kan leiden tot lange termijn samenwerking	Korte trajecten van focus waar partner op dat moment best mee geholpen is
Kosten extra overweging	Kosten gebruiker
Kosten om ondersteunen, moet voor beide partijen leuk zijn	Kostenmodel deelname aan app
Kostenmodel obstakel	Kostenmodel van de app
Krachtige VVV op Texel	Kritiek op de app
Laatste actor inwoners, maar vooral ondernemers	Lange termijn focus met voorbeeld
Lange termijn focus, beleving toeristen	Lange termijn vise
Lange termijn visie	Lange termijn voordeel behalen
Latere aansluitingen bij de app	Leeftijd ook heel belangrijk
Legitimiteit creeren door covid functionaliteiten	Leren belangrijk binnen organisatie
Limiet aan toerisme op Texel	Link Texelmap met deze spanning
Lokaal initiatief	Lokale initiatief wordt gewaardeerd
Lokale kennis is het onderscheidende karakter	Lokale samenwerkingen met andere partijen in dorp
Maandelijks opzegtermijn	Maandelijks vergadering met deze partijen
Machtige VVV te vriend houden	Manier om andere partijen in ecosysteem inzichtelijk te krijgen
Manier om andere partijen inzichtelijk te krijgen	Meedenken aan functionaliteiten voor partner
Meedenken aan nieuwe functionaliteiten voor partner	Meedenken functionaliteiten voor ondernemer
Meer adviserende rol voor externe partijen	Meer focus op kwaliteit dan google adwords
Meer samenwerking op Texel	Meer toeristen richting Vinkeveen



Mensen bewust maken van lokale omgeving	Minder contact met partijen buiten de branche
Misschien benaderd maar geen actie ondernomen	Mist begeleiding vanuit the driving force
Moeite om VVV mee te krijgen	MT vangt hooguit soms iets op
Na aansluiting pas gekeken wie onderdeel zijn	Nadruk op individuele ontwikkeling
Nauwe samenwerking met onderzoeksinstituut	Negatief tegenover app, al bestaand reserveringssysteem
Niet echt bezig met andere partijen	Niet echt een focus op deze spanningen
Niet echt onderzoek naar andere partijen, meer op gevoel	Niet enkel gefocust op Vinkeveen
Niet te commercieel overbrengen	Nieuwe functionaliteit app
No cure no pay	Nog een voordeel van gebruik app
Nog niemand tegengekomen die de app kent	Nog niet aangesloten want zijn nog niet open
Nog niet zo nodig voor de crisis	Noodzaak van veel partijen aansluiten
Normaal gesproken van tevoren overleg met partijen	Normaal meer overleg, met corona meer urgentie dus minder overleg
Nut ambassadeurs van app	Of the driving force iets moet veranderen
Onbenut potentieel, ieder doet eigen ding	Onderdeel uitgemaakt van vorig initiatief
Ondernemers die traditioneel in de wedstrijd zitten	Ondernemers en musea vaak alleen met zichzelf bezig
Ondernemers kunnen meer aan bezoekers verdienen door samen te werken	Ondernemers op Texel hebben het al druk genoeg
Ondernemers zien het niet of hebben geen zin	Ondernemersvereniging Vinkeveen vrij passief
Ondernemingsvereniging aanwezig Vinkeveen	Onderscheidende element the driving force

Onderscheidende elementen organisatie	Ontbrak the driving force aan professionele uitstraling
Ontdekte unieke cultuur binnen Texel	Ontwikkelingen en trends worden verspreid binnen organisatie
Ontwikkelingen in branche doorvoeren in eigen beleid	Ontwikkelingen in de branche
Ontwikkelingen in lokaal toerisme via via opgevangen	Ontwikkelingen op de korte termijn
Onvrede bij gebruikers app	Ook geen adviserende rol voor andere partijen
Ook geen externe partijen betrokken voor overleg	Ook keuze personeel voor lange termijn
Ook over de werking van de app heb ik ve	Ook zonder achterliggende reden wel meegedaan
Op Texel het wij gevoel	Op Texel mensen wel gewend om samen te werken
Op Texel VVV meer initiator	Op zoek naar ambassadeurs voor de app
Organisatie VVV, iedereen grip op	Organisatiestructuur
Overdragen kennis over Texelmap	Overdragen kennis over Texelmap binnen organisatie
Overdragen van kennis binnen de organisatie	Overleg met andere partijen over app
Overleg met andere partijen voor participatie Texelmap	Overstap met doel het beter sturen
Pakken coördinerende rol, samenwerking met lokale ondernemersvereniging	Participant Texelmap
Partijen bang dat het commerciële app wordt, bijverdienste VVV	Partijen bang dat het snel te druk wordt
Partijen doen ook niet mee uit principe	Partijen moeten het elkaar ook gunnen
Partijen nodig die ervoor open staan	Partijen waarbij het te druk is vinden dat prima want populair

Partijen waarmee wordt samengewerkt	Partijen zelf gevraagd wat alternatief zou zijn
Partner begrijpt dat het voor beide partijen interessant moet zijn	Partner maakt account aan voor vastleggen gegevens
Partner terughoudend in actief benaderen mensen	Partner vindt dat het voor beide partijen interessant moet zijn
Partner wil nergens aan vastzitten	Partner wilt niet ergens aan vastzitten
Personeel belangrijkste asset	Personeel heel positief
Personeel stimuleren	Persoonlijke betrokkenheid
Platform biedt kansen tot uitwisseling met andere ecosystemen	Platform is flexibel
Platform om mensen samen te brengen	Plekken benaderen met minder toeristen
Positief over innovatie om drukte te monitoren	Potentiele reden partner om toch niet mee te doen
Prettige ervaring bieden voor herhaalbezoek	Preventie spanningen binnen normale situatie
Primair verantwoordelijkheid identificeren omgeving bij eigenaar, secundair bij MT	Prioriteit voor opdoen van ervaring
Proberen partners actiever te krijgen	Probleem bij implementatie, nog in ontwikkeling
Problemen functionaliteit app	Problemen gebruiksvriendelijkheid app
Problemen Vinkeveen for You	Proces is efficiënter
Professionaliteit the driving force van belang	Promotie app richting toeristen
Promotie richting toeristen door VVV	Recent ook reden dat corona minder wordt
Recentelijk onderdeel geweest van een groot project	Reden niet deelnemen aan app
Reden om mee te doen aan de app	Reden om niet aan app mee te doen

Reden om niet deel te nemen aan app	Reden van terughoudendheid bij partijen
Reden waarom het zo belangrijk is partijen inzichtelijk te krijgen	Representatieve vertegenwoordiging van ecosysteem noodzakelijk
Rol onderliggende innovatieve karakter	Rol onomstreden positie van de VVV
Rol organisatie om brugfunctie te vervullen bij deze spanning	Rol van Texelmap in de lange termijn visie
Rol VVV Texel voor de Driving Force	Rol VVV Texel voor the Driving Force
Samengewerkt met andere partij die snel kon schakelen	Samenwerken met andere partijen neemt centrale rol in
Samenwerken met andere partijen niet heel belangrijk, eerst eigen onderneming	Samenwerken met andere partijen op lange termijn zeer belangrijk
Samenwerken wel heel belangrijk	Samenwerking belangrijk maar minder binnen Vinkeveen
Samenwerking binnen Texel om veerboot te regelen	Samenwerking met andere partijen op Texel
Samenwerking met andere partijen wel belangrijk	Samenwerking vroeger centraler dan nu
Samenwerkingen voornamelijk met andere duik partijen	Showcases opbouwen binnen Nederland
Snelheid bij dergelijke beslissing van belang	Snelheid voornaamste reden
Spanning individuele belangen en doelen kan leiden tot discussies	Spanning omtrent wenselijkheid drukte
Spanning voorzien, niet belang toerist maar geld	Speciale rol VVV in invoering Texelmap
Specialisme voor het inspelen op toerisme	Specifieke methoden om dit in kaart te krijgen
Strategie om individuele partner heel goed te helpen	Strategische keuze toch vaak voor VVV Texel ipv individuele partner

Texelmap relevanter krijgen	Texelmap sluit niet aan op bestaand boekingssysteem
The driving force vindt financiële deel wel redelijk	Toegangspunt voor alles wat er te doen is
Toekomstige functionaliteit Texelmap Ecomare	Toerisme liever meer verspreid zien
Toerisme mag nog naar hoger niveau	Totaal geen verantwoordelijkheidsgevoel om zelf de app te promoten
Totaal geen verantwoordelijkheidsgevoel om zelf app te promoten	Totaal niet bezig met spanningen
Traditionele horecabranche niet vooruitstrevend voor samenwerking	Twijfels over nut van app voor organisatie
Uiteindelijk ongeveer 30 van de bijna 300 aangesloten	Uiteindelijk ook internationaal
Unieke aanpak voor dit project	Unieke locatie organisatie
Unieke rol VVV bij toerisme op Texel	Vaak aanwezig bij initiatieven gemeente
Van tevoren al uitdagingen ontdekt	Van tevoren inzichtelijk krijgen wie meedoen aan Texelmap
Vanaf het begin enthousiast over product	Veel aangesloten partijen en gebruikers noodzakelijk
Veel contact met andere partijen	Veel horeca zitten al vol, hebben het niet nodig
Veel locaties alleen bezig met eigen onderneming	Veel ondernemers en gebruikers nodig
Veel ondernemers hebben genoeg klanten	Veel partijen hebben al veel dingen op dit gebied
Veel partijen hebben eigen website en/of app	Veel partijen leven in het nu
Veelvuldig overleg met externe partijen	Vereisten voor een ecosysteem
Vergadering met andere partijen in dezelfde branche	Verkoopmethode richting potentiële partners

Vershil tussen branches	Vershil van inzicht met VVV
Vershil van inzicht met VVV Texel	Verwachte begeleiding vanuit de VVV
Verwachting dat mensen niet primair het geheel kunnen overzien	Vier kerntaken VVV Texel
Vinkeveen beetje een proeftuin	Vinkeveen geïdentificeerd als soort proeftuin
Vinkeveen kleinschalig	Vinkeveen werkt niet samen en is niet georganiseerd
Visie dat het ieder voor zich is	Voelt als een pilot waar je voor betaalt
Voor en nadelen van een grote tussenpartij als de VVV	Voor invoering contact gehad met andere partijen
Voorafgaand aan beslissing overleg met partijen	Vooral samenwerking met horecabranche maar niet alleen
Voordeel lokaal initiatief ten opzichte van grotere partijen	Voornaamste reden niet aansluiten
Voornaamste redenen om niet aan te sluiten	Voornamelijk mensen uit omgeving zelf
Voornamelijk veel tijd en aandacht aan de ondernemers	Voorzien problemen bij het betrekken van andere partijen in beslissing
Voorziet eventueel concurrentie	Voorziet geen spanning bij andere partijen
Vorig initiatief dat is gefaald	Vorig initiatief met meer legitimiteit
Vorig initiatief samenwerking met andere actoren	Vorig initiatief via facebook ivm corona
Vorige initiatieven bij partners	Vorige vergelijkbare initiatieven
Waarom keuze voor Vinkeveen	Wantrouwen richting VVV Texel
Weerstand tegen de grotere organisaties	Weinig gebruik ook een spanning
Weinig partijen besloten om aan te sluiten	Wel informatie ingewonnen voor beslissing tot niet invoeren app

Wel overleg met andere partijen voorafgaand aan beslissing invoering Texelmap	Wel overleg met andere partijen want potentiële bedreiging
Wel overleg voor een dergelijke beslissing	Wel overleg voorafgaand aan beslissing invoeren Texelmap
Wellicht in nabije toekomst niet meer onderdeel	Werking spreiding binnen de app
Werknemers kennis laten vergaren door ownership	Werknemers niet voorbereid op deze spanning
Werknemers spelen geen rol in het identificeren van de omgeving	Werknemers vergaren kennis om met spanningen om te gaan door empowerment en ownership
Werkt niet voor organisatie want tussenpersoon	Werkvloer bezig met de dag, eigenaar met de toekomst
Werkzaamheden binnen Ecomare	Werkzaamheden organisatie
Werkzaamheden Scuba academie	Wijze van benadering voor deelname app
Wijze van benadering voor toetreding app	Wijze van samenwerking
Wijze van samenwerking met andere partijen	Willen alternatieven aanbieden
Willen er echt voor de ondernemer zijn	Willen geen concurrentie van andere horecagelegenheid
Willen geen vaste contracten	Zelf geen actieve rol in het oplossen van dit probleem
Zelf niet bezig met andere partijen	Zien potentie voor samenwerking
Ziet geen problemen bij betrekken andere partijen in beslissing	Ziet totaal geen nut om bijvoorbeeld toeristen bij dergelijke beslissing te betrekken
Ziet voor zichzelf geen concurrentie	Ziet wel rol voor partijen die van wezenlijk belang zijn
Zorgen over implementatie, wilt service leveren	Zorgen over wat er met data gebeurt

Zou losse beslissing zijn maar werken wel samen met partijen	Zoveel mogelijk wensen gebruikers uit laten komen



### 3. Transcripts

The data for this research can be found on the following pages:

- Transcript D1, page 82.
- Transcript D2, page 91.
- Transcript D3, page 99.
- Transcript D4, page 106.
- Transcript D5, page 117.
- Transcript D6, page 125.
- Transcript D7, page 133.
- Transcript D8, page 145.
- Transcript D9, page 152.
- Transcript D10, page 157.
- Transcript I1, page 166.
- Transcript I2, page 169.
- Transcript I3, page 170.
- Transcript I4, page 175.
- Transcript I5, page 179.