Elke Schüßler/Leonhard Dobusch/Lauri Wessel[*]

BACKSTAGE: ORGANIZING EVENTS AS PROTO-INSTITUTIONAL WORK IN THE POPULAR MUSIC INDUSTRY[**]

[*]   Elke Schüßler, Management Department, Freie Universität Berlin, Boltzmannstr. 20, 14195 Berlin, phone: +49 30 838-56807, fax: +49 30 838-56808, e-mail: elke.schuessler@fu-berlin.de (corresponding author). Leonhard Dobusch, Management Department, Freie Universität Berlin, Boltzmannstr. 20, 14195 Berlin, e-mail: leonhard.dobusch@fu-berlin.de. Lauri Wessel, Department of Business Information Systems, Freie Universität Berlin, Garystr. 21, 14195 Berlin, e-mail: lauri.wessel@fu-berlin.de.

ABSTRACT

We study how event organizers with an eye towards field configuration enact a situation of disruption in Germany's popular music industry. Our analysis of longitudinal data on three event series highlights how event organizers addressed the void left by the discontinuation of the field's incumbent event, the Popkomm trade fair, symbolizing the breakdown of the traditional music value chain. We find that the organizers in our sample experimented with alternative event formats, explored new themes, and embedded events regionally to set up their events in the field's changing event landscape. They hereby provided temporary arenas for testing out and debating new field boundaries and practices that gave directions for field reconfiguration. We argue that by setting up new events and staging alternative possibilities for a field's future event organizers engage in proto-institutional work. This perspective extends recent research on field-configuring events and institutional work in that it focuses on the 'backstage' role of event organizers in shaping field-level developments in a dynamically evolving field.

1   INTRODUCTION

Recent work on institutionalization processes in organizational fields has recognized the role of conferences (Garud (2008)), award ceremonies (Anand and Watson (2004)), or industry contests (Rao (1994)) as focal settings where actors with diverse motivations and backgrounds assemble. These events are sometimes labeled field-configuring events (Meyer, Gaba, and Colwell (2005)) and seen as "an important and understudied mechanism shaping the emergence and developmental trajectories of technologies, markets, industries and professions" (Lampel and Meyer (2008), 1025). They are platforms for different kinds of institutional work that may result in the creation of new (Hardy and Maguire (2010)) or the maintenance of existing institutions in a field (Zilber (2011)). Particularly in fields of cultural and creative production, they are recognized as important sites for forming and trading economic, social and symbolic resources (Lampel (2011); Moeran and Strandgaard Pedersen (2011); Rüling (2011)).

Past research has mainly focused on understanding the field-level outcomes of the exchanges that occur during events such as the establishment of classification systems (Anand and Jones (2008)), the alignment of cognitions (Oliver and Montgomery (2008)), or the formation of new relationships (Glynn (2008)). In this study, we shift attention to the role of event organizers in a field as actors "with an eye towards influencing field evolution" (Lampel and Meyer (2008), 1026). Rüling (2011) recently argued that leading events in organizational fields require a high degree of institutionalization and can become deinstitutionalized by rival events, weak community support, or changes in a field. Whereas Rüling (2011) studied how one event – the Annecy International Animation Film Festival – has changed over time to maintain its field-configuring position, we are interested in event organizers that set up new events in a disrupted and transforming field.

Our empirical analysis is set in the popular music industry in Germany, a field marked by an economic crisis and the deinstitutionalization of its central event, the Popkomm trade fair, which was cancelled in 2009 after a severe decline in the number of registered exhibitors. Several new event series have been founded to challenge the Popkomm and the business model it represented (Dobusch and Schüßler (2013)). This setting is ideal to examine how – i.e., by which organizing choices – event organizers try to gain a

legitimate position in an organizational field from which they can shape field structures, but also achieve private gains (Lampel and Meyer (2008)). We find that event organizers experimented with alternative event formats, explored new themes, and embedded events regionally to situate their event in the field's wider event landscape. Each event hereby mobilized a particular set of actors and proposed alternative ideas for new practices of music production and consumption. Together, they filled the void left by the Popkomm cancelation, which symbolized the decline of the traditional music value chain based on the sale of physically recorded music, with alternative (and to a large part complementary) possibilities for field reconfiguration.

Based on these findings we make the following contributions to existing research on events and their role in (re-)configuring organizational fields. First, we study a dynamically evolving event landscape rather than singular events or event series in an organizational field. This shift in the level and unit of analysis allows us to elaborate on the role of event organizers as actors who draw on and influence field-level developments through their work at the backstage of field-configuring events. We specifically highlight three dimensions – event formats, themes, and regional embeddedness – along which event organizers try to craft a unique field-configuring position vis-à-vis competing events in an organizational field. Second, we show how particularly in disrupted fields event series are more than sites for negotiating values (Moeran and Strandgaard Pedersen (2011)). Rather, they stage and enact alternative trajectories of field development and thereby constitute a testing ground for new field boundaries and practices. Thus, we may understand events as proto-institutions (Lawrence, Hardy, and Phillips (2002), 283) – new practices, technologies, and rules in the making that have the potential to become full-fledged institutions if social processes develop that entrench them and they are diffused throughout an institutional field – and organizing events as proto-institutional work. This contributes to the literatures on institutional work in that it directs attention to events not only as stages for the institutional work of event participants, but as arenas for the temporary representation and exploration of competing proto-institutions.

We proceed by first outlining our theoretical perspective on events and event organizing. After describing our cases and methods we present our results on three dimensions along which the organization of alternative events in our sample unfolded. Finally, we

discuss the implications of our findings for the concepts of field-configuring events and institutional work in a changing field.

2 THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE

2.1 EVENTS AND THEIR ROLE IN (RE-)CONFIGURING ORGANIZATIONAL FIELDS

The growing importance of research on fairs, festivals, conferences, or other kinds of organized events is testament to their importance for organizations, regions, or industries. Management research on events spans the domains of the promotion of global values such as human rights at United Nations Dedication celebrations (Drori (2005; 2008)), certification contests in the automobile industry (Rao (1994)), sports events such as the Olympic Games (Løwendahl (1995); Glynn (2008)), industry events in the global steel industry (Madhavan, Koka, and Prescott (1998)), or meetings of open source software entrepreneurs (Stam (2010)). Recent literature under the label of field-configuring events has outlined the potential of such events to change field-level structures such as technical standards (Garud (2008)), social conventions (McInerney (2008)), or new regulations (Hardy and Maguire (2010)) and to provide opportunities for participating organizations to change their resources, relations, and positions in organizational fields (Anand and Jones (2008)).

In fields of cultural and creative production, events such as trade fairs and film or music festivals play a central role in processes of economic and symbolic value creation. Creative industries are often embedded in conflicting logics since actors need to equilibrate aesthetics and economics (e.g. DeFillipi, Grabher, and Jones (2007)). Creative products are highly symbolic, experiential goods valued on the basis of aesthetic tastes rather than utility so that consumption patterns are highly uncertain (e.g. Caves (2000); Hirsch (2000); Lampel, Lant, and Shamsie (2000)). For these reasons events take on a valuation function that would otherwise be controlled by markets (Lampel (2011)). In the music industry, for instance, festivals and live concerts present and promote musicians and send signals about artists, products, and genres (Paleo and Wijnberg (2006)). In the fields of art and design, creative output is presented at gallery openings, exhibitions, or show cases (e.g. Thompson (2011)). Award ceremonies such as the Grammy Award create symbolic capital for the selected winners that can be transformed into economic

gains (Anand and Watson (2004); Wijnberg and Gemser (2000)).

At the same time, such events are often themselves an experiential creative product (Schüßler and Sydow (2013)). As such, the organizers of fairs, festivals, or award ceremonies need to secure resource flows from public administrations, sponsors, or private consumers and compete for audiences and media attention (Rüling and Strandgaard Pedersen (2010)). The interests of event organizers as actors seeking economic gains are hereby deeply entwined with their need to react to and anticipate field developments and to position themselves as intermediaries between potential audiences and broader field developments. Anand and Watson ((2008), 1039) thus refer to the actors responsible for staging the Booker Price award ceremony as "ritual entrepreneurs" who "take stock of assumptions about the current state of the relevant field" and "incorporate their own field-shaping agenda". Based on these considerations event organizing can be understood as a form of institutional work.

2.2   ORGANIZING EVENTS AS INSTITUTIONAL WORK

Institutional work is defined as *"the purposive action of individuals and organizations aimed at creating, maintaining and disrupting institutions"* (Lawrence and Suddaby (2006), 215). To date, events are mostly perceived as temporally and spatially bounded infrastructures *for* the institutional work of event participants. Möllering (2010), for instance, studied the institutional work of absorbing technological uncertainty into sensemaking processes about future industry trajectories by participants of a conference in the semiconductor industry. In a complementary fashion, events can also be *subject to* institutional work. The Annecy film festival, for instance, had to be actively positioned and maintained as an important institution in the animation industry by repeatedly changing its structure and organization in line with regulative and economic changes in the film and television market (Rüling (2011)). The French "Salon de Peinture", in contrast, refused to include new painting styles into its definition of high art in the late 19th century and was eventually deinstitutionalized when artists began to organize own exhibitions (Delacour and Leca (2011)). Thus, event organizers must continuously capture and enact new field developments in order to successfully establish events. Thereby they provide the ground for further field configuration.

Institutional work provides a conceptual lens to study the processes by which actors draw on and potentially impact upon their social-symbolic (Giddens (1984); Phillips and Lawrence (2012)) and technical contexts (Perkmann and Spicer (2008)) . While the concept primarily refers to reflexive forms of agency intended to affect institutions, institutional work is still a highly embedded activity influenced by unforeseen mechanisms and leading to unintended consequences (Lawrence, Suddaby, and Leca (2009)). In nascent or disrupted fields, a number of different institutional workers launch competing proto-institutions. Thus, "competing candidates for institutionalization" (Zietsma and McKnight (2009), 144) clash, only few of which may become shared practices and institutional logics in a given field (Friedland and Alford (1991); Lounsbury (2007), Marquis and Lounsbury (2007)). In evolving fields, institutional work can revolve around the reframing of field boundaries or the institutionalization of new sets of practices (Zietsma and Lawrence (2010)). The institutional work associated with events typically targets regulative institutions (e.g. Hardy and Maguire (2010); Schüßler, Rüling, and Wittneben (2013)) as well as broader cognitive-normative institutional logics (e.g. Oliver and Montgomery (2008)).

When studying event organization as institutional work, the focus of analysis is on the ways in which event organizers draw on material and symbolic field structures when making specific organizing choices that, in turn, contribute to further field structuration. Festivals, fairs, or conferences, for instance, build on the social networks present in a field (Maskell, Bathelt, and Malmberg (2006)), but the selection of particular audiences contributes to a (re-)formation of these networks. Festivals or award ceremonies draw on genres, topics, or debates to develop their unique agendas and, as an outcome, influence field-level cognitive structures by setting standards for what is good or bad (e.g. Wijnberg and Gemser (2000)). Events are often also tied to a specific spatial site and draw on the symbolic and economic capital of a particular location, but at the same time they feed back to that location's reputation. Municipalities, for instance, typically provide the infrastructures needed for the hosting of big events (Pipan and Porsander (1999)), but gain revenues from tourism and a stronger urban brand in return (e.g. Richards (2007)).

3 METHODS

Given that our knowledge of event organizing in a field in flux is still limited, our research methodology is largely inductive. A qualitative case study design as it is laid out below seems particularly suited for analyzing in detail a small number of cases of event organizing as instances of proto-institutional work so as to explore facets of this phenomenon.

3.1 FIELD AND CASE SELECTION

We have selected the field of popular music in Germany as a critical case (Flyvberg (2006)) to study the role of event organizers in a disrupted organizational field. The field comprises the actors, issues, and technologies that relate to each other in the production and consumption of popular music and revolves around creating and distributing popular music content (Passman (2009)). The emergence of the Internet in the late 1990s has significantly interrupted the business models of dominant music industry players and has sparked a new debate about broader societal institutions such as the regulation of copyright and the value of culture (Dolata (2009); Dobusch and Schüßler (2013)). In this situation, events such as trade fairs, conferences, or festivals are engaged in developing and debating music production, distribution, and consumption technologies and practices. In Germany, the third largest consumer market for popular music, the Popkomm, an annual congregation of major labels and other media industries and one of the largest music industry trade fairs worldwide, was canceled in 2009 with reference to the industry crisis and is fully terminated since 2012. This void opened up by the Popkomm cancelation provides a unique setting for studying the role of event organizers trying to set up new events in processes of field reconfiguration. Especially in 2009, but also in the years before, new events emerged in this field to debate the current changes and to provide an alternative to the traditional trade fair format of the Popkomm.

We select three of these events – the all2gethernow in Berlin, the c/o pop/C'n'B in Cologne, and the Reeperbahn Festival/Campus in Hamburg – for a closer analysis of event organizing choices. The three challenging events are theoretically relevant (Yin (2009)) because all of them represent alternative suggestions for the field's future and its respec-

tive organizers attempted to fill voids opened up by the Popkomm cancelation (*see Table I*). Furthermore, as has been shown elsewhere (Dobusch and Schüßler (2013)), all three events have regularly been discussed as potential Popkomm successors in both general and industry media outlets.

--- Insert Table I about here ---

The c/o pop festival – short for "Cologne on pop" – was founded in Cologne in 2004, when the Popkomm moved to Berlin as part of its internationalization strategy. It established itself nationally and internationally as an event geared towards "music 2.0" and created a new conference format "C'n'B" (Creativity & Business Convention) in 2010. When the Popkomm was canceled in 2009 as bookings were nearly 50% down compared to the previous year, an alternative event, the all2gethernow, has quickly been established in 2009 to fill the gap in Berlin. Also in the year of the Popkomm cancelation, the Reeperbahn Festival in Hamburg started to host a conference section called "Reeperbahn Campus". The Reeperbahn Festival was founded in 2006 in Hamburg as a live music festival imitating the successful SXSW in Texas in 2006.

3.2   DATA COLLECTION

We chose the time period from 2008 to 2010 to include the years before and after the Popkomm's first cancelation as a focal point for our analysis. We collected (mostly) qualitative data and did so in three parts.

First, we conducted 24 interviews lasting between 30 and 120 minutes with current and past event organizers from our sampled three events (10), from the Popkomm (6), and other field experts (8) to dive deeper into the focal actors' interpretations and contextualizations (e.g. Barley (2008); Suddaby (2010)). We selected the core organizing teams of each event as interview partners; on the field level we sought knowledgeable field experts who served as panelists and speakers at several of the events as interview partners and also talked to local politicians involved in supporting the events. All interviews were semi-structured and guided by an interview protocol comprising four elements (Spradley (1979)): (1) Background questions on the history of each event, (2) questions related to setting the event format, especially with regard to the differentiation of the

events, (3) questions on event scheduling, (4) questions on event audiences and (5) questions on public and private event funding.

We kept the interview protocol flexible in order to allow new themes to emerge. All interviews were attended by one researcher; six of them were conducted via telephone. To account for the routine criticisms of interview research, we repeatedly asked informants to explain viewpoints either by 2-3 specific examples or to explain something they just said in different words (Alvesson (2003)). All interviews but two (I 13 and I 23) were recorded and transcribed in German; interviewees' quotations presented in this paper were translated by the authors.

Second, were able to access a set of different documents collected in the realm of a larger research project on the German popular music field. Out of a ten year archive of press documents on the main music industry events, we included in our case study database articles on the three cases under study as well as the Popkomm that were published between 2008 and 2010. We mainly used these 644 articles, 337 from industry journals and 307 from selected daily press outlets (*see Table II*), to triangulate the self-reports of event organizers with the events' perception in the media. We also collected the thematic programs of all events for the years 2008-2010, if the events took place in these years.

Third, in 2009 and 2010 we engaged in participant observation at the c/o pop and all2gethernow events, the latter of which was co-located with the re-emerging Popkomm under the label "Berlin Music Week" in 2010. At least one of the authors, in the c/o pop case always supported by a student assistant, was present at these events during both years. We recorded selected panel discussions, collected leaflets and other documents distributed at the events and engaged in many informal conversations with the participants and exhibitors. This gave us an impression of the atmosphere at three of our four events, the relevance of different issues that were debated, and the kinds of participants that were attending.

--- Insert Table II about here ---

3.3   DATA ANALYSIS

We began by generating a narrative account of each event (Langley (1999)). The narratives focused on the founding histories of each event and the development of the event until the end of our focal (2008-2010) investigation period. These short event histories presented details and idiosyncrasies of each event and gave us a holistic understanding of each case to contextualize our subsequent analysis (Miles and Huberman (1994)). As suggested by Langley (1999), we based our theoretical analysis on these narratives. Specifically, we applied an inductive approach as it has been suggested in recent organizational theorizing (e.g. Ansari and Phillips (2011); Mair, Marti, and Ventresca (2012)): at first, we developed provisional "first-order concepts" (Miles and Huberman (1994)), slight abstractions of data that provide for an initial ordering and stay close to the language used by our interview partners. Second, we abstracted these concepts into three so-called "second-order themes", more theoretically tainted categories that embrace the interpretations of the research team: experimenting with alternative event formats, exploring new themes, and regionally embedding events. Lastly, we compared these second-order themes to extant literature to generate an overarching theoretical dimension: organizing events as proto-institutional work in a disrupted field (*see Table III*).

--- Insert Table III about here ---

Working one's way "bottom up" like this from the empirical material is a very useful approach for management research (cf. Gioia, Corley, and Hamilton (2013); Nag, Corley, and Gioia (2007); Clark et al. (2010)). It is particularly useful in areas where prior theorizing is thin since a researcher cannot know a priori how the empirical material will add to extant theorizing (e.g. Bansal and Corley (2012); Edmondson and McManus (2007)). The premise is thus to grant primacy to the data so long as the researcher begins seeing theoretical novelty within the empirical material (Alvesson and Kärreman (2007)). We started by analyzing the interview data to capture the self-descriptions of event organizers, complemented by our own observations. We collapsed these descriptions in first-order concepts and then added the media data to begin understanding how the media elaborated upon the organizers' attempts to institutionalize their ventures. Hence we used the interview data to generate first-order concepts and applied them to

the media data. This coding sequence showed two things: each event organizer strongly referred to the Popkomm when explaining his or her organizing choices, and the media stressed how each event compared to the Popkomm.

4   FINDINGS

4.1   EXPERIMENTING WITH ALTERNATIVE EVENT FORMATS

Event organizers experimented with alternative event formats mainly to differentiate themselves from two things: the Popkomm, and the other events that we sampled. Event-idiosyncratic experimentations are thus best understood when we display them in comparison between these events. The Popkomm was in the past using a classical trade fair format with various conference panels and a major trade show.

The early vision of the c/o pop founders, for instance, was explicitly to design an alternative, non-commercial event compared to incumbent Popkomm series: *„The Popkomm was designed as a business meeting financed by major labels. We are a cultural event made by the people for the people"* (c/o pop interview). As such, the c/o pop began as a festival for urban pop culture with a musical and cultural profile rooted heavily in the Cologne electronic music scene. It offered concerts, panels and presentations, which altogether lasted 17 days. From there it developed into a nationally and internationally well-known five-day music and discussion event. Over time, the organizers developed a more specific profile for its non-festival sections as a networking event moderating between different scenes and industries. In 2009, the c/o pop organizers created the "Europareise" format, an international networking platform aimed at bringing together different festivals and funding institutions from around the world as important intermediaries in the music business. In 2010, following the year of the Popkomm cancelation, the c/o pop organizers developed a new conference format, the Create and Business Convention (C'n'B), intended to create links across different creative industries, and to establish a dialogue between creative and 'conventional' industries.

The format of the all2gethernow is also best understood in the context of the Popkomm's development. The event was founded in 2009, the year of the Popkomm cancelation, as a direct reaction to the public reasoning for the Popkomm's problems:

"The term 'digital crisis', this was a central momentum for us." stated one of our interview partners from the all2gethernow team. In strict demarcation from the Popkomm approach, the all2gethernow organizers invited anybody to join the event and host a panel – hence the name "all2gethernow". The audience was integrated into the event planning process, which is one reason for why the all2gethernow quickly became labeled as the *"Grassroots Popkomm"* (Musikwoche). Interested parties were invited to event development workshops at so-called "Townhall Meetings", which were devoted to discussing and planning the all2gethernow. The rationale was that "*users and fans have a lot to say on what future revenue models could look like since they know how music is consumed best*" (all2gethernow interview). Since „*the Popkomm had been blamed for always applying the same toolkit to the event"* (all2gethernow interview), the all2gethernow organizers seized the opportunity to establish a completely novel event format.

The Reeperbahn Festival began as a three-day live music festival in September 2006 hosting gigs of about 100 bands in various clubs located on and around the Reeperbahn street. The Reeperbahn organizers told us that they had been thinking about developing a small conference section for a while, but only realized this idea when the Popkomm was canceled in 2009. The resulting "Reeperbahn Campus" hosted about 30 panels and workshops in 2009, but quickly grew to 70 panels already in 2010.

What these different formats have in common is that they all aimed to overcome the Popkomm's sense of exclusivity and narrow focus on the traditional music industry by opening up the events to non-industry actors, by explicitly addressing other industries, and by moving closer to the creative scenes in which music is produced and consumed, which is why we summarized these aspects under the first-order concept "Developing open platforms" (*see Table IV*).

--- Insert Table IV about here ---

Along with experimenting with new and more open formats event organizers carefully considered the timing of their event, especially in the year of the Popkomm cancelation and facing the emergence of several new events on the field's event landscape. We grouped these data under the first-order code "(Re-)Scheduling events" (*see Table IV*).

As stated by the *Musikwoche*: *"The cancelation of the Popkomm sets the schedule of the industry into motion."* The all2gethernow organizers, for instance, specifically scheduled their first event on the dates the Popkomm had been planned for to symbolize that the end of the Popkomm does not equal the end of music production and consumption, a message industry lobbyists tried to convey when the Popkomm cancelation was announced: *"We took this date to say 'we are here but where are you?'"* (all2gethernow interview). The press further supported the all2gethernow's message with statements such as "*this could render the Popkomm forgotten*" (Musikwoche) or "*last week, everybody partied in Berlin, but not at the Popkomm!*" (Rheinische Post). The industry magazine *Musikwoche* adequately sums up the main reasoning behind this scheduling decision: *"The a2n is the phantom pain after the cancelation of the Popkomm."* In the following year, the city of Berlin initiated the Berlin Music Week to revive the Popkomm and to ensure that Berlin would still host Germany's largest music industry event. The all2gethernow was also included as a part of the Berlin Music Week, so that its organizers "*now have to at least partially follow the rules given by the Senate*" (all2gethernow interview). While the press used this change to re-label the all2gethernow as the conference section of the Popkomm, the all2gethernow organizers adjusted the event's duration from three days in 2009 to six in 2010 to set their event apart from the Popkomm. The all2gethernow organizers emphasized that starting two days before the Popkomm and lasting two days longer was "*very important to us*" because "*we are not the conference-leg of the Popkomm*" (both quotes all2gethernow interviews).

The Reeperbahn organizers explained the original timing of their festival in late September with the rationale that holding a club-based festival during the summer months would not be attractive for visitors and during the winter months the festival would interfere with tour bookings. Yet, this timing close to the all2gethernow date in 2009 and both the all2gethernow and Popkomm dates in 2010 made them competitors, since "*many international visitors will not be in Berlin first and then 14 days later in Hamburg, or vice versa*". However, since the date for the Reeperbahn Festival had already been well-established, the organizers decided not the change that date even when the Berlin Music Week was announced.

The c/o pop organizers, in contrast, avoided scheduling-related competition in 2010 and moved the event forward for about six weeks into the end of June: "*Our original date in*

August would have exposed our visitors to three important events in four weeks – us in late August, Berlin Music Week in early September, and Reeperbahn Festival in mid-September. Nobody would have pardoned that" (c/o pop interview).

4.2   EXPLORING NEW THEMES

All of the event organizing teams we examined developed new thematic niches in response to the debate about the decline – and possible transformation – of the traditional music industry. They tried to explore new themes and trigger new debates through mainly two – partly interrelated – approaches, which we subsumed under the first-order categories of "Representing alternative music industry value chains" and „Opening up to other industries" (*see Table IV for representative data*). While the development of more open event formats laid the basis for attracting new audiences for events, thematic agenda-setting guided more specifically which kinds of audiences are invited. Again, the organizers in our sample aimed to set themes that diverged from the Popkomm and the business model based around major labels that this trade fair represented.

--- Insert Table V about here ---

The most thematically focused event in our sample is the Reeperbahn Festival/Campus. Its history as a show-case event conditioned that today most debates at the Reeperbahn Campus relate to the live business. Therefore the organizing team seeks to invite individuals and organizations working in live entertainment. Arguably, these are not new actors in the popular music field, but making them focal actors at an event *is* new, so that a new theme is explored. The c/o pop/C'n'B also started as a live event, but now targets a much wider audience. The organizers explicitly seek to attract actors from beyond the music industry and invite various representatives from other creative industries to their event. Both events thus establish connections between music scenes and business, albeit in different ways. In contrast, the all2gethernow wants to provide "*a platform for everybody interested in music, creativity and culture*" (Musikwoche (2009)). This goes hand in hand with the all2gethernow practice of having on open "camp" where everybody interested can host a panel session together with a conference section (*see above*). All three events decidedly deviate from the strict music industry audience of the Popkomm and make clear efforts to attract others participants than just music

industry representatives.

Each event hereby targets to debate possible futures of the music industry, but with different stances towards what this future could be. In an offensive deviation from the Popkomm, the all2gethernow in 2009 rhetorically embraced digital technologies for music distribution as the industry's future path, thereby reaching out to young and technology-oriented audiences in the soaring field of Internet-based start-ups – a group that Popkomm-founder and head of the main music industry association Dieter Gorny refers to as "interns". Earlier in that year, Gorny had justified the Popkomm cancelation by online music piracy, which prompted the all2gethernow organizers' opposing view: *"I was mad about this reasoning. Honestly, if you realized that piracy is a problem in 2009, then you have been dead asleep for a decade!"* (all2gethernow interview). In the all2gethernow's view, the Internet is the central source of new opportunities and the main reason why the organizers set out to promote this perspective. Similarly, the organizers of the Reeperbahn Festival/Campus chose a very specific focus of their event to crystallize their agenda that live entertainment is "the" branch of the music industry ready to prosper: *"Live entertainment, and probably publishing, are the only markets that will generate return in the future"* (Reeperbahn Festival interview). Thus both events chose more or less specific framings of the music industry's future, a concentration the c/o pop somewhat deviates from. The c/o pop/C'n'B is less driven towards a specific branch or a specific technology presented as "the" solution. Rather, it embraces ambiguity as the raison d'être of the event, or, in the words of one c/o pop organizer *"the industry needs new solutions. But until today, we did not know what they could be. Our event is set out to find them"*. In the course of the three-year period in which we studied the c/o pop/C'n'B, the organizers hereby struggled to define the right audience for leading this dialogue. Its initial focus on bringing all creative industries together was not particularly fruitful, so in its recent editions the organizers aimed to attract only selected creative industries as well as some large players from the telecommunications industry, following the idea that new sources of value creation lie in cross-industry relationships.

4.3   REGIONALLY EMBEDDING EVENTS

Along with opening up to new actors and themes and developing visions for the field of

popular music, each event we studied was closely and carefully embedded by its organizers in the respective regional and urban environment in which it took place – again a difference to the Popkomm which, as a major trade fair, was mainly geared towards international audiences and largely neglected its regional embeddedness, signified by its allegedly highly opportunistic move from Cologne to Berlin in 2004. The event organizers we studied instead heavily built on local spaces and networks when creating and institutionalizing new events, two aspects that we coded as "Harvesting locations" and „Strengthening local networks" (*see Table V for representative data*).

Specific locales have unique histories, atmospheres, and identities, resources that can be drawn on to give meaning to an event. Furthermore, each of the three cities has a vital creative scene and regional governments that aim profile their regions as creative, following the example of creative industry policies and metropolitan development initiatives in the UK since 1997. Urban environments and local creative scenes thus provide both financial and symbolic resources the events; in turn, the events contribute to the development of regional creative clusters or metropolitan regions. Each new event tried to explicitly tie its profile to the history of each city or region. This is most evident in the case of the c/o pop and the Reeperbahn Festival, because both of these events carry a clear reference to their host city in their name. By using the city's name in the title, the c/o pop organizers tried to harvest the city's image, because "*It's simply in people's minds that Cologne stands for electronic music*" and the name "*gave people an idea of what our event is all about in the early days*" (both quotes from c/o pop interviews). Similarly, the name of the Reeperbahn Festival is testament to Hamburg's most famous street's unsavory, yet glamorous verve.

Within the cities, especially the c/o pop and the all2gethernow experimented with different locations to further symbolize and support the respective event's mission. Many of the camps of first all2gethernow in 2009, for instance, were hosted in Berlin's old coinage, *"which added a funny twist as it reminded us of the days when the music industry still had money"* (all2gethernow interviews). In the c/o pop case, some shows in 2009 were hosted in the Cologne "Schauspielhaus" and in the rooms of the local philharmonic orchestra, which added an entirely new edge to the event that was traditionally rooted in the club scene: "*These shows reached totally different people than before. Our event now has a completely different standing in town*" (c/o pop interview). Similarly,

by hosting panels in famous club locations such as the "Große Freiheit 36" or "Uebel und Gefährlich" the organizers of the Reeperbahn Campus tried to create a more scene-based atmosphere despite following a rather conventional panel format.

In its two founding years the C'n'B took place in the buildings of the Cologne trade fair, but moving to this rather sterile, business-oriented, out-of-town venue has somehow undermined the event's ability to explore new forms of collaboration and facilitate fresh dialogues across diverse actor groups. In 2012, the C'n'B relocated to the rooms of the Cologne Chamber of Commerce and Industry and will relocate again in 2013 to the rooms of the Koelnischer Kunstverein in order to be closer in the city center and stay connected to the c/o pop festival and local creative scenes.

--- Insert Table VI about here ---

Municipal governments and local networks were important allies in all of our cases. Powerful partners such as Warner Music Central Europe (based in Hamburg) were repeatedly mentioned as strong advocates of the Reeperbahn Festival/Campus, for instance. Our interviewees confirmed the company's support of the festival and Bernd Dopp, Warner's CEO, repeatedly emphasized that the Reeperbahn Festival has bright prospects of becoming 'the' German music industry event. In line with their event format, all2gethernow's organizers relied less on industry networks or public funding, but rather on the diverse Berlin-based networks among IT firms, programmers, and underground music. The involvement of web-firms, do-it-yourself entrepreneurs and the grassroots approach to organizing helped in positioning the all2gethernow as a happening that "*practices the claim 'all together now' because everybody can come together and no one is excluded*" (all2gethernow interview).

5   ORGANIZING EVENTS AS PROTO-INSTITUTIONAL WORK IN A DISRUPTED FIELD

The de-institutionalization of the Popkomm, the incumbent event in the German popular music industry, opened up a void for alternative event organizers to fill. This opportunity was seized in different ways by different actors. One group of actors entered the field from other industries as the all2gethernow case showed. Another group comprised of

organizers of existing event series such as the Reeperbahn Festival and the c/o pop who transformed their events during the time when the Popkomm was deinstitutionalized. They, for instance, developed new conference sections in order to fill the void that was opening on the field-level. Across both groups of actors, event organizers experimented with alternative event formats, explored new themes, and regionally embedded events to develop an identity that differed from the Popkomm and the field logics and practices this previously incumbent event represented. In assembling different audiences, stimulating new debates, and connecting with local creative scenes instead of large industry players the three events we studied instantiated particular perspectives on the field's future development. In this sense we suggest that these new events, not yet fully institutionalized as new incumbents, may be understood as proto-institutions – institutions in-the-making which are not yet reified on the field-level (Lawrence, Hardy, and Phillips (2002)) but which are actively driven by the purposeful efforts of actors assigning value to their field-wide institutionalization (Zietsma and McKnight (2009)). Therefore, the organization of events such as those in our sample can be coined "proto-institutional work".

Research on proto-institutions within the body of institutional theory is still nascent. Lawrence and colleagues (2002) gave birth to the term proto-institution by pointing to the role of inter-organizational collaboration in creating new practices, rules, and technologies that transcend the level of singular organizations. Zietsma and McKnight (2009), then, bridged the notion of proto-institutions with the concept of institutional work. They emphasize the competition between different actors who attempt to proto-institutionalize their individual agendas. In our case, such alternative logics of field re-configuration materialized in different types of organized events that to some extent competed, but more importantly they tried to flesh out individual niches so as to diversi-fy the event landscape and present alternative possibilities in the German popular music field overall. Building on the work of the sociologist Alfred Schütz, Mische (2009) re-cently argued that such an open imagination of possible future states is an important driver for social change. Of course, the event organizers were also driven by the materi-al motive to successfully set up a new or change an existing event series. Their proto-institutional work was rather a result of the basic value proposition or business model of events, which is to provide platforms at which networks can be formed and new themes be placed on the public agenda. The proto-institutional work of event organizing hereby

is to pick up on issues, debates, actors, or practices that already exist in the transforming field, to concentrate them in a bounded space and time, and to make them visible, thereby facilitating a further reshaping of field boundaries and practices in a particular direction (cf. Zietsma and Lawrence (2010)).

The notion of event organizing as proto-institutional work extends research on organized, field-configuring events in several important ways. First, Rüling (2011) argued that event organizers institutionalize events and engage in maintenance work if the event is supposed to retain a strong field mandate vis-à-vis other events in a field's event circuit. Building on this argument, our study demonstrates that when a central event is missing a set of different events together can configure fields in a certain direction, suggesting that a field's wider event landscape may be a relevant unit of analysis for understanding events and their field-configuring impact. Elaborating on Rüling's (2011) notion of events as boundary organizations between different actors and institutional logics, our study demonstrates the importance of an event's regional embeddedness and its ability to bridge local creative scenes to wider organizational fields. Regional resources such as subsidies, localities, freelance workforces, and audiences are important material inputs for event organizers. Regional identities and histories furthermore provided symbolic inputs for developing a distinct event profile. Regions have been acknowledged as important to the business models and morales of actors (Marquis and Battilana (2009); Marquis, Davis, and Glynn (2013)). Lounsbury (2007) found that Boston-based mutual funds differ from their New York-counter parts in terms of their risk-averse portfolio structures, while Owen-Smith and Powell (2004; 2008) showed how Boston-based life sciences networks are committed to maintaining knowledge as a public good, whereas Californian networks in the same field uphold a profit-seeking motivation. These studies attribute these local differences to deep-seated ideals and moralities at the local level. In the context of events organization, this means that events not only contribute to a reformation of regional networks (Glynn (2008)), but that symbolic and material resources are important for defining the way in which events configure wider organizational fields.

A second implication of this study relates to reflections on events as (de)stabilizers of fields. Our findings indicate that incumbent events, especially in fields of cultural and creative production, mostly contribute to field maintenance. The disruption of such

events, in contrast, is very likely not only an outcome, but also trigger for field reconfiguration. In our case, the move and the cancelation of the Popkomm allowed new events to emerge that developed not only alternative event formats, but also alternative ways of framing the field. The all2gethernow and the C'n'B, for instance, widened the boundaries of the popular music field by explicitly targeting the open source community and other creative industries as important actors for defining paths of field reconfiguration. The Reeperbahn Festival, in contrast, contracted the boundaries of the field by focusing on the core issue of live music. They hereby also provided ideas about new industry logics and practices, e.g. by highlighting the "creative commons" as alternative forms of licensing cultural products or by providing platforms for cross-innovation.

The experimentation with new event formats also constitutes an important addition to existing research on field-configuring events, since formats pre-define the selections made by events. Zietsma and Lawrence (2010) argued that discrete spaces allow central and marginal actors to come together to negotiate compromises among diverging agendas. Events constitute such spaces, but who comes together at them is to a large part pre-defined by specific organizing choices. Albeit in different ways, each event in our sample tried to diverge from the industry-based selection mechanism of trade fairs to allow new actors to participate in the debate. The "Europareise"-format of the c/o pop facilitated a new dialogue among event organizers around the world, the "barcamp"-format of the all2gethernow attracted the digital scene and internet activists, and the format of the Reeperbahn Festival included musicians and consumers and not just industry actors. Brokering between business and creative logics thus constituted an important part of the proto-institutional work of each event.

Although we tried to apply an outmost rigor to our empirical analysis, our study also has important limitations. We do attempt a longitudinal analysis, but this analysis could include a much longer time-frame. However, given that we wanted to study closely the year of and the times right before and right after the Popkomm's cancelation, we opted for our chosen time-frame. Hence, we tried to balance quantity of analyzed years against the in-depth analysis of events in these (troubled) times. Furthermore, we only studied field-level effects in terms of media data. While understanding the actual long-term outcomes of competing institutionalization projects was not the core purpose of this paper, a study of field-level developments over time would provide a nice comple-

ment to our data. Finally, our notions of competitive event landscapes and positioning practices could have been refined in more depth by studying a larger sample of events and cities. Within Germany, the cities of Mannheim and Leipzig could further complement our sample. Internationally, the United Kingdom, the United States or the Netherlands would be interesting comparative cases as they have a similarly striving event landscape in the popular music industry.

We propose that the value of industry events to actors in the field is particularly high in disrupted fields where institutional openness demands spaces for actors to discuss novel ideas. Events provide such arenas where proponents and opponents of different trajectories or logics can dispute each other's claims (Hensmans (2003)). Building on this, further research could explore in more depth and in different fields the value of events to mobilize collective action, frame debates, and gain legitimacy for institutional change (e.g. Hargrave and Van de Ven (2006)). Furthermore, while in our case organizing events is much more concerned with creating institutions, further research could explore the role of events in maintaining or disrupting organizational fields, for instance mature fields (e.g. Greenwood and Suddaby (2006)) or complex fields (Greenwood et al. (2011)). Our study also indicates that the cancelation of events that have served as important institutions in an organizational field can create an institutional void (Aldrich and Fiol (1994); Mair and Marti (2009); Puffer, McCarthy, and Boisot (2010); Philips and Tracey (2011)) that opens up opportunities for new proto-institutional work. Whether such alternative events eventually converge (cf. Zietsma and McKnight (2009)), or whether a new incumbent event emerges is an empirical question and one that can be fruitfully addressed in further research also in different field contexts.

REFERENCES

Aldrich, Howard E., and C. Marlene Fiol (1994), Fools rush in? The institutional context of industry creation, *The Academy of Management Review*, 19(4), 645-670.

Alvesson, Mats (2003), Beyond Neopositivists, Romantics, and Localists: A Reflexive Approach to Interviews in Organizational Research. *The Academy of Management Review*, 28(1), 13-33.

Alvesson, Mats, and Dan Kärreman (2007), Constructing mystery: Empirical matters in theory development, *The Academy of Management Review,* 32(4), 1265-1281.

Anand, N., and Brittany C. Jones (2008), Tournament rituals, category dynamics, and field configuration: The case of the Booker Prize, *Journal of Management Studies,* 45, 1036-1060.

Anand, N., and Mary R. Watson (2004), Tournament rituals in the evolution of fields – The case of the Grammy Awards, *Academy of Management Journal*, 47, 59-80.

Ansari, Shahzad and Nelson Phillips (2011), Text Me! New Consumer Practices and Change in Organizational Fields, *Organization Science, 22*(6), 1579-1599.

Bansal, Pratima and Kevin Corley, (2012), Publishing in AMJ – Part 7: What's Different about Qualitative Research? *Academy of Management Journal*: 509-513.

Barley, Stephen R. (2008), Coalface Institutionalism, in Royston Greenwood, Christine Oliver, Kerstin Sahlin, and Roy Suddaby (eds.), The Sage Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism: 491-518. London, New Delhi: Sage.

Caves, Richard E. 2000. *Creative Industries. Contracts between Art and Commerce*, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press.

Clark, Shawn M., Dennis A. Gioia, David Ketchen Jr., and James B. Thomas (2010), Transitional Identity as a Facilitator of Organizational Identity Change during a Merger, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 3: 397-438.

DeFillippi, Robert, Gernot Grabher and Candace Jones (2007), Introduction to paradoxes of creativity: Managerial and organizational challenges in the cultural economy, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 28: 511-521.

Delacour, Helene and Bernard Leca (2011), A salon's life. Field configuring event, power and contestation in a creative field, in Brian Moeran and Jesper Strandgaard Pedersen (eds.), *Negotiating values in the creative industries: Fairs, festivals and other competitive events*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 36-58.

Dobusch, Leonhard and Schüßler, Elke (2013), Copyright reform and business model innovation: Regulatory propaganda at music industry conferences, *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, in print.

Dolata, Ulrich. (2009), Technological innovations and sectoral change: Transformative capacity, adaptability, patterns of change: An analytical framework, *Research Policy,* 38, 1066-

1076.

Drori, Gili S. (2005), United Nations' Dedications: A World Culture in the Making? *International Sociology*, 20, 175-199.

Drori, Gili S. (2008), Institutionalism and Globalization Studies, in Royston Greenwood, Christine Oliver, Kerstin Sahlin, and Roy Suddaby (eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism*, Thousand Oaks: Sage, 449-472.

Edmondson, Amy C. and Stacy E. McManus (2007), Methodological fit in management field research *Academy of Management Review*, 32(4), 1155-1179.

Flyvbjerg, Bent (2006), Five misunderstandings about case-study research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 12, 219-245.

Friedland, Rorger and Robert R. Alford (1991), Bringing society back in: Symbols, practice, and institutional contradictions, in Walter W. Powell and Paul DiMaggio (eds.), *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 232–263.

Garud, Raghu (2008), Conferences as venues for the configuration of emerging organizational fields: The case of cochlear implants, *Journal of Management Studies*, 45, 1062-1088.

Giddens, Anthony (1984), *The Constitution of Society. Outline of the Theory of Structuration,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gioia, Dennis. A., Corley, Kevin. G. and Hamilton, Aimee L. (2013), Seeking qualitative rigor in inductive research: Notes on the Gioia methodology, *Organizational Research Methods*, 16(1), 15-31.

Glynn, Mary A. (2008), Configuring the field of play: How hosting the Olympic Games impacts civic community, *Journal of Management Studies*, 45 (6), 1117–1146.

Greenwood, Royston, Mia Raynard, Farah Kodeih, Evelyn R. Micelotta, and Michael Lounsbury (2011), Institutional complexity and organizational responses, *The Academy of Management Annals*, 5(1), 317-371.

Greenwood, Royston and Roy Suddaby (2006), Institutional entrepreneurship in mature fields: The big five accounting firms, *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(1), 27-48.

Hardy, Cynthia, and Maguire, Steve (2010), Discourse, Field-Configuring Events, and Change in Organizations and Institutional Fields: Narratives of DDT and the Stockholm Convention, *Academy of Management Journal*, 6, 1365-1392.

Hargrave, Timothy. J. and Andrew H. Van de Ven (2006), A collective action model of institutional innovation, *Academy of Management Review*, 31(4), 864-888.

Hensmans, Manuel (2003), Social movement organizations: A metaphor for strategic actors in institutional fields. *Organization Studies*, 24(3), 355-381.

Hirsch, Paul M. (2000), Cultural industries revisited, *Organization Science*, 11(3), 356-361.

Lampel, Joseph (2011), Converting values into other values: fairs and festivals as resource valu-

ation and trading events, in Brian Moeran and Jesper Strandgaard Pedersen (eds.), *Negotiating Values in the Creative Industries: Fairs, Festivals and Competitive Events*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 334-347.

Lampel, Joseph and Alan D. Meyer (2008), Field-configuring events as structuring mechanisms: How conferences, ceremonies, and trade shows constitute new technologies, industries, and markets, *Journal of Management Studies*, 45, 1025-1035.

Lampel, Jospeh, Theresa Lant and Jamal Shamsie (2000), Balancing act: Learning from organizing practices in cultural industries, *Organization Science*, 11(3), 263-269.

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

Lawrence, Thomas B., and Roy Suddaby (2006), Institutions and institutional wor,. in Stewart R. Clegg, Cynthia Hardy, Walter R. Nord and Thomas B. Lawrence (eds.), *The Sage handbook of organization studies*, London: Sage, 215-254.

Lawrence, Thomas B., Roy Suddaby, and Bernard Leca (2009), Introduction: Theorizing and studying institutional work, in homas. B. Lawrence, Roy Suddaby and Bernard Leca (eds.), *Institutional work: actors and agency in institutional studies of organizations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1-28.

Lawrence, Thomas B., Roy Suddaby and Bernard Leca (2011), Institutional work: Refocusing institutional studies of organization,. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 20(1), 52-58.

Lawrence, Thomas B., Cynthia Hardy and Nelson Phillips (2002), Institutional effects of inter-organizational collaboration: The emergence of proto-institutions, *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(1), 281-290.

Lounsbury, Michael. (2007), A tale of two cities: Competing logics and practice variation in the professionalizing of mutual fund,. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50, 289-307.

Løwendahl, Bente R. (1995), Organizing the Lillehammer Olympic Winter Games, *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 11, 347-362.

Madhavan, Ravindranath, Balaji R. Koka and John E. Prescott (1998), Networks in Transition: How Industry Events (Re)Shape Interfirm Relationships, *Strategic Management Journal, 19*(5), 439-459.

Mair, J., Ignasi Marti, and Marc J. Ventresca (2012), Building Inclusive Markets in Rural Bangladesh: How Intermediaries Work Institutional Voids, *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(4), 819-850.

Mair, Johanna and Ignasi Marti (2009), Entrepreneurship in and around institutional voids: A case study from Baglades,. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 24(5), 419-435.

Marquis, Christopher and Lounsbury, Michael (2007), Vive la resistance: Competing logics and the consolidation of U.S. community banking, *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(4), 799-820.

Marquis, Christopher and Julie Battilana (2009), Acting globally but thinking locally? The enduring influence of local communities on organizations, *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 29: 283-302.

Marquis, Christopher, Gerald F. Davis and Mary A. Glynn (2013), Golfing alone? Corporations, elites, and nonprofit growth in 100 American communities, *Organization Science*, 24(1), 39-57.

Maskell, Peter, Bathelt, Harald and Malmberg, Anders (2006), Building global knowledge pipelines: The role of temporary clusters, *European Planning Studies*, 14(8), 997-1013.

McInerney, Paul-Brian (2008), Showdown at Kykuit: Field-configuring events as loci for conventionalizing accounts, *Journal of Management Studies*, 45, 1089-1116.

Meyer, Alan D., Vibha Gaba and Kenneth A. Colwell (2005), Organizing far from equilibrium: Non-linear change in organizational fields, *Organization Science*, 16, 456-473.

Miles, Matthew B. and A. Miles Huberman (1994), *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook*, Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Mische, Ann (2009), Projects and possibilities: Researching futures in action, *Sociological Forum*, 24(3), 694-704.

Möllering, Guido (2010), Collective market-making efforts at an engineering conference, *MPIfG Discussion Paper* 10/2.

Moeran, Brian and Jesper Strandgaard Pedersen (2011), Introduction, in Brian Moeran and Jesper Strandgaard Pedersen (eds.), *Negotiating Values in the Creative Industries: Fairs, Festivals and Competitive Events*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1-35.

Nag, Rajiv, Kevin G. Corley, and Gioia, Dennis A. (2007), The intersection of organizational identity, knowledge, and practice: Attempting strategic change via knowledge grafting, *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(4), 821-847.

Oliver, Amalya. L. and Kathleen Montgomery (2008), Using field-configuring events for sensemaking: A cognitive network approach, *Journal of Management Studies*, 45, 1147-1167.

Owen-Smith, Jason, and Walter W. Powell, (2004), Knowledge networks as channels and conduits: The effects of spillovers in the Boston biotechnology community, *Organization Science*, 15(1), 5-21.

Owen-Smith, Jason and Walter W. Powell (2008), Networks and institutions, in Royston Greenwood, Christine Oliver, Kerstin Sahlin, and Roy Suddaby (eds.), *The sage handbook of organizational institutionalism*, New York: Sage, 594-621.

Paleo, Iván O. and Nachoem M. Wijnberg (2006), Classification of popular music festivals: A typology of festivals and an inquiry into their role in the construction of music genres, *International Journal of Arts Management,* 8, 50-61.

Passman, D. (2009), *All you need to know about the music business*. New York: Free Press.

Perkmann, Markus and Spicer, Andre (2008), How Are Management Fashions Institutional-
ized? The Role of Institutional Work, *Human Relations*, 61(6), 811-844.

Phillips, N., and Tracey, P. (2011), Entrepreneurship in emerging markets: strategies for new
venture creation in uncertain institutional contexts*, Management International Review*,
51(1), 23-39.

Phillips, Nelson and Lawrence, Thomas B. (2012), The turn to work in organization and man-
agement theory: Some implications for strategic organization, *Strategic Organization*,
10(3) 223-230.

Pipan, Tatiana and Lena Porsander (1999), Imitating Uniqueness: How Big Cities Organize Big
Event,. *Organization Studies*, 21, 1-27.

Puffer, Sheila M., Daniel J. McCarthy and Max Boisot (2010), Entrepreneurship in Russia and
China: The Impact of Formal Institutional Voids, *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Prac-
tice*, 34(3), 441-467.

Richards, Greg (2007), The festivalization of society or the socialization of festivals? The case
of Catalunya, *Cultural Tourism: Global and Local Perspectives*. Richards, G. Binghamp-
ton, NY, Hawthorne Press: 257-280.

Rao, Hayagreeva. (1994), The social construction of reputation: Certification contests, legitima-
tion, and the survival of Organizations in the American automobile industry: 1895-1912,
Strategic Management Journal, 15, 29-44.

Rüling, Charles-Clemens (2011), Event institutionalization and maintenance: The Annecy ani-
mation festival 1960-2010, in Brian Moeran and Jesper. Strandgaard Pedersen (eds.), *Ne-
gotiating Values in the Creative Industries: Fairs, Festivals and Competitive Events*.
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 197-223.

Rüling, Charles-Clemens and Jesper Strandgaard Pedersen (2010), Film festival research from
an organizational studies perspective, *Scandinavian Journal of Management,* 26, 318-
323.

Schüßler, Elke and Sydow, Jörg (2013), Organizing events for configuring and maintaining
creative fields, in Candace Jones, Lorenzen, M. and Jonathan Sapsed (eds.), *The Oxford
Handbook of Creative Industries*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, in print.

Schüßler, Elke, Rüling, Charles-Clemens and Wittneben, Bettina (2013), On melting summits:
The limitations of field-configuring events as catalysts of change in transnational climate
policy, *Academy of Management Journal*, in print. doi: 10.5465/amj.2011.0812

Spradley, James P. (1979), *The ethnographic interview,* New York: Holt, Reinhart and Winston.

Stam, Wouter (2010), Industry Event Participation and Network Brokerage among Entrepre-
neurial Ventures, *Journal of Management Studies*, 47(4), 625-653.

Suddaby, Roy (2010), Challenges for Institutional Theory, *Journal of Management Inquiry*,
19(1), 14-20.

Thompson, Don (2011), Art fairs: The market is medium, in Brian Moeran and Jesper. Strandgaard Pedersen (eds.), *Negotiating Values in the Creative Industries: Fairs, Festivals and Competitive Events*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 59-72.

Wijnberg, Nachoem M. and Gerda Gemser (2000), Adding value to innovation: Impressionism and the transformation of the selection system in visual arts, *Organization Science*, 11(3), 323-329.

Yin, Ronald K. (2009), *Case study research. Design and methods*, Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Zietsma, Charlene and Thomas B. Lawrence (2010), Institutional work in the transformation of an organizational field: The interplay of boundary work and practice work, *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 55, 189-221.

Zietsma, Charlene and Brent McKnight (2009), Building the iron cage: Institutional creation work in the context of competing proto-institutions, in Thomas B. Lawrence, Roy Suddaby and Bernard Leca (eds.), *Institutional Work: Actors and Agency in Institutional Studies of Organizations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 143-175.

Zilber, Tammar B. (2011), Institutional Multiplicity in Practice: A Tale of Two High-Tech Conferences in Israel. *Organization Science,* 22(6), 1539–1559.

Table 1: **Case overview**

	Popkomm	*c/o pop/C'n'B*	*all2gethernow*	*Reeperbahn Festival/Campus*
Founding date/location	2001, Cologne; Berlin 2004-2011 (ex. 2009)	2004/2009, Cologne	2009, Berlin	2006/2009, Hamburg
Focus	Mainstream music industry, major labels	Alternative music industry, other creative industries	Digital scene, open source movement	Live music
Size (estimates)	15.000 visitors, 800 exhibits	1.000 visitors, 60 sessions	1.000 visitors, 100 sessions	1.500 visitors, 100 sessions

Table 2: **Case study database**

	c/o pop/C'n'B	*all2gethernow*	*Popkomm*	*Reeperbahn Festival/ Campus*	*Field experts*
Interviews	I 1: Founder/ CEO I 2: Head of convention I 3: Head of strategy I 4: Head of finance	I 5: Founder/ CEO I 6: Head of event I 7: Member of organizing team I I 8: Member of organizing team II	I 9: Founder/ former CEO I 10: Head of conference I 11: Manager exhibition I 12: Manager marketing I 13: Manager event I I 14: Manager event II	I 15: Founder/ CEO I 16: Head of program	I 17: Industry consultant I 18: Cologne City Cultural Office I 19: Cologne City Cultural Office/ CEO Event Association I 20: Industry consultant/ex-Sony I 21: Music Manager I 22: Member of the Berlin senate I 23: Cologne cluster manager I 24: Popkomm program consultant

Observation	2009, 2010	2009, 2010	2010	-
Documents	Programs 2005*-2010	Program 2009-2010	Programs 2003-2010	Programs 2009-2010**
Press	Industry press (337 articles between 2008-2010): Musikwoche, Musikmarkt Daily Press (307 articles, 2008-2010): National Newspapers: Süddeutsche Zeitung, Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung Regional Newspapers:. Berliner Zeitung (Berlin), Rheinische Post Düsseldorf (Cologne), Hamburger Abendblatt (Hamburg)			

* c/o pop conference was established in 2005
** Reeperbahn Campus was established in 2009

Table 3:   Data structure

1st order concepts	*2nd order themes*	*Aggregate dimension*
Developing open platforms	Experimenting with alternative event formats	Organizing events as proto-institutional work in a disrupted field
Re-scheduling events		
Representing alternative music industry value chains	Exploring new themes	
Opening up to other industries		
Harvesting locations	Regionally embedding events	
Strengthening local networks		

Table 4: **Representative first-order data for "experimenting with alternative event formats"**

Representative data	1st order concepts	2nd order theme
"Networking is our guiding theme. It is also important to collaborate with other events and to see what can be done together." (interview c/o pop/C'n'B)	Developing open platforms	Experimenting with alternative event formats
"Our event practices the claim 'all together now' because everybody can come together and no one is excluded" (interview all2gethernow)		
"Early September is a good time for our event because the tours have not yet started but holidays are over" (interview Reeperbahn Festival/Campus)	(Re-)Scheduling events	
"It is very important for us that a2n will be a 6 day event in 2010. We start on Monday with a camp. The follow-up are our two conference days parallel to Popkomm at Tempelhof and we conclude by a two day forum" (interview all2gethernow)		

Table 5:   Representative first-order data for "exploring new themes"

Representative data	1st order concepts	2nd order theme
"The live business is the future of the music business" (interview Reeperbahn Festival/Campus)	Representing alternative music industry value chains	Exploring new themes
"We wanted to describe what the music industry can look like without the 'classical' industry players and which new roles will develop" (interview all2gethernow)		
"We wanted to get in touch with other digital creative industry congresses to gain a mutual presence" (interview c/o po/C'n'B)	Opening up to other industries	
"The c/o pop brings together films, gaming, music and even the porn industry to debate new business models" (Musikwoche on c/o pop/C'n'B)		

Table 6:   Representative first-order data for "regionally embedding events"

Representative data	1st order concepts	2nd order theme
"Last year, we had the first show-cases in high-class theatres and I think that these locations will be even more important for our brand in the future." (interview c/o pop/C'n'B)	Harvesting locations	Regionally embedding events
"All the events took place on or around the famous Reeperbahn street" (Hambuger Abendblatt on Reeperbahn Festival/Campus)		
"We had to get the Berlin Music Commission and the Berlin Club Commission on board." (interview all2gethernow)	Strengthening local networks	
"Another project […] is Campus Spotlight, where we have invited all universities related to the different creative industries in Cologne to a workshop." (interview c/o pop/C'n'B)		