Research Paper

EPRA International Journal of Economic and Business Review-Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume - 13, Issue - 8, August 2025 | e-ISSN: 2347 - 9671| p- ISSN: 2349 – 0187

SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.862 || ISI Value: 1.433 || Journal DOI URL: https://doi.org/10.36713/epra2012

ALTRUISM AS AN ECONOMIC APPROACH. AN ANALYSIS OF THE 99:1 PRINCIPLE IN DIGITAL BUSINESS MODELS

Case Studies on Mr.Beast, Coursera, and Open Source Software

Sora Pazer[1]
[1]*IU-International University of Applied Science*

ABSTRACT DOI No: 10.36713/epra23739 Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.36713/epra23739

The article examines altruism as an economic strategy in digital markets and analyzes the so-called 99:1 principle: 99 percent of content or services are provided for free, while only 1 percent is monetized. Three case studies – YouTube creator MrBeast, educational platform Coursera, and open source company Red Hat – show how different industries operationalize this model in specific ways. The analysis makes it clear that the 99:1 principle is not an expression of moral generosity, but an economic rationality of the platform economy. It is based on the separation between freely available abundance and targeted scarcity of reputational or security-relevant goods. The article discusses potentials (reach, trust, scalability) as well as risks (dependence on paying minority, free riders, staging problems) and concludes that altruism in the digital economy is not the exception, but a strategic imperative.

KEYWORDS:*Altruism; 99:1 principle; Freemium; Creator Economy; Open source; Coursera; MrBeast; digital business models; platform economy; Trust; Network effects*

1. INTRODUCTION

Over the past two decades, digitalization has brought about fundamental changes in business models in almost all sectors of the economy. This change is particularly evident in the platform economy, where content, software and services are increasingly made available free of charge, while monetization relies on a comparatively small segment of users. This seemingly paradoxical model – almost completely free provision of products or content while maintaining high profitability – poses a challenge to classical economic theories, which assume a direct exchange logic between price and performance (Varian, 2000).

The focus of this study is on the key question of whether and under what conditions a business model based on *99 percent free and 1 percent paid* content can be sustainably profitable. This model is reminiscent of altruistic action, as the vast majority of the value is provided without any immediate consideration. However, numerous case studies show that it is precisely this apparent "altruism" that is economically rational and can even lead to considerable competitive advantages (Anderson, 2009; Osterwalder & Pigneur, 2010).

The relevance of this question is twofold: On the one hand, the global reach of digital platforms is leading to an increasing shift in the logic of value creation, which challenges classical models of supply and demand (Shapiro & Varian, 1999). On the other hand, in times of growing information overload, trust becomes a central resource in competition (Fukuyama, 1995; Coleman, 1990). Companies that voluntarily provide content and services free of charge create symbolic capital that can be converted into economic transactions (Bourdieu, 1986).

The present thesis pursues three goals: First, a theoretical framework is to be developed that explains "altruistic management" as a functional concept in business administration. Secondly, three business models (YouTube creator economy, open source software, online education platforms) are analysed with regard to their application of the 99:1 principle. Thirdly, there will be a comparative discussion of the opportunities and risks of such models as well as an outlook on their transferability to other industries.

In this way, the study contributes to the interface of business administration, sociology and behavioral economics. The article is aimed at scientists, practitioners and decision-makers who want to gain a deeper understanding of new mechanisms of value creation in the digital age.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The central thesis of this article is that altruism is no longer a moral add-on in the digital economy, but has become the central business logic. Classical models of price formation assume a direct exchange relationship between supply and consideration (Smith, 1776/2005). In the platform economy, on the other hand, this logic is systematically undermined: a radical oversupply of free services does not serve immediate profit, but rather the building of reach, trust and loyalty – resources that

can only be exploited secondarily economically (Bourdieu, 1986; Shapiro & Varian, 1999). In order to grasp this phenomenon analytically, the theoretical framework focuses on three central business models that embody the mechanics of the 99:1 principle in a special way.

2.1 Altruism as Social Capital

Altruism in an economic context is rarely free of self-interest. Rather, it is a mechanism for the accumulation of *social capital* (Coleman, 1990) and *symbolic capital* (Bourdieu, 1986). Companies that offer content for free invest in reputation and trust capital, which in turn form the basis for economic transactions. Trust acts as a barrier to entry: users are more willing to pay for exclusive additional offers if they have previously repeatedly experienced free added value (Fukuyama, 1995). The radical thesis is therefore that in markets with abundance, it is not the product, but the *level of trust* that decides who survives economically. One example of this is large YouTube creators who provide almost all of their content for free. Their economic value is not determined by the price of their videos – which are effectively worthless in the logic of the market – but by the size and loyalty of their community. This community can be used to generate sponsorship contracts, merchandising or premium offers. The altruism that creators embody in the form of their "free work" is thus not the antithesis of profit, but its prerequisite.

2.2 The Freemium Model as Economic Radicalization

The freemium principle has established itself as the paradigmatic business model of the platform economy (Anderson, 2009; Osterwalder & Pigneur, 2010). The radical asymmetry is characteristic: 90 to 99 percent of users pay nothing, while a small percentage – the so-called "converting users" – bear the entire value chain. Empirical studies show that this small group not only has a higher willingness to pay, but also increases the revenue per user exponentially through economies of scale (Pujol, 2010). The mechanism is provocatively simple: the more people you reach for free, the higher the absolute number of those who are willing to pay for additional benefits. Freemium is therefore not "altruistic", but a strategic radicalization of the principle of reach. From this perspective, the ratio of 99 to 1 does not appear as an exotic exception, but as a logical consequence of a scaling logic that is only possible in the digital space through abundance.

2.3 Pay-What-You-Want and Reciprocity

A third model that illustrates the logic of altruistic economic activity is *Pay-What-You-Want* (PWYW). Here, the consumer decides for himself whether and how much he pays for a product. Empirical studies show that users do not consume en masse for free, but are guided by social norms such as fairness, gratitude and reciprocity (Schmidt, Spann, & Zeithammer, 2015; Regner & Barria, 2009). The model works because people are not only utility maximizers, but also "moral actors" (Fehr & Gächter, 2000). If this is applied to the 99:1 distribution, it becomes clear that economic sustainability does not lie in a forced price, but in the voluntary decision of a minority to bear the "burden" for the community. In the gaming industry, for example, the so-called "whales" – often less than one percent of users – finance almost all of the revenue (Marder et al., 2019). This extreme form of economic reciprocity is only possible because the majority of the rest are allowed to participate free of charge.

2.4 Interim conclusion

The theoretical consideration shows that altruism is not a moral exception in the economy of the platform society, but a strategic imperative. Free content is not a losing business, but the prerequisite for reach, network effects and reciprocity. The models of the YouTube creator economy, the freemium principle and pay-what-you-want illustrate the logic: If you give away almost everything, you create the basis for a small minority to pay voluntarily, disproportionately and highly profitably. The 99:1 principle is therefore not a curious marginal phenomenon, but the most radical form of modern value creation.

3. METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

The present study is designed as a qualitative analysis of existing business models. The aim is to examine exemplary cases that embody the 99:1 principle – i.e. the almost complete provision of content free of charge with simultaneous monetization via a small proportion of users – in practice. The focus is on the structural logic of the models, the mechanisms of value creation and the psychological and social effects that these models generate.

3.1 Research Design

The thesis is based on the method of *comparative case study analysis* (Yin, 2018). This makes it possible to examine complex social and economic phenomena in their context and to work out similarities and differences. Case studies are particularly suitable for research questions that relate to new or difficult to quantify business models, as in the case of the digital platform economy.

3.2 Selection of Cases

Three cases were selected, each embodying a particular form of the 99:1 principle and at the same time located in different sectors:

1. **MrBeast (YouTube Creator Economy)**
   - MrBeast is considered one of the most successful content creators worldwide and is known for his extreme generosity, which is staged as part of his brand identity (Kumar, 2022).
   - In addition to his main channel, he runs his own philanthropy channel ("Beast Philanthropy"), where he donates millions and organizes free aid.
   - The central research question here is: To what extent can radically staged altruism be converted into reach and profit?
2. **Coursera (educational platform)**
   - Coursera is a leading platform for online education and exemplifies the freemium model: learning content can be consumed largely free of charge, monetized through the sale of certificates and specialized programs (Impey & Formanek, 2021).
   - Relevant here is the question of how educational offers are disseminated en masse above a low entry threshold and what role certificates play as a "scarce resource" in an otherwise abundance-oriented logic.

3. **Open source software (example: Red Hat / Linux ecosystem)**
    - Open source projects generally offer their software freely accessible, monetization takes place via additional services such as support, integration or premium features (Fitzgerald, 2006).
    - This raises the question of how collaborative work that appears to be organized altruistically can be transformed into sustainable commercial models.

These three cases cover different domains – entertainment, education and technology – and allow a systematic analysis of the mechanisms of altruistic economics.

3.3 Analysis Strategy

The analysis is carried out in three steps:

1. **Descriptive analysis:** Presentation of the respective business model, its structure and central mechanisms (e.g. reach, pricing model, community involvement).
2. **Theoretical classification:** Reference to the concepts discussed in Chapter 2 (social capital, freemium, reciprocity).
3. **Comparative evaluation:** Identification of similarities and differences with regard to the central research question of whether and how altruism functions as an economic strategy.

3.4 Methodological Limitations

The study is exploratory and qualitative. It does not aim at a representative statistical generalization, but at an *analytical generalization* (Yin, 2018). In addition, it must be taken into account that public data – for example on revenues or internal strategies – is only available to a limited extent. The analysis is therefore based on a combination of scientific literature, industry reports, media analysis and publicly available data.

4. Case Study 1: MrBeast and the Creator Economy

The creator economy, which has developed since the mid-2000s through platforms such as YouTube, Twitch or TikTok, represents a laboratory for researching altruistic business models. While traditional media companies place content behind paywalls, creators have relied on the logic of free access from the very beginning: reach is created by maximum visibility, and visibility is created by accessibility. A particularly impressive example of this mechanic is the US YouTuber Jimmy Donaldson, better known as MrBeast, who is one of the most successful content creators worldwide with over 200 million subscribers (Kumar, 2022).

MrBeast is paradigmatic for the 99:1 principle in two ways. First, all of its core content is available for free and without restriction. His videos are characterized by extreme generosity, giving away millions of dollars, staging competitions with enormous prize money or giving away entire supermarkets and restaurants to his fans. This generosity is not hidden behind a paywall, but deliberately displayed. Secondly, however, MrBeast generates revenue through its reach and peripheral business models that is in no way inferior to traditional media companies. Advertising, sponsorship, merchandising and his own branded products (e.g. MrBeast Burger, Feastables) form the economic basis of his "altruistic" appearance (Cunningham & Craig, 2021).

The connection between altruism and profit is particularly evident in MrBeast's side project *Beast Philanthropy*. Here, revenue from merchandising and advertising revenues is diverted into large-scale fundraising campaigns, such as food distributions or disaster relief. It is worth noting that this philanthropy does not function as a complement, but as an integral part of its brand identity. The viewer not only receives entertainment, but also witnesses altruistic actions that also serve as an economic lever: the more generous MrBeast is, the more his reach grows, and the greater his reach, the higher the income from advertising and sponsorship.

This spiral can be analytically described as self-reinforcement: altruism generates trust and sympathy, which in turn increase the reach, and the reach increases the economic potential. The special feature is that the core value – the giving away of money, products or services – does not generate direct profit, but only has an effect in the symbolic sphere. In the platform economy, reach and reputation become the actual "currency" that can be converted into economic transactions (Bourdieu, 1986; Cunningham & Craig, 2021).

From a scientific perspective, the example of MrBeast shows that altruism must not be understood as an antithesis to the economy, but as the business logic of the platform economy. The seemingly paradoxical strategy of giving away millions is rationalized by the fact that the cost of generosity is more than offset by the exponential increase in reach. Compared to classic freemium models, where there is a clear transition between free basic version and paid additional services, MrBeast operates in an even more radical form: It completely dispenses with direct monetization of its main content and shifts value creation to accompanying business areas.

The case study also illustrates the psychological mechanics of the 99:1 principle. Millions of viewers consume the content for free without ever spending money. A small minority, however, become active supporters – whether through the purchase of merchandising, participation in sponsorship campaigns or through donations in a philanthropic context. This minority contributes disproportionately to monetization, while the mass of free users ensures the reach and attractiveness of the brand.

In summary, it can be said that MrBeast embodies the mechanism of the "economy of generosity" in an ideal-typical form. His strategy confirms the thesis that radical altruism is not a loss-making business in digital markets, but the condition for disproportionate value creation. The staging of philanthropy not only serves social purposes, but is also a central element of a highly profitable business logic.

5. Case Study 2: Coursera and the Freemium Principle in Education

Coursera is one of the world's largest online education platforms and paradigmatically embodies the freemium model in the digital knowledge economy. Since its inception in 2012, Coursera has become a central player in the "Massive Open Online Course" (MOOC) market, offering more than 10,000 courses, specializations, and study programs in cooperation with leading universities (Impey & Formanek, 2021). The core of the business model is that the vast majority of content is accessible for free, while monetization is done through certificates, premium subscriptions, and academic degrees.

The principle of operation follows a clear logic: Users can attend almost all courses free of charge in the so-called audit mode, which allows access to videos, reading materials and often ungraded exercises. Only when they earn an official certificate or want access to graded exams and graded assignments will a fee be due. In this way, the entry is designed to be as low-threshold as possible in order to achieve the greatest possible reach. Monetization then kicks in at a point where the user no longer just wants to acquire knowledge, but needs a recognized record of achievement (Hollands & Tirthali, 2014).

The platform has differentiated this basic model through several extensions. In addition to individual certificates, Coursera offers so-called "Specializations" or "Professional Certificates", which bundle several courses thematically and depict a continuous learning journey. In addition, there is a flat-rate model called "Coursera Plus", which grants unlimited access to thousands of courses and certificates for a monthly or annual fee. In parallel, Coursera generates significant revenue in the B2B segment by selling corporate licenses for continuing education programs, as well as in the higher education segment by offering fully online degree programs in cooperation with universities (Coursera Inc., 2025).

Didactically and economically, Coursera works with a tension between abundance and artificial scarcity. While learning content is provided in abundance and free of charge, the very elements that are crucial for the job market and career development are scarce: exams, performance evaluations and certificates. This combination is crucial for the willingness of users to pay, as certificates function as symbolic and economic capital in the sense of Bourdieu (1986). By combining free access and paid credentials, Coursera is able to turn a large base of free attendees into a small but stable group of paying customers.

Empirical data on use confirm this logic. It is estimated that only a small percentage of millions of registered users convert into paying customers, but this minority is enough to ensure a sustainable business model (Impey & Formanek, 2021). Similar to MrBeast, it is the reach created by free content that in turn forms the basis for profitable additional offers. Without the wide, free accessibility, neither Coursera's global visibility nor brand authority would be possible to this extent.

The Coursera case study shows that the freemium model in the education sector is not only economically viable, but also didactically effective. It lowers barriers to entry, democratizes knowledge and links the willingness to pay to the acquisition of verifiable, reputation-effective credentials. In this way, Coursera confirms the same mechanics in another domain that is also visible in the creator economy: Altruism in the form of free access is not a loss, but an investment in a business model that is stabilized and supported by the willingness of a small minority to pay.

6. Case Study 3: Open Source Software and the Service Model

Open source software is a particularly revealing example of the logic of the 99:1 principle, as it embodies the contradiction between radical free of charge and economic success most clearly at first glance. Projects such as Linux, Apache or MySQL are made freely accessible by developer communities without users having to pay for them. Nevertheless, a billion-dollar market has emerged around this seemingly altruistic logic, the best-known example of which is Red Hat, which grew profitably over years with support services, certifications and ancillary offerings before being acquired by IBM in 2019 for $34 billion (Fitzgerald, 2006; West & Gallagher, 2006).

The basic idea of open source can be formulated simply: The source code is freely available, anyone can use, modify and pass it on. The economic exploitation does not take place through the sale of the software itself, but through services that are based on it. Red Hat, for example, provides a mission-critical Linux distribution whose core components are freely accessible. The business model is based on companies paying for support, security updates, technical integration, training, and certifications. It is therefore not the software itself that is in short supply, but the *service* around its use.

This model illustrates the mechanics of the 99:1 paradigm in a special way. While millions of developers and companies use open source products for free, there is a small but highly profitable group of users who are willing to pay for professional support. These users are typically large enterprises, government agencies, or organizations whose IT infrastructure depends on the stability and security of the systems. Their willingness to pay is so high that they are effectively cross-subsidizing the further development of the software and the continued existence of the community.

From a sociological perspective, Bourdieu's (1986) Logic of Symbolic Capital is clearly evident here. Open source communities create reputation and trust through voluntary, seemingly altruistic work. Companies like Red Hat succeed in converting this symbolic capital into economic capital by professionalizing and institutionalizing it. Success is not based on the scarcity of the product, but on the *scarcity of trust* and reliable services.

In scientific analysis, it can be stated that open source radicalizes the logic of the "economy of generosity". The core of the product is free, and the economic value is created through services that only a small proportion of users need. In this respect, the model is very similar to the freemium principle of platforms like Coursera, but differs in its more community-oriented creation logic. While Coursera or MrBeast deliberately use the free content strategically, altruism in the open source movement initially arises from the intrinsic motivation of the developers. Only secondarily do companies develop a business model from this generosity (Lerner & Tirole, 2002).

The stability of this approach is also remarkable. While other freemium models rely heavily on network effects and continuous user growth, the open source ecosystem is based on a combination of community logic and institutionalized commercialization. For decades, Red Hat has proven that a model based on 99 percent free access is not only profitable, but also sustainable and scalable.

In summary, the Open Source case study shows that the 99:1 principle is also successfully applied in the technology sector.

The combination of free software and paid services confirms the central thesis of this thesis: Altruism and profit are not opposites in the digital economy, but two sides of the same business logic.

7. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

The three case studies – MrBeast in the creator economy, Coursera as an educational platform, and Red Hat as an example of open source commercialization – illustrate how the 99:1 principle is implemented in practice in different contexts. Despite considerable differences in product, target group and market logic, key similarities can be identified that explain the success of these models.

A first finding concerns the **role of reach and trust**. In all three cases, the free provision of content or software forms the basis for reach, community building and symbolic capital. MrBeast gains sympathy and millions of followers through staged generosity. Coursera provides a global audience with free access to high-quality educational content, positioning itself as a central player in the online education landscape. Open source projects like Linux rely on the voluntary work of developers, creating a foundation of trust that companies like Red Hat turn into professional services. What all models have in common is that the actual currency is not the immediate product, but the reputation and reach generated by altruism.

A second finding concerns the **asymmetry between free users and the paying minority**. In the creator economy, millions of users consume MrBeast's content for free, while a small minority are monetized through merchandising, sponsorships, or donations. On Coursera, millions of learners participate in audit mode, but only a few purchase certificates or subscriptions. In the open source world, millions of developers and organizations use software freely, while a small circle of companies pay for support and services. This extreme asymmetry confirms the logic of the 99:1 principle and makes it clear that economic success in digital markets does not depend on the mass of payers, but on the willingness of a small minority to invest disproportionately.

A third finding concerns the **form of monetization**. The models differ in the way they generate willingness to pay: MrBeast monetizes via peripheral business areas (advertising, products, sponsorship), Coursera via artificially scarce goods such as certificates and degrees, Red Hat via services that ensure trust, security and stability. In all cases, monetization is *indirect*: it is not based on the consumption of the main product, but on accompanying or derived values. This indirect monetization is a characteristic feature of altruistic business models.

The similarities and differences can be clearly summarized in an overview:

Model	Free share	Monetization	Psychological mechanism	User relationship
MrBeast (YouTube)	100% of content free	Advertising, Sponsorship, Merch, Donations	Sympathy, trust, community loyalty	Millions of viewers vs. small buy/donor group
Coursera (Education)	Audit access almost completely free	Zertifikate, Abos, Degrees, B2B	Reputation value, career opportunities, artificial scarcity	Millions of learners vs. low conversion rate
Open Source (Red Hat)	Source code completely free	Support, Updates, Integration, Certifications	Trust in stability, professional security	Millions of users vs. small paying enterprise customers

The comparative analysis allows two central conclusions. First, it confirms the thesis that altruism in digital markets is not a moral exception, but a strategic imperative. Free accessibility is not a by-product, but the prerequisite for reach, network effects and ultimately economic viability. Secondly, it becomes clear that the concrete monetisation strategy depends heavily on the sector: entertainment uses emotions and community, education relies on symbolic capital through certificates, technology capitalises trust in stability and security.

This results in a consistent pattern: the markets differ in the way they are implemented, but the basic logic remains the same. The more content is given away, the greater the reach, and the greater the reach, the more stable the base for a small but highly profitable paying minority.

8. DISCUSSION

The analysis of the three case studies has shown that altruistic business models – understood as the almost complete provision of free content or services – form a structural logic in the digital economy that is successfully implemented in different sectors. In the following, the potentials, risks and limits of the 99:1 principle are critically discussed.

A major advantage is the **low entry threshold**. By making content freely accessible, the user base is maximized, barriers are broken down and reach grows exponentially. Platforms like YouTube or Coursera would never have been globally scalable without this accessibility. "Free access" is therefore less an altruistic gift and more a strategic constraint in markets that depend on network effects (Shapiro & Varian, 1999).

A second benefit is building **trust and community loyalty**. Generosity signals authenticity and credibility, which have become scarce in the digital age of abundance. Users don't stay because they have to, but because they feel emotionally and morally bound. MrBeast in particular shows how strongly trust can be translated into economic reach. In the education sector, on the other hand, loyalty comes from the fact that Coursera gives learners worldwide access to high-quality materials, while only the certification is monetized.

At the same time, there are considerable risks. A structural problem is the **dependence on a small paying minority**. Models such as free-to-play gaming or online education thrive on the fact that a very small proportion of users pay for the

whole. This dependence makes the model vulnerable to market fluctuations, changes in user behavior or regulatory interventions. In the case of open source, Red Hat would hardly be able to survive without major customers.

Another risk is the **free-rider effect**. Since the majority of users pay nothing, models can only survive if the minority is willing to invest disproportionately in the long term. This leads to a potential unequal distribution: a small proportion of users bear the economic burden for the masses. In the gaming industry, these are the so-called "whales", which generate enormous sales while the rest consume for free. This raises questions about fairness and sustainability (Marder et al., 2019).

In addition, there is the tension between **altruism and staging**. In MrBeast, for example, philanthropy itself becomes an economic strategy and thus commercialized at the same time. The line between genuine generosity and calculated staging is blurred. In science, this could be described as "instrumental altruism": altruistic actions become a consciously used economic lever. This raises questions about authenticity and ethics, which are relevant not least in the economics of education, when knowledge is freely accessible on the one hand, but certificates are sold as commercialized tickets to the labor market on the other.

The discussion thus also shows the **limits of transferability**. In digital markets with intangible products and low marginal costs (videos, software, online courses), the 99:1 model is highly functional. However, in classic industries with physical products and high production costs, logic reaches its limits. A car manufacturer can't give away 99% of its vehicles to become profitable through 1% premium buyers. This shows that altruism as a business model works primarily in markets where content and services can be scaled almost free of charge.

In summary, the 99:1 principle confirms the transformation of economic logics in the digital age. It uses abundance to build trust and channels trust into a minority that is willing to pay disproportionately. The strength of the model lies in its scalability, its weakness in its dependence on a few paying users. From a normative point of view, it raises questions about fairness, authenticity and possible exploitation of loyalty.

9. CONCLUSION AND OUTLOOK

The present study has shown that altruistic business models – understood as the almost complete provision of free content or services – are not only sustainable in the digital economy, but often the most profitable strategies. Based on the three case studies MrBeast, Coursera and Red Hat, it became clear that the 99:1 principle can be successfully implemented in different industries, although at first glance it contradicts the classic logic of the price-performance ratio.

In the case of MrBeast, it is clear that radical generosity is not a contradiction, but the basis of economic reach. The creator stages altruism as an entertainment format and builds a global community from it, whose loyalty is monetized in merchandising, sponsorship and donations. Coursera, on the other hand, demonstrates that in the education sector, the freemium model enables the democratization of knowledge, while the willingness to pay is linked to reputation-effective and scarce goods such as certificates. Finally, open source makes it clear that software functions as a common good in its free availability, while companies like Red Hat monetize services and security as commercial scarcity.

The common logic of these models lies in the deliberate separation between a surplus good (free content, software, access) and a scarce resource (reputation, certificate, service, community). In economic terminology, it can be said that altruism serves as an *acquisition strategy* , while monetization takes place via those aspects that are of particular importance to users or indispensable for organizations.

For the development of theory, the pointed thesis can be formulated: *Altruism is not a moral exception in the platform economy, but economic rationality.* The 99:1 principle describes less a deviation from market economy logic than a new market logic that arises from abundance, trust and network effects.

In practice, there are several implications. First, companies in the digital space should not primarily rely on restrictive pricing strategies, but should understand radical generosity as a means of growth. Secondly, it is important to identify at an early stage those points at which artificial scarcity can be created in order to trigger a willingness to pay. Third, companies need to be aware of the risks: dependence on a small paying minority, possible exploitation of loyal users, and the risk of staging altruism being perceived as fake.

The outlook shows that the 99:1 principle is likely to become even more important in the future. With the advent of artificial intelligence, which can generate content in infinite quantities, the abundance of free offers will continue to increase. This makes the question of how companies build trust and what forms of scarcity they can create in a sea of free content all the more relevant. It is conceivable that certification, exclusivity and community loyalty will become central sources of income to an even greater extent.
This means that the basic message remains: Whoever gives in the digital age wins. Altruism is no longer the antithesis of profit, but its most effective condition.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. *Anderson, C. (2009). Free: The future of a radical price. Hyperion.*
2. *Batson, C. D. (1991). The altruism question: Toward a social-psychological answer. Erlbaum.*
3. *Berg, J., Dickhaut, J., & McCabe, K. (1995). Trust, reciprocity, and social history. Games and Economic Behavior, 10(1), 122–142.*
4. *Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.), Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education (pp. 241–258). Greenwood.*
5. *Coleman, J. S. (1990). Foundations of social theory. Harvard University Press.*
6. *Coursera Inc. (2025). Annual report 2024. Coursera.*
7. *Cunningham, S., & Craig, D. (2021). Creator culture: An introduction to global social media entertainment. NYU Press.*
8. *Fehr, E., & Fischbacher, U. (2003). The nature of human altruism. Nature, 425(6960), 785–791.*

9. *Fehr, E., & Gächter, S. (2000). Fairness and retaliation: The economics of reciprocity. Journal of Economic Perspectives, 14(3), 159–181.*
10. *Fitzgerald, B. (2006). The transformation of open source software. MIS Quarterly, 30(3), 587–598.*
11. *Fukuyama, F. (1995). Trust: The social virtues and the creation of prosperity. Free Press.*
12. *Hollands, F. M., & Tirthali, D. (2014). MOOCs: Expectations and reality. Center for Benefit-Cost Studies of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University.*
13. *Impey, C., & Formanek, M. (2021). Massive open online courses (MOOCs): Strategic insights and future research directions. Frontiers in Education, 6, 650618.*
14. *Kahneman, D. (2011). Thinking, fast and slow. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.*
15. *Katz, M. L., & Shapiro, C. (1985). Network externalities, competition, and compatibility. The American Economic Review, 75(3), 424–440.*
16. *Kumar, A. (2022). The economics of YouTube stardom: MrBeast and the new philanthropy. Journal of Media Economics, 35(2), 75–89.*
17. *Lerner, J., & Tirole, J. (2002). Some simple economics of open source. The Journal of Industrial Economics, 50(2), 197–234.*
18. *Marder, B., Gattig, A., Collins, E., Pitt, L., & Kietzmann, J. (2019). The whales and the minnows of the mobile gaming industry. Journal of Consumer Marketing, 36(3), 419–427.*
19. *Osterwalder, A., & Pigneur, Y. (2010). Business model generation: A handbook for visionaries, game changers, and challengers. Wiley.*
20. *Pujol, J. M. (2010). The freemium business model. In Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Electronic Commerce (pp. 257–260). ACM.*
21. *Putnam, R. D. (2000). Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community. Simon & Schuster.*
22. *Rabin, M. (1993). Incorporating fairness into game theory and economics. American Economic Review, 83(5), 1281–1302.*
23. *Regner, T., & Barria, J. A. (2009). Do consumers pay voluntarily? The case of online music. Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization, 71(2), 395–406.*
24. *Schmidt, K. M., Spann, M., & Zeithammer, R. (2015). Pay what you want as a marketing strategy in monopolistic and competitive markets. Management Science, 61(6), 1217–1236.*
25. *Shapiro, C., & Varian, H. R. (1999). Information rules: A strategic guide to the network economy. Harvard Business School Press.*
26. *Smith, A. (2005). The wealth of nations. Cosimo. (Original work published 1776).*
27. *West, J., & Gallagher, S. (2006). Patterns of open innovation in open source software. In H. Chesbrough, W. Vanhaverbeke, & J. West (Eds.), Open innovation: Researching a new paradigm (pp. 82–106). Oxford University Press.*
28. *Yin, R. K. (2018). Case study research and applications: Design and methods (6th ed.). Sage.*