

Technology Analysis and Strategic Management (TASM)

Call for papers

Special Issue: Managing open innovation in current and emerging intermediaries in the technology transfer process

Guest Editors

Brendan Galbraith and Rodney McAdam, University of Ulster, Northern Ireland

Overview

Open innovation has been defined as a paradigm that assumes that firms can and should use external ideas, and internal and external paths to market, as the firms look to advance their technology (Chesbrough, 2003). This is a fairly broad definition of open innovation and may encompass a broad range of activities including: technology scouting, licensing technology from a university, forming a joint venture, inter-organisational networks and procurement of high-tech small firms (HTSFs). These open activities are well known in the innovation literature and individually, are nothing new. However, it is the well recited stories of open innovation champions in the US such as IBM and Procter and Gamble, who have shrunk their internal R&D departments and successfully tapped into external sources of innovation, that have helped to catapult growing worldwide interest in this apparent new paradigm.

A rapidly growing source of open innovation that has emerged in recent years are internet marketplaces, that have been referred to as [open] “*innovation intermediaries*” (Chesbrough, 2006), that essentially act as matchmakers for ideas, talent and technology. They range from general intermediaries such as InnoCentive (2008) and yourencore.com (2008), to specialised intermediaries such as Continua Alliance (2008) in the healthcare sector. The value proposition of these open innovation intermediaries is that they enable technology scouting, specialised talent scouting, partnering of companies and ideas. Yet, there is little is known of the performance of these intermediaries and very little information is provided by the firms that run them (Lichtenthaler and Ernst, 2008).

Moreover, at an EU level, there has been a plethora of open innovation policies and emerging private-public-people-partnerships (PPPP), sometimes referred to as ‘*quadruple-helix*’ models, that are currently being adopted in an attempt to ‘*implement the Lisbon strategy*’. A prominent example of this is the European Network of Living Labs (ENoLL) which is a PPPP that involves users in the creation, prototyping, validation and testing of new services, technologies and products in real-life contexts, such as cities or rural areas. However, current [open innovation] ‘*obsessions*’ of Europe, such as attention to user need, various types of networking and interactions with the local environment have been questioned, and conversely, there have been calls for increased policy measures aimed to both strengthen frontier research and, at the opposite end, strengthen European corporate actors (Dosi et al, 2005).

It can be argued that if Europe is to implement the Lisbon strategy and address the ‘*European Paradox*’ – that is, Europeans are generally better inventors than innovators, then emerging open innovation intermediaries need to be rigorously critiqued and, older ones that have already received large-scale investments (eg. science parks and incubators) and remain integral parts of existing innovation systems, need to be revisited and/or appropriated for open innovation modelling, policies and management practices. Undoubtedly, there is evidence of clear advantages of opening the innovation process to external ideas, knowledge and actors. Well established large firms such as Philips, Nokia, and Apple have demonstrated this and more recent innovations, such as Facebook, Second Life, Wikipedia owe their success to open business models. Moreover, there is a substantial literature base that criticises the basic premise of long-established intermediaries such as science park models and they have been characterised as an ‘*enclaves*’ rather than a ‘*seedbeds*’ for innovation. Could an open innovation approach help reverse this impression and indeed is there scope for emerging intermediaries to converge with existing ones? Given the lack of process studies at technology transfer intermediaries (science parks and incubators) (McAdam et al, 2006) it may also be timely to address this deficit through the lens of an open innovation framework. It would help to address the paucity of research into the nature of network relationships that intermediaries exist in (Howells, 2006). Also, it would be interesting to simultaneously study intermediaries, technology sources and technology recipients to arrive at an integrated view of intermediary-based transactions (Lichtenthaler and Ernst, 2008).

Therefore, the aim of this special issue is to appraise, compare and contrast current and emerging intermediaries in the technology transfer process between academia and commercialisation.

The emerging open PPPP innovation intermediaries, such as ENoLL, and industry-led intermediaries such as InnoCentive, Continua Alliance are populating innovation ecosystems that have drawn substantial investment in technology transfer intermediaries such as science parks and incubators. Can the emerging intermediaries supersede, compliment or renew existing ones such as university science parks or incubators? Is an open innovation intermediary, an aspiration for a new generation of science parks and incubators? How can science parks and incubators open up there technology transfer processes and act as a ‘*seedbed*’ for innovation? Also, how can ‘*the lifeblood of developed economies*’ – HTSFs harness open innovation activities that have been championed by large firms such as IBM and Proctor and Gamble? How can they organise open innovation processes and still protect their IP? These are crucial and fundamental questions that naturally generate its own research agenda and will be the focus of this special issue.

Subject Coverage

We welcome a broad range of theoretical and empirical contributions to our understanding of managing open innovation in current and emerging intermediaries in the technology transfer process. Topics may include, but are certainly not limited to:

- The role of HTSFs in open innovation ecosystems and their relationship with other actors such as intermediaries and large firms

- The open innovation processes, facilitators and challenges in science parks and incubators
- Open business models of innovation intermediaries
- Theoretical approaches that integrate open innovation with science parks and incubators
- Management implications of the co-creation of IP for HTSFs, large firms and science parks and incubators
- Network relationships and appropriation regimes of innovation intermediaries
- Typology of the range, diversity and function of innovation intermediaries
- An appraisal of Chesbrough's (2006) innovation intermediaries and existing intermediaries. Are they more open and effective in terms of speed, cost and reach?
- The application of user methods such as innovation toolkits and the lead user method to new contexts (eg. E-Health, eTourism, e-Energy, e-Government), and the role of an intermediary?

Notes for Prospective Authors

Submitted papers should not have been previously published nor be currently under consideration for publication elsewhere. Please submit your papers online on the Technology Analysis and Strategic Management (TASM) Journal website and make sure to follow the Submission Guidelines available at <http://www.tandf.co.uk/journals/CTAS>

All papers are refereed through a peer review process. A guide for authors, sample copies and other relevant information for submitting papers are available on the TASM website.

Important Dates:

Submission of full paper: 1 October 2009

Feedback from referees: 15 November 2009

Submission due date of revised paper: 10 January 2010

Notification of acceptance: 1 February 2010

Submission of final revised paper: 28 February 2010

Editors and Notes

Prospective authors are welcome to contact or submit an abstract to the guest editor for preliminary feedback on the appropriateness of their planned manuscript. Please clearly identify your submission in the email subject line "Managing Open Innovation in current and emerging intermediaries in the technology transfer process – Special Issue".

Brendan Galbraith

Department of Management
University of Ulster
Shore Road, Newtownabbey
County Antrim, BT37OQB
Northern Ireland

Email: b.galbraith@ulster.ac.uk

References

Chesbrough, H. (2003) Open Innovation: The New Imperative for Creating and Profiting from Technology. Harvard Business School Press: Boston, MA.

Chesbrough, H (2006) Open Business Models: How to thrive in the new innovation landscape. Harvard Business School Press: Boston, MA.

Continua Health Alliance (2008) <http://www.continuaalliance.org> [Accessed 19th August 2008]

Dosi, G., Llerena, P. and Labini, M.S (2005) Evaluating and comparing the innovation performance of the United States and the European Union. Expert report prepared for the TrendChart Policy Workshop.

ENOLL (2008) European Network of Living Labs www.openlivinglabs.eu [Accessed 19th August 2008]

Howells, J. (2006) Intermediation and the role of intermediaries in innovation. Research Policy. 35 5 pp 715-728.

InnoCentive (2008) www.innocentive.com [Accessed 19th August 2008]

Lichtenthaler, U. and Ernst, H. (2008) Intermediary Services in the Markets for Technology: Organizational Antecedents and Performance Consequences. Organizational Studies. 29 7 pp 1003-1038

McAdam, M., Galbraith, B., McAdam, R. and Humphreys, P. (2006) Business Processes and Networks in University Incubators: A Review and Research Agendas. Technology Analysis and Strategic Management. 18 5 pp 451-472

Your Encore (2008) yourencore.com [Accessed 19th August 2008]