

Editorial: 21st special issue for the ISPIM

Article (Accepted Version)

Tidd, Joseph, Huizingh, Eelko and Conn, Steffen (2019) Editorial: 21st special issue for the ISPIM. *International Journal of Innovation Management*, 23 (8). ISSN 1363-9196

This version is available from Sussex Research Online: <http://sro.sussex.ac.uk/id/eprint/87212/>

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies and may differ from the published version or from the version of record. If you wish to cite this item you are advised to consult the publisher's version. Please see the URL above for details on accessing the published version.

Copyright and reuse:

Sussex Research Online is a digital repository of the research output of the University.

Copyright and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable, the material made available in SRO has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full text items generally can be reproduced, displayed or performed and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

Pre-proof text, submitted 15 October 2019.

To be published in the *International Journal of Innovation Management*, 23(8), December 2019

Editorial

21st Special Issue for the ISPIM

Joe Tidd

Science Policy Research Unit (SPRU)

University of Sussex, U.K.

j.tidd@sussex.ac.uk

Eelko Huizingh

University of Groningen, Netherlands

Steffen Conn

International Society for Professional Innovation Management (ISPIM), U.K.

Welcome to the 21st special issue of the IJIM for ISPIM. This draws upon papers submitted to the ISPIM conference in Florence in June 2019. From this pool of more than 300 potential papers, ten were selected for further review, and the nine papers published in this issue are the results subsequent review and revision. The range of topics spans entrepreneurship, with a focus on start-ups and their eco-systems (Bessant and Tidd, 2018), innovation strategy (Tidd, 2020), through to the commercialization and adoption of innovations (Schweitzer and Tidd, 2018).

Bereczki examines start-ups and SMEs embedded in open innovation ecosystems. Such firms often must collaborate with external partners, including other SMEs and larger, established corporations, as well as accelerators, incubators and other support institutions. The paper examines these challenges based upon a case study. Kruft and Kock examine how incubators can be categorized and how different objectives and strategies relate to corporate incubator performance. They examine 14 different industries, and identify 16 clusters dependent of five objective and five strategy criteria. These criteria have a diverse relation to performance, which they interpret using transactional distance theory. Santonen and Julin develop a typology of transnational Living Labs (LL) to help identify what kind of services SMEs are expecting from these experiments. Based on 82 interviews, they identify twelve main needs, including testing services and internal barriers of SME internationalization. Woodfield and Husted explore how knowledge-sharing influences innovation across generations of a family firms. They argue that each generation contributes to the knowledge pool differently, and that there can be different levels of hostility towards sharing knowledge that can influence a family firm's ability to innovate. They present two models distinguishing the source of knowledge from the receiver of knowledge for each generation. When the senior generation is the source of knowledge, business tends to be as per usual. Conversely, when the source of

knowledge is the next generation, this can lead to new approaches to doing business being introduced, with potential for innovation activities and outcomes.

Schallmo *et al* develop an integrated approach for digital strategy, which consists of six phases: external strategic analysis, strategic forecasting, internal strategic analysis, strategic principle, strategic options and strategy formulation. Within the integrated approach they identify four generic digital strategies: product provider, service provider, product platform operator and service platform operator. Krätzig *et al* explore transitions pathways for electric vehicles. They adopt a strategic analytical procedure that links external factors from a multi-level-perspective and internal, company-specific dynamic capabilities. Based upon expert interviews of actors from the German automotive industry, they identify significant dynamic capabilities required, and provides recommendations for change managers and policy makers leading to successful, sustainable transition in the automotive industry.

Gernreich and Knop explore the unconscious processes of idea development in the front-end of innovation. Based on a survey of 122 employees of a German automotive company, they find an overall hierarchy of needs, and four clusters of employees based on the indicated needs in different phases of their idea development process. Also, the demand for resources varies significantly throughout the idea development process. Roosens *et al* assess the effects of aligning co-creation partners' communications on consumers' perceptions of joint innovation efforts. They conduct to online experiments, one testing content, the other visual alignment. Results reveal a positive effect of using complementary over identical message content on consumers' perceptions of the co-created product. The latter effect is reinforced by autonomous visual designs. The effect of content alignment on both the lead firm and co-creation partners are mediated by the perceived fit between partners and the perceived corporate credibility of the lead firm. This research is one of the first to study effects of communication by multiple co-creation partners and demonstrates the positive effects of adequately aligning partners' communications about joint innovation efforts. Adams *et al* identify the motivations and personality traits of retro-tech adopters using a survey conducted on Amazon Mechanical Turk. They find that retro-tech consumers are not a homogenous adopter category, as individuals are affected by different motivations – aesthetic, fashionability, nostalgic positive emotionality, non-conformism, and quality. Their study also suggests a cyclical conceptualisation of the Diffusion of Innovations model, or its extension to include a new group of retro-adopters.

Reference

Bessant, J. and J. Tidd (2018) *Entrepreneurship*. Wiley, New York.

Schweitzer, F. and J. Tidd (2018) *Innovation Heroes: Understanding customers as a valuable innovation resource*. World Scientific, London.

Tidd, J. (2020) *Digital Disruptive Innovation*. World Scientific, London.