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Welcome to the 22nd special issue of the IJIM for ISPIM. This draws upon papers submitted to the ISPIM virtual conference Innovating in Times of Crisis held in June 2020. From this pool of more than 300 potential papers, twelve were selected for further review, and the six papers published in this issue are the results subsequent review and revision. The range of topics spans many of the current core challenges in innovation management (Tidd and Bessant, 2021), including process innovations, experimentation, corporate ventures and collaboration, which transcend the simple linear model of product development which still dominates the field in mainstream business and management research and practice (Tidd, 2021).
Bustamante examines the role of process innovation in promoting sustainability-oriented innovation across industries. The study follows the market development process of a start-up founded on the principle of sustainability-oriented innovation and explores how the process innovation itself is used to shape the external market. The study considers the relationship between process innovations and external market development through a longitudinal case study of a vertical farm start-up. This shows that through a number of representational practices, process innovation can also serve external objectives and play a role in external market development for firms incorporating the principles of sustainability-oriented innovation.

Aas et al extend existing product–service system business model taxonomies to better incorporate digital services. They find that the firms’ business models vary depending upon a number of factors, including the degree of the suppliers’ ownership of delivered products, degree of smartness of the services provided and degree of performance orientation of contracts. Based on five case study firms, they propose a new product–service system business model taxonomy with eight categories.

Greve et al conduct a systematic review of the scholarly literature on Living Labs (LLs), drawing on a bibliometric analysis of a dataset of 411 journal articles. They reveal a diverse and fragmented field, with contributions spanning across different disciplines and application domains. Despite such fragmentation, some clusters of applications, scholars and publications are identified, as well as influential contributions. These emphasise the key role of open and collaborative approaches to innovation, making the use of LLs increasingly relevant for governments, companies, public organisations and individuals.

Ahlfänger, Kohut and Leker present an inductive case study of 20 CVC units, and identify how novel organizational subunits reconcile the conflicting logics in terms of their organizational structure. They show that, instead of fully aligning with one or the other environment, most units form hybrid organizations incorporating elements of both logics. Their data suggests that CVC units tend to follow the hybridization strategy of selective coupling rather than apply strategies of compromising or decoupling. The type of structure depends on factors on the intra-, inter-organizational and industry level, and they argue that a specific hybridization pattern that is especially beneficial in the achievement of a unit’s strategic objectives.

Gamber et al examine how corporate incubators are evaluated by their parent companies. Decisions depend on the balance between incubator’s contributions and the hosting company’s financial investment (top-level), while the incubator’s contributions again depend on the balance between incubator investment and the supported new business contributions (bottom-level). They apply the Barnard-Simon theory of organizational equilibrium to investigate the resource flow balance on both levels and to predict the resulting incubators’ performance, which determines their future survival. The analysis show that, counter-intuitively, incubators with a top-level equilibrium and a bottom-level disequilibrium perform better.

Smiljic builds on the open innovation and coopetition literature to explore the influence of research partners and clusters on the relationships between competing companies in different project phases of R&D projects, based on five R&D projects in mature industries. The study reveals the need for simultaneous involvement of research partners and clusters when establishing collaboration in the pre-project phase, while research partners have dominant roles in balancing coopetition in both the pre-project and project implementation phases.
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