

New Waves in Innovation Management Research

Edited by

Marcus Tynnhammar

ISPIM, United Kingdom

Luleå University of Technology, Sweden

Series in Innovation Studies



VERNON PRESS

Copyright © 2018 Vernon Press, an imprint of Vernon Art and Science Inc, on behalf of the author.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior permission of Vernon Art and Science Inc.

www.vernonpress.com

In the Americas:
Vernon Press
1000 N West Street,
Suite 1200, Wilmington,
Delaware 19801
United States

In the rest of the world:
Vernon Press
C/Sancti Espiritu 17,
Malaga, 29006
Spain

Series in Innovation Studies

Library of Congress Control Number: 2018948070

ISBN: 978-1-62273-434-4

Cover design by Vernon Press.

Cover image: designed by starline / Freepik.

Product and company names mentioned in this work are the trademarks of their respective owners. While every care has been taken in preparing this work, neither the authors nor Vernon Art and Science Inc. may be held responsible for any loss or damage caused or alleged to be caused directly or indirectly by the information contained in it.

Every effort has been made to trace all copyright holders, but if any have been inadvertently overlooked the publisher will be pleased to include any necessary credits in any subsequent reprint or edition.

Table of contents

<i>List of Figures</i>		<i>vii</i>
<i>List of Tables</i>		<i>ix</i>
<i>Introduction</i>		<i>xi</i>
Marcus Tynnhammar		
Chapter 1	The Resilient Innovation Team: a Study of Teams Coping with Critical Incidents during Innovation Projects	1
	Peter R.A. Oeij	
Chapter 2	The Benefits of Trusted Bridging Chains for Open Innovation	19
	Margarethe Lombard	
Chapter 3	An Analytical Approach to Assess the Matching Quality of Academic Partners for Open Innovation in the Form of University-Industry Collaboration	37
	Nisit Manotungvorapun*, Nathasit Gerd Sri	
Chapter 4	Exploring Inter-Organizational Collaboration for Innovation in a Regional Ecosystem	55
	Agnieszka Radziwon*	
Chapter 5	The Contribution of Socially Driven Businesses and Innovations to Social Sustainability	69
	Rakhshanda Khan*	
Chapter 6	Awakening Employee Creativity in Organizations	97
	Wenjing Cai*	
Chapter 7	Building Higher-Order Capabilities: Insights from Resource-Scarce Environments	115

Dr. Pavan Soni

Chapter 8	Investigating Innovation Champions in the Nonprofit Sector	129
	Courtney Molloy*	
Chapter 9	Design and Evaluation of a Process Model for the Early Stages of Product Innovation	149
	Patrick Brandtner*	
Chapter 10	Firm Responses to Disruptive Innovations	163
	Amber Geurts*	
Chapter 11	A Framework for Accelerated Product Innovation in a Big Data Environment	175
	Yuanzhu Zhan*	
Chapter 12	A Framework to Evaluate the Impact of ICT Usage on Collaborative Product Development Performance in Manufacturing Firms	191
	C. W. Chathurani Silva*	
Chapter 13	The Effects of Procedural Knowledge Transparency on Adoption in Corporate Social Networks	205
	Bjørn J. M. Jensen*	
Chapter 14	Technology Planning for Aligning Emerging Business Models and Regulatory Structures - the Case of Electric Vehicle Charging and the Smart Grid	219
	Kelly R. Cowan	
Chapter 15	From Gamestorming to Mobile Learning: a Conceptual Framework and a Gaming Proposition to Explore the Design of Flourishing Business Models	235
	Albert Lejeune*	

Chapter 16	Chinese Multinational Enterprises' R&D "Going out": a Prelude to Inclusive Globalization	249
	Sheng Wu*	
Chapter 17	The Impact of Strategic Alliances and Internal Knowledge Sources on the Manufacturing Firms' Innovation and on Their Financial Performance: a Comparison between Brazil and Europe	273
	Fábio O. Paula*	
Chapter 18	Reverse Innovation: Towards a New Global Innovation Model for Multinationals	287
	Marine Hadengue*	
Chapter 19	Never Venture, Never Win! The Chinese Rush to Innovation and Regional Development	303
	Antonio Crupi*	
Chapter 20	Innovation Management Systems: Systematic Structuration, Semantic Interoperability and Multi-Dimensional Measurement for Continuous Performance Improvement	323
	Lamyaa EL BASSITI*	
Chapter 21	First Things First - Think before You Decide the How, What and Who of Idea Screening	349
	Johan Netz*	
Chapter 22	Consumer Resistance to Innovations - Essays on Antecedents, Manifestations and Ways of Overcoming It	365
	Nadine Hietschold*	
Chapter 23	Entrepreneurial Opportunity Perception: Analysing the Effect of the Learning Style	379
	Alexandros Kakouris*	
Chapter 24	Antecedents and Consequences of Exploration and Exploitation Decisions:	

	Evidence from Corporate Venture Capital Investing	391
	Eui Ju Jeon*	
Chapter 25	A Journey through University Technology Transfer, Organizational Learning and the Search for Innovation	403
	Roberta Pellegrino	
Chapter 26	Processes and Ecosystems of Innovation with a Multi-KET Approach to Foster Technology Transfer and Commercialization of Nanotechnologies in the Field of Healthcare	417
	Cristina Páez-Avilés*	
Chapter 27	Innovation Hubs in Africa: Assemblers of Technology Entrepreneurs	435
	Nicolas Friederici*	
Chapter 28	Exploring Knowledge Intensity in Entrepreneurship: A Quantitative Study of Knowledge, Innovation and Performance in Entrepreneurial Firms	455
	Ethan A. Gifford*	
	<i>Acronyms</i>	467
	<i>Index</i>	469

List of Figures

Figure 1.1 Framework of the research.	6
Figure 2.1 Direct relationships versus searching through trusted bridging chains.	22
Figure 3.1 Research methodology	43
Figure 3.2 The Complementarity vs. Compatibility Matrix	45
Figure 3.3 The matching quality radar charts of university A	46
Figure 3.4 Three conditions of the matching quality translated from the matching quality radar	47
Figure 4.1 Key characteristics of the ecosystem and its members Source: Radziwon (2017)	60
Figure 6.1 An organizing framework for studies in the dissertation.	103
Figure 7.1 Research model depicting the task environment, managerial activities, and the creation of capabilities	120
Figure 8.1 Conceptual framework – championing and context	132
Figure 9.1 Summary of the research approach	154
Figure 9.2 Structural overview of the develop process model	156
Figure 11.1 Framework for accelerated product innovation in a big data environment	181
Figure 12.1 Finalized framework for evaluating the impact of ICT usage on CPD performance	197
Figure 13.1 Theoretical Model	210
Figure 14.1 Key Elements and Drivers Contributing to Smart Grid	222
Figure 14.2 Balancing Planning Perspectives in Regulated Industries	224
Figure 14.3 Summary of Research Gaps, Goals, and Questions	226
Figure 14.4 Research Outline	226
Figure 15.1 From Cube 1: Three Challenges from the Physical Environment	243
Figure 16.1 Number of overseas R&D subsidiaries	251
Figure 16.2 Regional distribution of parent firms	251
Figure 16.3 Global distribution of overseas R&D subsidiaries	252
Figure 16.4 Industrial distribution of overseas R&D subsidiaries	252
Figure 16.5 Nature of Overseas R&D theory system	255
Figure 16.6 Research roadmap	258
Figure 16.7 Theoretical framework on location determinants of Chinese firms' overseas R&D subsidiaries	259
Figure 16.8 Huawei's global R&D network	261
Figure 16.9 Evolution of Huawei's global R&D network	262

Figure 16.10 betweenness centrality and influencer	265
Figure 16.11 entry of actors into the network	266
Figure 16.12 Huawei's strategic route for production internationalization and R&D globalization	266
Figure 16.13 Global R&D organizational configurations system and adoption mechanism	267
Figure 16.14 Adoption of global R&D organizational configurations modes	268
Figure 17.1 Theoretical model	277
Figure 20.1 GenID Main Activities Model	336
Figure 20.2 GenID Lifecycle Model	337
Figure 20.3 GenID Learning Engine	338
Figure 20.4 GenID Ontology Main Concepts	339
Figure 20.5 GenID Actor Sub-Ontology Knowledge View	340
Figure 20.6 GenID Core-Idea Sub-Ontology Knowledge View	341
Figure 20.7 Innovation Context Sub-Ontology Knowledge View	342
Figure 21.1 Connections between projects, papers and research questions.	354
Figure 23.1 Shane's (2000) model for the effect of prior knowledge on opportunity recognition.	382
Figure 26.1 Summary of methodology used in the empirical study.	423
Figure 26.2 MCA for each categorical variable. Ellipses plot. Variables: (a) level of cross-fertilization, (b) technological distance, (c) technological effort, (d) access to information, (e) previous collaboration, (f) type of collaboration, (g) market orientation, (h) customer prioritization, and (i) experience in TRLs.	425

List of Tables

Table 1.1	Learnings from HROs for innovation teams	11
Table 2.1	Configurations for good and bad solutions	27
Table 3.1	Examples of studies on matching approaches for UICs	41
Table 3.2	The numeric results	44
Table 3.3	The matching quality gap bar charts of university A	47
Table 7.1	General model of capability creation	124
Table 7.2	Summary of how sequence/salience varies with external environment	125
Table 7.3	Elucidation of four environment-agnostic steps to capability creation across the six cases	126
Table 9.1	Summary of identified literature gaps and goals of the thesis	152
Table 10.1	Market size and the market share (turnover) of digital music	168
Table 13.1	Parameter Estimates Found Significant for Key Predictor Variables	213
Table 13.2	Confirmatory Answers (x) to RQs	214
Table 16.1	Variables, indicators and data source	259
Table 16.2	Regression results: Determinants of location choice of Chinese MNEs' overseas R&D	263
Table 17.1	Model's hypotheses	277
Table 17.2	Model's variables – Brazil and Europe	278
Table 17.3	Results of SEM – Brazilian firms	281
Table 17.4	Results of SEM – European firms	281
Table 18.1	Summary of the research organization	292
Table 18.2	Summary of methodologies used in the dissertation (by article)	293
Table 19.1	list of variables model 1	309
Table 19.2	list of variables model 2	310
Table 19.3	list of variables model 3	312
Table 19.4	results model 1	313
Table 19.5	results model 2	315
Table 19.6	results model 3 – first least square	316
Table 19.7	results model 3 – second least square	317
Table 20.1	Innovation Management Process Models Comparison (El Bassiti et al., 2017)	327
Table 20.2	Innovation Ontologies Evaluation (El Bassiti, 2017)	329
Table 20.3	Innovation Performance Models Review (El Bassiti a Ajhoun, 2016)	330

Table 22.1 Future research agenda	376
Table 22.2 Strategies for decision-makers	377
Table 25.1 Variables and Definitions	408
Table 25.2 Results	409
Table 27.1 Theoretical framework based on incubator/incubation literature	440
Table 27.2 Differences between broker-type intermediaries, incubators, and hubs	444
Table 28.1 Sectors included in the samples	460

Introduction

Marcus Tynnhammar

ISPIM, United Kingdom

Luleå University of Technology, Sweden

E-mail: marcus.tynnhammar@ltu.se

The ISPIM Dissertation Award was launched in 2011 to recognize the prolific contribution that PhD dissertations make to the field of Innovation Management. With the generous support of Innovation Leaders (*a global research programme that identifies the world's most effective innovators*), three winners are selected from the 100+ entries every year and receive their award at the annual ISPIM Innovation Conference.

Through this publication, the 2018 ISPIM Dissertation Award casts its spotlight beyond the top three dissertations and onto a much greater number of top submissions that cover a broad range of topics. It illustrates the depth and breadth of the coming wave in innovation management research.

Articles in the first section explore the theme of **Collaboration**. "The Resilient Innovation Team" suggests how a team might handle "critical incidents" during their projects. Next "The Benefits of Trusted Bridging Chains for Open Innovation," illustrates how trust in the form of social capital plays a big part in shaping Open Innovation relationships. Continuing with the theme of Open Innovation, "An Analytical Approach to Assess the Matching Quality of Academic Partners for Open Innovation in the Form of University-Industry Collaboration" showcases how partners can be selected, in particular when the perfect match between academia and industry is rare. "Exploring inter-organizational collaboration for innovation in a regional ecosystem" is the fourth contribution and it also deals with inter-organizational collaboration but moves the lens to understand how SMEs might work together in regional ecosystems. The final article in the section: "The Contribution of Socially Driven Businesses and Innovations to Social Sustainability," puts collaboration in a social setting by examining the importance of socially-driven businesses for sustainable development.

The second section is on **Creativity**, and starts with "Awakening employee creativity in organizations," which shows the different ways to increase em-

ployee creativity, from both the employee and employer perspectives. Next, "Building Higher-Order Capabilities" shows that creativity is a crucial ingredient when pursuing big endeavors with limited resources. Another way to study creativity is to look at how innovation champions promote innovations within their organizations, and this is the focus of the third article in this section: "Investigating innovation champions in the non-profit sector." Next, "Design and Evaluation of a Process Model for the Early Stages of Product Innovation" shows how the early creative phase of development can be structured. The final contribution to the section, "Firm Responses to Disruptive Innovations," leads into the following section on Digitalization by looking at how firms need to be creative in their response to digital disruption.

Digitalization has really become a popular topic in Innovation Management. "A Framework for Accelerated Product Innovation in a Big Data Environment" deals with Big Data and its effect on new product development. "A Framework to Evaluate the Impact of ICT Usage on Collaborative Product Development Performance in Manufacturing Firms" refines the focus to the effects of Big Data on collaboration. One way to collaborate is through social media, and the contribution "The Effects of Procedural Knowledge Transparency on Adoption in Corporate Social Networks" shows how this can have an effect on knowledge sharing. Another new disruptive technology is electric cars, and the article "Technology Planning for Aligning Emerging Business Models and Regulatory Structures" shows how companies can adapt to fit within these types of disruptions. The section closes with "From gamestorming to mobile learning," which shows how business models are changing to fit with digitalization.

Globalization is a well-examined topic and the next section has examples from all over the world on how countries adapt and try to be competitive in the global arena. "Chinese Multinational Enterprises' R&D" explains how China is reaching out to the global market. Next, "The Impact of Strategic Alliances and Internal Knowledge Sources on the Manufacturing Firms' Innovation and on Their Financial Performance" continues the globalization theme by comparing Brazil and Europe in terms of financial performance. The contribution of "Reverse Innovation" is to look at globalization from the perspective of how multinationals might need a new innovation model to succeed globally. And finally, "Never venture, never win! The Chinese rush to innovation and regional development" brings us back to China for a look at how regional development is being encouraged as a path to innovation.

The **Management** section starts with "Innovation Management Systems," on how to manage for continuous performance improvements. A crucial part of idea management is the ability to think before you decide, which is dealt with in "First things first - think before you decide." Besides managing operations and similar aspects, there is also a need to handle consumer resistance,

which is explained in "Consumer Resistance to Innovations," which suggests how to overcome such resistance. Next, "Entrepreneurial opportunity perception" discusses the learning styles of entrepreneurs. The final section looks at management through a financial lens: "Antecedents and Consequences of Exploration and Exploitation Decisions" deals with venture capital investments and innovation.

The final section in this book has four contributions on **Technology Transfer**. It starts with "A Journey through University Technology Transfer," on how academia affects innovation beyond the academic sphere. "Processes and Ecosystems of Innovation" is next and sheds light on effective ecosystems and the application of nanotechnology. Another common area for technology transfer is Innovation Hubs, and in the second to last article, "Innovation Hubs in Africa," we learn more about how these hubs assist in helping entrepreneurs. The final contribution, "Exploring knowledge intensity in entrepreneurship," also deals with entrepreneurs by looking at the role of knowledge intensity.

This publication provides both a showcase of what the latest generation of scholars are contributing to innovation management's body of knowledge as well as an insight into what they find significant and what might become important for the field as a whole over time. Scholars from 20 countries from Europe, Asia, North America and Africa are represented.

The Resilient Innovation Team: a Study of Teams Coping with Critical Incidents during Innovation Projects

Peter R.A. Oeij

E-mail: peter.oeij@tno.nl

Abstract: Organising in a mindful way is key to helping innovation teams become more resilient and thereby increase the chances of innovation success. Organising in a mindful way, called 'mindful infrastructure,' implies creating the right conditions for teams to excel. To this end, four elements are crucial. When teams are 1) feeling psychologically safe, 2) experience a learning environment, 3) have a say in decision-making, and 4) see that leadership creates synergy, the foundation is laid for resilient team behavior. In turn, this 'team innovation resilience behavior' enables teams to successfully deal with critical incidents, which, otherwise, could lead to innovation failure. Resilient innovation teams are extremely alert to small things that can become big problems, hate to jump to conclusions, link management goals with operational practice, value expertise stronger than rank, and can radically change course if required. This helps them keep their innovation projects on track and thus improve the chances of innovation success. This study has sought to investigate the scientific underpinnings of mindful infrastructure and team innovation resilience behavior. In addition, it provides practical guidelines for building a Resilient Innovation Team.

Keywords: Innovation; teams; project management; resilience; mindfulness; HRO.

1. Introduction

The study *The resilient innovation team: a study of teams coping with critical incidents during innovation projects* (Oeij 2017a) is rooted in the author's fascination about why so many innovations seem to fail (Sausser, Reilly and Shenhar, 2009). Innovations, in this study, are understood as new products, new services, new processes, or new working methods that are being developed in projects. Unlike other studies that explain reasons for innovation failure due to the role of markets, finance, technology, consumer demands and organizational developments, this study focuses on team behavior as a reason for innovation failure (Azim et al., 2010). The researcher's curiosity was driven by initial questions such as: do innovation projects fail because such

projects are complex? (Cicmil and Marshall, 2005). Do they fail because people in teams become defensive when there is tension, uncertainty and fear (Argyris, 2010) and become risk avoidant (Andriopoulos, Gotsi, Lewis and Ingram 2017)? Somewhere, outside the world of innovation management, there are teams that hardly ever fail. These are teams working in high-risk situations, namely teams in nuclear plants, on aircraft-carriers, in operating rooms, and in fire-brigades (Weick and Sutcliffe, 2007). Such teams are called HRO-teams after the High Reliability Organizations (HROs) that they are part of. HROs are studied in fields of safety and crisis management. Why do such teams hardly ever fail? Moreover, can innovation teams learn from HRO-teams? These questions led to the assumptions behind this study, namely, that knowledge from the field of safety and crisis management and their HRO-principles could be applied to the field of innovation management.

HRO-teams are characterized by the following: they are embedded in an organizational context that nourishes trust, learning, commitment and supportive leadership: a mindful infrastructure. Due to that context, particular team behavior is enabled that minimizes making mistakes and gets a team back on track should a mistake or accident occur. That type of team behavior is based on five HRO-principles (Weick and Sutcliffe, 2007), explained in Section 2. We mapped this team behavior to innovation teams and called it *innovation resilience behavior*. HRO-teams can minimize accidents and contain their escalation should they nonetheless occur: they have excellent team results. However, team results of innovation teams are different, namely achieving progress and positive results instead of the failure of innovations. Therefore, the research is directed at the applicability of HRO-principles in the context of innovation (management).

There are many reasons why projects and innovations fail or succeed, and there are several overviews of possible factors (Cooke-Davies, 2002; Han and Lorenz, 2015; Sauser, Reilly and Shenhar, 2009). Shenhar and Dvir (2007) argue that most people believe projects fail due to poor planning, a lack of communication, or inadequate resources, but the evidence suggests that failure is often found even in well-managed projects run by experienced managers and supported by highly regarded organizations. Projects are strongly affected by the dynamics of the environment, technology, or markets. That is why 'one size does not fit all,' and project success demands an adaptive approach to adjust the project to the environment, the task, and the goal (Shenhar and Dvir, 2007). Being able to adjust a project requires a shift of attention from only the 'hard factors' to including the 'soft factors.' Hard factors, such as the project management's iron triangle - the triple constraint of the criteria to complete the project on time, within budget and within performance goals or requirements - remain important, but soft factors, such as behavior, leadership, skills, communication, and organizational culture,

should not be ignored. The complexity of projects, where the small details of projects are inherently unpredictable, which can have serious consequences, is more often caused by people, than by a product or process, according to project managers (Azim, et al., 2010). Team behavior and the environment of teams, therefore, contain crucial leverage factors for both failure and success. This study has chosen specific aspects of team dynamics as its research topic to address the following theoretical gap and practitioner problem:

theoretical lacuna: this study applies insights from crisis and safety management within the field of innovations and their teams, which is somewhat novel. The gap is the absence of discussion about effective teamwork as developed within crisis and safety management in the innovation management literature; practitioner problems: although it is unclear how many innovations really 'fail' - definitions of failure vary - the reported average of 40% of product innovations is significant (Castellion and Markham, 2013). It seems clear that organizations have much to gain by improving the process of innovation in teams, acquiring a more profitable return on investments (ROI). This study intends to create knowledge that can help to reduce the percentage of failing innovation projects. Its main contribution is to develop a team context ('mindful infrastructure') and team behavior ('innovation resilience behavior') that foster intrapreneurship - acting like an entrepreneur within the organization - and risk taking, instead of playing safe and avoiding risky experiments which are so crucial for innovation.

2. Background and theory

Why should innovation teams act as mindful and innovation resilient?

There are four reasons why project teams in innovation should become capable of innovation resilience behavior and these reasons are interrelated. The first reason is that many projects and innovations are not successful (Castellion and Markham, 2013) and that greater success improves the competitiveness of organizations. The second reason is that higher alertness and resilience make teams more effective and efficient, analogous to HROs which make almost no mistakes (Alliger et al., 2015), and enable teams to recover from disappointing events such as project terminations (Todt, Weiss and Hoegl, 2017). The third reason is that organizations could make a challenging business case for higher success rates of innovation processes because it would not only save costs but improve their returns on investments more often, and faster (Castellion, 2013). The fourth reason is that there is suggestive evidence that organizational mindfulness is associated with a greater

number of patents, as an indicator of innovation (Vogus and Welbourne, 2003). These reasons suggest a sense of urgency for agents in the innovation management domain to act.

HROs invest in mindful working because it makes them more reliable; to them safety is more important than economic goals. Investing in HRO-principles is also beneficial for non-HROs, however. For non-HRO's striving for innovation thru organizational learning is a key factor, as safety is for HROs. These non-HROs do not invest in safety, but in organizational learning. Weick, Sutcliffe and Obstfeld (1999) plausibly suggest that learning capabilities enhance innovative capabilities, trust, motivation, collaboration and communication, and thus favor non-HROs. Teams nowadays are ubiquitous in the working world; many teams face challenges that can drain resources, adversely affect performance, and diminish team cohesion and team member well-being (Alliger et al., 2015).

The relevance of the crisis management and safety literature for innovation management

High-Reliability Organizations include power grid dispatching centers, air traffic control systems, nuclear aircraft carriers, nuclear power generating plants, hospital emergency departments, wildland firefighting crews, aircraft operators, and accident investigation teams. They operate "under very trying conditions all the time and yet manage to have fewer than their fair share of accidents" (Weick and Sutcliffe, 2007: pp. 17-18). According to Weick and colleagues (1999; 2007), the reason for this reliability is that these organizations have the characteristics of "mindful organizations." Five characteristics of mindful organization constitute a collective state of mindfulness. The attractiveness of HROs as a model or ideal type is that any organization can be measured against them (Hopkins, 2014). Despite some very good examples of HROs, there is no authoritative, systematic, representative and quantitative evaluation of HROs that provides compelling scientific evidence why HROs operate safely and how they manage to do so (Lekka, 2011). The best evidence of HROs to minimize accidents and mistakes comes from the many but scattered studied cases. Weick and colleagues (1999) analyzed these studies and drew general conclusions about HROs that count as an authoritative analysis (Hopkins, 2014).

The five HRO-principles

The HRO-principles have a psychological basis in the motivation to pursue cognitive effort in order to detect errors and act upon them, adapting the situation to effectively deal with (possible) errors. In this sense reliability refers to the stability of cognitive processes. The motivation to continually be

aware of unforeseen situations leads to stable cognitive processes with which to detect possible errors, and to a variable pattern of activities to adapt to events which require revision. This stability of cognitive processes ensures continuous learning from events that unfold in slightly different ways each time, and that eventually results in reliability (Weick et al., 1999: pp. 86-88).

Weick and colleagues then relate stable cognitive processes to effective error detection in five areas of concern. These five concerns are tied together by their joint ability to induce a rich awareness of discriminatory detail and a capacity for action, which the authors call 'mindfulness' (Weick et al., 1999: pp. 88-90). A successful HRO is an organization characterized by the absence of failures and errors through maximizing its reliability, by applying these five principles.

1. Preoccupation with failure involves learning from events that seldom occur and to converting them into grounds for improvement (being alert to weak signals).
2. Reluctance to simplify involves restricting simplification in interpretations to increase the number of precautions and minimize surprises.
3. Sensitivity to operations involves perceiving the integrated big picture of operations in the moment, at a higher level than operational level, and comprising the collective mind beyond the individual operator. There must be an unambiguous relationship and alignment between the actions at shop floor level and management level.
4. Commitment to resilience involves anticipation and resilience. Anticipation is the prediction and prevention of potential dangers before damage is done, whereas resilience is the capacity to cope with unanticipated dangers after they have become manifest and learning to bounce back. Resilience is the ability to not only bounce back from errors, but also to cope with surprises in the moment, and to respond as they occur.
5. Under-specification of structures refers to loosening the designation of the 'important' decision maker in order to allow decision making to migrate with problems. Weick and Sutcliffe (2007) later renamed this as 'deference to expertise': it is not the highest rank that makes decisions, but the person who is most expert.

Scientific evidence or entrepreneurial gut?

It was noted above that projects and product innovations have a substantial failure rate (Castellion and Markham, 2013). Castellion and Markham argue that the failure rate of new products can be whatever management tolerates, therefore the urgency to prevent failure is a business case: for HROs it is being reliable and safe; for businesses it is being profitable and competitive. Thus, there is the issue of whether HRO-thinking is suitable for non-HROs, which has not been much researched in the context of innovation and team dynamics. The evidence of HRO-principles in organizational performance is limited and context-specific. Paradoxically, the delivery of energy and electricity from a nuclear power plant, for example, is its primary production goal, and can at times be made subordinate to the safety of lives and the environment. Maximising reliability to maximize safety comes with an investment in mindful organizing, such as investing in training and facilitating the five key principles. For HROs, making the trade-off between investing in these resources and running the risk of failure is clear-cut: safety pays off.

For non-HROs, the trade-offs may be not as clear when the investments are high (Rousseau, 1989). The development of the five HRO-principles requires high investment in the selection and training of staff competences, and in organizational 'slack' to create space for maneuvering, all for the sake of safety. Not only are they a huge investment, but the evidence that HRO-principles are working is also merely suggestive, and the literature lacks convincing direct tests of whether, and through which mechanisms, genuine and emulating (i.e., hospitals) HROs enhance reliability (Lekka, 2011; Vogus and Iacobucci, 2016). Investing in HRO-principles remains a management choice, presumably based more on entrepreneurial guts than scientific fact. Weick and Sutcliffe (2007), are of the opinion that HRO-principles require a sense of urgency for non-HROs as well, not to invest in safety, but in (organizational) learning. Having said that, HRO-principles are thus far not investigated in relation to team behavior in innovation projects. To connect HRO-thinking about safety- and crisis management to innovation management and project teams, we developed a conceptual model that explains how innovation resilience behavior - a transfer of HRO-principles to the context of innovation - can emerge. Mindful infrastructure must be present to enable Team IRB. Figure 1.1 depicts the model in a simple format.



Figure 1.1 Framework of the research.

The **central question** of the study is: *How do project teams deal with critical incidents during their innovation projects?*

A critical incident is an event or situation that could cause a project to fail. What do these teams do in their projects when they encounter such critical incidents? And what characteristics do such teams have? Are these teams embedded in a mindful infrastructure (Vogus and Sutcliffe, 2012)? To investigate this, the study considers the presence of team psychological safety, team learning behavior (Edmondson, 1999), team voice (LePine and Van Dyne, 2001) and complexity leadership (Lawrence, Lenk and Quinn, 2009) that together constitute mindful infrastructure. These are the research variables mapping on the above-mentioned concepts of trust, learning, commitment and supportive leadership. Do teams exhibit innovation resilience behavior (Team IRB)? To investigate this, the study assesses the presence of the five HRO-principles that were modified by team behavior in innovation teams.

The **overall hypothesis** of the PhD thesis is that mindful infrastructure enables Team IRB, and that Team IRB has positive effects on project outcomes. The main question is divided into seven research questions:

1. What is mindful infrastructure and what is Team IRB? What is their relationship?
2. Does IRB affect perceived project results and perceived project progress?
3. Do teams have different configurations of mindful infrastructure?
4. Is IRB associated with defensive behaviors?
5. How do project leaders manage innovation projects?
6. How do teams respond to critical incidents during innovation projects?
7. What can innovation management teams learn from HRO teams?

3. Research design

The research took place among eleven Netherlands-based organizations, some of them are multi-nationals. These organizations are selected from the manufacturing sector, services and education; some are profit organizations, others are non-profit organizations. In these eleven organizations, eighteen teams and their innovation projects are studied as cases studies, and addi-

PAGES MISSING
FROM THIS FREE SAMPLE

Acronyms

ABM	Architectural BM
AMO	Ability-Motivation-Opportunity
AUTM	Association of University Technology Managers
BTF	Behavioral Theory of the Firm
BM	Business Model
BMC	Business Model Canvas
BMF	Business Model for a flourishing future
CEO	Chief Executive Officer
CFAT	Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching
CPD	Collaborative Product Development
CSN	Corporate Social Network
CSR	Corporate Social Responsibility
CVC	Corporate Venture Capital
DS	Design Science
DSRM	Design Science Research Methodology
FDI	Foreign Direct Investment
FEI	Front End of Innovation
FP	Financial Performance
fsQCA	fuzzy set Qualitative Comparative Analysis
GDP	Gross domestic product
GEE	Generalized Estimating Equations
HRM	Human Resource Management
HRO	High Reliability Organisations
IAOIP	International Association of Innovation Professionals
IB	International Business
ICT	Information and Communication Technology
IMS	Ideas and Innovation Management Systems
IP	Innovation Performance
IPO	Intellectual Property Office
IR	Investor Relations
IRB	Innovation Resilient Behavior
IWB	Innovative Work Behaviors
KET	Key Enabling Technology
KIE	Knowledge Intensive Entrepreneurship
KM	Knowledge Management
LDA	Latent Dirichlet Allocation
LDC	Least Developed Countries

LGT	Local Growth Teams
LLL	Linkage-Leverage-Learning
MBA	Master of Business Administration
MIT	Massachusetts Institute of Technology
MNC	Multinational corporation
MNE	Multinational Enterprises
NACE	Nomenclature of Economic Activities
NPD	New Product Development
OECD	The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
OI	Open Innovation
OIPT	Organizational Information Processing Theory
PhD	Philosophiae doctor, Doctor of Philosophy
PKT	Procedural Knowledge Transparency
QCA	Qualitative Content Analysis
R&D	Research and Development
RIO	Research Innovation Office
ROI	Return Of Investment
RRBV	Relational Resource-Based View
SAIMM	Southern African Institute of Mining and Metallurgy
SHP	Small Hydro Power
SDT	Self-Determination Theory
SDU	Sustainable Development Unit
SEM	Structural Equation Modelling
SLR	Systematic Literature Review
SSM	Soft Systems Methodology
TRL	Technological Readiness Levels
TTO	Technology Transfer Office
UIC	University Industry collaboration
UTTO	University Technology Transfer Officer
VBM	Value Business Model

Index

A

Absorptive Capacity, 37, 273
Accelerated Product Innovation,
175
Action Research, 235
active resistance, 365
Adoption, 205
Africa, 435
Ambidexterity, 391
anger, 365
Applied Research, 403
Appropriability, 37
assembly, 435
Austrian economics, 379
awareness-motivation-capability
framework, 163

B

Basic Research, 403
Bayesian Estimation, 273
Behavioral Theory of the Firm, 391
Big Data, 175
Brazil, 273
bridging features, 19
Business Model, 219, 235

C

Case Study, 175
Case study research, 115
chains, 19
champion of innovation, 129
China, 303
Chinese Companies, 175
Cognition, 235

Collaboration, xi, 205
Collaboration Capability, 37
collaboration performance, 191
Collaborative product
development, 191
commercialization, 417
Compatibility, 37
Complementarity, 37
Complexity Theory, 323
consumer emotion, 365
consumer resistance, 365
context and innovation, 129
Continuous Performance
Improvement, 323
cooperation, 163
Corporate Foresight, 149
Corporate Governance, 391
Corporate Social Networks, 205
Corporate Venture Capital, 391
CPD performance, 191
creativity, xi, 379
Creativity-based Experience, 323
Criteria, 349

D

Data Analytics, 175
Decision-making, 349
Design, 235
Design Science Research, 149
digital innovation, 163
Digitalization, xii
Discoveries, 403
disruptive innovation, 163

E

Early Stages of Product
 Innovation, 149
 ecosystem, 55
 Electric Vehicle, 219
 Electric Vehicle Charging, 219
 Emergence, 323
 Emerging Economies, 115
 Employee creativity, 97
 Employment, 303
 Enterprise Social Networks, 205
 entrepreneurial beliefs, 379
 entrepreneurial communities, 435
 entrepreneurial ecosystems, 435
 Entrepreneurial Firms, 455
 entrepreneurial networking, 435
 Entrepreneurial opportunity, 379
 entrepreneurship, 455
 Europe, 273
 Exploitation, 391
 Exploration, 391
 External R&D, 273

F

FDI, 303
 fear, 365
 Federal Funding, 403
 Financial Performance, 273
 firm growth, 455
 firm performance, 455
 Flourishing Business Models, 235
 Framework Development, 175
 frequency, 191
 Front End of Innovation, 149
 Front-End Innovation, 349
 frugal innovation, 69

G

Game storming, 235

Globalization, xii
 Grid Modernization, 219

H

Healthcare, 417
 Hierarchical Decision Modeling,
 37
 HRM practices, 97
 HRO, 1
 human capital, 455

I

ICT impact, 191
 Idea Assessment, 349
 Idea Evaluation, 349
 Idea Management, 323, 349
 Idea Screening, 349
 incentives, 249
 inclusive globalization, 249
 incubation, 435
 indirect relationships, 19
 Industrial Funding, 403
 innovation, 1, 19, 205, 303, 349,
 379, 455
 innovation adoption, 365
 innovation champion, 129
 innovation diffusion, 365
 innovation hubs, 435
 innovation intermediaries, 435
 Innovation Interoperability, 323
 Innovation Management, 115,
 149, 205, 287, 379, 417
 Innovation Performance, 273, 323
 Innovation Phases, 175
 Innovation Process Model, 149
 innovation resistance, 365
 Innovation Structuration, 323
 innovation teams, 379
 innovative work behavior, 97
 Intellectual Property, 303

intensity, 191
Interaction Effect, 403
Internal R&D, 273
inter-organizational
 collaboration, 55
Intuition, 349
Investing, 391

J

job characteristics, 97

K

KETs, 417
Knowledge Dynamics, 323
Knowledge intensive
 entrepreneurship, 455
Knowledge Management, 323
Knowledge Sharing, 205

L

leadership and supervisory
 behaviors, 97
learning asymmetry, 379
learning style, 379
Licences, 403
locations, 249

M

Macro cognition, 235
Management, xii
manufacturing, 191
Manufacturing Firms, 191, 273
Matching Quality, 37
Materiality, 235
mindfulness, 1
mixed method, 163
Mobile Learning, 235
Modern Organization, 323
Multinationals, 287

music industry, 163

N

Nanotechnologies, 303
nanotechnology, 417
negative emotion, 365
networks, 249
New Capability Creation, 115
New Product Development, 175
nonprofit innovation, 129
nonprofit sector, 129

O

Ontology, 323
open innovation, 19, 37, 55
opportunity perception, 379
opportunity recognition, 163
Organizational Communication,
 205
organizational identity, 163
organizational information
 processing theory, 191
organizational responses, 163

P

Partnership, 37
Patents, 303, 403
Procedural Knowledge
 Transparency, 205
Process Model Development, 149
proficiency, 191
project management, 1
psychological attributes, 97
Public and Private Investments,
 303

R

R&D, 403
R&D “going out” strategy, 249

R&D globalization, 249
R&D investment, 303
R&D organizational
 configurations, 249
Rationality, 349
Regional Development, 303
regional ecosystem, 55
Regional Innovation System, 303
Regional Policies, 303
relational resource-based view,
 191
resilience, 1
resistance leader, 365
resource-based view, 455
Resource-scarce environments,
 115
Reverse Innovation, 287

S

search, 455
Semantic Web, 323
Sensemaking, 205
Smart Grid, 219
SMEs, 55
social capital, 19
social enterprises, 69
social innovation, 69
social sustainability, 69
socially driven business, 69
socially driven innovation, 69
Strategic Alliances, 273
Strategic Innovation
 Management, 149

Strategic Issue Management, 149
Structural Equation Modelling,
 273
supporting features, 19
sustainability, 69, 235
sustainable business, 69
sustainable development, 69

T

team creativity, 97
teams, 1
technological diversity, 417
technology & innovation
 management, 163
technology entrepreneurs, 435
Technology Planning, 219
Technology Roadmapping, 219
technology transfer, xiii, 417
Transactive Energy, 219
Transformational Leadership, 37
Transparency, 205
Transportation Electrification, 219
trusted bridging chains, 19

U

University Technology Transfer,
 403
University-Industry Collaboration,
 37
Utility Planning, 219