

Managing Innovation

Coordinator: Pedro de Faria

Lecturers: Bernard Nijstad, Isabel Estrada, Pedro de Faria, Florian Noseleit and Pere Arque-Castells

Content of the course

The course consists of three modules. Jointly, these modules will give students a state-of-the-art overview of academic research on the management of innovation within and between firms at different levels of analysis. We will pay attention to recent theoretical and methodological developments in the field of innovation management. Each module consists of three half-day workshops. For each module, students will have to complete one assignment. Together, the individual assignments will constitute the final grade of the course.

All lectures will take place in room 5411.0119 (Duisenberg Building).

Module 1: Managing the exploration/exploitation dichotomy

Workshop 1.1: Managing the exploration/exploitation dichotomy at the individual and team level (15/11 13.00 – 16.00)

Teachers: Nijstad

Papers to read as preparation:

Anderson, N., Potocnik, K., Zhou, J. (2014). Innovation and creativity in organizations: A state-of-the-science review, prospective commentary, and guiding framework. *Journal of Management*, 40, 1297-1333.

Hülshager, U.T, Anderson, N., Salgado J.F. (2009). Team-level predictors of innovation at work: a comprehensive: Meta-analysis spanning three decades of research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94, 1128-1145.

Mom, T. J. M., Chang, Y-Y., Cholakova, M., Jansen, J. J. P. (2019). A Multilevel Integrated Framework of Firm HR Practices, Individual Ambidexterity, and Organizational Ambidexterity. *Journal of Management*, 45, 3009-3034.

Workshop 1.2: Managing the exploration/exploitation dichotomy at the organizational level & Introduction in multi-level studies on innovation (16/11 09.00 – 12.00)

Teachers: Estrada

Lavie, D., Stettner, U., Tushman, M. L. (2010). Exploration and exploitation within and across organizations. *Academy of Management Annals*, 4(1), 109-155.

Andriopoulos, C., Lewis, M. W. (2009). Exploitation-exploration tensions and organizational ambidexterity: Managing paradoxes of innovation. *Organization Science*, 20(4), 696-717.

Lavie, D., Rosenkopf, L. (2006). Balancing exploration and exploitation in alliance formation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(4), 797-818.

Workshop 1.3: Presentation assignment (29/11 13.00 - 16.00)

Teachers: Nijstad and Estrada

Assignment module 1:

Students are expected to prepare a 20 minutes PowerPoint presentation in which they present the conceptual model for a multi-level study on the exploration/exploitation dichotomy. The PowerPoint presentation should at least consider the following points: (i) Introduction to the core research question, (ii) Theoretically grounded hypotheses, (iii) Graphical illustration of the conceptual model and (iv) Discussion of methodological challenges in testing the conceptual model. The PowerPoint needs to be presented on 29/11. Based on feedback from the teachers, students will have the opportunity to further fine-tune the PowerPoint presentation before final grading. The deadline for handing in the final PowerPoint presentation is December 13.

Module 2: Managing Innovation Between Firms

Workshop 2.1: Open Innovation and Innovation Ecosystems (16/11 13.00 – 16.00)

Teacher: de Faria

Papers to read as preparation:

Laursen, K., Salter, A. J. (2006). Open for innovation: The role of openness in explaining innovation performance among U.K. manufacturing firms. *Strategic Management Journal*, 27(2), 131–150.

Shipilov, A., Gawer, A. (2020). Integrating research on interorganizational networks and ecosystems. *Academy of Management Annals*, 14(1), 92-121.

Chesbrough, H. (2006). Open Innovation: A new paradigm for understanding industrial innovation. in Chesbrough, H., Vanhaverbeke, W. and West, J., eds., *Open Innovation: Researching a New Paradigm*. /Oxford: Oxford University Press. Available at: <http://www.emotools.com/media/upload/files/Openinnovationparadigm.pdf>

Workshop 2.2: Alliance portfolios and networks (30/11 09.00 – 12.00)

Teacher: de Faria

Papers to read as preparation:

Aggarwal, V. A. (2020). Resource congestion in alliance networks: How a firm's partners' partners influence the benefits of collaboration. *Strategic Management Journal*, 41(4), 627-655.

Wassmer, U. (2010). Alliance Portfolios: A review and research Agenda. *Journal of Management*, 36(1), 141–171.

Gulati, R., Nohria, N., Zaheer, A. (2000). Strategic Networks. *Strategic Management Journal*, 21(3), 203–215.

Workshop 2.3: Governance of interfirm relationships (30/11 13.00 – 16.00)

Teacher: Estrada

Papers to read as preparation:

Faems, D., Janssens, M., Madhok, A., Van Looy, B. (2008). Toward an integrative perspective on alliance governance: Connecting contract design, trust dynamics, and contract application. *Academy of Management Journal*, 51(6), 1053-1078.

Hoetker, G., Mellewigt, T. (2009). Choice and performance of governance mechanisms: Matching alliance governance to asset type. *Strategic Management Journal*, 30(10), 1025-1044.

Keller, A., Lumineau, F., Mellewigt, T., & Ariño, A. (2021). Alliance governance mechanisms in the face of disruption. *Organization Science*, <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2021.1437>

Assignment module 2:

After completion of the module, students are expected to write a critical reflection connecting the topics of open innovation/innovation ecosystems and alliance governance. Instructions for the assignment will be given in workshop 2.1. In workshops 2.2 and 2.3, students will present their preliminary ideas for the assignment, based on the reading materials. In workshop 2.2 (25/11), students will reflect on the opportunities and challenges associated to open innovation and innovation ecosystems. In workshop 2.3 (25/11), students will discuss the advantages and disadvantages of different governance approaches. Based on the feedback from the teacher, students will have the opportunity to complete the assignment before final grading.

The critical reflection (4 pages max.) should consider: (i) opportunities and challenges of open innovation and innovation ecosystems (1 page), (ii) advantages and disadvantages of different governance approaches (1 page), and (iii) advantages and disadvantages of different governance approaches for different open innovation and innovation ecosystems settings (2 pages). For this latter part, students can focus on particular settings such as multi-partner alliances, alliances with competitors, universities, etc. The deadline is December 20 (send the assignment to the teachers of the module by email).

Module 3: Methodological perspectives on innovation management

Workshop 3.1: Secondary data research on managing innovation (20/12 13.00 – 16.00)

Teacher: Noseleit

Workshop 3.1 does not require you to prepare readings. However, you are expected to install STATA/SPSS for some in-class exercises.

Workshop 3.2: Evaluation of innovation policies (21/12 09.00 – 12.00)

Teacher: Arque-Castells

Papers to read as preparation:

Bloom, N., Van Reenen, J., Williams, H. (2019). A toolkit of policies to promote innovation. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 33(3), 163-84.

Howell, S.T. (2017). Financing innovation: Evidence from R&D grants. *American Economic Review*, 107(4), 1136-64.

Sampat, B., Williams, H.L. (2019). How do patents affect follow-on innovation? Evidence from the human genome. *American Economic Review*, 109(1), 203-36.

* [Non-compulsory reference] - Abadie, A., Cattaneo, M.D. (2018). Econometric methods for program evaluation. *Annual Review of Economics*, 10, 465-503.

Workshop 3.3: Case study research on managing innovation (21/12 13.00 – 16.00)

Teacher: Estrada

Papers to read as preparation:

Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989). Building theories from case study research. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(4), 532-550.

Eisenhardt, K. M., Graebner, M. E. (2007). Theory building from cases: Opportunities and challenges. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(1), 25-32.

In addition, please revisit the following case study papers, which have been discussed in prior workshops, focusing now on design and methodological aspects:

Andriopoulos & Lewis (2009) — from workshop 1.2.

Faems et al. (2008) — from workshop 2.3.

Keller et al. (2021) —from workshop 2.3.

Assignment module 3:

Students have to write a critical review on one of the three workshop topics of module 3 (1. Secondary data research; 2. Evaluation of innovation policies; 3. Case study research). The number of students that can choose a topic may be limited (topics will be assigned on a ‘first come, first served’ basis). The task of a critical review is to summarize and critically discuss the chosen topic. The reflection should go beyond the module lectures and encompass a comprehensive discussion of the role of a specific method for research on innovation. This should

comprise the strengths and weaknesses of a method, its limitations, pitfalls, opportunities, challenges and areas/settings in which it is likely to be successfully applied. A good review should be short, concise, and to the point. The length of your assignment should not exceed three pages. Deadline of the assignment is 17-01-2022 (send it to the teacher of the workshop by email).