### **Discussion**

Joel West
College of Business
San José State University
www.JoelWest.org

Academy of Management August 9, 2005



#### What is Ol?

- Incorporating external innovations
  - Finding them
  - Integrating them (overcoming NIH)
- Maximizing value for internal innovations
  - Appropriability needed if not integrated (Teece 1986)
- Tied together by business model



## **Applications of Ol**

- Utilizing external innovations
  - Firms understand this, fits known trends
  - Particularly like "free" spillovers
  - What are implications for corporation



## **Levels of Analysis**

- Individual: business models are rare
- Firm: strategies, competencies
- Value network: interdependencies of business models
- Industry: impact of a shock (e.g. new technology)
- National: role of policy



## **Potential OI Problems (1)**

#### For firms using external innovations

- What is your company's competency (Christensen 2006)
- Difficult for small firms (Laursen & Salter, 2005)
- Need to motivate ongoing supply (West & Gallagher, 2006)
- Attempts by suppliers to capture value may choke off cumulative innovation (Fabrizio 2006)



## **Potential OI Problems (2)**

For firms creating the external innovations (I.e. capturing value from internal innovations)

- Need to find interested buyers
  - Cf. Microsoft supplying Windows CE for set-top boxes
- Extremely dependent on appropriability (Teece 1986; Laursen & Salter, 2005; West and Gallagher, 2006; West, 2006)
- Tend towards "winner take all" outcome (cf. Arthur, 1996)



## **Potential OI Problems (3)**

#### For both partners to exchange:

- Need both value creation and value capture
- Business model is dependent on entire value network (Chesbrough & Rosenbloom, 2002)
- Modularization means customers or suppliers can encourage competition



## **Paper Presentations**

- Kira Fabrizio
  - How do IP rules affect supply of external innovation?
- Jens Frøslev Christensen
  - What does the use of OI mean for the 1990s view of core competencies?
- Keld Laursen and Ammon Salter
  - Firm and industry factors for innovation openness



## Fabrizio: University Science

- How do changes in IP policy affect availability and use of external innovations?
- Are there downsides for too much appropriability?



## **Findings**

- Bayh & Dole hoped IP would provide incentives for university tech transfer
- Also incentives to slow free spillovers of scientific knowledge
  - -Impacts cumulative science
  - Limits access by non-licensee firms



## **End of "Open Science"?**

#### **IP** ownership

		Public	Private
		(spillover)	(university)
	Public		Post-Bayh
)		Science ideal	Dole (hope)
3		Starving	Tech transfer
		scientists	offices

R&D funding



## **Christensen: Class D Amps**

### When a discontinuity comes along:

- Do you build or buy the capability?
  - Core rigidities constrain decision
  - Can you correct an error?
- Is there still a value to vertical integration?



## **Strategic Alternatives**

- Buy innovations on the market
- Acquire external innovators
- Acquire external innovators
- Internally innovate
- Ignore it



## **Christensen's Classification**

	External Focus		Internal Focus	
Timing	Acquisition -based	Partnership/ Licensing-based	Tight system Integration	Closed style
Early/dedicated movers	Texas Instru- ments	STMicro- electronics/ Apogee	Sony	
Early/slow mover				Philips
Late mover		Sanyo		

## Firm Response

Internal

N=10

Response

**Acquire** fail Component success Integrated fail? Integrator



External

success

fail

success

### **Unresolved Questions**

- Which strategy is sustainable longterm?
- What path dependencies (culture, core rigidities) constrain OI?
  - How does Sony sustain a differentiation cost structure without differentiation?



# Laursen & Salter: Firm Openness

- Openness as an antecedent to OI
  - What predicts the attitudes?
  - -Is openness determined by appropriability strategies?
- Key question: how open is open enough? (cf. West 2003)



## **Hypotheses**

- 1. Moderate appropriability best suited for openness to external innovation
- 2. More human capital, more OI
- 3. Startups with high human capital less open to external innovation
- 4. More technological change -> more opportunities -> more openness



Moderate appropriability best suited for openness to external innovation

#### **But:**

- Measure is how hard firms try to appropriate, not how much they are able to appropriate
- Some measures suggest weak appropriability
  - Trade secrets means that if it's not secret, it's not protected



#### More human capital, more OI

- If you limit to science & engineering, a weaker effect
  - Possible industry interaction effect
- Future research:
  - What impacts use of degrees?
  - Christensen: Sony very different from TI



# Startups with high human capital less open to external innovation

- Possible explanations:
  - L&S: Concern about leakage
  - Business model may be about innovation creation
  - Question of search heuristics/satisficing
- What is the effect size?



# More technological change -> more opportunities -> more openness

#### **Questions:**

- What about innovations that cross industries?
  - E-commerce created opportunities in retailing
- Relationship of firm, industry R&D intensity
  - Raw correlations, industry R&D is significant p<.001</li>
  - Test with path model? (or other test of mediation)



# Is Openness Determined by Appropriability?

#### **Appropriability**

	High	Low
High	pharma	open source
Low	†	textiles

† Does this case exist? Is it always sub-optimal?



## Role of Appropriability

- Is appropriability exogenous?
  - Tied to specific technology, policy regime
- Or can appropriability be created?
  - Creation of switching costs (Shapiro & Varian, 1999)
  - Layering value on open source (West & Gallagher 2006)



## **Audience Discussion**

For more info, see

www.OpenInnovation.net

