

CALL FOR PAPERS

California Management Review

Special Issue: 20 Years of Open Innovation

Guest Editors:

Marcel Bogers, TU Eindhoven, The Netherlands

Henry Chesbrough, UC Berkeley, USA

Marcus Holgersson, Chalmers University of Technology, Sweden

EXTENDED DEADLINE: OCTOBER 31, 2023

20 years ago the concept of open innovation was introduced in Henry Chesbrough's book 'Open Innovation: The New Imperative for Creating and Profiting from Technology'.¹ Open innovation is "a distributed innovation process based on purposively managed knowledge flows across organizational boundaries, using pecuniary and non-pecuniary mechanisms in line with each organization's business model".² Since the introduction of the concept, the research and practice of open innovation have grown rapidly.³

Despite this surge in the research and practice of open innovation, there is still ample need to better understand how to manage it. As open innovation has matured and become increasingly used it has been applied in new technological and industrial areas where its implications and specific management needs are yet to be fully understood. For example, in new and complex technologies the management of open innovation does not simply deal with a bilateral innovation collaboration between two firms but may include tens or hundreds of organizations, leading to significant coordination challenges.⁴ And as technologies and industries are increasingly data-driven, the management of open data becomes a key issue for the management of open innovation.⁵

In addition, the full life of the phenomenon now needs to be better understood, including potential failures⁶ along the way as well as the closing of open innovation.⁷ The application of open innovation is neither a binary decision nor a one-way street. We now know that open innovation can be used to boost firm performance, but more open is not always better.⁸ Therefore, the openness of innovation is dynamic, and these dynamics have implications on individual, technology, firm, and ecosystem levels.⁹ Moreover, the application of open innovation is not limited to driving business performance, but is increasingly relevant for tackling some of today's grand challenges on societal level.¹⁰ What we currently know about the management of open innovation needs to be reconsidered for such purposes.

California Management Review now invites submissions for a special issue dedicated to the management of open innovation. The aim of this special issue is to analyze the impact of open

innovation on a broad range of business and management subjects and offer guidance to organizations on how to best use and manage open innovation for sustainable value creation and value capture. Proposals can be based on all types of research, disciplinary or interdisciplinary, conceptual or empirical, but need to follow the submission and style guidelines of California Management Review and must be of managerial relevance. Some exemplary themes that this special issue intends to cover include, but are not limited to:

- The full life open innovation, from opening to closing.
- Open innovation failures, and how to manage them.
- Managing open data in open innovation.
- Developing and commercializing complex technologies with open innovation.
- Open innovation and ecosystem orchestration.
- Open innovation and firm strategy.
- Tackling grand challenges with open innovation.
- Managing value capture and value distribution in multi-actor open innovation.
- Open innovation and contracting.
- New technologies and tools for managing open innovation.
- The culture and cultural context of open innovation.
- Open innovation and geopolitics.

Submissions will be processed continuously after being submitted, and must be submitted no later than October 31, 2023 (extended deadline). Authors should submit a full manuscript to the attention of Marcel Bogers (m.l.a.m.bogers@tue.nl), Henry Chesbrough, (chesbrou@berkeley.edu), and Marcus Holgersson (marhol@chalmers.se). Manuscripts should run between 5,000 and 8,000 words (excluding charts, tables, figures, and endnotes). Additional CMR submission guidelines can be found at <http://cmr.berkeley.edu/resources/submit/>. Manuscripts should clearly state

- (i) the purpose of the study;
- (ii) the particular management issue addressed;
- (iii) the context in which this particular management issue is examined;
- (iv) the relevance of the study for practitioners, academic scholars, and CMR readership.

The Guest Editors and CMR's Editor-in-Chief will select submissions which are likely to result in first-rate, high-impact submissions, and the authors of these submissions will be invited to submit their article online through the CMR submission portal to be peer reviewed.

Endnotes

¹ Henry W. Chesbrough, *Open Innovation: The New Imperative for Creating and Profiting from Technology* (Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press, 2003).

² Henry W. Chesbrough and Marcel Bogers, "Explicating open innovation: Clarifying an emerging paradigm for understanding innovation," in *New Frontiers in Open Innovation*, ed. Henry Chesbrough, Wim Vanhaverbeke, and Joel West (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), p. 27.

³ Linus Dahlander, David M. Gann, and Martin W. Wallin, "How open is innovation? A retrospective and ideas forward," *Research Policy* 50/4 (2021): 104218; Chesbrough and Bogers, "Explicating open innovation: Clarifying an emerging paradigm for understanding innovation."; Krithika Randhawa, Ralf Wilden, and Jan Hohberger, "A Bibliometric Review of Open Innovation: Setting a Research Agenda," *Journal of Product Innovation Management* 33/6 (2016): 750-72.

⁴ Deepak Somaya, David J. Teece, and Simon Wakeman, "Innovation in multi-invention contexts: Mapping solutions to technological and intellectual property complexity," *California Management Review* 53/4 (2011): 47-79; Marcus Holgersson, Carliss Y. Baldwin, Henry Chesbrough, and Marcel L. A. M. Bogers, "The Forces of Ecosystem Evolution," *California Management Review* 64/3 (2022): 5-23.

⁵ Serdar Temiz, Marcus Holgersson, Joakim Björkdahl, and Martin W. Wallin, "Open data: Lost opportunity or unrealized potential?," *Technovation* 114 (2022): 102535.

⁶ Frederik von Briel and Jan Recker, "Lessons from a failed implementation of an online open innovation community in an innovative organization," *MIS Quarterly Executive* 16/1 (2017): 35-46.

⁷ Hardik Bhimani, Anne-Laure Mention, and Dimitrios Salampasis, "Disengagement in open innovation: A cognitive perspective," *British Journal of Management* 34/1 (2023): 241-58; Marcus Holgersson, Martin W. Wallin, Henry W. Chesbrough, and Linus Dahlander, "Closing open innovation," *Strategic Management Review* (Forthcoming).

⁸ Keld Laursen and Ammon Salter, "Open for innovation: The role of openness in explaining innovation performance among U.K. manufacturing firms," *Strategic Management Journal* 27/2 (2006): 131-50; Ann-Kristin Zobel, "Benefiting from Open Innovation: A Multidimensional Model of Absorptive Capacity*," *Journal of Product Innovation Management* 34/3 (2017): 269-88.

⁹ Melissa M. Appleyard and Henry W. Chesbrough, "The Dynamics of Open Strategy: From Adoption to Reversion," *Long Range Planning* 50/3 (2017): 310-21; Hanna Bahemia, John Sillince, and Wim Vanhaverbeke, "The timing of openness in a radical innovation project, a temporal and loose coupling perspective," *Research Policy* 47/10 (2018): 2066-76; Marcus Holgersson, Ove Granstrand, and Marcel Bogers, "The evolution of intellectual property strategy in innovation ecosystems: Uncovering complementary and substitute appropriability regimes," *Long Range Planning* 51/2 (2018): 303-19; Holgersson et al. (Forthcoming), op. cit.

¹⁰ Anita M. McGahan, Marcel L. A. M. Bogers, Henry Chesbrough, and Marcus Holgersson, "Tackling Societal Challenges with Open Innovation," *California Management Review* 63/2 (2021).