
Editorial

Marina Dabic

Department of International Economics,
Faculty of Economics and Business,
University of Zagreb,
J.F. Kennedy Square 6, 10000 Zagreb, Croatia
E-mail: mdabic@efzg.hr

Biographical notes: Marina Dabic is a Full Professor of Entrepreneurship and International Business at the University of Zagreb, Faculty of Economics and Business, Croatia. Her research appeared in wide variety of journals including *Journal of International Business Studies*, *Journal of World Business*, *European Management Journal*, *Thunderbird Business Review*, *Management Decision*, *Journal of Manpower* and others. She is the Editor of the *International Journal of Innovation Systems*, Inderscience. Her research areas include entrepreneurship, international business, innovation, management of technology and the impact of innovation on CEE countries. She is a Reviewer for the European Science Foundation and Tempus. For her research, she has been granted with Erasmus and Leonardo scholarships. Currently, she is a grant holder of EU JP TEMPUS Project: Fostering Entrepreneurships in Higher Education – FoSentHE. She has been a grant holder of several EU projects. In 2004, she was a Visiting Professor at Strathclyde University, Scotland sponsored by EU.

“Seeing what everyone has seen and thinking what no-one has thought.”

Farady

The fact that the nature and drivers of globalisation have changed with the onset of the global financial crisis may cause delays in the research and development projects due to insufficient funding available. Thus, in this issue of the *IJTIS* we deal with the global characteristics of the decision making and innovation processes in different countries, the key roles of the national innovation systems and innovation. Most models of internationalisation focus on concerns at the firm level and thereby understate the significant impact of firms’ managers and managerial mindsets on its internationalisation (Jones and Coviello, 2005; Knight and Cavusgil, 2004). The attribution theory indicates that it is the subjective perception of causality, and not necessarily the reality, that influences the outcome behaviour (Weiner, 2000; Cort et al., 2007). Given the achievement orientation of the traditional stage-based internationalisation models, Griffith argued that the attribution theory may provide academics and practitioners with a richer theoretical perspective for exploring the internationalisation process and a greater insight into the managers’ driving a firm’s internationalisation – an area yet to be fully explored. Chen et al. (2011) pointed out importance of knowledge sharing with aim to increase team effectiveness. The articles in this issue address an aspect of global behaviour in the commercialisation and/or internationalisation of the innovation processes either from the management perspective or the changes we faced in the

national innovation systems underwent in the last three decades and their roles in the respective countries, or the changes that occurred in the new missions of universities. Steiner et al. (2010) pointed important of networks and the position of organisations within the networks.

The first article of this issue entitled 'Key factors for management of global projects: a case study' by Wenche Aarseth, Asbjørn Rolstadås and Bjørn Andersen points out the key factors that tie directly to the management processes in global projects. In the article, the authors empirically analyse the potential benefits of process models in small technology firms. The results show that process models may facilitate commercialisation by helping entrepreneurs to manage the process phases and activities.

Creation of new knowledge and innovation requires managers to make new decisions in developing and exploiting innovation activities. In the second paper, Timothy Kiessling, Michael Harvey, Miriam Moeller and Andrew Hebdon wrote on 'Small and medium size firms top management teams' decision-making in global acquisitions' focusing on cognitive processes that foster a global mindset in small firms and highlight its importance as a driver of their internationalisation process.

When, where, with what purpose, how, with whom, and in what way a country can create proper environment for innovation are the issues addressed by Luis Manuel Fe de Pinho in the paper 'Creative business entrepreneurship: the Portuguese creative business incubators'. The author emphasises that process models have helped to overcome the challenges associated with the commercialisation process in two ways: they have helped to identify the key activities required for the commercialisation process and to ensure that these key activities are carried out efficiently.

Network innovation system is believed to have become superior in relation to the recent linear approach (Deakins and Freel, 2003; Etzkowitz and Leydesdorff, 2001; Rothwell et al., 1974). Universities contribute to economic development and research capacities through the processes of creating human capital, technology transfer from the university to the private sector by creating the basic knowledge that will penetrate through the existing framework and by setting up 'enterprises' that will do business in the competitiveness environment (Lazzeroni and Piccaluga, 2003). Cooperation between the enterprise, the state and the university is a well-known notion but the best form of collaboration has yet to be discovered. Universities' dual mission is traditionally expressed through research and education, but the new innovation system has generated a third role: contribution to economic development. The university is expected to uphold the economic development through two types of activities: the first refers to the perception of entrepreneurial sophistication of individual academic activities, such as publishing academic papers, scholarships and grants and contractual research, and the second refers to patenting, licensing and creating 'spin off' enterprises. While the first group of activities is considered to be traditional with most universities, the second group is more intensely entrepreneurial. Similarly, certain activities supporting economic development are expected to facilitate the financial progress of the universities themselves. Youtie and Shapira (2008) describe 'Mode 3' when addressing the universities' role as innovation-promoting knowledge hub-centres that are executed in configurations often referred to as triple helix-causalities (Etzkowitz and Leydesdorff, 1997, 2000). The external players range from suppliers, customers and competitors to research institutions and organisations in very different industries that either propose the solutions for improving a company's innovations or exploit the solutions a company has developed.

The fourth paper written by Nobuya Fukugawa on ‘Impacts and channels of university spillovers before the national innovation system reform in Japan’ debates the modifications of the role of universities, especially the perception of these institutions as the crucial component of innovation systems.

Subsequent to the fall of the Berlin Wall in the autumn of 1989, a sizable group of economists has been studying the process of transition from socialism or communism to capitalism in the former socialist economies, mostly focusing on Central and Eastern Europe, under the coined term ‘transition economics’ or ‘transformation economics’. Although interest in the research in transition has grown over time its focus has changed. Thus, policy significance and relevance for the economic theory can account for the growing interest in the transition process within the economics profession.

The last article on ‘Russia’s innovation system: reflection on the past, present and future’ by Dina Williams offers an insight into transition and into the dynamics of large-scale institutional change, i.e., how the momentum for reform is created and how institutions can evolve, as well as how the momentum can be lost and how one can get stuck in inefficient institutions. In that sense, transition has reinforced what Gérard (2000) calls “the evolutionary-institutionalist perspective, insisting on the institutional environment of agents at any moment in time as well as on its evolution”.

Conclusions

The contents of this issue start from establishing that in open economy technology start-ups should be born globally and their staff should think about internationalisation at the very beginning of their commercialisation process. Governments at all levels and all around world have agreed that they must place science and innovation at the heart of a strategy for long-term economic growth. However, there is a crucial difference between the impact and the impact agenda. Bringing together university policy, skills policy, business, regulation and competition policy, science and research policy has become in effect a way of making improvements in the quality of a nation. Innovation systems on regional and national levels ... are described by numerous authors (Klofsten et al., 1999; Etzkowitz et al., 2000; Inzelt, 2004; Motohashi, 2005; Etzkowitz and Leydesdorff, 2000). This path has been marked by changes both on micro and macro levels. It should be noted that every form of institutional change is a long-term process which requires years of systematic efforts to produce changes in the cultures of countries and institutions. However, before undertaking changes it is important to attain a certain level of institutional understanding and support in the form of belief in the goal’s appropriateness. These limits present challenges for politicians, practitioners and academics as they represent the lesser understood areas. Much more needs to be done to persuade businesses of the economic benefits to be gained from innovation, and of working in collaboration with university departments to achieve this goal as we still lack the how-to-do-it knowledge.

All this requires managerial attention and abundant ideas for further academic research highlighting the impact of the journals like *International Journal of Transition of Innovation Systems*, Inderscience. I would like to thank the members of the advisory board, the editorial board and the reviewers who inspire and enable the authors to give their contributions to building knowledge driven innovation economy and developing networks within the communities with similar goals. I am very grateful to all members of

IJTIS review board affiliated within this journal. I have learned a great deal from all of them both through collaboration and via numerous long academic exchanges that go far beyond joint cooperation.

I wish to express here my deep intellectual debt to Professor Michael Harvey. It was before I earned my PhD 15 years ago that he answered my e-mail which meant the start of our collaboration in different fields of significance to examining transition economies – thus putting me in direct contact with the network of researchers practicing at the cutting edge of modern applied economic theory.

I would also like to thank M.A. Dorgham, Jim Corlett, Darren Simpson, and other members of Inderscience Publishers for their outstanding assistance and for continuing to support the delivery of the *IJTIS* to the public.

References

- Chen, W., Hsu, B., Wang, M. and Lin, Y. (2011) 'Fostering knowledge sharing through human resource management in R&D teams', *International Journal of Technology Management (IJTM)*, Special Issue on Managing Research and Development – People, Projects and Technology Dimensions, Vol. 53, Nos. 2/3/4, pp.309–330.
- Cort, K.T., Griffith, D.A. and White, D.S. (2007) 'An attribution theory approach for understanding the internationalization of professional service firms', *International Marketing Review*, Vol. 24, No. 1, pp.9–25, (Best Paper Award; International Marketing Review).
- Deakins, D. and Freel, M. (2003) *Entrepreneurship and Small Firms*, 3rd ed., McGraw-Hill Education, Berkshire.
- Etzkowitz, H., Webster, A., Gebhardt, C., Regina, B. and Terra, C. (2000) 'The future of the university and the university of the future: evolution of ivory tower to entrepreneurial paradigm', *Research Policy*, Vol. 29, No. 2, pp.313–330.
- Etzkowitz, H. and Leydesdorff, L. (1997) *Universities in the Global Economy: A Triple Helix of University – Industry – Government Relations*, Cassell Academic, London.
- Etzkowitz, H. and Leydesdorff, L. (2000) 'The dynamics of innovation: from national systems and 'Mode 2' to a triple helix of university – industry – government relations', *Research Policy*, Vol. 29, No. 2, pp.109–123.
- Etzkowitz, H. and Leydesdorff, L. (2001) 'The transformation of university-industry-government relations', *Electronic Journal of Sociology*, ISSN: 1198 3655.
- Gérard, R. (2000) *Transition and Economics: Politics, Firms, Markets*, MIT Press, Cambridge.
- Inzelt, A. (2004) 'The evolution of university – industry – government relationships during transition', *Research Policy*, Vol. 33, Nos. 6–7, pp.975–995.
- Jones, M.V. and Coviello, N.E. (2005) 'Internationalisation: conceptualising and entrepreneurial process of behavior in time', *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 36, No. 3, pp.284–303.
- Klofsten, M., Dylan, J. and Carina, S. (1999) 'Growing the Linköping Technopole – a longitudinal study of the triple helix development in Sweden', *Journal of Technology Transfer*, Vol. 24, Nos. 2/3, pp.125–138.
- Knight, G.A. and Cavusgil, S.T. (2004) 'Innovation, organizational capabilities, and the born-global firm', *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 35, No. 4, pp.124–141.
- Lazzeroni, M. and Piccaluga, A. (2003) 'Towards the entrepreneurial university', *Local Economy*, Vol. 18, No. 1, pp.38–48.
- Motohashi, K. (2005) *An Empirical Analysis of IT Innovation*, March, Toyo Keizai Press, (in Japanese).
- Rothwell, R., Freeman, C., Horlsey, A., Jercis, V.T.P. and Robertson, A.B. (1974) *Sappho Updated – Project SAPPHO Phase II. Research Policy*, Vol. 3, No. 3, pp.258–291, Elsevier.

- Steiner, M., Gil, J.A., Ehret, O., Ploder, M. and Wink, R. (2010) 'European medium-technology innovation networks: a multi-methodological multi-regional approach', *International Journal of Technology Management (IJTM)*, Vol. 50, Nos. 3/4, pp.292–262.
- Weiner, B. (2000) 'Attributional thoughts about consumer behavior', *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 27, No. 3, pp.382–387.
- Youtie, J. and Shapira, P. (2008) 'Building an innovation hub: a case study of the transformation of university roles in regional technological and economic development', *Research Policy*, September, Vol. 37, No. 8, pp.1188–1204, Elsevier.