
Editorial

Francisco Javier Carrillo

Tecnologico de Monterrey,
CETEC CT-524, Campus Monterrey,
Eugenio Garza Sada 2501 Sur,
Monterrey 64849, NL, Mexico
and
The World Capital Institute,
Senda Caprichosa 4428, Villa Las Fuentes,
Monterrey 64890, NL, Mexico
Email: fjcarrillo@itesm.mx

Biographical notes: Francisco Javier Carrillo is a Professor of Knowledge Management and Chair of the Strategic Focus Research Group on Knowledge Societies at Tecnológico de Monterrey. He is the President of the World Capital Institute. His current research interests are: capital systems, knowledge markets, knowledge-based development and new economic cultures.

Natural and conventional cycles induce assessment and improvement actions as they get fulfilled. For the *IJKBD*, V5 involved a new shift in editorship role transfer, as originally established amongst the three Editors. Tan Yigitcanlar undertook the first bi-annual period (2010 to 2011), followed by Kostas Metaxiotis who recently completed the second period (2012 to 2013). I undertook this role for the period 2014 to 2015, giving continuity to the work of this editorial team.

During its first five years, *IJKBD* has established itself as the main reference in the field. With the only exception of the foundational volume composed by V1 N1 and V1 N2, all volumes have included the four issues resulting from a quarterly publishing. At the time of writing, a total of 167 papers had been submitted, from which 77 have been published and 70 rejected. A schedule of two regular issues and two special issues a year has been the usual mix and is likely to continue. The editorial scope of the journal is explained in the official Inderscience website, including topics covered, objectives, readership and contents. The journal is currently indexed in Scopus and other academic indices and lists. A renewed editorial board is providing both editorial continuity and new momentum to the journal's young life.

The set of papers included in this closing issue of volume 5, is a good sample of the topics that are currently driving research efforts in KBD. These topics have been consistently covered throughout the journal's former issues.

The paper by Katri Liis Lepik and Merle Krigul looks at cross-border cooperation between Helsinki and Tallinn. By examining knowledge sharing process across closely linked capital cities, the authors underlie the importance of understanding and managing the way common plans are set out and implemented. The challenge of building close cooperation links is substantiated. The paper also contributes to understanding barriers to establish channels for innovation-intensive cooperation and knowledge-transfer.

Most cities across the world hold a portfolio of twin cities and other forms of inter-city alliances. Often, these are merely protocolary agreements received from prior administrations and sustained only by symbolic bases such as shared name, historical links, or circumstances such as leadership convergences or political events. However, some of these urban twinships may have an untapped potential if properly redefined within the respective strategic map of both concerned cities. Lepik and Krigul's paper brings valuable insights into the possibilities of cross-city KBD-related cooperation. Twin knowledge-cities are a platform worth exploring (Carrillo, 2004).

In their paper on benchmarking clusters for knowledge potential, Murat Akpinar and Melike Mermercioglu cross-examine the tourism industry of Turkey and Finland from the perspective of clusterisation capabilities. In order to do so, they compare the tourism clusters in both countries along several dimensions:

- 1 educational attractiveness
- 2 talent attractiveness
- 3 R&D and innovation attractiveness
- 4 ownership attractiveness
- 5 environmental attractiveness
- 6 cluster attractiveness
- 7 knowledge dynamics.

Besides their well-established role in regional development, the full potential of clusters can best be approached from a KBD perspective. From the pioneer role of the Basque country knowledge cluster (Arbonies and Mosso, 2002), aimed at facilitating the development of all other industry-specific clusters by deliberately studying and managing the knowledge dynamics across their membership, the 'knowledge cluster' has gained increasing attention as a unit of analysis (Scheel, 2002; Tallman et al., 2004; Huggins, 2008).

The paper by Robert Mellor contributes with a quantitative model of adding innovators to SMEs. By means of a Monte Carlo-based fold, the author explores the performance of both, low-innovation and high-innovation SMEs in response to knowledge assets flow. The results imply that the addition of middle-management innovators may bring substantial profitability gains to both, low-innovation and high-innovation SMEs. However, interesting differences emerge with regard to the timing and pattern of assimilation.

This paper is well-focused on the modelling parameters and assumptions in departs from. As such, it brings valuable inputs into the theory, method and findings of 3D quantitative modelling, an important avenue for KBD. We look forward to the continued exploration of, on the one hand, extra-organisational and, on the other, weak ties, following the seminal challenge by Granovetter (1973).

Sven Conventz and Alain Thierstein deal with another topic that has received continued attention through the KBD and knowledge cities literature: hub-airports or airport cities (Carrillo, 2004). By looking at the cases of Amsterdam-Schipol and Frankfurt Rhine-Main, the authors analyse the evolution from space and agglomeration to knowledge-intensive capability-building.

Hub-airports provide suitable units of analysis for KBD. In this case, Amsterdam-Schipol and Frankfurt Rhine-Main exemplify the complexity of the spatial relation between multi-dimensional accessibility and knowledge economy dynamics. The results emphasise, on the one hand, the high interactivity of the knowledge-generation process and on the other, the role of knowledge-intensive companies in promoting and initiating the spatial and functional transformation of airport cities.

A last paper in this issue is authored by myself. When the team of editors launched this journal, we agreed that at some point each of us should contribute a position paper that would stimulate the editorial scope. This issue seemed a good opportunity to include a broad reflection on the very nature of KBD. By deconstructing two popular views pervading political discourse and media, the question emerges as to the distinctiveness and relevance of such perspectives on KBD. Alternatively, a third view is further developed from preliminary introductions in the literature, so as to reinforce the identity of KBD as a discipline on its own.

This exercise might be controversial insofar it departs from the received views and usages on what 'knowledge-based' means. Such characterisation constitutes by no means an editorial statement and should be regarded as what it is: a personal position paper. However, it is expected that, regardless the degree of convergence individual readers might find, this contribution somehow stirs her or his own views and contributes to take this field into the next level.

References

- Arbonies, A. and Mosso, M. (2002) 'Basque country: the knowledge cluster', *Journal of Knowledge Management*, Vol. 6, No. 4, pp.347–355.
- Carrillo, F. (2004) 'Capital cities: a taxonomy of capital accounts for knowledge cities', *Journal of Knowledge Management*, Vol. 8, No. 5, pp.28–46.
- Granovetter, M. (1973) 'The strength of weak ties', *The American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 78, No. 6, pp.1360–1380.
- Huggins, R. (2008) 'The evolution of knowledge clusters: progress and policy', *Economic Development Quarterly*, Vol. 22, No. 4, pp.277–289.
- Scheel, C. (2002) 'Knowledge clusters of technological innovation systems', *Journal of Knowledge Management*, Vol. 6, No. 4, pp.356–367.
- Tallman, S., Jenkins, M., Henry, N. and Pinch, S. (2004) 'Knowledge, clusters, and competitive advantage', *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 29, No. 2, pp.258–271.