
Editorial

Marina Dabić

University of Zagreb Faculty of Economics and Business,
J. F. Kennedy Square 6, 10 000 Zagreb, Croatia

Email: mdabic@net.efzg.hr

and

Nottingham Trent University,
Burton Street, NG1 4 BU, Nottingham, UK

Email: marina.dabic@ntu.ac.uk

“The world is changing very fast. Big will not beat small anymore. It will be the fast beating the slow.”

Rupert Murdoch (<http://www.izquotes.com/quote/132828>)

We are enchanted to have this opportunity to present you with the new issue of the *International Journal of Transition and Innovation Systems (IJTIS)*. The *IJTIS* authors debated how relations between a set of different, nationally bounded policies, firms, institutions and individuals supports and enables innovation and technological change and the attendances and diffusion of new knowledge. The *IJTIS* makes obtainable different frameworks by which countries, firms and researchers can accept, upturn and distinguish commitments of gathering up.

In the Vol. 6 issue one the first paper Stefan Huesig, Katalin Timar, and Claudia Doblinger explore ‘Influencing factors on the entrant’s motivation and ability in the context of the disruption process: a cross-country study in the Western European WLAN market’. In particular, they are addressing the question how regulation affects the motivation and ability of entrant firms to create successful new sub-markets that are shaped by a potential disruptive innovation. To do so, it is helpful to include the frequently neglected institutional embeddedness of incumbent and entrant firms, because also potentially disruptive innovation might operate differently in diverse innovation systems. In order to capture this diversity of innovation systems, they analysed the hotspot sub-market in 17 Western European countries as empirical basis. Their results indicate that the sub-market success of entrants in regulated markets depends both on the regulation and the resistance of incumbents to regulation in a specific country. The findings from this paper further contribute to the general understanding of the theory of disruptive innovation, suggesting that regulation can be an underestimated force than the nature of the innovation itself on market outcomes. Moreover, for Western Europe’s telecommunication industry, their results show a predominately sustaining innovation character of WLAN used as public hotspots and add to a long lasting discussion in this industry (Huesig et al., 2005; Christensen et al., 2004). Finally, this paper adds a more macroscopic and empirical based perspective to the very recent debate on the validity of Christensen’s (1997) initial theory of disruptive innovation (King and Baartartogtokh, 2015; Lepore, 2014; Wadhwa, 2015; Christensen et al., 2015).

In the second paper: 'From 'big data' to 'smart data': algorithm for cross-evaluation as a novel method for large-scale survey analysis' Darko Kantoci, Emir Džanić and Marcel Bogers discussed organisational culture as an important phenomenon in driving organisations' innovation and overall success. The outcome of such a process relies on organisational behaviour as well as on more abstract dimensions such as organisation's members' perception of the organisational culture. To better understand this issue, data gathered through measuring perception are used to better understand innovation in organisations, and survey methodology is increasingly used to collect the data for that measurement, often generating large datasets. Not only the bigness of data, but also other aspects such as missing data due to non-response, or appearance of latent variables are challenging existing methods of data analysis. For that reason, the application of new methods for data analysis such as mathematical algorithms to studying important phenomena such as innovation can explain relations between different dimensions important for that phenomenon. For example, studying perception of employees in relation to innovation can lead to discovery of latent variables and new relationships between data. Therefore, advanced algorithm analysis can become a new tool that allows for repeatable and validated evidence to emerge and can become useful for managerial internal analytics illuminating trends and patterns previously invisible within such datasets.

In third paper: 'Technology readiness levels enhancing R&D management and technology transfer capabilities: insights from a public utility in Northwest USA', the researchers Joao Ricardo Lavoie and Tugrul U. Daim (both from the Engineering and Technology Management Department at Portland State University) have investigated the potential benefits an organisation would realise towards R&D management and technology transfer by ways of adopting and deploying technology readiness levels (TRLs). They have interviewed two very experienced technology managers at a public utility company in the Northwest region of the USA and were able to capture their perceptions regarding this managerial tool and how it positively influences their daily activities. Results indicate that the use of TRLs do indeed enhance R&D management and technology transfer capabilities, particularly by balancing the technology development portfolio and by providing early and valuable insights to the technology transfer process.

The fourth paper 'Open innovation in financial institutions: individual and organisational considerations' by Dimitrios Salampasis and Anne-Laure Mention is anchored in the ground-breaking developments within the financial services industry and the emerging role of open innovation. It contributes to the extant literature by providing novel insights on how to organise for open innovation within financial institutions. Interviews with C-level executives of major financial institutions illuminate the peculiarities of open innovation positioned in the intersection between individual and organisational capabilities, which can excel the adoption of open innovation practices within the industry. The research outcomes are grounded within the leadership traits of the open innovation leader and the organisational environment conducive for open innovation practices. The emergence of FinTech innovation business models bringing the industry to the verge of disruption requires readiness by incumbent financial services

institutions. This paper provides insights on how open innovation can facilitate the process of transformation by exploring the invisible factors of individual and organisational capabilities towards ‘humanly-embedded’ financial institutions.

In the last paper of this issue ‘The blockchain and the sidechain innovations for the electronic commerce beyond the Bitcoin’s framework’ Olivier Hueber discussed one of most widespread innovation in finance sector the blockchain. With the proliferation of private electronic currencies using innovative blockchain technology, like Bitcoin, there is a growing need for coordination with public traditional currencies. Reliable gateways must be defined to allow a passage between traditional interbank networks and online private currencies. The success of the transition is through the use of sidechain technology that allows different blockchains to link together. This research paper first present how the use of this sidechain technology can shape a reliable monetary regime of private electronic currencies based on blockchain technology. In a second step, this paper explains how such a private monetary regime can be effectively coordinated with central government-led public monetary regimes.

Settled over the past seven years, the *IJTIS* has been widely acknowledged by scholars, practitioners and policy makers to illuminate innovation through multilevel analysis. We would like to end this editorial by appreciation to all those who are subsidising to make this journal a reality, in particular to Dr. Mohammed Dorgham, Alexandra Starkie, Darren Simpson and Jim Corlett from Inderscience Publishing, to *IJTIS* editorial team and to authors and reviewers for joining us in this endeavour.

References

- Christensen, C.M. (1997) *The Innovator’s Dilemma – When New Technologies Cause Great Firms to Fail*, Harvard Business School Press, Boston, Massachusetts.
- Christensen, C.M., Anthony, S.D. and Roth, E.A. (2004) *Seeing What’s Next – Using the Theories of Innovation to Predict Industry Change*, Harvard Business School Press, Boston, Massachusetts.
- Christensen, C.M., Raynor, M.E. and McDonald, C.R. (2015) ‘What is disruptive innovation?’, *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 93, No. 12, pp.44–53.
- Huesig, S., Hipp, C. and Dowling, M. (2005) ‘Analysing disruptive potential: the case of wireless local area network and mobile communications network companies’, *R&D Management*, Vol. 35, No. 1, pp.17–35.
- King, A.A. and Baatartogtokh, B. (2015) ‘How useful is the theory of disruptive innovation’, *MIT Sloan Management Review*, Vol. 57, No. 1, pp.77–90.
- Lepore, J. (2014) *The Disruption Machine – What the Gospel of Innovation Gets Wrong* [online] <http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2014/06/23/the-disruption-machine>, (accessed 30 November 17).
- Wadhwa, V. (2015) *How Recent Tech Success Stories Are Disrupting Disruption Theory* [online] http://www.singularityhub.com/2015/11/24/how-recent-tech-success-stories-are-disrupting-disruption-theory/?utm_content=buffera0953&utm_medium=social&utm_source=facebook.com&utm_campaign=buffer (accessed 30 November 17).