
Editorial

Ajoy K. Dey*

Birla Institute of Management Technology,
Plot No. 5, Knowledge Park II,
Greater Noida, 201306, India
Email: ak.dey@bimtech.ac.in
*Corresponding author

Tojo Thatchenkery

Schar School of Policy and Government,
George Mason University,
Arlington, VA 22201, USA
Email: thatchen@gmu.edu

Biographical notes: Ajoy K. Dey is a Professor of supply chain and operations management at the Birla Institute of Management Technology, Greater Noida, India. He is an editor of the *South Asian Journal of Business & Management Cases* – a Sage Publication, member of several editorial advisory boards and regular reviewer of many leading international management research journals. He is a university rank holder and possesses a blend of corporate, consultancy and academic experiences. His specific areas of interest are logistics and supply chain, engagement studies of students, patients and employees, project management and behaviour of millennial generation. He has conducted many training sessions, seminars and workshops in India and abroad. He has served as a resource person at many faculty and management development workshops. He conducts courses of supply chain management, operations management, research methodology and decision modelling with spread sheet.

Tojo Thatchenkery is featured as one of the leading *change thinkers* in the recently released *Palgrave Handbook of Organizational Change Thinkers*, 2017. He is a Professor and Director of the Organization Development and Knowledge Management Program at the Schar School of Policy and Government, George Mason University, Arlington, Virginia, USA. He is a member of the *NTL Institute of Applied Behavioral Science*, and *Taos Institute*. He is the author of over a dozen books and hundreds of articles. He has also published in practitioner journals such as *Harvard Business Review*. He has extensive consulting experience in change management, leadership development, organisation design and strategy, and knowledge management. His past and current clients include FAO of the UN, IBM, Fannie Mae, Booz Allen, PNC Bank, Alcatel Lucent, General Mills, 3M, British Petroleum, the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, USDA, EPA, Akbank (Turkey), and the Tata Consulting Services (India).

Organisations of all sorts care about innovation. Whether they are highly entrepreneurial firms in Silicon Valley or huge bureaucracies with thousands of employees, the rush to come up with new products and services is very visible. The very existence of certain organisations such as start-up firms is understandably dependent on continuous

innovation. However, in the case of supposedly slow moving government agencies or large multinational conglomerates, there is a new sense of urgency that unless change is brought about through innovation, their long-term competitiveness may be in jeopardy. At the same time, misconceptions exist regarding what types of organisations are more likely to engage in creating innovation. To the surprise of many, large government agencies in many countries have responded to the needs of their citizenry by creating new services and processes. In many cases, such innovations began in small branches of the agencies and spread to rest of the organisation gradually.

One of the challenges faced by organisations pushing for innovation centres around the need for commercialisation. If the innovation did not lead to commercial success, champions behind them may either get dispirited or not get the recognition they deserved. In many organisations, failure is punished, leading managers to play safe. At the same time, there are organisations such as Google, where employees are required to spend a certain percentage of their time on unrelated projects with no expectation for success. By letting employees be in a creative mindset without the fear of getting punished for failure, they flourish and come up with ideas that lead to eventual commercial success. Therein lies the paradox in the relationship between innovation and commercialisation. If employees are too concerned about commercialisation, they are less likely to take risks and think outside the box. Senior leadership in companies need to create a culture where it would be acceptable to fail. Good examples come from technology companies and pharmaceutical firms where it is understood that for every successful commercialisation, several failures precede them.

The second challenge confronting organisations in their quest for innovation is sustainability. Innovations have an element of novelty which is very attractive. Leaders like to be known as innovators and desire the reputational social capital that comes with the enhanced visibility. Yet, many innovations lose steam and simply wither away due to the lack of systematic sustainability planning. The six articles in this special issue address not only the challenges of commercialisation and sustainability, but also other aspects such as value creation, barriers to pro-environmental behaviour, growth-oriented incubation, virtual teams, and education.

In the first article in the special issue, 'Sustainable value creation in the commercialisation of innovation: the case of Auria Biobank', Hanna Lehtimäki, Ilpo Helén, Karoliina Snell, Päivi Eriksson and Tero Montonen offer an inductive interpretative case study to examine the emerging field of personalised medicine. From the perspective of a biobank seeking to create value on its depository of tissue samples, patient records, and digitised data, they examine how different logics of commercialisation are part of sustainable value creation. The authors share their insights regarding the challenges and opportunities faced by a company that is trying to develop healthcare innovation and thus contribute to the literature on the commercialisation of innovation. There is a unique examination of how sustainable value creation in an emerging industry builds on both planned and emergent commercialisation activities and how different logics of commercialisation are a part of sustainable value creation in personalised medicine.

Ville-Veikko Piispanen, Eeva Aromaa and Kaisa Henttonen have authored the second article of this special issue, 'A case study of exploring the barriers of pro-environmental behaviour'. As the title implies, their research focuses on how an entrepreneur makes sense of and possibly overcomes existing barriers of pro-environmental behaviour in the circular economy. They correctly point out that

previous research in this area has mostly focused on the individual and business level. They are concerned that barriers resulting from a circular economy have not been studied in small and medium-sized businesses. In an effort to address this gap, they analysed a circular economy diagnostics tool and interviewed an entrepreneur in energy industry which has many established industrial practices. Using content analysis of their sense making practices they found that the barriers are mostly related to economics and related structural, cultural, and contextual factors. One of their counter-intuitive findings was that pro-environmental concerns did not always lead to pro-environmental behaviour.

In the third article in this special issue, 'Drivers of and barriers to networked commercialisation: a business model perspective', Malla Mattila, Mika Yrjölä and Hanna Lehtimäki identify and analyse key drivers and barriers to the networked commercialisation of technology (NCT). They studied a company that was developing disruptive nanotechnological solutions for mass production and identified key drivers and barriers to business model decisions in the NCT. The results show that the tasks and activities involved in the NCT and business model development are connected to others operating in the business network. Their analysis contributes to commercialisation literature by illustrating the usefulness of the business model lens for analysing networked commercialisation.

Päivi Eriksson, Tero Montonen, Juha Vilhunen and Kalevi Voutilainen have authored the fourth article in this special issue. In 'The importance of being known: evaluating companies for growth-oriented incubation', they explore the early phases of the incubation process in small and medium-sized companies. Using the justification theory approach, they analyse how different orders of worth such as inspired, domestic, fame, civic, market, and industrial guide evaluation, selection, and justification in a face-to-face meeting between project staff and business experts. They found that justifications for the companies having most potential for incubation were informed by the domestic order of worth in particular. Such insights emphasise the evaluators' common history, mutual familiarity and personal relationships with the people and teams of the prospective companies. Regarding the industrial order of worth, they analysed professionalism, efficiency and a limited number of people related internal growth factors.

The fifth article by Kristine M. Brands and Debora A. Elam 'A case study on accounting faculty's perceptions of technology in accounting classes', chronicles the profound transformations impacting the accounting profession. Thanks to the advancement in information technology, the amount of financial data available to firms has expanded exponentially. The demand for real-time access to information and the use of business analytics have grown. Big data analytics have taken over human insights to some extent. The accountants and financial professionals of the future need to be qualified to address these challenges. Brands and Elam persuasively show that the higher education accounting degree programs must adapt their curriculums and courses to leverage technology tools and practices to ensure that their accounting faculties are prepared to share the latest developments in the field with students. They recognised that the starting point to change faculty's mindset is understanding their perceptions. Thus, in this case study, they explored accounting instructors' perceptions and experiences with technology and identified best practices that could enhance their technological proficiency. The hope was that eventually a technologically savvy instructor will be more comfortable with students and less resistant to changes affecting their profession.

Building on the theme of collaborative technology, Debora A. Elam and Kristine M. Brands use appreciative inquiry (AI) to study virtual teams. In ‘Appreciative inquiry – lessons learned from virtual teams’, the last article in this special issue, they demonstrate how collaborative technology can help in conducting AI when in-person intense engagements are not feasible either due to budgetary constraints or other factors. They also share learnings from a review of the current literature regarding the use of technology in AI, as well as learnings from other fields in which technology has been used to bring people together in a virtual environment. They point out that many of the insights typically gained from in person meetings are also available from virtual meetings when the right approach is used.

We hope that the papers in this special issue have shed new insights for seeing the value of innovation in accelerating commercialisation and sustainability in the various industry verticals that were discussed. We would like to thank the Editor-in-Chief, Professor Mohammed Dorgham for giving us this opportunity to guest edit the special issue. We also appreciate the timely assistance of the editorial staff of *Inderscience* throughout the review and production process.