

University of Groningen

An Open Invitation to Open Innovation

Rus, Diana; Wisse, Barbara; Rietzschel, Eric

Published in:
Open Innovation

DOI:
[10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199374441.003.0007](https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199374441.003.0007)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2016

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Rus, D., Wisse, B., & Rietzschel, E. (2016). An Open Invitation to Open Innovation: Guidelines for the Leadership of Open Innovation Processes. In A. B. Markman, & H. P. Naquin (Eds.), *Open Innovation: Academic and Practical Perspectives on the Journey from Idea to Market* (pp. 141-167). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199374441.003.0007>

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.



Open Innovation: Academic and Practical Perspectives on the Journey from Idea to Market

Arthur B. Markman (ed.)

<https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199374441.001.0001>

Published: 2016

Online ISBN: 9780190609023

Print ISBN: 9780199374441

CHAPTER

7 An Open Invitation to Open Innovation: Guidelines for the Leadership of Open Innovation Processes

Diana Rus, Barbara Wisse, Eric F. Rietzschel

<https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199374441.003.0007> Pages 141–168

Published: June 2016

Abstract

Leadership is crucial for the successful internal implementation of open innovation (OI) initiatives. Based on empirical evidence from the leadership, organizational change, and OI literatures, this chapter provides practical guidelines that can help leaders overcome some of the most common internal impediments to OI adoption. Specifically, it stresses the critical role that leaders can play in (1) getting people on board by creating and promoting a shared vision of OI, (2) earning employee commitment to OI by showing in words and deeds that it is more than just a new flavor of the month, (3) reshaping the definition of success by challenging assumptions about appropriate behaviors and aligning the reward/incentive systems, and (4) contributing to internal capability building by developing individuals and facilitating the development of internal networks. Moreover, it provides some practical strategies for leaders interested in embedding OI into their organizations.

Keywords: [Open innovation implementation](#), [leadership](#), [change management](#), [micro-level perspective](#), [OI guidelines](#)

Subject: [Social Psychology](#)

Collection: [Oxford Scholarship Online](#)

Innovation is crucial to how organizations create value for themselves, secure a position of competitive advantage, and attain market leadership (Christensen, 1997; Davis & Eisenhardt, 2011). For instance, in a study by Bain & Company among 1,208 global executives, 74% identified innovation as more important than cost reductions for the long-term success of their companies (Rigby & Bilodeau, 2013). However, in increasingly complex, dynamic industries with frequently changing and highly dispersed resources, it is unlikely that any single organization can consistently deliver breakthrough innovations on its own. Instead, more open and collaborative approaches to innovation are needed to enhance internal innovation capabilities and to secure a position of competitive advantage (Chesbrough, 2003, 2011; Chesbrough, Vanhaverbeke, & West, 2006; Dahlander & Gann, 2010).

p. 142 During the past decade, the academic and popular literature on open innovation (OI) has increased exponentially (for reviews, see Chesbrough & Bogers, 2014; Huizingh, 2011; van der Vrande, Vanhaverbeke,

& Gassmann, 2010). Moreover, companies such as Procter & Gamble, Hewlett-Packard, Intel, IBM, and Genzyme are often credited with having strongly profited from adopting the OI paradigm, by collaborating with external partners (Whelan, Parise, de Valk, & Aalbers, 2011). Fueled by the successes of these trailblazing companies, an increasing number of organizations of different sizes and across industries have followed suit in adopting the OI paradigm in the hope of reaping the same rewards. However, many of them are finding it difficult to replicate these successes and fully realize the benefits associated with OI (Mortara & Minshall, 2011; Slowinski & Sagal, 2010). Indeed, evidence suggests that returns from OI vary substantially among companies, with a large number of firms reporting failed OI projects (Laursen & Salter, 2006). However, little is known about why some firms are capable of profiting from OI, whereas others are not.

In this chapter, we argue that one of the main reasons why some organizations fail to fully capitalize on the promise of OI is their neglect of the intraorganizational, micro-level foundations of OI implementation. That is, we contend that some organizations that shift from a more closed to a more open innovation model fail to address the question of how to organize and manage OI internally. We therefore advocate taking an intraorganizational perspective by zooming in on leader behaviors and practices that, we believe, are crucial for successful OI implementation. In the following, we first provide more specific reasons as to why we think that a micro-level perspective in general, and a focus on leader behaviors in particular, is valuable in helping us better understand and manage the OI implementation process. We then show the value of taking a micro-level perspective by discussing how leaders can play a vital role in the OI implementation process, and we provide some much-needed practical advice to executives mired in the fog of embedding OI within their organizations.

p. 143

The Added Value of Taking a Micro-Level Perspective on Open Innovation

To date, most of the literature on OI has concentrated on identifying the macro-level organizational practices firms use to leverage external sources of knowledge and capture value from collaboration by boosting internal innovation (Salter, Criscuolo, & Ter Wal, 2014; van der Vrande et al., 2010). In contrast, our understanding of the micro-level foundations of OI adoption—the internal processes and dynamics of implementation, especially as they relate to the employees and leaders involved—is lagging behind (da Mota Pedrosa, Välling, & Boyd, 2013; Mortara & Minshall, 2014). Indeed, the individual and team levels of analysis are the most underinvestigated areas in the OI domain (Chesbrough & Bogers, 2014). However, there are several reasons why taking a micro-level perspective on OI in general, and a leadership perspective in particular, is essential and in need of more attention.

First, a successful shift from a paradigm of closed innovation to one of open innovation needs to be underpinned by foundations on two levels: (1) the *macro-level foundations* of (re)structuring units, workflows, and alliances involving potentially risky collaborations with external partners and (2) the *micro-level foundations* of instigating and leading a significant organizational change process (Mortara & Minshall, 2014; Salter et al., 2014). Thus, practitioners always need to balance two distinct sets of concerns: one focused on organizational structures and linkages with external collaborators and one focused on the process of managing implementation internally.

p. 144

Second, it is precisely the (understudied) micro-level processes of change management that seem to make successful OI implementation so difficult. Many companies have found their OI efforts stalled in large part due to internal barriers related to the human side of OI (Salter et al., 2014). For instance, a recent survey among executives of 125 European and American large firms found that the major challenges in managing OI are within the firm, with executives rating the change process from closed to open innovation as the most difficult task (Chesbrough & Brunswicker, 2013). Although the role of management has been touted as

crucial in overcoming the internal challenges of OI implementation (Chiaroni, Chiesa, & Frattini, 2011; Giannopolou, Yström, & Ollila, 2011; Mortara, Napp, Slacik, & Minshall, 2009), practical guidelines based on systematic empirical research are largely missing.

Third, even those processes that take place at the macro level often find their foundations at the micro level. The shift from closed to open innovation inevitably requires profound changes in terms of internal processes and structures. However, this always involves changes in the attitudes, mindsets, and behaviors of organizations' most "basic" constituents, namely the individuals within them. It is individuals that make decisions and act upon them, not organizations (Foss, Husted, & Michailova, 2010). Given that individuals are the driving force behind all organizational processes (Senge, 1990), a micro-level perspective is essential to our understanding of OI processes.

Fourth, a micro-level perspective on leader behaviors may help organizations capture concrete opportunities to successfully manage OI processes because out of all organizational members, leaders exert disproportionate amounts of influence on employee attitudes, motivation, behavior, and performance (for reviews, see Boal & Hooijberg, 2001; Yukl, 2008). Moreover, leaders have been identified as being crucial in sparking, driving, and sustaining organizational culture change (Kanter, 1983; Schein, 1993, 2004). However, although leaders' critical role in successful OI adoption has often been acknowledged (Elmquist, Fredberg, & Ollila, 2009; Mortara & Minshall, 2014), there is a relative paucity of research or practical guidelines devoted to understanding their role in successfully managing OI.

p. 145 The ensuing sections of this chapter are therefore dedicated to demonstrating how a micro-level perspective can be useful in facilitating the successful implementation of OI programs. We focus on the role of leadership in particular because, as stated previously, leaders can potentially influence the OI implementation process to a great extent. By drawing on our own experience with the implementation of OI programs as well as on empirical evidence from the leadership, organizational change, and open innovation literatures, we provide several guidelines that may increase leaders' chances of successful internal OI adoption. Note that we do not claim to be exhaustive; that would take several volumes instead of one chapter. We simply want to show that a micro-level perspective can help organizations seize and capitalize on opportunities to manage OI processes successfully. To this end, the remainder of this chapter is dedicated to answering the following question: "How can leaders contribute to the successful embedding of OI within their organizations?"

The Role Played by Leaders in the Internal Open Innovation Implementation Process

We identify four critical aspects of OI implementation in which leaders can play a vital role in ensuring success. All four aspects must be managed carefully because they are central to making or breaking employee motivation and the ability to engage in OI. Specifically, we focus on the role that leaders play in getting people on board, reassuring employees that OI is here to stay, reshaping the larger definition of success within the firm, and enabling internal capability building. Importantly, for each of these four aspects of OI implementation, we outline two possible practical strategies (based on empirical findings) that leaders could bring to bear to overcome impediments related to issues of employee motivation and ability.

Get People on Board

Provide opportunities for people to get on board. As with any fundamental shift, it will take time for people to fully digest the change that open innovation represents and its implications on the business and their specific role.

—Todd Boone, *Director of Market Development at Psion*¹

p. 146 Once a decision has been made by top management to make OI a strategic priority, it is imperative that the rest of the organization follows suit and embraces a shared view of open innovation. This much is obvious. However, it is often less obvious how this can best be achieved. Next, we outline two main strategies that leaders can employ to promote a shared view of open innovation within the organization: craft and communicate a compelling vision and promote shared ownership.

Craft and Communicate a Compelling Vision

One of the most effective ways to get people on board is to inspire them by advancing a simple, compelling vision of a desirable future (Conger & Kanungo, 1998; Shamir, Arthur, & House, 1994). Visions provide abstract guidelines that help direct the behaviors of organizational members by providing an ideal sketch of what the organization may look like in the future. Although goals and visions are similar, they are not the same. Visions are more abstract and global than goals, and unlike goals, they are not necessarily meant to be fully achieved (Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1996). A clear vision of OI can, for instance, incorporate what the organization tries to become by opening up the innovation process (e.g., the aim of Philips Research to “become a leader in health and well-being”²).

Organizational members can use the vision as a sort of standard against which they can hold their behaviors, thoughts, and feelings and assess their appropriateness (e.g., “Does this decision to bring in external knowledge help us become a leader in health and well-being?”). As such, a vision that incorporates OI promotes a set of desirable attitudes, values, and beliefs (e.g., collaboration, openness, and borrowing with pride). Importantly, a vision that creates a common sense of purpose and meaning around a set of collective goals by stressing a shared, organizational identity is more likely to inspire and motivate a wide array of internal stakeholders (Awamleh & Gardner, 1999; Stam, van Knippenberg, & Wisse, 2010). Focusing on collective goals and promoting a shared identity at the organizational level that supersedes individual, team, or business unit identities is especially important when shifting to OI, given the increased need for collaboration between people in different parts of the organization that may traditionally have pursued competing goals.

The success of a vision is contingent on how well it is communicated (Awamleh & Gardner, 1999), and this, in turn, is contingent on several leader behaviors. First, visions are more persuasive when they are communicated with the use of colorful language that appeals to people’s imagination and emotions. Skillful leaders address their audience directly and incorporate rhetoric devices, vivid imagery, metaphors, analogies, and symbols into their communication (Emrich, Brower, Feldman, & Garland, 2001). For instance, one vivid metaphor that has been effectively used in different contexts (e.g., the pharmaceutical industry and the retail industry) to depict the need for communication, coordination, and collaboration is that of a NASCAR race crew (Roberto & Levesque, 2005; Sutton & Rao, 2014). In addition, successful vision communicators use slogans, anecdotes, and tell compelling stories of past successes (Awamleh & Gardner, 1999; Den Hartog, & Verburg, 1997). For instance, DSM’s mantra of “Proudly found elsewhere,”³ Procter & Gamble’s “Look to connect and develop before you research and develop” (Cloyd & Euchner, 2012, p. 16), and Henkel’s “We borrow with pride”⁴ are excellent examples of the skillful use of slogans in sparking change. The importance of storytelling is noted by Amazon’s CEO Jeff Bezos, who stated in an interview that “there are stories we tell ourselves internally about persistence and patience, long-term thinking, staying

focused on the customer” (Hansen, Ibarra, & Peyer, 2013, p. 85), arguably in order to keep employees on track and unwavering. Finally, artful communicators instill a sense of shared identity (e.g., “We are Googlers”⁵) and do so by, for instance, frequently using collective pronouns such as “we,” “us,” and “ours” (Stam et al., 2010).

p. 148 Second, effective vision communicators use an expressive communication style bringing their conviction and intensity of emotions (e.g., optimism and enthusiasm) to the fore via the skillful use of voice (inflection and pauses), gestures, facial mimicry, and body language (Antonakis, Fenley, & Liechti, 2012). The use of emotional displays by leaders has been shown to be highly effective in securing buy-in from subordinates via processes of emotional contagion, whereby subordinates start feeling ↳ the emotions displayed by their leaders (Damen, van Knippenberg, & van Knippenberg, 2008). Most importantly, visions that are communicated with genuine passion and intent are more likely to generate internal commitment, which is crucial for perseverance and sustained performance in the face of obstacles (tough schedule, lack of resources, etc.) (Yukl, 2010).

Third, visions that are communicated frequently and are integrated across a variety of channels are more likely to be accepted and internalized (Argenti, Howell, & Beck, 2005; Yukl, 2010). Effective executives understand that they are the face and voice of the organization and that communication cannot be outsourced to the communication department. Frequent, personal, interactive communication, whether during company meetings, team-building exercises, or around the water cooler, tends to be the most effective because it actively engages the listeners and allows for questions and the voicing of concerns (Yukl, 2010). At the same time, making use of an integrated multiplatform approach—via the corporate website, videotaped speeches, internal documentation, e-mails, personal blogs, and social media—can help reinforce and strengthen the message.

Promote Shared Ownership

Successfully getting people on board in the shift from closed to open innovation goes beyond a top-down approach, in which leaders develop a vision of OI behind closed doors and then unleash a perfect storm of communication on a hapless group of employees. Effective leaders understand that large-scale acceptance and adoption of any vision of change requires distributing ownership of that vision as broadly as possible (Ready & Conger, 2008; Yukl, 2010).

p. 149 There are multiple ways to achieve this aim. First, to enable a sense of shared ownership, key stakeholders whose support is crucial for OI adoption should be involved at the very early stages. Depending on the organization, these could be members of the top management team, senior executives from the different business units, influential union leaders, as well as highly networked employees, regardless of their position in the formal organizational chart. Based on our own conversations with an executive trying to bring OI to her organization, it might even be helpful ↳ to include one or two of the most vocal opponents of OI, especially if they are well-respected members of the community. In her words, “The two of them wore us down with reasons why OI wouldn’t work, but once they were on board, we knew that we had crossed the Rubicon.”

The key advantage of mobilizing the support of such a wide array of stakeholders at the early stages of OI adoption is that those involved in the co-creation process are more likely to have a sense of shared ownership of the change and hence are more likely to be committed to it (Kotter & Schlesinger, 1979). However, there are several additional benefits to coopting such a variety of constituents early on in the process. One advantage is that these constituents can voice different views and perspectives on the issue and can articulate their concerns about potential challenges lying ahead. To this end, leaders should actively encourage an open exchange of opinions and explicitly promote the expression of conflicting points of view (Yukl, 2008). Some companies, such as IBM, Shell, Anheuser-Busch, and 3M, use formalized methods to

spark the discussion of conflicting points of view, such as dialectical inquiry methods (Schweiger, Sandberg, & Ragan, 1986) or devil's advocacy (Schwenk, 1984). Research shows that such "constructive controversy" contributes to successful decision-making and innovation (Chen & Tjosvold, 2002; Tjosvold & Yu, 2007). Furthermore, involving a wide array of constituents builds trust in top management and among the various stakeholders, and it serves as a signaling function to the rest of the organization, communicating that openness and collaboration are lived values and not just professed on paper.

p. 150 In addition, employees in favor of OI should be given a platform to advocate their support throughout the adoption process. As Worley and Lawler (2006) aptly stated, "Think of the corporation as a community of people spread over miles of hills, fields, and forests. To get everyone moving in a new direction, leaders need to be dispersed across the countryside" (p. 22). Those involved in the early stages of OI adoption are the most obvious line of offense in becoming active champions of OI. Another group of self-evident evangelists is those who already believe in the OI paradigm. They are intrinsically motivated to spread the news about the benefits of OI, thereby increasing support from the bottom up. ↪ These individuals exist in every organization; it is just a matter of finding them and empowering them to speak up by, for instance, granting them interviews in corporate news bulletins.

Show People That You Mean It

By far the most important [factor in OI adoption] is to have serious and visible support from top management. Without this, nothing can or will happen.

—Tomas Lackner, *Head of Open Innovation and Corporate Scouting at Siemens Corporate Technology*⁶

For the shift from closed to open innovation to be successful, employees need to believe that leaders really mean it and that OI is not yet another fad that shall also pass. In other words, they need to be convinced that leaders are committed to a long-term change. Too many change efforts fail because leaders run out of steam after the initial blitz of communicating the new vision (Gilley, Dixon, & Gilley, 2008). Effective leaders know that change does not happen overnight and that it requires patience, determination, and resilience. Importantly, they understand that it is a continual process of showing commitment and enabling people to enact the change. Hence, leaders need to do at least two things: walk the talk and show support.

Walk the Talk

Typically, visions of change toward OI are filled with buzzwords such as "openness," "collaboration," "trust," and "commitment." These slogans are often mounted on company plaques and plastered all over the company website, employee newsletters, and PowerPoint presentations. However, without leader behavior that matches the words, they become empty platitudes that (in the best case) are ignored and forgotten or (in the worst case) make leadership the butt of employee jokes and kill the change initiative.

p. 151 Real change only happens when employees know what is expected of them and when they trust their leaders. To make sure that employees know what is expected of them, leaders should role model desired behaviors (Bandura, 1986). Role modeling is helpful because employees watch their leaders (more than they do others) very closely, seeking signals and cues as to which behavior is desirable (Magee & Galinsky, 2008). The impact of role modeling may be particularly strong during periods of organizational change because these are typically characterized by uncertainty and ambiguity (Schein, 2004). Several examples of effective role modeling can be found in the literature. For instance, when ConocoPhillips aimed to increase cross-organizational knowledge sharing by introducing its Networks of Excellence, senior managers not only endorsed the networks but also actively joined the trenches by answering posts and acting as mentors in the discussions, thus inspiring employees to act the same way (Pugh & Prusak, 2013). Thus, the message is that

if you want more collaboration, stop running your own fiefdoms within the top management team and start collaborating. If you want more openness, be open to employee ideas and suggestions. If you want more information sharing, exit stealth mode and share more information.

Research has clearly indicated that walking the talk leads to increased trust in the leader (Palanski & Yammarino, 2009) as well as to increases in employees' willingness to accept change (Armenakis, Harris, & Mossholder, 1993). On the other hand, failing to match words and deeds can be viewed by employees as a form of betrayal and will have disastrous repercussions on the leader's long-term reputation and credibility.

Show Support

Top management support has frequently been touted as being crucial in successful OI implementation (Mortara & Minshall, 2014). In fact, in a cross-industry case study of 36 companies, top management support was identified as being the key enabler of OI implementation (Mortara et al., 2009).

p. 152 Interestingly, in the OI literature, "showing support" typically tends to be equated with "providing adequate resources for OI adoption," and ↪ "resources" in turn are usually taken to mean *financial* resources for project funding. Indeed, resources are critical for innovation (Ekvall & Ryhammer, 1999), and project funding is imperative. However, the potential value of other resources, such as time and human resources dedicated specifically to OI, should not be underestimated. Employees often need to balance their day-to-day job with involvement in OI projects for which they frequently have to learn new skills (Nakagaki, Aber, & Fetterhoff, 2012). This leads to conflicting demands on an already limited resource: time. It also implicitly indicates to employees that OI is not a top priority for management. Therefore, to increase the odds of successful OI adoption, it is crucial to explicitly incorporate OI activities into employees' job descriptions and set dedicated time aside for them. In addition, dedicated OI teams, armed with a clear mandate from the top and a budget, can help successfully implement OI by establishing new practices within the firm and by creating a common language around OI (Mortara & Minshall, 2011). Indeed, an increasing number of companies that are relatively successful with OI, such as Procter & Gamble, DSM, Philips, Siemens, and Unilever, have invested in the creation of OI teams (Mortara & Minshall, 2014). Finally, leaders can free up resources by removing organizational barriers (e.g., red tape and administrative hassles) to OI adoption that sap people's time and energy. For instance, if research and development (R&D) engineers spend a large proportion of their time filling in project status reports, leaders can drop the nonessential ones or simplify the process. This will not only free up employees' time schedule but also send a clear signal that leaders view OI as important and have every intention of embedding it in the organization.

p. 153 As remarked previously, there is more to showing support than providing resources. Leaders can also engage in supportive behaviors by showing that they value employee contributions and care about their well-being (Kottke & Sharafinski, 1988; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Although often neglected in the OI literature, this type of support is certainly worthy of attention. Leader supportive behaviors have been linked to several OI-relevant outcome variables, such as increased employee ↪ trust in leadership, motivation, cooperation, creativity, performance, and identification with the organization (Amabile, Schatzel, Moneta, & Kramer, 2004; Bass, 1990; Yukl, 2008; Zaccaro, Rittman, & Marks, 2001). Moreover, this perspective underscores the importance of also focusing on the role played by lower-level leaders in supporting OI implementation. Support by direct supervisors is particularly important, given that shifting to OI increases uncertainty regarding expected behaviors, or required skills and knowledge, on the part of employees. Because direct supervisors tend to be employees' most prominent focus of attention with regard to dealing with uncertainty, their support is indispensable.

Leader support behaviors can be divided into more instrumental, task-oriented or more relationship-oriented behaviors, although the boundaries between them tend to get blurred (Amabile et al., 2004; Tierney, 2009). The more instrumental behaviors that are perceived to be supportive by employees usually revolve around providing clarity and structure as well as feedback. Especially in the context of OI, it is imperative that direct supervisors provide goal clarity (“What are we trying to achieve?”), clarify terminology and behavioral expectations (“What does it mean and what do you need to do?”), as well as extend various forms of assistance and guidance throughout the process (Amabile et al., 2004). These types of behaviors not only facilitate learning and performance but also increase motivation and involvement (Amabile, 1996; Rietzschel, Slijkhuis, & Van Yperen, 2014; Yukl, 2008).

p. 154 In terms of the more relationship-oriented behaviors, sharing information openly, delegating control, consulting with employees about decisions that affect them, and providing them with a platform to voice their opinions and concerns tend to have a positive effect on motivation, acceptance of the change, and trust in the leader (Colquitt et al., 2013; Conger, Kanungo, & Menon, 2000). Other interpersonally sensitive behaviors, such as keeping employees informed about stressful issues, disclosing one’s own feelings, and showing concern, empathy, respect, and positive regard, have also been shown to increase trust, motivation, and performance (Amabile et al., 2004; Oldham & Cummings, 1996). Because engaging in any innovation-related behavior is potentially risky, it is also important that leaders provide political support by “standing up” for their employees (Tierney & Farmer, 2004) and by serving as an ambassador for their direct subordinates within the larger organization (Ancona & Caldwell, 1992).

Reshape the Meaning of Success

A success that has outlived its usefulness may, in the end, be more damaging than failure.

—Peter Drucker (1973, p. 159)

A third critical aspect of OI adoption that leaders can significantly influence concerns a redefinition of what it means to be successful. People’s deeply ingrained implicit assumptions about “how things are done around here”—that is, beliefs about behaviors that are prevalent and necessary to be successful within the organization—need to be unearthed, challenged, and reframed, especially if they run counter to OI principles. To this end, reward and incentive systems need to be changed and aligned with the new types of behaviors that are desired and expected. Here, we outline how leaders can promote behavioral change by taking a two-pronged approach aimed at unearthing and reframing implicit assumptions and aligning rewards.

Unearth and Reframe Implicit Assumptions

p. 155 In organizations, a large proportion of individuals’ behavior is guided by a set of deeply entrenched tacit beliefs about organizationally appropriate conduct. These beliefs have been developed over time, are socially reinforced, and provide the frame through which information is processed, goals are set, and events are interpreted (Detert & Edmondson, 2011; Senge, 1990). In essence, they are the invisible strings that direct individuals’ behavior from out of the shadows. Some of these implicit assumptions may pertain to the type of behavior that will help one climb the career ladder, such as “If you want to make it to the top here, you’d better be a rainmaker.” Others may refer to the type of behaviors that will most certainly either not help or actively hurt one’s career, such as “Spending all day talking to people trying to build relationships is jolly good fun, but it will not get you anywhere” or “If you make a mistake, hide it, and if possible blame others for it.” Yet others might be specifically related to one’s role, such as R&D researchers thinking “I need to solve this problem alone. Asking for help or working with others means admitting failure.”

These types of implicit beliefs complicate the shift from closed to open innovation. Some of them may promote behaviors that run counter to the behaviors needed for successful OI implementation (e.g., competition instead of collaboration). Furthermore, because they tend to be largely tacit, it is unlikely that their validity gets challenged, making it difficult to change them. Hence, it is critical that leaders uncover some of these deeply ingrained beliefs and actively challenge and change them where necessary (Fiol, Harris, & House, 1999). In essence, leaders need to nudge people's behaviors in a different direction by providing them with alternative "frames" for processing information and pursuing goals.

To change these implicit beliefs, leaders have language at their disposal as one potent tool they can employ. Language provides a powerful way to frame "reality" and shape behaviors by triggering certain associations regarding desirable/appropriate or undesirable/inappropriate behavior (Thaler & Sunstein, 2008). For instance, researchers found that participants spent a larger proportion of windfall money they had received if it was called a "bonus" rather than a "rebate" (Epley, Mak, & Idson, 2006). Similarly, studies have shown that the labeling of a prisoner's dilemma game—a game in which people can choose to either compete or cooperate—significantly influenced participants' behavior. For instance, calling a prisoner's dilemma game a "community game" led approximately 70% of participants to cooperate, whereas calling the same game a "Wall Street game" led only approximately 30% to cooperate (Lieberman, Samuels, & Ross, 2004).

p. 156 Some case studies also support the idea that leaders can effectively make use of language to shape their employees' behavior. For instance, to change a culture riddled by silence and blame, the COO of a children's hospital introduced a policy of "blameless reporting" in which words such as "errors" and "investigations" were replaced by words such as "accidents" and "analysis" (Garvin, Edmondson, & Gino, 2008). Similarly, to promote more creativity among their staff in the Consumer Marketing department, leaders at Facebook changed the name of the department to "Creative Marketing." This had an immediate effect on the group because people now viewed it as part of their job to be creative (Seelig, 2012). Likewise, OI leaders at Roche Diagnostics discovered that one of the main barriers to OI adoption among their research staff was that they tended to label themselves as "problem solvers." In the Roche Diagnostics context, this implied that researchers needed to solve problems on their own and that searching for help meant admitting failure. As such, this label clearly inhibited collaboration and precluded the use of external knowledge. To overcome this, managers encouraged the use of "solution finders" as a more inclusive label that would favor the search and use of knowledge regardless of where it came from (Nakagaki et al., 2012). Finally, leaders at DuPont skillfully articulated the shift to OI by replacing "We can do it all ourselves" with "Together we can achieve what no one of us individually can accomplish,"⁷ thus communicating that collaborative behaviors will lead to success.

Align the Rewards

Naturally, successfully reframing implicit assumptions will not be enough to redefine what it means to be successful. Both monetary and nonmonetary rewards need to be consistent with the desired behaviors. It is clearly perilous and counterproductive to reward for A (e.g., number of patents filed) while hoping for B (e.g., an increase in solutions that incorporate external knowledge) (Kerr, 1975).

p. 157 In terms of monetary rewards, if people continue to get primarily rewarded for in-house development (e.g., number of patents filed and publications), outside ideas will be ignored. Financial incentives need to be revised to reduce the focus on internal innovation and to increase the focus on OI by explicitly introducing incentives for solutions coming from OI. These could, for instance, include rewards for patents that are the result of collaboration, the identification of licensing opportunities, or the initiation of collaborative projects (Remneland-Wikhamn & Wikhamn, 2011; Salter et al., 2014). In addition, promotion systems would also have to be changed to account for the increased need for collaboration. For example, continuing

to promote only the “lone stars” that deliver excellent results but do not collaborate would dissuade employees from investing time in building and maintaining internal and external relationships.

With regard to promoting behavioral change, the value of nonmonetary incentives, such as acknowledgment, praise, and recognition, should not be underestimated. In addition to communicating to employees that their involvement and achievements are valued, nonmonetary incentives can serve as powerful signals to the rest of the organization suggesting that OI is desirable. Nonmonetary incentives could, for instance, consist of an “open innovator of the year” award (Salter et al., 2014) given to the one person who excels at OI or a “collaborator of the year” award for the one individual who has gone out of his or her way to share information and bring people together to find a solution to a problem. In this respect, in the 1990s, Texas Instruments instituted a “not invented here, but I did it anyway” award as part of its push to share best practices internally and increase collaboration (Davenport, De Long, & Beers, 1998). Another example is the strategy employed by Tor Myhren, President and Chief Creative Office at Grey Advertising, who instituted a “heroic failure”⁸ award. The award is given out on a quarterly basis to employees who take a major, edgy risk. This sends a clear signal throughout the organization that taking risks is encouraged and that failure is acceptable.

(Over) Invest in Capability Building

If open innovation is not seen as a long-term capability building exercise, then it will fail.

—Tomas Lackner, *Head of Open Innovation and Scouting at Siemens Corporate Technology*⁹

p. 158 A fourth and critical aspect of OI implementation that leaders can meaningfully steer concerns the investment in employee capability building. Open innovation requires not only the capability to bring outside knowledge in but also the internal capabilities to review and assess external opportunities and to assimilate them into the organization (Mortara et al., 2009). Indeed, a longitudinal study among 1,170 German firms shows that companies with a strong in-house capacity and extensive cross-functional internal collaboration reap higher benefits from openness than do those without these innovation management capabilities (Salge, Bohne, Farchi, & Piening, 2012). In our view, the development of these internal capabilities requires a concerted investment in developing individuals into effective innovators and enabling and leveraging internal connections among individuals.

Develop Individuals

A shift to OI implies that individuals will be faced with new challenges, such as finding promising opportunities on the outside, successfully selling these internally, navigating the “legal niceties” of what can and cannot be shared with outsiders, and being involved in more cross-functional internal collaboration. Some individuals might already have the necessary abilities and skills, whereas others might not. Throwing these individuals into the water assuming that they will learn to swim is not only unrealistic but also irresponsible. To facilitate successful OI adoption, leaders need to identify individual development needs and ensure that they are addressed.

It is only fair to admit that research into the skills, abilities, and attributes that are critical for OI is still in its infancy. However, some attributes seem logical candidates for development for all employees who are involved in OI activities. These attributes include a learning orientation, adaptability, flexibility, communication, cooperation, proactivity, creativity, and an entrepreneurial attitude (Mortara et al., 2009). Moreover, certain types of knowledge, such as having a broad grasp of the different functions within the company, knowing who knows what, and clearly understanding the company’s strategic OI direction, also seem to be helpful in facilitating employees’ OI-related activities, regardless of their actual position.

Leaders can play a vital role in ensuring that concerted employee development programs, consisting of a combination of training, mentoring, coaching, and job-rotation initiatives, are rolled out throughout the firm. For instance, creating “OI Academies” in which employees in all functions are trained in what OI means and how it can be beneficial to them can help distribute knowledge about OI throughout the firm (Mortara et al., 2009). To underscore the more general value of training in overcoming some barriers to OI adoption, a study among 311 firms showed that both training aimed at deepening existing professional skills and training aimed at increasing creativity skills helped buffer the negative effects of the not-invented-here (NIH) syndrome (De Araújo Burcharth, Knudsen, & Søndergaard, 2014).

Some attributes may need to be developed depending on the specific roles that people hold (e.g., idea scouts, R&D researchers, and OI leaders). For instance, some firms, such as Procter & Gamble, invest in training their tech scouts on how to identify potentially valuable opportunities. Other programs, such as Fiat’s “researchers with a briefcase” initiative, focus on training R&D people to become effective gatekeepers by clarifying the borders between information that can be openly shared with outsiders and information that cannot be shared. Yet others, such as Unilever’s attempt to roll out a training program for OI managers, focus on developing specific leadership skills needed for OI (Mortara & Minshall, 2014). We also draw attention to another type of role—the “assimilator” role—that is in need of developmental attention but has so far been largely ignored. External ideas need to be translated into a shape and form that will make them palatable internally. Therefore, the organization needs individuals who can help assimilate this external knowledge into the firm (Salter et al., 2014). Specifically, these individuals would need to have the capabilities and expertise to repackage external ideas into a form that appeals to internal stakeholders and to clarify how these ideas can add value internally. In our view, the development of this role is critical for successful OI adoption, given that a large proportion of external ideas brought in by the idea scouts never get absorbed internally.

Facilitate Internal Connections

Many internal barriers to OI—such as limited internal collaboration, difficulties in locating information internally (e.g., the needle-in-a-haystack problem), and problems with assimilating external ideas internally (e.g., the NIH syndrome)—can be traced back to either underdeveloped or underutilized internal networks. Leaders can play a key role in overcoming these barriers by establishing and leveraging a myriad of horizontal and vertical connections among employees across functions. This does not mean that everyone should be connected to everyone else. Rather, it implies that leaders need to take a targeted approach at ensuring that individuals with complementary skills and knowledge are connected to each other.

Leaders can employ a variety of initiatives to foster interpersonal connections that facilitate internal collaboration and the cross-pollination of knowledge. For instance, establishing cross-functional teams or task forces, or instituting horizontal job rotations, can have this effect. As a case in point, 3M managers attribute part of their success with OI to 3M’s unofficial job rotation policy, whereby technical employees regularly shift between businesses, labs, and countries (Jaruzelski & Holman, 2011). Other initiatives, such as development programs that promote cohort-based learning and peer coaching, help create not only trust-based personal relationships but also an internal network of peers who can act as advisors (Schweer, Assimakopoulos, Cross, & Thomas, 2012). To this end, BP’s peer assist program—a process whereby peer groups of managers are used to drive knowledge sharing and learning—is widely known to help collaboration and decrease the NIH syndrome (Ghoshal & Gratton, 2002). Finally, by identifying and co-opting the internal bridge-builders—the people who know where certain pockets of expertise reside within the company and are willing to connect people to each other—leaders can mitigate the inability to locate internal knowledge.

Keeping the context of open innovation in mind, internal connections can also increase the odds of internal absorption of external ideas. In order to achieve this, leaders would benefit from connecting idea scouts to internal idea brokers. For ideas from the outside to be accepted internally, they not only need to be translated in a form that is palatable internally but also need to reach the right persons (Salter et al., 2014; p. 161 Whelan et al., 2011). Typically, idea scouts do not have the required internal social standing or the distribution network to effectively broker their ideas. In contrast, successful idea brokers are the “go to” individuals within a company—they are at the center of a large social network, know who knows what, and have the social capital to bring external ideas to the right people. By connecting idea scouts to idea brokers, the odds of successful assimilation of external ideas improve dramatically (Whelan et al., 2011).

Conclusions

In this chapter, we argued that a micro-level perspective, focused on the role of leadership in the internal implementation of OI programs, is indispensable for an adequate understanding of OI and for the successful transition from a closed to an open innovation model. To this end, we presented a number of domains in which leaders can help to overcome some of the most common internal impediments to OI adoption, clustered around employees' motivation and ability to engage in OI activities. Specifically, we stressed the critical role that leaders can play in (1) getting people on board by creating and promoting a shared vision of OI within the organization, (2) earning employee commitment to OI by showing in words and deeds that it is more than just a new flavor of the month, (3) reshaping the definition of success within the organization by challenging assumptions about appropriate behaviors and aligning the reward and incentive systems, and (4) contributing to internal capability building by developing individuals and facilitating the development of internal networks. Moreover, we provided some practical strategies that leaders can employ in each of these domains.

As stated previously, our discussion of the role of leadership in facilitating the successful embedding of OI principles in the organization is not meant to be exhaustive, but we hope to have underscored the importance of acknowledging and accommodating motivational and capability factors in any large-scale change initiative from a closed to an open innovation model. Certainly other factors affect the internal p. 162 success of OI adoption efforts, such as creating the right systems, structures, and processes and ensuring that the more general organizational culture favors OI (Chesbrough & Bogers, 2014; Mortara & Minshall, 2014). Although different authors and practitioners may stress the importance of one factor over the others, it is critical to think about them as being interlocking parts of a larger system and not as stand-alone issues that can be addressed in isolation. Changing any part of a larger system, such as its structure or its processes, will inevitably affect other areas and might give rise to unanticipated consequences. Effective leaders understand that it is arduous work to achieve any large-scale change and work hard on aligning strategy with systems, processes, and structures—all the while being mindful of the effects that any of these changes will have on the people that are affected by them. They also understand that success will not happen overnight and that there will be some trial and error along the way.

Embedding OI into an organization will not just happen. If it is to become part and parcel of the organization, it cannot be left to serendipity and the grassroots efforts of a few OI champions. Rather, it needs to be nurtured and managed as a deliberate act. It is essential that leaders do not sit back and wait for employees to become innovative; instead, they must actively extend an open invitation to open innovation.

Notes

1. Retrieved from <http://www.15inno.com/2011/02/24/oppversusthreats>.

2. Retrieved from <http://www.research.philips.com/open-innovation>.
3. Retrieved from <http://www.dsm.com/corporate/about/innovation-at-dsm/open-innovation.html>.
4. Retrieved from http://www.henkel.com/com/content_data/141926_2009.09.02_10_Investor_Day_MueKi_Leading_in_Innovation.pdf.
5. Retrieved from <http://www.google.com/about/company/facts/culture>.
6. Retrieved from <http://www.innovationmanagement.se/2013/09/05/open-innovation-an-integrated-tool-in-siemens>.
7. Retrieved from http://openinnovation.berkeley.edu/Randolph_Gusch_9_17_12.pdf.
8. Retrieved from <http://grey.com/us/culture>.
9. Retrieved from <http://www.innovationmanagement.se/2013/09/05/open-innovation-an-integrated-tool-in-siemens>.

References

Amabile, T. M. (1996). *Creativity in context*. Boulder, CO: Westview.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Amabile, T. M., Schatzel, E. A., Moneta, G. B., & Kramer, S. J. (2004). Leader behaviors and the work environment for creativity: Perceived leader support. *Leadership Quarterly*, *15*, 5–32.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Ancona, D. G., & Caldwell, D. F. (1992). Bridging the boundary: External activity and performance in organizational teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *37*, 634–665.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Antonakis, J., Fenley, M., & Liechti, S. (2012). Learning charisma: Transform yourself into someone people want to follow. *Harvard Business Review*, *90*(6), 127–130.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Argenti, P. A., Howell, R. A., & Beck, K. A. (2005). The strategic communication imperative. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, *46*(3), 83–89.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Armenakis, A. A., Harris, S. G., & Mossholder, K. W. (1993). Creating readiness for organizational change. *Human Relations*, *46*, 681–703.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Awamleh, R., & Gardner, W. L. (1999). Perceptions of leader charisma and effectiveness: The effects of vision content, delivery, and organizational performance. *Leadership Quarterly*, *10*, 345–373.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Bass, B. M. (1990). *Handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research*. New York, NY: Free Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Boal, K. B., & Hooijberg, R. (2001). Strategic leadership research: Moving on. *Leadership Quarterly*, *11*, 515–549.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Chen, G., & Tjosvold, D. (2002). Cooperative goals and constructive controversy for promoting innovation in student groups in China. *Journal of Education for Business*, *78*(1), 46–50.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Chesbrough, H. (2003). *Open innovation: The new imperative for creating and profiting from technology*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Chesbrough, H. (2011). *Open services innovation: Rethinking your business to grow and compete in a new era*. San Francisco, CA: Wiley.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Chesbrough, H., & Bogers, M. (2014). Explicating open innovation: Clarifying an emerging paradigm for understanding innovation. In H. Chesbrough, W. Vanhaverbeke, & J. West (Eds.), *New frontiers in open innovation*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Chesbrough, H., & Brunswicker, S. (2013). *Managing open innovation in large firms: Survey report. Executive survey on open innovation 2013*. Retrieved from <http://openinnovation.berkeley.edu/managing-open-innovation-survey-report.pdf>.
[WorldCat](#)

Chesbrough, H., Vanhaverbeke, W., & West, J. (Eds.). (2006). *Open innovation: Researching a new paradigm*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Chiaroni, D., Chiesa, V., & Frattini, F. (2011). The open innovation journey: How firms dynamically implement the emerging innovation management paradigm. *Technovation*, 31, 34–43.
[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Christensen, C. M. (1997). *The innovator's dilemma: When new technologies cause great firms to fail*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

p. 164 Cloyd, G., & Euchner, J. (2012, July–August). Building open innovation at P&G: An interview with Gil Cloyd. *Research Technology Management*, 14–19.
[WorldCat](#)

Colquitt, J. A., Scott, B. A., Rodell, J. B., Long, D. M., Zapata, C. P., Conlon, D. E., & Wesson, M. J. (2013). Justice at the millennium, a decade later: A meta-analytic test of social exchange and affect-based perspectives. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98, 199–236.
[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1998). *Charismatic leadership in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Conger, J. A., Kanungo, R. N., & Menon, S. T. (2000). Charismatic leadership and follower effects. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21, 747–767.
[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

da Mota Pedrosa, A., Välling, M., & Boyd, B. (2013). Knowledge related activities in open innovation: Managers' characteristics and practices. *International Journal of Technology Management*, 61(3–4), 254–273.
[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Dahlander, L., & Gann, D. M. (2010). How open is innovation? *Research Policy*, 39(6), 699–709.
[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Damen, F., van Knippenberg, B. M., & van Knippenberg, D. (2008). Affective match in leadership: Leader emotional display, follower positive affect, and follower performance. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 38(4), 868–902.
[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Davenport, T. H., De Long, D. W., & Beers, M. C. (1998). Successful knowledge management projects. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 39(2), 43–57.
[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Davis, J. P., & Eisenhardt, K. M. (2011). Rotating leadership and collaborative innovation: Recombination processes in symbiotic relationships. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 56(2), 159–201.
[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

De Araújo Burcharth, A. L., Knudsen, M. P., & Søndergaard, H. A. (2014). Neither invented nor shared here: The impact and management of attitudes for the adoption of open innovation practices. *Technovation*, 34, 149–161.
[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Den Hartog, D. N., & Verbarg, R. M. (1997). Charisma and rhetoric: Communication techniques of international business leaders. *Leadership Quarterly*, 8, 355–391.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Detert, J. R., & Edmondson, A. C. (2011). Implicit voice theories: An emerging understanding of self-censorship at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(3), 461–488.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Drucker, P. (1973). *Management: Tasks, responsibilities, practices*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Ekvall, G., & Ryhammer, L. (1999). The creative climate: Its determinants and effects at a Swedish University. *Creativity Research Journal*, 12, 303–310.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Elmquist, M., Fredberg, T., & Ollila, S. (2009). Exploring the field of open innovation. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 12(3), 326–345.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Emrich, C. G., Brower, H. H., Feldman, J. M., & Garland, H. (2001). Images in words: Presidential rhetoric, charisma and greatness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46, 527–557.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Epley, N., Mak, D., & Idson, L. C. (2006). Bonus or rebate? The impact of income framing on spending and saving. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 19(3), 213–227.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Fiol, C. M., Harris, D., & House, R. (1999). Charismatic leadership: Strategies for effecting social change. *Leadership Quarterly*, 10, 449–482.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

p. 165 Foss, N. J., Husted, K., & Michailova, S. (2010). Governing knowledge sharing in organizations: Levels of analysis, governance mechanisms, and research directions. *Journal of Management Studies*, 47, 455–482.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Garvin, D. A., Edmondson, A. C., & Gino, F. (2008). Is yours a learning organization? *Harvard Business Review*, 86(3), 109–116.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Ghoshal, S., & Gratton, L. (2002). Integrating the enterprise. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 44(1), 31–38.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Giannopolou, E., Yström, A., & Ollila, S. (2011). Turning open innovation into practice: Open innovation research through the lens of managers. *International Journal of Innovation Management*, 15(3), 505–524.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Gilley, A., Dixon, P., & Gilley, J. W. (2008). Characteristics of leadership effectiveness: Implementing change and driving innovation in organizations. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 19(2), 153–169.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Hansen, M. T., Ibarra, H., & Peyer, U. (2013). The best-performing CEOs in the world. *Harvard Business Review*, 91(1), 81–95.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Huizingh, E. K. R. E. (2011). Open innovation: State of the art and future perspectives. *Technovation*, 31, 2–9.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Jaruzelski, R., & Holman, B. (2011, March–April). Casting a wide net: Building the capabilities for open innovation. *Ivey Business Journal*. Retrieved from <http://iveybusinessjournal.com/topics/innovation/casting-a-wide-net-building-the-capabilities-for-open-innovation#.U9E5VVYklds>.

[WorldCat](#)

Kanter, R. M. (1983). *The change masters*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Kerr, S. (1975). On the folly of rewarding for A while hoping for B. *Academy of Management Journal*, 18, 769–783.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Kirkpatrick, S. A., & Locke, E. A. (1996). Direct and indirect effects of three core charismatic leadership components on performance and attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 36–51.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Kotter, J. P., & Schlesinger, L. A. (1979). Choosing strategies for change. *Harvard Business Review*, 57(2), 106–114.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Kottke, J. L., & Sharafinski, C. E. (1988). Measuring perceived supervisory and organizational support. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 48, 1075–1079.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Laursen, K., & Salter, A. J. (2006). Open for innovation: The role of openness in explaining innovation performance among UK manufacturing firms. *Strategic Management Journal*, 27(2), 131–150.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Lieberman, V., Samuels, S. M., & Ross, L. (2004). The name of the game: Predictive power of reputations versus situational labels in determining prisoner's dilemma game moves. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 30(9), 1175–1185.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Magee, J. C., & Galinsky, A. D. (2008). Social hierarchy: The self-reinforcing nature of power and status. *Academy of Management Annals*, 2, 351–398.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Mortara, L., & Minshall, T. (2011). How do large multinational corporations implement open innovation? *Technovation*, 31, 586–597.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Mortara, L., & Minshall, T. (2014). Patterns of implementation of OI in MNCs. In H. Chesbrough, W. Vanhaverbeke, & J. West (Eds.), *New frontiers in open innovation*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

p. 166 Mortara, L., Napp, J. J., Slacik, I., & Minshall, T. (2009). *How to implement open innovation: Lessons from studying large multinational companies*. Cambridge, England: University of Cambridge Institute for Manufacturing.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Nakagaki, P., Aber, J., & Fetterhoff, T. (2012, July–August). The challenges in implementing open innovation in a global innovation-driven corporation. *Research Technology Management*, 32–38.

[WorldCat](#)

Oldham, G. R., & Cummings, A. (1996). Employee creativity: Personal and contextual factors at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39, 607–634.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Palanski, M. E., & Yammarino, F. J. (2009). Integrity and leadership: A multi-level conceptual framework. *Leadership Quarterly*, 20,

405–420.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Pugh, K., & Prusak, L. (2013). Designing effective knowledge networks. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 55(1), 79–88.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Ready, D. A., & Conger, J. A. (2008). Enabling bold visions. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 49(2), 70–76.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Remneland-Wikhamn, B., & Wikhamn, W. (2011). Open innovation climate measure: The introduction of a validated scale. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 20(4), 284–295.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 698–714.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Rietzschel, E. F., Slijkhuis, J. M., & Van Yperen, N. W. (2014). Close monitoring as a contextual stimulator: How need for structure affects the relation between close monitoring and work outcomes. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 23, 394–404.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Rigby, D., & Bilodeau, B. (2013). *Management tools and trends 2013*. Retrieved from http://bain.com/Images/BAIN_BRIEF_Management_Tools_%26_Trends_2013.pdf.

[WorldCat](#)

Roberto, M. A., & Levesque, L. C. (2005). The art of making change initiatives stick. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 46(4), 53–60.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Salge, T. O., Bohne, T. M., Farchi, T., & Piening, E. P. (2012). Harnessing the value of open innovation: The moderating role of innovation management. *International Journal of Innovation Management*, 16(3), 1–26.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Salter, A., Criscuolo, P., & Ter Wal, A. L. J. (2014). Coping with open innovation: Responding to the challenges of external engagement in R&D. *California Management Review*, 56(2), 77–94.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Schein, E. H. (1993). How can organizations learn faster? The challenge of entering the green room. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 34(2), 85–92.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Schein, E. H. (2004). *Organizational culture and leadership* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Schweer, M., Assimakopoulos, D., Cross, R., & Thomas, R. J. (2012). Building a well-networked organization. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 53(2), 35–42.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Schweiger, D. M., Sandberg, W. R., & Ragan, J. W. (1986). Group approaches for improving strategic decision-making: A comparative analysis of dialectical inquiry, devil's advocacy, and consensus. *Academy of Management Journal*, 29, 51–71.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Schwenk, C. (1984). Cognitive simplification processes in strategic decision-making. *Strategic Management Journal*, 5, 111–128.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

- p. 167 Seelig, T. L. (2012). *inGenius: A crash course on creativity*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.
[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)
- Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. New York, NY: Doubleday/Currency.
[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)
- Shamir, B., Arthur, M. B., & House, R. J. (1994). The rhetoric of charismatic leadership: A theoretical extension, a case study, and implications for future research. *Leadership Quarterly*, 5, 25–42.
[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)
- Slowinski, G., & Sagal, M. W. (2010, September–October). Good practices in open innovation. *Research Technology Management*, 38–45.
[WorldCat](#)
- Stam, D. A., van Knippenberg, D., & Wisse, B. M. (2010). The role of regulatory fit in visionary leadership. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 31(4), 499–518.
[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)
- Sutton, R. I., & Rao, H. (2014). *Scaling up excellence: Getting to more without settling for less*. New York, NY: Crown Business.
[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)
- Thaler, R. H., & Sunstein, C. R. (2008). *Nudge: Improving decisions about health, wealth, and happiness*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)
- Tierney, P. (2009). Leadership and employee creativity. In J. Zhou & C. E. Shalley (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational creativity* (pp. 95–125). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)
- Tierney, P., & Farmer, S. M. (2004). The Pygmalion process and employee creativity. *Journal of Management*, 30, 413–432.
[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)
- Tjosvold, D., & Yu, Z. Y. (2007). Group risk-taking: The constructive role of controversy in China. *Group and Organization Management*, 32, 653–674.
[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)
- van der Vrande, V., Vanhaverbeke, W., & Gassmann, O. (2010). Broadening the scope of open innovation: Past research, current state and future directions. *International Journal of Technology Management*, 52(3–4), 221–235.
[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)
- Whelan, E., Parise, S., de Valk, J., & Aalbers, R. (2011). Creating employee networks that deliver open innovation. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 53(1), 37–44.
[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)
- Worley, C. G., & Lawler, E. E. (2006). Designing organizations that are built to change. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 48(1), 19–23.
[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)
- Yukl, G. (2008). How leaders influence organizational effectiveness. *Leadership Quarterly*, 19, 708–722.
[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)
- Yukl, G. (2010). *Leadership in organizations* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)
- p. 168 Zaccaro, S. J., Rittman, A. L., & Marks, M. A. (2001). Team leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 12, 451–484. ↵

