

Tim Mazzarol · Sophie Reboud ·  
Delwyn Clark · Monique Moore ·  
Peter Malone · Geoffrey N. Soutar

# Commercialisation and Innovation Strategy in Small Firms

Learning to Manage Uncertainty

# Commercialisation and Innovation Strategy in Small Firms

Tim Mazzarol · Sophie Reboud · Delwyn Clark ·  
Monique Moore · Peter Malone ·  
Geoffrey N. Soutar

# Commercialisation and Innovation Strategy in Small Firms

Learning to Manage Uncertainty

Tim Mazzarol  
University of Western Australia  
Crawley, WA, Australia

Sophie Reboud  
Burgundy School of Business  
Dijon, France

Delwyn Clark  
University of Waikato  
Hamilton, New Zealand

Monique Moore  
University of Newcastle  
Callaghan, NSW, Australia

Peter Malone  
University of Western Australia  
Crawley, WA, Australia

Geoffrey N. Soutar  
University of Western Australia  
Crawley, WA, Australia

ISBN 978-981-19-2650-1

ISBN 978-981-19-2651-8 (eBook)

<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-2651-8>

© Springer Nature Singapore Pte Ltd. 2022

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors, and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, expressed or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

This Springer imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Singapore Pte Ltd.  
The registered company address is: 152 Beach Road, #21-01/04 Gateway East, Singapore 189721, Singapore

# Preface

The purpose of this book is to examine the process of commercialisation within innovative small firms (ISFs) with a view to understanding the factors that influence their success and failure. Our research has drawn upon the foundation work pioneered by Professor Michel Santi from HEC Paris, and Professor Sophie Reboud from ESC Dijon, Bourgogne France in the early 2000s. This work continued from 2003 with collaboration between Sophie Reboud and Professor Tim Mazzarol from UWA, and a global network of researchers from Austria, Australia, Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Spain, Singapore, Switzerland, and the United States, which collected data from 567 ISFs, examining the perceptions of these firms' managers as to the value they anticipated would flow from their commercialisation, and their approaches to systematic management of new product development (NPD), and commercialisation. This work was initially published as an edited book, *Strategic Innovation in Small Firms: An International Analysis of Innovation and Strategic Decision Making in Small and Medium Sized Enterprises* (Mazzarol & Reboud, 2011).

In developing this current book, we drew upon this foundation work, but focused specifically on several key areas relating to the commercialisation process of ISFs. The first of these is the initial decision to innovate and the firm's ability to assess the future potential value that future investment in the innovation's commercialisation might yield. The second is how to screen opportunities across the commercialisation process, using NPD tools and techniques to aid decision making. The third is the ability to design, develop, implement and re-engineer business models that can form a key part of the ISFs' commercialisation strategy. Fourth, is the importance of learning how to manage uncertainty, which is an essential aspect of commercialisation. Fifth, is the firm's ability to build and develop the capabilities to facilitate growth as the firm scales-up to realise the full value of the commercialisation. This involves building a *Capabilities Architecture*, comprising knowledge, skills, and competencies necessary for the successful execution of a commercialisation strategy. Sixth, is the role played by strategic alliances to assist the firm in accessing resources, skills, and knowledge. Finally, there is the firm's ability to create and maintain isolating mechanisms that will enable the firm to protect its competitive advantage.

A key part of our analysis are nine case studies which provide valuable insights into how ISFs engage in the commercialisation process. We wish to express our gratitude to their founders for agreeing to share their stories with us for this research. In this respect we thank the following people. Brianne West, founder of Ethique, a New Zealand based producer of environmentally sustainable beauty products. Roland Butcher, founder of Live Technologies, an Australian firm focused on commercialising an innovative digital lens filter for HD cameras. Guy Howard-Willis and Roland Alonzo, founders of the New Zealand based Manta5, a pioneer in hydrofoil bikes. Alison Coutts, CEO of Memphasys Ltd., and Australian bio-medical start-up focusing on in vitro fertilisation technology. Peter Beck, founder of the US-New Zealand based business Rocket Lab, producers of small satellite launch and spacecraft systems. Peter Clarke, CEO of the Australian-based Scanalyse Pty Ltd, a pioneer in the application of 3D Laser scanning technologies within the mining sector. Ned Montarello, founder of ThinkSmart, and Australian and British firm focused on point-of-sale financing for small business. Peter Malone, Leo Fung and Craig Piercy, founders of Skin Elements Ltd., an Australian firm specialising in natural sunscreen, skin care, and anti-viral cleansers. Finally, the owners of Martinot SA, a specialist precision machinery manufacturer in France.

What our work shows is that commercialisation is not well-understood within the academic literature and has been under researched with respect to small firms. Given the importance of small firms to the world's economies, it is essential that we understand the factors that enhance and restrict ISFs in their commercialisation process. This book seeks to address a gap in the literature and provide academic researchers, entrepreneurial managers, NPD project teams, and both government officials and professional services advisors new insights into the process of commercialisation within these firms.

Crawley, Australia  
Dijon, France  
Hamilton, New Zealand  
Callaghan, Australia  
Crawley, Australia  
Crawley, Australia

Tim Mazzarol  
Sophie Reboud  
Delwyn Clark  
Monique Moore  
Peter Malone  
Geoffrey N. Soutar

## Reference

Mazzarol, T., & Reboud, S., Ed. (2011). *Strategic Innovation in Small Firms: An International Analysis of Innovation and Strategic Decision Making in Small to Medium Sized Enterprises*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Innovation and Commercialisation in Small Firms</b>	<b>1</b>
	Tim Mazzarol	
1.1	Introduction	1
1.1.1	The Research Questions Guiding the Study	2
1.2	What Are Small Firms?	3
1.2.1	The Problems of Definition	4
1.2.2	The Challenge of Defining the Innovative Small Firm	6
1.2.3	Developing a Framework for the Definition of an Innovative Small Firm	9
1.3	Understanding the Reality of Commercialisation in Small Firms	14
1.3.1	Defining Commercialisation	15
1.3.2	How Do Small Firms Engage in Commercialisation?	21
1.4	The Role of Innovative Small Firms Within National Innovation Systems	26
1.4.1	How Much Do Small Firms Contribute to the NIS?	27
1.5	Conclusions	29
	Bibliography	31
<b>2</b>	<b>Conceptual Foundations of the Book</b>	<b>39</b>
	Tim Mazzarol and Monique Moore	
2.1	Introduction	39
2.2	The Conceptual Frameworks Surrounding the Innovative Small Firm	40
2.2.1	The Concept of Innovation Rent	42
2.2.2	Risk, Uncertainty, Quasi Rents, Entrepreneurial Rents	43
2.2.3	The Innovation Rent Typology	44

2.2.4	The Characteristics of the Innovation .....	46
2.2.5	Innovation Adoption and Diffusion—Customers’ Perception of Value .....	48
2.2.6	Innovation Adoption and Diffusion—Supplier and Customer Bargaining Power .....	49
2.2.7	Innovation Adoption and Diffusion—Substitution Threats and Risk .....	50
2.2.8	Strategic Decisions and Alliances in the Commercialisation Pathway .....	51
2.3	A Systematic Review of the Commercialisation Literature ....	54
2.3.1	Leximancer Analysis of the Literature .....	58
2.3.2	Summary of the Findings from the Literature Review .....	62
2.3.3	Overall Conclusions From the Literature Review ....	70
2.4	An International Survey of Innovative Small Firms .....	70
2.4.1	Assessing Commercialisation Readiness .....	71
2.4.2	Overall Summary of the Survey Findings .....	76
2.5	Case Studies of Innovative Small Firms .....	77
2.5.1	Ethique .....	78
2.5.2	Live Technologies .....	78
2.5.3	Manta5 .....	78
2.5.4	Martinot SA .....	79
2.5.5	Memphasys Ltd. ....	79
2.5.6	Rocket Lab .....	79
2.5.7	Scanalyse Pty Ltd. ....	80
2.5.8	Skin Elements Ltd. ....	80
2.5.9	THINKSMART .....	81
2.6	Conclusions .....	81
	Bibliography .....	84
<b>3</b>	<b>The Decision to Innovate .....</b>	<b>93</b>
	Peter Malone, Tim Mazzarol, and Sophie Reboud	
3.1	Introduction .....	93
3.2	Prior Research into Factors Influencing the Decision to Innovate .....	95
3.2.1	Sources of Innovation .....	95
3.2.2	Factors Influencing the Decision to Innovate .....	96
3.3	The Influence of Antecedent Factors on Commercialisation .....	105
3.3.1	The Role of Knowledge .....	105
3.3.2	The Role of Absorptive Capacity .....	108
3.3.3	The Role of Senior Management, Prior Experience, and Entrepreneurial Cognition .....	110



3.4	Cross Case Comparison of Innovation Decision Making with Three ISFs .....	112
3.4.1	Company-Specific Dimensions .....	114
3.4.2	Contextual Factors Influencing the Decision to Innovate .....	122
3.4.3	Innovation Specific Factors Influencing the Decision to Innovate .....	123
3.5	Knowledge, Absorptive Capacity, and Entrepreneurial Cognition .....	125
3.5.1	Skin Elements Limited .....	125
3.5.2	Scanalyse Pty Ltd. ....	128
3.5.3	Live Technologies Pty Ltd. ....	130
3.6	Conclusions .....	132
	Bibliography .....	138
<b>4</b>	<b>Screening Opportunities .....</b>	<b>145</b>
	Tim Mazzarol and Sophie Reboud	
4.1	Introduction .....	145
4.2	Opportunity Screening Within the Entrepreneurial Process ....	146
4.2.1	The Opportunity Assessment Decision .....	148
4.2.2	The Entrepreneurial Entry Decision .....	149
4.2.3	The Exploiting Opportunities Decision .....	149
4.2.4	The Entrepreneurial Exit Decision .....	150
4.2.5	Biases, Heuristics, Manager Characteristics and Environmental Influences .....	151
4.2.6	The Role of Entrepreneurial Orientation .....	152
4.3	Opportunity Screening as a Systematic Process .....	154
4.3.1	Fuzzy Front End (FFE) Analysis .....	155
4.3.2	New Concept Development (NCD) .....	157
4.3.3	New Product Development Process .....	159
4.3.4	The Stage-Gate® Model .....	160
4.3.5	Customer Development Process .....	163
4.4	Opportunity Screening Using NPD Tools and Techniques ....	166
4.4.1	Voice of the Customer (VOC) Research and QFD House of Quality .....	166
4.4.2	Product Definition Framework .....	167
4.4.3	KANO Model Analysis .....	169
4.4.4	VOC CAGE Model Analysis .....	170
4.4.5	Product-Technology Road-Mapping .....	172
4.5	Innovation Rent Analysis .....	174
4.5.1	The Role of the Innovation Rent Analysis in Opportunity Screening .....	174
4.5.2	Commercialisation Experience and Opportunity Screening .....	175
4.6	Case Study Opportunity Screening in THINKSMART .....	182

4.6.1	Background to the THINKSMART Case .....	182
4.6.2	Entrepreneurial Leadership .....	183
4.6.3	Opportunity Screening Using a Heuristic Framework .....	184
4.6.4	The Role of Strategic Alliances in Opportunity Screening .....	185
4.6.5	Lessons from the THINKSMART Case .....	187
4.7	Conclusions .....	188
	Bibliography .....	191
<b>5</b>	<b>The Business Model and Innovation Strategy .....</b>	<b>197</b>
	Delwyn Clark, Sophie Reboud, and Tim Mazzarol	
5.1	Introduction .....	197
5.2	Business Model Theory and Commercialisation .....	198
5.2.1	The Evolution of Business Model Theory .....	198
5.2.2	The Business Model Functions .....	200
5.2.3	The Business Model Elements .....	203
5.3	Business Models Reflect Strategy .....	206
5.4	Business Models and Entrepreneurial Ventures .....	209
5.4.1	Designing a New Business Venture .....	210
5.4.2	Commercialisation Pathways for ISFs .....	211
5.5	Case Studies of ISF Business Models and Commercialisation .....	214
5.5.1	Designing a New Business Venture: The Manta5 Story .....	214
5.5.2	Operationalising the Venture Growth Phase: The Ethique Story .....	219
5.5.3	Reviewing Business Performance: The Rocket Lab Story .....	224
5.6	Cross-Case Comparison of the Three Business Models and Lessons Learnt .....	229
5.7	Conclusions and Future Directions .....	233
5.7.1	Further Research Questions .....	233
5.7.2	Implications for Policy and Practice .....	234
	Bibliography .....	238
<b>6</b>	<b>Managing Uncertainty .....</b>	<b>241</b>
	Tim Mazzarol and Sophie Reboud	
6.1	Introduction .....	241
6.2	Risk Management .....	241
6.2.1	The Notions of Risk and Uncertainty .....	242
6.2.2	Risk Management in Small Firms .....	243
6.3	Absorptive Capacity and the Management of Risk .....	252
6.3.1	Proximity Effects, Biases, Heuristics, and the Law of Small Numbers .....	254

6.3.2	Informality in Risk Management Within Small Firms .....	255
6.3.3	Resource Scarcity and Associated Risk .....	256
6.4	Commercialisation and the Management of Risk and Uncertainty .....	260
6.4.1	Navigating Uncertainty in the NPD, Commercialisation Process .....	262
6.4.2	Developing a Risk Management Planning Process .....	266
6.4.3	Managing Risk Within the NPD Process .....	268
6.5	Perceived Risk and Uncertainty Amongst ISFs .....	279
6.5.1	Perceived Market Risk and Uncertainty .....	280
6.5.2	Perceived Innovation Management Risk and Uncertainty .....	283
6.5.3	Perceived Resource Risk and Uncertainty .....	288
6.5.4	Perceived Strategic Management Risk and Uncertainty .....	289
6.6	Conclusions and Lessons Learnt .....	293
6.6.1	Lessons for Business Practice .....	294
6.6.2	Lessons for Innovation Policy .....	295
6.6.3	Lessons for Future Research .....	296
	Bibliography .....	298
<b>7</b>	<b>Building Capabilities .....</b>	<b>305</b>
	Peter Malone and Tim Mazzarol	
7.1	Introduction .....	305
7.2	Growth, Innovation and Scaling-Up the Innovative Small Firm .....	306
7.3	Theories of Business Growth Within Small Firms .....	307
7.3.1	The Importance of the Owner-Manager .....	309
7.4	The Process of Managing Growth Within Small Firms .....	309
7.5	Navigating the Commercialisation Pathway in the Growth Process .....	311
7.5.1	How Should ISF NPD Success Be Measured? .....	312
7.5.2	What Business Planning Should ISFs Use in NPD? .....	312
7.5.3	What Competitive Market Positions Should ISFs Use in Commercialisation? .....	314
7.5.4	What Does the Firm's Relationship with Its Leading Customers Have on Success? .....	315
7.5.5	Do ISFs Follow Common Growth Paths? .....	316
7.6	Knowledge Management, Organisational Learning, and Resource Scarcity .....	317
7.6.1	Knowledge Management .....	317
7.6.2	Organisational Learning .....	319

7.6.3	Managerial Competence .....	321
7.6.4	Resource Scarcity .....	322
7.6.5	Strategic Networks and Complementary Actors .....	323
7.7	Case Studies of Capability Building Within ISFs .....	326
7.7.1	Skin Elements—Natural Organic Sunscreens, Skin Care and Antiviral Solutions .....	326
7.7.2	Scanalyse—Applying 3D Spatial Models to the Mining Sector .....	329
7.7.3	Live Technologies—Digital Camera Technology to Enhance Dynamic Range .....	332
7.8	Cross Case Analysis of ISF Capability Building .....	336
7.8.1	Assessment of the Anticipated (Potential) Innovation Rent .....	336
7.8.2	Navigating with the Innovation Diagnostic Diamond .....	340
7.9	Applying a Model of Entrepreneurial Innovation Value (EIV) .....	348
7.9.1	Findings from the Three Cases and the EIV Model .....	353
7.9.2	Conclusion and Lessons Learnt .....	359
7.9.3	Addressing the Research Questions .....	360
7.9.4	The Lessons of the EIV Model .....	362
	Bibliography .....	365
<b>8</b>	<b>Strategic Alliances for Commercialisation .....</b>	<b>373</b>
	Delwyn Clark, Tim Mazzarol, and Monique Moore	
8.1	Introduction .....	373
8.2	Strategic Alliance Theory and Commercialisation .....	374
8.2.1	Definition and Types of Strategic Alliances .....	374
8.2.2	Motives for Strategic Alliance Formation .....	377
8.2.3	Obtaining Resources for Commercialisation from Strategic Alliances .....	378
8.3	Strategic Alliance Management Processes .....	380
8.3.1	Strategic Alliance Partner Identification and Selection Processes .....	380
8.3.2	Developing and Negotiating Strategic Alliance Agreements and Contracts .....	383
8.4	Management Oversight and Control of Strategic Alliances ....	388
8.5	Termination of Strategic Alliances .....	389
8.6	Case Study: Memphasys Limited (MEM)—Commercialisation of Felix .....	390
8.6.1	Strategic Alliance Types and Resources—MEM Case .....	391
8.6.2	Strategic Alliance Management Processes—MEM Case .....	396

8.6.3	Case Discussion and Lessons Learnt	402
8.7	Conclusions and Future Directions	404
8.7.1	Further Research Questions	405
8.7.2	Implications for Policy and Practice	405
	Bibliography	408
<b>9</b>	<b>Creating Isolating Mechanisms</b>	<b>417</b>
	Sophie Reboud, Monique Moore, and Tim Mazzarol	
9.1	Introduction	417
9.2	What are Isolating Mechanisms?	418
9.3	Theoretical Framework—Why IMs are Important for ISF	
	Commercialisation	418
9.4	Factors Required to Create an Isolating Mechanism	421
9.4.1	What is an Isolating Mechanism?	421
9.5	Characteristics of Isolating Mechanisms	422
9.5.1	Imitability	422
9.5.2	Non-Transferability and Imperfect Mobility	423
9.5.3	Sustainability Over Time	423
9.6	Types of Isolating Mechanisms—Formal and Informal	423
9.6.1	Formal Isolating Mechanisms	424
9.6.2	When To Use Formal IMs	426
9.6.3	Challenges When Using Formal IMs	426
9.6.4	Informal Isolating Mechanisms	427
9.6.5	Blending Isolating Mechanisms	428
9.7	Martinot SA, the Role of Formal and Informal IMs in ISF	
	Commercialisation	430
9.7.1	Situation 1 “The Shop Keeper”—Martinot SA	
	Faces a Change	431
9.7.2	Situation 2 “The Salesman”—Martinot SA’s	
	Initial Intuitive Response	432
9.7.3	Situation 4 “The CEO”—Martinot SA’s New	
	Business Model	432
9.7.4	Identifying Martinot SA’s IMs	434
9.8	Conclusions and Lessons Learnt	436
9.9	Appendix A—Formal Isolating Mechanisms	439
9.10	Appendix B—Informal Isolating Mechanisms	440
	Bibliography	441
<b>10</b>	<b>Conclusions and Lessons Learnt</b>	<b>449</b>
	Tim Mazzarol and Sophie Reboud	
10.1	Introduction	449
10.2	Defining Commercialisation and ISFs	450
10.2.1	Defining the Commercialisation Process	451
10.2.2	Defining the ISF	452
10.3	Identifying and Screening Opportunities	459

10.3.1	Lessons From the Case Studies About Opportunity Screening .....	460
10.4	Business Models and the Commercialisation of Innovation ....	462
10.4.1	Lessons from the Case Studies About Business Model Design and Use .....	463
10.4.2	The Overall Value of Business Model Design to ISF Commercialisation .....	465
10.5	Managing the Uncertainty of the Commercialisation Process .....	466
10.5.1	Findings from the International Survey of ISFs .....	467
10.6	The Importance of Knowledge Management and Organisational Learning .....	469
10.6.1	What the Case Studies Suggest as to the Role of the Capabilities Architecture .....	471
10.7	Strategic Alliances for Commercialisation .....	472
10.7.1	What the Case Studies Show About the Value of Strategic Alliances to ISFs .....	474
10.8	Creating Isolating Mechanisms .....	475
10.8.1	What the Case Studies Show About the Value of IMs to ISFs .....	477
10.9	Overall, What Does Successful Commercialisation Look Like for ISFs? .....	478
10.9.1	Success for Ethique, Manta5, Rocket Lab, Memphasys and Skin Elements .....	479
10.9.2	Success for ThinkSmart and Martinot SA .....	480
10.9.3	Success for Scanalyse and Live Technologies .....	482
10.10	Final Conclusions .....	483
	Bibliography .....	484

## About the Authors

**Tim Mazzarol** is a Winthrop Professor at the University of Western Australia where his research focuses on entrepreneurship, innovation, small business management, marketing, strategy, commercialisation, and the co-operative and mutual enterprise business model. He is a Qualified Professional Researcher with the Australian Research Society, and the Coordinator of the Co-operative Enterprise Research Unit (CERU), at UWA. Tim is also the founder and Director of the Centre for Entrepreneurial Management and Innovation (CEMI), and a founder Director and Company Secretary of the Commercialisation Studies Centre (CSC) Ltd., a not-for-profit public company dedicated to encouraging best practice in commercialisation. He is also a Director and past president of the Small Enterprise Association of Australia and New Zealand (SEAANZ). He is the author of several books on entrepreneurship, small business management and innovation. His research into has been published internationally. He holds a Ph.D. in Management and an MBA with distinction from Curtin University of Technology, and a Bachelor of Arts with Honours from Murdoch University, Western Australia.

**Sophie Reboud** is professor of Entrepreneurship, Strategy and Management of Innovation at the Burgundy School of Business in Dijon, France, and an honorary Research Fellow at the University of Western Australia. She has twenty years of experience as a researcher and consultant in the field of management and strategy of small firms. Originally trained as an agronomist she served as a research engineer for École Nationale Supérieure des Mines de Paris for five years and completed her Ph.D. there. Sophie's research interests are in the strategic management of innovation and creativity. This includes firms in the food sector and low-tech industries with specific focus on intellectual property and strategy in small firms.

**Delwyn Clark** was a Professor of Strategic Management at the University of Waikato Management School, Hamilton, New Zealand until she retired in June 2021. For three decades her research agenda and teaching focussed on how to improve the performance and competitiveness of organisations. Specific research interests

included theoretical and applied projects on strategic management, innovation, and entrepreneurial processes. Her research leadership roles included serving as Associate Dean Research for fifteen years with responsibility for research policy development and Performance Based Research Fund (PBRF) processes. Delwyn received a Life Fellow Award from the Australian and New Zealand Academy of Management (ANZAM) in 2009 in recognition of her intellectual and service contributions.

**Monique Moore** is a Business Development Manager in the Research and Innovation Division of the University of Newcastle, Australia. She has recently completed a Ph.D. focusing on the intersection between business, law, and commercialisation of scientific discoveries at the University of Western Australia. She is a trained lawyer with a global industry experience in law and business, currently undertaking collaborative research with the Law School at the University of Newcastle, Australia researching emerging innovation in the legal industry.

**Peter Malone** is a doctoral student from the University of Western Australia completing his research thesis into innovation and commercialisation within innovative small firms, with specific focus on the Entrepreneurial Innovation Value (EIV) model that he has developed. His research is at the forefront of understanding commercialisation value in entrepreneurial SMEs. He is also an experienced entrepreneur who has successfully founded and commercialised numerous ventures. These includes his role as a founder director and Chair of Skin Elements Limited, a fast-growing biotech firm which formed one of the case studies used in this book. Peter is also Chair of the Commercialisation Studies Centre Ltd., a not-for-profit applied learning centre which he helped to found. He has 15 years' experience as a researcher and consultant in the fields of innovation and entrepreneurship having taught at the University of Western Australia, delivered presentations at Curtin University and the University of Notre Dame Australia. Peter holds in addition to current doctoral studies an MBA from the University of Western Australia and a Bachelor of Architecture from Curtin University.

**Geoffrey N. Soutar** is an Emeritus Professor at UWA, who retired in 2020. During his long career he held senior roles at Curtin University, Edith Cowan University (ECU) and UWA, and was Dean of the Business School at ECU. He was a Winthrop Professor and the Nancy Keegan and Don Voelte Distinguished Scholar in the UWA Business School, as well as a Fellow and Life Member of the Australian and New Zealand Academy of Management (ANZAM), and one of three Inaugural Fellows of the Australian and New Zealand Marketing Academy (ANZMAC). In 2015 he was granted ANZMAC's Distinguished Researcher Award and made a Fellowship in the Academy of the Social Sciences of Australia. He was the first business academic appointed to an expert panel of the Australian Research Council



(ARC). Professor Soutar has supervised more than 70 doctoral graduates to completion and has published more than 200 journal papers across a broad range of management and marketing areas, including in the fields of co-operative and mutual enterprises, consumer perception of value, personal values, service quality measurement, small business management and tourism. He was also a founder director of the Commercialisation Studies Centre (CSC) Ltd.

# List of Figures

Fig. 1.1	The key elements of commercialisation	22
Fig. 2.1	The commercialisation decision process of the innovative small firm	41
Fig. 2.2	Components of rent ( <i>Source</i> Mazzarol & Reboud, 2020a)	44
Fig. 2.3	Typology of configurations of anticipated innovation rent ( <i>Source</i> Mazzarol & Reboud, 2009)	46
Fig. 2.4	Leximancer concept map of the commercialisation literature relating to ISFs	61
Fig. 2.5	IDD market index	72
Fig. 2.6	IDD innovation index	73
Fig. 2.7	IDD Resources Index	74
Fig. 2.8	IDD strategy index	76
Fig. 2.9	IDD group average for international sample	77
Fig. 3.1	The SECI model of knowledge management ( <i>Source</i> Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995)	107
Fig. 3.2	The skin elements SECI model	126
Fig. 3.3	The Scanalyse SECI model	128
Fig. 3.4	The live technologies SECI model	130
Fig. 4.1	The Fuzzy Front End (FFE) in the process of discovery, NPD, and commercialisation ( <i>Source</i> Adapted from Koen et al., 2002)	155
Fig. 4.2	The New Concept Development (NCD) model ( <i>Source</i> Adapted from Koen et al., 2002)	157
Fig. 4.3	The New Product Development (NPD) process ( <i>Source</i> Mazzarol & Reboud, 2020)	160
Fig. 4.4	The Stage-Gate® process of spiral development ( <i>Source</i> Adapted from Cooper & Edgett, 2005)	162
Fig. 4.5	The Stage-Gate® process evolved ( <i>Source</i> Adapted from Cooper, 2019)	163
Fig. 4.6	The Customer Development (CD) model ( <i>Source</i> Adapted from Blank & Dorf, 2012)	164

Fig. 4.7	The House of Quality in QFD model ( <i>Source</i> Adapted from Griffin & Hauser, 1993) .....	168
Fig. 4.8	The integrated product definition framework ( <i>Source</i> Adapted from Cooper & Edgett, 2005) .....	168
Fig. 4.9	The KANO model analysis ( <i>Source</i> Adapted from Tan & Shen, 2000) .....	169
Fig. 4.10	The Voice of Customer CAGE model analysis ( <i>Source</i> Adapted from C2C Solutions, 2015) .....	170
Fig. 4.11	The product-technology development roadmap ( <i>Source</i> Mazzarol & Reboud, 2020) .....	173
Fig. 4.12	IDD Market Index and NPD success rates .....	176
Fig. 4.13	IDD Innovation Index and NPD success rates .....	177
Fig. 4.14	IDD Resource Index and NPD success rates .....	179
Fig. 4.15	IDD Strategy Index and NPD success rates .....	181
Fig. 5.1	The business model components and their relationships ( <i>Source</i> Adapted from Osterwalder, 2005) .....	203
Fig. 5.2	The Manta5 business model canvas .....	215
Fig. 5.3	The Ethique business model canvas .....	220
Fig. 5.4	The Rocket Lab business model canvas .....	225
Fig. 6.1	Managerial characteristics and task environment ( <i>Source</i> Mazzarol & Reboud, 2009) .....	248
Fig. 6.2	The effect of external risk perception on planning response ( <i>Source</i> Mazzarol & Reboud, 2009) .....	249
Fig. 6.3	The key elements of absorptive capacity .....	254
Fig. 6.4	The discovery stage for NPD ( <i>Source</i> Mazzarol and Reboud [2020], adapted from Cooper [2011] and Cooper and Edgett [2005]) .....	262
Fig. 6.5	The risk management process ( <i>Source</i> Adapted from White [1995] and Leopoulos et al. [2006]) .....	266
Fig. 6.6	Mapping technical risk vs. market risk ( <i>Source</i> Schnepple [2005] cited in Mazzarol and Reboud [2020]) .....	272
Fig. 6.7	The product portfolio categories in NPD commercialisation ( <i>Source</i> Adapted from Davis, 2002) .....	273
Fig. 7.1	Ansoff growth matrix ( <i>Source</i> Adapted from Ansoff, 1957) ....	307
Fig. 7.2	The role of social capital in ISF commercialisation and growth ( <i>Source</i> Adapted from Partanen et al., 2008) .....	324
Fig. 7.3	Timeline of the Skin Elements Ltd. case study .....	326
Fig. 7.4	Timeline of the Scanalyse case study .....	329
Fig. 7.5	Timeline of the Live Technologies case study .....	332
Fig. 7.6	The Sensing, Creating, Seizing, Transforming (SCST) model ( <i>Source</i> Teece, 2015) .....	350
Fig. 7.7	The evolved model of entrepreneurial innovation value (EIV) .....	351
Fig. 8.1	ISFs' perceived value of key contacts to strategic decision making in commercialisation .....	380

Fig. 8.2	Strategic alliance partner selection framework ( <i>Source</i> Adapted from Cummings & Holmberg, 2012) . . . . .	383
Fig. 9.1	Resources as isolating mechanisms in commercialisation ( <i>Source</i> Adapted from Alvarez & Barney, 2004) . . . . .	420
Fig. 9.2	The strategic situation and planning response matrix ( <i>Source</i> Mazzarol & Reboud, 2009) . . . . .	429

# List of Tables

Table 1.1	OECD, EU and IFC definitions of small firms .....	5
Table 1.2	Definitions of innovative, high growth and/or high tech small firms .....	7
Table 1.3	The small business concept and its antithesis, the anti-small business concept .....	9
Table 1.4	Typology of innovative small firms .....	11
Table 1.5	Typology of technology-based entrepreneurs .....	25
Table 2.1	The primary measures of potential rent .....	45
Table 2.2	Key considerations relating to the innovation .....	47
Table 2.3	Customer perceived benefits and sacrifices in adopting the innovation and their effects on sales volume .....	48
Table 2.4	Customer and supplier bargaining power their effects on rate of profit .....	50
Table 2.5	Substitution threats from technological and commercial risk .....	51
Table 2.6	Strategic decisions checklist in the commercialisation process of ISFs .....	52
Table 2.7	Options for commercialisation of new technologies by small firms when working with large firm partners .....	54
Table 2.8	Summary of previous published literature reviews addressing commercialisation .....	55
Table 2.9	Summary of the methodology used in the systematic review of the commercialisation literature relating to ISFs ....	57
Table 2.10	The most important themes and concepts in ISF commercialisation literature .....	59
Table 2.11	Comparison of the four ISF types of most important themes and concepts in ISF commercialisation literature .....	60
Table 3.1	Four types of innovation .....	95
Table 3.2	Company-specific factors influencing the decision to innovate .....	100
Table 3.3	Contextual factors influencing the decision to innovate .....	102

Table 3.4	Innovation specific factors influencing the decision to innovate .....	105
Table 4.1	Entrepreneurial discovery ( <i>alertness</i> ) key dimensions .....	148
Table 4.2	Entrepreneurial Orientation factors influence on opportunity screening within ISFs .....	154
Table 4.3	Difference between Fuzzy Front End (FFE) and the New Product Development (NPD) process .....	156
Table 4.4	The five elements of the NCD model .....	158
Table 4.5	The foundation principles of Stage-Gate® .....	161
Table 4.6	The key stages of the Customer Development (CD) process .....	165
Table 4.7	The eight key elements of the Voice of the Customer (VOC) model in Quality Function Deployment (QFD) .....	167
Table 4.8	The key elements of the VOC CAGE model .....	171
Table 4.9	Product-technology development roadmap common framework .....	173
Table 5.1	Business model components .....	204
Table 5.2	Business model patterns .....	209
Table 5.3	Awards received by Ethique and its founder .....	221
Table 6.1	Risk management in SMEs, summary of findings from a systematic literature review .....	244
Table 6.2	Informality over risk assessments and management—international survey of ISFs (n = 567) .....	257
Table 6.3	Resource scarcity—international survey of ISFs (n = 567) ...	259
Table 6.4	Determinants of new product success and evidence from ISF international survey .....	269
Table 6.5	NPVR—risk weighting by development category .....	276
Table 6.6	Market risk weighting assessment .....	276
Table 6.7	Technical risk weighting assessment .....	277
Table 6.8	User risk weighting assessment .....	277
Table 6.9	NPVR case example “New Category” product .....	278
Table 6.10	The key themes and concepts of the ISFs’ perception of potential risks within their market environment .....	281
Table 6.11	The key themes and concepts of the ISFs’ perception of potential risks within their innovation management .....	284
Table 6.12	The key themes and concepts of the ISFs’ perception of potential risks within their resource base .....	286
Table 6.13	The key themes and concepts of the ISFs’ perception of potential risks within their strategic management .....	290
Table 7.1	Assessment of the anticipated (potential) innovation rent—three case studies .....	337
Table 7.2	The Market Index—three case studies .....	341
Table 7.3	The Innovation Index—three case studies .....	343
Table 7.4	The Resource Index—three case studies .....	344
Table 7.5	The Strategy Index—three case studies .....	346

Table 7.6    Dynamic capabilities related paradigms ..... 349

Table 7.7    EIV analysis of all cases ..... 353

Table 8.1    Obtaining resources for commercialisation from strategic  
             alliances ..... 379

Table 8.2    Strategic alliance contracts—establishment, operating  
             and termination issues ..... 385

Table 8.3    Alliance capability conceptual framework ..... 389

Table 8.4    MEM case—historical timeline ..... 392

Table 9.1    Examples of formal and informal isolating mechanisms ..... 424

Table 9.2    Strategic Situations, points of attention and Isolating  
             Mechanisms ..... 430

Table 9.3    The change in the Martinot SA business model ..... 433

Table 10.1   The ISF cases used in the study ..... 454

# Chapter 1

## Innovation and Commercialisation in Small Firms



Tim Mazzarol

### 1.1 Introduction

Small Technology Firms (STFs) are currently facing increased competition characterised by product and market uncertainties, the internationalisation of markets, transfer of technologies and large amount of knowledge and information. In this environment, the ability of firms to rapidly create and commercialise new products has posed considerable challenges for the STFs. (Pellikka & Virtanen, 2009, p. 268)

Throughout the world most businesses are small, with the majority being single owner, non-employing, *nano* enterprises (OECD, 2016). These small firms are not only the most numerous of all businesses, but they also make a significant contribution to employment, value adding and, if adequately supported, innovation and commercialisation (OECD, 2010a). Despite their importance, small firms have been largely ignored by academic researchers, who have focused much of their attention on the rare and atypical high-growth firms that have been labelled as *Unicorns* or *Gazelles* (Aldrich & Reuff, 2018). This is particularly the case for innovation and commercialisation, where much of the focus has been on large firms, or the atypical high-growth and/or high-tech start-up ventures (Welter et al., 2017).

In addition to the lack of attention given to such firms by academic researchers, there are also problems in how government policy is formulated and implemented in relation to small firms. Governments have long been interested in stimulating their growth to increase job creation and economic prosperity since at least the 1980s (Birch, 1987). However, government policy relating to their innovation and commercialisation activities remains fragmented and underdeveloped due to a lack of any clear understanding of the challenges that such firms face.

Although *small to medium enterprises* (SMEs) comprise around 99% of all businesses, employ about two-thirds of the workforce and generate more than half the industry value added across most of the world's economies, the majority (70–95%) are nano or micro firms with either a single owner-manager (e.g., nano), or fewer



than 5–10 employees (e.g., micro) (OECD, 2010a, 2016). Further, most small firms do not seek to grow rapidly or create significant numbers of new jobs, and only a few are found in the high-tech or tech sector, which is itself poorly defined. An increasing view within academic researchers is that too much attention has been given to high-growth entrepreneurship. Indeed, as Acs et al. (2016, p. 16) note:

Few new firms enter to innovate, and very few entrepreneurs hire anyone except themselves and have no interest or ability to expand after creating a job for themselves. In conclusion, supporting people to become entrepreneurs would mostly support one-man, me-too shops in low-growth, low-margin industries where there is little, or no innovation undertaken.

Despite this rather dismal view of small firms as a potential engine room for innovation, economic and employment growth, their role within the *National Innovation System* (NIS) remains important. However, it is their potential that is of most significance, and that is the focus of this book. It is our view, based on the authors' experience as academics and entrepreneurs, that the latent potential of the small firm as a source of innovation and commercialisation remains largely untapped. This potential can be unlocked with appropriate attention to building the knowledge and networking capacity of their owners and managers. It can also be facilitated by targeted government support and focused academic research, across a wider base of entrepreneurial innovation and commercialisation in low, mid, and high-tech sectors, as well as including both products and services industries (Hirsch-Kreinsen et al., 2005; Reboud et al., 2014).

The ability to understand small firms, and how they engage with innovation and commercialisation, has been impeded by the lack of clear definition, not only as to what a *small firm* is, but also how to define and measure concepts such as *entrepreneurship*, *innovation*, and *commercialisation*. This chapter examines the nature of small firms and how they contribute to the NIS within their economies. It also addresses issues of definition and reviews the academic research that has been undertaken into small firm innovation and commercialisation. In doing so it outlines the research problem that this book sets out to address and provides a context for the chapters that follow.

### ***1.1.1 The Research Questions Guiding the Study***

A series of research questions guided the development of this book, and in this chapter and those that follow, we address these questions to provide insights into the way in which small firms undertake the process of commercialisation these questions are listed as follows:

1. What are the key attributes that define innovative small firms that engage in commercialisation?
2. What are the key attributes that define the commercialisation process?
3. What knowledge and motivation are needed to identify a potential opportunity?

4. What assessments should entrepreneurs make of an identified opportunity to decide whether it represents an opportunity for them specifically?
5. What influence does feedback from the exploitation of a current potential opportunity have on identification and assessment of subsequent potential opportunities?
6. What is the role of the business model in commercialisation of innovations by small firms?
7. What does the new product development (NPD), commercialisation pathway look like for innovators? and
  - a. How do they manage this commercialisation pathway?
  - b. What role do existing concepts, systems (e.g., StageGate®), play in facilitating this commercialisation pathway? and
  - c. How do SMEs address value identification and capture from their intellectual property assets?
8. What roles do organisational learning and capabilities play within the innovative small firm where resource scarcity is a key strategic consideration?
9. How important is knowledge management within the top management team and their key employees?
10. What is the importance of third-party networks and complementary actors?
11. What is the role of strategic alliances in successful commercialisation of ISFs?
  - a. What role do third party actors “innovation champions” play in the commercialisation process?
  - b. How important is their commitment to the commercialisation project to success?
  - c. How do SMEs seeking to commercialise, “de-risk” the project for such third-party actors?
12. What is the role of isolating mechanisms in commercialisation of innovations by small firms?
13. What does successful commercialisation look like for an innovative small firm?

## 1.2 What Are Small Firms?

In this book we have deliberately chosen to use the term *small firms* to describe the primary unit of analysis for our investigation, and the term *innovative small firm* (ISF). The challenge of defining what constitutes a small firm is surprisingly difficult and complex (Headd & Saade, 2008). One of the most common terms used is *small and medium enterprises* (SMEs), or more recently *micro, small, and medium enterprises* (MSMEs) (IFC, 2016; OECD, 2010a). However, there is no universally accepted definition of what a small firm is, nor is there agreement about the boundaries for SMEs or MSMEs (Kushnir et al., 2010; Storey, 1994; Tonge, 2001; Zhang, 2013). Indeed, the field of entrepreneurship and small business management remains

adversely affected by a lack of definition and measurement (Bouckennooghe et al., 2007; Nightingale & Coad, 2014; Tan et al., 2009). The most common measures used to define small firms are the number of people they employ, annual turnover, total assets, and whether they are independent in their ownership and operations, rather than being subsidiaries of larger organisations (ABS, 2005; ASIC, 2015; OECD, 2004).

### 1.2.1 *The Problems of Definition*

This lack of clarity over the definition of a small firm is important for several reasons. First, from a research perspective, unless the unit of analysis (e.g., the firm) can be appropriately defined, it is difficult to undertake any meaningful study from which comparisons can be made. For example, given the diversity found within the small firm sector, it is unlikely that all such firms will have the same characteristics, behaviour, problems, and needs. The number of employees the firm has, the industry it operates in, the level of innovation that it undertakes, and the characteristics and ambitions of its owners and senior managers are all important criteria. They are likely to determine what the firm will do, what problems it might face and the type of support it might need. Research into small firms in the United States, undertaken by the Small Business Administration (SBA), found mixing data on firms of different size, or type (e.g., employing versus non-employed), led to distorted results in relation to rates of growth, business structures, employment and ownership patterns and financing needs (Headd & Saade, 2008).

A second problem is the impact this lack of definition of the small firm has on government policy and regulation. How a small firm is defined influences how it is regulated and whether it will be subject to such things as taxes, compliance costs, workforce or labour laws, privacy and environmental regulations, or the receipt of government assistance (ASIC, 2015; Keefe et al., 2005; Productivity Commission, 2013). For example, a review of how federal government legislation impacts small firms within the United States, found that while small businesses were officially recognised in many federal statutes and programs, the definitions of what such a firm was varied widely. For example, within workplace and labour laws the criteria included employment, but with ranges from under 11 employees to under 100 employees. Within economic and financial laws, the criteria focused on a range of industry and annual turnover metrics. However, no common definition for *small business* was found (Keefe et al., 2005).

*The study concluded, ...* Given the wide range of thresholds that exist under different regulatory regimes, there is no simple answer to the question of how regulation impacts small business. The review raises an obvious question of how regulatory thresholds are determined and whether the threshold is appropriate or effective. (Keefe et al., 2005, p. 43)

A third problem relates to how academics and governments, have focused their attention onto small firms. Academics researching small firms, generally rely upon

**Table 1.1** OECD, EU and IFC definitions of small firms

	Employees	Annual turnover	Assets
<i>EU/OECD definitions</i>			
Micro-enterprise	1–9	<€2 million	<€2 million
Small enterprise	10–49	<€10 million	<€10 million
Medium-sized enterprise	50–249	<€50 million	< €43 million
Large enterprise	> 250	>€50 million	>€43 million
<i>IFC definitions</i>			
Micro-enterprise	1–9	<US \$100,000	<US \$100,000
Small enterprise	10–49	<US \$3 million	<US \$3 million
Medium-sized enterprise	50–299	<US \$15 million	<US \$15 million
Large enterprise	>300	>US \$15 million	>US \$15 million

Sources OECD (2004, 2010a), IFC (2012)

official government definitions and classification systems when defining what they are studying (Al-Qrim, 2005; Audretsch, 2002). As a result, the problems created by a wide range of definitions leads to potential confusion and problems of establishing the validity of research findings across jurisdictions and studies. Governments are aware of this issue and there has been some work done to develop greater consistency in how small firms are classified (IFC, 2012; OECD, 2004, 2010a; Zhang, 2013). For example, the European Union (EU), the Organisation of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), and the International Finance Corporation (IFC) have sought to provide standard definitions for small firms. These are outlined in Table 1.1, where measures of employment, annual turnover, and assets are used to classify firms into the micro, small, medium, and large categories.

However, while these measures—the EU/OECD definition—are becoming more common, the range of definitions used by governments remains diverse and problematic when seeking to undertake research. Perhaps more worrying, is that there appears to be a relative lack of concern within academic circles over how small firms are defined. For example, an examination of 217 research papers from 20 academic journals that specialise in entrepreneurship and small business management, found little consistency in how small firms were defined (Reboud et al., 2014). The most common (but not the majority) of papers used the EU/OECD definition. Employment was the most numerous markers for the definition, but this proved highly variable, ranging from under 9 employees to less than 791 employees. Sales turnover was less common, as were size and ownership structure, the age of the firm, and assets. A concern was the finding that a high proportion of papers (31%) did not provide any definition at all. This included research published in some of the best-regarded academic journals and seems to reflect either a rather cavalier approach to research by the authors, a lack of attention by reviewers and editors, and/or a lack of understanding of the importance of definition by all.

### 1.2.2 The Challenge of Defining the Innovative Small Firm

In addition to the problem of inadequate definition for small firms is the challenge of defining the nature of what an *innovative small firm* (ISF) is. Numerous titles have been given to firms that are innovative and growth oriented these include labels such as *Unicorns*, *Gazelles*, *Born Global*, *New Technology-based Firms*, and *Start-ups*. Table 1.2 lists several of the more common types of small, entrepreneurial, and innovative firms that have been the focus of academic research, popular media, and government policy in recent years.

The attention given to these specific types of small firms is due to their potential to generate significant returns to their investors, create employment, and make a major contribution to economic growth if they can successfully commercialise their innovations and scale-up. From a government policy perspective, interest in innovative and high-growth small firms can be traced back to the publication of a report *The Job Generation Process* (Birch, 1979). This longitudinal study of the 5.6 million American firms in the Dunn & Bradstreet database over the period 1969–1976 found that the primary driver of job generation were small firms rather than the large firms. This finding came at a time when the United States, like many of the world's advanced economies, was experiencing declining or stagnant economic growth and rising unemployment (Irvin, 2011).

Birch (1979) recommended that to stimulate employment growth, government policy should focus less on the large established firms, and more on small firms, start-ups, and self-employment, while encouraging immigration through targeted programs. Birch (1987) subsequently examined job creation data for the years 1981–1985 and found that firms with less than 20 employees generated around 88 % of all employment growth. He noted that most of this net-new job creation was being driven by a small number of high-growth firms he labelled *Gazelles*. However, Birch (1979) did caution that such firms were not only small and independent, but also highly volatile. As a result, it was difficult to predict the emergence of such firms and government policymakers were advised to go hunting for them with a rifle rather than a shotgun, reflecting the need for carefully targeted programs.

Birch's work has been criticised for lacking a strong theoretical foundation and having some methodological flaws (see, Davis et al., 1994; Tuerck, 1990). However, it captured the attention of governments seeking solutions to the high rates of unemployment and provided an impetus for research and public investment into new venture creation, small business, and entrepreneurship (Landström, 2005). Subsequent research has generally supported Birch's findings (e.g., Clayton et al., 2013; EDSE, 2016; Hendrickson et al., 2015; Neumark et al., 2011). *Gazelles* and high-growth firms are not only high-tech businesses, but can be found in all industry sectors, and are also quite rare, typically representing only 1%, or perhaps 3% of all firms (Hendrickson et al., 2015; OECD, 2010a). Yet such firms are typically innovative, growth-oriented, often export focused and good at exploiting their intellectual property (IP) assets, as well as being well-networked, and able to secure access to financial resources to facilitate their growth (OECD, 2010b). However, despite

**Table 1.2** Definitions of innovative, high growth and/or high tech small firms

Type of firm	Definition	Sources
Unicorns	Start-up businesses with a stock market value (or estimated value) of at least \$1 billion	Aldrich and Reuff (2018)
Gazelles	High-growth companies, particularly those that have increased their revenues by 20% or more annually over a period of four or more years	Birch (1987), Aldrich and Reuff (2018)
Born Global Firms	Small business that begins exporting within the first two years of foundation, export at least a quarter of total production, invest in value adding and are owned by founders who from the outset view global markets as their objective	Rennie (1993), Oviatt and McDougall (1994), Knight and Cavusgil (1996)
New Technology-Based Firms	A young, independently owned business less than 25 years old, based on the exploitation of an invention or technological innovation, led by founders who are willing to take substantial technological risks	Storey and Tether (1998), Patton and Higgs (2013)
High-Tech SMEs	Small firms that invest higher than average (typically more than 5%) of total annual turnover into R&D and employ a higher-than-average number of qualified scientists and engineers than other firms	Butchart (1987), Hirsch-Kreinsen et al. (2008), Reboud and Mazzarol (2017)
Entrepreneurial Start-Up	A business founded with a repeatable, scalable business model, specifically focused on growth, possessing strong innovation and commercialisation potential	Blank (2010), Stevens (2018)
Generic Start-Up	A new business, that is actively employing at least one person, and is independently owned and operated. Also, a business venture created to pursue and exploit an opportunity	Luger and Koo (2005), Drnovšek et al. (2010)