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• What are Global Innovation Networks?
  – Empirically
  – Theoretically

• The dominance of MNCs in:
  – The increasing globalisation of innovation
  – The increasing networkedness of innovation

• Reasons to expect MNCs to dominate GINs – or not

• What the evidence suggests
A GIN definition

- A globally organized network of interconnected and integrated functions and operations by firms and non-firm organizations engaged in the development or diffusion of innovations
What is happening?

• The apparent “end point” of globalisation is the emergence of GINs (Global Innovation Networks)
  – Firms do not only sell or produce across the globe, but also innovate globally
  – Moreover, they do this by drawing on a rich network of partners (both firms and non-firms like business schools, research institutes etc)
The globalisation of innovation

• Innovation is driven by
  • Increases in technological advances
  • Accelerating cycles of customer preferences
• A global dispersion of first production and increasingly innovation has resulted from
  • A scarcity of skilled resources
  • The need to tap into specialised expertise
• This process has been driven by established MNCs with their extensive reach
G + I + N = GIN?

• Do GINs represent the deepening of existing trends – where established MNCs continue to spearhead the evolution into GINs, given the increasing importance of globalisation and networkedness?

AND/OR

• Do GINs represent a new form of organisation where established MNCs may not be lead players?
### Methodology - survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>ICT</th>
<th>Auto</th>
<th>Agro</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td></td>
<td>69 (25.9%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>243 (2.7%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>324 (25.2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>84 (16.9%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL emerging markets</strong></td>
<td>567</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td></td>
<td>49 (23.3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>17 (14%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td>53 (4.7%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>181 (11.9%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>171 (10.3%)</td>
<td>24 (14.3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL developed countries</strong></td>
<td>369</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ALL</strong></td>
<td>936</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>1215</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For the three concepts (Global, Innovative and Networked), relevant questions in the survey were identified.

Each instance was scored relative to the other instances in the dataset. A formula was specified to give each instance in the dataset a continuous value greater than or equal to 0. This value was divided by the maximum value in the dataset, so that each instance had a continuous score between 0 and 1.

Scores were displayed on a scatter plot, and a combination of cluster analysis and inspection of the scatter plot used to identify the cut-off point between categories.
Three levels

- G / I / N – **TRULY** global / innovative / networked
- g / i / n – **somewhat** global / innovative / networked
- * / * / * – **not at all** global / innovative / networked

- Mathematically 27 (3x3x3) possible combinations e.g. giN or *In
- If theoretically driven, should have fewer
Some characteristics of gIn

- All industries
- European firms best represented
  - Drawing on rich institutional context
- Small firms (less than 50 employees)
- Standalone firms
- Little evidence of harvesting value
Global asset exploiters, Global Networkers & Networkers

85.68% Global networkers

3.13% Global asset exploiters

4.36% 1.32% 0.33% Networkers

0.58% 2.96%
Some characteristics of Gin, GiN & giN

• All industries
• Large firms – more than 1000 employees
• Mainly MNCs
  – European MNCs well represented among Gins – Global asset exploiters and giNs – non-global networkers
  – Emerging MNCs more likely to be GiNs – Global networkers
• Fairly traditional model – exploiting your locally developed capabilities abroad
Strong-form GINs
(15 out of 1215 firms in 9 countries)

85.68% Strong form GINs

G: 3.13%
N: 1.65%
I: 2.96%

4.36% 1.32% 0.58%
Some characteristics of GIN

• Not auto with its tiered hierarchy – but ICT and agro
• Between 50 and 1000 employees
  – Large enough to need to access resources globally
  – Small enough to manage that complex process
• Equal split between stand-alone firms and subsidiaries (of both established and emerging MNCs)
  – ALL located in developing countries rather than Europe
GINs – a dual emergence

• It seems that GINs are emerging from two quite different processes
  – Advanced MNCs (mainly from the US) are deepening the trend to innovate through increasingly global and increasingly networked processes
  – Players from emerging markets (sometimes emerging MNCs, but sometimes not) are developing capabilities in the creation and management of global networks to compensate for institutional limitations, e.g. skills shortages
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