Taylor & Francis
Online

Technology Analysis & Strategic Management ›
Volume 19, 2007 - Issue 6

2,746 Views | 174 CrossRef citations to date | 12 Altmetric

Original Articles

The Organization of Innovation Brokers: An International Review

Graham M. Winch & Roger Courtney

Pages 747-763 | Published online: 19 Nov 2007

Cite this article https://doi.org/10.1080/09537320701711223

Sample our
Economics, Finance,
Business & Industry Journals
>> Sign in here to start your access
to the latest two volumes for 14 days

Abstract

Research on networks of innovation has typically focused on relationships of competition and collaboration between firms in the network, sometimes extending the analysis to sources of new ideas such as universities. More recently, attention has been paid to the activities of intermediaries in such networks, which facilitate the innovation process, which are positioned between the sources and users of innovations. This paper focuses on the organization of a distinctive type of intermediary, which we have defined as an innovation broker, by providing an analysis of 10 case studies of organizations dedicated to innovation broking from around the world. Innovation brokers in our definition are organizations that are founded especially to undertake an intermediary role, rather than performing that role as a by-product of their principal activities. The results of this analysis suggest that the key role played by innovation brokers in the innovation process is the independent validation of new ideas, thereby facilitating diffusion. In order to carry out this task, innovation brokers are organized on

a not-for-profit basis, typically as a public–private partnership. The paper concludes by discussing the implications of the findings for innovation theory and research in networks of innovation.

Notes

1. D. J. Brass, J. Galaskiewicz, H. R. Greve & W. Tsai, Taking stock of networks and organizations: a multilevel perspective, Academy of Management Journal, 47, 2004, pp. 795–817; A. B. Hargadon, How Breakthroughs Happen (Boston, Harvard Business School Press, 2003); E. M. Rogers, The Diffusion of Innovations, 5th edn (New York, Simon and Schuster, 2003).

2. G. Ahuja, Collaboration networks, structural holes, and innovation: a longitudinal study, Administrative Science Quarterly, 45, 2000, pp. 425–455; P.-H. Soh & E. B. Roberts, Networks of innovators: a longitudinal perspective research policy, 32, 2003, pp. 1569–1588.

3. R. S. Burt, The social structure of competition, in: N. Nohria & R. G. Eccles (eds.), Networks and Organizations (Boston, Harvard Business School Press, 1992).

4. M. S. Granovetter, The strength of weak ties, American Journal of Sociology, 78, 1973, pp. 1360–1380; M. S. Granovetter, The strength of weak ties: a network theory revisited in: P. V. Marsden & N. Lin (eds.), Social Structure and Network Analysis (Beverly Hills CA, Sage, 1982).

5. J. Howells, Intermediation and the role of intermediaries in innovation, Research Policy, 35, 2006, pp. 715–728.

6. Although the term innovation broker would appear to be generic, it has not previously been used to describe intermediaries in innovation systems and networks; Howells, op. cit., Ref. 5.

7. J. Bessant & H. Rush, Building bridges for innovation: the role of consultants in technology transfer, Research Policy, 24, 1995, pp. 97–114; E. Muller & A. Zenker, Business services as actors of knowledge transformation: the role of KIBS in regional and national innovation systems, Research Policy, 30, 2001, pp. 1501–1516; G. M.

Winch & E. Schneider, Managing the knowledge-based organisation; the case of architectural practice, Journal of Management Studies, 30(6), 1993, pp. 923–937.

8. Howells, op. cit., Ref. 5.

9. D. Gann, Building Innovation: Complex Constructs in a Changing World (London, Thomas Telford, 2000); M. Miozzo & P. Dewick, Building competitive advantage: innovation and corporate governance in European construction, Research Policy, 31, 2002, pp. 989–1008; M. Miozzo & P. Dewick, Innovation and networks: benefits from inter-firm co-operation in a fragmented industry, International Journal of Technology Management, 27, 2004, pp. 68–92; M. Miozzo & P. Dewick, Innovation in Construction: A European Analysis (Cheltenham, Edward Elgar, 2004); G. M. Winch, Zephyrs of creative destruction: understanding the management of innovation in construction,Building Research and Information, 26, 1998, pp. 268–279.

10. A. Manseau & G. Seaden, (eds.), Innovation in Construction: An International Review of Public Policies (London, Spon, 2001).

11. C. Freeman, Networks of innovators: a synthesis, Research Policy, 20, 1991, pp. 499–514.

12. Rogers, op. cit., Ref. 1.

13. W. W. Powell, K. W. Koput & L. Smith-Doerr, Interorganizational collaboration and the locus of innovation: networks of learning in biotechnology, Administrative Science Quarterly, 41, 1996, pp. 116–145.

14. J. Owen-Smith & W. W. Powell, Knowledge networks as channels and conduits: the effects of spill-overs in the Boston biotechnology community, Organization Science, 15, 2004, pp. 5–21.

15. G. M. Winch, Managing complex connective processes: innovation broking, in: A. Manseau & R. Shields (eds.), Building Tomorrow: Innovation in Construction and Engineering (London, Ashgate Press, 2005).

16. R. V. Gould & R. M. Fernandez, Structures of mediation: a formal approach to brokerage in transaction networks, Sociological Methodology, 19, 1989, pp. 89–126.

17. It is not clear from the texts why the nomenclature changes. Knowledge broker is retained here because it would appear to be more generic and capture the broader

range of cases presented.

18. A. B. Hargadon, Firms as knowledge brokers: lessons in continuous innovation, California Management Review, 40, 1998, pp. 209–227; A. B. Hargadon, Brokering knowledge; linking learning and innovation, Research in Organizational Behavior, 24, 2002, pp. 41–85.

19. A. B. Hargadon & R. I. Sutton, Technology brokering and innovation in a product development firm, Administrative Science Quarterly, 42, 1997, pp. 716–749; Hargadon, op. cit., Ref. 1.

20. A. B. Hargadon & Y. Douglas, When innovations meet institutions: Edison and the design of electric light, Administrative Science Quarterly, 46, 2001, pp. 476–501; T. P. Hughes, Networks of Power: Electrification in Western Society 1880–1930 (Baltimore, John Hopkins University Press, 1983).

21. Burt, op. cit., Ref. 3.

22. Hargadon, op. cit., Ref. 18.

23. F. Kodama, Technology fusion and the new R&D, Harvard Business Review, July–August, 1992, pp. 70–78.

24. L. Rosenkopf & M. L. Tushman, Community Organization and Technological Evolution: Inter-organizational Cooperation over the Technology Cycle (Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania, 1994); L. Rosenkopf & M. L. Tushman, The coevolution of community networks and technology: lessons from the flight simulation industry, Industrial and Corporate Change, 7, 1998, pp. 311–346; L. Rosenkopf, A. Metiu & G. P. Varghese, From the bottom up? Technical committee activity and alliance formation, Administrative Science Quarterly, 46, 2001, pp. 748–772.

25. H. Aldrich, Organizations and Environments (Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice-Hall, 1978).

26. Rosenkopf & Tushman, 1998, op. cit., Ref. 24, figure 1.

27. R. Miller, M. Hobday, T. Leroux-Demers & X. Olleros, Innovation in complex systems industries; the case of flight simulators, Industrial and Corporate Change, 4, 1995, pp. 363–400.

28. Miller et al., op. cit., Ref. 27, p. 383.

29. Soh & Roberts op. cit., Ref. 2.

30. Soh & Roberts, op. cit., Ref. 29, p. 1578.

31. M. Hobday, Product complexity, innovation and industrial organization, Research Policy, 26, 1998, pp. 689–710.

32. Winch, op. cit., Ref. 9.

33. Rosenkopf & Tushman, 1998, op. cit., Ref. 24; Rosenkopf et al., op. cit., Ref. 24; Soh & Roberts, op. cit., Ref. 29.

34. Hargadon & Douglas, op. cit., Ref. 20; see also Hughes, op. cit., Ref. 20 and Hargadon, op. cit., Ref. 1.

35. Hargadon & Sutton, op. cit., Ref. 1; Hargadon, 2002, op. cit., Ref. 18.

36. Owen-Smith & Powell, op. cit., Ref. 14.

37. Howells, op. cit., Ref. 5.

38. Granovetter, 1982 op. cit., Ref. 4.

39. Howells, op. cit., Ref. 5.

40. The co-ordination of this international task group was funded by the UK's Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (award no. GR/R18734/01) and undertaken by the authors.

41. Rosenkopf & Tushman, 1998, op. cit., Ref. 24.

42. Hargadon & Sutton, op. cit., Ref. 19.

43. D. Gann, Putting academic ideas into practice: technological progress and the absorptive capacity of construction organizations, Construction Management and Economics, 19, 2001, pp. 321–330.

44. B.-Å., Lundvall, B. Johnson, E. S. Andersen & B. Dalum, National systems of production, innovation and competence-building, Research Policy, 31, 2002, pp. 213–231.

45. J. Bröchner & B. Grandinson, R&D Cooperation by Swedish contractors, Journal of Construction Engineering and Management, 118, 1992, pp. 3–16.

46. R. Courtney, Building research establishment—past, present and future, Building Research and Information, 25, 1997, pp. 285–291.

47. Freeman, op. cit., Ref. 11.

48. M. Porter, The Competitive Advantage of Nations (New York, Macmillan1990).

49. Hargadon & Sutton, op. cit., Ref. 19.

50. G. M. Winch, Institutional reform in British construction: partnering and private finance, Building Research and Information, 28, 2000, pp. 141–155.

51. Winch, op. cit., Refs 9 and 15.

52. Hargadon & Sutton, op. cit., Ref. 19.

53. G. Seaden, The future of national construction research organizations, Building Research and Information, 25, 1997, pp. 250–256.

54. Gould & Fernandez, op. cit., Ref. 16.

55. Winch, op. cit., Ref. 50.

56. R. E. Rice & E. M. Rogers, Reinvention in the innovation process, Knowledge: Creation, Diffusion, Utilization, 1, 1980, pp. 499–514.

57. Rosenkopf & Tushman, 1998, op. cit., Ref. 24.

58. Soh & Roberts, op. cit., Ref. 29.

59. Rosenkopf et al., op. cit., Ref. 24.

60. Powell et al., op. cit., Ref. 13; Owen-Smith & Powell, op. cit., Ref. 14.

61. Rosenkopf et al., op. cit., Ref. 24.

62. Ahuja, op. cit., Ref. 2.

63. Burk, op. cit., Ref. 3; Granovetter, op. cit., Ref. 4.

64. S. R., Barley, J. Freeman & R. C. Hybels, Strategic alliances in commercial biotechnology, in: N. Nohria & R. G. Eccles (eds.), Networks and Organizations (Boston, Harvard Business School Press, 1992); Powell et al., op. cit., Ref. 13.

65. L. C. Freeman, Centrality in social networks: conceptual clarification, Social Networks, 1, 1978, pp. 205–239.

66. D. Krackhardt, The strength of strong ties: the importance of philos in organizations, in: N. Nohria & R. G. Eccles (eds.), Networks and Organizations (Boston, Harvard Business School Press, 1992).

67. Manseau & Seaden, op. cit., Ref. 10.

68. Seaden, op. cit., Ref. 53.

69. Miozzo & Dewick, op. cit., Ref. 9.

Related research

People also read | Recommended articles | Cited by 174

Orchestrating innovation networks: The case of innovation brokers in the agri-food sector

Maarten H. Batterink et al.
Entrepreneurship & Regional Development
Published online: 27 Jan 2010

Who Are the Knowledge Brokers in Regional Systems of Innovation? A Multi-Actor Network Analysis

Martina Kauffeld-Monz et al.
Regional Studies
Published online: 5 Jul 2010

Information for

Authors

R&D professionals

Editors

Librarians

Societies

Open access

Overview

Open journals

Open Select

Dove Medical Press

F1000Research

Opportunities

Reprints and e-prints

Advertising solutions

Accelerated publication

Corporate access solutions

Help and information

Help and contact

Newsroom

All journals

Books

Keep up to date

Register to receive personalised research and resources by email

Sign me up

Copyright © 2026 Informa UK Limited Privacy policy

Cookies Terms & conditions Accessibility

Registered in England & Wales No. 01072954
5 Howick Place | London | SW1P 1WG

Taylor & Francis by informa