

## Internet Appendix A133: University Entrepreneurs

<b>Pitcher's Name</b>	Dinah Joesoef	FoR category		<b>Date Completed</b>	9 June 2016
<b>(A) Working Title</b>	The competing logics of university entrepreneurship collaborators in social sciences				
<b>(B) Basic Research Question</b>	How do competing logics shape collaborations during the research commercialisation process in social sciences?				
<b>(C) Key paper(s)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Jain, S., George, G., &amp; Maltarich, M. (2009). Academics or entrepreneurs? Investigating role identity modification of university scientists involved in commercialization activity. <i>Research Policy</i>, 38(6), 922-935.</li> <li>Pache, A.-C., &amp; Santos, F. (2013). Embedded in Hybrid Contexts: How Individuals in Organizations Respond to Competing Institutional Logics. <i>Research in the Sociology of Organizations</i>, 39B, 3-35.</li> <li>Reay, T., &amp; Hinings, C. R. (2009). Managing the rivalry of competing institutional logics. <i>Organization Studies</i>, 30(6), 629-652.</li> </ul>				
<b>(D) Motivation/Puzzle</b>	<p>In research commercialisation, collaboration is important to combine ideas and resources from different stakeholders such as academics, industry partners, and research commercialisation office staff. Each stakeholder has different motivations and goals, and approaches the collaboration from their own unique position, which may cause tensions. The stakeholders also bring their own institutional logic into collaboration, which compete and add to the tensions. Institutional logic is the way in which the behaviours of individuals are guided by the belief system and practices of their institutions (Friedland &amp; Alford, 1991). I was interested in social science collaborations between university and industry not only because it has received less attention than science, technology and engineering (Olmos-Peñuela, Castro-Martínez &amp; D'Este, 2014), but also because research commercialisation outputs from the social sciences disciplines differ from those of other disciplines (Leitch, Motion, Merlot, &amp; Davenport, 2014). Therefore the following questions arise. How do the stakeholders collaborate amid competing logics? How do stakeholders manage competing commercial and social dimensions? How do the social sciences context and the outputs from collaboration influence the strategies of the stakeholders?</p>				
<b>THREE</b>	<b>Three</b> core aspects of any empirical research project i.e. the "IDioTs" guide				
<b>(E) Idea?</b>	<p>With entrepreneurial activities, universities create economic value through the integration of scientific research, academic and commercialisation activities when academics cooperate with industry for research commercialisation or other entrepreneurial endeavours (Brennan &amp; McGowan, 2006; D'Este &amp; Perkmann, 2011; Etzkowitz, 2008; Rothaermel et al., 2007). For academics, disseminating their innovative research findings may include translating them into goods and services that can benefit the public. This study investigates collaborations between academics and other parties during this translation process. Prior studies mainly focus on organisational responses to competing logics, and less is known about the responses of individual academics. By directing attention to individuals inside organisations, how they develop workable solutions in spite of competing logics could be appreciated. Institutional logic can "explain connections that create a sense of common purpose and unity within an organizational field" (Reay &amp; Hinings, 2009, p. 629). This study draws on institutional logic principles to understand how stakeholders navigate competing logics that emerge during research commercialisation collaboration in social science disciplines.</p>				

<b>(F) Data?</b>	<p>The setting for this project was university spin-off companies that were established based on the research of social sciences academics from an Australian university. Data were collected in 2015. Two sources of data were used. The first was interviews with thirteen stakeholders from five spin-off companies including academics, industry partners, and research commercialisation officers. Participants were recruited using purposive sampling.</p> <p>The second was archival records on the research commercialisation companies and the stakeholders, including documents containing historical context for the establishment of each project, other publicly available documents from websites, university policies and procedures, and media reports. These documents were used to inform the researcher about the context of the companies, prepare the interviews, and to provide background information.</p>
<b>(G) Tools?</b>	<p>This study uses a case study design, using the data sources described above. Using a localist approach, the interviews were conducted as conversations where the researcher and participants discussed their specific experiences during commercialisation. The benefit of using the localist approach in semi-structured interviews was that the researcher could understand the participants' point of view more comprehensively by situating the participants' account within their social context (Qu &amp; Dumay, 2011).</p>
<b>TWO</b>	
<b>Two key questions</b>	
<b>(H) What's New?</b>	<p>The novelty of this study is that it provides a more explicit examination of institutional logic theory at the individual level. The focus of this research is research commercialisation in social science, which is not well understood. The strategies used by individuals in managing competing logics are distinctive due to the context of this study.</p>
<b>(I) So What?</b>	<p>One way to address challenges of reduced government funding and increased competition is for universities to include an economic mission such as becoming entrepreneurial. This mission of universities can be attained by collaborating with other stakeholders in research commercialisation. This study highlighted the strategies used by individuals to address the challenges in collaboration, providing references for potential collaborators and university leaders.</p>
<b>ONE</b>	
<b>One bottom line</b>	
<b>(J) Contribution?</b>	<p><i>Unique Contribution to theory</i> – Discussions on macrofoundations (behaviours of organisations) overwhelms the microfoundations (behaviours of individuals) of institutional theory (Pache &amp; Santos, 2013a; Powell &amp; Colyvas, 2008). This study attempts to redress this imbalance by focusing on individuals' logics during collaboration and their subsequent behaviours.</p> <p><i>Unique Contribution to practice &amp; policy</i> – University entrepreneurship has been researched frequently, but the strategies to mitigate the challenges in collaborations from individuals' perspectives have been seldom discussed. Moreover, a study on research commercialisation in the social sciences adds a more nuanced understanding of university entrepreneurship. Policy-makers, stakeholders, and potential collaborators are interested in strategies that can sustain collaboration. This study identifies the strategies used by the stakeholders to mitigate competing logics in social sciences spin-off companies, thus providing a guideline for policy-makers, stakeholders, and potential collaborators. In this study, the stakeholders generated a new logic to address competing logics and practised shared governance in their ongoing collaboration.</p>
<b>(K) Other Considerations</b>	<p>Targets Journals – Education and Training, Studies in Higher Education</p> <p>Risk – Low. Although there are many studies on university-industry engagement recently, I am not aware of anyone researching such a specialised topic.</p> <p>Ethical considerations are adhered to, and principles of anonymity, privacy and confidentiality applied.</p> <p>Scope – limitation may arise in selecting one university as the research setting</p>