IPDMC 2020
Abstract Submission Template

Please read carefully and adhere strictly to the GUIDELINES before uploading your submission!

1 - Abstracts containing author's information will be automatically deleted from the system.
2 - The Conference Track must be selected when submitting.
3 - Number of words of the abstract: +/- 500 words in total *(A list of central references used in the submitted abstract can be added to the 500 words)*
4 - Only pdf files are accepted
5 - Save the file and upload it in the system *(see web site : Call for papers section)*

Title:

How to create disruptive innovations? A look at the tactics level of various entrepreneurial methods

- Your abstract should cover some of the points listed below, depending on your type of research/study/ contribution:

- Objectives and theoretical and practical relevance
- Brief literature mapping and key references
- Theoretical development/research model/research questions
- Approach/Method
- Data/Findings
- Conclusion and contribution to the field
- Managerial implications

Disruption innovation (DI) as a process, has been addressed recently in the literature (Kumaraswamy et al., 2018). So far it is understood that companies disrupting and pioneering business models imply time (Snihur et al., 2018), and adaptation to other variables that influence the process, like the ecosystem particularities (Shazad et al., 2015), the incumbent's resilience (Cozzolino et al., 2018), and the collaboration

strategies (O'Reilly and Binns, 2019). Lately, Palmié (2020) determined three evolution stages for DI, finding that entrants at the early stage start to grow faster and gain legitimacy. The disruptor growth is due to its exploitation and adaptation capabilities (Ozalp et al., 2018), that prevails at that pace until the end of the second stage (Palmié et al., 2020).

Most of this literature is incumbent oriented focusing on how they can benefit from newcomers and compete with them (Christensen et al., 2018; Kammerlander et al., 2018). Previous scholars have analyzed the entrant perspective (Ozalp et al., 2018; Zietsma et al., 2018), finding that disruptors play different roles to face ecosystem tensions to re-define their entrepreneurial journeys (Shazad et al., 2015), but the disruptor's effort involved is still blurred (Yu and Hang, 2011). For instance, Berglund (2017) claims on more entrepreneurial action understandings on the disruptor's changes over the process, especially within its ecosystem particularities (Palmié et al., 2020). These claims are especially important, considering the DI role for economic growth (Hart and Christensen, 2002), and poverty reduction (Corsi and Di Minin, 2014; Si et al., 2015).

The goal of the presented research is to understand what entrepreneurs do to speed up the evolution process in the first's stages. We designed a case-based study (Goffin et al., 2019) around four startups that could be ideal candidates for DI, following a rigorous selection on the business model characteristics (Cozzolino et al., 2018; Hang et al., 2015; Yu and Hang, 2011), and their current position within the industry (Palmié et al., 2020; Renard and Hallam, 2018; Snihur et al., 2018).

Our findings suggest, that, in early stage's, startups change their innovation process thanks to an adaptation of practices coming from entrepreneurial methods and their

competitor's practices, that is strongly influenced by the founder background. Lter, they speed up the innovation process to compete aggressively for market share and venture capitalists. However, this second step is taken twofold: First, by adding or substituting some practices from methods with a higher experimental activity; and secondly by going out of the line, resulting with the creation of an organic and faster methodology that represents low cost.

We conclude with an identification of disruptor's practices during the process evolution within different industries. This research present theoretical and managerial contributions. We contribute tothe disruptor dilemma literature by reducing the gap between theory and practice through entrepreneurial action lens. The managerial contribution is given to entrepreneurs, to provide future guide in practical execution.

References

Berglund, H., Sandstrom, C., 2017. A new perspective on the innovator's dilemma - exploring the role of entrepreneurial incentives. Int. J. Technol. Manag. 75, 142–156. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJTM.2017.10006144

Christensen, McDonald, R., Altman, E., Palmer, J., 2018. Disruptive Innovation: An Intellectual History and Directions for Future Research. J. Manag. Stud. 55, 1043–1078. https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12349

Corsi, S., Di Minin, A., 2014. Disruptive Innovation ... in Reverse: Adding a Geographical Dimension to Disruptive Innovation Theory. Creat. Innov. Manag. 23, 76–90. https://doi.org/10.1111/caim.12043

Cozzolino, A., Verona, G., Rothaermel, F.T., 2018. Unpacking the Disruption Process: New Technology, Business Models, and Incumbent Adaptation. J. Manag. Stud. 55, 1166–1202. https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12352

Goffin, K., Åhlström, P., Bianchi, M., Richtnér, A., 2019. Perspective: State-of-the-Art: The Quality of Case Study Research in Innovation Management. J. Prod. Innov. Manag. 36, 586–615. https://doi.org/10.1111/jpim.12492

Hang, C.C., Garnsey, E., Ruan, Y., 2015. Opportunities for disruption. TECHNOVATION 39–40, 83–93. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2014.11.005

Hart, S., Christensen, C., 2002. The great Leap: Driving innovation from the base of the pyramid. MIT Sloan Manag. Rev. 51–56.

Kammerlander, N., Koenig, A., Richards, M., 2018. Why Do Incumbents Respond Heterogeneously to Disruptive Innovations? The Interplay of Domain Identity and Role Identity. J. Manag. Stud. 55, 1122–1165. https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12345

Kumaraswamy, A., Garud, R., Ansari, S. (Shaz), 2018. Perspectives on Disruptive Innovations. J. Manag. Stud. 55, 1025–1042. https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12399

O'Reilly, C., Binns, A.J.M., 2019. The Three Stages of Disruptive Innovation: Idea Generation, Incubation, and Scaling. Calif. Manage. Rev. 000812561984187. https://doi.org/10.1177/0008125619841878

Ozalp, H., Cennamo, C., Gawer, A., 2018. Disruption in Platform-Based Ecosystems.

Palmié, M., Wincent, J., Parida, V., Caglar, U., 2020. The evolution of the financial technology ecosystem: An introduction and agenda for future research on disruptive innovations in ecosystems. Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change 151. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2019.119779

Renard, S., Hallam, C., 2018. Technology shocks and the restructuring of an industry: A social network analysis application for the music business. Int. J. Technol. Intell. Plan. 12, 152–172. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJTIP.2018.096106

Shazad, A., Raghu, G., Arun, K., 2015. The disruptor dilemma: Tivo and the U.S. television ecosystem. Strateg. Manag. J. 37, 1829–1853. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj

Si, S., Yu, X., Wu, A., Chen, Shouming, Chen, Song, Su, Y., 2015. Entrepreneurship and poverty reduction: A case study of Yiwu, China. Asia Pacific J. Manag. 32, 119–143. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10490-014-9395-7

Snihur, Y., Thomas, L.D.W., Burgelman, R.A., 2018. An Ecosystem-Level Process Model of Business Model Disruption: The Disruptor's Gambit. J. Manag. Stud. 55, 1278–1316. https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12343

Yu, D., Hang, C.C., 2011. Creating technology candidates for disruptive innovation: Generally applicable R&D strategies. TECHNOVATION 31, 401–410. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2011.02.006

Zietsma, C., Ruebottom, T., Shantz, A.S., 2018. Unobtrusive Maintenance: Temporal Complexity, Latent Category Control and the Stalled Emergence of the Cleantech Sector. J. Manag. Stud. 55, 1242–1277. https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12350