

Innovation Networks in Different Industrial Settings; From Flexible to Smart Specialization

Håkan Ylinenpää*, Jukka Teräs† and Daniel Örtqvist[‡]

Ver 2010-05-03

* Professor of Luleå University of Technology/CiiR; Entrepreneurship & Innovation, SE 971 87 Luleå, Sweden (corresponding author; hakan.ylinenpaa@ltu.se)

† Senior Researcher at University of Turku, Dept. of Economic Geography, 20014 Turku University, Finland

[‡] Professor of Luleå University of Technology/CiiR; Entrepreneurship & Innovation, SE 971 87 Luleå, Sweden

INTRODUCTION

A growing interest in the region as a base for economic organization and political intervention has been eminent in recent decades of research within economic geography and regional development. Many studies have documented how rapid technological change and increased capital mobility have influenced the competitiveness and attractiveness of regions (see for instance Amin & Thrift, 1995; Tödtling, 2012). Renewal through innovation has been a suggested remedy for coping with changing demands. Many studies, not least in regional development, have moreover postulated that innovation is a necessity for keeping organizations and regions resilient to fluctuations in markets and to increased competition. To build networks for the purpose of developing new innovative products, services and/or organisational solutions/processes is, in a time when open innovation, outsourcing and innovation systems are honoured, an often occurring theme in research. The configuration of such an innovative strategic network is normally understood as conscious management initiatives based on enlightened individuals employing functional strategies. In this study we argue, however, that innovative configurations to a significant degree are path-dependent and result in innovation systems that are very different depending on what sector of industry and business that is in focus. It may e.g. be suggested that patterns and modes for innovative collaboration in traditional basic industries as compared to ditto's in more recently founded hi-tech industries are different. This assumption also represents the first research challenge for this study.

A second research challenge is then to discuss the consequences of such an assumption. A highly honoured concept in today's European policy is to support and foster regions to develop a smart specialization strategy, meaning specializing in one or a few strong regional industries or knowledge bases. While the concept of smart specialization speaks in favour of

developing and exploiting a regional focus, voices are also raised in favour of regional policies that strive for diversification preventing the risk of regional lock-in effects (cf. Essletzbichler 2007 or Bishop 2009). Employing diversification rather than focus promotes organizational/regional resilience and counteracts the risk of regional lock-in effects, but also includes the risk of becoming “stuck in the middle” without any real possibilities to develop a regional and company-based competitive advantage. Moreover, it should be noted that there is no “ideal model” for innovation policy as innovation activities differ strongly between central, peripheral and old industrial areas (Tödting & Trippel 2005, Asheim, Boschma & Cooke 2011). Building on longitudinal studies of two Nordic regions spanning over 25 years, the purpose of this paper is to address the challenges for an innovative regional development in optimizing the level of regional specialization by developing innovative networks linked to the region. Based on an explorative approach we especially question how a focus on specialization influences resilience and lock-in effects in regions. We also question which consequences such a strategy implies regarding modes for and support to innovative networking.

MANAGING PATH DEPENDENCY AND INNOVATIVE COLLABORATION

Michael Hannan and John Freeman – often referred to as fathers of the population ecology approach – have suggested that organisational development could be regarded as a result of a struggle for survival, where the organisations we see around us are the survivors of past processes of organisational founding and dissolution (Hannan & Freeman 1989). With its roots in Darwinistic thinking, evolution then becomes a process driven by natural selection where organisations with specific resources and expertise which make them well adapted to their environment develop and prosper, while generalist organisations without any organisational specialities normally face much tougher survival conditions (Hannan & Freeman 1977). This kind of basic thinking – developed further by Nelson and Winter (1982) – has had a significant impact on research addressing organisational innovation (see e.g. Tushman & Andersson 1986; Gersick 1991; or Romanelli & Tushman 1994; Metcalfe 1998) and to some extent in studies on regional development (St-Jean, LeBel & Audet, 2010).

Recognizing the relevance of evolutionary processes is also a prominent characteristic of research related to innovation and innovation networks and systems, e.g. research on regional innovation systems (e.g. Asheim, Boschma & Cooke 2011), sectoral innovation systems (e.g. Malerba 2005), technological innovation systems (e.g. Carlsson & Stankiewicz 1991) or development blocks (Dahmén 1950, 1984). To understand the development of an innovation system as an evolutionary endeavour means that the evolutionary process in itself is in focus. To develop research that addresses the evolutionary processes in play when innovation systems emerge and develop is however a challenge that still occupies researchers in the field, e.g. referring to the importance and role of path dependency in these kinds of evolutionary processes and the emergence of different kinds of innovative systems and constellations.

The fact that collaborative network structures may take different forms is not any new nor revolutionary insight, and was a theme already in Annalee Saxenian's classic study on culture and competition in Silicon Valley and Route 128 (Saxenian 1994). While the industrial cluster in Boston area was characterized by vertical integration where information exchange between independent and self-reliant partnering organizations was closed and non-transparent, similar clusters in the Bay Area was by Saxenian depicted as porous networks collaborating on the basis of specialized expertise, and where intended and unintended knowledge spill-overs were common. In a more recent study, Phil Cooke and Loet Leydesdorff (2006) advocated the idea that innovative network configurations in the US and other Anglo-American economies are different from innovative networks in countries such as the Nordic countries and Germany, and where the former was characterized as entrepreneurial regional innovation systems (ERIS) and the latter as institutional regional innovation systems (IRIS). The first-mentioned system is characterized as an entrepreneurial innovation system which due to its lack of well-developed and established institutional systems instead relies on individual actors dressed as entrepreneurs, venture capitalists/business angels, researchers, incubators and demanding pioneering customers for developing innovations primarily on the basis of analytical and research-based knowledge. The latter variant – the institutional innovation system – is developing and exploiting synthetic, engineering-based knowledge and building on a close collaboration between structures for production, knowledge development, and institutional frameworks.

There hence seems to be evidence for the understanding that network configurations may differ depending on geography and location; an understanding further underlined by Michael Porter's cluster concept and Richard Florida's concept of "the creative class" and its preferences for specific hot spots (Porter 1998; Florida 2005). It may however also be suggested that patterns and modes for innovative collaboration in traditional basic industries, as compared to ditto's in more recently founded hi-tech industries, are different regarding hierarchy, network centrality, confidentiality and openness (Mort & Weerawardena 2006; Heidenreich 2009). In traditional industries collaboration may hence be expected to be characterised by high density and strict hierarchy where the top of the hierarchy also show high degree of network centrality. In such settings there are strong links between partners securing confidentiality and long-term relations. Decision-making is in these industries based on the need for planning and control ("causation" in the wordings of Saras Sarasvathy, 2001). In more recent and high-tech oriented industrial configurations geared towards innovation, on the other hand, relations are typically not as dense and the hierarchies are not that pronounced. These settings sometimes include several rudimentary partners possessing similar resources and expertise and are often characterised by weak and only occasionally salient partners. Decision-making is founded on the logic of taking action based on available or accessible resources ("effectuation"; Sarasvathy 2001). As a consequence of these basic differences, the innovative systems configured by actor networks are very different. While collaborative configurations aiming for innovation in

more traditional basic industries normally reveal similarities with institutional innovation systems (IRIS; Cooke and Leydesdorff 2006), corresponding collaborative configurations in modern high-tech industries such as ICT and biotech best are understood as entrepreneurial innovation systems (ERIS; *ibid.*).

In an overview of network-based research in entrepreneurship, Hoang and Antoncic (2003) distinguish between three essential components of networks: (1) the content of the relationships; (2) the governance of these relationships; and (3) the structure or pattern that emerges from the crosscutting ties. In the construct of *content* they include those relationships that offer actors access to resources held by other actors (e.g. physical or immaterial resources such as information, advice or image/reputation). By *governance mechanisms* they understand means of coordinating or leading network collaboration in terms of trust, contracts, power relations and hierarchy. Their third construct (*network structure*) emanates from network theory and includes different measures related to network positioning, size and structure (centrality, structural holes, interfaces/bridges etcetera). We will in this paper make use of these constructs to discuss differences and similarities between different types of collaborative network structures. In the following theoretically deduced framework we adopt the perspective that innovative networks in different lines of industries may be characterised by their network content, governance mechanisms and network structure, and that these characteristics may be summarized as an orientation towards either an ERIS or an IRIS mode of network collaboration (Cooke and Leydesdorff 2006). Finally our framework also contains a simple SWOT analysis where strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats related to the two different systems are suggested.

	Dominating mode in traditional industries	Dominating mode in new industries
Examples	Exploitation of natural resources, tourism	Hi-tech industries in ICT, bio-tech etc. Media businesses
Network content (Hoang and Antoncic 2003)	Process innovations in focus, where access to suppliers of components and services at arm-length distance is critical. Closed innovation systems with absorptive capacity directed towards established partners integrated in the value chain. Limited knowledge spill-over out-side the partnership.	Product and service innovations in focus where access to complementary resources/ competences regardless of location is critical. Open innovation systems where absorptive capacity is directed externally. External knowledge spill-over common.
Governance mechanisms (Hoang and Antoncic 2003)	Planned research program based on the need for overview, control and risk-minimizing, and on long-term relations building on trust and contract forming stable local (mechanistic) configurations. Decision-making through causation – planning for and controlling the future.	More ad-hoc based processes based on experimental learning and on short-term win-win relations forming dynamic and organic porous network configurations. Decision-making through effectuation – actions based on available or accessible resources.
Network structure (Hoang and Antoncic 2003)	Institutions (companies and organisations) important. Relation to academic partners based on long-term and institutional collaboration (research programs).	Individuals acting on behalf of institutions important. Relation to academic partners based on collaboration with individual researchers on more short-term basis (research projects).
Overall characteristics ref. to Cooke & Leydesdorff (2006)	An orientation towards an IRIS mode of network collaboration.	An orientation towards an ERIS mode of network collaboration.
Strengths	Stable collaborative constellations where efficiency (to do things right) are highlighted	Dynamic and innovative constellations where effectiveness (to do the right things) are highlighted
Weaknesses	Risk of rigid and non-innovative partnerships	Risk of unintended knowledge leakage and spill-over
Opportunities	Development of competitiveness based on cost-efficiency	Development of competitiveness based on innovation and differentiation
Threats	Risk of lock-in effects	Risk of opportunistic behaviour

Figure 1: Suggested framework for analysing innovative networks in different settings

As suggested by the framework, the two different types of innovative configurations thus emerging may be expected to expose very different strengths and weaknesses and to be exposed to very different kinds of opportunities and threats. Innovative collaboration in more traditional and mature industries may hence be expected to reveal specific strengths when it comes to seek new innovative solutions related to efficiency (process innovations)¹ but to run a higher risk of being trapped into rigid and non-innovative partnerships. Innovative networks in new industries may on the other hand be expected to be more characterised by dynamic collaboration aiming for innovative products and services (effectiveness), but run the risk of opportunistic behaviour and unintended knowledge spill-overs (Kuang-Chieh, 2008).

In the following section of this paper we will use empirical illustrations from two Nordic regions as a test-bed for addressing the relevance of the suggested framework.

OUR EMPIRICAL TEST-BED: TWO NORDIC SISTER REGIONS

Luleå and Oulu, the locomotive cities of the northernmost parts of Sweden and Finland, respectively, are both located by the Gulf of Bothnia in Northern Europe, Luleå at the west coast and Oulu at the east coast of the gulf. Both cities have their historical roots in Sweden's imperial era in the 17th century and the mercantilist economic policy dominating this period. Luleå was granted the privileges of being a city (i.e. a monopoly to manage trade and thereby serve as a node for the state's tax-collection) in 1605, and Oulu was granted a similar position in 1621. A more significant process of growth of these cities and their regions did however not start until later; in Oulu during the second half of the 18th century due to the city's importance as a trade centre for tar and wood-products, and in Luleå during late 19th century as a result of the growth of a saw-mill industry, rail transport and the out-shipment of iron ore. A more substantial growth did not however emerge in Luleå until the 1950's, when an ironworks was located in the city and firms in mechanical engineering emerged. In the Oulu region the growth during the post-war period emanated both from industries processing natural resources, from private and public services and from the establishment of the first domestic university outside the nation's capital in 1958. Oulu university was already from the start assigned an important role in the development of culture, business and industry in the whole of northern Finland, and today has five faculties and 16 000 students. In Luleå a University of Technology was established later (1971), with a marked orientation towards the need for research and future employees in the region's historically important, but now mature, industries. Luleå University of Technology has today two faculties and about 16 000 students.

¹ Cf. the classic message in Utterback and Abernathy (1975)



During the 1970's both Luleå and Oulu regions, as well as other regions in the industrialised world, faced a structural transformation from large-scale production, often based on natural resources, to global competition and 'flexible specialisation' (Piore and Sabel 1984) based more on specific competencies and capabilities than on existing supplies of raw materials (Greenwood et al 1991). Location patterns and ways of co-operating and communicating across firms changed due to continuous development of information technology. New 'engines' or 'locomotives' for creating growth and development emerged, implicating new actors and new drivers for regional development. While the two regions historically share several similarities, they also represent cases where different development paths emerge in the two regions. Between 1970 and 1997 the number of inhabitants in Oulu region increased by 20 per cent (and in the city of Oulu by 60%), while corresponding figures for Luleå region/Norrbottnen was plus three per cent (and +21% in the city of Luleå). Between 1998 and 2006 Oulu region continues to grow (+ 6% in the region and +14% in the city) while Luleå region was on minus 4 per cent and the city on plus three per cent. During recent years we have however witnessed a more favourable development in northern Sweden due to the boom in world market demand for iron ore and other minerals.

Ylinenpää and Lundgren (1998) identified the evolution of hi-tech sectors in the two regions as one key factor behind demographic differences, and concluded that while hi-tech firms in the Oulu region almost doubled their employment from 4,590 to 8,141 between 1987 and 1996, an already marginal hi-tech employment in Luleå region decreased to 700 employees in 1996. During 1997-2005, however, both Oulu and Luleå experienced a significant growth in HT (hi-tech) sectors, especially in ICT-related industries (Teräs 2008). In Oulu, the rapid positive development of the HT sector in 1958-2001 was followed by a stabilization phase in 2002-2006. According to Teräs (2008), there has not been any significant slowdown period in Oulu HT cluster in 1958-2006. In Luleå, the HT sector developed in much slower pace compared to Oulu. The HT sector experienced a significant growth period from 1997 until the year 2001, peaking to 3,800 jobs in 2001. This upturn was followed by a slowdown caused by turbulence in the ICT sector. This downturn however affected the Luleå region much harder. According to Nordin (2008), 40 per cent of Luleå-based ICT companies went bankrupt around the millennium shift. In the years 2004-2006, the Luleå HT sector then recovered from this ICT sector downturn. The amount of people working in the ICT sector in Norrbotten was in 2006 2,855 persons, out of which 1,818 were located to the city of Luleå.

Here empirical evidence from our case study regions may illustrate some of the messages communicated by population ecologists. When Nokia Corporation in 1960 established a cable factory in Oulu they in fact introduced the first elements of new technology regime into a region dominated by basic industry and mechanical engineering. Through a close collaboration with the university and the research institute VTT and with important support from local and regional policy, a new line of industry requiring new competences and new markets started to emerge and soon developed into Finland's hot spot for hi-tech development and production of mobile phones and wireless communication systems. On a significantly smaller scale a similar development was visible also in the Swedish region, where e.g. the death of an outdated mining sector often was proclaimed and positive expectations related to the further development of a regional industry based on electronics and information technology were frequently expressed.

The new industries in Oulu and its region also prospered and developed for many years, fertilizing characteristics such as "the Silicon Valley of the North" (Hyry 2005). While IT industry in Luleå and northern Sweden was significantly damaged by the dot-com-crisis around the millennium shift, the ICT-based industry in Oulu managed to preserve a leading position in spite of increasing global competition (Teräs and Ylinenpää 2012). During the period 2008-2012, the previously obvious role of the Nokia Company as a locomotive of the high technology cluster had more or less eroded as Nokia had outsourced much of its R&D and production work to other countries. As an example, in 2010 the Japanese company Renesas Electronics acquired 460 Nokia engineers in Oulu specialized in R&D on wireless modems (Kauppalehti 2010). In early 2011, Nokia employed slightly less than 2,000 people and Nokia Siemens Networks 2,200 people in the Oulu region (Kaleva 2011), and the Mobile

Phone unit has continued job cuts and outsourcing. The Oulu region however still hosts a strong concentration of accumulated expertise especially in the ICT sector, although its present status differs considerably from the status of the 1990s. The previous cornerstones of the Oulu HT cluster – the research community and the Nokia-driven ICT industry – are still in place but currently at least partly in search for new opportunities to be explored. The diversification of the region's expertise into other sectors such as environmental sector, biotechnology, wellness technology, and content production and media has so far not been able to compensate for previous losses. The Green ICT sector, combining the expertise gained through former ICT & telecommunication jobs with the new opportunities opened in the environmental sector, is a candidate for restarting a positive development in the Oulu region. Moreover, the "renaissance" of the mining industry in North Finland in the 2000's has provided the high tech industry in the Oulu region with new, advanced needs, e.g. in the form of new ICT solutions and multidisciplinary research needs. Finally, a promising emerging, research-driven sector of printable electronics is developing rapidly in the Oulu region attracting domestic and foreign industrial actors.

From the viewpoint of innovative networks, the longitudinal analysis reveals that Oulu has experienced a development in which traditional, relatively closed innovation systems governed by traditional industry have gradually paved way for two different types of innovative networks. On the one hand, the multinational network represented by Nokia and its partners has strengthened its grip over the years, resulting in (besides significant job-cuts) diminishing local decision-making power and lower levels of intra-regional cooperation. On the other hand, however, the specific culture that previously constituted the so called "Oulu Phenomenon", emerging on the basis of collaboration between Nokia and its smaller partners and a trustful cooperation between different sectors of society (public-private-partnership), is still viable. The innovation system in Oulu has elements of both an IRIS mode and of an ERIS mode with a preference for the former. The regional innovation system is thus rooted in institutions such as universities, universities of applied sciences, and government-owned research centers (e.g. VTT).

The Luleå HT cluster does not have any major locomotive companies such as Nokia in Oulu. The companies can instead be divided into four major categories: units of nationally or internationally operating ICT companies, government-owned companies, niche companies having already experienced rapid development, and new spin-off companies hosted e.g. in the science park's business incubator. Two successful spin-offs from university-based research during recent years were the ICT-based companies Marratech and Nordnav. Marratech was however acquired by American Google in 2007, and after a short period relocated from Luleå to other parts of the Google imperia. The Luleå-based spin-off company Nordnav was in 2007 facing a similar destiny after being acquired by the British multinational company Cambridge Silicon Radio. These examples illustrate both commercial success and the vulnerability involved in new industries operating in ERIS-like innovative constellations. A

third example of such ERIS-like innovative configurations is depicted by Ylinenpää (2012), who describes and analyses a small ICT-based company with seven employees and how it operates in close collaboration with two researchers (who serve as an out-sourced R&D unit and a resource for business intelligence and environmental scanning respectively), and different types of actors offering venture capital spanning from local institutions to international venture capitalists and business angels. This innovation system resembles obvious similarities with Cooke's and Leydesdorff's (2004) ERIS-mode of innovative collaboration. This contrasts to the substantial collaboration and innovative networking that is established between actors such as the mining company LKAB and the University of Technology LTU. Here different centres for research collaboration have been founded (such as the Hjalmar Lundbohm Research Center, the Agricola Research Center, the Center of Advanced Mining and Metallurgy CAMM, Swedish Blasting Research Center SWEBREC, ProcessIT Innovations and the Faste Laboratory); all manifesting typical characteristics of an IRIS-like innovative constellation. Funding is granted from industry and research foundations on a long-term basis, and R&D operations are performed based on a detailed multi-year plans where process innovations are in focus. Individuals building up these innovative configurations are best described as agents for the organisations they represent rather than as the individual actors dominating in ERIS-like innovation systems.

Turning then to the degree of regional specialization in our two case study regions, both northern Finland and Northern Sweden share as already indicated a historic tradition of specialization on exploitation of natural resources as a base for the regional economy. After the establishment of a university in Oulu in 1959 and (later) the national research institute VTT, a new era based on modern knowledge-intensive technologies started. The unfavourable development of raw material prices accelerated the shift from natural resources to knowledge-based economy in the 1990s. The stagnation of the Oulu ICT cluster in the 2000's together with a more favourable development of the raw material prices resulted in yet another shift in the regional specialization - this time back to e.g. mining industries. The increased environmental thinking together with the advanced needs of the mining industry are currently producing the Sustainable Industry era in North Finland with a lot of high tech expertise directed towards clean-tech solutions respecting a vulnerable Arctic environment.

In the Swedish region the shift to a specialization on hi-tech industries has been far less visible. The university (established in 1971) has as compared to its sister university in Oulu still a much more pronounced orientation towards traditional basic industries. Under the heading "From hard rock to heavy metal", the University states that "prominent scientists work together from traditional mining research topics ore geology, geophysics, rock engineering, geotechnical engineering, mineral processing, process metallurgy and applied geology with researchers in fields such as chemistry, industrial production environment, operations and maintenance engineering, fluid mechanics, geotechnical engineering,

economics and statistics.” As already noted, however, also new fields of expertise have been developed over the years, for example in ICT and distance-spanning technologies, electronics and green technologies. These new areas of expertise have contributed to the emergence of a new but as compared to Oulu region significantly smaller hi-tech sector.

Two examples of specialization initiatives taken in the Swedish region during recent years however deserve attention. Instead of making a choice between established basic industries and new hi-tech dittos, the region launched an innovation system initiative named ProcessIT Innovation. This initiative was based on the idea that the traditional basic industry should strengthen its competitiveness with the help of smart ICT-based process solutions developed by LTUs researchers and the regional ICT industry, and soon got a ten year support from VINNOVA as a national excellence center (Johansson and Ylinenpää 2012). What is interesting in this empirical anecdote is that the region develops a kind of “smart specialization” not by contrasting the “old” and the “new”, but by developing the interface between the old and the new. Another empirical anecdote illustrating this is the establishment of Facebook and its servers for big data in Luleå – the first establishment for Facebook outside the U.S. Even if “Big Data” and the storing of enormous amount of data on servers in Luleå seems to be far away from the region’s tradition from steel works and paper and pulp industries, an ongoing research project (Ylinenpää 2013) reveals that the region’s capability to deliver reliable and renewable energy to Facebook’s server halls was one of the determining factors behind Facebook’s decision to locate its first European establishment to Sweden and to Luleå. Again; a regional capability to deliver safe and reliable electric power generated by the region’s hydro-power stations so important for the regional process industry also proved to serve as order-winning criteria for attracting new entrants such as Facebook to the region. By exploiting “related variety” (Asheim, Boschma and Cooke 2011) referring to regional knowledge bases a region may thus achieve spill-over effects that initiates “economic renewal, new growth paths and regional growth” (ibid. p. 896).

IMPLICATIONS FOR THEORY AND PRACTICE

In this study we have described and discussed interventions to stimulate regional development and innovation in two specific regions. Especially, our results highlight that both regions have gone from interventions to foster flexible specialization, with the motive of staying resilient and competitive over time, to approach a smart specialization, with the motive of building competitiveness from a focus on one to a few strong industries within the region. As illustrated by our empirical data, both our study regions have undergone periods of developing innovative clusters and systems related to both traditional and new industries. By following these regions during a longer period we may also note how development trajectories and priorities have shifted over the years:

- The Finnish region serving as an example of a region that during decades has developed into a European hot-spot for high technology but also a region that today experiences tough times due to globalization of the economy, with a need to redirect the accumulated knowhow of the ICT cluster to new applications and to utilize the natural resources in North Finland in a sustainable way.
- The Swedish region lagging behind its sister region in Finland regarding development of new industries and innovations in these sectors, but also a region that today best is described as a hot-spot for development based on natural resources such as iron ore and other minerals. The Swedish region also demonstrates interesting initiatives to develop “smart specialization” based on integration of “the old” and “the new”.

From normative books in management we have learned that a generic strategy based on focus pays off better than a diversifications strategy involving the risk of getting “stuck in the middle” (Porter 1980). We have also learned that developing core competences in a more knowledge-based economy is a gateway to success (Hamel and Prahalad 1990). Built on this logic, the dominating understanding in regional development policy and EU rhetoric’s today is that regions should develop their own smart specialisation strategy. For regions outside our big metropolitan areas, such as the two regions used as empirical illustrations in this paper, this normally implies targeting one specific sector or branch of business/industry. Developing a regional specialisation based on only one specific focus (e.g. natural resources or a local competence) however also comes with a cost: the cost of being exposed to volatile markets where global competition or market needs are radically changing the “rules of the game”, or where innovation and new materials may jeopardize existing market logics. This volatility may corner a region into structural lock-in situations and is clearly illustrated by our Finnish case, but is also instrumental for understanding the dynamic development that northern Sweden today is undergoing.

But is then diversification the answer? According to Bishop (2009), development of a specialized cluster expected to generate local and regional growth is not always a good and functional medicine. Instead especially new service-based companies and innovations develop better on a soil constituted by many different competences and actors (Essletzbichler 2007). A regional smart specialisation built on two or more existing (or emerging) sectors may therefore represent a truly “smart” specialisation since this allows for tapping into the development potential of more than one sector and (not least) allows for exploiting the development potential existing in the interface between two (or more) sectors of industry and business (cf. McCann & Ortega 2011). This also reduces the inherent risk of ‘picking the winner’ *a priori*; a documented high-risk strategy since new regional specialities and clusters normally emanate spontaneous processes rather than from orchestrated policy interventions (see e.g. Lambooy & Boschma 2001). Critical is to recognize that a region’s opportunities to diversify into new industries and new knowledge bases is affected by the

degree of related variety where “new industries are deeply rooted in related activities that are present in the region, and which set in motion a process of regional branching” (Asheim, Boschma & Cooke 2011, p. 895). Thereby a specific region may also achieve a form of system resilience that improves the region’s ability to cope with change and new demands, and at the same time counteracts the risk of regional lock-in effects into one specific and often cyclic and potentially outdated regional structure.

In our study we elaborate upon some of these regional characteristics which may mitigate the potential costs of smart specialization. We denote that the insight in the “rules of the game” for how to mitigate potential costs is very different in new and traditional industries. The characteristics and the opportunities and strengths involved in such an endeavour are depicted in Figure 1, and may hopefully serve as road-map for stakeholders interesting in exploring and exploiting the innovative potential in both traditional and new branches of business and industry.

This work is explorative and focuses on how regions focus on a shifting form of industrial specialization. The empirical material is based on two very specific regions; both located in the northern part of Scandinavia, and based on repeated interviews conducted over a 25 year time-period with policy makers, entrepreneurs and academicians in the studied regions. This is in line with proponents advocating more of longitudinal research based on “multi-method and qualitative research designs” (Hoang and Antoncic, 2003, p. 167) when attempting to further our understanding of the dynamics in regional innovation and competitiveness.

REFERENCES

- Amin, A. and Thrift, N. (1995). *Globalization, Institutions, and Regional Development in Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Asheim, B.T., Boschma, R., and Cooke, P. (2011). Constructing Regional Advantage: Platform Policies Based on Related Variety and Differentiated Knowledge Bases, *Regional Studies*, 45:7, 893-904.
- Bishop, P. (2009). Spatial spillovers and employment growth in the service sector, *The Service Industries Journal*, 29, 6: 791-803.
- Carlsson, B. and Stankiewicz, R. (1991). On the nature, function and composition of technological systems, *Journal of Evolutionary Economics*, 1: 93-118.
- Cooke, P. and Leydesdorff, L. (2006). Regional development in the knowledge-based economy: The construction of advantage, *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 31: 5-15.
- Dahmén, E. (1950). *Svensk industriell företagsverksamhet*, Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Dahmén, E. (1984). Schumpeterian Dynamics. Some Methodological Notes, *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 5, 1: 25-34.
- Essletzbichler, J. (2007). Diversity, stability and regional growth in the United States 1975–2002. In *Applied Evolutionary Economics and Economic Geography*, Edited by: Frenken, K. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, p. 203–229.
- Florida R. (2005). *Cities and the Creative Class*. London: Routledge.
- Gersick C.J.G (1991). Revolutionary Change Theories: A Multilevel Exploration of the Punctuated Paradigm. *Academy of Management Review* 16 (1): 10-36.
- Greenwood, M.J., Hunt, G. L., Rickman, D.S. and George I. Treyz, G.I. (1991). Migration, Regional Equilibrium, and the Estimation of Compensating Differentials. *The American Economic Review*, 8, 5: 1382-1390.
- Hamel, G., and Prahalad, C.K. (1990). The Core Competence of the Corporation. *Harvard Business Review*, May-June, 79-91.
- Hannan M.T. and Freeman J. (1977). The population ecology of organizations. *American Journal of Sociology* 83: 929-984.
- Hannan M.T. and Freeman J. (1989). *Organizational ecology*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.
- Heidenreich, M. (2009). Innovation patterns and location of European low- and medium-technology industries. *Research Policy*, 38: 483-494.
- Hoang H. and Antoncic B. (2003). Network-based Research in Entrepreneurship: A Critical Review. *Journal of Business Venturing* 18(2): 165–87.

- Hyry, M. (2005). *Industrial Growth and Development in Northern Finland: The Case of Oulu 1970-2002*, a thesis for the Degree of Doctor of philosophy, Coventry Business School, Coventry University.
- Johansson, J., and Ylinenpää, H. (2012). Can regional innovation systems be "constructed"? In: Rickne, A., Laestadius, S., & Etzkowitz, H. (eds.), *Innovation governance in an open economy: Shaping regional nodes in a globalized world*. London: Routledge, p. 208-230.
- Kaleva (2011). Nokia vähentää Oulussa (Nokia cuts jobs in Oulu). Cited from: www.kaleva.fi on Feb 11, 2011.
- Kauppalehti (2010). July 27, 2010: Renesas Electronics. cited from: www.kauppalehti.fi
- Kautonen, M. (2006). *The Regional Innovation System Bottom-Up: A Finnish Perspective*, Academic dissertation, University of Tampere.
- Kuang-Chieh, C. (2008). Helping glass industries to promote creative industry development in Hsinchucity, Taiwan. In Techniques and technologies for sustainability. Atkinson, A (Ed.). Proceedings: International Conference and Summer School 2007. Univerlagtuberlin.
- Lambooy, J.G., Boschma, R.A. (2001). Evolutionary economics and regional policy, *Annals of Regional Science*, 35 (1): 113-133.
- Malerba, F. (2005). Sectoral systems, How and why innovation differs across sectors, in Fagerberg, J., Mowery, D.C., and Nelson, R.R. (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Innovation*, Oxford University Press, p. 380-406.
- McCann, P. and Ortega-Argilés, R. (2011). *Smart Specialisation, Regional Growth and Application to EU Cohesion Policy*, Economic Geography Working Paper 2001, Faculty of Spatial Science, University of Groningen.
- Metcalf J.S. (1998). *Evolutionary Economics and Creative Destruction*. London: Routledge.
- Mort, G.S. and Weerawardena, J. (2006). Networking capability and international entrepreneurship: How networks function in Australian born global firms. *International Marketing Review*, 23(5): 549-572.
- Nelson, R. and Winter, S. (1982). *An evolutionary theory of economic change*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Nordin, H. (2008). *Bubblan som sprack: IT-kraschens inverkan på konkurser bland IT-företag i Luleå*. Bachelor thesis, Luleå University of Technology.
- Piore, M.J. and C.F. Sabel (1984). *The Second Industrial Divide: Possibilities for Prosperity*, New York: Basic Books.
- Porter, M. (1980). *Competitive strategy*. New York: The Free Press.

- Porter, M. (1998). Clusters and the new economics of competition, *Harvard Business Review* Nov-Dec: 77-90.
- Romanelli E. and Tushman M.L. (1994). Organizational Transformation as Punctuated Equilibrium: An Empirical Test. *Academy of Management Journal* 37 (5): 1141-1166.
- Sarasvathy, S.D. (2001). Causation and effectuation: toward a theoretical shift from economic inevitability to entrepreneurial contingency. *Academy of Management Review*, 26: 243-263.
- Saxenian A. (1994). *Regional Advantage Culture and Competition in Silicon Valley and Route 128*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- St-Jean, E., LeBel, L. and Audet, J. (2010). Entrepreneurial orientation in the forestry industry: A population ecology perspective, *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development* 17(2): 204-217.
- Teräs, J. (2008). *Regional Science-Based Clusters. A case study of three European concentrations*, Acta Publication Series C 302, Oulu: University of Oulu.
- Teräs, J., and Ylinenpää, H. (2012). Regional dynamics in non-metropolitan hi-tech clusters: A longitudinal study of two Nordic regions . In: Rickne, A., Laestadius, S., & Etzkowitz, H. (eds.), *Innovation Governance in an Open Economy: Shaping regional nodes in a globalized world*. London: Routledge, p. 69-91.
- Tushman, M.L. and Anderson, P. (1986). Technological Discontinuities and Organizational Environments. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 21, 3: 439-465.
- Tödtling, F. and Trippl, M. (2005). One size fits all? Towards a differentiated regional innovation policy approach, *Research Policy*, 34: 1203-1219.
- Tödtling, F. (2012). Technological change at the regional level: The role of location, firm structure, and strategy. *Environment and Planning A* 24(11): 1565-1584.
- Utterback, J.M. and Abernathy, W.J. (1975). A Dynamic Model of Process and Product Innovation, *Omega*, 6, 639-656.
- Ylinenpää, H. (2012). Entrepreneurship and Innovation Systems: Towards a Development of the ERIS/IRIS Concept. In Johannisson B & Lindholm Dahlstrand Å (eds.), *Enacting Regional Dynamics and Entrepreneurship. Bridging the Territorial and Functional Rationales*. London: Routledge.
- Ylinenpää, H. (2013), A case study of Facebook's decision to locate to Sweden and Luleå at the request of the Swedish Agency for Economic and Regional Growth (ongoing).
- Ylinenpää, H. and Lundgren, N-G. (1998). Regional dynamics – A comparison of two Nordic regions, paper presented at the conference 'SMEs and districts', LIUC, Castellanza, Italy, Nov.