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Introduction

For more than twenty years, the academic literature has encouraged scholar-practitioner collaborations to produce management knowledge that is both academically rigorous and practically relevant (Bartunek & Rynes, 2014). Several frameworks have thus been developed to integrate practitioners’ viewpoints in academic research. For instance, the British Academy of Management has developed since 1998 propositions basing itself on Gibbons et al.’s (1994) Mode 2 framework (see Starkey & Madan, 2001; Tranfield & Starkey, 1998). Later on, in the USA, Andrew Van de Ven has suggested to develop an “engaged scholarship” (see chapter 7). Many other prescriptive frameworks have been developed to foster practitioners’ involvement in academic research (e.g., Avenier & Cajaiba, 2012; Louis & Bartunek, 1992) as well as edited books giving practical insights on how to develop knowledge that would be more relevant for practice (e.g., Dameron & Durand, 2011; Mohrman & Lawler, 2011; Shani, 2008). However, despite this important amount of academic discussions and debates, Bartunek (2011) takes the example of Mode 2 to lament the fact that the framework is rarely
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mobilized in empirical research. There is consequently still a need to find ways to reconcile research with practice (see also Bartunek & Rynes, 2014; Kieser, Nicolai, & Seidl, 2015).

A recent explanation of these difficulties lies in the intrinsic tensions underlying the academic-practitioner relationships (Bartunek & Rynes, 2014). Even if they may be seen as fruitful for the advance of knowledge, it seems that they have discouraged more than one scholar-practitioner relationship. Bartunek and Rynes (2014) enumerate five of them:
difference in logics between research and practice due to their self-referential; differing time dimensions as academics’ timelines are seen as much longer than practitioners’; differences in terms of their knowledge representation (communication style); rigor and relevance which are seen as opposed, complementary or orthogonal; and scholars and practitioners’ different interests and incentives that divert them from working together.

To better understand how scholars and practitioners face these tensions while interacting, this chapter differentiates four types of interactions. For the purpose of this chapter, we illustrate each of them with developmental processes from five management concepts. The concepts include Balanced Scorecard (Kaplan & Norton, 1996), Blue Ocean Strategy (Kim & Mauborgne, 2005), Business Model Canvas (Osterwalder & Pigneur, 2010), Disruptive Innovation (Christensen, 1997) and Open Innovation (Chesbrough, 2003). Their authors have all been recognized as being among the best management thinkers and the books that have disseminated their concepts have been sold at more than a million copies as well as being taught throughout the world. In other words, the concepts are recognized as having reached a huge impact both in academia and practice. The construction of the developmental process of each concept is based on interviews conducted with the people who took part in it (i.e., Henry
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Chesbrough, Alexander Osterwalder, Yves Pigneur) and on secondary data (i.e., recorded conferences⁶, academic articles, book chapters).

The chapter is organized as follows. We first review each of the four interaction modes we found⁷. For each interaction mode, we define the interaction itself, present the concept we chose for illustration, develop two narratives, and suggest key learnings from them. We then conclude the chapter by generalizing our illustrative vignettes to show how tensions between research and practice can be managed. In particular, we discuss how technology may foster some interactions while only changes in academics’ incentives may improve others.

Collaboration between academics and practitioners for the development of major management concepts

Partnership interactions

Scholar-practitioner partnerships are based on interactions aimed at producing shared knowledge. They contribute to building common reasoning and exchanges of verbal messages through turn-taking sequences (Tsoukas, 2009). If the dialogue is productive, each interlocutor potentially makes the other realize the limitations of his focal awareness and stimulates a search for an ever broader one. We illustrate the partnership interaction through the developmental process of the Balanced Scorecard model as two successive but different partnerships occurred during its developmental process: one highlighting the necessity for curiosity with the other, and the other one, the complementarity in terms of skills between academics and practitioners.

⁶ See for instance https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WJzYTtxH7R0
⁷ To go further into the ways these four interaction modes have been built, see Carton and Dameron (2015).
Balanced scorecard

Named in 1992 after the eponymous article, the Balanced Scorecard is a strategy performance tool used by managers to keep track of the execution of activities by the staff within their control (see Kaplan & Norton, 1996). It is widely acknowledged that the prototype of the Balanced Scorecard emerged in 1987 within the Analog Device Inc., a semiconductor company based in Norwood, Massachusetts (Kaplan, 1998). Arthur Schneiderman, Vice President of Quality and Productivity Improvement, was in charge of the implementation of Total Quality Management (TQM). As he was the process owner for non-financial performance measurement, he created the scorecard between 1986 and 1987. However, it is not until Arthur Schneiderman had worked with Robert Kaplan, the Harvard Business School professor of accounting, that the scorecard was broadly diffused to the public at large.

Schneiderman-Kaplan partnership as curiosity-driven

As Schneiderman had read Relevance Lost (1987), he was aware of the work of Robert Kaplan. He asked him for help in the implementation of Activity-Based Costing within Analog Device. When entering the firm, Kaplan heard about the half-life system, an innovation measuring the rate of improvement of the company’s TQM program that Schneiderman had accidentally discovered in 1984. Interested in the approach, Kaplan developed with the help of Schneiderman a teaching case and published it in 1990 under the title “Analog Devices: The Half-life System”. As Kaplan and Schneiderman were discussing that innovation, they got to better know each other. That is how Kaplan heard about the scorecard Schneiderman had developed earlier on. The professor thus invited the practitioner to join a yearlong project led by Nolan, Norton & Co group that gathered several companies to work on performance measurement. As Analog Device’s corporate scorecard captured the interest of participants, all the participants experimented the scorecard in their organizations.
and reported back to the project on the results. It led to a publication from the leaders of the projects, Kaplan and Norton (1992), the second partnership that continued the development of the Balanced Scorecard.

**Norton-Kaplan partnership as a working team**

That first publication in Harvard Business Review illustrates the beginning of a partnership that took place for more than a decade. David Norton is a consultant from Nolan, Norton & Co specialized in information systems. Even if he holds a Doctorate of Business Administration (DBA) from Harvard Business School, Norton has always been interested in applied science as attests his consulting career spent in several consultancies. The Norton-Kaplan partnership builds on a common respect of their differing role boundaries. Kaplan is the one who focuses on concept development and who writes the books and articles while Norton provides Kaplan with real cases, implements the balanced scorecard in organizations and develops the tools. Their differing skills and distinctive roles allow them to complement each other. “There are few tandems with this unity” expresses a consultant who took part in the development of different management concepts. Their partnership led to the publication of more than 9 articles published in the HBR since the 1992-article, 5 co-authored books, and the implementation of many projects throughout the world.

**Key learnings from the Balanced Scorecard case**

Even though they are contrasted, the two successive Balanced Scorecard partnerships exemplify some of their benefits. First, the Schneiderman-Kaplan interaction illustrates the necessity for scholars to construct strong ties with practitioners while entering fields of research. Here, it allowed a move from a proprietary in-house innovation to an academic innovation shared with a broad community. Second, both interactions have occurred with
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mutual respect, each proponent of the partnership recognizing the other’s competencies and respecting the other’s boundaries. It helped reconciling their different representations of management knowledge (see also chapter 3, chapter 17 and chapter 18).

**Ambidexterity interactions**

Markides (2007, p. 764) defines ambidexterity for an individual as doing contrary things at the same time. In the interactions occurring between research and practice, for an individual, doing contrary things at the same time means acting both as a practitioner and a researcher. The illustration in this book developed by Laura Empson, in chapter 13, illustrates the discomfort it creates in one person. People can do it in several ways. On the one hand, scholars may engage in practice through experiments in real-life organizations. For instance, a full array of research paradigms have developed to foster ambidexterity, the most emblematic ones being *action science* (Argyris, Putnam, & Smith, 1985) or *process consultation* (Schein, 1969). Conversely, Schön (1983) acknowledges that practitioners’ actions may be generalized to contribute to management knowledge as their reflections-in-action makes them act as researchers.

We will show how ambidexterity interactions can also occur within research paradigms different from action research and process consultation. For that purpose, we take the cases of Disruptive Innovation and Open Innovation where doctoral studies have given a sense of rigor to a lived experience and where staying close to the phenomenon under study has improved the relevance of an academic work.

**Disruptive Innovation and Open Innovation**

Disruptive innovation is defined as a new practice or technique for creating “a simpler, more convenient product that sells for less money and appeals to a new or unattractive customer set.” (Christensen & Raynor, 2003). On the other hand, open innovation is defined as “a
distributed innovation process based on purposively managed knowledge flows across organizational boundaries, using pecuniary and non-pecuniary mechanisms in line with the organization’s business model.” (Chesbrough & Bogers, 2014). Both concepts offer appealing examples of ambidexterity interactions because Clayton Christensen and Henry Chesbrough, the two innovators behind those concepts, have both oscillated between academia and practice throughout their lives first by entering academia after a substantive business experience and second by practicing consulting activities and giving advices to firms in parallel to their academic activity (see similar illustrations in chapter 11 and chapter 13).

**Doctoral studies as a gateway to academia**

Ten years after graduating from his MBA in 1979 that he earned at Harvard Business School, Christensen pursued a DBA at the same business school. In between, he spent time working as a consultant at BCG, for the US government and as an entrepreneur. He based his dissertation on the historical study of the disk drive industry, where he had previously worked. His work gained in rigor by duplicating over time the concept of disruption from the disk drive industry to the excavating equipment industry and later to the steel industry. He also got credential from practitioners as his work had been empirically tested in different situations.

Similarly to Christensen, Chesbrough undertook doctoral studies after a first professional experience. He began his PhD at Haas School of Business (University of California, Berkeley) in 1992 after 7 years spent working for Quantum, a firm operating in the disk drive industry whose division was acquired in 2001 by Maxtor (later bought by Seagate). By comparing the US and the Japanese disk drive industries, Chesbrough noticed that a disruption phenomenon was taking place in the first territory while it was not happening in the latter. He explains it by the presence of many start-ups in the US that are not present in Japan,
that play the role of agents of disruption. After defending his dissertation in 1997, Chesbrough was hired as an assistant professor at Harvard Business School where he benefited from different connections that helped him go beyond the disk drive industry to explore other contexts. As he was denied tenure in 2003 because of his lack of academic publications in the allotted time, he went back to Haas School of Business as an adjunct professor and published *Open Innovation* (2003), a book modeling a phenomenon he had experienced during his professional experience, and matured during his PhD and upcoming experience at Harvard.

**Practicing an advice activity to stay close to the phenomenon under study**

As Christensen had published his ideas both in academic and practitioner outlets (e.g., Bower & Christensen, 1995; Christensen & Bower, 1996), companies got interested in his work. For instance, in 1996 he met Andy Grove, the CEO of Intel, to explain him the concept of disruptive innovation. It seems that Grove understood from that discussion that disruption could also happen in the microprocessor industry as the company put on the market the Celeron Processor to avoid disruption from Cyrix and AMD that were making cheap and low-performance chips. Celeron quickly became the highest-volume product in the company. As the *Innovator’s Dilemma* (1997) encountered a tremendous success, he launched *Innosight* in 2000, a consultancy that would dispense advice based on Disruptive Innovation. In 2007, he also founded *Rose Park Advisors*, an investment company that utilizes research based on Disruptive Innovation to make investments decisions.

On his side, after the publication of *Open Innovation* (2003), Chesbrough has always oscillated between research and practice. As his first book and practitioner-oriented articles (all published the same year in Harvard Business Review, MIT Sloan Management Review and California Management Review) had received some echo among practitioners, he spent time with companies to answer to their questions related to the application of Open
Innovation, either through consulting assignments or through workshops. In parallel, he enriched the academic side of the concept by organizing a Professional Development Workshop at the annual meeting of the Academy of Management in 2004, whose content was published as a handbook in 2006 (Chesbrough, Vanhaverbeke, & West, 2006). The same year, an article published by Laursen and Salter (2006) in the Strategic Management Journal participated in legitimating the concept in academia. Over time, Chesbrough has continued working on open innovation by acting both as a practitioner and a researcher, publishing books (Chesbrough, 2006, 2011) and regularly meeting with practitioners. He has been meeting with firms through the center he has developed at Berkeley (cf. section on “mediation”), and in parallel, he has improved the academic grounding of the concept by mobilizing a community as exemplify the handbook that has been published in 2014 (Chesbrough, Vanhaverbeke, & West, 2014) and the World Open Innovation Conference that has been organized since 2014. As he recognizes himself⁹, he is a boundary spanner between industry and academia. His knowledge of academic research in certain fields gives him the academic credentials while as he deeply interacts with industries and cares about being useful to them, he also feels like being part of practice.

Key learnings from the Disruptive Innovation and Open Innovation cases

The examples of Disruptive Innovation and Open Innovation first expresses the complementarity of knowing a field from a practitioner and an academic perspective. By exploring the same phenomenon in different industries with a scientific method, both Christensen and Chesbrough have been able to unravel things they were not able to make sense of as practitioners. Second, throughout their career, they have addressed practitioners’ interests in different ways on the phenomenon they have discovered.

⁹ This is based on an interview conducted in February 2014.
Mediation interactions

Mediation interactions take place when knowledge is co-constructed between academics and practitioners through media that enable a dialogue and knowledge exchanges between the two counterparts. Knowledge is refined and improved continuously. Again, the cases of Disruptive Innovation and Open Innovation offer interesting illustrations. To improve their concept, both Christensen and Chesbrough relied on the classroom and on forums gathering professionals.

Mobilizing the classroom to benefit from students’ interactions

To improve his theory of Disruptive Innovation, Christensen relied on the Building and Sustaining a Successful Enterprise (BSSE) class he developed at Harvard Business School for his MBA students (Christensen & Carlile, 2009). As the traditional case study method was hardly helping them understanding the theory of disruption, Christensen had to develop this class where, instead of acquiring knowledge through inductive case studies, students would rather learn through a deductive course architecture. For each class, students are assigned readings on a theory about a dimension of a general manager’s job and a case about a company facing a problem that is relevant to that theory. In class discussions, students look through the lens of the theory and test whether it adequately explains what happened in the firm. If it does well, students are able to suggest recommendations taken from the theory. If it does not, it means that they found anomalies that the theory cannot explain. In this way, the next class they are given a new theory and a new case. To each new case they apply all the theories they have already learnt and find either recommendations or anomalies. By enrolling about 160 MBA students a semester, the BSSE class helped Christensen develop and improve the theory of Disruptive Innovation. For instance, he found that neither Holiday Inn nor McDonald have been able to disrupt 5-star hotels and restaurants. Those insights helped
Christensen figure out that disruption has a technological core and led several publications. Apart from improving the rigor of the concept of disruption, the classroom also allowed the publication of practitioner-oriented articles (e.g., Christensen & Bever, 2014; Christensen, Kaufman, & Shih, 2008). It shows how beneficial the classroom interactions can be to raise insights among practitioners.

Chesbrough also relied on his MBA classes to improve the concept of Open Innovation but the mechanism differs from Christensen. In a class taught to MBA students and dedicated to Open Innovation, after explaining and illustrating the concept, Chesbrough assigns each student to write a 15-20-page final paper where he/she would develop his/her own example of Open Innovation. By scanning different situations that he would never be able to find by himself, Chesbrough has been able to figure out how the concept would work in fields he did not know much about, such as financial services or healthcare. In other words, he mobilized his students as very good eyes and ears to find new applications of the idea. Those insights helped replicating the concept in other contexts and in turn better understanding the phenomenon.

Developing third places to push thematic and organize regular exchanges with professionals Christensen also relied on mediation interactions through the creation in 2007 of the Innosight Institute to apply his ideas to healthcare and education. It later became the Clayton Christensen Institute for Disruptive Innovation. According to its website, it aims to “work to shape and elevate the conversation surrounding these issues through rigorous research and public outreach.”¹⁰ It offers a forum for discussion for policymakers, community leaders, and innovators by distilling and promoting the transformational power of disruptive innovation. To reach their purpose, members of the think-tank participate in conferences all around the

¹⁰ See www.christenseninstitute.com
world and write blog posts as well as white papers in order to bring scientific knowledge to political debates. In a nutshell, this mediation place allows debates on key societal themes by using Christensen’s concept.

In the case of Chesbrough, since his book quickly became a hit, he had received a lot of requests on Open Innovation. After a couple of months, as companies were asking the same questions over and over again, he decided to find a way to better address these questions all at once. It took the shape of a membership group of companies gathered within what he called the Berkeley Innovation Forum that contributes to research for the Center for Open Innovation he runs at Berkeley. People meet twice a year to exchange practices among non-competing companies, to listen to outside speakers, and to talk about the challenges they encounter while managing innovation. From 10 companies in 2005, the Forum was constituted of about 30 company members in 2016. Running that forum allows Chesbrough to listen and talk to companies on an ongoing basis. It became a very good way for him to conduct research on problem finding rather than problem solving.\(^\text{11}\)

Key learnings from the Disruptive Innovation and Open Innovation cases

Both Disruptive Innovation and Open Innovation offer interesting illustrations of mediation interactions. We showed that the classroom is an interesting way for academics to test theories and get feedbacks from practitioners and more specifically executives\(^\text{12}\) who have accumulated experiences and knowledge from a plurality of industries and countries. This way, it improves and refines theories. Mediation interactions can also use rigorous knowledge to improve an area that is seen as relevant for society and focus on problem-finding to address relevant issues (see also chapter 7).

\(^{11}\) This is based on an interview conducted in February 2014.
\(^{12}\) For mediation interactions occurring during executive education, see Tushman, O’Reilly, Fenollosa, Kleinbaum, and McGrath (2007).
Popularization interactions

We call popularization an interaction constituted by a one-way exchange of knowledge between academics and practitioners. Knowledge is produced by one counterpart and is then diffused to the other. From research to practice, it is the “transmission of scientific knowledge from scientists to the lay public for purposes of edification, legitimating and training” (Whitley, 1985: 3 in Schulz & Nicolai, 2015). On the other hand, from practice to research, it takes the form of relevant feedback effects from popularization media to scholarly journals that influence the degree of scholarly attention certain topics receive as well as influence the content of research (Schulz & Nicolai, 2015; see chapter 3). We develop this interaction by taking two successive examples: Blue Ocean Strategy that took a typical North-American popularization strategy, and Business Model Canvas that heavily relied on social media.

Blue Ocean Strategy and Business Model Canvas

Blue Ocean Strategy is a strategy concept defined as the simultaneous pursuit of differentiation and low cost to open up a new market space and create new demand by targeting non-customers. On the other hand, the Business Model Canvas is a strategic management and entrepreneurial tool that allows the description, the design and the invention of a business model. Both concepts are very popular among academics and practitioners, Blue Ocean Strategy (2005) and Business Model Generation (2010) being sold at more than a million copies.

Blue Ocean Strategy: an archetype of North-American popularization

The recipe of the popularization of Blue Ocean Strategy is built on different ingredients. After an academic career focused on publishing in the most rigorous outlets at the University of Michigan Ross School of Business, W. Chan Kim and Renée Mauborgne moved to INSEAD in 1992 and disseminated the Blue Ocean Strategy concept in a sequel of 9 articles published
in Harvard Business Review. This is an astonishing number of HBR articles as academics who disseminate knowledge to practitioners usually publish a book after two (or three) subsequent HBR articles. One may guess that the suspense it created participated in the success of the book.

Second, the authors have devoted a lot of time to improve the diffusion of the concept to faculty and students. As it is currently taught in more than 1,800 universities over more than 100 countries, efforts have been spent on ensuring its teaching quality rather than on co-creating knowledge with practitioners (for that purpose, see the “mediation” interaction). It involves the development of teaching materials such as syllabus for Blue Ocean Strategy electives and the creation of appealing paper and video cases. For instance, after Justin Trudeau’s victory in the Canadian elections in late 2015, Fares Boulos, an Affiliated Professor at INSEAD, has developed a case study for MBA students on Trudeau’s election victory that he assimilates as “blue ocean politics”. It also implies to rely on new pedagogical techniques such as developing simulation games, or developing applications for computers, tablets and smartphones.

Third, the book is the cornerstone of the popularization of Blue Ocean Strategy. Its name is appealing for the reader: would you rather fight among sharks or dive in the Caribbean Sea? Everyone chooses the blue ocean! It also relies on a high degree of rhetoric and persuasion. For instance, at the beginning of the book, the authors put a figure explaining that while Blue Oceans only account for 14% of the business, they represent 38% of the revenue and more importantly 61% of the profit (in comparison with red oceans that respectively account for 86% of the business launches, 62% of revenue and only 39% of
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13 According to blueoceanstrategy.com
14 A body of research has developed on metaphors in management (i.e., Cornelissen & Kafouros, 2008; Oswick, Keenoy, & Grant, 2002; Tsoukas, 1991).
15 These arguments have been developed elsewhere for similar books (e.g., Nørreklit, 2003).
profit). It aims at convincing the reader that he has in his hand a book that will help him generating revenue and profits! Finally, the book is made easy to read. It guides the reader page after page by having a chapter upfront dedicated to explaining all the tools and frameworks in a very systematic way and keeping the academic anchoring and justification for the end of the book. A lot of time has also been spent on the language to make it appealing for practitioners (see also chapter 17). The book is also illustrated with attractive cases selected for their relevance and originality. In a sense, one may even wonder if Cirque du Soleil did not become successful thanks to all the MBA students who have heard about the show during their Blue Ocean Strategy classes.

Fourth, the concept benefited from a promotion orchestrated by the authors themselves who have been involved in promotion tours, have written articles in business newspapers, and have given speeches all around the world to corporations, governments... For instance, in 2002, they specifically targeted the management strategy community by being guest speakers at the Paris-held Strategy Management Society conference that gathers academics, businessmen and consultants. This is where the phrase “Blue Ocean Strategy” was heard by the public at large for the first time. They went one step further by taking advisory positions with governments. For instance, W. Chan Kim worked with the prime minister of Malaysia to launch a National Blue Ocean Strategy in 2012 and Renée Mauborgne has been a board member of the White House Initiative on Historically Black Colleges and Universities since 2012.

Fifth and last, the concept has been popularized through the Blue Ocean Strategy Network, a gathering of consultants that has applied the concept within firms. As the practitioners involved in the network had a stake in the development of the concept, they would not misuse it. To ensure the quality of the consulting activity to outsiders and in order to prevent people
from improving themselves, experts, W. Chan Kim and Renée Mauborgne also created a certification process.

**Business Model Canvas: popularizing knowledge through social media**

The concept of Business Model Canvas has been developed a decade after Blue Ocean Strategy, as part of Alex Osterwalder’s dissertation conducted at HEC Lausanne under the supervision of Yves Pigneur (Osterwalder, 2004). The thesis offers a theoretical building of a conceptual model of a business model accompanied with guidelines on how to implement it as a tool.

Popularization first took place through the mobilization of social media. As Osterwalder had participated during his PhD to academic conferences, he noticed that the topic of business modelling was drawing the attention of both the academic and business communities. After finishing his PhD, he put his manuscript on the University of Lausanne’s website. Again, it attracted the public interest. He then began blogging and tweeting on business model while applying his concept within firms. These practices highly contributed to advertising his work. In the meantime, he shared online his ongoing work including his professional presentations, using Creative Commons licenses. At that time, a community of people following his work was growing. Consequently, when Osterwalder and Pigneur decided to publish their book and launch their first set of conferences in 2008, they immediately gathered some interest.

The book also played an important role in popularizing the concept. It was constructed and published through an innovative business model. It was co-created with the help of 470 contributors, first self-published before being published with Wiley (Osterwalder & Pigneur, 2010). The authors particularly paid attention to the illustrations and text. For that purpose,
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16 This interaction also had a mediation role as Alex Osterwalder and Yves Pigneur benefited from interactions with practitioners to improve their concept (cf. previous part).
Alan Smith was hired as a graphic designer for the book and Tim Clark, one of the contributors, also helped turning the text into a “pure US-based English”\(^\text{17}\). To advertise their book, Osterwalder and Pigneur put for free 80 pages on the Internet. They also put a 1-page Business Model Canvas registered under the Creative Common license that will be downloaded more than 6 million times on the website and reproduced on many others. The book will be translated in more than 29 languages and has sold at more than a million copies. They have then continued publishing on their concept. In 2012, Tim Clark decides to use the Business Model Canvas to apply it to the self and coordinates *Business Model You* (2012). Finally, in 2014, *Value Proposition Design* (2014) is published. The concept is currently taught all around the world and an online course is also offered on Business Model Canvas’ website\(^\text{18}\).

Even if Osterwalder and Pigneur already had the opportunity to organize workshops, it is not until 2009 that they took an important place in the popularization of the concept. They have first been developed as 2-day workshops addressed to independent or small consultancies, entrepreneurs, coaches. The workshops later reached people from corporations such as intrapreneurs or business developers and even top management teams and whole firms’ divisions. That way, the concept diffused through word of mouth within these communities. More recently, online courses have developed with a similar objective. Second, they aim at increasing the notoriety and the legitimacy of the concept. Both Osterwalder and Pigneur have organized 2-hour keynotes aimed at diffusing and selling the book. In 2013, they also organized the *Business Design Summit* where they invited 10 prominent scholars such as Steve Blank or Rita McGrath. It certainly contributed to Osterwalder and Pigneur’s visibility.

\(^{17}\) This is based on an interview conducted with Tim Clark in 2013. 
\(^{18}\) See Strategyzer.com
by helping them being recognized among top management scholars. Third, workshops also aimed at building a community that would popularize the concept without the help of its creators. In 2013, they have begun developing a specific workshop called “Train the trainer” aimed at a certifying business model trainers to practice workshops by themselves. Consequently, there are now about 30 certified trainers who can in turn popularize the business model canvas throughout the world.

Finally, tools also played a significant role in the popularization of the concept. As Osterwalder and Pigneur have always been willing to create some, they have developed a computer-based program to construct business model canvas that has been released in 2012. However, the challenge remains to integrate the tool with other software to ensure its use in the long run.

Key learnings from the Blue Ocean Strategy and Business Model Canvas cases

These two illustrations show that to get academic knowledge accepted by practitioners, there is a necessity to focus on particular outlets (i.e., books, bridge journals), to use metaphors and to mobilize a rhetoric. Social media and word of mouth are also key to attract the interest of an engaged community.

Discussion and Conclusion

As we reviewed the different frameworks that have been developed within academia to better link academia with practice (e.g., engaged scholarship, Mode 2 research, dialogic model, insider/outsider research teams), we lamented the fact they are rarely mobilized by academics or practitioners to undertake management research. For that purpose, this chapter offers a fine-grained model of collaboration between academics and practitioners by showing the
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19 This is based on an interview conducted with Yves Pigneur in 2013.
different interactions that occur between them and by taking illustrations from five major management concepts.

We explain how to actually create scholar-practitioner collaborations by detailing the different possible forms of interactions. Interestingly, among the four modes of interactions that we have developed, we shed light to a popularization interaction relying on social media, a way of interacting that has been overlooked in research on academic-practitioner collaborations. We also show that interactions between academics and practitioners are necessary throughout the development of a concept. For instance, we showed that both Christensen and Chesbrough have been ambidextrous for their whole academic journey, focusing both on rigor and relevance by addressing the academic and practitioner communities. Furthermore, as we have shown elsewhere (Carton & Dameron, 2015), management concepts are developed by relying on a complex mix of the four interactions succeeding over time. In that sense, relevance is instilled in academic research throughout the development of management concepts by relying on different scholar-practitioner interactions. Finally, we have highlighted that a common respect between scholars and practitioners is necessary to develop fruitful interactions (see also chapter 3, chapter 17 and chapter 18).

Based on the illustrations from this chapter, Table 14.1 summarizes our findings by showing how it is possible to navigate through the different tensions inherent to scholar-practitioner interactions. Importantly, to manage tensions through ambidexterity, an individual has to change his/her mindset to address the counterpart’s objective, as Henry Chesbrough and Clayton Christensen have done throughout their academic journey to span the academic/practice boundary. Second, to face tensions through mediation, a specific place, such as the classroom or a forum, has to be specifically designed to address expectations from both parties. Third, to face tensions through partnership, a mutual trust as well as a respect for
the other party is necessary to allow each counterpart to specialize in its domain. Fourth and last, if an academic want to popularize knowledge to practitioners, he/she has to adapt his/herself to the practitioner’s audience, using their own language and media.

------- Insert Table 14.1 about here -------

We did not intend in this chapter to develop a complete list of the different practices that can be put in place to favor scholar-practitioner interactions. In fact, with the rise of the digital era, we may expect novel interactions. In terms of mediation, we have just witnessed the development of online classes, either MOOCs or online classes such as HBX, the experiment developed by Harvard Business School\textsuperscript{20}. They may offer feedbacks for academics from a broad range of people coming from all around the world. Popular social media such as Facebook, Twitter or Pulse on LinkedIn may also provide quick feedbacks with a less focused audience. To compensate, one can develop more confined and thematic areas as did Gary Hamel by developing \textit{Management Innovation eXchange}\textsuperscript{21}.

In terms of popularization, we may expect open access policies to facilitate interactions between research and practice. New technologies may also develop ways to consume knowledge such as the experiment that the philosopher Bruno Latour did by launching a website playing the role of a serious game with his book, \textit{An inquiry into modes of existence}\textsuperscript{22}. Finally, we witness these last few years many business schools that have developed websites or quarterly publications aimed at popularizing their knowledge to the public at large, following the example of Knowledge@Wharton\textsuperscript{23} or of the Harvard Business Review. As Andrews (1977) explains for the case of HBR, the recipe of the success of such publications

\textsuperscript{20} See hbx.hbs.edu
\textsuperscript{21} See managementexchange.com
\textsuperscript{22} See modesofexistence.org
\textsuperscript{23} See knowledge.wharton.upenn.edu
lies in the following: “the ideal HBR article is original, analytical, and useful. It is not usually hair-raising, funny, artificial, superficial, or pointlessly academic.” (p. 1)

Even if technology may help developing new forms of mediation and popularization interactions, it hardly solves managerial issues. In fact, developing ambidexterity and partnership interactions largely rests on the development of incentives from business schools to favor scholar-practitioner collaborations. For instance, from hands-off methods of research, research in management may turn into more qualitative traditions of research, a way through which Chesbrough and Christensen have conducted their research. Furthermore, universities may also partner with firms to develop teaching case study as a first port of entry to the firm, following the Balanced Scorecard’s exemplar development. However, this change mainly rests on scholars’ evaluation, especially tenure requirements, that do not currently favor such investments with practice.
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Table 14.1: Solutions to face tensions taking place at the scholar-practitioner interface

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tensions / Interactions</th>
<th>Ambidexterity</th>
<th>Mediation</th>
<th>Partnership</th>
<th>Popularization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practices developed</td>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>Case</td>
<td>Popular press</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>activity by an</td>
<td>theory-testing</td>
<td>development,</td>
<td>(BOS), social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>academic (OI,</td>
<td>(DI), case</td>
<td>elective affinity</td>
<td>media (BMC),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DI), creation of</td>
<td>development</td>
<td>(BSC)</td>
<td>conferences and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a consultancy</td>
<td>through</td>
<td></td>
<td>workshops (BMC,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(DI), PhD/DBA</td>
<td>assignments</td>
<td></td>
<td>BOS), essay (BMC,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(DI, OI)</td>
<td>(OI), exchange</td>
<td></td>
<td>BOS), cases and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>forum (OI),</td>
<td></td>
<td>teaching material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>think-tank (DI)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(BOS), professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>certification (BMC,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BOS), consultancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(BOS), creation of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tools (BMC, BOS),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>advisory work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(BOS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different logics</td>
<td>Change of mindset to shift</td>
<td>Gathering of the two</td>
<td>Negotiation of common goals</td>
<td>Academics’ efforts to anchor their work in practitioners’ logic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change of mindset to shift</td>
<td>Gathering of the two</td>
<td>Negotiation of common goals</td>
<td>Academics’ efforts to anchor their work in practitioners’ logic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different time</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Negotiation of</td>
<td>Negotiation of a</td>
<td>Academics’ efforts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Long Term Objective</th>
<th>Common Long Term Practice</th>
<th>Practitioners’ Time Span</th>
<th>Specific Outlets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>A delimited time frame and using a specific platform in order to satisfy both parties' long term academic needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Different Communication Styles</th>
<th>Ability to Change the Communication Style Thanks to Knowledge of Both Academia and Practice</th>
<th>Development of a Common Language to Build Knowledge on That Basis with Differing Communication Styles</th>
<th>Assignment of Complementary Roles to Address Shorter Practitioners’ Time Span by Using Specific Outlets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Different Mindset to Change the Criteria of Rigor and Relevance Depending on the Target Audience</td>
<td>Change of Mindset to Change the Criteria of Rigor and Relevance Depending on the Target Audience</td>
<td>Development of Common Criteria of Rigor and Relevance</td>
<td>Assignment of Complementary Roles to Complement Rigor with Relevance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Different Change of Gathering of Negotiation of Academics’ Efforts | Rigor vs. Relevance | Academics’ Efforts |}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change of</th>
<th>Development of</th>
<th>Assignment of</th>
<th>Academics’ Efforts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change of</td>
<td>Development of</td>
<td>Assignment of</td>
<td>Academics’ Efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mindset to change the criteria of rigor and relevance depending on the target audience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interests and incentives</td>
<td>mindset to respond to the interests / incentives of the other part</td>
<td>communities within a specific platform gathering common interests and incentives</td>
<td>to specifically address practitioners’ issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>