

Forward for a Comprehensive Policy on User Innovation

Charles Edquist*

Department of innovation policy and governance of innovation systems, CIRCLE, Lund University, 22100 Lund, Sweden

Introduction

The goal of this article is to combine prior user innovation policy recommendations into an adapted system of innovation framework, which may be used to develop a future holistic user innovation strategy for the home sector. This is accomplished in [1] three phases. We begin by introducing the systems of innovation framework as a comprehensive foundation for [2]. an integrated approach to innovation policy. Second, we discover and evaluate policy recommendations produced by user innovation researchers, then categorise them using the systems of innovation framework's 10 main activities. Third, we combine the policy proposals discovered into an adapted framework that includes variables particular to user innovation [3]. in the household sector, using a systems of innovation viewpoint.

Traditionally, innovation research has viewed the firm as a producer of innovations inspired by Schumpeter's early studies. A linear model of innovation where the innovation process starts in corporate or university research and development has dominated strongly viewing customers and users as passive recipients of innovations.

The national surveys of user innovation in the household sector have empirically shown that user innovation activity is quite large (1.5%–7.3% of a country's population) especially regarding consumer products. Thus, it has a substantial effect on the economic and social welfare of society. The empirical evidence of user innovation activity related to sustainability transitions is weaker, but case studies in the energy sector, provide indications of high activity of incremental user innovations to diffuse more efficient energy technologies in the households. The indicated size of user innovation activity and level of sustainability engagement from users demonstrates that user innovation in the household sector is a major source of innovation. In this way, the policies may affect economic growth, social wellbeing, and sustainability transition in a substantial way. User innovation policies can also influence which trajectories that innovation processes follow, including influencing them in a more sustainable direction. For these reasons, politicians, decision-makers in companies, and public sector organizations should care for and support user innovation in the household sector. However, the national surveys and the academic literature revealed that some countries and sectors had a low level of user innovation activities. While it is hard to know what level of user innovation that corresponds to an optimal performance level, it is evident that some countries, such as South Korea and Japan, have a much lower actual level of user innovation than, for instance, Sweden and the UK. The countries with low levels may wish to take public policy action to raise the level and intensity of user innovation in the household sector. The second policy problem, low levels of diffusion of valuable user innovations, seems to be more universal according to results from the national surveys. In all surveyed countries only a minor fraction of user innovations, ranging from 5% to 21.9% of all innovations, are diffused. The main diffusion mechanism is peer-to-peer interaction. The practical implication for policy-makers consists of examples of suitable policy instruments for each key activity (and discussed the need to put an initial emphasis on changing the constituents of the innovation system followed by policy instruments related to the other key activities to effectively provide policy support to

user innovation. As innovation processes are complex, interactive, and multi-causal, the systems of innovation framework imply consideration of interrelatedness between innovation policy instruments. We argue that the policy integration of user innovation in the national, regional, and/or sectoral systems of [4]. innovation will not only benefit the user innovators themselves but also producing firms as well as public organizations and governance of innovation [5]. The reasons are that producing firms and public organizations can focus their resources on development activities that user innovators do not engage.

Acknowledgement

I would like to thank my Professor for his support and encouragement.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that they are no conflict of interest

References

1. Allen DL, Leinwand LA (2001) Postnatal myosin heavy chain isoform expression in normal mice and mice null for IId or IIb myosin heavy chains. *Dev Biol* 229: 383-395.
2. Argentati C, Tortorella I (2020) Harnessing the potential of stem cells for disease modeling: progress and promises. *J Pers Med* 10: 8.
3. Bartos DC, Grandi E (2015) Ion channels in the heart. *Compr Physiol* 5: 1423-1464.
4. Bedada FB, Chan SSK (2014) Acquisition of a quantitative, stoichiometric ally conserved radiometric marker of maturation status in stem cell-derived cardiac myocytes. *Stem Cell Rep* 3: 594-605.

*Corresponding author: Charles Edquist, Department of innovation policy and governance of innovation systems, CIRCLE, Lund University, 22100 Lund, Sweden, E-mail: charles.@circle.lu.se

Received: 07-Feb-2022, Manuscript No: ijaiti-22-60553, Editor assigned: 09-Feb-2022, PreQC No: ijaiti-22-60553 (PQ), Reviewed: 15-Feb-2022, QC No: ijaiti-22-60553, Revised: 19-Feb-2022, Manuscript No: ijaiti-22-60553 (R), Published: 26-Feb-2022, DOI: 10.4172/2277-1891.1000170

Citation: Edquist C (2022) Forward for a Comprehensive Policy on User Innovation. *Int J Adv Innovat Thoughts Ideas*, 11: 170.

Copyright: © 2022 Edquist C. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.