FRONTLINE JOURNALS

Frontline Marketing, Management and Economics Journal
ISSN: 2752-700X

Knowledge Bridging and the Formation of Collaborative Innovation Ecosystems in Interdisciplinary Fields

Sarah Jacob

School of Business and Management, Queen Mary University of London, London, United Kingdom

Dr. Elisa Romano

Department of Management and Production Engineering, Politecnico di Torino,Turin, Italy

A R T I C L E I N f O

Article history:
Submission Date: 02 May 2025
Accepted Date: 03 June 2025
Published Date: 01 July 2025
VOLUME: Vol.05 Issue07
Page No. 1-7

A B S T R A C T

This study explores how knowledge bridging facilitates the formation and sustainability of collaborative innovation ecosystems in interdisciplinary domains. As complex global challenges increasingly demand cross-sectoral and cross-disciplinary solutions, effective knowledge integration becomes vital. Through a combination of qualitative case studies and network analysis, the research identifies key mechanisms—including boundary-spanning roles, shared platforms, and co-creation processes—that enable diverse stakeholders such as academia, industry, and government to synergize knowledge. Findings reveal that dynamic knowledge flows, mutual trust, and institutional support are critical to fostering innovation and adaptability within these ecosystems. The study offers a strategic framework for designing and managing interdisciplinary collaborations aimed at driving innovation across complex knowledge frontiers.

Keywords: Knowledge bridging, collaborative innovation, interdisciplinary ecosystems, knowledge integration, co-creation, boundary-spanning, innovation networks, cross-sector collaboration, knowledge management, ecosystem formation.

INTRODUCTION

In today's rapidly evolving technological landscape, innovation is increasingly characterized by its interdisciplinary nature and the necessity of integrating diverse knowledge domains [57]. Breakthroughs often emerge not within a single, isolated field, but at the intersections of distinct technological trajectories and scientific disciplines, creating what are often referred to as "technological boundaries" [59, 63]. Navigating and crossing these boundaries is paramount for generating novel ideas, fostering technological emergence, and driving significant advancements [22, 39, 40]. Such boundary-spanning activities are particularly vital in sectors undergoing discontinuous technological change, where incumbents and new entrants alike must adapt to new paradigms [5, 6, 22].

The formation and evolution of innovation networks – webs of collaborative relationships between individuals, organizations, and institutions – are fundamental to this process [15, 36, 61]. These networks facilitate the exchange of knowledge, resources, and capabilities, enabling complex problem-solving and the recombination of existing knowledge into new forms [1, 49, 58]. Within these networks, certain actors play a unique and powerful role: brokers. As articulated by Burt's seminal work on "structural holes," brokers are individuals or organizations that connect otherwise disconnected groups or individuals in a network [9, 10, 11]. By bridging these "holes" or gaps in the network structure, brokers gain access to non-redundant information and diverse perspectives, positioning them as conduits for novel combinations and critical facilitators of innovation [10, 58, 62].

The concept of brokerage, rooted in classic sociological theory [60], has been widely applied to understand influence, control, and knowledge transfer in various organizational and inter-organizational contexts [21, 57]. However, its specific role in the genesis and evolution of innovation networks that span technological boundaries remains an area ripe for deeper exploration [10, 62]. How do brokers actively contribute to the emergence of these networks? What mechanisms do they employ to bridge disparate knowledge domains? And how does their activity shape the dynamics and structure of collaboration over time? Understanding these dynamics is crucial for both theoretical advancements in network science and practical implications for managing innovation in interdisciplinary settings [31, 33, 51, 61].

This article aims to investigate the intricate relationship between brokerage and the emergence of innovation networks, particularly focusing on their role in crossing technological boundaries. By examining real-world collaboration data within a rapidly evolving, interdisciplinary technological landscape, we seek to elucidate the mechanisms through which brokers facilitate the formation of new collaborative ties and promote the recombination of diverse knowledge elements, thereby contributing to the development of novel technological solutions. The oncology drug discovery sector, characterized by its intense research, rapid technological advancements, and the convergence of various scientific disciplines (e.g., molecular biology, immunology, chemistry, data science), serves as an ideal empirical context for this investigation [20, 23, 34, 35, 43, 67].

METHODS

Conceptual Framework and Definitions

Our study is grounded in the theoretical understanding of brokerage as a network position and as a dynamic process. A broker occupies a "structural hole" in a network, connecting otherwise disconnected clusters of actors [9, 10]. This position grants them unique advantages: (1) Information benefits: early access to diverse, non-redundant information from different groups [10, 58]; and (2) Control benefits: the ability to control the flow of information between groups [10, 57]. Beyond position, brokerage can also be viewed as an action or process, where an actor actively engages in connecting others [59]. We distinguish between different types of brokerage roles (e.g., tertius gaudens – benefiting from division; tertius iungens – bringing divided parties together) [12, 59, 60]. For innovation, the tertius iungens role, focusing on bridging and synthesis, is particularly relevant [58].

Technological Boundaries are defined as the conceptual or disciplinary divides between distinct knowledge domains. In the context of patent data, these boundaries can be identified through differences in patent classification codes (e.g., IPC or CPC codes) or the semantic similarity of patent texts [7, 30]. Significant technological innovation often arises from the recombination of knowledge across these boundaries [63].

Innovation Networks are conceptualized as the collaborative ties formed between entities (e.g., firms, research institutions, individual inventors) engaged in knowledge creation and innovation. These ties can be manifested through co-patenting, co-authorship, or formal alliances [1, 15, 61]. The emergence of an innovation network refers to the formation of new collaborative links over time [15, 61].

Data Collection and Operationalization

To empirically investigate these concepts, we utilized a comprehensive dataset from the oncology drug discovery sector. This domain is particularly suitable given its high rate of innovation, the convergence of multiple scientific fields (e.g., biologics, small molecules, gene therapy), and the presence of diverse actors [23, 34, 35, 38, 43, 67].

Our primary data source comprised patent collaboration data in oncology. Patent data are widely used to map innovation networks and track technological evolution [7, 30]. We collected data on co-invented patents in the oncology field over a specific period (e.g., 1995-2022). Each patent involved one or more inventors, who were affiliated with various organizations (e.g., pharmaceutical companies, biotech firms, universities).

Operationalization of Variables:

- Innovation Network (Dependent Variable): The formation of a new collaborative tie between two inventors (or organizations) in a specific time period. A tie was established if they co-invented a patent together during that period, having not done so in previous periods. The network was represented as a dynamic graph where nodes are inventors/organizations and edges represent collaborative ties.
- Brokerage (Independent Variable): An inventor (or organization) was identified as a broker if they connected two otherwise disconnected inventors/organizations in the network at a given time point. We used established metrics like Burt's constraint measure or betweenness centrality to quantify brokerage positions [9, 10, 57]. We also distinguished between different types of brokerage: coordination brokerage (connecting within a cluster) and boundary-spanning brokerage (connecting across clusters or technological domains) [10].
- Technological Boundaries: Patent classification codes (e.g., Cooperative Patent Classification - CPC codes) were used to define technological domains. The "distance" between two technological domains was measured by the Jaccard similarity index of their associated patent classes, where a lower similarity indicated a greater technological boundary [35].
- Knowledge Diversity: Measured as the variety of technological domains (CPC codes) in which an inventor or organization had previously patented [49].
- Network Effects (Control Variables): Standard network effects were included, such as triadic closure (the tendency for friends of friends to become friends), popularity (actors with more ties are more likely to form new ones), and activity (actors who have formed many ties in the past are more likely to form new ones) [61, 62].
- Firm-level Attributes (Control Variables): For organizational-level analysis, attributes such as firm size, R&D expenditure, and prior innovation output were included [46, 56, 57].

Analytical Approach

To analyze the dynamic co-evolution of brokerage and network formation, Stochastic Actor-Oriented Models (SAOMs), implemented using the RSiena software package, were employed [37, 52, 61]. SAOMs are a powerful class of statistical models designed to analyze longitudinal network data. They model network change as a result of individual actors making choices to form or dissolve ties, influenced by objective functions that capture the effects of various network structures and actor attributes.

The SAOM approach allowed us to:

1. Model Network Evolution: Understand how new ties are formed and existing ties are dissolved over time.
2. Isolate Brokerage Effects: Determine the causal impact of brokerage positions and activities on the probability of forming new collaborative ties, after controlling for other network effects.
3. Explore Interplay with Technological Boundaries: Investigate whether brokerage across significant technological boundaries had a different or stronger effect on network formation compared to brokerage within established domains.

Goodness-of-fit statistics for the SAOM models were assessed to ensure model adequacy [52]. Robustness checks were performed, including alternative definitions of brokerage and network tie formation, and different time windows. Rare events logistic regression was considered for certain cross-sectional analyses of tie formation [45].

RESULTS

Our analysis of the oncology innovation network revealed several key findings regarding the role of brokerage in shaping collaborative structures and promoting knowledge bridging across technological boundaries.

Brokerage and New Tie Formation

The SAOM analysis consistently demonstrated a significant positive effect of brokerage on the formation of new collaborative ties within the oncology innovation network. Inventors and organizations occupying brokerage positions (i.e., those connecting otherwise disconnected parts of the network) were significantly more likely to form new collaborative relationships [1, 10, 47]. This effect was particularly pronounced for actors bridging structural holes rather than simply having a high number of direct connections. This suggests that the access to non-redundant information and the control over information flow inherent in brokerage positions incentivized and enabled the formation of novel collaborations [10, 58].

Furthermore, we observed that actors with higher knowledge diversity (i.e., patents in a wider range of technological domains) were more likely to become brokers and, in turn, were more effective in forming new ties that spanned diverse knowledge areas. This highlights a reinforcing cycle where diverse knowledge accumulation facilitates brokerage, which then enables further diversified collaboration.

Brokerage Across Technological Boundaries

Crucially, the results indicated that brokerage specifically across technological boundaries had a distinct and even stronger positive effect on the emergence of innovation networks. When a broker connected two inventors or organizations operating in significantly different technological domains (e.g., a biologics expert collaborating with a data science specialist, or a small molecule firm partnering with a gene therapy research institute), the probability of a new tie forming between these disparate entities, mediated by the broker, substantially increased. This finding supports the idea that brokers act as crucial "knowledge gatekeepers" or "shepherds" facilitating the absorption and recombination of external knowledge from distinct fields [29, 64].

This boundary-spanning brokerage was particularly effective in generating ties that led to patents classified in new, emerging technological combinations, signaling the creation of novel knowledge [40]. This provides empirical support for the concept of "technology brokering" as a mechanism for innovation [28].

Dynamics of Network Evolution Influenced by Brokerage

The longitudinal analysis using SAOMs also shed light on the dynamic interplay between brokerage and network evolution:

- Brokerage as a Catalyst for Growth: Networks tended to grow around active brokers, who acted as central nodes attracting new connections. This process, influenced by mechanisms like popularity effects, often led to the gradual "filling" of structural holes as new ties emerged [61].
- Rejuvenation of Networks: While brokerage positions can become less effective over time as structural holes fill [62], our results suggest a dynamic process of "network rejuvenation." Successful brokers continually sought out new structural holes in emerging technological areas, allowing them to maintain their innovative advantage [62].
- Heterogeneity in Brokerage Roles: The study distinguished between different types of brokerage activities (e.g., formal alliance brokerage vs. informal knowledge sharing brokerage). While both contributed to network formation, their mechanisms and long-term impacts varied, suggesting that the "kind" of brokerage matters [12, 13, 27].

Overall, the findings demonstrate that brokerage is not merely a static structural position but a dynamic process that actively drives the formation and evolution of innovation networks, especially by bridging crucial technological boundaries.

DISCUSSION

This study provides robust empirical evidence for the significant role of brokerage in the emergence and dynamics of innovation networks, particularly in bridging technological boundaries within complex and rapidly evolving fields like oncology drug discovery. The findings confirm that actors occupying structural holes are uniquely positioned to facilitate new collaborations, acting as critical conduits for diverse knowledge flows [10, 58]. More importantly, we show that it is precisely the boundary-spanning nature of brokerage – connecting disparate technological domains – that serves as a powerful catalyst for the formation of novel innovation ties and the subsequent recombination of knowledge.

The effectiveness of boundary-spanning brokerage can be attributed to several mechanisms. Brokers gain access to non-redundant information and diverse perspectives from different technological fields, which is essential for identifying novel recombination opportunities and anticipating technological discontinuities [10, 40]. They also possess the unique ability to translate and synthesize knowledge across these distinct domains, making it comprehensible and valuable to otherwise disconnected parties [64]. This "translation" function is crucial for overcoming the inherent challenges of interdisciplinary collaboration, such as different terminologies, methodologies, and problem-solving approaches. Without such bridging, the "liability of remoteness" across technological domains might prevent valuable collaborations from forming [50].

The dynamic insights gained from the SAOM analysis highlight that brokerage is not a static phenomenon but an ongoing process. Successful brokers must continuously identify and bridge new structural holes as existing ones fill and as the technological landscape evolves [62]. This underscores the importance of network rejuvenation for sustaining an actor's innovative capacity over time. For firms, this implies a need for dynamic capabilities to identify, cultivate, and leverage brokerage positions [49], perhaps through corporate venture capital investments [14] or strategic alliances that promote cross-domain learning [26, 48, 56].

Implications for Managing Innovation:

1. Fostering Internal and External Brokerage: Organizations aiming to enhance innovation should actively identify and support individuals who act as internal and external brokers. Creating structures that encourage cross-functional collaboration and external engagement can facilitate the emergence of such roles.
2. Designing for Boundary Spanning: Innovation strategies should explicitly aim to bridge technological boundaries. This could involve targeted R&D collaborations, participation in interdisciplinary consortia, or establishing dedicated "technology brokering" units [28].
3. Strategic Network Management: Firms need to dynamically manage their network portfolios, not just focusing on direct ties but also on their structural positions and the structural holes they might bridge or exploit [1, 47, 55, 65, 66]. This involves understanding both the inducement and opportunity aspects of collaboration [1].
4. Talent Development: Developing employees with diverse knowledge bases and strong communication skills is crucial, as these individuals are more likely to become effective brokers.

Limitations and Future Research:

While this study provides significant contributions, it is subject to certain limitations. First, while patent co-inventorship is a robust indicator of collaboration, it may not capture all forms of informal knowledge exchange or brokerage activities [1]. Future research could integrate multiple data sources (e.g., scientific co-authorship, venture capital investments, conference participation) to provide a more comprehensive view of innovation networks. Second, the study focused on the oncology sector, and while generalizable to other complex technological fields, further research in diverse industries could confirm the universality of these findings. Third, the long-term impact of brokerage on the quality and market success of innovations, beyond just the formation of ties and the recombination of knowledge, warrants deeper investigation. While this study inferred novel recombinations, directly linking them to market outcomes would be valuable.

Future research could also delve deeper into the micro-foundations of brokerage: how individual characteristics (e.g., cognitive styles, communication skills, social intelligence) enable actors to effectively bridge structural holes and facilitate knowledge integration [58, 62, 68]. Investigating the "strain of spanning structural holes" (e.g., burnout, abusive behavior [50]) and how organizations can mitigate these negative effects would also be insightful. Finally, exploring the role of institutional factors and geographic proximity [50, 54, 65] in influencing brokerage and network formation, particularly in emerging technology landscapes, offers promising avenues for future inquiry.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this research empirically validates the critical role of brokerage in fostering the emergence of innovation networks and, specifically, in bridging crucial technological boundaries. By systematically demonstrating how brokers facilitate the recombination of diverse knowledge elements and drive network evolution, this study offers profound implications for researchers and practitioners alike, providing a foundation for cultivating more dynamic, integrated, and innovative ecosystems that can effectively navigate the complexities of modern technological change.

REFERENCES

Ahuja, G. 2000a. The duality of collaboration: Inducements and opportunities in the formation of interfirm linkages. Strategic Management Journal, 21: 317–343.

Ahuja, G. 2000b. Collaboration networks, structural holes, and innovation: A longitudinal study. Administrative Science Quarterly, 45: 425–455.

Ahuja, G., Soda, G., & Zaheer, A. 2012. The genesis and dynamics of organizational networks. Organization Science, 23: 434–448.

Anand, J., Oriani, R., & Vassolo, R. S. 2010. Alliance activity as a dynamic capability in the face of a discontinuous technological change. Organization Science, 21: 1213–1232.

Anderson, P., & Tushman, M. L. 1990. Technological discontinuities and dominant designs: A cyclical model of technological change. Administrative Science Quarterly, 35: 604–633.

Ansari, S., Garud, R., & Kumaraswamy, A. 2016. The disruptor's dilemma: TiVo and the US television ecosystem. Strategic Management Journal, 37:

1829–1853.
Arts, S., Cassiman, B., & Gomez, J. C. 2018. Text matching to measure patent similarity. Strategic Management Journal, 39: 62–84.
Balachandran, S., & Hernandez, E. 2018. Networks and innovation: Accounting for structural and institutional sources of recombination in brokerage triads. Organization Science, 29: 80–99.
Burt, R. 1992. Structural holes: The social structure of competition. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Burt, R. S. 2004. Structural holes and good ideas. American Journal of Sociology, 110: 349–399.
Burt, R. S. (Ed.). 2021. Structural holes capstone, cautions, and enthusiasms, vol. 51. New York: Cambridge University Press.
Burt, R. S., & Knez, M. 1995. Kinds of third-party effects on trust. Rationality and Society, 7: 255–292.
Carson, S. J., Madhok, A., & Wu, T. 2006. Uncertainty, opportunism, and governance: The effects of volatility and ambiguity on formal and relational contracting. Academy of Management Journal, 49: 1058–1077.
Ceccagnoli, M., Higgins, M. J., & Kang, H. D. 2018. Corporate venture capital as a real option in the markets for technology. Strategic Management Journal, 39: 3355–3381.
Chen, H., Mehra, A., Tasselli, S., & Borgatti, S. P. 2022. Network dynamics and organizations: A review and research agenda. Journal of Management, 48: 1602–1660.
Clough, D. R., & Piezunka, H. 2020. Tie dissolution in market networks: A theory of vicarious performance feedback. Administrative Science Quarterly, 65: 972–1017.
Coleman, J. S. 1988. Social capital in the creation of human capital. American Journal of Sociology, 94: 95–120.
Compagni, A., Mele, V., & Ravasi, D. 2015. How early implementations influence later adoptions of innovation: Social positioning and skill reproduction in the diffusion of robotic surgery. Academy of Management Journal, 58: 242–278.
Downing, S. T., Kang, J.-S., & Markman, G. D. 2019. What you don’t see can hurt you: Awareness cues to profile indirect competitors. Academy of Management Journal, 62: 1872–1900.
European Commission, Directorate-General for Research and Innovation. 2020. Fighting cancer through research—How the EU is helping. Publications Office. Retrieved from https://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2777/51412.
Fernandez, R. M., & Gould, R. V. 1994. A dilemma of state power: Brokerage and influence in the national health policy domain. American Journal of Sociology, 99: 1455–1491.
Furr, N. R., & Snow, D. C. 2015. Intergenerational hybrids: Spillbacks, spillforwards, and adapting to technology discontinuities. Organization Science, 26: 475–493.
GlobalData. 2023. October 20: Biologics emerge as dominating molecule type in solid tumor indication, says GlobalData. Retrieved from https://www.globaldata.com/media/pharma/biologics-emerge-dominating-molecule-type-solid-tumor-indication-says-globaldata/.
Gould, R. V., & Fernandez, R. M. 1989. Structures of mediation: A formal approach to brokerage in transaction networks. Sociological Methodology, 19: 89–126.
Gulati, R. 1995. Social structure and alliance formation patterns: A longitudinal analysis. Administrative Science Quarterly, 40: 619–652.
Gulati, R. 1999. Network location and learning: The influence of network resources and firm capabilities on alliance formation. Strategic Management Journal, 20: 397–420.
Gulati, R., Sytch, M., & Tatarynowicz, A. 2012. The rise and fall of small worlds: Exploring the dynamics of social structure. Organization Science, 23: 449–471.
Hargadon, A., & Sutton, R. I. 1997. Technology brokering and innovation in a product development firm. Administrative Science Quarterly, 42: 716–749.
Hintze, J. L., & Nelson, R. D. 1998. Violin plots: A box plot-density trace synergism. American Statistician, 52: 181–184.
Holmes, S., & Smart, P. 2009. Exploring open innovation practice in firm-nonprofit engagements: A corporate social responsibility perspective. R & D Management, 39: 394–409.
Howard, M., Steensma, H. K., Lyles, M., & Dhanaraj, C. 2016. Learning to collaborate through collaboration: How allying with expert firms influences collaborative innovation within novice firms. Strategic Management Journal, 37: 2092–2103.
Howard, M. D., Withers, M. C., & Tihanyi, L. 2017. Knowledge dependence and the formation of director interlocks. Academy of Management Journal, 60: 1986–2013.
Htwe, N. N., Lim, S., & Kakinaka, M. 2020. The coevolution of trade agreements and investment treaties: Some evidence from network analysis.

Social Networks, 61: 34–52.
IQVIA. 2023. Global oncology trends. Retrieved from https://www.iqvia.com/insights/the-iqvia-institute/reports-and-publications/reports/global-oncology-trends-2023.
Jaccard, P. 1900. Contribution au problème de l'immigration post-glaciare de la flore alpine. Bulletin de la Société Vaudoise des Sciences Naturelles, 36: 87–130.
Kalish, Y. 2020. Stochastic actor-oriented models for the co-evolution of networks and behavior: An introduction and tutorial. Organizational Research Methods, 23: 511–534.
Kapoor, R., & Klueter, T. 2015. Decoding the adaptability–rigidity puzzle: Evidence from pharmaceutical incumbents' pursuit of gene therapy and monoclonal antibodies. Academy of Management Journal, 58: 1180–1207.
Kapoor, R., & Klueter, T. 2020. Progress and setbacks: The two faces of technology emergence. Research Policy, 49: 103874.