

## Bibliography

- Agrawal, A., Cockburn, I., & McHale, J. (2006). Gone but not forgotten: knowledge flows, labor mobility, and enduring social relationships. *Journal of Economic Geography*, 6, 571–591.
- Ahuja, G. (2000). Collaboration networks, structural holes and innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 45, 425–455.
- Allen, T. (1977). *Managing the flow of technology: Technology transfer and the dissemination of technological information within the research and development organization*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Allen, T. J. & Henn, G. W. (2006). *The Organization and Architecture of Innovation. Managing the Flow of Technology*. Amsterdam: Butterworth-Heinemann/Architectural Press.
- Allison, P. D. (1977). Testing for interaction in multiple regression. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 83 (1), 144–153.
- Alm, H. & McKelvey, M. (2000). When and why does cooperation positively or negatively affect innovation? an exploration into turbulent waters. *CRIC Discussion Paper*, No. 39.
- Amemiya, T. (1984). Tobit models: A survey. *Journal of Econometrics*, 24, 3–61.
- Amin, A. & Cohendet, P. (2004). *Architectures of knowledge. Firms, capabilities, and communities*. Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Amin, A. & Roberts, J. (2008). Knowing in action: Beyond communities of practice. *Research Policy*, 37, 353–369.
- Andrews, K. M. & Delahaye, B. L. (2000). Influences on knowledge processes in organizational learning: The psychosocial filter. *Journal of Econometrics*, 37 (6), 797–810.
- Antlitz, A. (1999). *Unternehmensgrenzen und Kooperationen. Make-cooperate-or-buy im Zusammenspiel von Kompetenz- und Strategieentwicklung [Firm boundaries and cooperation. Make-cooperate-or-buy in the interplay of competence and strategy development]*. Wiesbaden: Betriebswirtschaftlicher Verlag Dr. Th. Gabler GmbH und Deutscher Universitäts-Verlag GmbH.
- Archibugi, D. & Lundvall, B.-Å. (2001). *The Globalizing Learning Economy*. Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Archibugi, D. & Pianta, M. (1992). *The Technological Specialization of Advanced Countries*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

- Argyris, C. & Schön, D. A. (1996). *Organizational Learning II. Theory, Method, and Practice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Arnold, E. & Thuriaux, B. (1997). Developing firm's technological capabilities. *Working paper, Technopolis Ltd.*, (pp. 1–43).
- Arrow, K. (1962). Economic welfare and the allocation of resources for invention. In K. Arrow (Ed.), *The Rate and Direction of Inventive Activity* (pp. 1–38). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Arundel, A. & Geuna, A. (2001). *Does Proximity Matter for Knowledge Transfer from Public Institutes and Universities to Firms?* Technical report, SPRU, Electronic Working Paper Series No. 73.
- Asheim, B. & Gertler, M. S. (2005). The geography of innovation. regional innovation systems. In J. Fagerberg, D. D. Mowery, & R. R. Nelson (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Innovation* chapter 11, (pp. 291–317). Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Atteslander, P. & Kopp, M. (2006). *Methoden der empirischen Sozialforschung [Methods for social science research]*. Berlin: Schmidt Verlag, 11<sup>th</sup> edition.
- Audretsch, D. B. & Feldman, M. P. (1996). R&d spillovers and the geography of innovation and production. *The American Economic Review*, 86 (3), 630–640.
- Axelrod, R. (1984). *The Evolution of Cooperation*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Bakker, R. & Janowicz-Panjaitan, M. (2009). Time matters: the impact of 'temporariness' on the functioning and performance of organizations. In P. Kenis, M. Janowicz-Panjaitan, & B. Chambré (Eds.), *Temporary Organizations. Prevalence, Logic an Effectiveness* chapter 4, (pp. 121–141). Cheltenham, UK, Norhampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.
- Balconi, M., Pozzali, A., & Viale, R. (2007). The “codification debate” revisited: a conceptual framework to analyze the role of tacit knowledge in economics. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 16 (5), 823–849.
- Balland, P.-A. (2009). Proximity and the evolution of collaboration networks: Evidences from r&d projects within the gnss industry. *Utrecht Universtiy: Papers in Evolutionary Economic Geography*, 09.14, 1–28.
- Barkema, H. G., Bell, J. H. J., & Pennings, J. M. (1996). Foreign entry, cultural barriers, and learning. *Strategic Management Journal*, 17, 151–166.
- Barkema, H. G. & Vermeulen, F. (1997). What differences in the cultural backgrounds of partners are detrimental for international joint ventures. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 28, 845–864.
- Barney, J. B. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17 (1), 99–120.

- Barney, J. B. & Clark, D. N. (2007). *Resource-Based Theory. Creating and Sustaining Competitive Advantage*. Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Bartholomew, S. (1997). National systems of biotechnology innovation: complex interdependence in the global system. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 28, 241–266.
- Bathelt, H., Malmberg, A., & Maskell, P. (2004). Cluster and knowledge: Local buzz, global pipelines and the process of knowledge creation. *Progress in Human Geography*, 28 (1), 31–56.
- Baum, J. A. C., Calabrese, T., & Silverman, B. S. (2000). Don't go it alone: alliance network composition and startups' performance in canadian biotechnology. *Strategic Management Journal*, 21, 267–294.
- Becker, C. (2004). Innovationskooperation aus sicht der transaktionskostentheorie – eine empirische analyse zum einatz institutioneller arrangements bei komplexen innovationstransaktionen. [innovation cooperation from the perspective of transaction cost theory – an empirical analysis on the use of institutional arrangements in complex innovation transactions]. In M. Fritsch (Ed.), *Marktdynamik und Innovation. Gedächtnisschrift für Hans-Jürgen Ewers. [Market dynamic and innovation*. (pp. 45–71). Berlin: Duncker & Humblot GmbH.
- Becker-Ritterspach, F. A. A. (2006). The social consitution of knowledge integration in mnes: A theoretical framework. *Journal of International Management*, 12, 358–377.
- Beckert, J. (2005). Soziologische netzwerkanalyse [social network analysis]. In D. Keasler (Ed.), *Aktuelle Theorien der Soziologie. Von Shmuel N. Eisenstadt bis zur Postmoderne [Current theories from sociology. From Shmuel N. Eisenstadt to postmodernism]*. Munich: Verlag C. H. Beck.
- Bellet, M., Colletis, G., & Lung, Y. (1993). Introduction au numéro special “économie de proximités”. *Revue d'Économie Régionale et Urbaine*, 3, 357–361.
- Belussi, F., Sammarra, A., & Sedita, S. R. (2008). Managing long distance and localized learning in the emilia romagna life science cluster. *European Planning Studies*, 16 (5), 665–692.
- Belussi, F., Sammarra, A., & Sedita, S. R. (2010). Learning at the boundaries in an “open regional innovation system”: A focus on firms' innovation strategies in the emilia romagna life science industry. *Research Policy*, 39, 710–721.
- Bhagat, R., Kedia, B. L., Harveston, P. D., & Triandis, H. C. (2002). Cultural variations in the cross-border transfer of organizational knowledge: an integrative framework. *Academy of Management Review*, 27 (2), 204–221.
- BIO-Deutschland (2010). Deutsch-us-amerikanische zusammenarbeit [german-us-american collaboration]. <http://www.bio-deutschland.org/deutsch-us-amerikanische-zusammenarbeit.html>.

- Biocom (2010). *Die deutsche Biotechnologie-Branche 2010 [The German Biotechnology Sector 2010]*. Technical report, Biocom AG.
- Bleeke, J. & Ernst, D. (1993). *Collaborating to Compete: Using strategic alliances and acquisitions in the global marketplace*. New York NY: John Wiley.
- Blind, K., Edler, J., Frietsch, R., & Schmoch, U. (2006). Motives to patent: Empirical evidence from Germany. *Research Policy*, 35 (5), 655–672.
- Bloodgood, J. M. (1996). The internationalization of new high-potential U.S. ventures: Antecedents and outcomes. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 20 (4), 61–76.
- BMBF (2005). *BioRegions in Germany. Strong impulses for national technological development*. Technical report, Berlin: Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung (BMBF) [German Ministry for Education and Research].
- Boekholt, P., Edler, J., Cunningham, P., & Flanagan, K. (2009). *Drivers of International collaboration in research*. Technical report, European Commission.
- Borgatti, S. P., Mehra, A., Brass, D. J., & Labianca, G. (2009). Network analysis in the social sciences. *Science*, 323 (5916), 892–895.
- Bortz, J. & Doering, N. (1995). *Forschungsmethoden und Evaluation [Research methods and evaluation]*. Berlin: Springer Verlag.
- Boschma, R. (2005a). Proximity and innovation: A critical assessment. *Regional Studies*, 39(1), 61–74.
- Boschma, R. & Frenken, K. (2009). The spatial evolution of innovation networks: a proximity perspective. *Utrecht University: Papers in Evolutionary Economic Geography*, 09.05, 1–17.
- Boschma, R. A. (2005b). Editorial. role of proximity in interaction and performance: Conceptual and empirical challenges. *Regional Studies*, 39 (1), 41–45.
- Bouba-Olga, O. (2005). La géographie de l'économie des connaissances: un modèle proximate. *CRIEF Working Paper T2005-03*.
- Bouba-Olga, O. & Grossetti, M. (2005). Une (ré)definition des notions de proximité. *CRIEF Working Paper T2007-02*.
- Bouba-Olga, O. & Grossetti, M. (2007). Why are there still proximity effects in innovation processes? *CRIEF Working Paper T2007-02*.
- Bouba-Olga, O. & Zimmermann, J.-B. (2004). Modèles et mesures de la proximité. In B. Pecqueur & J.-B. Zimmermann (Eds.), *Economies de proximité* (pp. 77–99). Paris: Hermès Science publication.
- Bouncken, R. B. & Winkler, V. (2010). National and cultural diversity in transnational innovation teams. *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management*, 22 (2), 133–151.

- Boutellier, R., Gassmann, O., & von Zedtwitz, M. (2000). *Managing Global Innovation. Uncovering the Secrets of Future Competitiveness*. Heidelberg: Springer Verlag.
- Brandenburger, A. M. & Nalebuff, B. J. (1996). *Co-Opetition : A Revolution Mindset That Combines Competition and Cooperation : The Game Theory Strategy That's Changing the Game of Business*. New York, NY: Currency Doubleday.
- Brannen, M. Y., Doz, Y. L., & dos Santos, J. F. (2007). Unpacking absorptive capacity: Understanding the nature and contexts of knowledge. *MERIT-Infonomics Research Memorandum series*.
- Breschi, S. & Lissoni, F. (2001). Knowledge spillovers and local innovation systems: A critical survey. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 10 (4), 975–1005.
- Breschi, S. & Lissoni, F. (2006). Mobility of inventors and the geography of knowledge spillovers. new evidence on us data. *CESPRI Working Paper*, No. 184.
- Brink, J., McKelvey, M., & Smith, K. (2004). Conceptualizing and measuring modern biotechnology. In M. McKelvey, A. Rickne, & J. Laage-Hellman (Eds.), *The Economic Dynamics of Modern Biotechnology*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.
- Broekel, T. & Boschma, R. (2009). Knowledge networks in the dutch aviation industry: the proximity paradox. *Utrecht Universiteit: Papers in Evolutionary Economic Geography*, 09.05, 1–35.
- Brossard, O. & Vicente, J. (2007). Cognitive & relational distance in alliance networks: Evidence on the knowledge value chain in the european ict sector. *Cahiers du GRES 2007-18, Groupement de Recherches Economiques et Sociales*.
- Brown, J. S. & Duguid, P. (1991). Organizational learning and communities of practice: Towards a unified view of working, learning and innovation. *Organization Science*, 2 (1), 40–57.
- Brown, J. S. & Duguid, P. (2000). Mysteries of the region: knowledge dynamics in silicon valley. In C.-M. Lee (Ed.), *The Silicon Valley Edge: A Habitat for Innovation and Entrepreneurship* (pp. 16–39). Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.
- Buckley, P. J. & Casson, M. (1988). A theory of cooperation in international business. In F. J. Contractor & P. Lorange (Eds.), *Cooperative Strategies in International Business*. Lexington Books.
- Burr, W. (2004). *Innovationen in Organisationen [Innovation in Organizations]*. Stuttgart: Verlag W. Kohlhammer.
- Burt, R. S. (1992a). The social structure of competition. In N. Nohria & R. G. Eccles (Eds.), *Networks and Organizations. Structure, Form, and Action* chapter 2, (pp. 57–91). Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Burt, R. S. (1992b). *Structural Holes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Burt, R. S. (2001). Structural holes versus network closure as social capital. In N. Lin, K. S. Cook, R. S. Burt, & A. de Gruyter (Eds.), *Social Capital: Theory and Research*. ?
- Burt, R. S. (2008). Industry performance and indirect access to structural holes. In J. A. C. Baum & T. J. Rowley (Eds.), *Network Strategy* (pp. 315–360). Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Cairncross, F. (1997). *The death of distance*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Camagni, R. (1991). Local ‘milieu’, uncertainty and innovation networks: towards a new dynamic theory of economic space. In R. Camagni (Ed.), *Innovation in Networks: Spatial Perspectives* (pp. 131–142). London: Belhaven Press.
- Cameron, A. C. & Trivedi, P. K. (2009). *Microeconometrics Using Stata*. Texas: StataCorp LP.
- Cantner, U. & Meder, A. (2006). Determinants influencing the choice of a cooperation partner. *Jenaer Schriften zur Wirtschaftswissenschaft*, 20/2006, 1–21.
- Carlsson, B. & Stankiewicz, R. (1991). On the nature, function, and composition of technological systems. *Journal of Evolutionary Economics*, 1, 93–118.
- Carrincazeaux, C., Lung, Y., & Vicente, J. (2008). The scientific trajectory of the french school of proximity: Interaction- and institution-based approaches to regional innovation systems. *European Planning Studies*, 16 (5), 617–628.
- Caspar, S. & Murray, F. (2004). Examining the marketplace for ideas: how local are europe’s biotechnology clusters? In M. McKelvey, A. Rickne, & J. Laage-Hellman (Eds.), *The Economic Dynamics of Modern Biotechnology*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.
- Chandler, A. D. (1962). *Strategy and Structure: Chapters in the History of the Industrial Enterprise*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Chandler, A. D. (1977). *The Visible Hand: The Managerial Revolution in American Business*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Chandler, A. D. (1990). *Scale and Scope: The Dynamics of Industrial Capitalism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Chesbrough, H. W. (2003). *Open Innovation. The New Imperative for Creating and Profiting from Technology*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Chesbrough, H. W. (2006). *Open Business Models: How to Thrive in the New Innovation Landscape*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Child, J. (2000). Trust and international strategic alliances: The case of sino-foreign joint ventures. In C. Lane & R. Bachmann (Eds.), *Trust within and between organizations: Conceptual Issues and Empirical Applications* (pp. 241–272). Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press.

- Child, J., Faulkner, D., & Tallman, S. (2005). *Cooperative Strategy. Managing Alliances, Networks, and Joint Ventures*. Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Child, J. & Rodrigues, S. (1996). The role of social identity in the international transfer of knowledge through joint ventures. In S. Clegg & G. Palmer (Eds.), *The politics of management knowledge* (pp. 46–68). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Cloodt, M., Hagedoorn, J., & Van Kranenburg, H. (2006). Mergers and acquisitions: their effect on the innovative performance of companies in high-tech industries. *Research Policy*, 35, 642–668.
- Coase, R. H. (1937). The nature of the firm. *Economica*, 4 (16), 386–405.
- Coenen, L. (2006). *Faraway, so close! The changing geographies of regional innovation*. Lund: Lund University, CIRCLE - Centre for Innovation, Research and Competence in the Learning Economy.
- Coenen, L., Moodysson, J., & Asheim, B. (2004). Nodes, networks and proximities: on the knowledge dynamics of the medicon valley biotech cluster. *European Planning Studies*, 12 (7), 1003–1018.
- Coenen, L., Moodysson, J., Asheim, B. T., & Jonsson, O. (2003). The role of proximities for knowledge dynamics in a cross-border region: Biotechnology in øresund. *Paper presented at the DRUID Summer Conference 2003 on Creating, sharing and transferring knowledge. The role of geography, institutions and organizations, Copenhagen June 12-14, 2003*.
- Cohen, S. (1986). Knowledge and context. *The Journal of Philosophy*, 83 (10), 574–583.
- Cohen, W. M. & Levinthal, D. A. (1990). Absorptive capacity: A new perspective on learning and innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35, 128–152.
- Colby, C. C. (1933). Centrifugal and centripetal forces in urban geography. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 23 (1), 1–20.
- Coleman, J. (1990). *Foundations of Social Theory*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 94, S95–S120.
- Colombo, M. G. (2003). Alliance form: A test of the contractual and competitive perspectives. *Strategic Management Journal*, 24, 1209–1229.
- Contractor, F. J. & Lorange, P. (1988). Why should firms cooperate? the strategy and economics basis for cooperative ventures. In F. J. Contractor & P. Lorange (Eds.), *Cooperative Strategies in International Business* chapter 1, (pp. 3–30). Lexington, Massachusetts/Toronto: Lexington Books, D.C. Health and Company.

- Cooke, P. (2005). Rational drug design, the knowledge value chain an bioscience megacentres. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 29, 325–341.
- Cooke, P. (2006). *European Asymmetries: A Comparative Analysis of German and UK Biotechnology Clusters (mimeo)*. Technical report, Cardiff: Centre for Advanced Studies in the Social Sciences.
- Cooke, P. (2008). Biotechnology dynamics at the global scale. In H. Patzelt & T. Brenner (Eds.), *Handbook of Bioentrepreneurship*. Berlin: Springer Verlag.
- Cooke, P., Uranga, M. G., & Etxebarria, G. (1997). Regional innovation systems: Institutional and organisational dimensions. *Technovation*, 26, 475–491.
- Coombs, R. & Georghiou, L. (2002). Research and development. a new "industrial ecology". *Science*, 296, 471.
- Coombs, R., Harvey, M., & Tether, B. (May 2001). Analysing distributed innovation processes. CRIC discussion paper 43.
- Coombs, R. & Metcalfe, S. (1998). Distributed capabilities and the goverance of the firm. CRIC discussion paper 16.
- Copeland, T. E. & Keenan, P. T. (1998). Making real options real. *McKinsey Quarterly*, 3, 128–141.
- Corbin, J. & Strauss, A. (1990). Grounded theory research: Procedures, canons, and evaluative criteria. *Qualitative Sociology*, 13 (1), 3–21.
- Corbin, J. & Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of Qualitative Research 3e*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Coviello, N. E. (2006). The network dynamics of international new ventures. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 37 (5), 713–731.
- Coviello, N. E. & Munro, H. (1997). Network relationships and the internationalisation process of small software firms. *International Business Review*, 6 (4), 361–386.
- Cowan, R., David, P. A., & Foray, D. (2000). The explicit economics of knowledge codification and tacitness. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 9 (2), 211–253.
- Cowan, R. & Foray, D. (1997). The economics of codification and the diffusion of knowledge. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 6 (3), 595–622.
- Cowan, R. & Jonard, N. (2008). If the alliance fits ...: Innovation and network dynamics. In J. A. C. Baum & T. J. Rowley (Eds.), *Network Strategy* (pp. 427–455). Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Creswell, J. W. (1999). Mixed-method research: Introduction and application. In T. Cijek (Ed.), *Handbook of educational policy* (pp. 455–472). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.



- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research Design. Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed method approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc., 2<sup>nd</sup> edition.
- Cummings, J. (2003). *Knowledge Sharing: A Review of the Literature*. Technical report, The World Bank Operations Evaluation Department (OED).
- Cummings, J. N. & Kiesler, S. (2007). Coordination costs and project outcomes in multi-university collaborations. *Research Policy*, 36, 1620–1634.
- Currall, S. C. & Inkpen, A. C. (2002). A multilevel approach to trust in joint ventures. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 33, 479–495.
- Daft, R. & Lengel, R. (1984). Information richness: A new approach to managerial behavior and organizational design. In B. Straw & L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (pp. 191–223). Greenwich: CT: JAI.
- D'Agata, A. & Santangelo, G. (2003). Cognitive distance, knowledge spillovers and localisation in a duopolistic game. *Catania, mimeo*.
- Dahlander, L. & McKelvey, M. (2005). The occurrence and spatial distribution of collaboration: Biotech firms in gothenburg, sweden. *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management*, 17(4), 409–431.
- Darr, E. D. & Kurtzberg, T. R. (2000). An investigation of partner similarity dimensions on knowledge transfer. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, 82 (1), 28–44.
- Das, T. K. & Teng, B.-S. (2000). A resource-based theory of strategic alliances. *Journal of Management*, 26 (1), 31–61.
- Davenport, T. H. & Prusak, L. (1998). *Working knowledge: how organizations manage what they know*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- DeCuir-Gunby, J. T. (2008). Designing mixed methods research in the social sciences: A racial identity scale development example. In J. Osborne (Ed.), *Best Practices in Quantitative Methods* (pp. 292–307). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Delerue, H. & Simon, E. (2009). National cultural values and the perceived relational risks in biotechnology alliance relationships. *International Business Review*, 18, 14–25.
- Denzin, N. K. (1978). The logic of naturalistic inquiry. In N. K. Denzin (Ed.), *Sociological methods: A sourcebook* (pp. 3–49). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Dhanaraj, C. (2004). Managing tacit and explicit knowledge transfer in iijvs: the role of relational embeddedness and the impact on performance. *Monash University, Department of Management, Working Paper Series*, 35 (5), 428–442.
- Dierickx, I. & Cool, K. (1989). Asset stock accumulation and sustainability of competitive advantage. *Management Science*, 35 (12), 1504–1511.

- DiMasi, J. A., Hansen, R. W., & Grabowski, H. G. (2003). The price of innovation: New estimates of drug development costs. *Journal of Health Economics*, 22, 151–185.
- Dohse, D. & Staehler, T. (2008). *BioRegio, BioProfile and the Rise of the German Biotech Industry*. Technical report, Kiel Institute for the World Economy Working Papers.
- Dong, L. & Glaister, K. W. (2007). National and corporate culture differences in international strategic alliances: Perceptions of chinese partners. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 24, 191–205.
- Downward, P. & Mearman, A. (2007). Retrodution as mixed-methods triangulation in economic research: reorienting economics into social sciences. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 31, 77–99.
- Doz, Y. L. (1996). The evolution of cooperation in strategic alliances: initial conditions or learning processes? *Strategic Management Journal*, 17, 55–83.
- Dunning, J. H. (1995). Reappraising the eclectic paradigm in the age of alliance capitalism. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 26, 461–491.
- Duschek, S. (2004). Inter-firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Management Revue*, 15 (1), 53–73.
- Duysters, G., Kok, G., & Vaandrager, M. (1999). Crafting successful strategic technology partnerships. *R&D Management*, 29 (4), 343–351.
- Dyer, J. H. & Hatch, N. W. (2006). Relation-specific capabilities and barriers to knowledge transfers: creating advantage through network relationships. *Strategic Management Journal*, 27, 701–719.
- Dyer, J. H. & Singh, H. (1998). The relational view: cooperative strategy and sources of interorganizational competitive advantage. *Academy of Management Review*, 23 (4), 660–679.
- Easterby-Smith, M., Golden-Biddle, K., & Locke, K. (2008a). Unpacking absorptive capacity: Understanding the nature and contexts of knowledge. *Organizational Research Methods*, 11, 419–429.
- Easterby-Smith, M., Graça, M., Antonacopoulou, E., & Ferdinand, J. (2008b). Absorptive capacity: A process perspective. *Management Learning*, 39 (5), 483–501.
- Easterby-Smith, M., Lyles, M. A., & Tsang, E. W. K. (2008c). Inter-organizational knowledge transfer: Current themes and future prospects. *Journal of Management Studies*, 45 (4), 677–690.
- EC (2002). *Life Sciences and Biotechnology – A Strategy for Europe*. Technical report, Brussels: European Commission, 27.
- EC (2009). Sme definition. [http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/sme/facts-figures-analysis/sme-definition/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/sme/facts-figures-analysis/sme-definition/index_en.htm).

- Edler, J. (2007). Globalisierung im 21. Jahrhundert: Segen oder fluch für den europäischen mittelstand? [globalisation in the 21<sup>st</sup> century: Blessing or curse for european smes?]. In *presented on the forum for Entrepreneurship for Professionals: "Österreichischer Mittelstand goes international – Rivalität oder Kooperation mit CEE und Asien" [Internationalisation of Austrian SMEs – Rivalry or cooperation with CEE and Asia?]*. Management Center Innsbruck, 02,23,2007.
- Eggers, T. (2004). *Organisationsumwelt und Organisationsgrenzen kooperativer Unternehmen - Eine empirische Analyse interorganisationaler Netzwerke im Verarbeitenden Gewerbe [Organisational environment and organisational boundaries of collaborating firms – an empirical analysis of inter-organisational networks within manufacturing firms]*. Stuttgart: Fraunhofer IRB Verlag.
- Egri, C. P. & Ralston, D. A. (2004). Generation cohorts and personal values: A comparison of china and the united states. *Organization Science*, 15 (2), 210–220.
- Eisenhardt, K. (1989a). Building theories from case study research. *Academy of Management Review*, 16 (3), 532–550.
- Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989b). Agency theory: An assessment and review. *Academy of Management Review*, 14, 57–74.
- Eisenhardt, K. M. & Martin, J. A. (2000). Dynamic capabilities: What are they? *Strategic Management Journal*, 21, 1105–1121.
- Eisenhardt, K. M. & Schoonhoven, C. B. (1996). Resource-based view of strategic alliance formation: Strategic and social effects in entrepreneurial firms. *Organization Science*, 7 (2), 136–150.
- Ely, R. J. & Thomas, D. A. (2001). Cultural diversity at work: The effects of diversity perspectives on work group processes and outcomes. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46 (2), 229–273.
- Enzing, C., van der Giessen, A., van der Molen, S., Manicad, G., Reiss, T., Lindner, R., & Dominguez-Lacasa, I. (2007). *BioPolis. Inventory and Analysis of National Public Policies that Stimulate Biotechnology Research, its Exploitation and Commercialisation by Industry in Europe in the Period 2002-2005*. Technical report, European Commission, Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the EU.
- Ermisch, R. (2007). *Management Strategischer Kooperationen im Bereich Forschung und Entwicklung*. Wiesbaden: Gabler-Verlag.
- Ernst & Young (2008). Beyond borders. global biotechnology report 2008. [http://www.ey.com/Publication/vwLUAssets/Global\\_Biotechnology\\_Report\\_2008\\_-\\_inklusive\\_der\\_Regionen\\_USA,\\_Europa\\_und\\_Asien\\_Pazifik/\\$FILE/BeyondBorders\\_2008\\_vermailbar.pdf](http://www.ey.com/Publication/vwLUAssets/Global_Biotechnology_Report_2008_-_inklusive_der_Regionen_USA,_Europa_und_Asien_Pazifik/$FILE/BeyondBorders_2008_vermailbar.pdf).
- Ernst & Young (2009). Beyond borders. global biotechnology report 2009. [http://www.ey.com/Publication/vwLUAssets/Global\\_biotechnology\\_report\\_2009./\\$FILE/Beyond\\_borders\\_2009.pdf](http://www.ey.com/Publication/vwLUAssets/Global_biotechnology_report_2009./$FILE/Beyond_borders_2009.pdf).

- Fabrizio, K. (2006). The use of university research in firm innovation. In H. Chesbrough, W. Vanhaverbeke, & J. West (Eds.), *Open Innovation; Researching a New Paradigm* (pp. 134–160). Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Fagerberg, J. (2005). Innovation. a guide to the literature. In J. Fagerberg, D. D. Mowery, & R. R. Nelson (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Innovation*. Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Faulkner, D. O. & de Rond, M. (2000). Perspectives on cooperative strategy. In D. O. Faulkner & M. de Rond (Eds.), *Cooperative Strategy. Economic, Business, and Organizational Issues* chapter 1, (pp. 3–39). Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Fernández-Ribas, A. & Shapira, P. (2009). The role of national and regional innovation programmes in stimulating international cooperation in innovation. *International Journal of Technology Management*, 48 (4), 473–498.
- Ferru, M. (2009). The multi-scale dimension of innovation: a proximitist analysis of partnership build-up. In *paper presented at the Summer Conference 2009, CBS - Copenhagen Business School, Denmark, June 17-19, 2009*.
- Foss, K. & Foss, N. J. (2004). The next step in the evolution of the rbv. *Management-Revue*, 15 (1), 107–121.
- Freeman, C. (1987). *Technology Policy and Economic Performance*. London: Pinter.
- Gaisser, S., Nusser, M., & Reiss, T. (2005). *Stärkung des Pharma-Innovationsstandortes Deutschland [Strengthening the German pharmaceutical innovation location]*. Stuttgart: Fraunhofer IRB Verlag.
- Gallaud, D. & Torre, A. (2004). Geographical proximity and circulation of knowledge through inter-firm cooperation. In *Paper presented at the ERSA Conference, Porto, August 2004*.
- Gassmann, O. & Enkel, E. (2005). Open innovation forschung – forschungsfragen und erste erkenntnisse [open innovation research – research questions and first insights]. *University of St.Gallen - Alexandria Repository*.
- Gassmann, O. & Keupp, M. M. (2007a). The competitive advantage of early and rapidly internationalising smes in the biotechnology industry: A knowledge-based view. *Journal of World Business*, 42, 350–366.
- Gassmann, O. & Keupp, M. M. (2007b). The internationalisation of research and development in swiss and german born globals: survey and case study evidence. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, 4 (3), 214–233.
- Gay, B. & Dousset, B. (2005). Innovation and network structural dynamics: study of the alliance network of a major sector of the biotechnology industry. *Research Policy*, 34 (10), 1457–1475.

- Geletkanycz, M. A. (1997). The salience of 'culture's consequences': The effects of cultural values on top executive commitment to the status quo. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18 (8), 615–634.
- Gersick, C. & Hackman, J. R. (1990). Habitual routines in task-performing groups. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 47, 65–97.
- Gertler, M. S. (1995). "being there": Proximity, organization, and culture in the development and adoption of advanced manufacturing technologies. *Economic Geography*, 71 (1), 1–26.
- Gertler, M. S. (2003). Tacit knowledge and the economic geography of context, or the undefinable tacitness of being (there). *Journal of Economic Geography*, 3, 75–99.
- Gertler, M. S. (2006). Buzz without being there? communities of practice in context. In *Presented at the Cambridge-MIT Institute Forum on Knowledge Exchange, Networks and Regional Innovation, Cambridge, UK, December 6-7, 2006*.
- Gertler, M. S. & Levitte, Y. M. (2003). Local nodes in global networks: The geography of knowledge flows in biotechnology innovation. In *Paper presented at the DRUID Summer Conference 2003 on creating, sharing and transferring knowledge. The role of Geography, Institutions and Organizations. Copenhagen June 12-14, 2003*.
- Gerybadze, A. (1995). *Strategic Alliances and Process Design: Effective Management and Restructuring of cooperative Projects and Networks*. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Gherardi, S. & Nicolini, D. (2002). Learning in a constellation of interconnected practices: canon or dissonance? *Journal of Management Studies*, 39 (4), 419–436.
- Gibson, C. B. & Gibbs, J. L. (2006). Unpacking the concept of virtuality: The effects of geographic dispersion, electronic dependence, dynamic structure, and national diversity on team innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 51(3), 451–495.
- Gilly, J.-P. & Wallet, F. (2002). Forms of proximity, local governance and the dynamics of local economic spaces: The case of industrial conversion processes. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 25: 3, 553–570.
- Gilsing, V., Nooteboom, B., Vanhaverbeke, W., Duysters, G., & van den Oord, A. (2008). Network embeddedness and the exploration of novel technologies: Technological distance, betweenness centrality and density. *Research Policy*, 37, 1717–1731.
- Gilsing, V. A. & Duysters, G. M. (2008). Understanding novelty creation in exploration networks – structural and relational embeddedness jointly considered. *Technovation*, 28, 693–708.

- Gilsing, V. A. & Nooteboom, B. (2005). Density and strength of ties in innovation networks: an analysis of multi-media and biotechnology. *Tilburg University, Center for Economic Research, Discussion Paper 2005-41*.
- Giuri, P., Mariani, M., Brusoni, S., Crespi, G., Francoz, D., Gambardella, A., Garcia-Fontes, W., Geuna, A., Gonzales, R., Harhoff, D., Hoisl, K., Lebas, C., Luzzi, A., Magazzini, L., Nesta, L., Nomaler, O., Palomeras, N., Patel, P., Romanelli, M., & Verspagen, B. (2006). Everything you always wanted to know about inventors (but never asked): Evidence from the patval-eu study. *Munich School of Management, University of Munich, Discussion Paper 2006-11, 1-45*.
- Glaister, K. W. & Buckley, P. J. (1996). Strategic motives for international alliance formation. *Journal of Management Studies, 33* (3), 301-332.
- Golafshani, N. (2003). Understanding reliability and validity in qualitative research. *The Qualitative Report, 8* (4), 597-607.
- Gomes-Casseres, B., Hagedoorn, J., & Jaffe, A. B. (2006). Do alliances promote knowledge flows? *Journal of Financial Economics, 80*, 5-33.
- Gorman, G. E. & Clayton, P. (2005). *Qualitative research for the information professional. A practical handbook*. London, UK: Facet Publishing, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition.
- Granovetter, M. (1973). The strength of weak ties. *American Journal of Sociology, 78* (6), 1360-1380.
- Granovetter, M. (1983). The strength of weak ties: A network theory revisited. *Social Theory, 1*, 201-233.
- Granovetter, M. (1985). Economic action and social structure: The problem of embeddedness. *American Journal of Sociology, 91*, 481-510.
- Granovetter, M. (1992). Problems of explanation in economic sociology. In N. Nohria & R. G. Eccles (Eds.), *Networks and Organizations: Structure, Form, and Action* chapter 1, (pp. 25-56). Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Granstrand, O. (1999). Internationalization of corporate r&d: a study of japanese and swedish corporations. *Research Policy, 28*, 275-302.
- Grant, R. M. (1996). Toward a knowledge-based theory of the firm. *Strategic Management Journal, 17*, 109-122.
- Grant, R. M. & Baden-Fuller, C. (1995). A knowledge-based theory of inter-firm collaboration. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, (pp. 17-21).
- Grant, R. M. & Baden-Fuller, C. (2004). A knowledge accessing theory of strategic alliances. *Journal of Management Studies, 41* (1), 61-84.
- Gray, B. (2000). Assessing inter-organizational collaboration. multiple concepts and multiple methods. In D. O. Faulkner & M. De Rond (Eds.), *Cooperative Strategy. Economic, Business, and Organizational Issues* chapter 11, (pp. 243-260). Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press.

- Groen, A. J. (2005). Transfer – knowledge transfer in networks. In A. Jetter, J. Kraaijenbrink, H.-H. Schröder, & F. Wijnhoven (Eds.), *Knowledge Integration: the Practice of Knowledge Management in Small and Medium sized Enterprises* (pp. 115–125). Physica Springer.
- Grossetti, M. & Bès, M.-P. (2001). Encastrements et découplages dans les relations science - industrie [embeddedness and decoupling in science industry relations]. *Revue Française de Sociologie*, 42 (2), 327–355.
- Grupp, H. (1998). *Foundations of the Economics of Innovation. Theory, Measurement and Practice*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.
- Guellec, D. & Pottelsberghe, B. (2001). The internationalization of technology analysed with patent data. *Research Policy*, 30 (8), 1253–1266.
- Gulati, R. (1995a). Does familiarity breed trust? the implications of repeated ties for contractual choice in alliances. *Academy of Management Journal*, 19, 293–317.
- Gulati, R. (1995b). Social structure and alliance formation patterns: A longitudinal analysis. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40, 619–652.
- Gulati, R. (1998). Alliances and networks. *Strategic Management Journal*, 19, 293–317.
- Gulati, R. & Gargiulo, M. (1999). Where do interorganizational networks come from? *American Journal of Sociology*, 104 (5), 1439–1493.
- Gulati, R., Nohria, N., & Zaheer, A. (2000). Strategic networks. *Strategic Management Journal*, 21, 203–215.
- Hagedoorn, J. (2002). Inter-firm r&d partnerships: an overview of major trends and patterns since 1960. *Research Policy*, 31 (4), 477–492.
- Hagedoorn, J. & Frankort, H. T. W. (2008). The gloomy side of embeddedness: The effects of overembeddedness on inter-firm partnership formation. *Advances in Strategic Management*, 25, 503–530.
- Hagedoorn, J., Link, A. N., & Vonortas, N. S. (2000). Research partnerships. *Research Policy*, 29, 567–586.
- Hall, E. T. & Hall, M. R. (1990). *Understanding cultural differences. Germans, French, Americans*. Yarmouth, Maine: Intercultural Press.
- Hamel, G. (1991). Competition for competence and interpartner learning within international strategic alliances. *Strategic Management Journal*, 12 (special issue), 83–104.
- Handy, C. (1995). Trust and the virtual organization. *Harvard Business Review*, May-June, 41–50.
- Hansen, M. T. (1999). The search-transfer problem: the role of weak ties in sharing knowledge across organizational subunits. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44, 82–111.

- Harrigan, K. R. (1988). Strategic alliances and partner asymmetries. *Management International Review*, 28, 52–72.
- Hauschildt, J. (2007). *Innovationsmanagement*. München: Vahlen, 4<sup>th</sup> edition.
- Haworth, D. A. & Savage, G. T. (1989). A channel-ratio model of intercultural communication: The trains won't sell, fix them please. *The Journal of Business Communication*, 26 (3), 231–254.
- Helpman, E. (1998). General purpose technologies and economic growth: Introduction. In E. Helpman (Ed.), *General Purpose Technologies and Economic Growth* (pp. 1–13). Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Hennart, J.-F. (1988). A transaction costs theory of equity joint ventures. *Strategic Management Journal*, 9, 361–374.
- Hennart, J.-F. & Zeng, M. (2002). Cross-cultural differences and joint-venture longevity. *Journal of international Business Studie*, 33 (4), 699–716.
- Herbsleb, J. D., Mockus, A., Finholt, T. A., & Grinter, R. E. (2001). An empirical study of global software development: distance and speed. In *International Conference on Software Engineering archive; Proceedings of the 23<sup>d</sup> International Conference on Software Engineering* (pp. 81 – 90). Washington, DC: IEEE Computer Society.
- Herstad, S. J., Bloch, C., Ebersberger, B., & van de Velde, E. (2008). *Open innovation and globalisation: Theory, evidence and implications*. Technical report, VISION ERA-Net.
- Hildreth, P., Wright, P., & Kimble, C. (1999). Knowledge management: Are we missing something? In L. Brooks & C. Kimble (Eds.), *Information Systems - The Next Generation. Proceedings of the 4<sup>th</sup> UKAIS Conference, York, UK, April 1999*.
- Hinds, P. & Pfeffer, J. (2003). Beyond knowledge management: Sharing expertise. In M. Ackerman, V. Pipek, & V. Wulf (Eds.), *Why organizations don't "know what they know": Cognitive and motivational factors affecting the transfer of expertise* (pp. 3–26). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Hinds, P. J. (1999). The cognitive and interpersonal costs of video. *Media Psychology*, 1, 283–311.
- Hinds, P. J. & Bailey, D. E. (2003). Out of sight, out of sync: Understanding conflict in distributed teams. *Organization Science*, 14 (6), 615–632.
- Hinds, P. J. & Mortensen, M. (2005). Understanding conflict in geographically distributed teams: The moderating effects of shared identity, shared context, and spontaneous communication. *Organization Science*, 16 (3), 290–307.
- Hirschman, A. O. (1970). *Exit, voice, and loyalty: responses to decline in firms, organizations, and states*. Harvard University Press.



- Hite, J. M. (2008). The role of dyadic multi-dimensionality in the evolution of strategic network ties. In J. A. C. Baum & T. J. Rowley (Eds.), *Network strategy*, volume 25 of *Advances in Strategic Management* (pp. 133–170). Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Hoang, H. & Rothaermel, F. T. (2005). The effect of general and partner-specific alliance experience on joint r&d project performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48 (2), 332–345.
- Hodgson, G. M. (2006). What are institutions? *Journal of Economic Issues*, XL (1), 1–25.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition.
- Hoopes, D. G. & Madsen, T. L. (2008). A capability-based view of competitive heterogeneity. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 17 (3), 393–426.
- Hopkins, M. M., Martin, P. A., Nightingale, P., Kraft, A., & Mahdi, S. (2007). The myth of the biotech revolution: An assessment of technological, clinical and organisational change. *Research Policy*, 36 (4), 566–589.
- Hough, E. A. (1972). Communication of technical information between overseas markets and head office laboratories. *R&D Management*, 3 (1), 1–5.
- Howells, J. (2008). New directions in r&d: current and prospective challenges. *R&D Management*, 38 (3), 241–252.
- Howells, J. R. (1995). Going global: the use of ict networks in research and development. *Research Policy*, 24, 169–184.
- Hull, R. & Andiani, P. (2003). Managing knowledge associated with innovation. *Journal of Business Research*, 56, 145–152.
- Inkpen, A. C. (1998). Learning and knowledge acquisition through international strategic alliances. *The Academy of Management Executive*, 12 (4), 69–80.
- Inkpen, A. C. (2000). A note on the dynamics of learning alliances: competition, cooperation, and relative scope. *Strategic Management Journal*, 21 (7), 775–779.
- Jackson, S. E., May, K. E., & Whitney, K. (1995). Understanding the dynamics of diversity in decision making teams. In R. A. Guzzo & E. Salas (Eds.), *Team Effectiveness and Decision Making in Organizations* (pp. 204–261). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Jaffe, A., Trajtenberg, M., & Henderson, R. (1993). Geographic localization of knowledge spillovers as evidenced by patent citations. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 108, i-fj(3), 577–598.
- Janowicz-Panjaitan, M., Cambré, B., & Kenis, P. (2009). Introduction: temporary organizations – a challenge and opportunity for thinking about organizations. In P. Kenis, M. Janowicz-Panjaitan, & B. Cambré (Eds.), *Temporary Organizations. Prevalence, Logic and Effectiveness*. Cheltenham, UK, Norhampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.
- Jansen, D. (1999). *Einführung in die Netzwerkanalyse. Grundlagen, Methoden, Anwendungen [Introduction into network analysis. Basics, methods, applications]*. Opladen: Leske und Budrich.
- Jehn, K. A., Chadwick, C., & Thatcher, S. (1997). To agree or not to agree: Diversity, conflict, and group outcomes. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 8, 287–306.
- Jehn, K. A., Northcraft, G. B., & Neale, M. (1999). Why differences make a difference: A field study of diversity, conflict, and performance in workgroups. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44, 741–763.
- Jick, T. D. (1979). Mixing qualitative and quantitative methods: Triangulation and qualitative approaches. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24, 602–611.
- Johanson, J. & Vahlne, J.-E. (1977). The internationalization process of the firm. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 8 (1), 23–32.
- Johanson, J. & Vahlne, J.-E. (1990). The mechanism of internationalisation. *International Marketing Review*, 7 (4), 11–24.
- Johanson, J. & Vahlne, J.-E. (2009). The uppsala internationalization process model revisited: From liability of foreignness to liability of outsidership. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 40, 1411–1431.
- Johanson, J. & Wiedersheim, P. (1975). The internationalization of the firm- four swedish cases. *Journal of Management Studies*, 12, 305–322.
- Johnson, B., Lorenz, E., & Lundvall, B.-Å. (2002). Why all this fuss about codified and tacit knowledge? *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 11 (2), 245–262.
- Johnson, B. & Turner, L. A. (2003). Data collection strategies in mixed methods research. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Handbook of Mixed Methods in social & behavioral research* chapter 11, (pp. 297–319). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Justus, A. (1999). *Wissenstransfer in strategischen Allianzen: Eine verhaltens-theoretische Analyse [Knowledge Transfer in strategic Alliances: A behavioural analysis]*. PhD thesis, Frankfurt am Main : Lang (University of Göttingen).

- Jyrämä, A., Kauppilaa, O.-P., & Rajalab, R. (2009). Knowledge sharing through virtual teams across borders and boundaries. *International Conference on Organizational Learning, Knowledge and Capabilities, Amsterdam April 26-28, 2009*.
- Kale, P. & Singh, H. (2000). Learning and protection of proprietary assets in strategic alliances. *Strategic Management Journal*, 21, 217–238.
- Katz, J. (1994). Geographical proximity and scientific collaboration. *Scientometrics*, 31 (1), 31–43.
- Katz, R. & Allen, T. (1982). Investigating the not invented here (nih) syndrome: a look at the performance, tenure and communication patterns of 50 r&d project groups. *R&D Management*, 12, 7–19.
- Kenis, P., Cambré, B., Lucas, G. J. M., & Oerlemans, L. A. G. (2009). Applying organization theory to temporary organizations. In P. Kenis, M. Janowicz-Panjaitan, & B. Cambré (Eds.), *Temporary Organizations. Prevalence, Logic and Effectiveness*. Cheltenham, UK, Norhampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.
- Khanna, T., Gulati, R., & Nohria, N. (1998). The dynamics of learning alliances: competition, cooperation, and relative scope. *Strategic Management Journal*, 19 (2), 193–210.
- Kiesler, S. & Cummings, J. (2002). What do we know about proximity and distance in work groups? In P. Hinds & S. Kiesler (Eds.), *Distributed Work* (pp. 57–80). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Kim, C. & Song, J. (2007). Creating new technology through alliances: An empirical investigation of joint patents. *Technovation*, 27, 461–470.
- Kim, J. W. & Higgins, M. C. (2007). Where do alliances come from? the effects of upper echelons on alliance formation. *Research Policy*, 36, 499–514.
- Kirat, T. & Lung, Y. (1999). Innovation and proximity. territories as loci of collective learning processes. *European urban and regional studies*, 6, 27–38.
- Kirzner, I. (1979). *Perception, Opportunity, and Profit*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Kline, S. J. (1995). Innovation is not a linear process. *Research Management*, 28, 36–45.
- Kline, S. J. & Rosenberg, N. (1986). An overview of innovation. In R. Landau & N. Rosenberg (Eds.), *The Positive Sum Strategy: Harnessing Technology for Economic Growth* (pp. 275–305). Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.
- Knoben, J. & Gössling, T. (2009). Proximity in temporary organizations. In P. Kenis, M. Janowicz-Panjaitan, & B. Cambré (Eds.), *Temporary organizations: Prevalence, logic and effectiveness* (pp. 155–170). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.

- Knoben, J. & Oerlemans, L. (2006). Proximity and inter-organizational collaboration: A literature review. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 8 (2), 71–89.
- Knorr-Cetina, K. (1984). *Die Fabrikation von Erkenntnis. Zur Anthropologie der Naturwissenschaft [The Manufacture of Knowledge. An Essay on the Constructivist and contextual Nature of Science]*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Knorr Cetina, K. (1999). *Epistemic Cultures: How the Sciences Make Knowledge*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kodama, F. (1992). Technology fusion and the new r&d. *Harvard Business Review*, July-August, 70–78.
- Kogut, B. & Singh, H. (1986). Entering the united states by acquisition or joint venture, country patterns and cultural characteristics. *Wharton School, Working Paper*.
- Kogut, B. & Zander, U. (1992). Knowledge of the firm, combinative capabilities, and the replication of technology. *Organization Science*, 3 (3), 383–397.
- Kohler, U. & Kreuter, F. (2008). *Datenanalyse mit Stata. Allgemeine Konzepte der Datenanalyse und ihre praktische Anwendung [data analysis with stata. General concepts of data analysis and their practical use]*. Oldenbourg Wissenschaftsverlag GmbH.
- Köppel, P. (2007). *Konflikte und Synergien in multikulturellen Teams. Virtuelle und face-to-face-Kooperationen [Conflicts and synergies in multicultural teams. Virtual and face-to-face co-operation]*. Beiträge zum Diversity-Management [Contributions to diversity management]. Wiesbaden: Deutscher Universitätsverlag.
- Koschatzky, K. (2001). *Räumliche Aspekte im Innovationsprozess. Ein Beitrag zur neuen Wirtschaftsgeographie aus Sicht der regionalen Innovationsforschung. [Regional aspects within the innovation process. A contribution to New Economic Geography from the perspective of regional innovation research.]*. Münster: LIT Verlag.
- Kostova, T. (1999). Transnational transfer of strategic organizational practices: a contextual perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 24 (2), 308–324.
- Kraut, R. E., Egidio, C., & Galegher, J. (1990). Patterns of contact and communication in scientific research collaborations. In J. Galegher, R. Kraut, & C. Egidio (Eds.), *Intellectual Teamwork: Social Foundations of Cooperative Work* (pp. 149–172). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Kruse, J. (2008). *Reader Einführung in die Qualitative Interviewforschung [Introduction into qualitative interview research]*. Uni Freiburg.
- Laage-Hellman, J., McKelvey, M., & Rickne, A. (2004). Introduction. In M. McKelvey, A. Rickne, & J. Laage-Hellman (Eds.), *The Economic Dynamics of Modern Biotechnology*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.

- Lam, A. (2005). Organizational innovation. In J. Fagerberg, D. D. Mowery, & R. R. Nelson (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Innovation* (pp. 115–147). Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Lamburgety, T. L., Al-Laham, A., Tzabbar, D., & Aharonson, B. (2008). The structural evolution of multiplex organizational networks: Research and commerce in biotechnology. In J. A. C. Baum & T. J. Rowley (Eds.), *Network Strategy* (pp. 171–209). Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Lane, C. (2000). Introduction: Theories and issues in the study of trust. In C. Lane & R. Bachmann (Eds.), *Trust within and between organizations: Conceptual Issues and Empirical Applications* (pp. 1–30). Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Lane, P. J. & Lubatkin, M. (1998). Relative absorptive capacity and interorganizational learning. *Strategic Management Journal*, 19, 461–477.
- Lane, P. J., Salk, J. E., & Lyles, M. A. (2001). Absorptive capacity, learning, and performance in international joint ventures. *Strategic Management Journal*, 22 (12), 1139–1161.
- Lange, K. (2009). Institutional embeddedness and the strategic leeway of actors: the case of the German pharmaceutical biotech industry. *Socio-Economic Review*, 7, 181–207.
- Lanza, A. (2005). Managing heterogeneity, allocative balance, and behavioral and technology concerns in competitive and cooperative inter-firm relationships. In A. Capasso, G. B. Dagnino, & A. Lanza (Eds.), *Strategic capabilities and knowledge transfer within and between organizations. New perspectives from acquisitions, networks, learning and evolution* (pp. 17–34). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.
- Laursen, K., Reichstein, T., & Salters, A. (2010). Exploring the effect of geographical proximity and university quality on university–industry collaboration in the United Kingdom. *Regional Studies*, Preprint version, 1–17.
- Laursen, K. & Salter, A. (2006). Open for innovation: the role of openness in explaining innovation performance among U.K. manufacturing firms. *Strategic Management Journal*, 27, 131–150.
- Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: legitimate peripheral participation*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lavie, D. & Miller, S. R. (2008). Alliance portfolio internationalization and firm performance. In *Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, Industry Studies 2008, Annual Conference, May 1-2 2008, Boston, MA*.
- Lavie, D. & Rosenkopf, L. (2006). Balancing exploration and exploitation in alliance formation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(4), 797–818.
- Lawson, T. (1988). Probability and uncertainty in economic analysis. *Journal of Post Keynesian Economics*, XI (1), 38–65.

- Leonard-Barton, D. (1992). Core capabilities and core rigidities: A paradox in managing new product development. *Strategic Management Journal*, 13, 111–125.
- Leonard-Barton, D. (1995). *Wellsprings of Knowledge: Building and Sustaining the Sources of Innovation*. Harvard Business School Press, Boston, MA, USA.
- Loebbecke, C., Fenema, P. C. V., & Powell, P. (1999). Co-opetition and knowledge transfer. *The DATA BASE for Advances in Informatoin Systems*, 30 (2), 14–25.
- Lorentzen, A. (2008). Knowledge networks in local and global space. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 20, 533–545.
- Lubatkin, M., Florin, J., & Lane, P. (2001). Learning together and apart: A model of reciprocal interfirm learning. *Human Relations*, 54 (10), 1353–1382.
- Lundvall, B.-Å. (1988). Innovation as an interactive process: From user-producer interaction to the national system of innovation. In G. Dosi, C. Freeman, R. Nelson, G. Silverberg, & L. Soete (Eds.), *Technical Change and Economic Theory* (pp. 349–369). London: Pinter Publishers.
- Lundvall, B.-Å. (1992). User-producer relationships, national systems of innovation and internationalisation. In B.-Å. Lundvall (Ed.), *National Systems of Innovation. Towards a Theory of Innovation and Interactive Learning* (pp. 45–67). London, UK: Pinter Publishers.
- Lundvall, B.-Å. (2006). Knowledge management in the learning economy. *DRUID Working Paper 06-06*.
- Lundvall, B.-Å. (2010). *National Systems of Innovation: Towards a Theory of Innovation and Interactive Learning*. New York, NY: Anthem Press.
- Lundvall, B.-Å. & Johnson, B. (1994). The learning economy. *Journal of Industry Studies*, 1 (2), 23–42.
- Luo, X. (2007). Working with rivals. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 44 (2), 73–83.
- Macher, J. T. & Richman, B. D. (2008). Transaction cost economics: An assessment of empirical research in the social sciences. *Business and Politics*, 10 (1), 1–65.
- Machlup, F. (1980). *Knowledge: Its Creation, Distribution, and Economic Significance*, volume 1. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Madhok, A. (1995). Revisiting multinational firms' tolerance for joint ventures: A trust-based approach. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 26 (1), 345–369.
- Madhok, A. (2000). Transaction (in)efficiency, value (in)efficiency, and inter-firm collaboration. In D. O. Faulkner & M. De Rond (Eds.), *Cooperative Strategy. Economic, Business, and Organizational Issues*. Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press.

- Madsen, T. K. & Servais, P. (1997). The internationalisation of born globals. *International Business Review*, 6 (6), 561–583.
- Maignan, C., Pinelli, D., & Ottaviano, G. I. P. (2003). Ict, clusters and regional cohesion: A summary of theoretical and empirical research. [http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=438507](http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=438507).
- Makri, M., Hitt, M. A., & Lane, P. J. (2010). Complementary technologies, knowledge relatedness, and invention outcomes in high technology mergers and acquisitions. *Strategic Management Journal*, 31 (6), 602–628.
- Malerba, F. & Orsenigo, L. (2000). Knowledge, innovative activities and industrial evolution. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 9 (2), 289–314.
- March, J. G. & Simon, H. (1958). *Organizations*. New York: Wiley.
- Marsden, P. V. (1981). Introducing influence processes into a system of collective decisions. *American Journal of Sociology*, 86, 1203–1235.
- Martin, P. (1996). *The Death of Geography*. Financial Times, 22 February.
- Martin, X. & Salmon, R. (2003). Knowledge transfer capacity and its implications for the theory of the multinational corporation. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 34 (4), 356–372.
- Maskell, P. & Lorenzen, M. (2003). The cluster - and other current forms of market organization. [http://www.economia.unimo.it/convegni\\_seminari/CG\\_sept03/Papers/Parallel%20Session%202.6/Maskell\\_Lorenzen.pdf](http://www.economia.unimo.it/convegni_seminari/CG_sept03/Papers/Parallel%20Session%202.6/Maskell_Lorenzen.pdf).
- Mayrhofer, U. (2004). The influence of national origin and uncertainty on the choice between cooperation and merger-acquisition: an analysis of french and german firms. *International Business Review*, 13, 83–99.
- Mayring, P. (2002). *Einführung in die Qualitative Sozialforschung [Introduction into qualitative social research]*. Weinheim: Beltz Verlag.
- McAllister, D. J. (1995). Affect- and cognition-based trust as foundations for inter-personal co-operation in organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38 (1), 24–59.
- McKelvey, M. (2004). What about innovation collaboration in biotech firms? revisiting occurrence and spatial distribution. *Copenhagen Business School*, Biotech Business Working Paper No. 02-2004, 1–21.
- Meder, A. (2008). Technological and geographical patterns in the choice of cooperation partner. In *Jena Economic Research Papers, 2008-054*.
- Mellewig, T. (2003). *Management von strategischen Kooperationen: eine ressourcen-orientierte Untersuchung in der Telekommunikationsbranche. [Management of strategic cooperation: a resource-based analysis in the telecommunications industry]*. Wiesbaden: Deutscher Universitätsverlag.

- Miles, R. E., Miles, G., & Snow, C. C. (2005). *Collaborative entrepreneurship*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Minbaeva, D. (2008). Hrm practices and knowledge transfer in multinational companies. In K. O'Sullivan (Ed.), *Strategic Knowledge Management in Multinational Organizations* (pp. 1–27).: Hershey PA: Idea Group Publishing.
- Minbaeva, D. & Michailova, S. (2004). Knowledge transfer and expatriation practices in mncs: The role of disseminative capacity. *Employee Relations*, 26 (6), 663–679.
- Möllering, G. (2006). *Trust: Reason, Routine, Reflexivity*. Oxford, UK; Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Elsevier Ltd.
- Moodysson, J. (2007). *Sites and modes of knowledge creation. On the Spatial Organization of Biotechnology Innovation*. PhD thesis, Lund University, Department of Social and Economic Geography.
- Moodysson, J. (2008). Principles and practices of knowledge creation: On the organization of “buzz” and “pipelines” in life science communities. *Economic Geography*, 84 (4), 449–469.
- Moodysson, J. & Jonsson, O. (2007). Knowledge collaboration and proximity: The spatial organization of biotech innovation projects. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 14 (2), 115–131.
- Mora-Valentin, E. M., Montoro-Sanchez, A., & Guerras-Martin, L. A. (2004). Determining factors in the success of r&d cooperative agreements between firms and research organizations. *Research Policy*, 33, 17–40.
- Morgan, K. (2001). The exaggerated death of geography: Localised learning, innovation and uneven development. [http://www.utoronto.ca/onris/research\\_review/WorkingPapers/WorkingDOCS/Working01/Morgan01\\_Death.pdf](http://www.utoronto.ca/onris/research_review/WorkingPapers/WorkingDOCS/Working01/Morgan01_Death.pdf).
- Morgan, K. (2004). The exxagerated death of geography: learning, proximity and territorial innovation systems. *Journal of Economic Geography*, 4 (1), 3–21.
- Morrone, M. (2006). *Knowledge, Scale and Transactions in the Theory of the Firm*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Morse, J. M. (1991). Approaches to qualitative-quantitative methodological triangulation. *Nursing Research*, 40, 120–123.
- Mowery, D. C., Oxley, J. E., & Silverman, B. S. (1996). Strategic alliances and interfirm knowledge transfer. *Strategic Management Journal*, 17, Issue Special Issue: Knowledge and the Firm (Winter, 1996), 77–91.
- Mowery, D. C., Oxley, J. E., & Silverman, B. S. (1998). Technological overlap and interfirm cooperation: Implications for the resource-based view of the firm. *Research Policy*, 27 (5), 507–552.



- Mu, J., Tang, F., & MacLachlan, D. L. (2009). Absorptive and disseminative capacity: Knowledge transfer in intra-organization networks. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 34 (4), 356–372.
- Müller, C. (2003). *Projektmanagement in FuE-Kooperationen - eine empirische Analyse in der Biotechnologie [Project management in R&D co-operation - an empirical analysis within biotechnology]*. Norderstedt: Books on demand.
- Nahapiet, J. & Ghoshal, S. (1998). Social capital, intellectual capital, and the organizational advantage. *Academy of Management Review*, 23 (2), 242–266.
- Nair, A., Hanvanich, S., & Cavusgil, T. S. (2007). An exploration of the patterns underlying related and unrelated collaborative ventures using neural network: Empirical investigation of collaborative venture formation data spanning 1985–2001. *International Business Review*, 16 (6), 659–750.
- Narula, R. (2003). *Globalization and Technology*. Cambridge, MA: Polity Press.
- Narula, R. (2004). R&d collaboration by smes: new opportunities and limitations in the face of globalisation. *Technovation*, 24, 153–161.
- Narula, R. & Hagedoorn, J. (1999). Innovating through strategic alliances: moving towards international partnerships and contractual agreements. *Technovation*, 19 (5), 283–294.
- Narula, R. & Santangelo, G. D. (2007). Location and r&d alliances in the european ict industry. *CIBS Working Paper*, No. 2007-001.
- Narula, R. & Santangelo, G. D. (2009). Location, collocation and r&d alliances in the european ict industry. *Research Policy*, 38, 393–403.
- Nelson, R. (1993). *National Innovation Systems*. Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Nelson, R. R. & Winter, S. G. (1982). *An Evolutionary Theory of Economic Change*. Cambridge, MA and London, UK: Belknap Press.
- Nielsen, B. B. (2007). Determining international strategic alliance performance: A multidimensional approach. *International Business Review*, 16, 337–361.
- Nightingale, P. (1998). A cognitive model of innovation. *Research Policy*, 27 (7), 689–709.
- Nohria, N. (1992). Introduction: Is a network perspective a useful way of studying organizations? In N. Nohria & R. G. Eccles (Eds.), *Networks and Organizations. Structure, Form, and Action* (pp. 1–22). Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Nonaka, I. & Konno, N. (1998). The concept of ba: Building for knowledge creation. *Organization Science*, 5 (1), 40–54.

- Nonaka, I. & Takeuchi, H. (1995). *The Knowledge-Creating Company. How Japanese Companies Create the Dynamics of Innovation*. Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Nonaka, I., Toyama, R., & Hirata, T. (2008). *Managing Flow. A Process Theory of the Knowledge-Based Firm*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire and New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Nooteboom, B. (1999). *Inter-Firm Alliances. Analysis and Design*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Nooteboom, B. (2000). *Learning and Innovation in Organizations and Economies*. Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Nooteboom, B. (2002). *Trust. Forms, Foundations, Functions, Failures and Figures*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.
- Nooteboom, B. (2004a). Governance and competence: how can they be combined? *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 28, 505–525.
- Nooteboom, B. (2004b). *Inter-firm collaboration, learning & networks. An integrated approach*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Nooteboom, B. (2006a). Beyond penrose: A cognitive theory of the firm. *Tilburg University, Center for Economic Research, Discussion Paper 2006-34*.
- Nooteboom, B. (2006b). Transaction costs, innovation and learning. *Tilburg University, Center for Economic Research, Discussion Paper 2006-36*.
- Nooteboom, B. (2009). *A Cognitive Theory of the Firm: Learning, governance and dynamic capabilities*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.
- Nooteboom, B. (2010). The dynamics of trust: communication, action, and third parties. [http : //www.bartnooteboom.nl/site/index.n.cfm?act = teksten.tonen&parent = 4954&varpag = 4151](http://www.bartnooteboom.nl/site/index.n.cfm?act=teksten.tonen&parent=4954&varpag=4151), January 2010.
- Nooteboom, B., Vanhaverbeke, W., Duysters, G., Gilsing, V., & van den Oord, A. (2006). Optimal cognitive distance and absorptive capacity. *Tilburg University Discussion Paper No. 2006-33*.
- Nordmann, A. (2004). *Converging Technologies: Shaping the Future of European Societies*. Technical report, HLEG - High Level Expert Group - Foresighting the New Technology Wave, Brussels.
- North, D. C. (1990). *Institutions, institutional change and economic performance*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Nummela, N. (2003). Looking through a prism: multiple perspectives to commitment to international r&d collaboration. *Journal of High Technology Management Research*, 14 (1), 135–148.

- Nusser, M., Wydra, S., Hartig, J., & Gaisser, S. (2007). *Forschungs- und wissensintensive Branchen: Optionen zur Stärkung ihrer internationalen Wettbewerbsfähigkeit [Research and knowledge-intensive industries: Options to strengthen their international competitiveness]*. Technical Report 116, Büro für Technikfolgen-Abschätzung beim Deutschen Bundestag [Office for technology assessment at the German Federal Parliament].
- OECD (2000). *OECD Science, Technology and Industry Outlook*. Technical report, Paris: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.
- OECD (2003). Research and development - unesco. <http://stats.oecd.org/glossary/detail.asp?ID=2312>.
- OECD (2005a). *A framework for biotechnology statistics*. Technical report, OECD.
- OECD (2005b). *Oslo Manual: Guidelines for Collecting and Interpreting Innovation Data, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition*. Technical report, Organisation for economic co-operation and development, OECD Publishing.
- OECD (2008). *Open Innovation in Global Networks*. Technical Report 978-92-64-04767-9, OECD.
- Oerlemans, L. & Pretorius, T. (2010). Governing temporary interorganisational projects. *Essays Innovate*, 4, 31–35.
- O'Grady, S. & Lane, H. (1996). The psychic distance paradox. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 27 (4), 309–333.
- Olsen, D. S. (2009). Connecting different disciplines to develop new technology: making nanomaterials to combat bird-flu. In *International Conference on Organizational Learning, Knowledge and Capabilities (OLKC), 26-28 April 2009, Amsterdam, the Netherlands* (pp. 1–17).
- Olson, G. M. & Olson, J. S. (2000). Distance matters. *Human-Computer Interaction*, 15, 139–178.
- Olson, G. M., Olson, J. S., & Venolia, G. (2009). What still matters about distance? In *Proceedings of HCIC 2009*.
- Osborn, R. N. & Hagedoorn, J. (1997). The institutionalization and evolutionary dynamics of interorganizational alliances and networks. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 40 (2), 1–65.
- Oviatt, B. M. (1994). Toward a theory of international new ventures. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 25 (1), 45–64.
- Oviatt, B. M. & McDougall, P. P. (1997). Challenges for internationalization process theory. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 37 (2), 85–99.
- Owen-Smith, J. & Powell, W. (2004). Knowledge networks as channels and conduits: the effects of spillovers in the boston biotechnology community. *Organization Sciences*, 15 (1), 5–21.

- Oxley, J. E. & Sampson, R. C. (2004). The scope and governance of international r&d alliances. *Strategic Management Journal*, 25, 723–749.
- Pak, Y. S., Ra, W., & Park, Y.-R. (2009). Understanding iJV performance in a learning and conflict mediated context. *International Business Review*, 18, 470–480.
- Palmisano, J. (2008). A motivational model of knowledge sharing. In F. Burstein & C. W. Holsapple (Eds.), *Handbook on decision support systems 1* (pp. 355–370). Berlin Heidelberg: Springer Verlag.
- Panten, G. & Boßow-Thies, S. (2007). Analyse kausaler wirkungszusammenhänge mit hilfe von partial least squares (pls) [analysis of causal relationships with the aid of partial least squares (pls)]. In S. Albers, D. Klapper, U. Konradt, A. Walter, & J. Wolf (Eds.), *Methodik der empirischen Forschung [Methods of empirical research]* chapter 3, (pp. 311–326). Wiesbaden: Gabler-Verlag, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition.
- Park, S. H. & Ungson, G. (1997). The effect of national culture, organizational complementarity, and economic motivation on joint venture dissolution. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40 (2), 279–307.
- Parkhe, A. (1991). Interfirm diversity, organizational learning, and longevity in global strategic alliances. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 22 (4), 579–601.
- Parkhe, A. (1993). Strategic alliances structuring: a game theoretic and transaction cost examination of interfirm cooperation. *Academy Management Journal*, 36 (4), 794–882.
- Patzelt, H. & Brenner, T. (2008). Introduction to the handbook of bioentrepreneurship. In H. Patzelt & T. Brenner (Eds.), *Handbook of Bioentrepreneurship*. Berlin: Springer Verlag.
- Pavitt, K. (1984). Sectoral patterns of technical change: Towards a taxonomy and a theory. *Research Policy*, 13, 343–373.
- Pavitt, K. (2005). Innovation processes. In J. Fagerberg, D. D. Mowery, & R. R. Nelson (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Innovation* (pp. 87–114). Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Pavitt, K. & Patel, P. (1999). Global corporations and national systems of innovation: Who dominates whom? In D. Archibugi, J. Howells, & J. Michie (Eds.), *Innovation Policy in a Global Economy* (pp. 94–119). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pearce, R. (1989). *The Internationalisation of Research and Development by Multi-national Enterprises*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Pecqueur, B. & Zimmermann, J.-B. (2004). *Economie de proximités*. Paris: Lavoisier.

- Pelled, L. H., Eisenhardt, K. M., & Xin, K. (1999). Exploring the black box: An analysis of work group diversity, conflict, and performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44, 1–28.
- Peng, M. W. & Shenkar, O. (2002). Joint venture dissolution as corporate divorce. *Academy of Management Executive*, 16, 92–105.
- Penrose, E. (1959). *The Theory of the Growth of the Firm*. Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Penrose, E. (1995). *The Theory of the Growth of the Firm*. Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition.
- Perlitz, M. (2004). *Internationales Management [International management]*. Stuttgart: Lucius & Lucius, 5<sup>th</sup> edition.
- Peteraf, M. A. (1993). The cornerstones of competitive advantage. *Strategic Management Journal*, 14 (3), 179–191.
- Pfeffer, J. & Salancik, G. R. (1978). *The external control of organizations*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Phene, A., Fladmoe-Lindquist, K., & Marsh, L. (2006). Breakthrough innovations in the u.s. biotechnology industry: The effects of technological space and geographic origin. *Strategic Management Journal*, 27, 369–388.
- Picot, A., Reichwald, R., & Wigand, R. T. (2003). *Die grenzenlose Unternehmung. Information, Organisation und Management [The boundless firm. Information, organization, and management]*. Wiesbaden: Gabler-Verlag, 5<sup>th</sup> edition.
- Pindyck, R. S. & Rubinfeld, D. L. (1997). *Econometric models and economic forecast*. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill International Editions.
- Pisano, G. P. (1991). The governance of innovation: Vertical integration and collaborative arrangements in the biotechnology industry. *Research Policy*, 20, 237–249.
- Pisano, G. P. (2006). *Science Business: The Promise, The Reality, and The Future of Biotech*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Pisano, G. P. (2010). The evolution of science-based business: innovating how we innovate. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 19 (2), 465–482.
- Podolny, J. M. (1994). Market uncertainty and the social character of economic exchange. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 39, 458–483.
- Podolny, J. M. (2001). Networks as the pipes and prisms of the market. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 107, 33–60.
- Polanyi, M. (1958). *Personal Knowledge: Towards a Post-Critical Philosophy*. London: Routledge.
- Polanyi, M. (1966). *The Tacit Dimension*. New York: Doubleday.

- Ponds, R., van Oort, F., & Frenken, K. (2007). The geographical and institutional proximity of research collaboration. *Papers in Regional Science*, 68 (3), 423 – 443.
- Porac, J. F., Wade, J. B., Fischer, H. M., Brown, J., Kanfer, A., & Bowker, G. (2004). Human capital heterogeneity, collaborative relationships, and publication patterns in a multidisciplinary scientific alliance: a comparative case study of two scientific teams. *Research Policy*, 33, 661–678.
- Porst, R. (2008). *Fragebogen. Ein Arbeitsbuch [Questionnaire. A manual]*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Porter, M. (1998). Clusters and competition: new agendas for companies, government, and institutions. In M. Porter (Ed.), *On competition* (pp. 197–288). Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Publishing.
- Porter, M. E. & Fuller, M. B. (1986). Coalitions and global strategy. In M. E. Porter (Ed.), *Competition in Global Industries* (pp. 315–344). Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Pothukuchi, V., Damanpour, F., Choi, J., Chen, C. C., & Park, S. H. (2002). National and organizational culture differences and international joint venture performance. *International Business Studies*, 33, 243–265.
- Powell, W., Koput, K., & Smith-Doerr, L. (1996). Interorganizational collaboration and the locus of innovation: networks of learning in biotechnology. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41 (1), 116–145.
- Powell, W. W. & Brantley, P. (1992). Competitive cooperation in biotechnology: Learning through networks? In N. Nohria & R. G. Eccles (Eds.), *Networks and Organizations. Structure, Form, and Action* chapter 14, (pp. 366–394). Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Powell, W. W. & Grodal, S. (2005). Networks of innovators. In J. Fagerberg, D. C. Mowery, & R. R. Nelson (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Innovation* chapter 4, (pp. 56–85). Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Powell, W. W. & Smith-Doerr, L. (1994). Networks and economic life. In N. Smelser & R. Swedberg (Eds.), *The Handbook of Economic Sociology* (pp. 368–402). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press and Russell Sage Foundation.
- Powell, W. W., White, D. R., White, D. R., & Owen-Smith, J. (2005). Network dynamics and field evolution: The growth of interorganizational collaboration in the life sciences. *American Journal of Sociology*, 110 (4), 1132–1205.
- Prahalad, C. K. & Hamel, G. (1990). The core competence of the corporation. *Harvard Business Review*, May-June, 79–91.
- PWC (2000). *Global Pharmaceutical Company Partnering Capabilities Survey*. Technical report, PWC.

- Pyka, A. & Saviotti, P. (2005). The evolution of r&d networking in the biotech industries. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation Management*, 5, 49–68.
- Quintana-García, C. & Benavides-Velasco, C. A. (2004). Cooperation, competition, and innovative capability: a panel data of european dedicated biotechnology firms. *Technovation*, 24, 927–938.
- Ragin, C. (1987). *The comparative method. Moving beyond qualitative and quantitative strategies*. Barkley, CA: University of California Press.
- Ragin, C. C. (1994). *Constructing social research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Rallet, A. & Torre, A. (1999a). Is geographic proximity necessary in the innovation networks in the era of global economy? *GeoJournal*, 49, 373–380.
- Rallet, A. & Torre, A. (1999b). Which need for geographical proximity in innovation networks at the era of global economy? <http://www-sre.wu-wien.ac.at/ersa/ersaconfs/ersa99/Papers/a128.pdf>.
- Rallet, A. & Torre, A. (2009). Temporary geographical proximity for business and work coordination: When, how and where? *Monash University, Department of Management, Working Paper Series*.
- Ralston, D. A., Gustafson, D., Cheung, F., & Terpstra, R. (1993). Differences in managerial values: A study of us, hong kong and prc managers. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 24 (1), 177–207.
- Ralston, D. A., Holt, D. H., Terpstra, R. H., & Yuan, K. C. (1997). The impact of national culture and economic ideology on managerial work values: A study of the united states, russia, japan and china. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 28 (1), 177–207.
- Ralston, D. A., Nguyen, V. T., & Napier, N. K. (1999). A comparative study of the work values of north and south vietnamese managers. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 30 (4), 655–672.
- Rasche, C. (2004). Der wettbewerbsvorteil im fadenkreuz der resource based view [competitive advantage in the crosshairs of the resource based view]. In S. A. F. von den Eichen, H. H. Hinerhuber, K. Matzler, & H. K. Stahl (Eds.), *Entwicklungslinien des Kompetenzmanagements [Developments of competence management]* (pp. 197–230). Wiesbaden: Gabler Edition Wissenschaft.
- Rasche, C. & Wolfrum, B. (1993). Ressourcenorientierung im strategischen management - ein paradigmwechsel? [resource orientation in strategic management - a paradigm change?]. *Lehrstuhl für Betriebliche Absatzwirtschaft und Handelsbetriebslehre, Arbeitspapier Nr. 1/93*.
- Reed, R. & DeFillippi, R. (1990). Causal ambiguity, barriers to imitation, and sustainable competitive advantage. *Academy of Management Review*, 15, 88–102.

- Richardson, G. (1972). The organisation of industry. *The economic journal*, 82, 883–896.
- Rocco, E., Finholt, T. A., & Hofer, E. C. (2000). Out of sight, short of trust. *Technical Report Number: CREW-01-10*.
- Roijakkers, N. & Hagedoorn, J. (2006). Inter-firm partnering in pharmaceutical biotechnology since 1975: trends, patterns and networks. *Research Policy*, 35, 431–446.
- Rolf, B. (2004). Two theories of tacit and implicit knowledge. [http://www.nt.fh-koeln.de/philosophyandinformatics/AutumnMeeting2004/sois/SOI\\_Rolf.pdf](http://www.nt.fh-koeln.de/philosophyandinformatics/AutumnMeeting2004/sois/SOI_Rolf.pdf).
- Rosenkopf, L. & Almeida, P. (2003). Overcoming local search through alliances and mobility. *Management Science*, 49: 6, 751–766.
- Rosenkopf, L., Metiu, A., & George, V. (2001). From the bottom up? technical committee activity and alliance formatio. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46, 748–772.
- Rosenkopf, L. & Nerkar, A. (2001). Beyond local search: Boundary-spanning, exploration, and impact in the optical disk industry. *Strategic Management Journal*, 22 (4), 287–306.
- Rothaermel, F. T. (2001). Incumbent's advantage through exploiting complementary assets via interfirm cooperation. *Strategic Management Journal*, 22, 687–699.
- Rothwell, R. & Dodgson, M. (1994). Innovation and size of firm. In M. Dodgson (Ed.), *Handbook of Industrial Innovation* (pp. 310–324). Aldershot, UK, and Brookfield, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing Group.
- Rowley, T. J. & Baum, J. A. C. (2008). Introduction: Evolving webs in network economies. In J. A. C. Baum & T. J. Rowley (Eds.), *Network Strategy* (pp. xiii–xxxii). Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Rumelt, R. P. (1984). Towards a strategic theory of the firm. In B. Lamb (Ed.), *Competitive strategic management* (pp. 556–570). Prentice-Hall, NY: Englewood Cliffs.
- Sæther, B. (1998). Retrodution: An alternative research strategy? *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 7, 245–249.
- Sale, J. E. M., Lohfeld, L. H., & Brazil, K. (2004). Revisiting the quantitative-qualitative debate: Implications for mixed-methods research. *Quality and Quantity*, 36 (1), 43–53.
- Sammarra, A. & Biggiero, L. (2008). Heterogeneity and specificity of inter-firm knowledge flows in innovation networks. *Journal of Management Studies*, 45 (5), 800–829.



- Sampson, R. C. (2007). R&d alliances and firm performance: the impact of technological diversity and alliance organization on innovation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50 (2), 364–386.
- Sapsed, J. & Salter, A. (2004). Postcards from the edge: Local communities, global programs and boundary objects. *Organization Studies*, 25 (9), 1515–1534.
- Saviotti, P. P. (1998). On the dynamics of appropriability of tacit and of codified knowledge. *Research Policy*, 26 (7-8), 843–856.
- Saviotti, P. P. & Catherine, D. (2008). Innovation networks in biotechnology. In H. Patzelt & T. Brenner (Eds.), *Handbook of Bioentrepreneurship* (pp. 53–82). Berlin: Springer Verlag.
- Saxton, T. (1997). The effects of partner and relationship characteristics on alliance outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40 (2), 443–461.
- Schank, R. & Abelson, R. (1977). *Scripts, Plans, Goals and Understanding; An inquiry into human knowledge structures*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Schneider, S. C. & Barsoux, J.-L. (2003). *Managing across cultures*. Harlow, UK: Pearson Education Limited, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition.
- Schnell, R., Hill, P. B., & Esser, E. (2005). *Methoden der empirischen Sozialforschung [Methods for empirical social research]*. München: Oldenburg Verlag.
- Schoenmakers, W. & Duysters, G. (2006). Learning in strategic technology alliances. *Technology Analysis and Strategic Management*, 18, 245–264.
- Schoenmakers, W. & Duysters, G. (2010). The technological origins of radical inventions. *Research Policy*, 39 (8), 1051–1059.
- Scholl, A. (2006). *Erfolgsbedingungen grenzüberschreitender Forschungs- und Entwicklungs-Kooperationen [Success factors of cross-border research and development co-operation]*. Hamburg: Verlag Dr. Kovač.
- Scholl, W. (1992). Informationspathologien [information pathologies]. In E. Frese (Ed.), *Handwörterbuch der Organisation [Handbook of organization]* (pp. 900–912). Stuttgart: Schäffer-Poeschel, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition.
- Schrader, J. C. (1990). *Zwischenbetrieblicher Informationstransfer. Eine empirische Analyse kooperativen Verhaltens. [Inter-organizational information transfer. An empirical analysis of cooperative behaviour]*. Berlin: Dunker & Humboldt.
- Schrader, S. (1991). Informal technology transfer between firms: Cooperation through information trading. *Research Policy*, 20, 153–170.
- Schumpeter, J. A. (1997). *Theorie der wirtschaftlichen Entwicklung [The Theory of Economic Development]*. Berlin: Duncker & Humblot GmbH, 9<sup>th</sup> edition.
- Scott, A. J. (2006). Entrepreneurship, innovation and industrial development: geography and the creative field revisited. *Small Business Economics*, 26, 1–24.

- Senker, J. (1995). Tacit knowledge and models of innovation. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 4 (2), 425–447.
- Shan, W. J., Walker, G., & Kogut, B. (1994). Interfirm cooperation and startup innovation in the biotechnology industry. *Strategic Management Journal*, 15, 387–394.
- Shipilov, A. V., Li, S. X., & Braum, J. A. (2007). The liabilities of strangers: Performance consequences of non-local partnering. *Insead Working Paper 2007/65/ST*.
- Shmulewitz, A., Langer, R., & Patton, J. (2006). Convergence in biomedical technology. *Nature Biotechnology*, 24 (3), 277–281.
- Sierra, C. (1997). Proximité(s), interactions technologiques et territoriales: une revue. *Revue d'économie industrielle*, 82 (1), 7–38.
- Simmie, J. (1997). *Innovation, Networks and Learning Regions*. Gateshead: Atheneum Press.
- Simmie, J. (1998). Reasons for the development of 'islands of innovation': Evidence from hertfordshire. *Journal Urban Studies*, 35 (8), 1261–1289.
- Simonin, B. L. (1999). Ambiguity and the process of knowledge transfer in strategic alliances. *Strategic Management Journal*, 20, 595–623.
- Singh, J. (2005). Collaborative networks as determinants of knowledge diffusion patterns. *Management Science*, 51 (5), 756–770.
- Sirmon, D. G. & Lane, P. J. (2004). A model of cultural differences and international alliance performance. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 35, 306–319.
- Sorenson, O. & Audia, P. (2000). The social structure of entrepreneurial activity: Geographic concentration of footwear production in the united states, 1940-1989. *American Journal of Sociology*, 106, 424–461.
- Specht, G., Beckmann, G., & Emelingmeyer, J. (2002). *F&E-Management. Kompetenz im Innovationsmanagement [R&D Management. Competence in innovation management]*. Stuttgart: Schaeffer-Poeschel Verlag.
- Spender, J.-C. (1996). Making knowledge the basis of a dynamic theory of the firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, 17, 45–62.
- Stahl, G. K., Maznevski, M. L., Voigt, A., & Jonsen, K. (2010). Unraveling the effects of cultural diversity in teams: A meta-analysis of research on multicultural work groups. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 41, 690–709.
- Steensma, K. H., Marino, L., Weaver, M. K., & Dickson, P. H. (2000). The influence of national culture on the formation of technology alliances by entrepreneurial firms. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43 (5), 951–973.
- Stuart, T. E. & Podolny, J. M. (1996). Local search and the evolution of technological capabilities. *Strategic Management Journal*, 17, 21–38.

- Swoboda, B. (2003). Kooperation: Erklärungsperspektiven grundlegender theorien, ansätze und konzepte im überblick [cooperation: Explanatory perspectives of basic theories, approaches and concepts]. In J. Zentes, B. Swoboda, & D. Morsschett (Eds.), *Kooperationen, Allianzen und Netzwerke. Grundlagen – Ansätze – Perspektiven [Cooperation, alliances and networks: Basics, concepts, and perspectives]* (pp. 35–64). Wiesbaden: Gabler Verlag.
- Sydow, J. (1992). *Strategischen Netzwerke. Evolution und Organisation [Strategic Networks. Evolution and Organisation]*. Wiesbaden: Gabler Verlag.
- Sydow, J. (2009). Foreword. In P. Kenis, M. Janowicz-Panjaitan, & B. Cambré (Eds.), *Temporary Organizations. Prevalence, Logic and Effectiveness*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.
- Sydow, J., Lindkvist, L., & DeFillippi, R. (2004). Project-based organizations, embeddedness and repositories of knowledge: Editorial. *Organization Studies*, 25 (9), 1475–1489.
- Sydow, J., Schreyögg, G., & Koch, J. (2009). Organizational path dependence: opening the black box:. *Academy Management Review*, 34(4), 689–709.
- Sydow, J. & Windeler, A. (1998). Organizing and evaluating interfirm networks: A structurationist perspective on network processes and effectiveness. *Organization Science*, 9 (3), 265–284.
- Sydow, J. & Windeler, A. (1999). Projektnetzwerke: Management von (mehr als) temporären systemen [project networks: management of (more than) temporary systems]. In J. Engelhard & E. J. Sinz (Eds.), *Kooperation im Wettbewerb. Neue Formen und Gestaltungskonzepte im Zeichen von Globalisierung und Informationstechnologie [Co-operation within competition. New forms and organisational designs in the sign of globalisation and information technology]* (pp. 211–235). Ergebnisse der 61. Wiss. Jahrestagung des Verbandes der Hochschullehrer für Betriebswirtschaft e.V., Wiesbaden 1999.
- Sytch, M. & Bubenzer, P. (2008). Research on strategic alliance in biotechnology: An assessment and review. In H. Patzelt & T. Brenner (Eds.), *Handbook of Bioentrepreneurship* chapter 6, (pp. 105–131). Berlin: Springer Verlag.
- Szulanski, G. (2006). *Sticky Knowledge. Barriers to knowing in the firm*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition.
- Tajfel, H. (1982a). Introduction. In H. Tajfel (Ed.), *Social identity and intergroup relations*, European Studies in Social Psychology. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Tajfel, H. (1982b). Social psychology of intergroup relations. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 33, 1–39.
- Talbot, D. (2007). Appropriability, proximity, routines and innovation. institutions as creators of proximities. volume Copenhagen, CBS, Denmark, June 18 - 20, 2007.

- Talbot, D. & Kirat, T. (2005). Proximité et institutions: nouveaux éclairages [proximity and institutions: New insights]. *Économie et Institutions*, 6/7, 9–15.
- Tallman, S. (2000). Forming and managing shared organization ventures. resources and transaction costs. In D. O. Faulkner & M. de Rond (Eds.), *Cooperative Strategy. Economic, Business, and Organizational Issues* chapter 5, (pp. 96–118). Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Tallman, S. & Phene, A. (2007). Leveraging knowledge across geographic boundaries. *Organization Science*, 18 (2), 252–260.
- Tashakkori, A. & Teddlie, C. (2003). *Mixed Methodology: combining qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Teddlie, C. & Tashakkori, A. (2003a). Major issues and controversies in the use of mixed methods in the social and behavioral sciences. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Handbook of Mixed Methods in Social and Behavioural Research* chapter 1, (pp. 3–49). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Teddlie, C. & Tashakkori, A. (2003b). Principles of mixed methods and multimethod research design. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Handbook of Mixed Methods in Social and Behavioural Research* chapter 7, (pp. 189–208). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Teece, D. J., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18 (7), 509–533.
- Teixeira, A. A. C., Santos, P., & Broachado, A. O. (2008). International r&d cooperation between low-tech smes: The role of cultural and geographical proximity. *European Planning Studies*, 16 (6), 785–810.
- Tenenhaus, M., Vinzi, V. E., Chatelin, Y.-M., & Lauro, C. (2005). Pls path modeling. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 48 (1), 159–205.
- Thomas, R. R. (1996). *Redefining Diversity*. New York.
- Thune, T. (2006). *Formation of research collaborations between universities and firms. Towards an integrated framework of tie formation motives, processes and experiences*. PhD thesis, BI Norwegian School of Management, Department of Leadership and Organization.
- Tobin, J. (1958). Estimation of relationships for limited dependent variables. *Econometrica*, 26, 24–36.
- Torre, A. & Gilly, J.-P. (2000). On the analytical dimension of proximity dynamics. *Regional Studies*, 34 (2), 169–180.
- Torre, A. & Rallet, A. (2005). Proximity and localization. *Regional Studies*, 39: 1, 47–59.

- Trippel, M. (2009). Islands of innovation and internationally networked labor markets: Magnetic centers for star scientists? *Institute for the Environment and Regional Development, SRE-Discussion 2009/06*.
- Tripsas, M., Schrader, S., & Sobrero, M. (1995). Discouraging opportunistic behavior in collaborative r&d: A new role for government. *Research Policy*, 24, 367–389.
- Tung, R. L. (2008). The cross-cultural research imperative: The need to balance cross-national and intra-national diversity. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 39 (1), 41–46.
- Tushman, M. L. (1977). Special boundary roles in the innovation process. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 22, 587–605.
- UNCTAD (2005). *World Investment Report 2005. Transnational Corporations and the Interantionalization of R&D*. Technical report, United Nations New York and Geneva.
- Uzzi, B. (1997). Social structure and competition in interfirm networks: The paradox of embeddedness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42, 35–67.
- van de Ven, A. (1986). Central problems in management of innovations. *Management Science*, 32 (5), 590–607.
- van den Hooff, B. & Schipper, S. (2009). Competitive organizational cultures and knowledge sharing. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, (pp. 1–20).
- van der Vrande, V., de Jong, J. P., Wanhaverbeke, W., & de Rochemont, M. (2009). Open innovation in smes: Trends, motives and management challenges. *Technovation*, 29, 423–437.
- van Knippenberg, D., Dreu, C. K. D., & Homan, A. C. (2004). Work group diversity and group performance: An integrative model and research agenda. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 1008–1022.
- van Wijk, R., Jansen, J. J. P., & Lyles, M. A. (2008). Inter- and intra-organizational knowledge transfer: A meta-analytic review and assessment of its antecedents and consequences. *Journal of Management Studies*, 45 (4), 830–853.
- Verspagen, B. (2005). Innovation and economic growth. In J. Fagerberg, D. C. Mowery, & R. R. Nelson (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Innovation* chapter 18, (pp. 487–513). Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Verspagen, B. & Duysters, G. (2004). The small worlds of strategic technology alliances. *Technovation*, 24, 563–571.
- von Hippel, E. (1988). *The Sources of Innovation*. Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press.
- von Hippel, E. (1994). “sticky information” and the locus of problem solving: Implications for innovation. *Management Science*, 40 (4), 429–439.

- Wagner, D. (1998). Internationales arbeitsumfeld [international work environment]. In B. Kumar & D. Wagner (Eds.), *Handbuch des internationalen Personalmanagements [Handbook of international personnel management]*. Munich: C.H. Beck.
- Wagner, D. & Sepehri, P. (2000). Managing diversity – wahrnehmung und verständnis im internationalen management [managing diversity – perception and understanding in international management]. *Personal*, 9, 456–462.
- Walker, G., Kogut, B., & Shan, W. J. (1997). Social capital, structural holes and the formation of an industry network. *Organization Science*, 8, 109–125.
- Wang, Q. & von Tunzelmann, G. N. (2000). Complexity and the functions of the firm: Breadth and depth. *Research Policy*, 29, 805–818.
- Waxell, A. & Malmberg, A. (2007). What is global and what is local in knowledge-generating interaction? the case of the biotech cluster in uppsala, sweden. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 19, 137–159.
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice. Learning, meaning and identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wernerfelt, B. (1984). A resource based view of the firm. *Strategic management journal*, 16, 171–174.
- White, H. C. (1992). Agency as control in formal networks. In N. Nohria & R. G. Eccles (Eds.), *Networks and Organizations. Structure, Form, and Action* chapter 3, (pp. 92–117). Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Whittington, K. B., Owen-Smith, J., & Powell, W. W. (2009). Networks, propinquity, and innovation in knowledge-intensive industries. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 54, 90–122.
- Williamson, O. (2003). Transaction cost economics and economic society. *CSES Working Paper No. 13*.
- Williamson, O. E. (1973). Markets and hierarchies: Some elementary considerations. *Organizational Forms and Internal Efficiency*, 63 (2), 316–325.
- Williamson, O. E. (1975). *Markets and hierarchies, analysis and antitrust implications: a study in the economics of internal organization*. Free Press, New York.
- Williamson, O. E. (1979). Transaction-cost economics: The governance of contractual relations. *The journal of law & economics*, 22 (2), 233–261.
- Williamson, O. E. (1985). *The Economic Institutions of Capitalism: Firms, Markets, Relational Contracting*. Free Press, New York.
- Williamson, O. E. (1991). Comparative economic organization: The analysis of discrete structural alternatives. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36 (2), 269–296.

- Winter, S. G. (2000). The satisficing principle in capability learning. *Strategic Management Journal*, 21, 981–996.
- Winter, S. G. (2003). Understanding dynamic capabilities. *Strategic Management Journal*, 24, 991–995.
- Witt, A., Brökel, T., & Brenner, T. (2007). Knowledge and its economic characteristics - a conceptual clarification. *University of Jena: Jena Economic Research Papers*, 2007-013.
- Wooldridge, J. M. (2000). *Introductory Econometrics: A Modern Approach*. Mason, OH: South-Western College Publishing.
- Wuyts, S., Colombo, M. G., Dutta, S., & Nooteboom, B. (2005). Empirical tests of optimal cognitive distance. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 58, 277–302.
- Yamao, S. & Fenwick, M. (2006). Knowledge transfer success in mnes: The role of training and development and knowledge transfer capacity. *Monash University, Department of Management, Working Paper Series*, 0/06, 1–9.
- Yamin, M. (1996). Understanding strategic alliances: The limits of transaction cost theories. In R. Coombs, A. Richards, P. P. Saviotti, & V. Walsh (Eds.), *R. Coombs, A. Richards, P. Saviotti & V. Walsh, 1996, Technological Collaboration: The Dynamics of Cooperation in Industrial Innovation* (pp. 165–179). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.
- Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case Study Research. Design and Methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Zaheer, A. & Bell, G. G. (2005). Benefiting from network position: firm capabilities, structural holes, and performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 26, 809–825.
- Zeller, C. (2001). Clustering biotech: A recipe for success? spatial patterns of growth of biotechnology in munich, rhineland and hamburg. *Small Business Economics*, 17, 123–141.
- Zeller, C. (2002). Project teams as means of restructuring research and development in the pharmaceutical industry. *Regional Studies*, 36 (3), 275–289.
- Zeller, C. (2004). North atlantic innovative relations of swiss pharmaceutical and the proximities with regional biotech arenas. *Economic Geography*, 80 (1), 83–111.
- Zhang, Q., Ribiere, V. M., & Chintakovid, T. (2008). The impact of group relationships on knowledge-sharing: A cross-cultural study. In K. O’Sullivan (Ed.), *Strategic Knowledge Management in Multinational Organizations* chapter 3, (pp. 40–52). Covent Garden: IGI Global.
- Zollo, M., Reuer, J. J., & Singh, H. (2002). Interorganizational routines and performance in strategic alliances. *Organization Science*, 13 (6), 701–713.

- zu Knyphausen-Aufseß, D. (1993). "Why Are Firms Different?" Der "Ressourcenorientierte Ansatz" im Mittelpunkt einer Kontroverse im Strategischen Management ["Why are firms different?" The "resource based view" in the centre of a controversy in strategic management]. *Die Betriebswirtschaft*, 53, 771 – 792.
- zu Knyphausen-Aufseß, D. (1997). Auf dem Weg zu einem ressourcenorientierten Paradigma? Resource-Dependence-Theorie der Organisation und Resource-based View des Strategischen Managements im Vergleich [On the way to a resource based paradigm? Resource dependence theory of organizations and resource based view of strategic management in comparison]. In G. Ortman, J. Sydow, & K. Türk (Eds.), *Theorien der Organisation - Die Rückkehr der Gesellschaft [Organizational theories - The comeback of the society]* (pp. 452 – 480). Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Zylbersztajn, D. (2006). Costs, transactions and transaction costs: (are there simple answers for complex questions?). *Universidade de Sao Paulo, Departamento de administracao, Working Paper*, No. 03/2006.



# A Interview Guideline



## Interview Guide

### **A General Information**

- 1 Company Overview
- 2 Company Strategy
  - 2.1 Product-Market Strategy
  - 2.2 R&D Strategy
  - 2.3 R&D Co-operation Strategy

### **B Case Study Co-operation**

- 1 General Information
- 2 Co-operation Rationale
  - 2.1 Co-operation Objectives
  - 2.2 Co-operation Content
- 3 Partner Choice
  - 3.1 Formation Process
  - 3.2 Relational Characteristics
- 4 Co-operation Management
  - 4.1 Co-operation Process
  - 4.2 Co-operation Coordination
- 5 Co-operation Results
  - 5.1 Contribution of the Co-operation
  - 5.2 „Lessons learned“

## **A General Information**

Company Name

Company Contact Details

Name of Interviewee

Position of Interviewee

Interviewee Contact Details

## **1 Company Overview**

Year of Foundation

Number of Employees (FTE)  
(End of 2008)

Employee development (2006-2008)       growth       same       decrease

Main Field of Activity

Ownership Structure

## 2 Company Strategy

### 2.1 Product-Market Strategy

Business Model  Product Company  Service Company  Technology provider (R&D)  
 Other

Steps of the value chain internalised  Exploratory Research  Applied Research  Pre-Clinical Development  
 Development  Upscaling/ Production  Marketing/ Sales

Market Strategy  Big Market  Market Niche  
 High Quality  Lower Costs

Main Markets/ Key customers  Local, regional  National  International

### 2.2 R&D Strategy

R&D expenses as a percentage of the annual expenses/revenues (2007/2008)

≤ 10 %  > 10 % ; ≤ 20 %  > 20 % ; ≤ 30 %  
 > 30 % ; ≤ 50 %  > 50 % ; ≤ 75 %  > 75 % ; ≤ 100 %

Approx. how many R&D projects did you pursue during the last five years? (need not be finished)

1  2  3  4  5-10  > 10

Goals of R&D activities

New Products  New Processes/ Technologies  Service Innovations  
 Enhanced Products  Enhanced Processes/ Technologies  Lower Costs  
 Superior IP  New Knowledge  Organisational Innovations  
 Others \_\_\_\_\_

### 2.3 R&D Co-operation Strategy

A **co-operative project in R&D** is defined as a

- (temporary) organisational arrangement (project)
- between two legally independent parties
- where the parties explicitly agree
- to combine resources and capabilities in the area of R&D
- to achieve a pre-defined goal.

Organisations involved can be universities, other public research organizations, hospitals, laboratories, governmental agencies; they can involve customers, suppliers, competitors or unrelated organisations.

Pure licensing agreements and contract research or development activities which include no further scientific or technological interaction are excluded.

In approximately how many co-operative projects in R&D were you engaged in during the period 2003 - 2008?

- 1       2       3       4       5-10       > 10

Who were/are the (five most important) partners? Can you rank these in terms of strategic importance?

Partner	Name & Location	Rank
Partner 1		
Partner 2		
Partner 3		
Partner 4		
Partner 5		

Are there different types of partners distinguishable?

What is the importance of international partners for you?

How do you generally proceed to identify and select a suitable partner?

**What are generally the prime motives for engaging in a co-operative project in R&D?**

Cooperation Motives	Low importance	High importance
<b>Leverage resources &amp; capabilities</b>		
Access complementarities	<input type="checkbox"/> 1-	<input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5
Realise synergies	<input type="checkbox"/> 1-	<input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5
Learn	<input type="checkbox"/> 1-	<input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5
Secure future options	<input type="checkbox"/> 1-	<input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5
<b>Positioning</b>		
Create market standards, dominant designs	<input type="checkbox"/> 1-	<input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5
Shape market structures	<input type="checkbox"/> 1-	<input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5
Enhance legitimacy, reputation	<input type="checkbox"/> 1-	<input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5
Access markets, internationalise	<input type="checkbox"/> 1-	<input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5
<b>Efficiency</b>		
Realise economies of scale, scope	<input type="checkbox"/> 1-	<input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5
Realise economies of time	<input type="checkbox"/> 1-	<input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5
Reduce costs, share risks	<input type="checkbox"/> 1-	<input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5
Flexibility	<input type="checkbox"/> 1-	<input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5
<b>Policy/Others</b>		
Adapt to market or regulatory requirements	<input type="checkbox"/> 1-	<input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5
Leverage supporting regulatory framework	<input type="checkbox"/> 1-	<input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5
Access public funds of home/host government	<input type="checkbox"/> 1-	<input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5
	<input type="checkbox"/> 1-	<input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5

## B Case Study Co-operation

For the following, please select **one international co-operative project in R&D** which was either recently completed or which is in an advanced stage where you were involved in the planning, partner-selection, set-up, and execution phase and for which you can assess the success of the co-operation project along various outcome dimensions.

### 1 General Information

Partner Name

Partner Location

Type of the partner

- |                                     |                                    |  |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> University | <input type="checkbox"/> Other PRO | <input type="checkbox"/> Firm            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hospital   | <input type="checkbox"/> NGO       | <input type="checkbox"/> Regulatory body |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other      |                                    |  |

Relationship

- |                                     |                                    |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Competitor | <input type="checkbox"/> Supplier  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Customer   | <input type="checkbox"/> Unrelated |

Size of the partner

- |                                  |                               |                                 |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Smaller | <input type="checkbox"/> Same | <input type="checkbox"/> Larger |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|

Year of establishment

Length of co-operation

- |  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Short-term (<12 months) | <input type="checkbox"/> Medium-term (12-36 months) | <input type="checkbox"/> Long-term (>3 years) |
|--|---|---|

Co-operation Scope

- |  |                                      |                                   |
|--|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Project-based | <input type="checkbox"/> Task-driven | <input type="checkbox"/> On-going |
|--|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|

Type of co-operation

- |   |  |                                    |
|---|--|------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Financial              | <input type="checkbox"/> Non-Financial | <input type="checkbox"/> Consortia |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Formal/<br>Contractual | <input type="checkbox"/> Informal      |                                    |

Content of co-operation

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Basic Research           | <input type="checkbox"/> Applied Research |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Pre-Clinical Development | <input type="checkbox"/> Development      |

Goals of R&D activities  
(within the co-operation)

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> New Products                        | <input type="checkbox"/> Superior IP                   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Enhanced Products                   | <input type="checkbox"/> Lower Costs                   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> New Processes/<br>Technologies      | <input type="checkbox"/> Service Innovations           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Enhanced Processes/<br>Technologies | <input type="checkbox"/> New knowledge                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Others                              | <input type="checkbox"/> Organisational<br>Innovations |

## 2 Co-operation Rationale

### 2.1 Co-operation Objectives

What were the main objectives of the co-operation project?

Co-operation Objectives		Low importance	High importance
1.		<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
2.		<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
3.		<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	

### 2.3 Co-operation Motives

What were the main (strategic) motives for engaging in a co-operative project?

Cooperation Motives		Low importance	High importance
<b>Leverage resources &amp; capabilities</b>			
	Access complementarities	<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
	Realise synergies	<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
	Learn	<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
	Secure future options	<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
<b>Positioning</b>			
	Create market standards, dominant designs	<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
	Shape market structures	<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
	Enhance legitimacy, reputation	<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
	Access markets, internationalise	<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
<b>Efficiency</b>			
	Realise economies of scale, scope	<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
	Realise economies of time	<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
	Reduce costs, share risks	<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
	Flexibility	<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
<b>Policy/Others</b>			
	Adapt to market or regulatory requirements	<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
	Leverage supporting regulatory framework	<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
	Access public funds of home/host government	<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
		<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	



### **3 Partner Choice**

#### **3.1 Formation Process**

**The co-operation project was initiated by**

us

partner

jointly

If you (co-)initiated the co-operation project:

**How did you identify this partner?**

**What were the rationales for selecting this particular partner?**

**3.2 Relational Characteristics**

Please characterise the relationship, your partner and his country in regard to the following dimensions. How do they impact on partner choice and functioning of the co-operation? What can be done to efficiently and effectively bridge the distances incurred?

3.2.1 Geographic Distance	
Absolute geographic distance*	km
Travel time	approx. hours
Time zone difference	approx. hours
Overall assessment of accessibility	Difficult <input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5 Convenient

\* to be calculated afterwards

**Open Discussion** (importance, impact, key measures):

3.2.2 Institutional Distance	Strongly disagree	Strongly agree
The country of the partner differed strongly from Germany in respect to its...		
... regulatory framework	<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
... norms, values	<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
... culture, habits, attitudes and mentality	<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
In some instances we experienced misunderstandings or problems of expressing certain things due to differences in native languages.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	

**Open Discussion** (importance, impact, key measures):

3.2.3 Organisational Distance	Strongly disagree	Strongly agree
The partner's organisation resembled ours in terms of its...		
... basic goals and self-perception (basic logics)	<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
... organisational (administrative) structure	<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
... mode of operation (work practices, routines, "typical" approach)	<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
... organisational culture, commitment and motivation (goals; incentive structures)	<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	

**Open Discussion** (importance, impact, key measures):

3.2.4 Strategic Distance	Strongly disagree	Strongly agree
At the time of the co-operative project, we were already in a rivalling position with the partner.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
At the time of the co-operative project, it was likely that the partner could be a future competitor.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
Our long-term strategic goals were compatible.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
The partner also engages in co-operative projects with other (potential) competitors (indirect spill-over risk).	<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	

**Open Discussion** (importance, impact, key measures):

3.2.5 Technological Distance	Strongly disagree	Strongly agree
We shared experience, expertise and thematic understanding due to an overlap/similarities in our ...		
... product-market field	<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
... methods and techniques	<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
... scientific disciplines*	<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
Understanding and interpretation was possible due to prior experiences with the field of expertise of the partner.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	

\* Which disciplines are combined on both sides? In what ways do they differ (e.g. different basic approaches to R&D)?

**Open Discussion** (importance, impact, key measures):

3.2.6 Relational Distance	Strongly disagree	Strongly agree
The relationship with the partner was characterised by high affinity & trust from the beginning due to ...		
... previous business relations with the partner	<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
... personnel relations, shared human capital (e.g. former employees, board/VC interlocks)	<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
... prior informal personal relations	<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
... 3 <sup>rd</sup> party referral	<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	

**Who exactly had prior ties with the partner?** (project leader, project team members, adjacent functions)

**Open Discussion** (importance, impact, key measures):

## 4 Co-operation Management

### 4.1 Co-operation Process

Can you please describe the process of the co-operation in more detail?  
(Can different stages be identified?)

In what way did the distances as identified before impact on these different stages?

### 4.2 Co-operation Co-ordination

To which extent did the following mechanisms support this process?

Exchange via	Very rarely	Very frequently
Email	<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
Internet/shared databases (group software, chats)	<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
Telephone, teleconference	<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
Videoconference	<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
Face-to-face (project) meetings*	<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
(Informal) meetings at other events (e.g. at conferences)	<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
On site demonstration*	<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
Personnel exchanges, secondments of team members (incl. PhDs)*	<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
(Temporary) Co-location of project team*	<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	

\* How many full day equivalents did you spend together with the partner during one year? (overall?)

Who participated at personal meetings? (upper echelon, cooperation team members)

## 5 Co-operation Results

### 5.1 Contribution of the Co-operation

To what degree were the main objectives achieved within the co-operation project?

Main Objectives	Not achieved	Exceeded expectations
1.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
2.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
3.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	

To what degree did the co-operation project contribute to the following?

Success Measures	Not achieved	Exceeded expectations
<b>Inventive, Innovative</b>		
High impact/quality publications	<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
New IP	<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
Prototypes (e.g. NBE); New/Enhanced products, processes, services	<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
<b>Strategic, Technological</b>		
Achievement of strategic goals	<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
Achievement of R&D objectives	<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
Fulfilment of technical requirements	<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
<b>Operational</b>		
Compliance with cooperation budget	<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
Compliance with cooperation timelines	<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
Cooperation stability	<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
<b>Personal</b>		
Satisfaction with partner performance	<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
Personally enjoyed working in the alliance	<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
Positive learning effect from the cooperation (e.g. routines, pitfalls)	<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
<b>Relational</b>		
Development of a trust-based relationship	<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
Establishment of a long-term relationship (potential future re-mobilization, JV, M&A)	<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
Opened access to other partners	<input type="checkbox"/> 1- <input type="checkbox"/> 2- <input type="checkbox"/> 3- <input type="checkbox"/> 4- <input type="checkbox"/> 5	

Did it live up to full expectations?

## **5.2 „Lessons learned“**

**Please recapitulate the course of the co-operation project.**

**What were the most important difficulties experienced in the course of the cooperation?**  
(any "critical" or "key" situations?)

**Reflecting back on the course of the co-operation project, what would have been the most important action/responses to facilitate co-operation?**

**Are there any further "lessons learned" for future co-operation projects?**

## **B List of Interviewed Firms**

Table B.1: Registry of Interviewed Firms

No.	Firm name	Interviewee position
1	AC Immune SA.	CEO
2	Affectis Pharmaceuticals AG	CEO
3	Agenolab GmbH Co. KG	Managing Director/COO
4	Agilent - Biotechnology/ Life Sciences	Project manager
5	Agilent - Control & Automation	Project manager
6	Apogenix GmbH	Vice president business development
7	ATG:biosynthetics	CEO
8	Bicoll GmbH	Managing Director
9	BIOBASE GmbH	CEO
10	BioM – Die BioM Biotech Cluster Development GmbH	Managing Director
11	B·R·A·I·N AG	CEO
12	CellGenix Technologie Transfer GmbH	CEO
13	Coatema – Coating Machinery GmbH - co.don@AG	CEO
14	co.don@AG	CSO
15	Curetis AG	Director assay development
16	DIREVO Industrial Biotechnology GmbH	CEO
17	Entelechon GmbH	Managing Director
18	Epigenomics AG	Senior vice president corporate development
19	Epiontis GmbH	CEO
20	GENEART AG	CEO
21	Genionics AG	CEO
22	IbA GmbH	CEO/CSO



## Registry of Interviewed Firms (continued)

No.	Firm name	Interviewee position
23	IDEA AG	Head of research and clinical development
24	imaGenes GmbH	Managing Director
25	MediGene AG	CEO; project manager
26	Miltenyi Biotec GmbH	Head of R&D
27	MorphoSys AG	Director/Head of alliance management
28	Nycomed Germany Holding GmbH	Early alliance manager
29	PANATecs GmbH	CEO
30	Pharmicell Europe GmbH	Managing Director
31	PLS-Design GmbH	CEO
32	Probiodrug AG	CSO/vice CEO
33	Probiogen AG	CSO
34	ProQinase GmbH	Head of R&D
35	Protagen AG	CEO
36	Qiagen N.V.	Senior scientific director
37	RIEMSER Arzneimittel AG	Director R&D/marketing & sales
38	Sloning BioTechnology GmbH	CEO
39	SYGNIS Pharma AG	Vice president operations
40	Synovo GmbH	CEO
41	TARGOS Molecular Pathology GmbH	CEO
42	TherapySelect GmbH & Co. KG	Managing Director/CSO
43	vasopharm GmbH	Head of business development
44	Warburg-Glycomed GmbH	CEO

# C Statistical Annex

Table C.1: Correlation Analysis: Interdependencies of Independent Variables

	Geographic distance	Institutional distance	Organisational distance	Strategic distance	Technological distance	Relational distance	Firm Age
Geographic distance	1.000						
Institutional distance	0.247	1.000					
Organisational distance	0.013	0.061	1.000				
Strategic distance	-0.054	-0.131	0.279*	1.000			
Technological distance	-0.252	0.178	0.217	-0.110	1.000		
Relational distance	-0.114	-0.204	0.022	0.009	-0.029	1.000	
Firm Age	-0.026	0.016	0.007	0.081	0.313*	-0.146	1.000
Firm Size	0.008	-0.051	0.124	0.232	0.294*	-0.148	0.479***
R&D intensity	0.318*	0.133	0.090	-0.178	-0.086	0.044	-0.599***
R&D breadth	0.154	0.101	-0.064	0.257	0.161	-0.273	0.527***
Network centrality	0.207	0.041	-0.041	0.187	0.064	0.006	0.331**
Duration	0.064	0.153	-0.078	-0.237	0.094	0.123	-0.172
Invention stage	-0.227	-0.036	-0.041	0.048	0.342**	-0.115	0.030
Learning rationale	-0.014	-0.208	-0.020	0.001	-0.060	0.152	-0.245
	Firm size	R&D intensity	R&D breadth	Network Centrality	Duration	Invention stage	Learning rationale
Firm size	1.000						
R&D intensity	-0.459***	1.000					
R&D breadth	0.383**	-0.362**	1.000				
Network Centrality	0.421**	-0.067	0.685***	1.000			
Duration	0.018	0.268	-0.184	0.111	1.000		
Invention stage	-0.050	-0.012	0.375**	0.278	-0.007	1.000	
Co-operation rationale	0.076	0.268	-0.010	0.238	0.199	0.190	1.000

\* p<.10, \*\* p<.05, \*\*\* p<.01

Table C.2: The Impact of Distance on Project Outcomes (Tobit Regression, Full Model)

	Goal Achievement		Inventive Outcome		Strategic Outcome	
	Coef. (Std. err.)	Marginal effect	Coef. (Std. err.)	Marginal effect	Coef. (Std. err.)	Marginal effect
Geogr. dist.	-0.097 (0.143)	-0.0938 (-0.68)	-0.180 (0.196)	-0.171 (-0.92)	0.256 <sup>†</sup> (0.129)	0.247 <sup>†</sup> (1.99)
Institut. dist.	1.923* (0.872)	1.853* (2.21)	2.875 (-1.732)	2.727 (1.66)	0.971 (0.804)	0.935 (1.20)
(Institut. dist.) <sup>2</sup>	-0.418* (0.188)	-0.403* (-2.23)	-0.592 (0.360)	-0.561 (-1.65)	-0.265 (0.169)	-0.255 (-1.56)
Organisat. dist.	-0.018 (0.087)	-0.0178 (-0.21)	0.092 (0.130)	0.0874 (0.71)	0.016 (0.076)	0.0158 (0.22)
Strat. dist.	-0.216 <sup>†</sup> (0.113)	-0.208 <sup>†</sup> (-1.90)	-0.065 (0.161)	-0.0619 (-0.40)	-0.339** (0.106)	-0.326** (-3.21)
Technol. dist.	2.123** (0.680)	2.045** (3.12)	3.089** (-1.017)	2.930** (3.05)	2.491*** (0.619)	2.400*** (4.02)
(Technol. dist.) <sup>2</sup>	-0.495*** (0.116)	-0.477*** (-4.26)	-0.600** (0.167)	-0.569** (-3.61)	-0.482*** (0.103)	-0.464*** (-4.69)
Relat. dist.	0.382 (0.116)	0.368 (0.18)	-1.181 (-2.913)	-1.120 (-0.41)	1.892 (-1.942)	1.823 (0.97)
(Relat. dist.) <sup>2</sup>	-0.023 (0.271)	-0.022 (-0.09)	0.212 (0.370)	0.201 (0.57)	-0.212 (0.248)	-0.205 (-0.85)
Firm Size	0.001* (0.000)	0.001* (2.13)	0.001 (0.001)	0.001 (1.66)	0.000 (0.000)	0.000 (0.11)
Firm Age	0.013 (0.027)	0.0122 (0.47)	0.025 (0.049)	0.024 (0.51)	-0.046 <sup>†</sup> (0.025)	-0.044 <sup>†</sup> (-1.86)
R&D intensity	0.086 (0.103)	0.0828 (0.84)	0.102 (0.184)	0.0966 (0.55)	-0.137 (0.091)	-0.132 (-1.50)
R&D breadth	-0.129 (0.128)	-0.124 (-1.00)	0.300 (0.191)	0.284 (1.57)	-0.190 (0.114)	-0.183 (-1.66)
Network Centr.	-0.123 (0.153)	-0.119 (-0.81)	-0.514* (0.222)	-0.488* (-2.32)	0.388* (0.139)	0.374* (2.80)
Duration	-0.234 (0.220)	-0.225 (-1.07)	0.325 (0.308)	0.309 (1.05)	-0.604** (0.189)	-0.572** (-3.26)
Inv. stage	0.533+ (0.262)	0.514 <sup>†</sup> (2.03)	0.879 <sup>†</sup> (0.439)	0.834 <sup>†</sup> (1.99)	0.735* (0.255)	0.708* (2.88)
Learn. rationale	0.189 (0.242)	0.182 (0.78)	0.473 (0.348)	0.448 (1.37)	0.089 (0.213)	0.086 (0.42)
Constant	-0.005 (-4.127)		-2.851 (-5.542)		-2.708 (-3.704)	
Sigma constant	0.499*** (0.065)		0.660*** (0.094)		0.425*** (0.058)	
No. of cases	39		37		38	
ll	-26.289		-31.983		-21.024	
Chi <sup>2</sup>	43.683		35.672		49.244	
Prob > Chi <sup>2</sup>	0.0004		0.0051		0.0001	
R <sup>2</sup> <sub>pseudo</sub>	0.454		0.358		0.539	

<sup>†</sup> p<.10, \* p<.05, \*\* p<.01, \*\*\* p<.001

Table C.3: The impact of distance on project outcomes (Tobit regression, full model), continued

	Operational Outcome		Personal Outcome		Relational Outcome	
	Coef. (Std. err.)	Marginal effect	Coef. (Std. err.)	Marginal effect	Coef. (Std. err.)	Marginal effect
Geogr. dist.	0.099 (0.175)	0.0977 (0.56)	0.135 (0.100)	0.134 (1.36)	-0.141 (0.135)	-0.141 (-1.05)
Institut. dist.	0.601 (0.941)	0.595 (0.64)	-0.367 (0.601)	-0.364 (-0.61)	2.469** (0.809)	2.463** (3.05)
(Institut. dist.) <sup>2</sup>	-0.152 (0.200)	-0.151 (-0.76)	-0.002 (0.129)	-0.002 (-0.02)	-0.602** (0.174)	-0.601** (-3.45)
Organisat. dist.	-0.050 (0.091)	-0.050 (-0.55)	-0.146* (0.061)	-0.145* (-2.39)	0.133 (0.083)	0.133 (1.62)
Strat. dist.	-0.123 (0.127)	-0.122 (-0.97)	0.038 (0.078)	0.0381 (0.49)	-0.137 (0.109)	-0.137 (-1.26)
Technol. dist.	1.087 (0.686)	1.076 (1.58)	2.854*** (0.453)	2.837*** (6.29)	2.292** (0.637)	2.287** (3.60)
(Technol. dist.) <sup>2</sup>	-0.219† (0.115)	-0.217† (-1.90)	-0.547*** (0.076)	-0.544*** (-7.23)	-0.412** (0.108)	-0.411** (-3.82)
Relat. dist.	3.861† -2.099	3.823† (1.84)	-1.217 -1.493	-1.210 (-0.82)	-0.780 -1.996	-0.778 (-0.39)
(Relat. dist.) <sup>2</sup>	-0.494† (0.264)	-0.489† (-1.87)	0.158 (0.190)	0.157 (0.83)	0.053 (0.253)	0.0525 (0.21)
Firm Size	0.001 (0.001)	0.001 (1.10)	0.001* (0.000)	0.001* (2.11)	0.000 (0.000)	0.000467 (1.18)
Firm Age	-0.016 (0.027)	-0.0156 (-0.57)	-0.051* (0.018)	-0.0506* (-2.77)	-0.083** (0.026)	-0.0825** (-3.24)
R&D intensity	0.092 (0.111)	0.0912 (0.83)	-0.088 (0.071)	-0.0874 (-1.23)	-0.021 (0.096)	-0.0211 (-0.22)
R&D breadth	-0.043 (0.131)	-0.0422 (-0.33)	-0.245* (0.086)	-0.243* (-2.85)	-0.358** (0.120)	-0.357** (-2.98)
Network Centr	0.089 (0.162)	0.0880 (0.55)	0.255* (0.105)	0.253* (2.44)	0.398* (0.143)	0.397* (2.78)
Duration	-0.934*** (0.209)	-0.913*** (-4.58)	-0.304† (0.151)	-0.302† (-2.03)	-0.192 (0.210)	-0.192 (-0.92)
Inv. stage	0.754** (0.251)	0.747** (3.00)	0.916*** (0.183)	0.911*** (5.03)	0.671* (0.247)	0.669* (2.72)
Learn. rationale	-0.075 (0.225)	-0.0740 (-0.33)	-0.082 (0.170)	-0.0812 (-0.48)	-0.429† (0.225)	-0.427† (-1.91)
Constant	-5.226 -4.078		4.266 -2.881		1.336 -3.860	
Sigma constant	0.459*** (0.061)		0.340*** (0.046)		0.468*** (0.058)	
No. of cases	37		39		39	
ll	-21.725		-15.125		-22.889	
Chi <sup>2</sup>	34.927		64.659		51.379	
Prob > Chi <sup>2</sup>	0.0064		0.0000		0.0000	
R <sup>2</sup> <sub>pseudo</sub>	0.446		0.681		0.529	

† p&lt;.10, \* p&lt;.05, \*\* p&lt;.01, \*\*\* p&lt;.001