

Bibliography

- Ahrne, G., & Brunsson, N. (2010). Organization outside organizations: The significance of partial organization. *Organization*, 18(1), 83–104. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508410376256>
- Alexy, O., & Dahlander, L. (2014). Managing open innovation. In M. Dodgson, D. M. Gann, & N. Phillips (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of innovation management* (pp. 442–461). Oxford University Press.
- Alexy, O., & Reitzig, M. (2013). Private–collective innovation, competition, and firms’ counterintuitive appropriation strategies. *Research Policy*, 42(4), 895–913. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2012.12.003>
- Alexy, O., West, J., Klapper, H., & Reitzig, M. (2017). Surrendering control to gain advantage: Reconciling openness and the resource-based view of the firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, 39(6), 1704–1727. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.2736>
- Allen, R. H., & Sriram, R. D. (2000). The role of standards in innovation. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 64(2–3), 171–181. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0040-1625\(99\)00105-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0040-1625(99)00105-7)
- Arora, A., Athreye, S., & Huang, C. (2016). The paradox of openness revisited: Collaborative innovation and patenting by UK innovators. *Research Policy*, 45(7), 1352–1361. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2016.03.019>
- Arthur, W. B. (2007). The structure of invention. *Research Policy*, 36(2), 274–287. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2006.11.005>
- Ates, A. (2022). Impeding factors for the generation of collaborative innovation performance in ecosystem-based manufacturing. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 72(8), 2225–2246. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPPM-06-2021-0320>
- Bachmann, R., Gillespie, N., & Priem, R. (2015). Repairing trust in organizations and institutions: Toward a conceptual framework. *Organization Studies*, 36(9), 1123–1142. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840615599334>
- Bachmann, R., & Inkpen, A. C. (2011). Understanding institutional-based trust building processes in inter-organizational relationships. *Organization Studies*, 32(2), 281–301. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840610397477>
- Bachmann, R., & Zaheer, A. (2014). Trust in inter-organizational relations. In S. Cropper (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of inter-organizational relations* (pp. 533–554). Oxford University Press.
- Baldwin, C., & von Hippel, E. (2011). Modeling a paradigm shift: From producer innovation to user and open collaborative innovation. *Organization Science*, 22(6), 1399–1417. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1100.0618>
- Baldwin, C. Y., & Clark, K. B. (2000). *Design rules: The power of modularity* (Vol. 1). MIT Press.
- Barley, S. R. (1986). Technology as an occasion for structuring: Evidence from observations of CT scanners and the social order of radiology departments. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 31(1), 78–108. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2392767>
- Baumstark, B. A. (2020). Barriers in profiting from external knowledge: The role of organizational design. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 29(4), 979–995. <https://doi.org/10.1093/icc/dtaa018>

- Beck, N., & Walgenbach, P. (2005). Technical efficiency or adaptation to institutionalized expectations? The adoption of ISO 9000 standards in the German mechanical engineering industry. *Organization Studies*, 26(6), 841–866. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840605054593>
- Bengtsson, L., Lakemond, N., Laursen, K., & Tell, F. (2017). Managing knowledge integration across multiple boundaries. In F. Tell, C. Berggren, S. Brusoni, & A. van de Ven (Eds.), *Managing knowledge integration across boundaries* (pp. 87–105). Oxford University Press.
- Berger, P., & Luckmann, T. (2009). *Die gesellschaftliche Konstruktion der Wirklichkeit: Eine Theorie der Wissenssoziologie* (22. Aufl.). Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag.
- Berggren, C., Bergek, A., Bengtsson, L., Hobday, M., & Söderlund, J. (2011a). *Knowledge integration and innovation: Critical challenges facing international technology-based firms*. Oxford University Press.
- Berggren, C., Bergek, A., Bengtsson, L., & Söderlund, J. (2011b). Exploring knowledge integration and innovation. In C. Berggren, A. Bergek, L. Bengtsson, M. Hobday, & J. Söderlund (Eds.), *Knowledge integration and innovation: Critical challenges facing international technology-based firms* (pp. 3–19). Oxford University Press.
- Berggren, C., Sydow, J., & Tell, F. (2017). Knowledge boundaries and reflective agency in path-dependent processes. In F. Tell, C. Berggren, S. Brusoni, & A. van de Ven (Eds.), *Managing knowledge integration across boundaries* (pp. 57–71). Oxford University Press.
- Bijker, W. E. (1995). *Of bicycles, bakelites, and bulbs: Toward a theory of sociotechnical change*. MIT Press.
- Bijker, W. E. (2010). How is technology made? – That is the question! *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 34(1), 63–76. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cje/bep042>
- Bijker, W. E., Hughes, T. P., & Pinch, T. J. (Eds.). (1987). *The social construction of technological systems: New directions in the sociology and history of technology*. MIT Press.
- Bitektine, A. (2007). Prospective case study design. *Organizational Research Methods*, 11(1), 160–180. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428106292900>
- Bjornali, E. S., Giones, F., & Billstrom, A. (2017). Reveal or conceal? Signaling strategies for building legitimacy in cleantech firms. *Sustainability*, 9(10), 1815. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su9101815>
- Blätzel-Mink, B. (2015). Das persönliche Element im Wirtschaftsleben – Joseph A. Schumpeter. In B. Blätzel-Mink & R. Menez (Eds.), *Kompodium der Innovationsforschung* (pp. 67–81). Springer Fachmedien.
- Blätzel-Mink, B., & Menez, R. (2015). *Kompodium der Innovationsforschung* (2. Aufl.). Springer Fachmedien.
- Blind, K. (2012). The influence of regulations on innovation: A quantitative assessment for OECD countries. *Research Policy*, 41(2), 391–400. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2011.08.008>
- Blind, K., Petersen, S. S., & Riillo, C. A. (2017). The impact of standards and regulation on innovation in uncertain markets. *Research Policy*, 46(1), 249–264. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2016.11.003>
- Blumer, H. (1954). What is wrong with social theory? *American Sociological Review*, 19(1), 3–10. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2088165>
- Bø Lyng, H., & Brun, E. C. (2020). Innovating with strangers: Managing knowledge barriers across distances in cross-industry innovation. *International Journal of Innovation and Technology Management*, 17(1), 2050008. <https://doi.org/10.1142/S0219877020500083>

- Bogers, M., Bekkers, R., & Granstrand, O. (2012). Intellectual property and licensing strategies in open collaborative innovation. In C. de Pablos Heredero & D. López (Eds.), *Open innovation in firms and public administrations* (pp. 37–58). IGI Global.
- Bogers, M., & West, J. (2012). Managing distributed innovation: Strategic utilization of open and user innovation. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 21(1), 61–75. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1/j.1467-8691.2011.00622.x>
- Borrás, S., & Edler, J. (2014). *The governance of socio-technical systems: Explaining change*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Boxenbaum, E., & Jonsson, S. (2008). Isomorphism, diffusion and decoupling. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, R. Suddaby, & K. Sahlin-Andersson (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of organizational institutionalism* (pp. 78–98). SAGE.
- Brown, J. S., & Duguid, P. (2001). Knowledge and organization: A social-practice perspective. *Organization Science*, 12(2), 198–213. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.12.2.198.10116>
- Brunsson, N., Rasche, A., & Seidl, D. (2012). The dynamics of standardization: Three perspectives on standards in organization studies. *Organization Studies*, 33(5–6), 613–632. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840612450120>
- Brubaker, E.R., Sheppard, S.D., Hinds, P.J., & Yang, M.C. (2023). Objects of Collaboration: Roles and Sequences of Objects in Spanning Knowledge Group Boundaries in Design. *Journal of Mechanical Design*. <https://doi.org/10.1115/1.4056798>
- Caccamo, M., Pittino, D., & Tell, F. (2023). Boundary objects, knowledge integration, and innovation management: A systematic review of the literature. *Technovation*, 122, 102645. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2023.102645>
- Carlile, P. R. (2002). A pragmatic view of knowledge and boundaries: Boundary objects in new product development. *Organization Science*, 13(4), 442–455. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.13.4.442.2953>
- Carlile, P. R. (2004). Transferring, translating, and transforming: An integrative framework for managing knowledge across boundaries. *Organization Science*, 15(5), 555–568. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1040.0094>
- Carlile, P. R., & Reberich, E. S. (2003). Into the black box: The knowledge transformation cycle. *Management Science*, 49(9), 1180–1195. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.49.9.1180.16564>
- Cassiman, B., & Valentini, G. (2015). Open innovation: Are inbound and outbound knowledge flows really complementary? *Strategic Management Journal*, 37(6), 1034–1046. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.2375>
- Cheng, C. C., & Huizingh, E. K. (2014). When is open innovation beneficial? The role of strategic orientation. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 31(6), 1235–1253. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jpim.12148>
- Chesbrough, H. (2003). *Open innovation: The new imperative for creating and profiting from technology*. Harvard Business School Press.
- Chesbrough, H. (2006a). Open innovation: A new paradigm for understanding. In H. Chesbrough, W. Vanhaverbeke, & J. West (Eds.), *Open innovation* (pp. 1–12). Oxford University Press.
- Chesbrough, H. W. (2006b). *Open innovation: The new imperative for creating and profiting from technology*. Harvard Business Press.
- Chesbrough, H. W., & Bogers, M. (2014). Explicating open innovation: Clarifying an emerging paradigm for understanding innovation. In H. W. Chesbrough, W. Vanhaverbeke, & J. West (Eds.), *New frontiers in open innovation* (pp. 3–28). Oxford University Press.

- Cohen, W. M., & Levinthal, D. A. (1990). Absorptive capacity: A new perspective on learning and innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35(1), 128–152. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2393553>
- Cook, K. S., & Gerbasi, A. (2011). Trust. In P. Hedström & P. S. Bearman (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of analytical sociology* (pp. 218–241). Oxford University Press.
- Cropper, S., & Palmer, I. (2009). Change, dynamics, and temporality in inter-organizational relationships. In S. Cropper, C. Huxham, M. Ebers, & P. S. Ring (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of inter-organizational relations* (pp. 635–663). Oxford University Press.
- Crozier, M., & Friedberg, E. (1979). *Macht und Organisation: Die Zwänge kollektiven Handelns* (3. Aufl.). Athenäum-Verlag.
- Czarnitzki, D., & Spielkamp, A. (2000). Business services in Germany: Bridges for innovation. *Discussion Paper / ZEW, Zentrum für Europäische Wirtschaftsforschung GmbH Industrial Economics and International Management*, 2000(52), Mannheim: ZEW.
- Dahlander, L., & Gann, D. M. (2010). How open is innovation? *Research Policy*, 39(6), 699–709. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2010.01.013>
- Dannenberg, L. (2013). Technische Rahmenbedingungen. In J. Böttcher (Ed.), *Handbuch Off-shore-Windenergie, BWL 10–2012* (pp. 289–352). Oldenbourg.
- Davidson, E., & Pai, D. (2004). Making sense of technological frames: Promise, progress, and potential. In T. Kaplan, D. P. Truex III, D. Wastell, A. T. Wood-Harper, & J. I. DeGross (Eds.), *Information systems research* (pp. 473–491). Springer US.
- Davis, J. P., & Eisenhardt, K. M. (2011). Rotating leadership and collaborative innovation: Recombination processes in symbiotic relationships. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 56(2), 159–201. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0001839211428131>
- Dekkers, M. (2014). Die Stärkung der Innovationskraft als gemeinsame Aufgabe von Wirtschaft, Politik und Gesellschaft. In M. Mai (Ed.), *Handbuch Innovationen* (pp. 55–72). Springer Fachmedien.
- DiMaggio, P. (1988). Interest and agency in institutional theory. In L. G. Zucker (Ed.), *Research on institutional patterns: Environment and culture* (pp. 3–21). Ballinger Publishing Co.
- DiMaggio, P., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48(2), 147–160. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2095101>
- Dodgson, M., & Gann, D. M. (2014). Technology and innovation. In M. Dodgson, D. M. Gann, & N. Phillips (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of innovation management* (pp. 375–393). Oxford University Press.
- Dodgson, M., Gann, D. M., & Phillips, N. (2014). Perspectives on innovation management. In M. Dodgson, D. M. Gann, & N. Phillips (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of innovation management* (pp. 3–25). Oxford University Press.
- Dokko, G., Nigam, A., & Rosenkopf, L. (2012). Keeping steady as she goes: A negotiated order perspective on technological evolution. *Organization Studies*, 33(5–6), 681–703. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840612443627>
- Dörrenbächer, C., & Gammelgaard, J. (2011). Subsidiary power in multinational corporations: The subtle role of micro-political bargaining power. *Critical Perspectives on International Business*, 7(1), 30–47.
- Dosi, G., & Nelson, R. R. (2010). Technical change and industrial dynamics as evolutionary processes. In *Handbook of the economics of innovation* (pp. 51–127). North-Holland.

- Dougherty, D. (2001). Reimagining the differentiation and integration of work for sustained product innovation. *Organization Science*, 12(5), 612–631. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.12.5.612.10096>
- Dougherty, D., & Dunne, D. D. (2011). Organizing ecologies of complex innovation. *Organization Science*, 22(5), 1214–1223. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1100.0615>
- Easterby-Smith, M., Golden-Biddle, K., & Locke, K. (2007). Working with pluralism: Determining quality in qualitative research. *Organizational Research Methods*, 11(3), 419–429. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428107308072>
- Ebers, M., & Maurer, I. (2014). Connections count: How relational embeddedness and relational empowerment foster absorptive capacity. *Research Policy*, 43(2), 318–332. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2013.10.017>
- Edgerton, D. (2008). *The shock of the old: Technology and global history since 1900*. Profile Books.
- Edquist, C. (2002). Innovation policy—a systemic approach. In *The globalizing learning economy* (pp. 219–238). Oxford University Press.
- Edquist, C. (2005). Systems of innovation: Perspectives and challenges. In J. Fagerberg, D. C. Mowery, & R. Nelson (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of innovation* (pp. 181–208). Oxford University Press.
- Egbekokun, A., & Svin, I. (2015). Absorptive capacity and innovation: When is it better to cooperate? In A. Pyka (Ed.), *The evolution of economic and innovation systems* (pp. 373–399). Springer.
- Engstrand, Å.-K., & Enberg, C. (2020). The power in positionings: A Foucauldian approach to knowledge integration processes. *Management Learning*, 51(3), 336–352. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350507619889028>
- Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989). Building theories from case study research. *The Academy of Management Review*, 14(4), 532–550. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1989.4308385>
- Eisenhardt, K. M., & Graebner, M. E. (2007). Theory building from cases: Opportunities and challenges. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 50(1), 25–32. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2007.24160888>
- Elster, J. (2007). *Explaining social behavior: More nuts and bolts for the social sciences*. Cambridge University Press.
- Elster, J. (2011). Norms. In P. Hedström & P. S. Bearman (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of analytical sociology* (pp. 195–217). Oxford University Press.
- Emirbayer, M. (1997). Manifesto for a relational sociology. *American Journal of Sociology*, 103(2), 281–317. <https://doi.org/10.1086/231209>
- Esser, H. (2000). *Soziologie. Spezielle Grundlagen: Institutionen* (Vol. 5). Campus Verlag.
- Faems, D., Looy, B. V., & Debackere, K. (2005). Interorganizational collaboration and innovation: Toward a portfolio approach. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 22(3), 238–250. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0737-6782.2005.00120.x>
- Fagerberg, J. (2005). Innovation: A guide to the literature. In J. Fagerberg, D. C. Mowery, & R. R. Nelson (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of innovation*. Oxford University Press.
- Feldman, M. S. (2016). Routines as process: Past, present, and future. In J. Howard-Grenville, C. Rerup, A. Langley, & H. Tsoukas (Eds.), *Organizational routines: How they are created, maintained, and changed* (pp. 23–46). Oxford University Press.

- Feldman, M. S., & Pentland, B. T. (2003). Reconceptualizing organizational routines as a source of flexibility and change. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 48(1), 94–118. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3556620>
- Fiss, P. C. (2009). Case studies and the configurational analysis of organizational phenomena. In D. Byrne & C. C. Ragin (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of case-based methods* (pp. 424–440). SAGE Publications.
- Flick, U. (2002). *Qualitative Sozialforschung: Eine Einführung*. Rowohlt Taschenbuch Verlag.
- Fligstein, N., & McAdam, D. (2011). Toward a general theory of strategic action fields. *Sociological Theory*, 29(1), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9558.2010.01385.x>
- Fligstein, N., & McAdam, D. (2012). *A theory of fields*. Oxford University Press.
- Fornahl, D., Hassink, R., Klaerding, C., Mossig, I., & Schröder, H. (2012). From the old path of shipbuilding onto the new path of offshore wind energy? The case of Northern Germany. *European Planning Studies*, 20(5), 832–855. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09654313.2012.667908>
- Foss, N. J., Laursen, K., & Pedersen, T. (2011). Linking customer interaction and innovation: The mediating role of new organizational practices. *Organization Science*, 22(4), 980–999. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1100.0584>
- Foucart, R., & Li, Q. C. (2021). The role of technology standards in product innovation: Theory and evidence from UK manufacturing firms. *Research Policy*, 50(2), 104157. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2020.104157>
- Freeman, C., & Soete, L. (1999). *The economics of industrial innovation* (3rd ed.). Pinter.
- Gallini, N. (2014). Cooperating with competitors: Patent pooling and choice of a new standard. *International Journal of Industrial Organization*, 36, 4–21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijindorg.2014.03.006>
- Gambardella, A., & Panico, C. (2014). On the management of open innovation. *Research Policy*, 43(5), 903–913. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2013.12.002>
- Garriga, H., von Krogh, G., & Spaeth, S. (2013). How constraints and knowledge impact open innovation. *Strategic Management Journal*, 34(9), 1134–1144. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.2049>
- Garud, R., Jain, S., & Kumaraswamy, A. (2002). Institutional entrepreneurship in the sponsorship of common technological standard: The case of Sun Microsystems and Java. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(1), 196–214. <https://doi.org/10.5465/3069292>
- Gerring, J., & Cojocar, L. (2016). Selecting cases for intensive analysis: A diversity of goals and methods. *Sociological Methods & Research*, 45(3), 392–423. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0049124116631692>
- Gibbert, M., & Ruigrok, W. (2010). The "what" and "how" of case study rigor: Three strategies based on published work. *Organizational Research Methods*, 13(4), 710–737. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428109351319>
- Gibbert, M., Ruigrok, W., & Wicki, B. (2008). What passes as a rigorous case study? *Strategic Management Journal*, 29(13), 1465–1474. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.722>
- Giddens, A. (1984). *The constitution of society: Outline of the theory of structuration*. Polity Press.
- Grigoriou, K., & Rothaermel, F. T. (2016). Organizing for knowledge generation: Internal knowledge networks and the contingent effect of external knowledge sourcing. *Strategic Management Journal*, 37(3), 431–454. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.2489>
- Granstrand, O., & Holgersson, M. (2014). The challenge of closing open innovation: The intellectual property disassembly problem. *Research-Technology Management*, 57(5), 19–25. <https://doi.org/10.5437/08956308X5705257>

- Grant, R. M. (1996a). Prospering in dynamically-competitive environments: Organizational capability as knowledge integration. *Organization Science*, 7(4), 375–387. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.7.4.375>
- Grant, R. M. (1996b). Toward a knowledge-based theory of the firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, 17(S2), 109–122. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.4250171110>
- Gurca, A., Bagherzadeh, M., Markovic, S., & Koporcic, N. (2020). Managing the challenges of business-to-business open innovation in complex projects: A multi-stage process model. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 89, 191–207. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2020.03.016>
- Habersang, S., Küberling-Jost, J., Reihlen, M., & Seckler, C. (2018). A process perspective on organizational failure: A qualitative meta-analysis. *Journal of Management Studies*, 56(1), 19–56. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12341>
- Hage, J., & Hollingsworth, J. R. (2000). A strategy for the analysis of idea innovation networks and institutions. *Organization Studies*, 21(5), 971–1004. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840600215003>
- Håkanson, L. (2010). The firm as an epistemic community: The knowledge-based view revisited. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 19(6), 1801–1828. <https://doi.org/10.1093/icc/dtq052>
- Heidenreich, M. (1997). Zwischen Innovation und Institutionalisierung. In B. Blättel-Mink & O. Renn (Eds.), *Zwischen Akteur und System: Die Organisation von Innovation* (pp. 177–206). VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Heidenreich, M., Kädtler, J., & Mattes, J. (Eds.). (2017). *Kollaborative Innovationen: Die innerbetriebliche Nutzung externer Wissensbestände in vernetzten Entwicklungsprozessen*. Universitätsverlag Göttingen.
- Hendry, C., & Harborne, P. (2011). Changing the view of wind power development: More than “bricolage.” *Research Policy*, 40(5), 778–789. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2011.03.004>
- Henkel, J., Schöberl, S., & Alexy, O. (2014). The emergence of openness: How and why firms adopt selective revealing in open innovation. *Research Policy*, 43(5), 879–890. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2013.12.006>
- Henttonen, K., Hurmelinna-Laukkanen, P., & Ritala, P. (2016). Managing the appropriability of R&D collaboration. *R&D Management*, 46(S1), 145–158. <https://doi.org/10.1111/radm.12172>
- Heras-Saizarbitoria, I., & Boiral, O. (2012). ISO 9001 and ISO 14001: Towards a research agenda on management system standards. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 15(1), 47–65. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2370.2012.00328.x>
- Herstad, S. J., Sandven, T., & Ebersberger, B. (2015). Recruitment, knowledge integration and modes of innovation. *Research Policy*, 44(1), 138–153. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2014.07.015>
- Hoffman, A. J. (1999). Institutional evolution and change: Environmentalism and the U.S. chemical industry. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42(4), 351–371. <https://doi.org/10.5465/257008>
- Hofman, E., Halman, J. I. M., & van Looy, B. (2016). Do design rules facilitate or complicate architectural innovation in innovation alliance networks? *Research Policy*, 45(7), 1436–1448. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2016.05.008>
- Hollingsworth, J. R., & Boyer, R. (1997). Coordination of economic actors and social systems of production. In J. R. Hollingsworth & R. Boyer (Eds.), *Contemporary capitalism: The embeddedness of institutions* (pp. 1–47). Cambridge University Press.

- Hollingsworth, R. J. (2000). Doing institutional analysis: Implications for the study of innovations. *Review of International Political Economy*, 7(4), 595–644. <https://doi.org/10.1080/096922900750034575>
- Holzner, B. (1972). *Reality construction in society*. Schenkman Publishing.
- Horn, A., Urias, E., Klein, J. T., Hess, A., & Zweckhorst, M. B. M. (2023). Expert and non-expert at the same time: Knowledge integration processes and dynamics in interdisciplinary teamwork. *Sustainability Science*, 18(5), 2357–2371. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-023-01305-3>
- Huenteler, J., Ossenbrink, J., Schmidt, T. S., & Hoffmann, V. H. (2016). How a product's design hierarchy shapes the evolution of technological knowledge—Evidence from patent-citation networks in wind power. *Research Policy*, 45(6), 1195–1217. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2016.03.014>
- Huenteler, J., Schmidt, T. S., Ossenbrink, J., & Hoffmann, V. H. (2016). Technology life-cycles in the energy sector—Technological characteristics and the role of deployment for innovation. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 104, 102–121. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2015.09.022>
- Hughes, T. P. (1987). The evolution of large technological systems. In W. E. Bijker, T. P. Hughes, & T. J. Pinch (Eds.), *The social construction of technological systems: New directions in the sociology and history of technology* (pp. 51–82). MIT Press.
- Huxham, C., & Beech, N. (2010). Inter-organizational power. In S. Cropper, M. Ebers, C. Huxham, & P. S. Ring (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of inter-organizational relations* (pp. 555–579). Oxford University Press.
- Idelchik, M., & Kogan, S. (2012). GE's open collaboration model. *Research-Technology Management*, 55(4), 28–31. <https://doi.org/10.5437/08956308X5504085>
- Jackwerth, T. (2009). *Die Einführung von Informationssystemen und ihre Auswirkungen auf die Arbeit und Kommunikation im Unternehmen: Eine empirische Untersuchung dreier SAP-Einführungsprojekte bei einem Unternehmen aus der Transport- und Logistikbranche*. Kovač.
- Jackwerth, T. (2014). Studie zum Windenergiesektor. Eine empirische Analyse der betrieblichen Nutzung verteilten Wissens. *Oldenburger Studien zur Europäisierung und zur transnationalen Regulierung*, (23), 1–24.
- Jackwerth, T. (2017). Formen der Wissensintegration in Innovationsnetzwerken: Das Beispiel der Windenergie. In M. Heidenreich, J. Kädtler, & J. Mattes (Eds.), *Kollaborative Innovationen* (pp. 163–192). Universitätsverlag Göttingen.
- Jacobsson, S., & Karltorp, K. (2013). Mechanisms blocking the dynamics of the European offshore wind energy innovation system—Challenges for policy intervention. *Energy Policy*, 63, 1182–1195. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2013.08.077>
- Johnsen, T. E., Lamming, R. C., & Harland, C. M. (2009). Inter-organizational relationships, chains, and networks. In S. Cropper, M. Ebers, C. Huxham, & P. S. Ring (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of inter-organizational relations* (pp. 61–89). Oxford University Press.
- Kaldellis, J. K., & Zafirakis, D. (2011). The wind energy (r)evolution: A short review of a long history. *Renewable Energy*, 36(7), 1887–1901. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2011.01.002>
- Kamp, L. M., Smits, R. E., & Andriess, C. D. (2004). Notions on learning applied to wind turbine development in the Netherlands and Denmark. *Energy Policy*, 32(14), 1625–1637. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0301-4215\(03\)00134-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0301-4215(03)00134-4)

- Kappelhoff, P. (2014). Kompetenzentwicklung in Netzwerken: Die Sicht der Komplexitäts- und allgemeinen Evolutionstheorie. In A. Windeler & J. Sydow (Eds.), *Kompetenz, Organisation und Gesellschaft* (pp. 109–223). VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Karnøe, P., & Garud, R. (2012). Path creation: Co-creation of heterogeneous resources in the emergence of the Danish wind turbine cluster. *European Planning Studies*, 20(5), 733–752. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09654313.2012.667923>
- Kash, D. E., & Rycroft, R. (2002). Emerging patterns of complex technological innovation. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 69(6), 581–606. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0040-1625\(01\)00168-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0040-1625(01)00168-8)
- Katzy, B., Turgut, E., Holzmann, T., & Sailer, K. (2013). Innovation intermediaries: A process view on open innovation coordination. *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management*, 25(3), 295–309. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09537325.2013.764982>
- Knights, D. (2009). Power at work in organizations. In M. Alvesson, T. Bridgman, & H. Willmott (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of critical management studies* (pp. 144–165). Oxford University Press.
- Kogut, B., & Zander, U. (1992). Knowledge of the firm, combinative capabilities, and the replication of technology. *Organization Science*, 3(3), 383–397. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.3.3.383>
- Kriegesmann, B., & Kerka, F. (2014). Unternehmerisches Innovationsmanagement. In M. Mai (Ed.), *Handbuch Innovationen* (pp. 73–87). Springer Fachmedien.
- Krücken, G. (2016). Paul J. DiMaggio und Walter W. Powell: The iron cage revisited—Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. In *Schlüsselwerke der Wirtschaftssoziologie* (pp. 195–200). Springer Fachmedien.
- Kumar, Y., Ringenberg, J., Depuru, S. S. S. R., Devabhaktuni, V. K., Lee, J. W., Nikolaidis, E., Andersen, B., & Afjeh, A. (2016). Wind energy: Trends and enabling technologies. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 53, 209–224. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2015.07.129>
- Langhof, A., Hahn, L., Bergmann, J., & Wagner, G. (2014). Einführende Überlegungen zum Scheitern aus organisations- und wirtschaftssoziologischer Perspektive. In J. Bergmann, M. Hahn, A. Langhof, & G. Wagner (Eds.), *Scheitern – Organisations- und wirtschaftssoziologische Analysen* (pp. 9–28). Springer Fachmedien.
- 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(2), 131–150. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.507>
- Laursen, K., & Salter, A. J. (2014). The paradox of openness: Appropriability, external search and collaboration. *Research Policy*, 43(5), 867–878. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2013.10.004>
- Lawrence, T. B. (2008). Institutions and organizations. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, R. Suddaby, & K. Sahlin-Andersson (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of organizational institutionalism* (pp. 170–197). SAGE.
- Lawrence, T. B. (Ed.). (2010). *Institutional work: Actors and agency in institutional studies of organizations* (1st paperback ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Lawrence, T. B., & Suddaby, R. (2006). Institutions and institutional work. In S. R. Clegg, C. Hardy, T. B. Lawrence, & W. R. Nord (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of organization studies* (pp. 215–254). SAGE.

- Lawrence, T. B., Suddaby, R., & Leca, B. (2010). Introduction: Theorizing and studying institutional work. In T. B. Lawrence, R. Suddaby, & B. Leca (Eds.), *Institutional work: Actors and agency in institutional studies of organizations* (pp. 1–27). Cambridge University Press.
- Lee, S., Park, G., Yoon, B., & Park, J. (2010). Open innovation in SMEs—An intermediated network model. *Research Policy*, 39(2), 290–300. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2009.12.009>
- Lema, R., Nordensvärd, J., Urban, F., & Lütkenhorst, W. (2014). Innovation paths in wind power: Insights from Denmark and Germany. *German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE)*.
- Lewin, A. Y., Massini, S., & Peeters, C. (2011). Microfoundations of internal and external absorptive capacity routines. *Organization Science*, 22(1), 81–98. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1100.0525>
- Lijphart, A. (1971). Comparative politics and the comparative method. *American Political Science Review*, 65(3), 682–693. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1955513>
- Love, J. H., Roper, S., & Vahter, P. (2013). Learning from openness: The dynamics of breadth in external innovation linkages. *Strategic Management Journal*, 35(11), 1703–1716. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.2170>
- Luhmann, N. (2006). *Organisation und Entscheidung* (2. Aufl.). VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Lyng, H. B., & Brun, E. C. (2020). Innovating with strangers: Managing knowledge barriers across distances in cross-industry innovation. *International Journal of Innovation and Technology Management*, 17(1), 2050008. <https://doi.org/10.1142/S0219877020500083>
- Maitlis, S., & Christianson, M. (2014). Sensemaking in organizations: Taking stock and moving forward. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 8(1), 57–125. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19416520.2014.873177>
- Mäkitie, T. (2019). Corporate entrepreneurship and sustainability transitions: Resource redeployment of oil and gas industry firms in floating wind power. *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09537325.2019.1668553>
- Malerba, F., & Adams, P. (2014). Sectoral systems of innovation. In M. Dodgson, D. M. Gann, & N. Phillips (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of innovation management* (pp. 183–203). Oxford University Press.
- March, J. G. (1991). Exploration and exploitation in organizational learning. *Organization Science*, 2(1), 71–87. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2.1.71>
- Mariotti, F., & Delbridge, R. (2012). Overcoming network overload and redundancy in interorganizational networks: The roles of potential and latent ties. *Organization Science*, 23(2), 511–528. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1100.0568>
- Markard, J. (2011). Transformation of infrastructures: Sector characteristics and implications for fundamental change. *Journal of Infrastructure Systems*, 17(3), 107–117. [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)IS.1943-555X.0000056](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)IS.1943-555X.0000056)
- Mattes, J. (2014). Formalisation and flexibilisation in organisations – Dynamic and selective approaches in corporate innovation processes. *European Management Journal*, 32(3), 475–486. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2013.10.003>
- Mautz, R. (2012). Sozioökonomische Dynamik der Energiewende. In P. Bartelheimer, S. Fromm, & J. Kädtler (Eds.), *Berichterstattung zur sozioökonomischen Entwicklung in Deutschland* (pp. 223–241). VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

- McEvily, B., Perrone, V., & Zaheer, A. (2003). Trust as an organizing principle. *Organization Science*, 14(1), 91–103. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.14.1.91.12814>
- McKenna, R., van der Leye, P. O., & Fichtner, W. (2014). Key challenges and prospects for large wind turbines. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 53, 1212–1221. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2014.02.015>
- Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83(2), 340–363. <https://doi.org/10.1086/226550>
- Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1991). Institutional organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. In W. W. Powell & P. J. DiMaggio (Eds.), *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis* (pp. 41–62). University of Chicago Press.
- Meyer, U. (2016). *Innovationspfade: Evolution und Institutionalisierung komplexer Technologie*. VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Nakagaki, P., Aber, J., & Fetterhoff, T. (2012). The challenges in implementing open innovation in a global innovation-driven corporation. *Research-Technology Management*, 55(4), 32–38. <https://doi.org/10.5437/08956308X5504086>
- Narayanan, V., & Chen, T. (2012). Research on technology standards: Accomplishment and challenges. *Research Policy*, 41(8), 1375–1406. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2012.02.003>
- Nieto, M. J., & Santamaría, L. (2007). The importance of diverse collaborative networks for the novelty of product innovation. *Technovation*, 27(6–7), 367–377. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2006.10.001>
- Nightingale, P. (2000). The product-process-organisation relationship in complex development projects. *Research Policy*, 29(7–8), 913–934. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0048-7333\(00\)00130-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0048-7333(00)00130-2)
- Nightingale, P. (2014). What is technology? Six definitions and two pathologies. *SPRU Working Paper Series, SWPS 2014–19*, 1–29.
- Nooteboom, B. (2014). Learning and innovation in inter-organizational relationships. In S. Cropper, C. Huxham, M. Ebers, & P. S. Ring (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of inter-organizational relations* (pp. 606–634). Oxford University Press.
- North, D. C. (1990). *Institutions, institutional change and economic performance*. Cambridge University Press.
- North, D. C., & Thomas, R. P. (1976). *The rise of the Western world: A new economic history*. Cambridge University Press.
- Ohlhorst, D. (2009). *Windenergie in Deutschland*. VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Orlikowski, W. J. (2001). Due duality of technology: Rethinking the concept of technology in organizations. In C. G. A. Bryant (Ed.), *The contemporary Giddens* (pp. 62–96). Palgrave.
- Orlikowski, W. J. (2002). Knowing in practice: Enacting a collective capability in distributed organizing. *Organization Science*, 13(3), 249–273. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.13.3.249.2776>
- Orlikowski, W. J. (2007). Sociomaterial practices: Exploring technology at work. *Organization Studies*, 28(9), 1435–1448. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840607081138>
- Orlikowski, W. J. (2010). The sociomateriality of organisational life: Considering technology in management research. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 34(1), 125–141. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cje/bep058>
- Orlikowski, W. J., & Gash, D. C. (1994). Technological frames: Making sense of information technology in organizations. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems*, 12(2), 174–207. <https://doi.org/10.1145/196734.196745>

- Ortmann, G. (1999). Innovation als Paradoxieentfaltung. In D. Sauer & C. Lang (Eds.), *Paradoxien der Innovation* (pp. 249–263). Campus Verlag.
- Ortmann, G. (2014). Das Driften von Regeln, Standards und Routinen. In J. Bergmann, M. Hahn, A. Langhof, & G. Wagner (Eds.), *Scheitern – Organisations- und wirtschaftssoziologische Analysen* (pp. 31–59). Springer Fachmedien.
- Ortmann, G., Sydow, J., & Windeler, A. (2000). Organisation als reflexive Strukturierung. In G. Ortmann, J. Sydow, & K. Türk (Eds.), *Theorien der Organisation* (pp. 315–354). VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Owen-Smith, J., & Powell, W. W. (2008). Networks and institutions. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, R. Suddaby, & K. Sahlin-Andersson (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of organizational institutionalism* (pp. 596–623). SAGE Publications.
- Pisano, G. P., & Teece, D. J. (2007). How to capture value from innovation: Shaping intellectual property and industry architecture. *California Management Review*, 50(1), 278–296. <https://doi.org/10.2307/41166428>
- Powell, W. W. (1990). Neither market nor hierarchy: Network forms of organization. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 12, 295–336.
- Powell, W. W. (1996). Weder Markt noch Hierarchie: Netzwerkartige Organisationsformen. In P. Kenis & V. Schneider (Eds.), *Organisation und Netzwerk* (pp. 213–271). Campus-Verlag.
- Powell, W. W., & Giannella, E. (2010). Collective invention and inventor networks. In B. H. Hall & N. Rosenberg (Eds.), *Handbook of the economics of innovation* (Vol. 2, pp. 575–605). Elsevier North-Holland.
- Powell, W. W., Koput, K. W., & Smith-Doerr, L. (1996). Interorganizational collaboration and the locus of innovation: Networks of learning in biotechnology. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41(1), 116–145. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2393988>
- Rammert, W. (2007). *Technik – Handeln – Wissen*. VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Rau, C., Möslin, K. M., & Neyer, A.-K. (2015). Playing possum, hide-and-seek, and other behavioral patterns: Knowledge boundaries at newly emerging interfaces. *R&D Management*, 46(S2), 341–353. <https://doi.org/10.1111/radm.12164>
- Reckwitz, A. (2002). Toward a theory of social practices: A development in culturalist theorizing. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 5(2), 243–263. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368431022225432>
- Rodrigues, S., Restrepo, C., Kontos, E., Pinto, R. T., & Bauer, P. (2015). Trends of offshore wind projects. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 49, 1114–1135. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2015.04.092>
- Rossoni, A. L., Vasconcellos, E. P. G. de, & Rossoni, R. L. de C. (2024). Barriers and facilitators of university-industry collaboration for research, development and innovation: A systematic review. *Management Review Quarterly*, 74(4), 1841–1877. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11301-023-00349-1>
- Salter, A., & Alexy, O. (2014). The nature of innovation. In M. Dodgson, D. M. Gann, & N. Phillips (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of innovation management* (pp. 26–49). Oxford University Press.
- Sandholtz, K. W. (2012). Making standards stick: A theory of coupled vs. decoupled compliance. *Organization Studies*, 33(5–6), 655–679. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840612443621>
- Sankowska, A., & Söderlund, J. (2015). Trust, reflexivity and knowledge integration: Toward a conceptual framework concerning mobile engineers. *Human Relations*, 68(6), 973–1000. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726714542732>

- Schaffarczyk, A. (2013). Technische Rahmenbedingungen. In J. Böttcher (Ed.), *Handbuch Windenergie* (pp. 163–263). Oldenbourg Verlag.
- Schmidt, C. (2004, Mai). Analyse von Leitfadeninterviews. In U. Flick, E. v. Kardorff, & I. Steinke (Eds.), *Qualitative Forschung* (pp. 447–456). Rowohlt Taschenbuch Verlag.
- Schroll, A., & Mild, A. (2012). A critical review of empirical research on open innovation adoption. *Journal für Betriebswirtschaft*, 62(2), 85–118. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11301-012-0080-4>
- Schubert, C., Sydow, J., & Windeler, A. (2013). The means of managing momentum: Bridging technological paths and organisational fields. *Research Policy*, 42(8), 1389–1405. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2013.04.010>
- Schumpeter, J. A. (1934). *The theory of economic development: An inquiry into profits, capital, credit, interest, and the business cycle*. Harvard University Press.
- Schumpeter, J. (2006). *Theorie der wirtschaftlichen Entwicklung*. Duncker & Humblot GmbH.
- Scott, W. R. (2008). *Institutions and organizations: Ideas and interests* (3rd ed.). SAGE.
- Silva, P. C., & Klage, B. (2013). The evolution of the wind industry and the rise of Chinese firms: From industrial policies to global innovation networks. *European Planning Studies*, 21(9), 1341–1356. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09654313.2012.755842>
- Simmie, J. (2012). Path dependence and new technological path creation in the Danish wind power industry. *European Planning Studies*, 20(5), 753–772. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09654313.2012.667924>
- Star, S. L., & Griesemer, J. R. (1989). Institutional ecology, translations and boundary objects: Amateurs and professionals in Berkeley's Museum of Vertebrate Zoology, 1907–39. *Social Studies of Science*, 19(3), 387–420. <https://doi.org/10.1177/030631289019003001>
- Stones, R. (2009). Power and structuration theory. In S. Clegg & M. Haugaard (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of power* (pp. 89–107). SAGE Publications.
- Svärd, A. (2016). Trust, reciprocity, and actions: The development of trust in temporary inter-organizational relations. *Organization Studies*, 37(12), 1841–1860. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840616655481>
- Swedberg, R., & Granovetter, M. (2018). Introduction to the third edition. In M. Granovetter & R. Swedberg (Eds.), *The sociology of economic life* (pp. xiii–xli). Routledge.
- Sydow, J. (2010). Management von Netzwerkorganisationen: Zum Stand der Forschung. In J. Sydow (Ed.), *Management von Netzwerkorganisationen* (pp. 373–470). Gabler Verlag.
- Sydow, J. (2014). Organisation als reflexive Strukturation: Grundlage. In J. Sydow & C. Wirth (Eds.), *Organisation und Strukturation* (pp. 17–55). Springer Fachmedien.
- Sydow, J., Schüßler, E., & Müller-Seitz, G. (2016). *Managing inter-organizational relations: Debate and case*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Takeichi, A. (2002). Knowledge partitioning in the interfirm division of labor: The case of automotive product development. *Organization Science*, 13(3), 321–338. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.13.3.321.2772>
- Tassey, G. (2000). Standardization in technology-based markets. *Research Policy*, 29(4–5), 587–602. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0048-7333\(99\)00091-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0048-7333(99)00091-6)
- Teece, D. J. (2018). Profiting from innovation in the digital economy: Enabling technologies, standards, and licensing models in the wireless world. *Research Policy*, 47(8), 1367–1387. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2018.05.011>

- Tell, F. (2011). Knowledge integration and innovation: A survey of the field. In C. Berggren, A. Bergek, L. Bengtsson, M. Hobday, & J. Söderlund (Eds.), *Knowledge integration and innovation: Critical challenges facing international technology-based firms* (pp. 20–58). Oxford University Press.
- Tell, F. (2017). Managing across knowledge boundaries. In F. Tell, C. Berggren, S. Brusoni, & A. van de Ven (Eds.), *Managing knowledge integration across boundaries* (pp. 19–38). Oxford University Press.
- Timilsina, G. R., van Kooten, G. C., & Narbel, P. A. (2013). Global wind power development: Economics and policies. *Energy Policy*, 61, 642–652. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2013.06.091>
- Tucci, C. L., Chesbrough, H., Piller, F., & West, J. (2016). When do firms undertake open, collaborative activities? Introduction to the special section on open innovation and open business models. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 25(2), 283–288. <https://doi.org/10.1093/icc/dtw002>
- Tushman, M. L. (1977). Special boundary roles in the innovation process. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 22(4), 587–605. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2392402>
- Un, C. A., Cuervo-Cazurra, A., & Asakawa, K. (2010). R&D collaborations and product innovation. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 27(5), 673–689. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5885.2010.00744.x>
- Vanhaverbeke, W., & Cloudt, M. (2014). Theories of the firm and open innovation. In H. Chesbrough, W. Vanhaverbeke, & J. West (Eds.), *New frontiers in open innovation* (pp. 256–278). Oxford University Press.
- Veer, T., Lorenz, A., & Blind, K. (2016). How open is too open? The mitigating role of appropriation mechanisms in R&D cooperation settings. *R&D Management*, 46(S3), 1113–1128. <https://doi.org/10.1111/radm.12206>
- Vuillemot, R., Rivière, P., Beignon, A., & Tabard, A. (2021). Boundary objects in design studies: Reflections on the collaborative creation of isochrone maps. *Computer Graphics Forum*, 40(3), 355–360. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cgf.14312>
- Volberda, H. W., Foss, N. J., & Lyles, M. A. (2010). Absorbing the concept of absorptive capacity: How to realize its potential in the organization field. *Organization Science*, 21(4), 931–951. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1090.0503>
- von Estorff, O., Heitmann, K., Lippert, S., Lippert, T., Reimann, K., Ruhnau, M., & Schwarz, M. (2013). Unterwasser-Rammschall: Eine Herausforderung bei der Errichtung von Offshore-Windparks und für die numerische Simulation. *Lärmbekämpfung*, 8(2), 61–71. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11822-013-0184-1>
- von Hippel, E. (1994). “Sticky information” and the locus of problem solving: Implications for innovation. *Management Science*, 40(4), 429–439. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.40.4.429>
- Walsh, J. P., Lee, Y.-N., & Nagaoka, S. (2016). Openness and innovation in the US: Collaboration form, idea generation and implementation. *Research Policy*, 45(8), 1660–1671. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2016.05.012>
- Weick, K. E., Sutcliffe, K. M., & Obstfeld, D. (2005). Organizing and the process of sensemaking. *Organization Science*, 16(4), 409–421. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1050.0133>
- West, J., & Bogers, M. (2014). Leveraging external sources of innovation: A review of research on open innovation. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 31(4), 814–831. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jpim.12125>

- West, J., Salter, A., Vanhaverbeke, W., & Chesbrough, H. (2014). Open innovation: The next decade. *Research Policy*, 43(5), 805–811. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2014.03.001>
- Whittington, R. (2006). Completing the practice turn in strategy research. *Organization Studies*, 27(5), 613–634. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840606064101>
- Williams, R., & Edge, D. (1996). The social shaping of technology. *Research Policy*, 25(6), 865–899. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0048-7333\(96\)00885-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0048-7333(96)00885-2)
- Windeler, A. (2001). *Unternehmensnetzwerke: Konstitution und Strukturierung*. Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Windeler, A. (2014). Können und Kompetenzen von Individuen, Organisationen und Netzwerken: Eine praxistheoretische Perspektive. In A. Windeler & J. Sydow (Eds.), *Kompetenz, Organisation und Gesellschaft* (pp. 225–301). VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Windeler, A., & Sydow, J. (2001). Project networks and changing industry practices: Collaborative content production in the German television industry. *Organization Studies*, 22(6), 1035–1060. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840601226005>
- Witke, V., Heidenreich, M., Mattes, J., Hanekop, H., Feuerstein, P., & Jackwerth, T. (2012). Kollaborative Innovationen: Die innerbetriebliche Nutzung externer Wissensbestände in vernetzten Entwicklungsprozessen. *Oldenburg Studies for Europeanisation and Transnational Regulation*, 22, 1–37.
- Witzel, A. (2000). The problem-centered interview. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.17169/fqs-1.1.1132>
- Wooten, M., & Hoffman, A. J. (2008). Organizational fields: Past, present and future. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, R. Suddaby, & K. Sahlin (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of organizational institutionalism* (pp. 130–147). SAGE Publications.
- Yang, H., & Steensma, H. K. (2014). When do firms rely on their knowledge spillover recipients for guidance in exploring unfamiliar knowledge? *Research Policy*, 43(9), 1496–1507. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2014.04.004>
- Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Zasa, F. P., & Buganza, T. (2024). Artefacts as boundary objects for concept development: A configurational approach. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 27(9), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJIM-01-2023-0033>
- Zhang, W., Jiang, Y., & Zhang, W. (2019). Capabilities for collaborative innovation of technological alliance: A knowledge-based view. *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TEM.2019.2936678>
- Zheng, Y., Venters, W., & Cornford, T. (2010). Collective agility, paradox and organizational improvisation: The development of a particle physics grid. *Information Systems Journal*, 21(4), 303–333. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2575.2010.00360.x>
- Zobel, A.-K., Balsmeier, B., & Chesbrough, H. (2016). Does patenting help or hinder open innovation? Evidence from new entrants in the solar industry. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 25(2), 307–331. <https://doi.org/10.1093/icc/dtw002>
- Zucker, L. G. (1986). Production of trust: Institutional sources of economic structure, 1840–1920. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 8, 53–111.

