Enduring Entrepreneurship in the Context of Public-Private Partnerships

Thomas G. Pittz
University of Tampa

Rebecca White
University of Tampa

As institutional innovations designed to effect societal change, this work considers public-private partnerships (PPPs) as exemplars of enduring entrepreneurship. By surviving beyond the initial objectives of the partnership, many PPPs exhibit continual renewal and repeated acts of entrepreneurship as they explore novel solutions to intractable social problems. With recognition of goal interdependence between partner firms and a structure of open governance, PPPs create unique opportunities for innovative ideas and knowledge exploration and exploitation. This manuscript explores the formative conditions of PPPs and suggests two important outcomes - enhanced absorptive capacity and knowledge spillovers – that contribute to enduring entrepreneurship and long-lasting partnerships.

INTRODUCTION

The provision of public goods and services has become more complex in today's economy and novel collaborations and partnerships have sprung up to take on the challenge. These public-private partnerships represent an example of what Schumpeter termed institutional innovations (Schumpeter, 1942) that provide an opportunity for organizations to share knowledge and innovate in new ways. Collaborations that span economic sectors allow firms to approach problems from different perspectives (Waddell, 2005) and create a unique space for enduring entrepreneurship (Ireland, et al., 2014). By studying these collaborations from the perspective of the relational view of the firm (Dyer & Singh, 1998), we can recognize those partnerships that transcend initial objectives and provide ongoing renewal and value to the host firms. This view suggests that performance can be measured not only as relative to industry (e.g. Porter, 1980), nor only as related to firm-owned resources (e.g., Barney, 1991; Rumelt, 1984, Wernerfelt, 1984), but through the network of relationships in which the firm is embedded (Dyer & Singh, 1998).

As the preponderance of literature treats these public-private partnerships as transactional in nature (the resource based view, for example, approaches them as transient arrangements for the purpose of resource acquisition), the perspective of enduring collaborations contributes to our understanding of public-private arrangements. When viewed as long lasting as opposed to transactional, the value created in public-private collaborations can be recognized as occurring through shared sense of goal interdependence. The formative extra-organizational boundary conditions of PPPs also create fertile ground for open governance, which has been shown to contribute to a continual refreshing of partnership goals and objectives. This manuscript begins by exploring the key characteristics of public-private partnerships that describe longevity beyond initial partnership goals. Then, two key outcomes of public-private partnerships that contribute to a state of continual renewal and revitalization are proposed.

Characteristics of Enduring Public-Private Partnerships

Public-private social partnerships (PPPs) have been defined as projects formed explicitly to address concerns that engage partners on an ongoing basis (Selsky & Parker, 2005). Recent demands for corporate social responsibility, nonprofit accountability, and government transparency have pushed PPPs into the fore of institutional innovation. Their effectiveness is derived from diversity: when firms from different sectors focus on the same issue, they are likely to think about it differently and take different approaches to the solution. Scholars have emphasized the importance of PPPs since social issues are complex, multi-faceted, and transcend the boundaries of organizations, sectors, and nations (Waddell, 2005).

Public-private partnerships can be comprised of for-profit firms, government agencies, nonprofit organizations, and other organizations in the public domain such as community groups. They have been demonstrated to vary considerably in scope, length, and size and even motivation, as firms may desire to collaborate based on goals surrounding image enhancement, legitimacy, or to attract employees. Despite these distinctions, however, the underlying assumption of this work is that any type of public-private collaboration engaged in seeking a solution for a social issue is considered relevant to this discussion. In management scholarship, PPPs have typically been analyzed using organizational theory and many have been shown to transcend the initial goals of the partnership (London, et al., 2006).

Management scholars have begun to critique and redefine traditional notions of the value creation assumption typically characterizing PPPs. For example, Le Ber (2010) argues for the inclusion of beneficiary voice in any consideration of value creation. Koschmann, Kuhn, and Pfarrer (2012) stress the *collective agency* of PPPs, suggesting that any attempts at measuring the value creation of PPPs consider them as 'distinct organizational forms.' Similar to the 'synergy effect' prevalent in the teams literature (e.g., Hertel, 2011) and in accordance with the assertion that PPPs are formed to 'make a difference,' Kocschmann, Kuhn, and Pfarrer (2012) suggest that PPPs that are empowered to act collectively are those most likely to create value. Drawing from communications literature, they posit that if PPP members are able to meaningfully participate in the creation of a PPP's formative text, including its naming, acceptance of a coherent narrative, and individual organizations' recognition of the PPP, then value creation is a logical outcome. Kolk, van Dolen, and Vock (2010) present a multi-level conceptualization of PPPs, arguing that 'trickle effects' among micro (employees/managers and customers/clients), meso (PPP member organizations), and macro (PPP metagoal(s)) levels ultimately allow the PPP to create wider benefits.

Drach-Zahavy (2011) has demonstrated the uniqueness of the type of team present in PPPs, noting that members may have allegiance to both their individual organizations and the team's broader goal. This makes the team similar to a cross-functional team, except that complexity is increased because the differentiating commitments, obligations, and identities between one's organization and one's team may actually be conflicting. In this way, there is no one broader goal to which the team member may choose to subscribe at all times – in a given context, different goals may appear more salient. Team members from different sectors (and thus, organizations) may be required to maintain boundaries that are more open in order to include all appropriate external stakeholders within the team's focus (Drach-Zahavy, 2011). Overall, one of the greatest lessons from previous scholarship regarding the operation of a PPP is the importance of boundaries. The public-private team must stand as a cohesive and independent unit, apart from individual members' jobs and organizations. The ability to achieve this affects team relations, individuals, and places a premium on collaborative decision-making.

More generally, scholars have explored frameworks for understanding PPPs (Bryson, Crosby, & Stone, 2006), considered sensemaking mechanisms underlying the understanding of PPPs (Selsky & Parker, 2010), suggested that PPP members continually reconstitute their roles, and outlined a number of challenges associated with PPPs (e.g., Babiak & Thibault, 2009; O'Regan & Oster, 2000). It is our contention that two key aspects of PPPs, recognition of goal interdependence and a platform of open governance, create fertile conditions for enduring entrepreneurship to flourish.

THEORETICAL DEVELOPMENT

Goal Interdependence

A hallmark of public-private partnerships is recognition by firms choosing to partner of interdependence toward the achievement of a mutual goal. Goal interdependence fosters a shared set of beliefs and a cooperative approach to achieving objectives, encourages interaction between areas of function knowledge, and acts as a coordination capability that enhances knowledge exchange across hierarchical boundaries (Henderson & Cockburn, 1994; Teece, et al., 1997). The degree of interdependence recognized by employees in the workplace originates from several sources including the manner in which goals are defined, role differentiation, the distribution of resources, and the manner in which performance is rewarded and feedback is given (Wageman, 1995). Previous studies have demonstrated a link between goal interdependence and innovative behavior (Van der Vegt & Janssen, 2003) and effects on productivity and organizational outcomes by goal interdependence have been shown in social psychology research (Rosenbaum, et al., 1980), organizational research (Shea & Guzzo, 1987; Saavedra, et al., 1993), and education research (Johnson & Johnson, 1989).

Goal interdependence has also been studied in strategic alliances (Gulati & Singh, 1998; Kumar & Set, 1998; Thompson, 1967) where it has been found to moderate the trust relationship with performance (Krishnan, et al., 2006). Chang, et al., (2012) also found goal interdependence to be an important aspect in describing how information technology teams adjust to changes in requirements due to environmental shifts. Perhaps most influential, Wong, et al., (2010) demonstrated a link between goal interdependence and the ability of outsourcing partners to learn from each other in a study of Chinese business practices. There has been considerable research to support the notion that cooperation, compared with competition or independence, creates open communication that leads to effective work (Deutsch, 1973; Johnson & Johnson, 1989; Johnson, et al., 1981).

Gazley (2010) has also measured goal agreement in government-nonprofit partnerships and found strong support for the link between the perceptions of goal agreement and effectiveness of the partnership. In her process view of collaboration, Gray (1985) highlights the importance of interdependence as condition that facilitates collaboration efforts. Gray proposes a process of initial recognition of interdependence by partner firms, followed by a coincidence of values, culminating in a high degree of ongoing interdependence as the collaboration takes shape. Recognition of goal interdependence is also an important formative condition for opening of the governance structure to participants beyond the top management team (Pittz & Adler, 2014).

> *Proposition 1: Recognition of goal interdependence is a characteristic of PPPs that fosters enduring entrepreneurship*

Open Governance

Collaborative efforts such as public-private partnerships provide a robust opportunity to seek out new knowledge when a governance structure is in place that permits and encourages input and feedback. A decision-making platform that is open to stakeholders at the periphery of organizations as well as external stakeholders has advantages in generating new ideas and reinvigorating the partnership. Our research suggests that the tenants of open strategy including transparency, inclusiveness, and participatory decision-making (Whittington et al., 2011; Pittz & Adler, 2015) combine to both heighten awareness to environmental cues and lubricate internal organizational processes and routines within PPPs.

One of the key theoretical components of open strategy, inclusiveness, stipulates that information is shared and gathered from organizational stakeholders beyond the top management team both internal and external to the organization (Whittington, et al., 2011). Gray (1985) argues that sufficient power distribution is a critical component of successful PPPs. She describes limits to adversarial problem solving that create maladaptive responses to turbulent environments and argues instead for a "domain level interdependence" (pp. 915) among stakeholder firms. Since only a portion of the problem can be apprehended by individual stakeholders, "by pooling perceptions, greater understanding of the context can be achieved" (pp. 216).

When members have a stake in developing organizational processes, the level of engagement with those processes increases and, consequently their ability to recognize necessary and beneficial changes increases when new knowledge would suggest doing so. Transparency during strategy formulation and participation in the setting of organizational objectives provide a well-understood framework within which to evaluate ideas. Likewise, Cohen & Levinthal (1990) originally proposed that shared decision-making increases the range of prospective "receptors" to the environment that facilitate new knowledge acquisition. Conceptual research has also suggested that participation in decision-making increases both the quantity and quality of ideas and proposals (Sheremata, 2000).

The notion of openness considers the pooling of knowledge for innovative purposes where the contributors have access to all inputs and have no exclusivity in rights to the final product (Chesbrough, 2007). The value created from such a partnership represents a public good where users directly contributed ideas to improve the quality and variety of the product. Open innovation has become a well-studied phenomenon in highly dynamic industry settings but has strong applicability in the PPP context as well where governing structures inherently trend toward openness (Pittz & Intindola, 2015).

Studying open innovation in the context of PPPs expressly considers the trend toward interorganizational innovation processes (Vanhaverbeke, Van de Vrande, & Chesbrough, 2008) and demonstrates a means by which firms are managing the challenges of open innovation due to competition, intellectual property, and information propriety. An aspect of PPPs that makes studying open innovation so intriguing is that, in large measure, the concern over whether the costs of openness exceed the benefits of openness is largely mitigated. Firms engaged in public-private partnerships are unwilling and largely unable to compete directly due, in part, to legal entity considerations and concerns over mission creep and core competency deviance. While network size remains an issue to consider (Hansen, 1999), the primary competitive concerns of sharing knowledge are diminished in collaborations across sectors.

On the spectrum of innovation, PPPs are inherently more open than their competitive counterparts and studying strategy and entrepreneurship in this context provides valuable contributions to the paradigm. Scholarship has typically treated PPPs from a transactional point of view - that they are established only long enough to combine resources toward a specific objective - but many examples exist of long lasting collaborations that transcend initial goals. When this occurs, the partnership experiences constant renewal with repeated acts of entrepreneurship and innovation.

Proposition 2: Openness in governance and innovation is a characteristic of PPPs that fosters enduring entrepreneurship

Regardless of the genesis of the partnership, collaboration will succeed in the long-term if mutual benefit exists for both partners in a PPP. Creating opportunities for innovation is key to producing lasting mutual benefit and enables partner firms to adapt to turbulent environmental conditions. March and Simon (1958: 188) suggest that most innovation is the result of mimicry as opposed to invention and research has demonstrated that exposure to external knowledge contributes to the quality of organizational decision-making (March & Simon, 1993) and facilitates the development of future capabilities (McGrath, 2001). Scholars have also argued that firms that systematically participate in knowledge-intensive collaborations are more likely to improve their internal competencies and knowledge assimilation abilities (Van Wijk, et al., 2001).

As information is shared, lessons are learned, and objectives are met during the course of a partnership, the capability *within* a PPP to acquire and utilize new knowledge to solve problems is expanded. Additionally and importantly, these benefits of knowledge expansion through collaboration are derived *without* the PPP by the focal organizations that have chosen to partner. Thus, a mutual benefit received by both the PPP and focal firms contributes to a refreshing of the partnership. In the next section, we discuss how successful PPPs exhibit enduring entrepreneurship as they continually create novel and inventive ideas that, on occasion, transcend the initial objectives of the partnership. To do so, we outline the primary mechanisms by which the PPP and focal firms are able to enhance their capacity for innovation.

Absorptive & Inventive Capacities

To sustain knowledge exploration, firms must develop dynamic capabilities that enable them to reconfigure their resources to adapt to changing environments (Eisenhardt & Martin, 2000; Raff, 2000; Teece, Pisano, and Shuen, 1997). These dynamic capabilities have served to explain firm success and competitive advantage over time (Teece, 2007) and researchers have argued that these dynamic capabilities are embedded within organizational processes (Zott, 2001). Absorptive capacity (ACAP), for example, proposed originally by Cohen & Levinthal (1990), is a firm's "ability to recognize the value of new information, assimilate it, and apply it to commercial ends" (Cohen & Levinthal, 1990: 128). It has been argued that absorptive capacity is a dynamic capability (Zahra & George, 2002) and can influence a firm's ability to create and deploy knowledge necessary for building other organizational capabilities (e.g. production, finance, human resources, distribution, etc.).

A firm is more efficient if costs of acquiring knowledge are low and this capability is a source of value (Brandenburger & Stuart, 1996). The development of organizational capabilities enables firms to apply current and new knowledge (Eisenhardt & Martin, 2000) and has been shown to be path-dependent (Teece, et al., 1997) which makes the advancement of absorptive capacity both rare and difficult to imitate or substitute. The industrial-organization (IO) economics-based explanation argues that if costs of acquiring external knowledge are small it is because the firm has already invested in the development of the ability to "identify, assimilate, and exploit knowledge from the environment" (1989: 569). Thus, ACAP is critical to the success of a firm's innovative activities. It has been suggested that ACAP enhances the speed, frequency, and magnitude of innovation, which in turn may produce knowledge that becomes a part of a firm's future absorptive capacity (Zahra & George, 2002).

Contrary to ACAP, inventive capacity refers to a firm's ability to internally explore knowledge or to generate new knowledge from inside the organization (Lichtenthaler, 2011). When a firm perceives unexplored opportunities, it typically looks inward to generate new ideas prior to searching the environment for solutions. The creation of inventive capacity can result in a significant competitive advantage in its own right (Lichtenthaler & Lichtenthaler, 2009). Inventive capacity is also related to matching innovations with their marketplace (March, 1991). As firms partner, their capacity for identifying opportunities for sharing knowledge, both mutually and individually, is enhanced. The growth of absorptive and inventive capacity is demonstrated in long lasting and successful collaborations and previous literature has highlighted their importance to cross-sector collaborations (Pittz & Intindola, 2015).

Proposition 3: Absorptive and inventive capacities are enhanced in PPPs and in organizations choosing to partner

Knowledge Spillovers

Knowledge spillover refers to the transfer of value between firms without compensation that relates to the benefits accrued from the creation of knowledge by a party other than the creator of that knowledge (Arrow, 1962). It has been suggested that organizations possess an abundance of under-exploited knowledge that is constrained by structure, culture, or cognition (Agarwal, et al., 2004). As this knowledge "spills over" to members of another firm, new perspectives may generate new ideas and opportunities.

Following the prevailing theory of economic growth that entrepreneurial opportunities are endogenous as opposed to exogenous (Acs, et al., 2008), this work suggests that knowledge is created internally within PPPs that spills over to firms choosing to partner, thereby renewing and reinvigorating the partnership itself. The notion of identifying and creating entrepreneurial opportunities through knowledge spillovers has received a fair amount of recent attention in scholarship (Agarwal, et al., 2008; Audretsch & Keilbach, 2005; Acs, et al., 2008). That firms can appropriate the value of their own creations links firm capabilities, such as absorptive capacity, to performance.

This phenomenon of knowledge spillover is facilitated through employees departing firms and scientists leaving research institutions to create new ventures (Smith & Alexander, 1988; Chesbrough & Rosenbloom, 2002). Thus, through this lens, new ventures are a manifestation of the intersection between knowledge spillover and entrepreneurial action. Public-private partnerships offer substantial opportunity for knowledge spillover and fresh perspectives to meet for recognizing entrepreneurial opportunity. As firms choosing to partner bring in new ideas and new employees to the collaboration, more chance for opportunity recognition exists and, as a result, a continual state of renewal within the PPP can be achieved.

Proposition 4: Knowledge spillovers create value in PPPs and in the organizations choosing to partner

DISCUSSION

Anecdotal evidence of institutionalized entrepreneurship in companies such as 3M and Apple as well as evidence of serial entrepreneurs demonstrate that entrepreneurship can endure beyond initial market disruption. This manuscript argues that the context of public-private partnerships is ideally suited to foster enduring entrepreneurship. Through shared goals and openness in governance, space is created for knowledge spillovers and enhanced absorptive and inventive capacity in PPPs that is less likely to exist in traditional firm structures. Relative mitigation of the deleterious factors of competition in the PPP context allow for genuine mutual knowledge exploration and exploitation that is difficult to replicate in other business contexts.

Another interest of this paper is to explicate the internal mechanisms and capabilities that affect a rendering of the boundaries of collaboration and permit public-private partnerships to thrive. Specifically, joining the collaboration and strategy literature highlights the importance of open governance and goal interdependence. As these two factors are likely to be more prominent in PPPs, they can be emphasized in both descriptive and prescriptive considerations of open innovation and open strategy in future studies. As such, this manuscript contributes to the public-private partnership literature by considering the context from a strategic perspective beyond that typecast of impermanence.

Implications for Future Research

Theoretical consensus has yet to be reached regarding the context of public-private partnerships and it is still a largely unexplored organizational phenomenon by empirical analysis. This study attempts to link critical aspects of PPP scholarship with literature on open strategy, open innovation, and dynamic capabilities to create opportunities for further development. Specifically, data-driven research regarding the antecedents of absorptive capacity in public-private partnerships would be a valuable contribution to the literature. Likewise, testing whether open innovation is more likely to occur in public-private partnerships than it is in same-sector collaborations would provide an interesting and insightful contribution.

Innovative solutions to complex social problems require novel approaches that can be generated via the establishment of public-private partnerships. This research suggests that managers who are engaged in or considering taking part in PPPs should emphasize interdependence and an open decision-making process as they construct collaborative efforts. This research also suggests that exploration and exploitation of new knowledge is critical both to repeated acts of innovation and to the long-term success of public-private partnerships. It is our suggestion that PPPs survive beyond the initial goals of the partnership when value is created for the host firms through knowledge spillovers and enhanced absorptive capacity.

REFERENCES

Acs, Z.J., Braunerhjelm, P., Audretsch, D.B., & Carlsson, B. (2009). The knowledge spillover theory of entrepreneurship. *Small Business Economics,* 32, 15-30.

Agarwal, R., Audretsch, D.B., & Sarkar, M.B. (2008). The process of creative construction: knowledge spillovers, entrepreneurship, and economic growth. *Jena Economic Research Papers,* 2008, 008.

Arrow, K.J. (1962). Economic welfare and the allocation of resources for invention. *The Rate and Direction of Inventive Activity*. R.R. Nelson. Princeton, NJ. Princeton University Press, 609-626.

Austin, J. (1998). Partnering for Progress. *Harvard Business School*: *Social Enterprise Series*, Number 5.

Babiak, K., & Thibault, L. (2009). Challenges in multiple public-private partnerships. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 38(1), 117-143.

Barney, J.B. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17, 99-120.

Bardach, E. (1998). Getting agencies to work together: The practice and theory of managerial craftsmanship. *Brookings,* Washington, DC.

Brown, L.D., & Ashman, D. (1996). Participation, social capital, and intersectoral problem solving: African and Asian cases. *World Development*, 24(9), 1467-1479.

Brandenburger, A.M., & Stuart, H.W. (1996). Value-Based Business Strategy. *Journal of Economics and Management Strategy*, 5(1), 5-24.

Bryson, J.M., Crosby, B.C., & Stone, M.M. (2006). The design and implementation of public-private collaborations: Propositions from the literature. *Public Administration Review*, 66(s1), 44-55.

Chesbrough, H.W., & Appleyard, M.M. (2007). Open Innovation and Strategy. *California Management Review*, 50(1), 57-76.

Chesbrough, H., & Crowther, A. (2006). Beyond high tech: early adopters of open innovation in other industries. R&D Management, 36(3), 229-236.

Chesbrough, H., & Rosenbloom, R.S. (2002). The role of the business model in capturing value from innovation: Evidence from Xerox corporation's technology spin-off companies. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 11(3), 529-555.

Chesbrough, H., Vanhaverbeke, W., & West, J. (Eds.) (2006). Open Innovation: Researching a new paradigm. Oxford, UK. *Oxford University Press*.

Cohen W.M., & Levinthal, D.A. (1990). Absorptive Capacity: A New Perspective on Learning and Innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36, 128-152.

Drach-Zahavy, A. (2011). Interorganizational teams as boundary spanners: The role of team diversity, boundedness, and extrateam links. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 20(1), 89-118.

Dutta, D., & Crossan, M. (2005). The Nature of Entrepreneurial Opportunities: Understanding the Process Using the 4I Organizational Learning Framework. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, July, 425-499.

Eisenhardt, K.M., & Martin, J.A. (2000). Dynamic Capabilities: What are they? *Strategic Management Journal*, 21, 1105-1121.

Galunic, D.C., & Rodan, S. (1998). Resource recombinations in the firm: Knowledge structures and the potential for Schumpeterian innovation. *Strategic Management Journal*, 19, 1193-1201.

Gazley, B. (2010). Why not partner with local government? Nonprofit managerial perceptions of collaborative disadvantage. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 39(1), 51-76.

Gray, B. (1985). Conditions facilitating interorganizational collaboration. *Human Relations*, 38(10), 911-936.

Grindley, P., Mowery, D., Silverman, B. (1994). SEMATECH and Collaborative Research: Lessons in the Design of High-Technology Consortia. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 13(4), 723-758.

Gupta, A.K., & Govindarajan, V. (2000). Knowledge flows within multinational corporations. *Strategic Management Journal*, 21, 473-496.

Hamel, G. (1991). Competition for Competence and Inter-Partner Learning within International Strategic Alliances. *Strategic Management Journal*, 12(4), 83-103.
Hansen, M. (1999). The Search-Transfer Problem: The Role of Weak Ties in Sharing Knowledge across Organization Subunits. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(1).
Hertel, G. (2011). Synergetic effects in working teams. *Journal of Managerial Psychology,* 26(3), 176-184.
Kirzner, I. (1999). Creativity and/or Alertness: A Reconsideration of the Schumpeterian Entrepreneur. *Review of Austrian Economics*, 11, 5-17.
Koschmann, M.A., Kuhn, T.R., & Pfarrer, M.D. (2012). A communicative framework of value in public-private partnerships. *Academy of Management Review*, 37(3), 332-354.
Kolk, A., van Dolen, W., and Vock, M. (2010). Trickle effects of public-private social partnerships. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 94(1), 123-137.
Kostopoulos, K., Papalexandris, A., Papachroni, M., & Ioannou, G. (2010). Absorptive Capacity, Innovation, and Financial Performance. *Journal of Business Research*, 1-9.
Lane, P., & Lubatkin, M. (1998). Relative Absorptive Capacity and Interorganizational Learning. *Strategic Management Journal*, 19, 461-477.
Lane, P.., Salk, J., Lyles, M. (2001). Absorptive Capacity, Learning, and Performance in International Joint Ventures. *Strategic Management Journal*, 22, 1139-1161.
Le Ber, M. (2010, January). Towards a Critical Theory of Value Creation in Public-private Partnerships. In *Academy of Management Proceedings* (Vol. 2010, No. 1). Academy of Management.
Lewis, D. (1998). Nongovernmental organizations, business, and the management of ambiguity. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 9(2), 135-151.
Lichtenthaler, U. (2011). Open Innovation: Past Research, Current Debates, and Future Directions. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, February, 75-93.
Lichtenthaler, U. & Lichtenthaler, E. (2009). A Capability-Based Framework for Open Innovation: Complementing Absorptive Capacity. *Journal of Management Studies*, 46(8), 1315-1338.
London, T., Rondinelli, D.A., & O'Neill, H. (2006). *Strange bedfellows: Alliances between corporations and nonprofits*. In O. Shenkar & J.J. Reuer (Eds.), Handbook of Strategic Alliances, 353-366. Thousand Oaks, CA. Sage.
March, J. (1991). Exploration and exploitation in organizational learning. *Organization Science*, 2, 71-87.
McGrath, R.G. (2001). Exploratory learning, innovative capacity, and managerial oversight. *Academy of Management Journal,* 44, 118-131.
Mowery, D.C., & Oxley, J.E. (1996). Strategic alliances and interfirm knowledge transfer. *Strategic Management Journal*, 17, 77-91.
O'Regan, K.M., & Oster, S.M. (2000). Nonprofit and for-profit partnerships: Rationale and challenges of public-private contracting. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 29(suppl 1), 120-140.
Pittz, T.G. & Adler, T. (2014). Entrepreneurial Piracy through Strategic Deception: the 'Make, Buy, or Steal' Decision. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, 22(4), 466-481.
Pittz, T.G. & Adler, T. (2015). Exploring Open Strategy in Cross-Sector Social Partnerships. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, Vancouver, BC, August, 2015.
Pittz, T.G., & Intindola, M. (2015). Exploring Absorptive Capacity in Cross-Sector Social Partnerships. *Management Decision*, 53(6), 1-16.
Porter, M.E. (1980). *Competitive Strategy*. New York: Free Press.
Schumpeter, J. (1942). Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy. New York: *Harper and Row.*
Selsky, J.W., & Parker, B. (2005). Public-private partnerships to address social issues: Challenges to theory and practice. *Journal of Management*, 31(6), 849-873.
Selsky, J.W., & Parker, B. (2010). Platforms for public-private partnerships: Prospective sensemaking devices for social benefit. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 94(1), 21-37.
Smith, D.K, & Alexander, R.C. (1988). *Fumbling the future*. New York, William Morrow.
Rumelt, R.P. (1984). *Towards a strategic theory of the firm*. In R.B. Lamb (Ed.), Competitive strategic management, 556-571. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Teece, D., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic Capabilities and Strategic Management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18(7), 509-533.

Teece, D.J. (2007). Explicating dynamic capabilities: the nature and microfoundations of (sustainable) enterprise performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 28, 1319-1350.

Van Wijk, R., Van den Bosch, F., & Volberda, H. (2001). The impact of knowledge depth and breadth of absorbed knowledge on levels of exploration and exploitation. Academy of Management Proceedings, Washington DC.

Vrande, V., Jong, J., Vanhaverbeke, W., & Rochemont, M. (2009). Innovation in SMEs: Trends, motives, and management challenges. *Technovation,* 29, 423-437.

Waddell, S. (2005). Societal learning and change. *Greenleaf*, Sheffield, UK.

Wernerfelt, B. (1984). A resource based view of the firm. *Strategic Management Journal,* 5, 171-180.

Zahra, S. A., & George, G. (2002). Absorptive Capacity: A Review, Reconceptualization, and Extension. *Academy of Management Review,* 27(2), 185-203.

Zhou, K.Z., & Wu, F. (2010). Technological Capability, Strategic Flexibility, and Product Innovation. *Strategic Management Journal*, 31, 547-561.