

KNOWLEDGE IN RESOURCE INTERACTION: STARTING A DIALOGUE AMONG IMP AND OTHER THEORIES

Heli Aramo-Immonen¹, Roberta Bocconcelli², Lars Huemer³,
Alessandro Pagano², Andrea Perna^{4,5}

¹*Örebro University, Business School Örebro University, Örebro, Sweden*

²*University of Urbino, Urbino, Italy,*

³*BI Norwegian Business School, Oslo, Norway*

⁴*Polytechnic University of Marche, Ancona, Italy*

⁵*Uppsala University, Uppsala, Sweden*

Abstract

This work-in-progress paper is aimed to start a discussion within IMP school regarding 'knowledge' in resource interaction. IMP studies over years have contributed to the understanding of the resource interaction process which is assumed to be central and relevant facet of any business relationship, but what about the role of 'knowledge' as resource over the interaction process? To start a preliminary discussion on the outlined question, IMP view on knowledge in the resource interaction framework has been analysed along with two other mainstream theories that are currently and actively debating the importance of resources in business networks, with knowledge occupying a central role in the discussion: Knowledge Based View (KBV) and Service-Dominant Logic (SDL). Preliminary results show that relevant differences can be traced in the ways the three approaches treat knowledge in a resource context, given the profound divergence in basic assumptions. However also important points of contacts seem to emerge that could be useful for the development of IMP perspective over the role of knowledge in resource interaction framework.

Keywords: Knowledge, Resource, Resource Interaction, IMP

INTRODUCTION

Since the late '90s early 2000s, the emerging of a "new economy" is increasingly debated among scholars in different disciplines (Powell and Snellman, 2004). Within the broad label of *Knowledge Economy* researchers emphasize the transition underway in advanced industrial nations from a traditional capitalistic/industrial economy based on natural resources and physical inputs towards an economy based on intellectual assets.

This shift has been analyzed under different perspectives. In particular in the managerial field, relying on Drucker's line of thought, scholars focused on the role of learning and continuous innovation inside firms (Drucker, 1993, Nonaka and Takeuchi, 1995). Knowledge has been thus investigated as a key feature/component in several marketing and management processes - e.g. innovation and technological development, market analysis and strategy development, supply chain management. Moreover, knowledge has been increasingly investigated in an inter-organizational context, putting emphasis on concepts such as knowledge sharing, knowledge networks, collective learning (Lawson and Lorenz, 1999; Phelps et al., 2012; Peters et al., 2017).

In this context, even if a definition of knowledge - given its complex nature - is difficult and maybe not necessary, it could be argued that knowledge, is a central "resource" in the current business landscape.

In this respect, while in relevant theories on business enterprises, knowledge constitutes a pillar and is often treated as a resources *per se* - i.e. knowledge has been faced as a resource in an explicit way - in IMP where both resources and knowledge are key concepts, still knowledge remains in the "background" of the interaction processes occurring among resources. Knowledge in IMP has been always considered crucial in technological development and innovation processes (Håkansson, 1982), as well as new knowledge generation is implicitly assumed as one of the main output of the interaction process in the business network: i.e. knowledge transforms and develops through interaction occurring at resources, actors and activities levels. In this respect, IMP contribution to the interpretation of innovation and technological development in B2B context as mainly inter-organizational (network) phenomena, has been largely acknowledged (Gummesson and Mele, 2010; Hadjikhani and LaPlaca, 2013).

Taking the resource side of the IMP thought, the concept of resource is undoubtedly a central feature. The main assumption of IMP is the resource heterogeneity: a resource does not exist *per se* but is defined by the ongoing interaction processes occurring within a complex web of business relationships (Håkansson and Snehota, 1995; Håkansson et al., 2009; Håkansson and Snehota, 2017). This implies that a resource is embedded in a multidimensional context, since every resource is part of several resources combinations and thus changes and develops characteristics over time, often creating tensions in related resources. Within the ARA model (activity-resource-actor) resources, resource ties and resource network represent one of the three layers of substance: the features of resources take shape and develop with other resources in the business network setting (Håkansson and Snehota, 1995). Over time, resource layer has attracted increasing attention among IMP scholars and different contributions - especially dealing with technological development and innovation - consider resource interaction as a central feature of such processes (Baraldi, 2003; Håkansson and Waluszewski, 2002). So far, and increasingly focusing on the concepts of resource interfaces and combination, different frameworks such as 4R interaction model, DPU (developing-producing-using), have been developed and used by IMP scholars (Baraldi and Bocconcelli 2001; Håkansson and Waluszewski, 2007; Baraldi et al., 2012). However, in these studies, even if knowledge remains central, it concurrently assumes multifaceted role in the processes under investigation.

In particular, we claim that, while IMP has largely contributed to unveil the role of knowledge in a networked business world and to explore the role of business relationships as central for the process of resource "combining" (Gadde and Hakansson, 2008) - especially with reference to innovation and technological development processes - it lacks of a deeper investigation and a clearer conceptualization of knowledge within the resource interaction setting as highlighted in Baraldi et al. (2012: 274): *"although knowledge obviously plays a pivotal role in the processes of resource interaction in interorganisational networks, this resource is not the object of any detailed elaboration"*. We argue that discussing knowledge within IMP RI framework could benefit from comparison with theories in the management field where knowledge has a strong conceptual relevance, notably Knowledge-Based View (KBV) and Service Dominant Logic (SDL) - in line with the discussion developed in Baraldi and colleagues (2012). KBV represents in our perspective an evolution of RBV approach placing emphasis on knowledge related processes.

Relying on this line of thought the goal of this paper is to trace how knowledge has been treated so far in IMP - especially within the context of the resource interaction - and make a comparison with other relevant theories in which knowledge has been differently treated as a resource.

Our initial research question is formulated as follows:

- Which commonalities and divergences can be traced between IMP studies and other relevant resource-focused theories in order to open up a discussion over the role of knowledge in Resource Interaction framework?

To achieve the goal, the paper, conceptual in nature, will be structured as follows. Section two will address the development of knowledge concept within IMP and RI framework. Section three will face how KBV and SDL treat knowledge in their theoretical evolution. The fourth section discusses results of the analysis in order to delineate a "research agenda" with respect of the conceptualization of knowledge IMP RI framework. The final section is devoted to final remarks.

KNOWLEDGE AND RESOURCE INTERACTION IN IMP STUDIES

Knowledge has been central in IMP thought since the beginning, being strictly connected to technological development and innovation within business networks (Håkansson, 1982; Håkansson and Waluszewski, 2002). In IMP, knowledge has been thus considered the main driver of innovation and technological change, in line with the knowledge economy paradigm, but with a substantial difference with respect to the position that knowledge assumes within the scene. Knowledge in management and organizational studies discussing knowledge economy, is something to be caught, to be "accessed to", in order to improve the "core competence" (see following section). Sources of knowledge can be found outside the company such as academic research or new technology. In IMP, on the contrary, knowledge is something that does not reside within a bounded place (i.e. an organization, or a company) indeed different types of knowledge are activated in business relationships arguing that resource, activity and actor knowledge could be effective categories of knowledge. Notably, knowledge has been treated and developed throughout a huge amount of contributions in

strict relation with the interaction concept: "...*The link between interaction and knowledge has been explored and the role of knowledge in business relationships on a general level has been discussed intensively*" (La Rocca and Snehota, 2011: 80). Eventually, it can be argued that in IMP, knowledge and interaction cannot be considered in isolation. Knowledge is always "embodied" within actors, activities and resource and thus interaction is considered a mean to activate, acquire, develop, exploit and integrate knowledge in business relationships and networks (Håkansson and Ingemansson, 2011; La Rocca and Snehota, 2011; Baraldi, 2008).

Few attempts in IMP have been made to discuss the concept of knowledge within the context of a specific layer (i.e. actors, activities and resources) trying to disentangle it from the general issue of interaction in business relationship. At the actors layer, knowledge has been investigated as "knowledge in use by actors about each other" focusing on the aspects of strategic behavior (La Rocca and Snehota, 2011). Authors highlight how their findings "...*contrast with the view of knowledge in business management literature which tend to treat the knowledge mostly as the objective and empirically grounded representations and interpretations that can be transferred and put in use in a different context*" (pag. 89). At the activity layer, knowledge has been faced for example in the specific context of projects (construction companies) where activities represent a major challenge (Håkansson and Ingemansson, 2011). Authors argue that there are different degrees of knowledge being transferred in the construction network, and that there are examples of close interaction where learning takes place. In the same time, the organisation of activities and processes of such industry seems to hinder companies to commit in long-lasting relationships, thus affecting what can be learned from others.

Taking the resource layer side different authors over time have emphasized the primacy of interaction concerning heterogeneous resources (both social and material) in innovation processes (Håkansson and Waluszewski, 2007; Håkansson et al., 2009; Gadde and Lind, 2016). Several conceptual frameworks have been developed and used so far in those studies: the resource interaction model (Baraldi, 2003), the 4R model (Baraldi and Bocconcelli, 2001; Håkansson and Waluszewski, 2002), the DPU framework (Håkansson and Waluszewski, 2007).

According to the above mentioned studies (Baraldi et al., 2012) knowledge has been certainly considered to be relevant and central concept but it has been not clearly addressed in all its facets. For instance, the 4R model provides a typology of resources in terms of *products*, *facilities*, *business units* and *business relationships*. Products and facilities are classified as *physical resources*. Business units and business relationships are of a social character displaying intangible characteristics and are thus categorized as *organizational* or *social* resources. In the model it emerges that knowledge is contained into business units, but in the same time that knowledge itself might be viewed as the 'result' of the interactive mechanisms. Baraldi (2003) argues that knowledge assumes an important identity when considered such as 'meta' resource on which other resources rely to be combined in order to produce value. Studies based on DPU framework put into light how (new) knowledge, particularly that related to resources, needs to be integrated into already existing knowledge and resources (Håkansson and Waluszewski, 2007; Baraldi and Strömsten, 2006; Waluszewski et al., 2009; Perna et al., 2015). For instance, by taking a DPU perspective for studying the connections between social-material structures and monetary flows, Perna et al.

(2015) show that ‘value’ is created along with the innovation journey only if knowledge resource is combined and doesn’t clash with the already existent industrial structures.

Actually, it should be noticed that in this line of thought few studies directly discuss knowledge *per se* in the context of resource interaction - i.e. resource layer - (Waluszewski, 2016; Eklinder-Frick, 2016; Koch, Jørgensen and Mathiasen, 2013). Kock et al. (2013), explain and show the role of knowledge as a central resource in favouring the creation of new competences for carrying out offshoring initiatives. Waluszewski (2016) confronts with Knowledge Management concept adopting a RI perspective. She argues that knowledge is strongly related to resources and resource heterogeneity concepts: "... *While the latter [knowledge Management] is focused on how to access knowledge, IMP's focus on interaction concerning heterogeneous resources directs the interest to how new social and/or material resources – in which knowledge is always embedded – can contribute to increased value in specific producer-user interfaces...*" (pag. 108). What matters is then ‘how’ producer/users in interaction would use knowledge, instead of starting from the point that knowledge is available and easy to catch. Eklinder-Frick (2016), shows how knowledge is extremely context dependent therefore knowledge becomes very tricky and demanding to manage. By adopting an industrial network approach in studying an innovation journey from a policy perspective, author shows that knowledge is ‘entangled’ with the context where producers/users interact and therefore it becomes hard to ‘extract’ knowledge and apply it successfully for spreading innovation.

Summing up, within IMP and RI frameworks, there are still big open questions regarding the nature of the knowledge and the understanding of its role within the business network context.

KNOWLEDGE IN OTHER THEORIES/APPROACHES

In this section we will try to catch how knowledge has been treated within two major theories in the management field in which the concept of resource represents a building block. Notably, our starting point is that KBV and SDL are two perspectives within marketing and management theory that are currently actively debating the importance of resources in business networks, with knowledge having a primary role (Caridà et al., 2019; Martin and Javalgi, 2019, in press).

KBV has its roots on Resource Based View (RBV). The resource-based view (RBV) focuses on the uniqueness of a company’s resources set. Notably, RBV focuses on the view of the firm as a unique bundle of idiosyncratic resources where the primary task of management is to maximize value through the optimal deployment of existing resources and capabilities, while developing the firm's resource base for the future (Penrose, 1959; Wernerfelt, 1984; Barney, 1986, 1991). Relying on RBV, KBV takes its point of departure from the recognition of knowledge as the key resource in order to create new capabilities and competences in a fast changing economic scenario. In KBV firm is thus considered as an integrator of knowledge (key resource) and a 'dynamic perspective' on resources is adopted instead of a more static view compared with RBV. In particular KBV highlights that individuals in organizations have a key role as knowledge resides within the individual, and the primary role of the organization is knowledge application rather than knowledge creation. Moreover

knowledge is crucial in developing, deploying and protecting competences and resources (Nelson and Winter, 1982; Grant, 1996).

In this line of thought, it is not surprising that KBV increasingly focuses on the definition of different types of knowledge residing in individuals and on learning and organizational learning processes. Whereas RBV treats knowledge as a general resource, KBV goes further identifying different types of knowledge (e.g. tacit knowledge, explicit knowledge, data, information and wisdom). KBV also promotes strongly knowledge as a manageable resource via knowledge management (KM) practices (e.g. Alavi and Leider, 2001). According to KBV organizational learning is vital for organization in order to gain, create and transfer new knowledge (Nonaka and Takeuchi 1995; Argyris and Schön 1978). Hansen et al. (1999) suggest two types of KM strategies depending on which role knowledge as a resource have in the firm. These strategies are codification strategy and personalization strategy for companies who deliver customized solutions to unique problems (like technology solutions, software engineering or research & development or business consultation and business intelligence system development for example). Depending on which is more valuable resource (or both in parallel) firm should conduct codification strategy focused on managing explicit knowledge orientation; typically technology-led; codified knowledge; using data-bases and having high knowledge turn over (Koskinen and Pihlanto 2008). Jashapara (2004) characterizes this type of knowledge resources storage in large data-bases of codified knowledge. Key resources are stored as a knowledge-objects, which can be re-used by the firm into the similar type of customer solutions. In project based companies this knowledge is stored in "knowledge-repositories" so that other people can use this knowledge in next projects. According to Hansen et al. (1999) in personalization KM strategy it is more question about the people. The focus is on networking inside the company and dialogue between people in order to find business solutions. Knowledge sharing, analytical skills, mentoring and creativity are focal in this strategy.

Another increasingly relevant theory in management and marketing field is Service-Dominant Logic (SDL), which has been developed following the increasing service-orientation in business activities during the last two decades (Vargo and Lusch, 2004; Vargo and Lusch, 2017). This approach is based on two main principles: the centrality of services as the main unit of exchange - replacing the goods-centered logic - and the co-creation/co-production role of suppliers and customers (Vargo and Lusch, 2004), within a networked and interactive structure (Vargo and Lusch, 2008). This shift from tangible to intangible dimensions has meant placing great emphasis on knowledge - and its specialization - as a key component in the provision of services: *"we define services as the application of specialized competences (knowledge and skills) through deeds, processes, and performances for the benefit of another entity itself"* (Vargo and Lusch, 2004: 2). Knowledge is thus conceived as "an operant resource", which is "employed to act on operand resources" (as natural resources). Operant resources are defined as "intangible, continuous and dynamic". Knowledge is linked to both people and individuals - who possess physical and mental skills - and tangible goods - where knowledge is embedded. Therefore knowledge has a primary role, because operant resources represent "the producers of the effects", which - when are beneficial - generate value for the customer and thus represent the competitive advantage for the supplier firm. Within the SDL approach over time there has been an increasing attention towards resource integration as a key aspect: *"organizations exist to integrate and transform*

micro-specialized competences into complex services that are demanded in the marketplace" (Lusch and Vargo, 2006: 53). Later, SDL recognises, in line with IMP thought, that resources are non important per se: *"a focal resource, in effect, becomes a resource only when it is deployed for a specific intended activity, and ensuing value is derived from its use by focal actors"* (Peters et al., 2014: 254). Moreover, recent contributions have placed emphasis on an actor-to-actor orientation and on the role of practices - as argued in practice theory contributions - in market exchange (Vargo and Lusch, 2011; Mele and Russo-Spena, 2015).

DISCUSSION

The discussion of the role of knowledge as a resource in IMP and RI framework, KBV and SDL shows both some convergences and differences which could help in further conceptual development and empirical analysis. Table 1 offers a synthesis of the results of the analysis conducted in the previous sections.

Table 1: Knowledge/resources in IMP and other theories

Theories	Knowledge dimensions		
	<i>Definitions/Assumptions</i>	<i>Nature/Articulation</i>	<i>Inter and intra-organizational processes</i>
IMP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No explicit definition of knowledge as "resource" 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Embedded in business relationships - Embedded in social and physical resources - Embedded in resource interfaces 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Knowledge creation through resource interaction - Knowledge creation through resource combination - Learning in business relationships
KBV	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Knowledge as the strategic resource - Knowledge as an "object" - Knowledge as an "independent" resource 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tacit (routines) and explicit knowledge - Technological and organisational knowledge (organisational practices) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Knowledge management processes (codification/ personalization) - Storage of knowledge - Knowledge creation - Knowledge transfer - Knowledge diffusion - Organisational learning
SDL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Knowledge as an operant resource 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - knowledge embodied within social and economic actors shaping other resources (both operant and operand) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Knowledge integrating activities (valuing, matching, using) performed by social and economic actors

With regard to the role of knowledge and its main assumptions, it could be argued that knowledge as a resource itself has a primary role and explicit recognition in KBV and SDL, while in IMP it is not conceptually distinct and it is debated within IMP frameworks (ARA, RI, DPU). In terms of assumptions, both KBV and SDL place emphasis on knowledge per-se, as an objective and independent resource - with clear boundaries and sources - while in the IMP approach knowledge is embedded in interaction processes. Another difference - notably between IMP and KBV - is that KBV essentially represents an ‘inside-out’ perspective in the sense that the firm (the unit of analysis) is the beneficiary of knowledge, and uses it to

increase its own performance. IMP, representing an ‘outside-in’ perspective on firms, does not recognize competitive advantage of a single firm, on the contrary IMP considers interactions as the engine of the business landscape. This implies that the boundaries of knowledge, in line with IMP thinking, are not given. KBV praises knowledge for its capacity to generate sustainable competitive advantage, while IMP is interested in understanding how knowledge can facilitate resource interactions, activity links and actor bonds. However, all three conceptual approaches recognize, even with different assumptions, the heterogeneous nature of knowledge as a resource.

With regard to the articulation of knowledge, both IMP and SDL offer limited analysis of typologies of knowledge, which are linked to their conceptual views of actors and resources. KBV instead provides in-depth discussions over how knowledge emerges in practice within organizations - tacit *vs* explicit knowledge/technological *vs* organisational knowledge - with a growing focus on specific carriers of knowledge - as routines and practices - which combine the individual and collective levels.

With regard to the main processes, all three approaches place emphasis on how knowledge is created and shared, even though with different focus and perspectives, related to the specific assumptions about knowledge. Even though KBV is more concerned with internal processes, all three streams highlight, in their development over time, the inter-organizational dimension of knowledge development: IMP places attention on interaction processes among organizations; KBV fosters analyses over open innovation configurations; SDL centres on actor-to-actor in service-based exchanges.

The main difference, with respect to processes, concerns the possibility of "managing" knowledge. In KBV ‘knowledge management’ is the process of creating, sharing, using and managing the knowledge of an organization. Making ‘the best use’ of knowledge implies reaching a sustained level of competitive advantage. IMP contrasts knowledge management perspective, and takes a much more complex approach by acknowledging interdependencies both among firms, resources in general and knowledge in particular. What is ‘the best’ use of knowledge will therefore always depend on the level of analysis in question. IMP scholars often stress that ‘we do not manage relationships or networks’; we manage ‘in relationships and in networks’. A parallel line of thinking may apply to knowledge as well; that is, there are multiple and simultaneous flows of knowledge occurring at any given point in time. Understanding and reflecting upon these may be as important as trying ‘to manage them’.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

This paper aims to provide a preliminary discussion over the role of knowledge as a resource in IMP and RI framework thinking while starting a dialogue with other two main approaches in the management field, KBV and SDL. Notwithstanding our effort is still in an early stage, this paper provides useful insights over the state of the art and possible avenues to be explored in more depth. Firstly, this paper highlights the "fuzzy" position of knowledge in IMP conceptual thinking, although it has gained a prominent role in terms of research themes and empirical analysis - as the IMP studies on technological innovation show. Secondly, this attempt to compare IMP, KBV and SDL highlights differences in the main assumptions but also possible convergence - to be investigated in more depth on the analysis of knowledge

related processes, both at the intra and inter-organizational level, as the recent interest on knowledge-in context shows (Eklinder-Frick, 2016).

With regard to future steps, we aim to continue our effort along three paths. Firstly, we intend to explore in more depth the role of knowledge as a resource in IMP, KBV and SDL. Secondly, we might consider also other emerging theories in the management field - as practice theory (La Rocca et al., 2016) - which could shed light on knowledge development in actual interaction processes. Thirdly, we are willing to introduce in the discussion the analysis of relevant illustrative empirical cases - showing current knowledge-related phenomena in business companies - which could help in highlighting conceptual challenges common to IMP thinking and other management theories and approaches.

REFERENCES

- Alavi, M., and Leidner, D.E., (2001). Review: Knowledge Management and Knowledge Management Systems: Conceptual Foundations and Research Issues. *MIS Quarterly*, Vol.25, No.1.
- Argyris, C., & Schön, D. (1978). *Organizational learning: A theory of action perspective*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Baraldi, E., and Bocconcelli, R. (2001). The quantitative journey in a qualitative landscape. Developing a data collection model and a quantitative methodology in business network studies. *Management Decision*, 39, 564-577.
- Baraldi, E. (2003). *When Information technologies faces resource interaction*. Doctoral Thesis, Uppsala University: Uppsala.
- Baraldi, E. (2008). Strategy in Industrial Networks: Experiences From IKEA. *California Management Review*, 50(4), 99-126.
- Baraldi, E., Gressetvold, E. and Harrison, D. (2012). Resource interaction in inter-organizational networks: Foundations, comparison, and a research agenda. *Journal of Business Research*, 65, 266-276.
- Baraldi, E., and Strömsten, T. (2006). Embedding, Producing and Using Low Weight: Value Creation and the Role of the Configuration of Resource Interfaces in the Networks around IKEA's Lack Table and Holmen's Newsprint. *The IMP Journal*, 1(1), 39-70.
- Barney, J. B. 1991, Firm Resources and Sustained Competitive Advantage. *Journal of Management*, Vol. 17, No. 1, pp. 99–120.
- Barney, J. B. (1986). Strategic factor markets: Expectations, luck, and business strategy. *Management Science*, Vol. 21,1231-1241.

- Caridà, A., Edvardsson, B. and Colurcio, M. (2019). Conceptualizing resource integration as an embedded process: Matching, resourcing and valuing. *Marketing Theory*, 19 (1), 65-84.
- Drucker P.R. (1993). *Post-Capitalist Society*. New York: Harper Bus.
- Eklinder-Frick, J.O. (2016). Clustering or interacting for knowledge?: towards an entangled view of knowledge in regional growth policy. *The IMP Journal*, 10 (2), 221-242.
- Gadde, L-E., and Lind, F. (2016). Interactive resource development: implications for innovation policy. *IMP Journal*, 10 (2), 317-338.
- Gadde, L-E., Håkansson, H. (2008). Business Relations and Resource Combining. *The IMP Journal*, 2(1), 31-45.
- Grant, R.M. (1996). Toward a Knowledge-Based Theory of the Firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, 17, 109-122.
- Gummesson, E. and Mele, C. (2010). Marketing as value co-creation through network interaction and resource integration. *Journal of Business Market Management*, 4 (4), 181-198.
- Hadjikhani, A., LaPlaca, P. (2013). Development of B2B marketing theory. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 42(3), 294-305.
- Hansen, M T., Nohria N., and Tierney, T. (1999). What's Your Strategy for Managing Knowledge?" *Harvard Business Review*, 77 (2), 106-116.
- Håkansson, H. (ed.) (1982). *International marketing and purchasing of industrial goods – an interaction approach*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
- Håkansson, H., Ford, D., Gadde, L.-E., Snehota, I., and Waluszewski, A. (2009). *Business in networks*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
- Håkansson, H., and Ingemansson, M. (2011). Construction Companies and How they Acquire Knowledge through Business Interaction. *IMP Journal*, Vol. 5 No. 2, pp. 67-78.
- Håkansson, H., and Snehota, I. (eds.), (1995). *Developing Relationships in Business Networks*, Routledge: London.
- Håkansson, H., and Snehota, I. (2017) (eds). *No business is an island: Making sense of the interactive business world*. Bingley: Emerald Publishing Limited.
- Håkansson, H. and Waluszewski, A. (2002). *Managing Technological Development. IKEA, the environment and technology*. Routledge: London.
- Håkansson, H., Waluszewski, A. (2007). *Knowledge and Innovation in Business and Industry. The importance of using others*. Routledge: London.

- Jashapara, A., (2004). *Knowledge Management: An Integral Approach*. Harlow. Pearson Education Ltd.
- Koch, C., Jørgensen, C., and Mathiasen, J. (2013). Strategic sourcing development - emerging resource combination and knowledge interaction. *The IMP Journal*, 7(1), 12–23.
- Koskinen, K. and Pihlanto, P. (2008). *Knowledge Management in Project-Based Companies. An Organic Perspective*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- La Rocca A., and Snehota, I. (2011). Knowledge in Use in Business Relationships. *IMP Journal*, 5(2), 79-93.
- Lawson C., and Lorenz E. (1999). Collective Learning, Tacit Knowledge and Regional Innovative Capacity, *Regional Studies*, 33 (4), 305-317.
- Lusch, R. F. and S. L. Vargo (2006). Service-Dominant Logic: Reactions, Reflections and Refinements. *Marketing Theory*, 6 (September), 281-288.
- Martin S.L., and Javalgi R.G. (2019). Explaining performance determinants: A knowledge based view of international new ventures. *Journal of Business Research*, in press.
- Mele, C., and Russo-Spena, T. (2015). Innomediary agency and practices in shaping market innovation. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 44, 42–53.
- Nelson, R., Winter, S. (1982). *An Evolutionary Theory of Economic Change*. Belknap: Cambridge, MA.
- Nonaka, I. and Takeuchi, H. (1995). *The Knowledge-Creating Company: How Japanese Companies Create the Dynamics of Innovation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Penrose, E.G. (1959). *The Theory of the Growth of the Firm*. Wiley: New York.
- Perna, A., Baraldi, E., and Waluszewski, A. (2015). Is the value created necessarily associated with money? On the connections between an innovation process and its monetary dimension: The case of Solibro's thin-film solar cells. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 46, 108-121.
- Peters, L.D., Löbner, H., Brodie, R.J., Breidbach, C.F., Hollebeek, L.D., Smith, S.D., Sorhammar, D. and Varey, R.J. (2014). Theorizing about resource integration through service-dominant logic, *Marketing Theory*, 14 (3), 249-268.
- Peters L.D., Pressey A.D., Johnston W.J. (2017). Contagion and learning in business networks. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 61, 43–54.
- Phelps, C., Heidl, R, Wadhwa, A. (2012). Knowledge, Networks, and Knowledge Networks: A Review and Research Agenda, *Journal of Management*, 38 (4), 1115-1166.
- Powell, W.W., and Snellman, K. (2004). The Knowledge Economy, *Annual Review of Sociology*, 30, 199-220.

- Vargo, S. L. and R. F. Lusch (2004). Evolving to a New Dominant Logic for Marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 68 (January), 1-17.
- Vargo, S.L. and Lusch, R.F. (2008). Service dominant logic: continuing the evolution, *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 36 (1), 1-10.
- Vargo, S.L. and Lusch, R.F. (2011),. It's All B2B ... and beyond: Toward a Systems Perspective of the Market, *Industrial Marketing Management*. 40(1), 181–187.
- Vargo, S. L., and R.F. Lusch (2017).Service-Dominant Logic 2025.*International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 34 (1), 46–67.
- Waluszewski, A., Baraldi, E., Linné, Å., and Shih, T. (2009). Resource interfaces telling other stories about the commercial use of new technology: The embedding of biotech solutions in US, China and Taiwan. *The IMP Journal*, 3(2), 86-123.
- Waluszewski, A. (2016). What's "knowledge management" when resources are unknowable and deals negotiated? *The IMP Journal*, 10(1), 107-128.
- Wernerfelt, B. (1984). A resource-based view of the firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, 5(2),171-180.