

reference	list	focus of study quote	description of network in focus quote	indep. var X	dependent var (description) Y	level of analysis	dep.var: (structure, content)	dep.var: (ION dynamic)	dep. var: phase in network life	longit.?	given theoretical mechanism (argumentation)	background / theory	alternative ET mechanism	analogy	ET-perspective alternatives	Notes
Ahuja, G. (2000b). The duality of collaboration: Inducements and opportunities in the formation of interfirm linkages. <i>Strategic Management Journal</i> , 21(3), 317-343.	A	firm's inducement and opportunities to form linkages	unknown	firm characteristics	linkages formation	dyadic	structure	relationship formation	evolution	yes	firms' characteristics (possession of stocks of technical, social and commercial capital) enhance linkage formation OR firms' capability of generating a radical technological breakthrough	resource-based literature, social network theory	sexual selection (female choice)  +  isolated populations can cause punctuated equilibria (probability paradigm)	Firm's with high level of richness in memetic traits are preferred by potential partners.  +  The development of breakthrough innovation (variation) may occur in an isolated firm.	Richness on knowledge (accepted memes) enhances chances of memetic overlap with potential mating partners. (other: richness enhances sexual attraction/selection (female choice) as it suggests genetic strength)  +  Firms' (isolated memetic population) ability to innovate (eminent memetic variation) creates possibility to create innovation (punctuated equilibrium) by taking over natural order	
Auster, E. R. (1992). The relationship of industry evolution to patterns of technological linkages, joint ventures, and direct investment between united-states and japan. <i>Management Science</i> , 38(6), 778-792.	A	industry evolution and costs and benefits of each form of resource investment to predict patterns of technological linkages, joint ventures, and direct investments	Japanese companies in the U.S.	maturity of industry	linkage coordination form	dyadic	content?	type of coordination form	all	?	maturity of industry determines needs of individual firms and thus the form of direct investment coordination form	transaction cost economics			?? mature industries (environment?) have more crystalized cultural norms?	relational forms; tech linkages, joint ventures, direct investm.
Axelrod, R., Mitchell, W., Thomas, R. E., Bennett, D. S., & Brudner, E. (1995). Coalition-formation in standard-setting alliances. <i>Management Science</i> , 41(9), 1493-1508.	A	predicting configuration of alliance formation by businesses. How Coalition-formation in standard-setting alliances to develop and sponsor technical standards	alliances to develop and sponsor technical standards	alliance size (+) and presence of (close) rivals in the alliance (-)	joining an alliance	network	structure	relationship formation	formation	no	utility of a firm to join a standard-setting alliance increases with alliance size, decreases with presence of (close) rivals in the alliance. Result is based on Nash equilibria (those sets of alliances for which no single firm has an incentive to switch to another alliance)				?? learning up with bigger alliances increases chances of survival, evading competitors??	
Beckman, C. M., Haunschild, P. R., & Phillips, D. J. (2004). Friends or strangers? Firm-specific uncertainty, market uncertainty, and network partner selection. <i>Organization Science</i> , 15(3), 259-275.	A	exploring factors that affect the choice of alliance and interlock partners	interlock and alliance networks for 300 largest U.S. firms during 1988-1993 period	type of uncertainty	partner selection	egonetwork	structure AND content	exploration (broadening) and exploitation (reinforcing)	evolution	no	type of uncertainty (firm-specific or market-level), leads to exploitation or exploration of firm's network. Partnering choices depend on the type of uncertainty perceived				deficits necessary to survive determine the search/acquisition.  firm-specific uncertainty = lack of (access to) necessary memes.  market-level uncertainty = environmental instability; cooperation	
Darr, A., & Talmud, I. (2003). The structure of knowledge and seller-buyer networks in markets for emergent technologies. <i>Organization Studies</i> , 24(3), 443-461.	A	impact of knowledge structures on relational patterns in markets for emergent technologies and in mass markets	markets for emergent technologies and mass markets in consumer electronics industry	knowledge structure emerging from technological maturity of market	relational patterns	network	structure AND content	communication intensity AND heterogeneous AND concentration AND hierarchy	formation	no	buyer and seller must develop a common image of product use through communicating contextual knowledge in markets of emergent technologies	social embeddedness theory			?? Network structure is developed around the development of shared memes in emergent technologies, later on less based on interaction/meme development. It underlines the importance of developing a mutual shared set of memes before going into 'mainstream'	is dit wel een A-artikel?
Davis, G. F., & Mizuchi, M. S. (1999). The money center cannot hold: Commercial banks in the us system of corporate governance. <i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i> , 44(2), 215-239.	A	centrality of banks in declining returns from lendings of major coprs. Role of financial intermediation in shaping the social organization of the economy.	connections of boards of 50 largest banks with large nonbank corps from 1982-1994	firm's strategy/focus	firm's centrality	network	structure	actor centrality	evolution	yes	centrality of banks declined as executives of major (central) corporations, joined bank boards at a lower rate, due to strategic choice of the bank: returns on major corps declined, so less recruitment of central directors.	embeddedness			???	
Jimeno, J. (2004). Competition within and between networks: The contingent effect of competitive embeddedness on alliance formation. <i>Academy Of Management Journal</i> , 47(6), 820-842.	A	how firms respond to the alliance network of their rivals	global airline industry (1994-1998)	rival's alliancing activities	alliance formation	network	structure	relationship formation	evolution	yes	firms react (strategic responses) to rivals by either allying with rival's partners (nonspecialized alliances) or by building countervailing alliances (cospecialized alliances), but depends on cospecialization				the meme of forming a specific partnership (=variation) spreads (=selection through isomorphism)	
Gulati, R. (1995b). "Social structure and alliance formation patterns: A longitudinal analysis." <i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i> 40(4): 619.	A	how social structures affects interfirm alliance formation patterns		social structure	partnership selection	network	structure	relationship formation	evolution	yes	prior chosen partnerships shape the partnerships in the future; firms base their partnership selection on the context emerging from prior alliances and considerations of strategic interdependence	alliance formation = path dependency			memes (routines) encounter path dependency	
Gulati, R. (1999). "Network location and learning: The influence of network resources and firm capabilities on alliance formation." <i>Strategic Management Journal</i> 20(5): 397.	A	firm's proclivity to enter new alliances by available network resources (network resources result from the informational advantages they obtain from their participation in interfirm networks that channel valuable information) and alliance formation capabilities		available network resources (NOT alliance formation capabilities)	proclivity to enter new alliances	network	structure	relationship formation	evolution	yes	The results of the longitudinal analysis confirm that, over time, the proclivity of firms to enter new alliances is influenced by the amount of network resources available to them, and not by alliance forming capabilities.	embeddedness			access to... ????	

reference	list	focus of study quote	description of network in focus quote	indep. var X	dependent var (description) Y	level of analysis	dep.var: (structure, content)	dep.var: (ION dynamic)	dep. var: phase in network life	longit.?	given theoretical mechanism (argumentation)	background / theory	alternative ET mechanism	analogy	ET-perspective alternatives	Notes
Gulati, R. and M. Gargiulo (1999). "Where do interorganizational networks come from?" The American Journal of Sociology 104(5): 1439.	A	antecedents of alliance formation probability		interdependence; embeddedness aspects (prior mutual alliances; common third parties; joint centrality) and differentiation (mediating var.)	probability of new alliances	network	structure	relationship formation	evolution	yes	probability of new alliances between specific orgs increases with their interdependence and with their prior mutual alliances, common third parties, joint centrality, differentiation of the emerging network mitigates the interdependence effect and enhances the social embeddedness aspects	social embeddedness theory			closeness of memes; memes replicatin/survival technique	
Haunschild, P. R. (1993). Interorganizational imitation - the impact of interlocks on corporate acquisition activity. Administrative Science Quarterly, 38(4), 564-592.	A	direct evidence for the influence of interorganizational imitation on corporate acquisitions		information through directorship	imitation of acquisition activities	network	structure	relationship formation	evolution	?	acquisitions as a result of exposure to the activities of other firm's in which managers take place in their board. (directorship --> imitation)	embeddedness, institutional theory			imitation = spread of memes	
Hoetker, G. (2005). How much do you know versus how well you know you: Selecting a supplier for a technically innovative component. Strategic Management Journal, 26(1), 75-96.	A	test a model integrating three approaches (TCE, interfirm relationships, firm capabilities), allowing us to understand the trade-offs involved in selecting a supplier for a innovative component		level of uncertainty	partnership selection	network	structure	relationship formation	evolution		uncertainty is determining factor: (1) low: capabilities determine supplier, (2) increasing: prior relationship and internal supplier, (3) extremely high: internal supplier	TCE, inter-firm relationships, firm capabilities			survival of memes; when high uncertainty; combining with others, higher uncertainty: closer memetic relatives.  Uncertainty about survival creates survival mechanism: less cooperation (efficiency argument) but more kin selection (memetic proximity)	
Holland, C. P., G. Lockett, et al. (1994). "The Evolution of a Global Cash Management System." Sloan Management Review 36(1): 37.	A															KOPIEREN!
Jones, C., Hestery, W. S., Fladmoe-Lindquist, K., & Borgatti, S. P. (1998). Professional service constellations: How strategies and capabilities influence collaborative stability and change. Organization Science, 9(3), 396-410.	A	examine two tensions inherent in multi-partner collaborative work: managing hybrid systems, which are composed of individual and group tasks and outcomes, and aligning partners' logics of action.		individual strategies	network stability	network	structure	network stability	evolution		due to the focus of individual firms promiscuous (of individualistic firms) or polygamous (of collectivistic firms) networks develop, in which the latter is stable and the first should be organized around a governance system to develop stability				individual strategy (part of memetic approach) may result in stable/unstable "systems" (What's evolutionary about this one????)	lastig artikel
Kogut, B., & Walker, G. (2001). The small world of germany and the durability of national networks. American Sociological Review, 66(3), 317-335.	A	"small world"-networks		"small worlds"	network stability	network	structure	network stability	evolution		intermediary effect of "small worlds" (closely knit clusters of firms) on the globalization effect on network relations; small worlds appear to be stable.				combination of memetic proximity (within niches) and path-dependency???	
Kogut, B., Walker, G., & Kim, D. J. (1995). Cooperation and entry induction as an extension of technological rivalry. Research Policy, 24(1), 77-95.	A	how the structure of cooperation in an industry influences the dynamics of entry of start-up firms		semi-conductor industry	dominance of a technology	entry of new firms	network	structure	entry of firms	evolution	certainty of established standard/dominant technology (centrality) correlates with entry of (start-up) firms	embeddedness			competition induces chance of meme-survival (acceptance by new firms)	
Li, S. X., & Rowley, T. J. (2002). Inertia and evaluation mechanisms in interorganizational partner selection: Syndicate formation among us investment banks. Academy Of Management Journal, 45(6), 1104-1119.	A	partner selection		U.S. investment banking industry	inertia AND several evaluation criteria (reciprocity, experience, and prior performance)	partner selection	egonetwork	structure	partner selection	evolution	inertia as well as several evaluation criteria (incl. reciprocity, experience, prior performance) influence partner selection				??	ARTIKEL NOG ZOEKEN, NIET ONLINE BECHIKBAAR
Mayer, K. J. and N. S. Argyres (2004). "Learning to Contract: Evidence from the Personal Computer Industry." Organization Science 15(4): 394.	A	we conduct a detailed study to explore whether and how firms learn to contract.		two partners, both of whom participate in the	cooperation learning-process	interfirm contracts	dyadic	content	type of coordination form	evolution	yes	these changes are largely the result of processes in which the firms were learning how to work together, including learning how to contract with each other.			development of isomemeticism	
Oik, P., & Young, C. (1997). Why members stay in or leave an r&d consortium: Performance and conditions of membership as determinants of continuity. Strategic Management Journal, 18(11), 855-877.	A	determinants of the decision to stay or leave an R&D consortium		184 member organizations of U.S.-based R&D consortia	performance AND conditions of membership	continuity	network	structure	stability	evolution	no	performance and the conditions of knowledge-related involvement, network ties, learning, and alternatives are related to the decision to stay in or leave. (performance leads to the conditions of memberships)			performance = efficiency, other effects seem to be related to path dependent and/or memetic proximity??	
Powell, W. W., White, D. R., Koput, K. W., & Owen-Smith, J. (2005). Network dynamics and field evolution: The growth of interorganizational collaboration in the life sciences. American Journal of Sociology, 110(4), 1132-1205.	A	decentralized structure of the commercial field of the life sciences.		biotech life sciences industry	central actors?	network evolution?	network	structure	evolution	evolution	Neither money nor market power—not even the sheer force of novel ideas—dominates the field. Rather, those organizations with diverse portfolios of well-connected collaborators are found in the most cohesive, central positions and have the largest hand in shaping the evolution of the field.  "Thus we see a combination of the rich-get-richer and multiconnectivity at work for these core participants, and they may well set the pace for the dominant trend in the field.	embeddedness theory			path-way dependency  embeddedness is important; a balanced number of traits is more beneficial than single sheer power; pro cooperation argument  ????	utgebred artikel over netwerk dynamica!!

reference	list	focus of study quote	description of network in focus quote	indep. var X	dependent var (description) Y	level of analysis	dep.var: (structure, content)	dep.var: (ION dynamic)	dep. var: phase in network life	longit.?	given theoretical mechanism (argumentation)	background / theory	alternative ET mechanism	analogy	ET-perspective alternatives	Notes
Rao, H., Davis, G. F., & Ward, A. (2000). Embeddedness, social identity and mobility: Why firms leave the nasdaq and join the new york stock exchange. Administrative Science Quarterly, 45(2), 268-292.	A	the role of a (positive) social identity from memberships in formal groups and the effect of defecting	organizations that migrated from the NASDAQ stock market to the NY Stock Exchange	proximity to others	choice to exit from network	network	structure	dissolution / stability	evolution		impact/effect of identity discrepant cues (other group members defect to another group) to defect the in-group, is reduced by strong ties to in-group members and enhanced by strong ties to out-group. Proximity to defectors increases cross-overs.	embeddedness				
Rowley, T. J., Greve, H. R., Rao, H., Baum, J. A. C., & Shipilov, A. V. (2005). Time to break up: Social and instrumental antecedents of firm, exits from exchange cliques. Academy of Management Journal, 48(3), 499-520.	A	we examined whether social similarity and cohesion reduced exits of members from these cliques;	Canadian investment bank cliques  complimentarity through differentiated roles  inequality in structural holes	social similarity & cohesion	exit from clique	clique	structure	dissolution / stability	evolution		We found that complementarity and inequality were more powerful antecedents of clique exits than similarity and cohesion. Our results suggest that clique stability is a function of three social and instrumental processes: building social attraction to govern exchanges, developing complementarity to accomplish collaborative tasks, and distributing the value created by a clique among its members					dit
Stuart, T. E. (1998). "Network positions and propensities to collaborate: An investigation of strategic alliance formation in a high-technology industry." Administrative Science Quarterly 43(3): 668.	A	paper develops a network-based mapping of the technological position of firms in an industry and applies this model in a longitudinal study of the formation of alliances between organisations	semi-conductor firms (six year period)	crowdedness AND prestige	alliance formation	network	structure	partnership formation	evolution	yes	firms in crowded positions (participate in technological segments in which many firms actively innovate) and those with high prestige (trck record of developing seminal inventions) form alliances at the highest rates					
Walker, G., Kogut, B., & Shan, W. J. (1997). Social capital, structural holes and the formation of an industry network. Organization Science, 8(2), 109-125.	A	combining structural hole theory and social capital theory for explaining network formation	biotechnology start-ups	development/nurturing of social capital	network formation	network	structure	network formation	formation		network formation and industry growth are significantly influenced by the development and nurturing of social capital	structural hole theory, social capital theory			path dependency, dependability	geeft aanleiding voor whole netw.-perspectief!
Zajac, E. J. and J. D. Westphal (1996). "Director reputation CEO-board power, and the dynamics of board interlocks." Administrative Science Quarterly 41(3): 507.	A	how contest for intraorganizational power can affect interorganizational ties	491 of the largest U.S. corporations over a recent seven-year period	contest for intraorganizational power	interorganizational ties	ego-network	structure	partnership formation / selection	evolution	yes	variation in CEO-board power relations across orgs has contributed to a segmentation of corporate director network (directors and boards both try to maintain power by selecting power-accepting opposite partner)	power dependence?			(natural) selection	
<b>Totaal</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>8</b>