

# R&D alliances, knowledge flows, and innovation : three studies on the value of collaborative R&D

Citation for published version (APA):

Frankort, J. T. W. (2010). *R&D alliances, knowledge flows, and innovation : three studies on the value of collaborative R&D*. [Doctoral Thesis, Maastricht University]. Maastricht University Press. <https://doi.org/10.26481/dis.20100618jf>

## Document status and date:

Published: 01/01/2010

## DOI:

[10.26481/dis.20100618jf](https://doi.org/10.26481/dis.20100618jf)

## Document Version:

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

## Please check the document version of this publication:

- A submitted manuscript is the version of the article upon submission and before peer-review. There can be important differences between the submitted version and the official published version of record. People interested in the research are advised to contact the author for the final version of the publication, or visit the DOI to the publisher's website.
- The final author version and the galley proof are versions of the publication after peer review.
- The final published version features the final layout of the paper including the volume, issue and page numbers.

[Link to publication](#)

## General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

If the publication is distributed under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license above, please follow below link for the End User Agreement:

[www.umlib.nl/taverne-license](http://www.umlib.nl/taverne-license)

## Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at:

[repository@maastrichtuniversity.nl](mailto:repository@maastrichtuniversity.nl)

providing details and we will investigate your claim.

PROPOSITIONS BELONGING TO THIS DISSERTATION:  
R&D Alliances, Knowledge Flows, and Innovation  
Three Studies on the Value of Collaborative R&D

Hans T. W. Frankort

1. The size of a firm's R&D alliance portfolio and the research focus of the firm's R&D alliances jointly determine the amount of technological knowledge flowing into the firm. (*This dissertation, chapter 2*)
2. The interfirm network structure that results from firms' engagement in interfirm R&D alliances matters for firm innovation. (*This dissertation, chapter 3*)
3. Technological dynamism conditions the performance effects associated with alternative forms of R&D alliance governance. (*This dissertation, chapter 4*)
4. Careful performance studies generate normative implications for firm behavior. (*This dissertation, chapters 1 and 5*)
5. In research unlike in teaching, substance outweighs form.
6. If multiple individuals teach different groups of students enrolled in a single course, then a solitary reliance on student-based teaching evaluations ignores the incentives of students, and how these in turn affect the incentives of teachers who long to brag about their evaluations, those whose performance appraisal relies most on such evaluations, and the ones who do not worry about integrity.
7. The Dutch habit of optimizing the appearance of a doctoral dissertation is disproportionate to the dissertation's modern-day function as a repository of separate articles.
8. Like scores in ski jumping, teaching evaluations should be assessed only after discarding the highest and the lowest scores.
9. The most useful answers are often questions.
10. "No passion so effectually robs the mind of all its powers of acting and reasoning as fear." (*Edmund Burke, 1756*)
11. Inclusion of one overtly jesting proposition would suggest that all the others are to be taken as dead serious.