



HAL
open science

Ties that Spatially Bind? A Relational Account of the Causes of Spatial Firm Mobility

Joris Knobens, Leon Oerlemans

► **To cite this version:**

Joris Knobens, Leon Oerlemans. Ties that Spatially Bind? A Relational Account of the Causes of Spatial Firm Mobility. *Regional Studies*, 2008, 42 (03), pp.385-400. 10.1080/00343400701291609 . hal-00514673

HAL Id: hal-00514673

<https://hal.science/hal-00514673>

Submitted on 3 Sep 2010

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Ties that Spatially Bind? A Relational Account of the Causes of Spatial Firm Mobility

Journal:	<i>Regional Studies</i>
Manuscript ID:	CRES-2006-0148.R1
Manuscript Type:	Main Section
JEL codes:	L14 - Transactional Relationships Contracts and Reputation Networks < L1 - Market Structure, Firm Strategy, and Market Performance < L - Industrial Organization, R12 - Size and Spatial Distributions of Regional Economic Activity < R1 - General Regional Economics < R - Urban, Rural, and Regional Economics, R23 - Regional Migration Regional Labor Markets Population < R2 - Household Analysis < R - Urban, Rural, and Regional Economics
Keywords:	Firm relocation, Spatial mobility, Spatial lock-in, Embeddedness, Inter-organizational relationship, Spatial inertia

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Ties that Spatially Bind?

A Relational Account of the Causes of Spatial Firm Mobility

J. Knoben, Department of Organisation Studies, Tilburg University, The Netherlands

- Warandelaan 2, P.O. Box 90153, 5000 LE, The Netherlands. Phone: +31 466 2111,

E-mail: j.knoben@uvt.nl

L.A.G. Oerlemans, Department of Organisation Studies, Tilburg University, The

Netherlands & Department of Engineering and Technology Management, University of

Pretoria, Republic of South Africa

- Warandelaan 2, P.O. Box 90153, 5000 LE, The Netherlands. Phone: +31 466 31531,

E-mail: l.a.g.oerlemans@uvt.nl

Ties that Spatially Bind?

A Relational Account of the Causes of Spatial Firm Mobility

Abstract

The existing literature on the spatial mobility of firms neglects inter-organizational relations (IORs). This is striking since there is a strong theoretical argument that firms with a high level of embeddedness are unlikely to relocate. Therefore, the following research question is posed: *“To what extent is the level of embeddedness of firms in (localized) innovative inter-organizational relationships of influence on their propensity to relocate?”*

Based on data from the automation service sector, an ordered logit model is estimated. The results show that embeddedness is an important determinant of spatial firm mobility. More specifically, there is a strong spatial lock-in effect of having a high degree centrality.

Key words: Firm relocation, spatial mobility, spatial lock-in, spatial inertia, inter-organizational relationships, embeddedness.

JEL: L14, R12, and R23

Ties that Spatially Bind?

A Relational Account of the Causes of Spatial Firm Mobility

1. Introduction

The causes of the spatial mobility of firms have been studied in numerous papers. However, the vast majority of these papers focus primarily on geographical characteristics. The fact that most firms do not operate in isolation but are often engaged in inter-organizational relationships (IORs) and networks that influence their actions is largely neglected. This is especially striking since it is widely accepted in the scientific literature that exchanges within networks have an ongoing structure that both enables and constrains the behavior of its members (Granovetter, 1985). A possible constraining effect of being involved in IORs and networks is spatial lock-in, also known as spatial inertia, of a firm (Romo & Schwartz, 1995), which implies that firms are unable to relocate even though they might like to do so from a cost perspective.

Following Granovetter (1985), the extent to which being involved in IORs and networks influences the spatial mobility of firms can be argued to be dependent on both the overall structure of the inter-organizational network in which the firm operates as well as on the characteristics of the dyadic relations of a firm. However, only weak empirical evidence is available for the proposed relationships between the level of a firm's participation in (localized) IORs and its propensity to relocate. The main goal of this research is to provide empirical insights into this relationship. Based on the above, the following research question has been formulated: *“To what extent is the level of embeddedness of a firm in (localized) innovative inter-organizational relationships of influence on its propensity to relocate?”*

The contributions of this paper to the literature are threefold. First, it adds a relational perspective to the literature with regard to firm relocation, which so far has largely neglected

1
2
3 that fact that firms do not operate in isolation, but often maintain IORs which influence their
4
5 behavior. Combining this relational perspective with the existing geographical perspective
6
7 seems fruitful since IORs and networks are getting more and more abundant, are increasing in
8
9 importance, and have a large influence on the behavior of firms (Borgatti & Foster, 2003).
10
11 Second, it empirically explores a possible constraining effect of IORs and networks. Even
12
13 though the possible constraining effects of networks are largely acknowledged, most
14
15 empirical research in inter-organizational settings has focused on the enabling effects of
16
17 network relations and network structures only (Kim *et al.*, 2006; Knoblen *et al.*, 2006).
18
19 Finally, this research will empirically research the claim that several characteristics of a
20
21 dyadic tie, and high levels of organizational proximity in particular, can negate the need for
22
23 geographical proximity in IORs. This claim is often made in the literature (e.g. Torre &
24
25 Rallet, 2005), but has received little empirical attention so far. Therefore, this paper might
26
27 provide an (onset to an) answer to an ongoing debate in the literature.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 The remainder of this paper starts with a discussion of the traditional drivers of a firm's
37
38 relocation propensity (Section Two). Subsequently, the concept of spatial lock-in will be
39
40 discussed (Section Three). In Section Four, the dataset that has been used for this analysis will
41
42 be presented and the methodology that is used to analyze the data will be discussed. In
43
44 Section Five, the main outcomes of the analyses will be presented and discussed. Finally
45
46 (Section Six), the implications of the findings will be discussed and put into a broader
47
48 perspective.
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 **2. Traditional drivers of firm relocation**

56
57 The causes of firm relocation have been studied extensively from a geographical point of
58
59 view. Four groups of factors, which incorporate the most commonly found determinants of
60

1
2
3 firm relocation in the literature (c.f. Brouwer *et al.*, 2004; Van Dijk & Pellenbarg, 2000;
4
5 Holguin-Veras *et al.*, 2005; Holl, 2004; Van Steen, 1998), are included in this research. These
6
7 groups of factors are: firm internal characteristics, characteristics of the building,
8
9 characteristics of the site, and characteristics of the region.
10
11

12 13 14 15 *2.1 Firm internal characteristics*

16
17 The internal characteristics of a firm that are found to be of influence on its propensity to
18
19 relocate are the growth rate of a firm, the geographical scale of its operations, and its previous
20
21 relocation behavior. The impact of these characteristics on a firm's propensity to relocate will
22
23 be discussed subsequently.
24
25

26
27 The growth rate of a firm is of importance for the propensity of firms to relocate since it
28
29 gives an indication of the speed with which the firm is expanding. An expanding firm is likely
30
31 to need more room, for example to accommodate its employees, and therefore is more likely
32
33 to relocate (Schmenner, 1980; Van Wissen, 2002). Moreover, fast growing firms are more
34
35 likely to access new costumers/markets in order to realize their growth and might therefore
36
37 relocate to obtain a more strategic position (Stam, 2003). On the other hand, a firm with a
38
39 large negative growth rate is likely to relocate as well, since its current location will become
40
41 too large and too expensive.
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 H1: There is a U-shaped relationship between the growth rate of a firm and its propensity to
49
50 relocate.
51
52

53
54
55 The geographical scale of operations refers to the spatial scale within which the firm buys and
56
57 sells its products/services. Previous research has shown that firms in industries with a tendency
58
59 to buy and sell many products/services in their home region are less likely to move compared
60

1
2
3 to firms that sell products throughout the country or even the world (Schmenner, 1980). The
4
5 main reason is that these firms are dependent on the local market (and sometimes vice versa
6
7 (Kilkenny *et al.*, 1999)) and, therefore, have much to lose when they relocate.
8
9

10
11
12 H2: The higher the level of localization of the scale of operations of a firm, the lower its
13
14 propensity to relocate.
15
16

17
18
19 Research has shown that firms that have moved recently (i.e. during the last two years) are
20
21 unlikely to move, whereas firms that moved between 5 and 10 years ago show a higher
22
23 propensity to move (again) (Van Steen, 1998). The underlying train of thought is that firms,
24
25 on average, outgrow their new location in approximately 5 to 10 years, which gives cause for
26
27 another relocation (Van Dijk & Pellenbarg, 2000). This results in the following hypothesis.
28
29
30

31
32
33 H3: Firms that have relocated in the last two years show a lower propensity to relocate,
34
35 compared to firms that did not relocate during this period.
36
37
38
39
40

41 *2.2 Characteristics of a firm's building*

42

43
44 The characteristics of a firm's building that are found to be of influence on its propensity to
45
46 relocate are the available room for expansion and the question whether or not a firm owns the
47
48 building in which it is located.
49

50
51 The available room for expansion is considered to be one of the main drivers of firm
52
53 relocation. Of all firms that relocate, 77% indicates that the main driver was the lack of room
54
55 for expansion (Van Steen, 1998: 42).
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 H4: Firms with insufficient room for expansion in their current building will face a higher
4 propensity to relocate compared to firms with enough room for expansion.
5
6
7
8
9

10 Ownership of the building is of importance for a firm's propensity to move, since the costs
11 and trouble of getting rid of the present building are much higher compared to firms that rent
12 their building. Furthermore, the reverse might also be true, because firms will only decide to
13 buy a building if they expect to stay at that location for a long time.
14
15
16
17
18
19

20
21
22 H5: Firms that own their buildings will face a lower propensity to relocate compared to firms
23 that rent their building.
24
25
26
27
28

29 *2.3 Characteristics of the site at which a firm is located*

30

31 Two characteristics of a site at which a firm is located are generally found to be of importance
32 on a firm's propensity to relocate, namely the distance to infrastructural facilities and the type
33 of area in which a firm is located (Holl, 2004).
34
35
36
37

38 The importance of the accessibility of the building seems logical, especially in countries
39 plagued by congestion such as The Netherlands. It is generally found that firms that are
40 located nearby main infrastructural facilities will have a better accessibility and, therefore,
41 will be less likely to move (Holl, 2004).
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 H6: The longer the travel-time between a firm and main infrastructural facilities, the higher its
51 propensity to relocate.
52
53
54
55

56 The importance of the type of area a firm is located in is tied to the fact that certain types of
57 areas face more congestion and face more problems with regard to accessibility regardless of
58
59
60

1
2
3 the presence of infrastructural facilities (Van Dijk & Pellenbarg, 2000). Firms located in a city
4 center can face large congestion problems and might decide to relocate to a location with
5 better accessibility at the edge of the city (Medda *et al.*, 1999). Firms located in residential
6 areas are very often start-ups, which also face a high propensity to relocate. On the other
7 hand, firms located in rural areas (Kilkenny *et al.*, 1999) or at the borders of cities (Van Dijk
8 & Pellenbarg, 2000) are likely to experience lower propensities to relocate.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 H7: Firms located in residential areas or city centers will face a higher propensity to relocate
21 than firms located in rural areas or at city borders.
22
23
24
25
26

27 *2.4 Characteristics of the region in which a firm is located*

28
29 Only a single regional characteristic is often found to be of influence on a firm's propensity to
30 relocate, namely the type of region in which a firm is located. The type of region a firm is
31 located in is of importance due to differences in economic activity and regional labor market
32 situations between regions. As such, firms are more likely to move from the rural regions to
33 the more urbanized regions (Holl, 2004). It should be noted, however, that this relationship is
34 not expected to hold for all sectors (e.g. agriculture), but is primarily applicable to service
35 sectors. This observation has several implications for the choice of the sampling frame which
36 will be discussed in Section Four.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 H8: The higher the level of urbanization of the region in which a firm is located, the lower its
51 propensity to relocate.
52
53
54
55

56 *2.5 Control variable*

57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The size of a firm is sometimes found to be an important predictor of firm relocation as well.
4
5 In general, relocating firms are smaller than non-relocating firms (Van Dijk & Pellenbarg,
6
7 2000). This is mainly due to the fact that the absolute costs of moving for small firms are
8
9 much lower compared to large firms. However, the size of a firm is also known to affect the
10
11 number of direct IORs a firm has (Oliver & Ebers, 1998). Therefore, the size of a firm is
12
13 taken into account is a control variable.
14
15

16 17 18 19 20 **3. Adding relational drivers of firm relocation to the equation** 21

22 The traditional determinants of firm relocation discussed in the previous section completely
23
24 neglect the fact that firms are often engaged in IORs and networks. This omission is striking
25
26 since IORs networks are abundant and, moreover, previous research has shown that the
27
28 relational variables have a large influence on firm behavior (e.g. Schutjens & Stam, 2003).
29
30 Therefore, it seems logical to add relational variables to the equation when trying to predict
31
32 the spatial behavior of firms.
33
34

35
36
37
38 First, following Resource Dependence Theory (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978), it can be argued
39
40 that a firm that makes extensive use of resources possessed or controlled by external actors
41
42 for its innovative processes, will become dependent on these actors. These dependencies, in
43
44 turn, influence the behavioral options that are viable for firms. By themselves, the
45
46 relationships in which these dependencies exist are non-spatial. However, since geographical
47
48 proximity is assumed to facilitate the successful exchange of (especially tacit) knowledge
49
50 through IORs (Schutjens & Stam, 2003), dependency on other firms can also lead to
51
52 dependency on a certain geographical location (e.g. Silicon Valley), and thus to spatial lock-in
53
54 (Romo & Schwartz, 1995).
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Second, the concept of transaction specific investments from transaction cost theory
4 (Williamson, 1981) also holds for investments in a location. This specific case of transaction
5 specific investments is called “site specificity” (Dyer, 1996). The investments made in its
6 present location, which can be seen as sunk costs, are, to a certain extent, specific to that
7 location and will be lost once a firm decides to leave that location. This reasoning can be
8 applied to both material investments (e.g. buildings) and to more intangible costs, such as
9 investments in (localized) IORs. As such, firms that have invested heavily in their IORs might
10 face a disincentive to relocate.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 Finally, similar arguments can be found in the literature on Territorial Innovation Models
23 (see for an overview: Moulaert & Sekia, 2003). In this body of literature, regions are
24 considered to be entities with a collective pool of knowledge, institutional structure, and
25 social conventions in which a firm is embedded (Malmberg, 1997). Therefore, the
26 development of (the capabilities of) firms will be both region- and path-dependent (Stam,
27 2003). These developments lead to dependence on localized inputs and production factors,
28 which, in turn, might deter a firm from relocating even if doing so is beneficial from a cost
29 perspective (Romo & Schwartz, 1995).
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 Even though the above presents arguments for the existence of the relationship between a
42 firm’s level of embeddedness and its propensity to relocate, more specific mechanisms are
43 needed in order to formulate concrete hypothesis based on measurable concepts. For this
44 purpose, the theoretical discussion of embeddedness by Granovetter (1985) offers several
45 handholds. Granovetter states that the behavior of actors is influenced by both the overall
46 structure of its network as well as by the characteristics of its dyadic relationships. In order to
47 analyze the effect of the level of embeddedness on a firm’s propensity to relocate, both
48 aspects of embeddedness will have to be taken into account.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

3.1 Overall network structure

The effect of a firm's overall network structure refers to the fact that firms occupy a certain position in the network(s) in which they participate (e.g. central vs. peripheral). This structural position has been shown to influence a firm's behavioral options (Gnyawali & Madhavan, 2001). In the literature, many different indicators for the network position of a firm can be distinguished. One of the most commonly used indicators of a firm's structural network position is the degree centrality of firm (e.g. Ahuja, 2000). The degree centrality of a firm is simply measured by counting the total number of direct ties that a firm has. Direct ties in this respect refer to two actors that have a direct, dyadic relation in contrast to indirect ties, which refers to actors that are linked only through another actor (e.g. friends of a friend) (Wasserman & Faust, 1994). By focusing on the direct ties of a firm, its ego-network can be constructed. That is, the relations between the focal firm (the ego) and its direct partners (the alters) can be mapped.

The theoretical mechanism underlying the relation between the amount of direct ties that a firm has and its propensity to relocate is based on the need for stability in IORs. Resource exchange, and more specifically knowledge exchange, is facilitated by stable, long term, IORs (Ahuja, 2000). A relocation might threaten this stability, which hampers the functioning of these relationships and, ultimately, the performance of a firm. Therefore, firms are likely to be hesitant to relocate when they are involved in many IORs. The need for stability is strongest in direct relations that are based on knowledge exchange (rather than for example simple buyer-supplier relations), since such relations are characterized by high levels of uncertainty, strong appropriation concerns, and require high levels of trust (Saviotti, 1998). Therefore, the relationship between the number of IORs of a firm and its propensity to relocate can be mainly attributed to these, so called, direct innovative IORs. Based on the above, the following hypothesis has been formulated.

1
2
3
4
5
6 H9: The more direct innovation IORs a firm has, the lower its propensity to relocate.
7
8
9

10 Another structural characteristic of the ego-network of a firm which might influence its
11 spatial behavior is the extent to which the ego-network is localized. Being dependent on
12 localized partners (i.e. knowledge sources) might lead to spatial inertia because geographical
13 proximity facilitates face-to-face contacts, which facilitate the transfer of tacit knowledge
14 (Schutjens & Stam, 2003). It can be argued that high degrees of localization of a firm's ego-
15 network will lead to a lower propensity to relocate for a firm. Consequently, the following
16 hypothesis has been formulated.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 H10: The higher the level of localization of a firm's external knowledge sources the lower its
30 propensity to relocate.
31
32
33
34
35

36 *3.2 Interactions in dyadic relationships*

37

38 Besides the structural characteristics described in the above, several characteristics of
39 interactions that take place in dyadic ties that might influence a firm's propensity to relocate
40 can be found in the literature as well. First, not all IORs are equally important to firms.
41 Therefore, the strength of a firm's direct innovative IORs is likely to influence the relation
42 between the number of direct innovative ties a firm has and the overall level of localization on
43 the one hand, and its propensity to relocate on the other hand.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 The relationship proposed in the above is in contrast with the "strength of weak ties"
54 argument posed by Granovetter (1973), and rather builds on the argument of the "strength of
55 strong ties". This argument basically states that strong ties will have the largest effect on an
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 actor's (in this case a firm's) behavior, since strong ties carry more value to a firm especially
4
5 in uncertain situations, such as innovative projects (Krackhardt, 1992).
6
7
8
9

10 H11: The stronger a firm's innovative IORs, the more negative the relationship between the
11
12 number of direct innovative IORs and the localization of external knowledge sources and its
13
14 propensity to relocate.
15

16
17
18
19
20 Second, the necessity of geographical stability for successful inter-organizational knowledge
21
22 exchange is not undisputed in the literature. Several authors claim that high levels of
23
24 organizational proximity may facilitate knowledge exchanges over large and changing
25
26 geographical distances (see for an overview: Torre & Rallet, 2005). Organizational proximity
27
28 can be defined as *"the set of routines – explicit or implicit – which allows coordination*
29
30 *without having to define beforehand how to do so. The set of routines incorporates*
31
32 *organizational structure, organizational culture, performance measurements systems,*
33
34 *language and so on"* (Rallet & Torre, 1999). High levels of organizational proximity are
35
36 argued to generate the capacity to transfer tacit knowledge and other non-standardized
37
38 resources despite large geographical distances (Burmeister & Colletis-Wahl, 1997).
39
40
41
42

43
44 If this claim holds, participation in direct innovative IORs will not necessarily have an
45
46 effect on the spatial behavior of firms, since a firm can maintain its IORs just as easily from a
47
48 different geographical location if the level of organizational proximity is high enough
49
50 (Morgan, 2004).
51
52
53
54

55 H12: The higher the level of organizational proximity between a firm and its innovative IORs,
56
57 the less negative the relationship between the number of innovative IORs and the localization
58
59 of external knowledge sources and its propensity to relocate.
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Based on the studies above, the following conceptual framework is constructed (Figure 1). In the next sections, the data collection procedure and the operationalization of these theoretical concepts will be discussed.

Insert Figure 1 here

4. Data collection, measurement, and methodology

In order to collect information with regard to the concepts discussed in the above, a questionnaire was mailed to all firms in the automation services sector in The Netherlands with more than 5 full-time employees. A single sector design has been chosen since there are large differences in relocation propensity between sectors. The automation service sector was chosen since it is a fairly dynamic sector in which firm relocations are relatively common (compared to for example manufacturing or wholesale) and it is a sector in which IORs are relatively common as well. Furthermore, the automation services sector is a relatively “footloose” sector, due to the high level of ICT-usage in this sector (Hoogstra & van Dijk, 2004). If a spatial lock-in effect of embeddedness could be found in such a sector, this would prove a strong test of the hypothesized effects.

A list of all relevant firms and their addresses were obtained from the Dutch Chamber of Commerce (CoC). After purging the list for empty holdings, bankruptcies, firms with several subsidiaries with the same address, and duplicates, 2.553 firms remained. A questionnaire was sent to all of these firms by mail. Unfortunately, due to the limitations of the database of the CoC, no reliable names of contact person were available. Therefore, the questionnaires were sent to the managing director(s) of all firms.

1
2
3 Ultimately, 203 firms returned a useable questionnaire (a response rate of 8%). Even
4
5 though this seems like a low response rate, comparable response rates were obtained in
6
7 similar micro level studies. Oerlemans and Meeus (2005), for example, obtained a response
8
9 rate of 8%, whereas Rooks *et al.* (2005) achieve a response rate of 8.4%. Both studies used a
10
11 similar research approach and were conducted in the same field of science. Additionally, from
12
13 several meta-analyses of response rates (e.g. Baruch, 1999; Cook *et al.*, 2000; Klassen &
14
15 Jacobs, 2001) it may be concluded that, besides the general downward trend in response rates
16
17 caused by “saturation” of respondents and lack of time, several other explanations can be
18
19 given for the relatively low response rates. Most importantly, Baruch (1999) finds that
20
21 surveys mailed to individuals (and about individual characteristics) have a much higher
22
23 response rate than surveys mailed to organizational representatives. Klassen and Jacobs
24
25 (2001) find that SMEs, of which the sector sampled in this research is mainly composed,
26
27 generally respond less to surveys compared to their larger counterparts. When taking all of
28
29 these aspects into account the response rate of 8% is not unexceptional.
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 Nevertheless, the fact that a large group of firms did not respond raises the question
37
38 whether or not the data might suffer from a sample bias. Therefore, a non-response analysis
39
40 was performed. A group of 179 non-respondents were approached by telephone and asked to
41
42 give answers to several key-questions from the questionnaire. These key questions included
43
44 the relocation propensity, the size of the firm and the presence of innovative IORs. These
45
46 questions were asked since they include the dependent variable and the main (hypothesized)
47
48 independent variable. Moreover, firm size was included since it is a variable that is likely to
49
50 contain bias. Of these 179 firms, 130 were willing to cooperate (response rate of 73%). When
51
52 asked about the reason for their non-response, the vast majority of the firms (61%) indicated
53
54 that they had never received the questionnaire. This high percentage can be explained by the
55
56 fact that the CoC database did not contain reliable information about contact persons. Most
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 other respondents indicated that they had no time to answer the questionnaire (32%). Other
4
5 answers given included a principal decision never to cooperate with surveys (5%) or the fact
6
7 that the survey contained too many confidential questions (2%). The data obtained from these
8
9 non-respondents allows for a detailed comparison of the respondents and the non-respondents
10
11 and provide valuable information with regard to the representativeness of the data. A
12
13 comparison of the data from the non-respondents and the respondents can be found in Table
14
15
16
17
18 1.

22 Insert Table 1 here

26
27 From Table 1 can be derived that there are no significant differences between the respondents
28
29 and the non-respondents with regard to the variables under scrutiny. The fact that firms with a
30
31 very low propensity to relocate are a little bit underrepresented as respondents might be
32
33 explained by the fact that firms with this characteristic might be less interested in the topic
34
35 and, therefore, are less inclined to return the questionnaire. However, this difference is not
36
37 statistically significant.
38
39

40
41 For several other variables, the respondents could be compared to the whole population,
42
43 since these variables could be extracted from the CoC database. A comparison between the
44
45 respondents and the entire population with regard to these variables can be found in Table 2.
46
47
48
49

51 Insert Table 2 here

54
55 From Table 2 it can be derived that, for the variables under scrutiny, there is no difference
56
57 between the respondents and the sample as a whole. Both the spatial distribution and the past
58
59 relocation behavior of the respondents seems to be representative for the population as a
60

1
2
3 whole. On the basis of Table 1 and 2, it can be concluded that there do not seem to be any
4
5 structural differences between the respondents and the non-respondents. Therefore, there is no
6
7 indication of sample bias in the data.
8
9

10 11 12 *4.1 Measurement* 13

14
15 The dependent variable in the model is the propensity of a firm to relocate. The relocation
16
17 propensity of a firm has been measured by a scale developed by Van Steen (1998), which is
18
19 also used by Van Dijk and Pellenbarg (2000) and Brouwer *et al.* (2004). Van Steen (1998)
20
21 developed an 8 point scale (see Table 1 for a precise description of this scale) which reflects
22
23 how likely a firm is to relocate within the next two years.
24
25

26
27 The relational variables that deal with the overall structure of a firm's ego network are the
28
29 number of direct innovative IORs and the level of localization of a firm's external knowledge
30
31 sources. In order to obtain information with regard to these variables, respondents were first
32
33 asked to report the total number of innovative IORs they had. Furthermore, respondents were
34
35 asked to report on the total number of organizations the firm used as external knowledge
36
37 sources, and the number of these organizations that were located within 20 kilometers of the
38
39 respondent's firm. From these answers, the percentage of a firm's external knowledge sources
40
41 that can be considered localized was computed.
42
43
44

45
46 In order to obtain information about the characteristics of the dyadic relations of a firm,
47
48 respondents were asked to answer several questions about the main innovative IOR of a firm.
49
50 This approach has been chosen since the survey has insufficient space to question all
51
52 innovative IORs of a firm in detail. Moreover, the problem of non-response becomes
53
54 exceedingly large when firms are asked about characteristics of more than one IOR. The
55
56 approach of focusing on the main innovative IOR of a firm has been adopted from the
57
58 Community Innovation Survey (CIS).
59
60

1
2
3 The strength of the main IOR of a firm is measured by using the dimensions of tie strength
4 as discussed by Gilsing and Nooteboom (2005), which are basically inter-organizational
5 translations of the dimensions of inter-personal tie strength proposed by Granovetter (1985).
6
7 The scope of the tie, the level of formal control, the specific investments in mutual
8 understanding, the duration of the tie, and the frequency of (face-to-face) interaction are used
9 as measures of tie strength.¹ The first four items are measured by asking a firm's response (on
10 a 5-point likert scale) to statements about these dimensions of tie strength. The last two items
11 are measured by asking firms about the duration of the relation with their focal IOR and the
12 frequency of their contacts with this partner.
13
14

15
16 These items were analyzed with a factor analysis (see Table 3). From this factor analysis, it
17 becomes clear that the concept of tie strength consists of 2 separate dimensions, namely
18 intensity and the form of a tie. The first factor contains items that describe the intensity of the
19 interaction between two actors, whereas the second factor contains items that describe the
20 functional form in which the interactions take place. Both dimensions are used separately in
21 the final analysis.
22
23
24

41 Insert Table 3 here

42
43
44
45 The level of organizational proximity between the focal firm and its main direct IOR is
46 measured by asking firms (on a 5 point likert scale) to react on statements with regard to
47 whether or not the main IOR has the same other partners (relation dimension), the same
48 organizational norms and values (institutional and cultural dimension), and the same
49 organizational structure (structural dimension). These dimensions correspond to the most
50 common and complete definition of organizational proximity (see: Knoben & Oerlemans,
51 2006; Torre & Rallet, 2005).
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 These dimensions were analyzed with a factor analysis (see Table 4). From this factor
4 analysis, it becomes clear that the concept of organizational proximity is indeed captured by
5 these three dimensions (i.e. they form a single factor).
6
7
8
9

10
11
12 Insert Table 4 here
13
14
15

16
17
18 The growth rate of a firm is measured by looking at the change in the number of employees
19 (in FTE's) over the last two years.
20
21

22 The scale of operations is determined by asking the respondent what share of its total input
23 and output is tied to its home region, which is determined as a circle around the firm with a
24 20km radius. This is in line with measurements used in earlier studies (Oerlemans *et al.*,
25 2001).
26
27
28
29
30

31 The previous relocation behavior of the firm is measured by asking respondents to map the
32 total spatial history of the firm. Data is collected on the year of the relocation(s), the
33 municipality of origin, and the municipality of destination (similar to: Van Dijk & Pellenburg,
34 2000).
35
36
37
38
39

40 The available room for expansion is measured by asking whether or not there is sufficient
41 room for expansion in the current building of the firm, which is identical to the approach used
42 by Van Steen (1998).
43
44
45
46
47

48 Ownership of the building is determined by asking whether or not the firm is the owner of
49 the building it is currently established in (identical to: Van Dijk & Pellenburg, 2000).
50
51

52 The accessibility of the building is measured by asking the respondent about the average
53 travel time between the firm and the nearest highway and the nearest train station. This
54 approach is slightly more sophisticated than the distance measures that are normally used (e.g.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Van Dijk & Pellenbarg, 2000), since it uses travel time, rather than straight line distance
4
5
6 measures. As such, this measure represents the concept of accessibility better.
7

8 The type of area a firm is located in will be determined on the basis of the 6 digit postal
9
10 code of the responding firm. On the basis of its postal code, it will be determined whether a
11
12 firm is located in a rural area, a city centre, at the edge of a city, or in a residential area. This
13
14 approach is identical to the one used by van Dijk and Pellenbarg (2000) and corresponds to
15
16 the categorization that is used in the theoretical literature concerning firm relocation as well.
17
18

19 The type of region a firm is determined by using the level of urbanization of the
20
21 municipality the firm is located in. These data has been obtained from the Dutch Central
22
23 Bureau of Statistics. Their scale of urbanization distinguishes between 5 levels of
24
25 urbanization, ranging from (1) heavily urbanized to (5) rural.
26
27
28
29
30

31 A short overview of the variables described in the above and their definition can be found in
32
33 Table 5.
34
35
36
37

38 Insert Table 5 here

39 40 41 42 43 *4.2 Methodology*

44 The structure of the measurement of the dependent variable has some implications for the
45
46 methodology that can be used to analyze these data. The dependent variable consists of eight
47
48 categories. Even though these categories represent chances that a firm will relocate in the
49
50 coming two years, the unit distance between the different categories does not carry any
51
52 significance. For this type of data, ordered logit models are the most suitable methodology
53
54 (Norušis, 2004). This methodology has been used in earlier studies with an identical
55
56 dependent variable as well (e.g. Brouwer *et al.*, 2004; Van Dijk & Pellenbarg, 2000).
57
58
59
60

The ordered logit model is based on the following specification (Verbeek, 2004: 203):

$$y_i^* = \beta x_i' + \varepsilon_i$$

Where x_i is a set of explanatory variables and ε_i is the disturbance term. Finally, y_i^* is the unobserved probability that a firm will relocate in the coming two years. What is observed can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} y_i &= 0 \text{ if } y_i^* \leq \mu_0, \\ y_i &= 1 \text{ if } \mu_0 < y_i^* \leq \mu_1, \\ y_i &= 2 \text{ if } \mu_1 < y_i^* \leq \mu_2, \\ &\dots\dots\dots \\ y_i &= 7 \text{ if } y_i^* \leq \mu_6. \end{aligned}$$

Where the μ 's are unknown parameters to be estimated with the β 's. Each respondent has its own y_i^* , which is determined by the measured x_i 's and the unobserved factors ε_i . Each respondent chooses the category of y that represents its y_i^* most closely.

When fitting an ordinal regression model, it is assumed that the relationships between the independent variables and the logits are the same for all logits. This assumption can be tested with the so called "test of parallel lines". Ordinal regression is an appropriate methodology when the value of this test is above 0.10 (Norušis, 2004: 74).

Since the goal of this research is to assess the added value of relational variables to the relocation literature, the obtained models, both with and without relational variables, have to be compared in terms of model fit. In order to compare models, the Akaike's Information Criterion (AIC) has been calculated for each model. The AIC provides information about the explanatory power of a model relative to the number of parameters that has been used (Sakamoto, 1991). The lower the AIC, the better the fit of the model.

5. Empirical results

1
2
3 Two different samples have been used for the analyses. One for all responding firms and one
4
5 for firms with one or more IORs. This sub-sample has been made to be able to include the
6
7 moderating effects of the relational variables proposed in the theoretical section of this paper.
8
9 Since firms without any direct innovative IORs do not score on these variables at all, they had
10
11 to be excluded from this analysis. Descriptive statistics and correlation matrices for both
12
13 samples can be found in Table 6 and 7. From these Tables, it can be derived that both samples
14
15 are very similar and that the level of collinearity between the variables is very low. Therefore,
16
17 no problems of multicollinearity occurred.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

Insert Table 6 and 7 here

25
26
27
28
29 In total, six different models have been estimated, two for all responding firms (model 1 and
30
31 2) and four for only the firms with at least one direct innovative IOR (model 3 through 6).
32
33 Model 1 serves as a baseline model. In this model, only the traditional drivers of firm
34
35 relocation, as used in many geographical studies, have been incorporated and all respondents
36
37 have been included. Model 2 expands model 1 by incorporating the structural characteristics
38
39 of a firm's ego network. Model 3 is another baseline model, but this time it has been
40
41 estimated for a sub-sample of firms with at least one direct innovative IOR only. Model 4 is
42
43 equivalent to model 2, but specified to the subset of firms with at least one direct innovative
44
45 IOR. Finally, model 5 and 6 incorporate the moderating effects of the relational variables
46
47 proposed in hypothesis 11 and 12. The results of the estimation of these models are presented
48
49 in Table 8.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

Insert Table 8 here

1
2
3 From Table 8, it becomes clear that ordinal regression is indeed the appropriate technique to
4
5 analyze these data, as the value of the test of parallel lines is sufficiently high for all models
6
7 (Norušis, 2004: 74). Moreover, all models fit the data well, as can be derived from the
8
9 significance levels and the differences in log-likelihood between the restricted model and the
10
11 estimated model, which is also reflected in the relatively high levels of the pseudo-R².
12
13
14

15 As can be derived from the AICs presented in Table 8, model 2 is the best fitting model for
16
17 the entire sample, whereas model 5 is the best fitting model for the sub sample of firms IORs.
18
19 This indicates that the addition of relational variables significantly increases the explanatory
20
21 power of the models compared to the models including only the traditional drivers of firm
22
23 relocation.
24
25

26
27 Next, the estimation results for each of the categories of variables distinguished earlier will
28
29 be discussed.
30
31
32
33

34 *5.1 Firm internal characteristics*

35
36 With regard to the “traditional” drivers of relocation, some interesting results are obtained.
37
38 First, the relationship between the growth rate of a firm and its propensity to relocate is highly
39
40 significant, but seems to follow an inverse U-shape, rather than the hypothesized U-shape.
41
42 The implication of this finding is that firms that performed either very poorly (i.e. are
43
44 shrinking) or extremely well (i.e. quadrupled in size within 2 years) are very unlikely to
45
46 relocate. The former might be explained by the fact that poorly performing firms lack the
47
48 financial resources to relocate, but it is harder to interpret the latter finding. It might be the
49
50 case that firms that grow at such enormous rates employ other strategies to accommodate their
51
52 growth (such as mergers, takeover, and branching) (Brouwer *et al.*, 2004; Hoogstra & van
53
54 Dijk, 2004). Another possible explanation lies in the fact that the dataset contains a limited
55
56 number of firms that shrank (i.e. 13). The number of observations on the left hand side of the
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 range is rather low, which might account for the fact that no U-shaped pattern is found. Based
4
5 on the above, hypothesis one is rejected.
6
7

8 Second, producing for a highly localized market seems to reduce a firm's likelihood to
9
10 relocate, whereas drawing mainly from localized inputs does not. These findings substantiate
11
12 the importance of proximity to markets for the location preferences of firms and confirm the
13
14 predictions made in hypothesis two.
15
16

17 Third, previous relocation within the last two years indeed seems to lower the likelihood of
18
19 (another) relocation. Therefore, hypothesis three is confirmed.
20
21

22 Finally, the size of a firm is significant only in model 1. The fact that it becomes
23
24 insignificant in model 2 can be explained by the fact that, as expected, there is a, but relatively
25
26 small, correlation between the number of IORs of a firm and its size (see Table 6). As a result,
27
28 the effect of firm size drops from just significant to non-significant. Moreover, in model 3
29
30 size is insignificant due to the fact that for the sub-sample of firms with one or more IORs the
31
32 size variable has a smaller range compared to the whole sample (see Table 5).
33
34
35
36
37

38 39 *5.2 Characteristics of a firm's building*

40
41 Previous research found that the characteristics of the building in which a firm is housed are
42
43 important predictors of a firm's propensity to relocate. The findings presented in Table 8
44
45 partly substantiate these findings. Firms that experience a lack of expansion room face a much
46
47 higher propensity to relocate compared to firms with enough room to expand. Moreover,
48
49 firms that own the building in which they are housed report a lower propensity to relocate.
50
51 However, this last effect is mainly significant for the sample as a whole and not for firms with
52
53 IORs. This indicates that site ownership is a weaker keep factor for firms with IORs
54
55 compared to firms in general. As such, hypothesis four is confirmed, whereas hypothesis five
56
57
58
59
60 is only partly confirmed.

5.3 Characteristics of the site at which a firm is located

The characteristics of the site seem to play a peripheral role as determinants of a firm's propensity to relocate. Only the accessibility of a firm's location by train seems to be of importance, and only for the sub-sample of firms with one or more direct innovative IORs. This might indicate that for firms with IORs, being located on an easily accessible location is more important than for other firms. The underlying explanation could be that these firms require frequent face-to-face contacts with their partners to collaborate efficiently, which emphasizes the importance of accessibility.

These weak effects of the accessibility of a site might be explained by the characteristics of the country in which this data was gathered. The Netherlands is a rather small country with a very dense road and railway network. Therefore, the vast majority of firms are located very close to these infrastructural facilities. Earlier research into the relationship between accessibility and the relocation propensity of firms in The Netherlands indeed found (almost) no effects of the level of accessibility of a site (Van Dijk & Pellenbarg, 2000), whereas for other countries in which this relationship has been tested, significant effects are found (e.g. for in Portugal see Holl, 2004). Therefore, hypothesis seven is rejected, whereas hypothesis six is only partly (and weakly) confirmed.

5.4 Characteristics of the region in which a firm is located

The characteristics of the region in which a firm is located do seem to be of importance for a firm's propensity to relocate. With the exception of model 1, the level of urbanization has a significant effect in all models. The fact that it becomes significant in model 2 is likely to be caused by the small correlation between the share of localized external knowledge sources and the level of urbanization of a region in which a firm is located. This correlation seems

1
2
3 logical since the higher the level of urbanization of a region, the more firms are located within
4
5 it. Therefore, the probability of finding suitable knowledge sources within this region
6
7 increases, leading to a higher share of localized external knowledge sources.
8
9

10 On the whole, the findings indicate that firms that are located in regions with a higher level
11
12 of urbanization show, *ceteris paribus*, significantly higher relocation propensities than firms in
13
14 more rural areas. The findings are contradictory to hypothesis 8 and indicate that firms in
15
16 rural areas are less likely to relocate. These findings might be explained by the fact that these
17
18 firms often serve a more local market and are more intertwined with their market area in
19
20 general (KILKENNY *et al.* 1999).
21
22
23

24 The difference between model 1 and 3 indicates that being located in an urbanized region
25
26 is a push factor for firms with one or more IORs. This might be an indication that these firms
27
28 are less dependent on being in urbanized areas since they access external resources through
29
30 other channels (i.e. their IORs).
31
32
33

34 35 36 5.5 Relational variables 37

38 With respect to hypothesis 9, strong support is found in the data. In all models in which the
39
40 variable has been included, a significant negative effect of the amount of direct innovative
41
42 IORs on a firm's propensity to relocate is found. This indicates that firms with a high degree
43
44 centrality indeed experience a spatial lock-in effect as a result of their structural network
45
46 position. Moreover, it is a clear indication that being involved in large amounts of IORs does
47
48 not only hold benefits for the participating firms, but also constrains their (in this case spatial)
49
50 behavior.
51
52
53

54 With regard to the percentage of localized external sources mixed results are obtained. In
55
56 model 2, 4 and 5, the sign of this variable is, as expected, negative, but statistically
57
58 insignificant. However, in model 5, this coefficient is significant and carries the expected
59
60

1
2
3 negative sign. It may be concluded that, relative to other firms that make use of external
4
5 knowledge sources, firms that use predominantly localized external knowledge sources
6
7 experience a somewhat lower propensity to relocate. However, the fact that the effect of the
8
9 total amount of IORs is much stronger (in terms of significance) than the effect of the
10
11 localization of external knowledge sources indicates that the effect of a firm's overall ego
12
13 network structure on its propensity to relocate can be mainly attributed to its degree centrality
14
15 rather than to the level of localization of its ego network.
16
17
18

19
20 When comparing the AIC of the models including the structural characteristics of a firm's
21
22 ego-network to the models without these characteristics, it becomes clear that the models
23
24 including these characteristics fit the data better. This indicates that the addition of structural
25
26 characteristics of a firm's ego-network to a model with traditional drivers of firm relocation
27
28 enhances the explanatory power of these models.
29
30
31

32
33
34 The characteristics of the main IOR of a firm seem to matter only for localized relations.
35
36 From the comparison of model 4, 5, and 6 it can be concluded that both high levels of
37
38 organizational proximity as well as specific functional forms of IORs (i.e. young and highly
39
40 formalized relations) can negate the spatial lock-in effects of relying heavily on localized
41
42 external knowledge sources. However, the intensity of a relation does not seem to strengthen
43
44 the spatial lock-in effect. These findings indicate that organizational proximity can indeed
45
46 facilitate knowledge transfers over large(r) geographical distances, whereas the need for
47
48 geographical proximity can be negated by choosing the appropriate functional form for an
49
50 IOR. Furthermore, when comparing model 5 and 6 to model 4 it becomes evident that the
51
52 negative coefficient of the total number of direct innovative IORs a firm has is larger when
53
54 the analysis is corrected for the characteristics of the main IOR of the firm. This finding also
55
56 indicates that part of the spatial lock-in effects of a firm's overall network structure can be
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 negated by dyadic characteristics. On the whole, these findings support hypothesis 9 and
4
5 partly support hypothesis 10, 11, and 12.
6
7

8 When comparing the AIC of the models including relational characteristics to the models
9
10 without these characteristics, it becomes clear that the models including these characteristics
11
12 fit the data better. Their explanatory power is better than the model including only the
13
14 traditional drivers of firm relocation, but also better than the model including only the
15
16 structural characteristics of a firm's ego-network. This indicates that the addition of relational
17
18 variables enhances the explanatory power of the models even further than the models
19
20 including only the structural characteristics of a firm's ego-network and, thereby, provides
21
22 evidence that both dimensions of a firm's level of embeddedness are relevant for the spatial
23
24 behavior of firms.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 **6. Conclusions**

33
34 The research presented in this paper was set out with the aim to assess the relative
35
36 contribution of adding relational variables to a field of research that has been dominated by
37
38 (economic) geographers. Moreover, it tried to shed some light on the possible constraining
39
40 effects of IORs, which is a largely neglected topic in the literature. Finally, it set out to
41
42 provide an onset of an empirical answer to the question whether a high levels of
43
44 organizational proximity is a substitute for geographical proximity in IORs.
45
46
47

48 With regard to the first point, this research shows that, even when all traditional drivers of
49
50 firm relocation are included, relational variables are significant additions to the model. This
51
52 does not indicate that the relational variables are better predictors of a firm's propensity to
53
54 relocate than the traditional determinants, but it does signal that they provide a valuable
55
56 addition. Better fitting models that explain larger parts of the observed variance are obtained
57
58 when both groups of variables are included. The fact that variables based on two different
59
60

1
2
3 scientific disciplines jointly explain a large part of the variance of a firm's propensity to
4 relocate is strong support for inter-disciplinary approaches. Searching for more topics in
5
6 which (economic) geography and organization science can jointly explain the behavior of
7
8 firms might therefore be a promising endeavor.
9
10
11

12
13 With regard to the second point it can be concluded that there seems to be a clear spatial
14
15 lock-in effect of a firm's structural position in its ego-network. From these findings it can be
16
17 derived that being part of an ego-network with many direct innovative IORs can indeed
18
19 constrain the subsequent actions of firms. Being involved in IORs limits the spatial mobility
20
21 of firms and ties them to their current location, even though relocation might carry significant
22
23 benefits for the firm. Moreover, the existence of this spatial lock-in effect also makes it likely
24
25 that the relocation of a firm could serve as a critical event and, therefore, could lead to large
26
27 changes in the relocation firm's inter-organizational network (Knoben *et al.*, 2006).
28
29
30

31
32 However, the results also indicate that the spatial lock-in effect caused by a strong
33
34 localization of external knowledge sources can be (partly) negated by the functional form of a
35
36 firm's relationships or by high levels of organizational proximity. These findings point at the
37
38 importance of "managing" the form of a firm's direct relationships to (partly) negate the
39
40 constraining effects of being involved in these relations. However, the relationship between
41
42 the characteristics of ties and their effect on the behavior of firms seems to more intricate than
43
44 theory proposes, since a large spatial lock-in effect of a firm's network position seems to be
45
46 present whatever the characteristics of a firm's dyadic ties.
47
48
49

50
51 Finally, with regard to the third point, based on the findings presented in this paper it can
52
53 be concluded that high levels of organizational proximity can indeed act as a substitute for
54
55 geographical proximity. The spatial lock-in effect of geographical embeddedness can be
56
57 negated by organizational proximity. However, the spatial lock-in effect of structural
58
59 embeddedness seems to be unaffected by high levels of organizational proximity. These
60

1
2
3 findings point at an intricate relationship between different types of embeddedness and the
4
5 role of different types of proximity. Therefore, the findings with regard to the relation
6
7 between organizational and geographical proximity presented in this paper should merely be
8
9 seen as the starting point for future research into this topic.
10
11

12 13 14 15 **Endnotes**

16
17 ¹: Gilsing and Nooteboom (2005) also use the level of trust as a determinant of tie strength.
18
19 Unfortunately, questions about the level of trust between the firm and its focal IOR did not
20
21 carry any demarcating value. Therefore, this dimension is left out of this analysis.
22
23
24
25

26 27 **References**

- 28 Ahuja, G. (2000). Collaboration networks, structural holes, and innovation: A longitudinal
29
30 study. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 45(3), 425-457.
31
32
33 Baruch, Y. (1999). Response rate in academic studies: A comparative analysis. *Human*
34
35 *Relations*, 52(4), 421-438.
36
37
38 Borgatti, S. P., & Foster, P. C. (2003). The Network Paradigm in Organizational Research: A
39
40 Review and Typology. *Journal of Management*, 29(6), 991-1013.
41
42
43 Brouwer, A. E., Mariotti, I., & van Ommeren, J. N. (2004). The firm relocation decision: An
44
45 empirical investigation. *Annals of Regional Science*, 38(2), 335-347.
46
47
48 Burmeister, A., & Colletis-Wahl, K. (1997). Proximity in production networks: The
49
50 circulatory dimension. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 4(3), 231-241.
51
52
53 Cook, C., Heath, F., & Thompson, R. L. (2000). A meta-analysis of response rates in Web- or
54
55 internet-based surveys. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 60(6), 821-836.
56
57
58 Van Dijk, J., & Pellenbarg, P. H. (2000). Firm relocation decisions in the Netherlands: An
59
60 ordered logit approach. *Papers in Regional Science*, 79(1), 191-219.

- 1
2
3 Dyer, J. H. (1996). Specialized supplier networks as a source of competitive advantage:
4
5 Evidence from the auto industry. *Strategic Management Journal*, 17(4), 271-291.
6
7
8 Gilsing, V., & Nooteboom, B. (2005). Density and strength of ties in innovation networks: an
9
10 analysis of multimedia and biotechnology. *European Management Review*, 2(3), 179-197.
11
12 Gnyawali, D. R., & Madhavan, R. (2001). Cooperative networks and competitive dynamics:
13
14 A structural embeddedness perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 26(3), 431-445.
15
16
17 Granovetter, M. S. (1973). The strength of weak ties. *The American Journal of Sociology*,
18
19 78(6), 1360-1380.
20
21
22 Granovetter, M. S. (1985). Economic action and social structure: The problem of
23
24 embeddedness. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 91(3), 481-510.
25
26
27 Holguin-Veras, J., Xu, N., Levinson, H. S., Paaswell, R. E., Mcknight, C. E., Weiner, R. D.,
28
29 Ozbay, K., & Ozmen-Ertekin, D. (2005). An investigation on the aggregate behavior of
30
31 firm relocations to New Jersey (1990-1999) and the underlying market elasticities.
32
33 *Networks and Spatial Economics*, 5(3), 293-331.
34
35
36 Holl, A. (2004). Start-ups and relocations: Manufacturing plant location in Portugal. *Papers*
37
38 *in Regional Science*, 83(4), 649-668.
39
40
41 Hoogstra, G. J., & van Dijk, J. (2004). Explaining firm employment growth: Does location
42
43 matter? *Small Business Economics*, 22(3-4), 179-192.
44
45
46 Kilkeny, M., Nalbarte, L., & Besser, T. (1999). Reciprocated community support and small
47
48 town - small business success. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 11(3), 231-
49
50 246.
51
52
53 Kim, T. Y., Oh, H., & Swaminathan, A. (2006). Framing interorganizational network change:
54
55 A network inertia perspective. *Academy Of Management Review*, 31(3), 704-720.
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Klassen, R. D., & Jacobs, J. (2001). Experimental comparison of Web, electronic and mail
4 survey technologies in operations management. *Journal of Operations Management*, 19(6),
5 713-728.
6
7
8
9
10 Knobens, J., & Oerlemans, L. A. G. (2006). Proximity and inter-organizational collaboration:
11 A literature review. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 8(2), 71-89.
12
13
14 Knobens, J., Oerlemans, L. A. G., & Rutten, R. P. J. H. (2006). Radical changes in inter-
15 organizational network structure: The longitudinal gap? *Technological Forecasting and*
16 *Social Change*, 73(4), 390-404.
17
18
19
20
21
22 Krackhardt, D. (1992). The Strength of Strong Ties: The Importance of Philos in
23 Organizations. In N. Nohria & R. G. Eccles (Eds.), *Networks and Organizations:*
24 *Structure, Form, and Action* (pp. 216-239). Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
25
26
27
28
29
30 Malmberg, A. (1997). Industrial geography: Location and learning. *Progress In Human*
31 *Geography*, 21(4), 573-582.
32
33
34 Medda, F., Nijkamp, P., & Rietveld, P. (1999). Urban industrial relocation: The theory of
35 edge cities. *Environment and Planning B*, 26(5), 751-761.
36
37
38
39 Morgan, K. (2004). The exaggerated death of geography: Learning, proximity and territorial
40 innovation systems. *Journal of Economic Geography*, 89(1), 3-21.
41
42
43
44 Moulaert, F., & Sekia, F. (2003). Territorial innovation models: A critical review. *Regional*
45 *Studies*, 37(3), 289-302.
46
47
48
49 Norušis. (2004). *SPSS 13.0 Advanced statistical procedures companion*. New Jersey: Prentice
50 Hall.
51
52
53 Oerlemans, L. A. G., & Meeus, M. T. H. (2005). Do organisational and spatial proximity
54 impact on firm performance? *Regional Studies*, 39(1), 89-104.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Oerlemans, L. A. G., Meeus, M. T. H., & Boekema, F. W. M. (2001). On the spatial
4 embeddedness of innovation networks: An exploration of the proximity effect. *Tijdschrift*
5
6
7
8
9
10 Oliver, A. L., & Ebers, M. (1998). Networking network studies: An analysis of conceptual
11
12 configurations in the study of inter-organizational relationships. *Organization Studies*,
13
14
15
16
17
18 Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G. R. (1978). *The external control of organizations: A resource*
19
20
21
22
23 Rallet, A., & Torre, A. (1999). Is geographical proximity necessary in the innovation
24
25 networks in the era of global economy? *GeoJournal*, 49(4), 373-380.
26
27
28 Romo, F. P., & Schwartz, M. (1995). The structural embeddedness of business decisions: The
29
30 migration of manufacturing plants in New York state, 1960 to 1985. *American*
31
32
33
34 Rooks, G., Oerlemans, L., Buys, A., & Pretorius, T. (2005). Industrial innovation in South
35
36 Africa: a comparative study. *South African Journal of Science*, 101(3-4), 149-150.
37
38
39 Sakamoto, Y. (1991). *Categorical data analysis by AIC*. Tokyo: KTK Scientific Publishers.
40
41
42 Saviotti, P. P. (1998). On the dynamics of appropriability, of tacit and of codified knowledge.
43
44
45
46
47 Schmenner, R. W. (1980). Choosing new industrial capacity: On-site expansion, branching,
48
49 and relocation. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 95, 103-119.
50
51
52 Schutjens, V. A. J. M., & Stam, E. (2003). The evolution and nature of young firm networks:
53
54 a longitudinal perspective. *Small Business Economics*, 21, 115-134.
55
56
57
58
59
60 Stam, F. C. (2003). *Why butterflies don't leave: Locational evolution of evolving enterprises*.
Utrecht: Utrecht University.

- 1
2
3 Van Steen, P. J. M. (1998). *Bedrijvenlandschap 2000+*. Groningen: Rijksuniversiteit
4
5 Groningen.
6
7
8 Torre, A., & Rallet, A. (2005). Proximity and localization. *Regional Studies*, 39(1), 47-59.
9
10 Verbeek, M. (2004). *A guide to modern econometrics* (2d ed.). Chichester: Wiley & Sons.
11
12 Wasserman, S., & Faust, K. (1994). *Social Network Analysis: Methods and Applications*.
13
14 Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
15
16
17 Williamson, O. E. (1981). The economics of organization: The transaction cost approach.
18
19 *American Journal of Sociology*, 87, 548-577.
20
21
22 Van Wissen, L. J. G. (2002). Demography of the Firm: A useful metaphor? *European Journal*
23
24 *of Population*, 18(3), 263-281.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure 1. Conceptual framework




Table 1. Non-response analysis

	Respondents	Non-Respondents	Difference	Significance
Propensity to relocate	Percent	Percent	Percent	p-value
0 (0%)	31	38	7	0,36 ^a
1 (1 to 11%)	22	19	-3	
2 (11 to 25%)	13	10	-3	
3 (26 to 50%)	8	7	-1	
4 (51 to 75%)	7	5	-2	
5 (76 to 90%)	6	5	-1	
6 (91 to 99%)	3	3	0	
7 (100%)	12	12	0	
Mean	2,2	2,1	-0,1	
	Respondents	Non-Respondents	Difference	Significance
Size of the firm				
Mean	23,5	33,5	5,9	0,21 ^b
Variance	1603,3	7253,2		
Presence of innovative partnerships	Percent	Percent	Percent	
Mean	56	51	-5,00	0,29 ^c
a: Mann-Whitney U-test				
b: T-test				
c: Phi-test				

Table 2. Respondents compared to whole population

	Total Sample	Response	Difference	Significance
Spatial distribution (by province)	Percent	Percent	Percent	p-value
Drenthe	1,4	1,0	-0,4	0,18 ^a
Flevoland	2,7	2,5	-0,2	
Friesland	1,6	2,0	0,4	
Gelderland	11,6	13,4	1,8	
Groningen	2,3	1,5	-0,8	
Limburg	3,5	5,5	2,0	
Noord-Brabant	14,1	20,9	6,8	
Noord-Holland	20,6	14,4	-6,2	
Overijssel	4,6	5,0	0,4	
Utrecht	13,0	10,9	-2,1	
Zeeland	0,6	0,5	-0,1	
Zuid-Holland	24,1	22,4	-1,7	
<hr/>				
Relocation behavior	Percent	Percent	Percent	p-value
% Movers (last 2 years)	23,2	23,9	0,7	0,82 ^a
% Movers (last 5 years)	39,3	40,8	1,5	0,66 ^a
<hr/>				
a: Chi-square test				

Table 3. Factor analysis: Tie strength

Variable	Factor	
	IOR intensity	IOR form
Scope	0,676	
Contact frequency	0,671	
Face to face contacts	0,618	
Level of specific investments	0,576	
Inverse duration		0,733
Level of formal control		0,754

Cronbach's alpha	0,548	0,457
------------------	-------	-------

KMO measure	0,639
Test of Sphericity	54,801
Significance	0,000
% of variance explained	52,099

Table 4. Factor analysis: Organizational proximity

	Factor
Variable	Organizational Proximity
Cultural proximity	0,859
Structural proximity	0,848
Relational proximity	0,453

Cronbach's alpha	0,558
------------------	-------

KMO measure	0,541
Test of Sphericity	47,075
Significance	0
% of variance explained	55,383

Table 5. Variables and definitions

Variable	Definition
Propensity to relocate	Likelihood that a firm will relocate within the next 2 years
Growth rate	Growth in employees (in FTE's) of a firm over the last two years
Growth rate squared	Squared growth in employees (in FTE's) of a firm over the last two years
Localization of operations (inputs)	Share of inputs that is drawn from within a radius of 20 km around the firm
Localization of operations (outputs)	Share of turnover that is generated within a radius of 20 km around the firm
Previous relocation (past 2 years)	Dummy variable coded "1" if the firm has relocated with the last two years and "0" otherwise
Firm size (ln)	Natural logarithm of the amount of employees (in FTE's) that work in a firm
Lack of room for expansion	Dummy variable coded "1" if the firm has insufficient room for expansion for the next two years and "0" otherwise
Site ownership	Dummy variable coded "1" if the firm owns the building in which it is presently located and "0" otherwise
Travel time to nearest highway	Travel time in minutes to the nearest highway ramp (by car)
Travel time to nearest transport hub	Travel time in minutes to the nearest public transport hub (by car)
Type of area	Type of area the firm is located in, coded "1" if the firm is located in a residential area or city center and "0" otherwise
Level of urbanization	Level of urbanization of the municipality the firm is located in
Total # of IORs	Total number of direct innovative inter-organizational relations maintained by a firm (i.e. its degree centrality)
% of localized external sources	Share of total external knowledge sources employed by the firm that is located with a 20 km radius around the firm
# of IORs * organizational proximity	The degree centrality of a firm times the level of organizational proximity with its main partner
# of IORs * tie strength (intensity)	The degree centrality of a firm times the tie strength with its main partner
# of IORs * tie strength (form)	The degree centrality of a firm times the tie form with its main partner
% of localized external sources * organizational proximity	The localization of a firm's external knowledge sources times the level of organizational proximity with its main partner
% of localized external sources * tie strength (intensity)	The localization of a firm's external knowledge sources times the tie strength with its main partner
% of localized external sources * tie strength (form)	The localization of a firm's external knowledge sources times the tie form with its main partner

Table 6. Descriptive statistics

Variable	All respondents				Respondents with 1 or more IORs			
	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Std. Deviation	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Std. Deviation
Propensity to relocate	2,22	0	7	2,36	2,28	0	7	2,40
Growth rate	19%	-45%	500%	56%	25%	-45%	500%	71%
Growth rate squared	3495%	0%	250000%	25030%	5666%	0%	250000%	33185%
Localization of operations (inputs)	1,68	0	5	1,25	1,67	0	5	1,24
Localization of operations (outputs)	1,75	0	5	1,18	1,67	0	5	1,16
Previous relocation (past 2 years)	0,24	0	1	0,43	0,29	0	1	0,45
Firm size (ln)	2,55	0,41	5,62	1,00	2,60	0,69	5,42	0,96
Lack of room for expansion	0,29	0	1	0,46	0,31	0	1	0,46
Site ownership	0,15	0	1	0,36	0,13	0	1	0,34
Travel time to nearest highway	7,28	0,5	30	5,68	7,30	1	30	6,04
Travel time to nearest transport hub	12,91	1	45	7,81	12,73	1	45	8,24
Type of area	0,81	0	1	0,39	0,79	0	1	0,41
Level of urbanization	2,53	1	5	1,18	2,44	1	5	1,18
Total # of IORs	1,24	0	10	1,70	2,17	1	10	1,74
% of localized external sources	19%	0	100	26%	17%	0	100	24%
# of IORs * organizational proximity	-	-	-	-	-0,05	-8,15	9,81	2,44
# of IORs * tie strength (intensity)	-	-	-	-	0,41	-6,02	22,44	3,23
# of IORs * tie strength (form)	-	-	-	-	-0,11	-7,49	11,70	2,42
% of localized external sources * organizational proximity	-	-	-	-	0,03	-0,70	1,43	0,25
% of localized external sources * tie strength (intensity)	-	-	-	-	0,03	-1,93	0,78	0,29
% of localized external sources * tie strength (form)	-	-	-	-	-0,01	-1,35	2,05	0,32

Table 7. Correlation matrices

Whole sample									
Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1 Growth rate	-								
2 Growth rate squared	0,91***	-							
3 Localization of operations (inputs)	-0,04	-0,06	-						
4 Localization of operations (outputs)	-0,07	-0,07	0,41**	-					
5 Firm size (ln)	-0,03	-0,08	-0,07	-0,18*	-				
6 Travel time to nearest highway	-0,10	-0,07	-0,10	-0,09	-0,18*	-			
7 Travel time to nearest transport hub	0,00	0,01	-0,02	-0,03	-0,03	0,18*	-		
8 Level of urbanization	0,02	0,10	-0,23**	-0,15*	-0,18*	0,10	0,12	-	
9 Total # of IORs	0,06	0,05	-0,04	-0,09	0,22**	-0,02	0,07	-0,07	-
10 % of localized external sources	-0,05	-0,07	0,23**	0,36**	-0,07	-0,02	0,03	-0,15*	-0,02

Firms with one or more IORs only

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1 Growth rate	-														
2 Growth rate squared	0,94***	-													
3 Localization of operations (inputs)	-0,05	-0,08	-												
4 Localization of operations (outputs)	-0,10	-0,08	0,36**	-											
5 Firm size (ln)	-0,12	-0,13	-0,12	-0,15	-										
6 Travel time to nearest highway	-0,12	-0,09	-0,10	-0,04	-0,16	-									
7 Travel time to nearest transport hub	0,02	0,01	-0,07	-0,01	0,08	0,19*	-								
8 Level of urbanization	0,09	0,15	-0,22*	-0,10	-0,14	0,08	0,08	-							
9 Total # of IORs	-0,03	-0,02	-0,07	-0,08	0,33**	-0,04	0,14	-0,03	-						
10 % of localized external sources	-0,05	-0,09	0,19*	0,34**	-0,09	0,09	0,02	-0,23*	0,05	-					
11 # of IORs * organizational proximity	0,06	0,05	0,16	0,16	0,16	0,02	-0,13	-0,06	-0,09	0,12	-				
12 # of IORs * tie strength (intensity)	-0,06	-0,08	-0,06	0,05	0,19*	0,03	0,03	-0,03	0,45**	0,11	-0,01	-			
13 # of IORs * tie strength (form)	0,13	0,12	-0,01	0,04	-0,19*	0,03	0,11	0,02	0,02	-0,11	-0,33**	0,01	-		
14 % of localized external sources * organizational proximity	-0,04	-0,03	0,03	0,10	0,05	0,02	-0,07	-0,03	0,02	0,09	0,59***	0,12	-0,14	-	
15 % of localized external sources * tie strength (intensity)	0,02	-0,01	0,00	0,29**	0,05	0,00	-0,10	0,02	0,18	0,05	0,16	0,41**	-0,06	0,07	-
16 % of localized external sources * tie strength (form)	0,11	0,03	0,00	0,05	-0,08	0,22*	0,03	0,06	-0,10	-0,13	-0,11	-0,04	0,45**	-0,11	-0,06

*: significant at the 10% level
 **: significant at the 5% level
 ***: significant at the 1% level

Table 8. Ordered logit regression results

	All respondents		Respondents with one or more IORs only			
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6
Firm internal characteristics						
Growth rate	1,700***	1,748***	1,716**	1,895**	2,261**	1,452*
Growth rate squared	-0,398***	-0,404***	-0,401**	-0,439**	-0,509***	-0,360**
Localization of operations (inputs)	0,046	0,061	-0,009	0,019	0,090	0,042
Localization of operations (output)	-0,249**	-0,216*	-0,334*	-0,561***	-0,317*	-0,556***
Previous relocation (past 2 years)	-0,528*	-0,544*	-0,751*	-0,864**	-0,805*	-0,916*
Firm size (ln)	-0,268*	-0,215	-0,301	-0,006	-0,020	-0,023
Characteristics of the building						
Lack of room for expansion	2,374***	2,436***	2,249***	2,656***	2,968***	2,740***
Site ownership	-0,605*	-0,624*	-0,789	-0,728	-0,797	-1,026*
Characteristics of the site						
Travel time to nearest highway	-0,026	-0,027	-0,024	-0,021	0,027	-0,002
Travel time to nearest public transport hub	0,016	0,022	0,035	0,047*	0,045*	0,056**
Type of area	-0,171	-0,232	0,033	-0,050	0,193	0,155
Characteristics of the region						
Level of urbanization	-0,174	-0,213*	-0,319*	-0,395**	-0,422**	-0,415**
Structural characteristics						
Total # of IORs		-0,186**		-0,561***	-0,640***	-0,641***
% of localized external sources		-0,764		-1,363	-1,704**	-1,392
Relational characteristics						
Organizational proximity * # of IORs					-0,052	
Tie strength (intensity) * # of IORs					0,023	
Tie strength (form) * # of IORs					-0,013	
Organizational proximity * % localized external sources						1,364*
Tie strength (intensity) * % localized external sources						0,740
Tie strength (form) * % localized external sources						1,302**
Model statistics						
-2 Log likelihood	652,931	646,485	354,838	335,282	312,703	320,634
Restricted Log likelihood	734,135	734,135	409,882	409,882	394,429	394,429
Test of parallel lines	0,555	0,177	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
Nagelkerke's Pseudo R-squared	33,5%	36,6%	38,6%	49,6%	54,2%	53,9%
Significance	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000
Akaike's Information Criterion (AIC)	676,931	674,485	378,838	363,282	346,703	354,634
N	203	203	109	109	109	109

*: significant at the 10% level

**: significant at the 5% level

***: significant at the 1% level