



HAL
open science

Geographies of Knowledge Formation in Advanced Producer Services: Some Evidence from the Dutch Randstad

Bart Lambregts

► **To cite this version:**

Bart Lambregts. Geographies of Knowledge Formation in Advanced Producer Services: Some Evidence from the Dutch Randstad. *Regional Studies*, 2008, 42 (08), pp.1173-1186. 10.1080/00343400802360402. hal-00514717

HAL Id: hal-00514717

<https://hal.science/hal-00514717>

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.



**Geographies of Knowledge Formation in Advanced Producer Services:
Some Evidence from the Dutch Randstad**

Journal:	<i>Regional Studies</i>
Manuscript ID:	CRES-2006-0249.R2
Manuscript Type:	Main Section
JEL codes:	D21 - Firm Behavior < D2 - Production and Organizations < D - Microeconomics, D83 - Search Learning Information and Knowledge < D8 - Information and Uncertainty < D - Microeconomics, F23 - Multinational Firms International Business < F2 - International Factor Movements and International Business < F - International Economics, L8 - Industry Studies: Services < L - Industrial Organization
Keywords:	knowledge relationships, advanced producer services, multi-office firms , geography, regional competitiveness, Randstad



1
2
3 **Geographies of Knowledge Formation in Mega City–Regions: Some Evidence**
4
5
6
7 **from the Dutch Randstad**
8
9

10
11
12
13 **Bart Lambregts**
14

15
16 **Amsterdam institute for Metropolitan and International Development Studies**
17

18
19 **(AMIDSt), University of Amsterdam, Nieuwe Prinsengracht 130, 1018VZ**
20

21
22 **Amsterdam, the Netherlands. E-mail: b.lambregts@uva.nl.**
23

24
25 **First received: October 2006**
26

27
28 **Accepted: April 2008**
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 *Abstract*
5
6

7 An important source of competitiveness for mega city–regions results from
8
9
10 their capacity to combine a strong local knowledge capital base with high
11
12
13 levels of connectivity to similar regions elsewhere in the global economy.
14
15
16 Globally networked advanced producer services firms are presumed to play a
17
18
19 key role in transferring knowledge between local and global circuits. But how
20
21
22 does this actually work? Which kinds of knowledge may be acquired through
23
24
25 global networks and which others not? An in–depth analysis of the practices
26
27
28 of knowledge production by advanced producer services firms in the mega
29
30
31 city–region of the Randstad provides some answers.
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 Keywords: Mega city–regions, knowledge relationships, advanced producer
39
40
41 services, multi–office firms, regional competitiveness, the Randstad
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 JEL codes: D21, D83, F23, L8
49

50 Des géographies de la formation de la connaissance dans des mégalo­poles:
51 des preuves provenant de la Hollande Randstad
52
53

54
55 Lambregts
56
57

58
59 Une source importante de compétitivité pour les mégalo­poles provient de leur capacité à
60 combiner une base de connaissance locale forte avec des niveaux de connectivité aux régions
similaires quelque part ailleurs dans l'économie mondialisée. Les sociétés de services avancés

à l'industrie qui sont en réseau sur le plan mondial sont censées jouer un rôle clé dans le transfert de la connaissance entre des circuits locaux et mondiaux. Mais il faut se poser les questions suivantes. Comment est-ce que cela se déroule dans la réalité? Quelle connaissance est-ce que on peut ou est-ce qu'on ne peut pas acquérir par le canal des réseaux mondialisés? Une analyse approfondie des méthodes de production de la connaissance par les sociétés de services avancés à l'industrie situées dans les mégapoles de la Randstad fournit quelques réponses.

Mégapoles / Rapports de connaissance / Services avancés à l'industrie / Sociétés à bureaux multiples / Compétitivité régionale / Randstad

Classement JEL: D21; D83; F23; L8

Geografien der Wissensbildung in Megastadtregionen: Belege aus der Randstad in Holland

Bart Lambregts

Abstract

Ein wichtiger Faktor der Wettbewerbsfähigkeit von Megastadtregionen liegt in ihrer Kapazität begründet, eine starke lokale Wissenskapitalbasis mit einem hohen Maß an Verknüpfung mit ähnlichen Regionen an anderen Orten der globalen Wirtschaft zu kombinieren. Es wird angenommen, dass weltweit vernetzte Wirtschaftsdienstleister bei der Übertragung von Wissen zwischen lokalen und globalen Kreisläufen eine zentrale Rolle spielen. Doch wie funktioniert dies in der Praxis? Welche Arten von Wissen lassen sich über globale Netzwerke erwerben und welche anderen nicht? Eine intensive Analyse der Praktiken der Wissensproduktion durch Wirtschaftsdienstleister in der Megastadtregion Randstad liefert einige Antworten.

Keywords:

Megastadtregionen

Wissensbeziehungen

Wirtschaftsdienstleistungen

Firmen mit mehreren Filialen

Regionale Wettbewerbsfähigkeit

Randstad

JEL codes: D21, D83, F23, L8

Geografías de la formación de conocimiento en las regiones mega-ciudad: algunos ejemplos del Randstad en Holanda

Bart Lambregts

Abstract

Un factor importante de la competitividad de las regiones mega-ciudades radica en la capacidad de combinar una base sólida de capital de conocimientos locales con altos niveles de conectividad para regiones similares en otras partes de la economía global. Se supone que las empresas de los servicios avanzados de productores con redes en todo el mundo desempeñan un papel fundamental en transferir conocimientos entre circuitos locales y globales. Pero ¿cómo funciona esto en la práctica? ¿Qué tipos de conocimientos podrían adquirirse a través de redes globales y cuáles no? Un análisis exhaustivo de los métodos de producción de conocimientos

1
2
3 por parte de empresas de servicios avanzados al productor en la región mega-
4 ciudad de Randstad nos ofrece algunas respuestas.

5
6 Keywords:

7 Regiones mega-ciudad

8 Relaciones de conocimiento

9 Servicios avanzados de productores

10 Empresas con varias oficinas

11 Competitividad regional

12 El Randstad

13
14
15 JEL codes: D21, D83, F23, L8
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 INTRODUCTION

24
25
26 In today's knowledge intensive economy, the competitiveness of regions is
27
28 highly dependent on the capacity of actors located within them to generate
29
30 leading edge knowledge. In generating state-of-the-art knowledge, however,
31
32 no city or region can be constantly self-supporting. No matter how
33
34 'knowledgeable' and creative a region's economic agents are, it is rather
35
36 likely that elsewhere in the world particular pieces of new and valuable
37
38 knowledge are formed either just a little bit earlier or in just a slightly more
39
40 advanced form. Regions that combine a strong local knowledge capital base
41
42 (sustained by a healthy 'local buzz') with high levels of connectivity to similar
43
44 regions elsewhere in the global economy ('global pipelines') are best off in
45
46 this matter (SIMMIE, 2003; BATHELT et al., 2004).
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Global or mega city–regions (from here referred to as MCRs), in their
5
6
7 capacity as ‘basic motors of the global economy’ (SCOTT, 2001, p.4), should
8
9
10 have such qualities almost by definition. After all they stand out as regional
11
12
13 accumulations of (economic) mass and opportunity and they are typically
14
15
16 very well tied into the global economy (SCOTT et al., 2001; HALL and PAIN,
17
18
19 2006). Their local knowledge bases should be rich enough to fuel a
20
21
22 continuous process of leading edge knowledge formation and the myriad
23
24
25 external relationships maintained by their many internationally oriented and
26
27
28 globally networked firms should ensure that new and valuable bits of
29
30
31 knowledge created elsewhere quickly find their way to these regions as well.
32
33

34
35 MCRs’ external knowledge relationships may be maintained by a variety of
36
37
38 (economic) actors, including universities and research institutes,
39
40
41 governmental agencies and firms. Advanced producer services firms
42
43
44 [endnote no. 1] form a particularly interesting category among these. After
45
46
47 all, advanced producer services (from here referred to as APS) have over the
48
49
50 past three decades rapidly evolved into a very central and highly knowledge–
51
52
53 intensive feature of today’s post–industrial economy and the firms have
54
55
56 emerged as active agents in the creation and circulation of knowledge in
57
58
59 local and regional economies (COFFEY, 2000; SASSEN, 2001; Wood, 2002;
60

1
2
3
4 UNCTAD, 2004). In many of Europe's most urbanised regions, APS now make
5
6
7 up 15 to 30 percent of the local employment base with the highest scores
8
9
10 reached in such typical MCRs as South East England, the Paris region, the
11
12
13 Brussels Capital Region and the Dutch Randstad (EUROSTAT, 2006;
14
15
16 RUBALCABA and GAGO, 2003). The APS firms find in MCRs the human
17
18
19 resources and the client base that they so critically need and through their
20
21
22 active role in investment, innovation and technical change, the firms actively
23
24
25 facilitate the continuous adaptation of the MCR's production system.
26
27
28 Moreover, the 'global players' among the APS firms through their
29
30
31 transnational office networks maintain a great many of relations with other
32
33
34 centres of knowledge creation all over the world (TAYLOR, 2004) and as such
35
36
37 may be conceived as - at least potentially - strongly constitutive to MCRs'
38
39
40 external knowledge linkages.
41
42
43

44
45 Yet, while such notions may sound rather straightforward, they are in
46
47
48 principle not much more than a set of interconnected ideas and assumptions.
49
50
51 There is empirical support for parts of it (e.g. APS firms do tend to
52
53
54 concentrate in large urban agglomerations or MCRs), but less so for others
55
56
57 (cf. COE, 2003). Much remains to be explored. Unanswered questions include
58
59
60 those about the extent to which APS firms' transnational office networks are

1
2
3
4 used indeed for the exchange of knowledge, the kinds of knowledge that are
5
6
7 typically acquired and exchanged through these networks, the kinds of
8
9
10 knowledge of which the acquisition is typically a local affair, and the ways in
11
12
13 which intra- and extra-regional knowledge circuits interconnect. These are
14
15
16 the questions that occupy centre stage in this article and they will be
17
18
19 addressed by looking at the knowledge exchanging activities of
20
21
22 internationally networked APS firms in the Dutch MCR of the Randstad. The
23
24
25 Randstad is Europe's fourth or fifth regional economy measured by gross
26
27
28 regional product, a major APS stronghold, and a particularly multifaceted and
29
30
31 well-connected space economy (LAMBREGTS et al., 2006; TAYLOR, 2002),
32
33
34 and as such makes an interesting case. The analysis is meant to contribute to
35
36
37 our understanding of how a key group of economic actors organises its
38
39
40 knowledge practices and by means thereof helps MCRs to stay at the
41
42
43 forefront of knowledge developments.
44
45
46

47
48 The article is structured as follows. Section 2 digs deeper into the
49
50
51 relationship between knowledge and geography. It briefly discusses some of
52
53
54 the key literature dealing with knowledge generating practices in regional
55
56
57 contexts and takes due note of some recent contributions that emphasise the
58
59
60 importance of relational as opposed to spatial proximity in the theorization

1
2
3
4 of knowledge formation. Next, we take note of the dynamics of knowledge
5
6
7 formation in transnational multi-office firms, borrowing from such
8
9
10 disciplines as international business studies and organisational sciences. In
11
12
13 the fourth section, the specific knowledge needs of APS firms are identified
14
15
16 and transformed into a typology of knowledge domains relevant to APS firms.
17
18
19 This typology structures the empirical analysis of the knowledge practices of
20
21
22 multi-office APS firms in the Randstad. This analysis, which takes up the fifth
23
24
25 section, draws from the insights gained through some 64 in-depth interviews
26
27
28 with Randstad-based APS firms. The article concludes with a discussion of
29
30
31 the implications for theory and policy.
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 FROM SPATIALLY BOUNDED TO TRANS-SCALAR GEOGRAPHIES OF 39 40 41 KNOWLEDGE CREATION 42

43
44
45 In 2005, businesses in the Randstad were responsible for 32 percent of R&D
46
47
48 performed in the Netherlands (STATISTICS NETHERLANDS, 2007). The
49
50
51 Netherlands as a whole at that time conducted no more than one percent of
52
53
54 world R&D (OECD, 2007). For the Randstad this means that the ratio between
55
56
57 R&D performed within and beyond its boundaries is close to 1:300. Even if all
58
59
60 of the region's businesses would qualify as extremely alert and advanced, it

1
2
3
4 is still rather likely that valuable pieces of knowledge in many cases are
5
6 developed just a little bit earlier or in a slightly more advanced form
7
8
9
10 somewhere else in the Netherlands or, more likely even, elsewhere in the
11
12 world. And with the share of non-OECD countries in the production of world
13
14 R&D having increased from eight to twenty percent between 1995 and 2006
15
16 (OECD, 2007), the importance of such places 'elsewhere in the world' will
17
18 probably only increase in the years to come.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 This example serves well to illustrate that few cities or regions, not even a
27
28 substantial regional economy as the Dutch Randstad , can assume to be fully
29
30 self-supporting in terms of state-of-the-art knowledge creation. Claims like
31
32 these have recently both been theorised (e.g. BATHELT et al., 2004) as well as
33
34 tentatively empirically explored. For example, SIMMIE (2002, 2003) indeed
35
36 finds a (positive) relationship between the innovativeness of firms and the
37
38 reach of their networks and linkages. He argues that for the most innovative
39
40 firms national and international customers are the most important sources of
41
42 knowledge and concludes that '[a]s no region has a monopoly on new
43
44 knowledge those that form nodes in national and international systems of
45
46 knowledge exchanges benefit from both high levels of local knowledge
47
48 capital and being the first to receive and decode new knowledge from other
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 similar nodes' (SIMMIE, 2003, p. 618). Obviously, and as noted by BATHELT
4
5
6
7 *et al.* (2004) these benefits become more substantial as the agents that are
8
9 actually involved in receiving and decoding this knowledge are better capable
10
11 of transmitting the newly acquired knowledge to other actors operating in
12
13 their direct surroundings.
14
15
16
17

18
19 The kinds of knowledge referred to in these arguments include both
20
21 'explicit' knowledge - to which access is becoming easier anyway - *and* 'tacit'
22
23 knowledge. Tacit knowledge is the kind of knowledge that is 'person-
24
25 embodied, context-dependent, spatially sticky and socially accessible only
26
27 through direct physical interaction' (MORGAN, 2004, p. 12). It differs from
28
29 explicit knowledge in that it 'is difficult to communicate effectively through
30
31 written - and sometimes even verbal - form'; 'often resides in the
32
33 unconscious realm of knowledge'; and is 'context-specific' (GERTLER, 2003,
34
35 p. 105-106). The central idea is that it is formed relationally and that its
36
37 formation and transmission depend on 'close and deep interaction' between
38
39 parties who already share some basic similarities such as the same language;
40
41 common codes of communication; shared conventions and norms; and
42
43 personal knowledge of each other based on a past history of successful
44
45 collaboration or informal interaction (*ibid.*, p. 106). Explicit and tacit
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 knowledge are complementary categories. Often it needs tacit insights to
5
6
7 meaningfully interpret explicit knowledge and it is often from the interaction
8
9
10 between explicit and tacit knowledge that new knowledge is created
11
12
13 (NONAKA et al., 2000). While 'a firm's ability to produce, access and control
14
15
16 tacit knowledge' is widely considered to be 'most important to its
17
18
19 competitive success' (GERTLER, 2003, p. 106), the question to what extent
20
21
22 tacit knowledge can be transmitted and formed over longer distances and
23
24
25 across boundaries is currently the subject of a lively debate.
26
27
28

29 Since the 1980s, an extensive body of literature has emerged on the
30
31
32 spatiality of innovation and learning. Until recently, this literature was
33
34
35 dominated by perspectives that see a strong link between knowledge
36
37
38 diffusion and spatial proximity. Examples include knowledge-based theories
39
40
41 of spatial clustering (e.g. MASKELL et al., 1998; MALMBERG and MASKELL,
42
43
44 2002), the learning regions thesis (e.g. MORGAN, 1997) and the systems of
45
46
47 innovation literature (e.g. LUNDVALL and JOHNSON, 1994; COOKE et al.,
48
49
50 1998). In a nutshell, these theories, each with its own emphasis, build upon
51
52
53 the notion that the basic similarities referred to above are especially likely to
54
55
56 emerge if the actors involved are part of the same spatially confined
57
58
59 environment and thus have been shaped by the same unique combination of
60

1
2
3
4 socio-economic, cultural and institutional conditions – a factor emphasized
5
6
7 by the systems of innovation literature notably – and thus are able to meet
8
9
10 each other in person relatively frequently. Over time, such conditions may
11
12
13 prove conducive to the (path-dependent) formation of (increasingly) distinct
14
15
16 and localised ‘ecologies’ of knowledge formation that potential imitators in
17
18
19 other regions may find very difficult to follow (GERTLER, 2003). A key
20
21
22 characteristic of such ecologies is that they produce (assumedly) likewise
23
24
25 spatially bounded knowledge spillovers. These are knowledge externalities
26
27
28 that enable their beneficiaries ‘to introduce innovations at a faster rate than
29
30
31 rival firms located elsewhere’ (BRESCHI and LISSONI, 2001) and as such have
32
33
34 come to be seen as important determinants of local and regional
35
36
37 competitiveness (MALMBERG and MASKELL, 2002) and an important
38
39
40 agglomerative force (GORDON and MCCANN, 2000).
41
42
43

44
45 During the past decade or so, however, a growing number of authors have
46
47
48 started to ask if these readings of the spatiality of knowledge diffusion and
49
50
51 creation do not put too high a premium on spatial proximity (e.g. OINAS,
52
53
54 2000; COE and BUNNELL, 2003; AMIN and COHENDET, 2004; BATHELT et al.,
55
56
57 2004; BOSCHMA, 2005). They share the concern that knowledge generating
58
59
60 processes have come to be understood too narrowly as highly localised or

1
2
3
4 'island' activities and that 'internal links and/or "home-base" characteristics,
5
6 distinguishable from external and distant or omnipresent forces' have come
7
8 to be seen too selectively and partially as the main factors driving business
9
10 creativity and performance (AMIN and COHENDET, 2004, p. 92). In response,
11
12 these authors, each in his or her way, call for greater sensitivity to the
13
14 existing variety of geographical contexts in which knowledge tends to be
15
16 formed and circulated. While acknowledging: a) that the formation and
17
18 sharing of (tacit) knowledge depends indeed primarily on the existence of
19
20 'thick' relationships in which people are able to 'internalize shared
21
22 understandings or [...] translate particular performances on the basis of their
23
24 own tacit and codified understandings' (ALLEN, 2000, p. 28); and b) that
25
26 spatial proximity does actually increase the likelihood of regular encounters
27
28 and the development of 'thick' relationships between actors; they also argue
29
30 that 'geographical proximity per se is neither a necessary nor a sufficient
31
32 condition for learning to take place' (BOSCHMA, 2005, p. 62). Support for
33
34 this viewpoint comes from the 'communities of practice' literature (e.g.
35
36 WENGER, 1998; WENGER and SNYDER, 2000), which contends that tacit
37
38 knowledge 'may also flow across regional and national boundaries if
39
40 organizational or "virtual community" proximity is close enough' (GERTLER,
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 2003, p. 106), and from increasingly credible indications that, enabled by
5
6
7 ever more sophisticated means of communication and ease of travel, learning
8
9
10 and knowledge sharing do in fact take place between persons or
11
12
13 communities that are distant but linked through cultural, ideological,
14
15
16 occupational or organisational affinities and ties (AMIN and COHENDET,
17
18
19 2004; COE and BUNNELL, 2003).
20
21

22
23 The geography of knowledge formation that results from these views is
24
25
26 trans-scalar rather than made up of constructs implying a high degree of
27
28
29 spatial boundedness (e.g. 'islands of innovation', 'clusters', 'districts'). For
30
31
32 example, COE and BUNNELL (2003) consider the making of a priori
33
34
35 presumptions as to how the configurations of knowledge generating network
36
37
38 relations are spatially bounded simply unproductive. Instead they view
39
40
41 innovation systems as 'combination[s] of intra-local, extra-local and
42
43
44 transnational network connections, the exact balance of which is an empirical
45
46
47 outcome that will vary from place to place, and sector to sector' (ibid.,
48
49
50 p.454). AMIN and COHENDET (2004, p. 93), likewise, envision knowledge
51
52
53 practices as 'tracings in criss-crossing and overlapping networks of varying
54
55
56 length and reach' so as to allow individual sites to be understood as 'node[s]
57
58
59 of multiple knowledge connections of varying intensity and spatial distance'.
60

1
2
3
4 Below, while exploring the knowledge practices of APS firms in the Dutch
5
6
7 Randstad such notions will be firmly kept in mind.
8
9

10 11 12 **KNOWLEDGE CREATION AND THE TRANSNATIONAL MULTI-OFFICE FIRM** 13

14
15
16 In the literature on the functioning of trans-scalar or 'stretched' knowledge
17
18 relationships much attention is given to the knowledge practices of
19
20 (transnational) multi-office firms. The latter are seen as organisational forms
21
22 that pre-eminently facilitate practices of both 'decentred learning in local
23
24 communities' and 'distanced learning' across corporate space and, as
25
26 such, may be suspected of playing an important role in interconnecting
27
28 different regional innovation systems (COE and BUNNELL, 2003). While
29
30 (transnational) multi-office firms are a heterogeneous lot, they all try hard 'to
31
32 hold various knowledge architectures in place' and seek to achieve relational
33
34 proximity across their distant sites 'through translation, travel, shared
35
36 routines, talk, common passions, base standards, brokers, epistemic and
37
38 community bonding, and the ordering and orientation provided by files,
39
40 documents, codes, common software and so on' (AMIN and COHENDET,
41
42 2004, p. 96, 99).
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 This does not mean, however, that knowledge gets transferred and formed
5
6
7 in such organisations without any resistance. Transnational corporations
8
9
10 have gradually come to be seen as to owe their existence at least in part to
11
12
13 their ability to transfer and exploit knowledge more efficiently than markets
14
15
16 (GUPTA and GOVINDARAJAN, 2000) but it is also recognised that the barriers
17
18
19 to knowledge transfer are many and substantial (e.g. KOGUT and ZANDER,
20
21
22 1993; FROST, 2001; SCHULZ, 2001; HANSEN, 2002). FOSS and PEDERSEN
23
24
25 (2002), for example, consider the success of knowledge transfer to be a
26
27
28 function of a) motivational factors; b) the existence and richness of
29
30
31 transmission channels; c) the characteristics of the transferred knowledge
32
33
34 (e.g. in terms of tacitness, ambiguity, context-relatedness) and d) the
35
36
37 recipients' absorptive capacity. Motivational factors can work both against
38
39
40 and in favour of effective knowledge transfer. Depending on a corporation's
41
42
43 culture and the nature of the relationships between its individual units, units
44
45
46 may either feel that they have something to lose (e.g. bargaining power, a
47
48
49 competitive edge) by passing on knowledge to other subsidiaries or the
50
51
52 headquarters or know that they will gain something if they manifest
53
54
55 themselves as active knowledge transmitters (e.g. recognition, status,
56
57
58 influence, knowledge shared by other returning the favour).
59
60

1
2
3
4 The knowledge creation process itself, in turn, has been carefully modelled
5
6
7 by NONAKA et al. (2000). They view organisations as continuously concerned
8
9
10 with creating and re-creating knowledge and define knowledge itself as
11
12
13 dynamic, context-specific, humanistic and relational. Knowledge, after all,
14
15
16 they argue: 'is created in social interactions amongst individuals and
17
18
19 organisations', has meaning in a 'particular time and space' only, is
20
21
22 'essentially related to human action' and becomes valuable when it is
23
24
25 'interpreted by [...] and given a context and anchored in the beliefs and
26
27
28 commitments of individuals' (ibid., p. 7). Knowledge creation is understood
29
30
31 by these authors as a dynamic process shaped through the interactions
32
33
34 between explicit and tacit knowledge. Such interactions lead to knowledge
35
36
37 conversions of which NONAKA et al. (p. 9-10) identify four modes:
38
39
40 socialisation; externalisation; combination; and internalisation. Socialisation
41
42
43 refers to the process whereby tacit knowledge gets shared (e.g. through
44
45
46 sharing experiences in communities of practice or through the interaction
47
48
49 between client and producer in the production of a service) and converted to
50
51
52 form new tacit knowledge. Externalisation concerns the process of
53
54
55 articulating tacit knowledge into explicit knowledge, as for example happens
56
57
58 in the presentation of new concepts in a product development process.
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

Combination is the process of converting 'basic' explicit knowledge into more complex and systematic sets of explicit knowledge. It includes such processes as the putting together of explicit knowledge from many different sources in one context and the further dissemination of the new knowledge product. Internalisation, finally, is the process where explicit knowledge is assimilated into tacit knowledge. It occurs when individuals make themselves familiar with pieces of explicit knowledge, reflect upon them and, as such, enrich their tacit knowledge base. According to NONAKA et al. (2000), the knowledge creating process is a continuous process of dynamic interactions and shifts between all these different modes of knowledge conversion, whereby knowledge transmissions may take place both within and beyond organisational boundaries.

45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60

APS FIRMS' KNOWLEDGE NEEDS

Knowledge is a heterogeneous resource and the empirical study of knowledge generating practices full of challenges (AMIN and COHENDET, 2004). The above two sections have already produced the insight that making a priori presumptions about the spatiality of knowledge generating practices may not be productive and that the occurrence of various modes of

1
2
3
4 knowledge conversion should be anticipated. In addition to this, the
5
6
7 literature is riddled with different knowledge typologies (e.g. explicit versus
8
9
10 tacit knowledge, individual versus collective knowledge, general knowledge
11
12
13 versus specific knowledge), that may be of help to further direct an empirical
14
15
16 analysis. Not all of these, however, are equally practicable for our purpose.
17

18
19 Our aim, once again, is to empirically explore the knowledge
20
21
22 generating practices of (global) APS firms in the MCR of the Randstad. Such
23
24
25 an analysis, it could be argued, should also be sensitive to the specific
26
27
28 knowledge needs of such firms (cf. COE, 2003; LINDSAY et al., 2003). Much
29
30
31 of the literature on knowledge and multinational organizations is tuned to
32
33
34 the conditions pertaining to manufacturing firms. However, important
35
36
37 organizational differences exist between these firms and their antipodes in
38
39
40 the producer services domain. While global manufacturers typically roll out
41
42
43 their value chains across the world in search of the right match between
44
45
46 activity and locality, global services firms typically replicate (almost) the
47
48
49 entire value chain in each city or country of operation (MOORE and
50
51
52 BIRKINSHAW, 1998). Naturally, such differences also affect the knowledge
53
54
55 generating practices in such firms. Whereas the various units of a global
56
57
58 manufacturing firm are often engaged in distinct and highly specialised
59
60

1
2
3
4 (production and/or design) activities and, consequently, require and produce
5
6
7 very specific knowledge inputs and outputs, the units of a global advanced
8
9
10 producer services firm in many cases are involved in a much broader range of
11
12
13 activities and therefore face a much wider set of knowledge needs. The
14
15
16 knowledge concerns of, for example, a Dell or a Procter & Gamble global
17
18
19 production facility in Malaysia (or any other country) are likely to remain
20
21
22 confined mainly to issues relating to the management of the local production
23
24
25 process, local regulatory and labour market conditions and local logistics,
26
27
28 and not to spill into such fields as marketing and product development (since
29
30
31 other Dell or P&G units take care of that). The latter is not true for services
32
33
34 firms. A branch office of, for example, KPMG or Clifford Chance in
35
36
37 Amsterdam (or any other city), in order to be able to successfully service the
38
39
40 local market, not only needs to be familiar with local regulatory and labour
41
42
43 market conditions, but also should know all about the workings of the local
44
45
46 client market (marketing) and, in addition to that, make sure its service
47
48
49 products continue to satisfy local preferences and needs (product
50
51
52 development).
53
54
55

56
57
58 Generally speaking, the operations of a fully-fledged APS front-office
59
60 can be divided into three 'activity packages': the acquisition of new business,

1
2
3
4 the actual delivery (production) of services, and the continuous anticipation
5
6
7 of, adaptation to and exploitation of conditions produced by a variety of
8
9
10 relevant environments. Performance in each of these fields depends largely
11
12
13 on the extent to which these firms are successful in acquiring, internalising
14
15
16 and using to their advantage the corresponding informations and
17
18
19 knowledges. These can be boiled down to: (i) the knowledge required to
20
21
22 successfully acquire new business; (ii) the knowledge required to keep the
23
24
25 quality of the service products up-to-date; (iii) the knowledge that is
26
27
28 required to optimally deal with the regulatory environment (the rules of the
29
30
31 game); and (iv) a residual category reserved for knowledges relating to other
32
33
34 environments in which the firm operates (e.g. the labour market). I will label
35
36
37 these respectively: market-related knowledge, product-related knowledge,
38
39
40 knowledge related to the regulatory context, and knowledge related to other
41
42
43 contexts. Especially for market- and product-related knowledge it
44
45
46 furthermore makes sense to distinguish between operational and strategic
47
48
49 components. The operational components are essential for running daily
50
51
52 operations. They are exemplified by such questions as: which business
53
54
55 opportunities does the market currently offer, or how should service product
56
57
58 X by adjusted to satisfy the needs of client Y. The strategic components, in
59
60

1
2
3
4 contrast, are crucial for the long-term competitiveness of the firm: what will
5
6
7 'tomorrow's' market conditions look like? Which product innovations should
8
9
10 be anticipated given expected developments in, for instance, information
11
12
13 technologies or clients' regulatory environment? For an APS firm to master
14
15
16 these and other questions in a timely and adequate fashion requires the
17
18
19 constant collection and processing of various kinds of explicit and tacit
20
21
22 knowledge (as modelled by NONAKA et al., 2000; see the previous section).
23
24
25
26 In the next section we explore how these processes work out for each of the
27
28
29 knowledge categories identified and how they articulate in (and beyond) the
30
31
32 space of the MCR of the Randstad.
33
34
35
36
37

38 **KNOWLEDGE PRACTICES OF MULTI-OFFICE APS FIRMS IN THE RANDSTAD**

39
40
41 At the start of this article it was argued that the global players among
42
43
44 regions' advanced producer services firms may be strongly constitutive to
45
46
47 such regions' external knowledge relationships. Armed with the insights
48
49
50 developed above on the spatiality of knowledge diffusion/creation, the
51
52
53 dynamics of knowledge creation in organisations, and the main knowledge
54
55
56 domains APS firms need to master, it is now time to turn to the actual
57
58
59 behaviour of these firms and try to find out exactly how they acquire and
60

1
2
3
4 create knowledge, and how these activities are articulated in space. This
5
6
7 section draws from the insights gained through 64 in-depth interviews with
8
9
10 Randstad-based APS firms held within the framework of the POLYNET project
11
12
13 (see the introduction to this issue). In the summer and fall of 2004 these
14
15
16 firms were asked about, among other things, the ins and outs of their
17
18
19 knowledge practices. The semi-structured, face-to-face interviews were held
20
21
22 with senior staff members (mostly executives) occupying key positions within
23
24
25 the firms. The firms were selected for having multiple offices in various
26
27
28 regions of which at least one should be located in the Randstad. The 64 firms
29
30
31 (listed in Appendix 1) divide more or less equally across the eight APS
32
33
34 industries adopted in the study (i.e. legal services, accountancy, financial
35
36
37 services, insurance, ICT/management consultancy, advertising, design
38
39
40 consultancy and logistics services). For a dozen of these firms, the office
41
42
43 networks remained confined to the Netherlands. The networks of the other
44
45
46 firms (more than 80 percent) were European and/or global in scope. The
47
48
49 typology of APS knowledge needs developed in the previous section is used
50
51
52 to organise this section, meaning that successively market-related, product-
53
54
55 related, legal environment related and other knowledge needs pass in review.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 For starters, however, the Randstad and its APS complex are briefly
5
6 introduced.
7
8
9

10 11 12 *Advanced producer services in the Randstad*

13
14
15
16 The Randstad is the horseshoe-shaped urban configuration in the western
17
18 part of the Netherlands. It roughly runs from Dordrecht and Rotterdam in the
19
20 south, via The Hague and Leiden in the west to Amsterdam in the north and
21
22 Utrecht and Amersfoort in the east. These cities surround a predominantly
23
24 rural area called the 'Green Heart'. The area measures about 70km by 75km
25
26 (16 per cent of the Dutch land area) and houses about 6.6 million people (40
27
28 per cent of the Dutch population). They live in a large number of mainly
29
30 medium-sized cities and an even larger number of smaller towns and
31
32 villages. At the beginning of 2007, the region included 12 cities with more
33
34 than 100,000 inhabitants and another 13 in the range 70,000–100,000. The
35
36 biggest cities are Amsterdam (743,000), Rotterdam (584,000), The Hague
37
38 (474,000) and Utrecht (288,000). The co-presence of so many individual
39
40 smaller and larger cities in a relatively small area gives the Randstad its
41
42 archetypal polycentric appearance.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 The Randstad is also the country's economic powerhouse. It is home to
5
6
7 some 3.3 million jobs (47 percent of Dutch employment), most of them in
8
9
10 various kinds of services. The main population centres and their
11
12
13 surroundings are also the main job centres, with the exception of Schiphol
14
15
16 airport, which has developed into a massive logistics and services centre of
17
18
19 its own. The Randstad stands out as the Netherlands's most services-
20
21
22 oriented region. At the end of 2005, 816,000 or 56 per cent of the country's
23
24
25 jobs in financial and business services were located in the Randstad.
26
27
28 Financial and business services accounted for 24 per cent of total
29
30
31 employment in this region compared to 21 percent in the rest of the
32
33
34 Netherlands (STATISTICS NETHERLANDS, 2008). Within the Randstad, the
35
36
37 Amsterdam and Utrecht regions are particularly important business services
38
39
40 strongholds. Here, the share of financial and business services in local
41
42
43 employment is almost 30 percent.
44
45
46
47

48 The region is well-served by global APS firms. From the 100 global
49
50
51 service firms identified by TAYLOR (2004) some 75 percent has a presence in
52
53
54 the Randstad (LAMBREGTS et al., 2006). Most of these (almost 75 percent)
55
56
57 have their Dutch headquarters in the Amsterdam region (ibid). Quite
58
59
60 interesting, however, is the fact that many of these global APS firms service

1
2
3
4 the Randstad market through two (front) offices or more. In 2004, the sample
5
6
7 of 177 multi-office and inter-regionally networked firms from which the
8
9
10 interviewed firms were selected, together had at least 436 offices in the
11
12
13 Randstad area (on average 2.5 per firm). Apparently, many such firms do not
14
15
16 find it feasible to serve the entire Randstad from a single office (LAMBREGTS
17
18
19 et al., 2006). Below we will see how this finding relates to the knowledge
20
21
22 practices of these firms.
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 *Market-related knowledge*

30
31
32 The acquisition of operational market-related information for most (if not all)
33
34
35 APS firms is an ongoing and vitally important process that is very much
36
37
38 interwoven with the actual practice of acquiring new contracts itself. For the
39
40
41 latter different models apply, but they have in common that a firm's chance
42
43
44 of success strongly depends on the extent to which it has access to not
45
46
47 publicly available information.
48
49

50
51 Tenders for service contracts are sometimes publicly advertised but more
52
53
54 often they are not. In such cases the organisation in need of a service may
55
56
57 either grant the work directly to its 'preferred supplier' (e.g. the bank,
58
59
60 accountant, legal office or insurance company it usually works with), it may

1
2
3
4 follow the advice of a trusted contact (quite often one of the preferred
5
6
7 suppliers just referred to) and grant the job (more or less) directly to another
8
9
10 service supplier, or it may invite a small number of service suppliers to
11
12
13 present a bid in competition. In each of these cases it is essential for service
14
15
16 firms to be on the radar screen of as many as possible organisations
17
18
19 belonging to or being associated with their target group(s), especially in
20
21
22 times such organisations are planning to put out to tender. As many
23
24
25 interviewees reported, the art is to become *and* remain 'preferred supplier'
26
27
28 for particular clients and, in addition to that, to get short-listed and invited
29
30
31 for tender procedures as often as possible. This is in part a matter of
32
33
34 delivering good quality services, careful name building and keeping existing
35
36
37 clients satisfied, but also a (never-ending) process of securing access to
38
39
40 information that helps the service provider to undertake purposive actions
41
42
43 aimed at winning new contracts. Such information is highly valuable and
44
45
46 typically transmitted through personal, trust-based relationships. Such
47
48
49 relationships are maintained by the service firm's individual employees,
50
51
52 notably the customer-oriented among them. In their work and even beyond
53
54
55 the latter are continuously concerned with the scope of their inter-personal
56
57
58 networks and the quality of the individual ties. They are constantly, also
59
60

1
2
3
4 during weekends at the proverbial sports club, on the alert for useful
5
6
7 information that may give them an (temporal) advantage over their
8
9
10 competitors. Interviewees repeatedly emphasised that building and
11
12
13 cultivating such trust-based networks with clients, former clients, potential
14
15
16 clients, (occasional) partners, suppliers, people working in adjacent producer
17
18
19 services branches, et cetera requires more or less frequent interpersonal,
20
21
22 face-to-face encounters (be they organised or not). E-mail and telephone
23
24
25 exchanges were considered useful for filling the spaces in between but not to
26
27
28 suffice on their own. While at first sight the practice of acquiring operational
29
30
31 market-related information may come across as a relatively straightforward
32
33
34 information collection process, it actually concerns the employment of a deep
35
36
37 (tacit) understanding of a market in order to secure access to exclusive
38
39
40 information that is often distributed among a (very) few people only. As one
41
42
43 Amsterdam-based accountant observed: "it is possible to serve a client in
44
45
46 Maastricht [a provincial capital some 200 km south of Amsterdam] from
47
48
49 Amsterdam without much trouble, but to acquire new business is a
50
51
52 completely different story: you will need to be there for quite some time in
53
54
55 order to become an insider and secure access to the right people and their
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 information, and thus become able to compete successfully with the local
4
5
6 firms”.

7
8
9
10 The interviews also learned that a trickle of useful ‘inside’ information on
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
The interviews also learned that a trickle of useful ‘inside’ information on
upcoming business opportunities travels between different offices of the
same firm or a well-functioning alliance, but although some interviewees
observed a gradual increase in the importance of such channels, their
relevance was generally considered of secondary importance at best. The
prevailing picture is clearly one whereby the acquisition of operational
market-related knowledge for APS firms is very much a story of ‘being there’
- physically that is - and that it is notably this particular knowledge need that
eventually leads APS firms to service the Randstad market through more than
one office, if resources allow.

The story for strategic market-related knowledge, however, runs rather
differently. For APS firms to prepare for ‘tomorrow’s’ market conditions they
need to familiarise themselves with a variety of local, national and global
trends that may in the (near) future affect the volume and the nature of the
demand, the place where demand will manifest itself most prominently, and
the behaviour of competitors. While in the acquisition of operational market-
related knowledge we chiefly see NONAKA et al.’s (2000) ‘socialisation’ and

1
2
3
4 'internalisation' modes of knowledge conversion at work (i.e. sharing tacit
5
6
7 knowledge and converting explicit knowledge into tacit knowledge, see also
8
9
10 above), the formation of strategic market-related knowledge rather involves
11
12
13 a combination of the 'combination', 'internalisation' and 'externalisation'
14
15
16 modes of knowledge conversion. From the firm's perspective it involves the
17
18
19 collection and synthesis of various streams of mostly explicit knowledge
20
21
22 ('combination'), the interpretation and further development of this
23
24
25 knowledge with help of the firm's tacit understanding of its line of business
26
27
28 and the local markets in which it operates ('internalisation'), and the
29
30
31 articulation of the result into a knowledge product that can be shared
32
33
34 throughout the firm ('externalisation'). Networked firms have typically
35
36
37 introduced a division of labour between their units to perform this strategic
38
39
40 knowledge activity, with headquarters or a dedicated subsidiary taking care
41
42
43 of the identification and interpretation of the global trends and the (other)
44
45
46 subsidiaries seeing to the translation of these insights to their national
47
48
49 and/or local contexts. For the 'average' subsidiary, the office network of
50
51
52 which it is part and the local and national contexts in which it operates
53
54
55 constitute about equally important arenas from which strategic market-
56
57
58 related knowledge gets abstracted and internalised. In geographical terms
59
60

1
2
3
4 this results in a rather more diverse and 'stretched' configuration of
5
6
7 knowledge relationships than for operational market-related knowledge.
8
9

10 11 12 13 *Product-related knowledge* 14

15
16 APS firms are often hired to solve more or less unique problems that require
17
18 highly customised solutions. Jobs may start with the (tentative) application of
19
20 an 'off-the-shelf' solution but in many cases require considerable fine-
21
22 tuning or even the development of a completely new product for the problem
23
24 to be solved. New knowledge is likely to be produced along the way, with an
25
26 important role set aside for the client itself. The latter, after all, possesses
27
28 much of the (explicit and tacit) knowledge that the service provider needs to
29
30 successfully deliver its service solution (see also BETTENCOURT et al., 2002).
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 Interviewees explained that the mobilisation of (operational) product-
42
43 related knowledge often already starts during the making of a bid. This is
44
45 still part of the business acquisition process and tends to happen at the
46
47 office of the service firm. Depending on the complexity of the contract on
48
49 offer, the making of the bid document may require intense communication
50
51 between the makers and other experts. These experts are initially searched
52
53 for within the office, but it may well be the case that they are only available
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 elsewhere in the firm (or even only outside the firm). Mobilisation of the
4
5
6
7 knowledge of these experts is either facilitated through (as some
8
9
10 interviewees were keen to show) sometimes very advanced virtual knowledge
11
12
13 sharing devices or, if the potential gains associated with the contract are
14
15
16 large enough, through flying in the expert(s) in person. In either way the bid
17
18
19 makers benefit from the 'stretched' knowledge relationships that are
20
21
22 available within the firm.
23

24
25
26 Once a work is granted, the actual production and delivery of the service
27
28
29 begins. Here again, a variety of models can be identified. There are jobs in
30
31
32 which a (team of) service provider(s) for a certain period of time is stationed
33
34
35 at the client's to manage a particular process or design and implement a
36
37
38 particular tool. Especially these kinds of jobs offer enable the service provider
39
40
41 to acquire and take advantage of the tacit knowledge embedded in the
42
43
44 client's organisation. There are also assignments, however, where most of
45
46
47 the service production takes place in the office of the service firm and where
48
49
50 producer and client just meet (or otherwise communicate) on a regular basis
51
52
53 to discuss progress, share knowledge and make decisions. The nature of the
54
55
56 product and the need for either 'inside' information or frequent intermediate
57
58
59 consent from the client determines how intensive interaction during the
60

1
2
3
4 service production process is, which modes of communication are used and
5
6
7 whether the bulk of the production takes place 'at the client's' or 'in-house'.
8
9
10 Depending on the value attached to the job by both the client and the service
11
12
13 provider, both parties may be willing to invest heavily in communication.
14
15
16 Respondents referred frequently to jobs requiring frequent travel over large
17
18
19 distances (e.g. weekly between Amsterdam and London or daily between
20
21
22 different places in the Randstad) or the installation of quite extraordinary
23
24
25 data-transmission devices (e.g. a dedicated satellite-based communication
26
27
28 device to facilitate massive data transport between a Rotterdam-based
29
30
31 service firm and its client in Beijing). Apart from these, the people working on
32
33
34 a particular job of course have at their disposal the same possibilities to
35
36
37 mobilise missing knowledge parts within and, if necessary, outside their firm
38
39
40 environment as their 'bid making' colleagues referred to above.
41
42
43

44
45 After a job is finished, the knowledge that has been generated along the
46
47
48 way is usually 'brought back' to the office where it may be enhanced
49
50
51 (possibly by dedicated product or knowledge development divisions), filed
52
53
54 and made accessible to the firm at large ('externalisation' in the words of
55
56
57 NONAKA et al., 2000). The latter often happens with the help of the same
58
59
60 (sometimes very advanced) virtual knowledge sharing devices mentioned

1
2
3
4 above, but traditional (intra-firm) face-to-face knowledge sharing meetings
5
6
7 are also still in use and, reportedly, valued. Within a single office these may
8
9
10 take the shape of monthly presentations over lunch while at the firm level
11
12
13 thematic specialists may congregate once every so many months to discuss
14
15
16 the latest (extra-firm) developments and (intra-firm) experiences within a
17
18
19 particular field.
20

21
22 As far as operational product-related knowledge is concerned, other
23
24
25 sources than the firm's client base and internal knowledge resources appear
26
27
28 to be of secondary importance at best. Relationships with universities and
29
30
31 other knowledge producing institutes do exist, but most respondents
32
33
34 observed that these tend to serve junior staff recruitment rather than
35
36
37 knowledge development objectives. In a similar vein, branch organisations
38
39
40 and the like were considered useful for many things but not in particular for
41
42
43 the formation of product-related knowledge.
44
45
46

47
48 Altogether, interactions with clients and other units within the firm
49
50
51 appeared to be the most instrumental to a subsidiary's operational product-
52
53
54 related knowledge formation. As the client base of the APS subsidiaries
55
56
57 interviewed often appeared to be largely regionally defined (i.e. coinciding
58
59
60 with the Randstad or parts thereof) and since the office networks they are

1
2
3
4 part of often spanned (large parts of) the world, the resulting geography of
5
6
7 the knowledge relationships is typically multi-scalar with nearby and
8
9 stretched relationships complementing each other.
10
11

12
13 Strategic product-related knowledge often gets developed in close
14
15 relationship with and along the same lines as strategic market-related
16
17 knowledge (discussed above). Insight in tomorrow's market demand enables
18
19 and stimulates thinking about the matching service products. An important
20
21 difference between the two processes seems to be that in the development of
22
23 strategic product-related knowledge a slightly more important role is
24
25 reserved for the subsidiaries. Service products are often 'cut to size' in order
26
27 to be compatible with nationally defined socio-institutional and legal
28
29 frameworks and practices. Their further development depends heavily on
30
31 dedicated, hands-on knowledge of these national contexts and therefore is
32
33 best done locally.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 *Knowledge related to the regulatory environment*

52

53
54 Regulatory frameworks define the 'rules of the game' in a particular line of
55
56 business. Such frameworks are frequently adjusted by the responsible
57
58 legislative powers, usually only marginally, but every now and then also more
59
60

1
2
3
4 drastically (see for instance the recent regulatory changes affecting especially
5
6
7 accountancy and management consultancy firms). An important development
8
9
10 is that firms' operations are no longer affected only by the rules and
11
12
13 regulations set up by national legislative bodies but increasingly also by
14
15
16 those established by international bodies such as the EU and the US
17
18
19 Securities and Exchange Commission. Even if firms do not strictly fall under
20
21
22 the jurisdiction of a (foreign-based) legislative body, they may still feel the
23
24
25 need to follow its rule in order to stay on a par with important international
26
27
28 competitors. This means that the regulatory context for many APS firms (with
29
30
31 sectoral differences) has become more complex over the years and probably
32
33
34 will continue to do so in the years to come. Legal intelligence teams usually
35
36
37 keep track of the international developments at the corporate level and
38
39
40 translate ('internalise') their consequences for the firm as a whole. At the
41
42
43 national level, subsidiaries are usually able to benefit from the services of
44
45
46 professional bodies whose job it often is to translate national (as well as
47
48
49 international) legislation into a set of workable directives for its member
50
51
52 firms. Yet, there always remains some intelligence and translation work to be
53
54
55 done within the firm/subsidiary itself as well. From a subsidiary's
56
57
58 perspective, the key knowledge relations in this domain appear to be with the
59
60

1
2
3
4 corporate unit(s) responsible for keeping up to date with and internalising
5
6
7 international regulatory changes and with the professional body (or bodies)
8
9
10 that do the same at the national level, meaning that in geographical terms we
11
12
13 are talking about both relatively nearby and stretched knowledge
14
15
16 relationships.
17

22 *Knowledge related to other contexts*

25
26 Firms can further enhance their competitiveness by making sure that they are
27
28 getting the best out of the local labour market, making the most of their
29
30 office location, using to their best advantage the knowledge spillovers
31
32 produced by the region, etcetera. Questions such as: 'which high-potentials
33
34 currently working for competitors might be willing to make a career move';
35
36 'how do we make sure that our new office will get 20 percent more parking
37
38 places as set out in the local building code'; and 'which people are currently
39
40 busy figuring out something that might come in handy if we want to enhance
41
42 this product of ours', all require delicate intelligence procedures in order to
43
44 be answered. As in the case of the acquisition of operational market-related
45
46 knowledge (see above), such procedures rely heavily upon trusted
47
48 interpersonal relationships and a sound understanding of the local
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 institutions, cultures and practices. The main knowledge conversion mode at
5
6
7 work, to refer once more to the typology developed by NONAKA et al.,
8
9
10 (2000), is that of socialisation (sharing of tacit knowledge). The arenas across
11
12
13 which such knowledge relationships stretch are typically quite tightly
14
15
16 spatially bounded, perhaps more tightly even than those associated with the
17
18
19 acquisition of market-related knowledge. Respondents mentioned that the
20
21
22 kinds of knowledge referred to, are typically shared by befriended employees
23
24
25 from different firms during non-office hours, for example while enjoying the
26
27
28 pleasures of the local nightlife. Figure 1 provides a summary of the above.
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 Figure 1: Knowledge formation by multi-office APS firms in the Randstad:
36
37
38 summary of findings
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR REGIONAL POLICY

46
47
48 The above analysis of knowledge acquiring practices in multi-office APS
49
50
51 firms in the Randstad puts flesh on the idea of MCRs qualifying as nexus of
52
53
54 intra- and extra-regional knowledge relationships. The analysis shows that it
55
56
57 is not possible to speak of *the* geography of knowledge production in APS in
58
59
60 the Randstad but that there are, in line with some recent additions to the

1
2
3 literature on the spatiality of knowledge formation (e.g. AMIN and
4
5
6 COHENDET, 2004; COE and BUNNELL, 2003) many such geographies indeed.
7
8
9
10 The analysis has first of all revealed that in order to get a feel for the variety
11
12
13 of geographies present, it is helpful to connect to the different knowledge
14
15
16 domains that are central to APS operations. Introducing a distinction between
17
18
19 market-related knowledge, product-related knowledge, knowledge related to
20
21
22 the regulatory environment and knowledge related to other contexts proved
23
24
25 to be very useful. Closer analysis of how and from where the firms tended to
26
27
28 acquire such knowledges produced a composite picture in which highly
29
30
31 localised knowledge relationships alternated and co-existed with
32
33
34 relationships spanning larger distances. Locally defined circuits were found
35
36
37 especially instrumental to the acquisition of operational market-related
38
39
40 knowledge and a selection of more 'secondary' knowledge types (i.e.
41
42
43 knowledge related to local labour market characteristics or the knowledge
44
45
46 required to efficiently maintain an office in a particular place). It is the
47
48
49 requirement of physically 'being there' in order to acquire operational
50
51
52 market-related knowledge combined with the fact that the sources from
53
54
55 which such knowledge should be acquired are scattered across the
56
57
58 (polycentric) Randstad, that forces many APS firms to maintain various offices
59
60

1
2
3
4 in the area. For the other knowledge categories the picture appeared to be
5
6
7 much more mixed with the 'stretched' knowledge relationships available
8
9
10 within the firms' office networks complementing locally defined ones. Nearby
11
12
13 and stretched knowledge relationships appeared to complement each other
14
15
16 especially well in the formation of operational product-related knowledge
17
18
19 and it is probably this category where the benefits of APS firms' 'external
20
21
22 knowledge relationships' for the regional economy at large are most
23
24
25 substantial. After all, it is through the actual delivery of services that APS
26
27
28 firms let their knowledge spill into a regional economy and if this knowledge
29
30
31 is kept 'state-of-the-art' by knowledge inputs from other advanced
32
33
34 economies the regional economy should eventually notice the difference.
35
36
37

38
39 It should be noted of course, that our sample of interviewed firms was
40
41
42 biased in the sense that all firms concerned (transnational) multi-office firms
43
44
45 and that stretched knowledge relationships within such firms are more likely
46
47
48 to occur than in other firms. Without doubt, the interviews as such have
49
50
51 produced richer information on long-distance knowledge relationships than
52
53
54 they would have done if the majority of the firms interviewed were single-
55
56
57 office firms. However, since (transnational) multi-office firms do constitute a
58
59
60 crucial part of the economies of MCRs and since they are, as observed by for

1
2
3 example COE and BUNNELL (2003, p. 450), among ‘the main “connectors”
4
5
6
7 between regional innovation systems in different national territories’, the
8
9
10 findings are of consequence in a discussion on regions’ external
11
12
13 relationships.
14

15 16 17 18 19 *Fostering external knowledge relationships* 20

21
22 These results should be of interest to regional policymakers not only in the
23
24
25 Randstad but also beyond. If we follow MALMBERG’s (2003, p. 159)
26
27
28 suggestion that the quality of the local knowledge structure is to some
29
30
31 extent ‘a function of the quality of the global connections that the individual
32
33
34 actors in the local milieu have collectively managed to develop’, and if FOSS
35
36
37 and PEDERSEN (2002, p. 95) are right in claiming that in dynamic, well-
38
39
40 functioning transnational corporations one of the power-wielding assets is
41
42
43 ‘the dynamic capability to produce and transfer new knowledge’ and that
44
45
46 hence ‘influence is likely to flow to a subsidiary that is able to continuously
47
48
49 transfer knowledge to other subsidiaries’, we have identified a powerful,
50
51
52 potentially self-reinforcing mechanism that certainly deserves the attention
53
54
55 of policymakers. Three areas of special interest can be distinguished.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 The first is the level of external connectivity itself. External, knowledge-
5
6
7 enhancing connections have to be initiated and maintained. Multi-office and
8
9
10 transnational firms almost by definition maintain such relations, but the
11
12
13 (large) majority of firms does not possess the means or does not aspire to
14
15
16 become a (transnational) multilocal firm. A compromise is to become a
17
18
19 member of a larger alliance or to initialise one. As there seems to be no
20
21
22 upper limit to the benefits of 'being connected' for the region at large
23
24
25 (BATHELT et al., 2004; but note that this is different for the individual firm,
26
27
28 which is likely to reach a point where the costs of maintaining multiple
29
30
31 connections start to outdo the benefits accruing from them), there may be a
32
33
34 case for regional policymakers in encouraging individual firms to engage in
35
36
37 knowledge-enhancing relations to actors operating in other 'centres of
38
39
40 excellence'. Local or regional governments, possibly together with
41
42
43 professional associations, could for example think of promoting and
44
45
46 facilitating international events for small and medium sized business in
47
48
49 particular (as the larger firms have abundant possibilities and resources
50
51
52 themselves) in the hope that these will yield new international (as well as
53
54
55 intra-regional) connections.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Next to this, policy makers should also ask whether and how they can be
5
6
7 of help to local offices that wish to defend and possibly strengthen their
8
9
10 position in their respective firm networks. In the loosely structured, partly
11
12
13 cooperative, partly competitive network forms that characterise most service
14
15
16 transnationals (COE, 2003), many factors determine the relative position or
17
18
19 centrality of a particular branch office. The firm's history frequently plays an
20
21
22 important role, with essential power (and thus centrality) often remaining
23
24
25 concentrated in one or more home country offices (e.g. headquarters).
26
27
28 However, local offices may gain influence within the network if they stand out
29
30
31 in some respect. Sales and profit margins are obvious power-wielding assets
32
33
34 (with the larger and more profitable offices having a bigger say in the firm's
35
36
37 concerns), but so is the capability of an office to produce and transmit new
38
39
40 and valuable knowledge products to the firm at large (FOSS and PEDERSEN,
41
42
43 2002). An office that is able over time to build a reputation as an active
44
45
46 'knowledge provider' in some cases may even become (one of) the firm's
47
48
49 'knowledge centre(s)' in a particular field. In all cases, however, it is likely
50
51
52 that the office's knowledge production results in more frequent and more
53
54
55 intensive interactions with other offices. And while it is true that such
56
57
58 interactions principally serve to 'export' the locally produced knowledge to
59
60

1
2
3
4 the network, they will also bring benefits in return (e.g. useful feedback,
5
6
7 status and more). Since a local office's knowledge generating capacity
8
9
10 depends at least partly on the quality of the local knowledge environment
11
12
13 (the local 'buzz' in the words of BATHELT et al., 2004), it is here that policy
14
15
16 support may be helpful. For policy interventions into the local knowledge
17
18
19 environment to be effective it is crucial to identify which local knowledge
20
21
22 sources are most productive to which type of industry (or segments thereof).
23
24
25 For APS it has been argued that much of the most valuable product-related
26
27
28 knowledge is created in producer-client relationships. The quality of the
29
30
31 demand for services largely determines the extent to which service firms are
32
33
34 challenged and stimulated to innovate (cf. PORTER, 1990; MOORE and
35
36
37 BIRKINSHAW, 1998). Policy makers could consider to complement their
38
39
40 traditional supply-side orientation with a demand-oriented approach and at
41
42
43 least examine the opportunities they have to support the production of
44
45
46 sophisticated demand for services. Such an approach could start with the
47
48
49 identification of the actual producers of sophisticated demand for each and
50
51
52 every relevant services subsector (as these may differ), and continue with
53
54
55 addressing the question whether anything should and could be done to
56
57
58 sustain (some of) them. An investigation like that is likely to find that larger
59
60

1
2
3
4 companies and multinational corporations (notably their headquarters) are
5
6
7 typical producers of sophisticated demand for producer services, but it may
8
9
10 well be the case that particular categories of small and medium-sized
11
12
13 businesses appear on the radar screen as well (e.g. those operating in the
14
15
16 vanguard of their fields where uncertainties are many and the need for
17
18
19 specialized services possibly high). And whereas the former (i.e. the larger
20
21
22 companies and multinationals) often already enjoy substantial policy
23
24
25 attention, policymakers may find it opportune to develop an interest in the
26
27
28 ins and outs and the particular needs of the latter as well. Finally,
29
30
31 governments should not forget that they are themselves (key) producers of
32
33
34 demand for business services as well and in some fields (e.g. architecture
35
36
37 and engineering) capable of rendering 'regular' into 'sophisticated' demand.
38
39
40

41
42 The third and final area of interest for policymakers is – of course – the
43
44
45 infrastructure that such firms require for the transmission and sharing of
46
47
48 knowledge. The region's infrastructure should be able to adequately receive,
49
50
51 accommodate, move around and send off the carriers of tacit knowledge
52
53
54 disguised as travelling executives, project teams, specialists and the like.
55
56
57 Frequent and direct flights to the world's major business/knowledge centres
58
59
60 are an asset in this respect and the same goes for high-speed train

1
2
3
4 connections. Essential as well is the region's infrastructure for virtual
5
6
7 communications. Here the difference is not so much made by the
8
9
10 infrastructure that facilitates normal telephone and e-mail traffic (large parts
11
12
13 of the world pretty much constitute a level playing field in this respect), but
14
15
16 rather by the facilities and capacities that are required to support the most
17
18
19 advanced information sharing systems and – in terms of bits and bytes – the
20
21
22 most sizeable transmissions.
23

24
25
26 It is, to conclude, not the MCR's 'regional knowledge base' alone that
27
28
29 deserves the attention of policymakers but also the region's external
30
31
32 knowledge relations and their constituting factors. Sensitivity to sectoral
33
34
35 peculiarities is essential: enhancing the knowledge creating capacities of
36
37
38 manufacturing industries requires partly different tricks than the ones that
39
40
41 might prove successful for advanced producer services.
42

43 44 45 46 47 48 **Acknowledgement:**

49
50
51 The author wishes to thank two anonymous referees for their useful
52
53
54 comments and Robert Kloosterman, Merijn van der Werff, Robert Röling, and
55
56
57 the late Loek Kapoen for their indispensable help in carrying out the
58
59
60 interviews and other parts of the study.

Note

1. Here defined as to include activities such as: legal services, accountancy, financial services, insurance, ICT/management consultancy, advertising, design consultancy and logistics services.

LITERATURE

ALLEN, J. (2000) Power/Economic Knowledges: Symbolic and Spatial Formations, in BRYSON, J., DANIELS, P.W., HENRY, N. and POLLARD, J. (Eds), *Knowledge, Space, Economy*, pp. 15–33. London: Routledge.

AMIN, A. and COHENDET, P. (2004) Architectures of Knowledge. *Firms, Capabilities, and Communities*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

BATHELT, H., MALMBERG, A. and MASKELL, P. (2004) Clusters and knowledge: local buzz, global pipelines and the process of knowledge creation, *Progress in Human Geography* 28, 31–56.

BETTENCOURT, L.A., OSTROM, A.L., BROWN, S.W. and ROUNDTREE, R.I. (2002) Client Co-Production in Knowledge-Intensive Business Services, *California Management Review* 44, 100–128.

1
2
3
4 BOSCHMA, R.A. (2005) Proximity and Innovation: A Critical Assessment,
5
6
7 *Regional Studies* 39, 61–74.
8

9
10 BRESCHI, S. and LISSONI, F. (2001) Knowledge spillovers and local innovation
11
12 systems: a critical survey, *Industrial and Corporate Change* 10, 975–1005.
13
14

15
16 COE, N.M. (2003) Review Essay: Servicing the Global Economy, *The Service*
17
18 *Industries Journal* 23, No. 4, pp. 150–157.
19
20

21
22 COE, N.M. and BUNNELL, T.G. (2003) ‘Spatializing’ knowledge communities:
23
24 towards a conceptualisation of transnational innovation networks, *Global*
25
26 *Networks* 3, 437–456.
27
28
29

30
31
32 COFFEY, W.J. (2000) The Geographies of Producer Services, *Urban Geography*
33
34
35 21, 170–183.
36

37
38 COOKE, P., URANGA, M. G. and ETXEARRIA, G. (1998) Regional systems of
39
40 innovation: an evolutionary perspective, *Environment and Planning A* 30,
41
42
43 1563–1584.
44
45

46
47
48 EUROSTAT (2006) Regio Database. Accessible at:
49
50
51 <http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/>.
52

53
54 FOSS, N.J. and PEDERSEN, T. (2002) Sources of subsidiary knowledge and
55
56 knowledge transfer in MNCs, in LUNDAN, S.M. (Ed) *Network Knowledge in*
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 *International Business*, pp. 91–114. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing
5
6
7 Limited.

8
9
10 FROST, T.S. (2001) The Geographic Sources of Foreign Subsidiaries'
11
12 Innovations, *Strategic Management Journal* 22, 101–123.

13
14
15
16 GERTLER, M. (2003) The Spatial Life of Things: The Real World of Practice
17
18 within the Global Firm, in PECK, J. and WAI-CHUNG YEUNG, H. (Eds)
19
20 *Remaking the Global Economy. Economic-Geographic Perspectives*, pp.
21
22 101–113. London, Thousand Oaks, Delhi: Sage Publications.
23
24
25

26
27
28
29 GORDON, I. and MCCANN, P. (2000) Industrial Clusters: Complexes,
30
31 Agglomeration and/or Social Networks? *Urban Studies* 37, 513–532.
32
33

34
35
36 GUPTA, A.K. and GOVINDARAJAN, V. (2000) Knowledge flows within
37
38 multinational corporations, *Strategic Management Journal* 21, 473–496.
39
40

41
42 HALL, P. and PAIN, K. (2006) From Metropolis to Polyopolis, in HALL, P. and
43
44 PAIN, K. (Eds) *The Polycentric Metropolis. Learning from Mega-City*
45
46 *Regions in Europe*, pp. 3–18. London: Earthscan.
47
48
49

50
51 HANSEN, M.T. (2002) Knowledge Networks: Explaining Effective Knowledge
52
53 Sharing in Multiunit Companies, *Organization Science* 13, 232–248.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 KOGUT, B. and ZANDER, U. (1993) Knowledge of the firm and the
5
6
7 evolutionary theory of the multinational corporation, *Journal of*
8
9
10 *International Business Studies* 24, 625–645.

11
12
13 LAMBREGTS, B., KLOOSTERMAN, R. WERFF, M. VAN DER, RÖLING, R. and
14
15
16 KAPOEN, L. (2006) Randstad Holland: Multiple Faces of a Polycentric Role
17
18
19 Model, in HALL, P. and PAIN, K. (Eds) *The Polycentric Metropolis. Learning*
20
21
22 *from Mega-City Regions in Europe*, pp. 137–145. London: Earthscan.

23
24
25
26 LINDSAY V., CHADEE, D., MATTSSON, J., JOHNSTON, R. and MILLET, B. (2003)
27
28
29 Relationships, the role of individuals and knowledge flows in the
30
31
32 internationalisation of service firms, *International Journal of Service*
33
34
35 *Industry Management* 14, 7–35.

36
37
38 LUNDVALL, B.A. and JOHNSON B. (1994) The learning economy, *Journal of*
39
40
41 *Industry Studies* 1, 23–42.

42
43
44
45 MALMBERG, A. (2003) Beyond the Cluster – Local Milieus and Global
46
47
48 Connections, in PECK, J. and WAI-CHUNG YEUNG, H. (Eds) *Remaking the*
49
50
51 *Global Economy. Economic-Geographic Perspectives*, pp. 145–159.
52
53
54 London, Thousand Oaks, Delhi: Sage Publications.

1
2
3 MALMBERG, A. and MASKELL, P. (2002), The elusive concept of localization
4
5
6 economies: towards a knowledge-based theory of spatial clustering,
7
8
9
10 *Environment and Planning A* **34**, 429–49.

11
12
13 MASKELL, P., ESKELINEN, H., HANNIBALSON, I., MALMBERG, A. and VATNE, E.
14
15
16 (1998) *Competitiveness, localised learning and regional development:*
17
18
19 *specialisation and prosperity in small open economies*. London and New
20
21
22 York: Routledge.

23
24
25
26 MOORE, K. and BIRKINSHAW, J. (1998) Managing knowledge in global service
27
28
29 firms: Centers of Excellence, *Academy of Management Executive* **12**, 81–
30
31
32 92.

33
34
35 MORGAN, K. (1997) The Learning Region, *Regional Studies* **31**, 491–503.

36
37
38 MORGAN, K. (2004) The exaggerated death of geography: learning, proximity
39
40
41 and territorial innovation systems, *Journal of Economic Geography* **4**, 3–21.

42
43
44
45 NONAKA, I., TOYAMA, R. and KONNO, N. (2000) SECI, Ba and Leadership: a
46
47
48 Unified Model of Dynamic Knowledge Creation, *Long Range Planning* **33**,
49
50
51 5–34.

52
53
54 OECD (2007) *Main Science and Technology Indicators (MSTI): 2007/2 edition*.
55
56
57 Paris: OECD.

- 1
2
3
4 OINAS, P. (2000) Distance and learning: does proximity matter? in BOEKEMA,
5
6 F., MORGAN, K., BAKKERS, S. and RUTTEN, R. (Eds) *Knowledge, innovation*
7
8 *and economic growth: the theory and practice of learning regions*, pp. 57-
9
10 69. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
11
12
13
14
15
16 PORTER, M. (1990) *The Competitive Advantage of Nations*. London:
17
18 Macmillan.
19
20
21
22 RUBALCABA, L. and GAGO, D. (2003) Regional Concentration of Innovative
23
24 Business Services: Testing some Explanatory Factors at European Regional
25
26 Level, *The Service Industries Journal* 23, 77-94.
27
28
29
30
31
32 SASSEN, S. (2001) *The Global City; New York, London, Tokyo* (Second
33
34 Edition). Princeton/London: Princeton University Press.
35
36
37
38 SCHULZ, M. (2001) The Uncertain Relevance of Newness: Organizational
39
40 Learning and Knowledge Flows, *Academy of Management Journal* 44, 661-
41
42 681.
43
44
45
46
47
48 SCOTT, A.J. (2001) Introduction, in SCOTT, A.J. (Ed) *Global City-Regions;*
49
50 *Trends, Theory, Policy*, pp. 1-9. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
51
52
53
54 SCOTT, A.J., AGNEW, J., SOJA, E. and STORPER, M. (2001) Global city-regions,
55
56 in SCOTT, A.J. (Ed) *Global City-Regions; Trends, Theory, Policy*, pp. 11-30.
57
58
59
60 Oxford: Oxford University Press.

1
2
3
4 SIMMIE, J. (2002) Trading Places: Competitive Cities in the Global Economy,
5
6
7 *European Planning Studies* 10, 201–214.
8

9
10 SIMMIE, J. (2003) Innovation and Urban Regions as National and International
11
12
13 Nodes for the Transfer and Sharing of Knowledge, *Regional Studies* 37,
14
15
16 607–620.
17

18
19 STATISTICS NETHERLANDS (2007) Research en development (R&D) bedrijven;
20
21
22 naar landsdeel. Statistics Netherlands, Voorburg/Heerlen.
23

24
25
26 STATISTICS NETHERLANDS (2008) Regional employment statistics. Statistics
27
28
29 Netherlands, Voorburg/Heerlen.
30

31
32 TAYLOR, P.J. (2002) Amsterdam in a World City Network, Research Report,
33
34
35 Department of Geography, Loughborough University (available at
36
37
38 <http://www.lboro.ac.uk/gawc/rb/rm1.pdf>).
39

40
41
42 TAYLOR, P.J. (2004) *World City Network, A Global Urban Analysis*. London:
43
44
45 Routledge.
46

47
48 UNCTAD (United Nations Conference on Trade and Development) (2004)
49
50
51 *World Investment Report 2004. The Shift Towards Services*. New York and
52
53
54 Geneva: United Nations.
55

56
57 WENGER, E. (1998) *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning and Identity*.
58
59
60 Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

1
2
3
4 WENGER, E. and SNYDER, W.H. (2000) Communities of Practice: The
5
6 Organizational Frontier, *Harvard Business Review* 78, Jan.–Feb., pp. 139–
7
8
9
10 145.

11
12
13 WOOD, P. (2002) Knowledge-intensive Services and Urban Innovativeness,
14
15
16 *Urban Studies* 39, 993–1002.
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: Knowledge formation by multi-office APS firms in the Randstad:

summary of findings

Knowledge categories	Market-related knowledge	Product-related knowledge	Knowledge related to the regulatory context	Knowledge related to other contexts
Operational	Formed mainly through myriad networks of mainly (but not exclusively) locally defined relationships	Formed mainly through myriad networks of mainly (but not exclusively) locally defined relationships (clients), complemented with varied inputs from the corporate network	Formed mainly through a small number of locally defined relationships and complemented by	Formed mainly through myriad networks of quite strictly locally defined relationships
Strategic	Formed by dedicated input from the corporate network combined with in-house knowledge of local conditions	Formed by in-house knowledge of local conditions combined with dedicated input from the corporate network	dedicated input from the corporate network	