

Strategies for Alliance Network Configuration: Node Selection, Relationship Construction and Structural Design

Qiuli Huang^{1,a,*}

¹Business School, Central University of Finance and Economics, Haidian District, Beijing, China

^a2018211028@email.cufe.edu.cn

*Corresponding author

Keywords: Alliance Network Configuration, Strategic Alliances, Node Selection, Inter-organizational Relationships, Network Structure

Abstract: As rapid shifts in technology and market dynamics render traditional business operations inadequate, firms are increasingly turning to collaborative networks as a strategic response to gain a competitive edge. Our analysis reveals a substantial gap in understanding how to tailor these networks to contemporary business environments effectively. Through an extensive review of existing literature and theoretical frameworks, this research focuses on three pivotal aspects of alliance network configurations: node selection, relationship construction, and network structuring. We find that strategic positioning and partner attributes—such as resources, capabilities, and market presence—are critical for effective node selection. Our examination of relationship construction explores the patterns, strengths, and contents of network relationships, emphasizing the significance of proximity types and relationship quality. In network structuring, we assess the implications of network size, the diversity of structural arrangements, and the strategic balance of goals. The paper further addresses the dynamics of competition and cooperation, along with resource matching in the configuration of alliance networks. This multidimensional analysis not only advances theoretical understanding of the complexities within alliance networks but also provides actionable strategies for firms to design and manage these networks more effectively. The findings underscore the necessity of integrating multiple factors to adjust network content and structure, optimizing resources to enhance market competitiveness. Ultimately, this research contributes to the field of strategic management by offering a coherent framework for alliance network configuration that integrates node selection, relational dynamics, and structural design, thus promoting better strategic alignment and enhanced performance in dynamic market conditions.

1. Introduction

Since the 1980s, rapid advancements in technology have profoundly transformed corporate operations and innovation strategies [1]. Traditional business models are increasingly seen as inadequate in the face of evolving market dynamics, prompting organizations to pivot towards

collaborative networks to secure competitive advantages [2]. Illustrative examples such as the industrial ascension of Japan, the robust expansion of Silicon Valley, and the rise of Zhongguancun in China highlight the strategic benefits of adopting networked approaches in sectors like computing, telecommunications, electronics, pharmaceuticals, and aerospace [3,4]. These networks, which include a diverse array of stakeholders such as vendors, customers, competitors, and cross-industry entities, facilitate resource sharing and risk mitigation through various forms of cooperation including agreements, joint ventures, and equity investments [5].

The strategic relevance of alliance networks is further evidenced by the growing trend among leading global corporations to enhance their engagement within these networks. Research indicates that on average, each Fortune 500 company maintains strategic partnerships with approximately 60 other firms [6]. Additionally, the period from 1990 to 2000 saw a significant increase in the participation of U.S. IT public companies in alliances, from 32% to 95%, with the average number of alliances per company rising from four to 32 [7]. This surge in network orchestration is exemplified by major enterprises such as Toyota, whose modular production system and projects like Australia's FedSat and Boeing's Dreamliner program have greatly benefited from well-structured network strategies. In a strategic maneuver in 2021, Xiaomi's entry into the smart electric vehicle market, capitalizing on an established automotive cluster in Beijing Yizhuang, demonstrated its strategy to optimize supply chain efficiencies and enhance market competitiveness through collaborative initiatives.

This paper explores the concept of alliance network configuration, a paradigm shift from analyzing dyadic joint venture relationships to examining complex network relationships [8]. Defined as the proactive management of network participants through strategic planning and design [9], alliance network configuration necessitates detailed planning of internal relationship modes and strategic positioning of focal firms. Drawing on network composition, this study systematically evaluates alliance strategies focusing on node selection, relationship interconnections, and interaction modalities. This analysis explores how these components collectively shape the architecture and operational efficacy of network structures, thereby enriching our understanding of strategic alliance management mechanisms.

2. Selection of Alliance Network Nodes

Alliance networks, comprising focal firms and their collaborative partners, rely fundamentally on the strategic optimization of two core areas: the network positioning of the focal firm and the meticulous selection of partners. The strategic placement of the focal firm within the network significantly influences its access to essential resources and information, which in turn affects its competitive power both internally and externally. Furthermore, the characteristics of the partners, such as their resources, capabilities, market standing, and their compatibility and complementarity with the focal firm, are critical in shaping the functional efficacy of the network.

The positioning of the focal firm can be evaluated based on two key dimensions: centrality within the network and the presence or absence of structural holes, often assessed against structural closure [10]. Node centrality highlights the importance and resource control capabilities of the firm within the network, measured by degree centrality, betweenness centrality, and closeness centrality. These metrics collectively depict the node's influence, social standing, and pivotal role in the flow of resources. High centrality confers significant network power, facilitating easier access and control over crucial information and resources [11,12]. However, excessive centrality may also induce negative outcomes such as reciprocal exclusivity, embedded inertia, and opportunistic behaviors, which can undermine the benefits derived from network interactions [13]. Alternatively, structural holes represent gaps between unlinked nodes, offering unique brokerage opportunities

that allow a firm to access and control diverse, non-redundant resources [14]. This advantageous position, however, is also accompanied by challenges such as increased managerial complexity and the need for maintaining multiple disparate connections, which can complicate organizational coordination and communication [15]. Future research is required to delve deeper into managing the risks associated with high centrality and leveraging structural holes, thereby providing robust strategies for navigating complex alliance networks.

Moreover, effective relationship management within alliance networks expands the theoretical scope to include the critical process of partner selection, which impacts not only the operational dynamics but also the governance structure of the network [16]. Inappropriate partner selection can lead to opportunistic behavior and heighten the risks of collaborative failure [17]. Recent academic inquiries, adopting diverse theoretical and managerial lenses, have examined the criteria and strategies for partner selection within network focal firms. Hao, Li, and Fligman-Wanshang (2014) have organized existing research into a framework comprising knowledge matching, relational interaction, strategic synergy, and institutional embedding [18]. Knowledge matching underscores the importance of complementary and diverse knowledge bases between partners, crucial for effective knowledge absorption and utilization. The relational interaction perspective emphasizes the role of informal relationships in reducing cooperation risks and enhancing resource integration efficiency, highlighting the value of enduring, trust-enhancing interactions. Strategic synergy focuses on aligning potential partners with the focal firm's overarching strategies, business objectives, and market positioning. Finally, the institutional embedding perspective considers the broader institutional environment's impact on partner selection, particularly significant in international markets and multinational corporate collaborations.

Node selection forms the cornerstone of relationship building within alliance networks. Building on an in-depth analysis of strategic positioning and the complexities of partner selection, this paper will delve into the intricacies of constructing network relationships, aiming to elucidate the mechanisms that enhance collaborative efficacy and strategic coherence.

3. Construction of Alliance Network Relationships

This analysis addresses these relationships across three dimensions: relationship patterns, strength, and content, each essential for understanding inter-firm cooperation and enhancing network configuration strategies.

Initially, various types of proximity, such as geographical, technological, social, cognitive, institutional, and organizational, play distinct roles in shaping corporate interactions and performance [19]. Geographical, organizational, and institutional proximities significantly enhance collaboration, especially evident in global satellite navigation system development. In contrast, cognitive and social proximities have less pronounced impacts [20]. Geographical proximity is particularly noted for facilitating knowledge spillover through agglomeration effects and enhancing interactive learning within local networks, thereby deepening inter-partner collaboration [21]. On the other hand, research indicates that social proximity greatly benefits marketing relationships, while geographical proximity plays a smaller role in this context [22]. The "proximity paradox" emerges as a critical concept, suggesting that overly low proximity levels can hinder interactive learning and network formation, whereas too high proximity may cause "lock-in" problems, restricting network flexibility and adaptability [23].

Further, relationship strength, which encompasses the closeness and activity level between partners, is a key focus within network research and includes elements of stability, quality, and reciprocity within network ties [14]. The ongoing debate in network research centers on whether "strong ties" or "weak ties" are more effective in fostering beneficial outcomes. Strong ties are

noted for their role in building trust mechanisms that facilitate the acquisition of external knowledge and improve business outcomes [24]. Conversely, the non-redundancy of weak ties is considered essential for accessing new, valuable knowledge that enhances specific business results [25]. Recent studies have broadened the scope of network relationship research to include more comprehensive concepts such as relationship strength, density, clustering, heterogeneity, and diversification, thereby enriching our understanding of how network ties influence resource acquisition, capability enhancement, and specific business outcomes [26].

Lastly, the content of bilateral relationships encompasses core aspects and foundational properties of cooperation between partners [5]. These elements include governance structures, relationship age, models of cooperation, and the overall scope of collaboration. Governance structures specifically outline the formal arrangements of cooperation, such as equity participation, which sets the framework for rights, obligations, and the distribution of decisions and benefits. The age of an alliance serves as an indicator of the relationship's depth and stability, with longstanding collaborations generally reflecting a deeper mutual understanding and trust. The model of cooperation, whether bilateral or multilateral, influences the complexity of integrating resources and coordinating actions. The scope of cooperation covers various functional areas like marketing, R&D, or production; it also defines the extent of the value chain interaction—either horizontal or vertical—and the extent of learning, whether it is aimed at exploring new knowledge or leveraging existing one. The diversity or similarity of capabilities contributed by partners and the goals of knowledge management—whether to acquire new insights or access existing information—further delineate the cooperation's breadth. The selection of these governance structures, models, and scopes crucially affects the synergistic outcomes of alliances, underscoring the importance for firms to meticulously consider each dimension when constructing their network relationships.

This analysis explores the complexities of bilateral relationships within alliance networks, focusing on their patterns, strengths, and content. It highlights the critical roles of proximity, relational ties, and multidimensional cooperation aspects. Traditional research often focuses on individual dyadic relationships, potentially overlooking how a network's collective relationships influence actor dynamics [27].

4. Structural Configuration of Alliance Networks

In alliance network research, the academic focus has broadened from examining relationships between individual firms and their strategic partners to a macroscopic view of entire organizational networks. This shift has led scholars to delve into the structure and content of alliance network configurations, emphasizing five critical areas: network size, structural arrangements, network diversity, balancing conflicting strategic objectives, and interactions among multiple alliances.

Firstly, network size, reflecting the breadth and potential resource pool of an alliance network, is a pivotal factor in corporate performance. Scholars utilize resource-based views, social network theories, and economic principles to probe how network size influences performance disparities among firms. While the debate on whether "bigger is always better" persists, it is clear that network size significantly impacts performance outcomes. Some research suggests that larger networks access more extensive information resources, thereby enhancing corporate results [28]. Conversely, others argue that increased network size can burden members with higher demands on time and effort, potentially degrading relationship quality and trust, which in turn diminishes performance [29]. Further studies challenge the notion of a positive linear relationship between network size and corporate output, noting that benefits diminish beyond a specific threshold [30]. Subsequent research highlights that network size alone does not dictate performance; rather, the breadth, efficiency, and quality of partnerships might play more substantial roles in deriving benefits from

alliances. Networks smaller in size but characterized by high breadth, efficient configurations, or high-quality partners might prove more beneficial and cost-effective than larger networks with redundant resources and information [5]. Future research should therefore explore the nuanced relationship between network size and performance, considering both quantitative and qualitative measures, such as partner quality, network breadth and efficiency, and the synergistic effects of direct and indirect connections.

Secondly, structural arrangements within networks focus on the stable architecture linking members, involving network density, small-world characteristics, stability, robustness, connectivity, clustering coefficients, overlap, multiplexity, and core-periphery structures [31]. These elements underscore that the transmission of information and resources relies not only on direct interactions but also on the broader indirect connections throughout the network. Discussing specific arrangements, Afuah (2013) emphasizes that behaviors within the network are as crucial to value creation as the network's structural design [32]. Hallen and Eisenhardt (2012) point out that while network relationships are essential for specific business outcomes, the strategies for linking network nodes warrant further exploration [33]. They suggest two effective strategies: leveraging robust existing connections and proactively generating new business linkages. Addressing this overlooked role of agency in network research, Tasselli and Kilduff (2021) advocate for reintegrating individual actors into the analysis of network structure antecedents [34], challenging the prevalent notion that structure dictates actor behavior. They argue that it is the actors, not the network structure, who initiate action [35]. This focus has validated many significant insights but frequently underplays the actors' role in constructing the network. Recognizing that interactions among actors are foundational to network formation, and that these actions form the core of organizational capabilities and performance, suggests a shift towards examining 'how firms construct networks' can yield more practical guidance for strategic network management.

Thirdly, network diversity emphasizes variations in nodes and linkages within networks, extending beyond mere partner characteristics to encompass partner selection, functional purposes, and governance structures [36]. This broader framework assesses alliance portfolio diversity, focusing on the complementarity of partners' resources, skills, and technologies. It distinguishes between resource complementarity that facilitates strategic alliances and characteristic differences that may increase communication challenges, revealing the dual impact of partner diversity on alliance efficiency. Diverse partners can introduce new perspectives and resources, broadening avenues for innovation and resource acquisition. However, excessive diversity might increase management complexity and coordination costs, necessitating a balance between resource diversity and operational efficiency. Functional diversity in alliances plays a critical role within a firm's value chain, enabling expansion in business scope and enhancement of core competitiveness. Alliances with varying functional purposes offer diverse opportunities for market coverage, value creation, and capability enhancement, correlating positively with firm performance. Governance diversity concerns the impact of different governance structures on alliance management efficiency. Each structure demands specific resource commitments and presents unique management challenges, urging firms to select governance frameworks that align with internal management practices and minimize transaction costs. Combining entity diversity with resource costs provides a nuanced approach to measuring resource diversity, recognizing that managing diverse alliances typically incurs higher coordination and transaction costs [37].

Fourthly, constructing and managing alliance networks entails balancing conflicting strategic objectives, such as aligning internal and external resources, balancing revenue against costs, and making decisions between exploration and exploitation, within a "resources-partners-firm" framework. Russo and Vurro (2010) demonstrate how cross-boundary ambidexterity allows firms to synchronize internal strategies for improving existing products with external efforts to explore new

markets or technologies [38]. Wassmer and Madhok (2017) illustrate how firms can balance increased revenue and reduced costs by leveraging new alliances for fresh resources while capitalizing on existing resources from previous partnerships, despite potential performance impacts from conflicts between new and old resources [39]. Extending ambidexterity to alliance networks enables firms to dedicate some alliances to new opportunities while others exploit existing resources, maintaining strategic equilibrium. Lavie, Kang, and Rosenkopf (2011) discuss cross-organizational ambidexterity, which encompasses functional, structural, and cross-domain balancing strategies, providing a framework for simultaneous innovation and optimization of existing operations across various business functions and partnerships [40]. Additionally, Kavusan and Frankort (2019) propose three strategies for configuring alliance networks based on "resource richness, partner availability, and firm receptivity": collaborating with new partners on existing resources, partnering with existing allies on new resources, or jointly exploring new resources with new partners [41]. This strategy not only expands the resource pool and introduces new cooperative models but also necessitates careful management of the complexities and competitive risks involved. Repetitive alliance structures bolster relationship strength and value extraction, while diverse governance structures may reduce the efficiency of innovation efforts.

Fifthly, research in corporate alliance network configuration highlights the interdependence of firm relationships, necessitating the coordination of various bilateral relationships to achieve synergistic effects. This coordination involves four key areas: managing multiple bilateral relationships within multilateral alliances, integrating multiple alliances within single business sectors, synchronizing alliances across diverse business areas, and assessing the cumulative effects of direct and indirect connections [42]. Drawing on network and resource-based theories, the literature explores the interplay between network relationships and resource characteristics, focusing on the dynamics of competition and cooperation within relationships, and the complementarity across connections [43]. Research shows that competitive-cooperative interactions, involving both the focal firm and its partners, necessitate a careful balance during alliance formation to prevent competitive tensions from undermining cooperative gains. Additionally, the strategic use of strong and weak ties, supported by structural hole theory, facilitates effective information flow and innovation, promoting diverse resource and knowledge integration. Success in alliances also critically depends on the compatibility and characteristics of partner resources. Effective resource matching, essential for achieving collective strategic goals, requires precise evaluation and integration of potential partners' resources, ensuring that alliances are functionally cohesive and strategically aligned.

5. Conclusion and Discussion

This study employs a tripartite analytical framework—nodes, links, and structure—to systematically dissect alliance network configurations. This approach clarifies the network's complex interrelations, providing a robust theoretical and empirical foundation. However, existing research predominantly emphasizes the effects of direct connections and less so on indirect ones [44]. Indirect connections, where firms are linked through intermediaries rather than directly, offer new information and opportunities, acting as bridges to external social groups and providing access to otherwise inaccessible resources [45]. Future research should focus on optimizing both direct and indirect connections within network configuration strategies to enhance their strategic value comprehensively.

The dimensions of node, relationship, and structure offer distinct layers for analyzing alliance network configurations. The primary aim is to clarify how corporate behaviors modify network structures and contents, guiding both efficiency and strategic alignment [46]. The term "structure"

describes the network's architecture, including its size, density, structural holes, and centrality, which illustrate the connectivity between nodes and are essential for evaluating network function [46]. Conversely, "content" involves the resources and information within the network, both tangible (like financial resources and technology) and intangible (such as knowledge and reputation), impacting the network's functionality and the depth of internal interactions. Content flow—including asset exchanges, cognitive sharing, reputational transfers, and affective support—is central to network activities. Current research often highlights structural features, neglecting the nuanced impacts of content flow [47], partly due to methodologies like egocentric network measurements that focus on the quantitative aspects of relationships [46]. However, Zou and Storz (2023) suggest that variations in network content could be a key to understanding performance differences among firms, especially when network structures remain stable [47]. Leveraging resource-based theory, they advocate for a broader diversity of resource types and ranges within networks to maximize benefits. Future studies should deepen the examination of the content dimension to enrich our understanding of network dynamics and support the development of network design and management strategies.

References

- [1] Zhang, B. J., Hu, H. Q. and Zhang, D. H. (2011) *The formation and evolution of corporate innovation networks: A social network theory perspective*. *China Industrial Economics*, 4, 10
- [2] Lu, R. Y., Zhou, Y., Ding, Y. W., Zhou, D. M. and Feng, X. (2021) *Corporate innovation networks: Origin, evolution, and research prospects*. *Management World*, 37(1), 217-233.
- [3] Han, W. and Wu, Y. B. (2022) *How to enhance corporate performance through alliance portfolio construction*. In J. Yang, H. Zhu, and X. Y. Yu (Eds.), *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research: Issues, Theories, and Methods*. Mechanical Industry Press.
- [4] Penney, C. R. and Combs, J. G. (2020) *A transaction cost perspective of alliance portfolio diversity*. *Journal of Management Studies*, 57(6), 1073-1105.
- [5] Wassmer, U. (2010). *Alliance portfolios: A review and research agenda*. *Journal of Management*, 36(1), 141-171.
- [6] Dyer, J. H., Kale, P. and Singh, H. (2001) *Strategic alliances work*. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 42(4), 37-43.
- [7] Lavie, D. (2007) *Alliance portfolios and firm performance: a study of value creation and appropriation in the US software industry*. *Strategic Management Journal*, 28(12), 1187-1212.
- [8] He, D. and Huo, C. H. (2022) *Network orchestration: Connotation characteristics, theoretical framework and future prospects*. *Foreign Economics & Management*, 44(06), 47-62.
- [9] Hoffmann, W. H. (2007) *Strategies for managing a portfolio of alliances*. *Strategic Management Journal*, 28(8), 827–856.
- [10] Koka, B. R. and Prescott, J. E. (2008) *Designing alliance networks: the influence of network position, environmental change, and strategy on firm performance*. *Strategic Management Journal*, 29(6), 639-661.
- [11] Shi, W., Sun, S. L. and Peng, M. W. (2012) *Sub-National Institutional Contingencies, Network Positions, and IJV Partner Selection*. *Journal of Management Studies*, 49(7), 1221–1245.
- [12] Wang, L., Shao, Y. H. and Wang, Y. N. (2021) *Network structure and bank efficiency: A study based on the time-varying "bank-shareholder" network*. *Economic Research Journal*, 56(12), 60-76.
- [13] Li, D. H., Fan, L. B. and Yang, Z. N. (2017) *Can enterprise network embedding be worry-free? An examination based on Chinese listed manufacturing companies*. *Nankai Business Review*, 20(01), 67-82.
- [14] Uzzi, B. (1997) *Social Structure and Competition in Interfirm Networks: The Paradox of Embeddedness*. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42(1), 35-67.
- [15] Bizzi, L. (2013) *The dark side of structural holes: A multilevel investigation*. *Journal of Management*, 39(6), 1554-1578.
- [16] Baum, J. A., Cowan, R. and Jonard, N. (2010) *Network-independent partner selection and the evolution of innovation networks*. *Management science*, 56(11), 2094-2110.
- [17] Ding, R., Dekker, H. C. and Groot, T. (2013) *Risk, partner selection and contractual control in interfirm relationships*. *Management Accounting Research*, 24(2), 140-155.
- [18] Hao, B., Li, J. L. and Fligangwanshang. (2014) *The latest progress in research on inter-firm relationship partner selection*. *Foreign Economics & Management*, 36(01), 55–64.
- [19] Lazzaretti, L. and Capone, F. (2016) *How Proximity Matters in Innovation Networks Dynamics Along the Cluster Evolution*. *Journal of Business Research*, 69(12), 5855-5865.

- [20] Balland, P.A. (2012) Proximity and the evolution of collaboration networks. *Regional Studies*, 46(6), 741-756.
- [21] Belussi, F., Sedita, S. and Sammarra, A. (2010) Learning at the boundaries in an "Open Regional Innovation System": A focus on firms' innovation strategies in the Emilia Romagna life science industry. *Research Policy*, 39, 710-721.
- [22] Geldes, C., Felzensztein, C., Turkina, E. and Durand, A. (2015) How does proximity affect interfirm marketing cooperation? A study of an agribusiness cluster. *Journal of Business Research*, 68, 263-272.
- [23] Broekel, T. and Boschma, R. (2012) Knowledge networks in the Dutch aviation industry: The proximity paradox. *Journal of Economic Geography*, 12, 409-433.
- [24] Liu, X. Y., Ding, W. J. and Zhao, X. D. (2016) The relationship between relationship strength, absorptive capacity, and innovation performance in corporate innovation networks. *Nankai Management Review*, 19(01), 30-42.
- [25] Frankenberger, K., Weiblen, T. and Gassmann, O. (2013) Network configuration, customer centrality, and performance of open business models: A solution provider perspective. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 42(5), 671-682.
- [26] Guan, J. and Liu, N. (2016) Exploitative and Exploratory Innovations in Knowledge Network and Collaboration Network: A Patent Analysis in the Technological Field of Nano-Energy. *Research Policy*, 45(1), 97-112.
- [27] Zhang, C. and Du, N. (2011) Inter-organizational networks at the network level: A review of empirical literature on whole networks. *Management World*, 10, 154-167.
- [28] Bouncken, R. B. and Fredrich, V. (2016) Learning in cooptation: Alliance orientation, network size, and firm types. *Journal of Business Research*, 69(5), 1753-1758.
- [29] Huang, J. W. (2019) Is the corporate social network always useful? A literature review. *Science Research Management*, 40(09), 57-64.
- [30] Huang, M. X., Yu, Y. H., Yao, J. X. and He, T. (2023) The impact of technological and human network structures on bank performance: A panoramic study based on spatial competition of bank branches. *Journal of Management Sciences in China*, (05), 174-199.
- [31] Zaheer, A., Gözİbİyİk, R. and Milanov, H. (2010) It's the Connections: The Network Perspective in Interorganizational Research. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 24(1), 62-77.
- [32] Afuah, A. (2013) Are network effects really all about size? The role of structure and conduct. *Strategic Management Journal*, 34(3), 257-273.
- [33] Hallen, B. L. and Eisenhardt, K. M. (2012) Catalyzing Strategies and Efficient Tie Formation: How Entrepreneurial Firms Obtain Investment Ties. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(1), 35-70.
- [34] Tasselli, S. and Kilduff, M. (2021) Network Agency. *Academy of Management Annals*, 15(1), 68-110.
- [35] Burt, R. S. (2012) Network-related personality and the agency question: Multirole evidence from a virtual world. *American Journal of Sociology*, 118, 543-591.
- [36] Jiang, R.J., Tao, Q.T. and Santoro. (2010) Alliance portfolio diversity and firm performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 31(10), 1136-1144.
- [37] Goerzen, A. and Beamish, P. W. (2005) The Effect of Alliance Network Diversity on Multinational Enterprise Performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 26(4), 333-354.
- [38] Russo, A. and Vurro, C. (2010) Cross-boundary ambidexterity: Balancing exploration and exploitation in the fuel cell industry. *European Management Review*, 7(1), 30-45.
- [39] Wassmer, U., Li, S. and Madhok, A. (2017) Resource ambidexterity through alliance portfolios and firm performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 38(2), 384-394.
- [40] Lavie, D., Kang, J. and Rosenkopf, L. (2011) Balance Within and Across Domains: The Performance Implications of Exploration and Exploitation in Alliances. *Organization Science*, 22.
- [41] Kavusan, K. and Frankort, H.T.W. (2019) A behavioral theory of alliance portfolio reconfiguration: evidence from pharmaceutical biotechnology. *Strategic Management Journal*, 40(10), 1668-1702.
- [42] Hoffmann, W. H. (2005) How to Manage a Portfolio of Alliances. *Long Range Planning*, 38(2), 121-143.
- [43] Han, W. and Deng, Y. (2018) A review and prospect of alliance portfolio research: Interaction, dynamics, and impact effects of alliance portfolios. *Management Review*, 30(10), 169-183.
- [44] Yang, Z. B. (2018) Network embeddedness and technological innovation: How indirect ties and alliance diversity affect corporate technological innovation. *Science of Science and Management of S. & T.*, (07), 51-64.
- [45] Granovetter, M. S. (1973) The strength of weak ties. *American Journal of Sociology*, 78(6), 1360-1380.
- [46] van Burg, E., Elfring, T. and Cornelissen, J. P. (2022) Connecting content and structure: A review of mechanisms in entrepreneurs' social networks. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 24(2), 188-209.
- [47] Zou, N. and Storz, C. (2023) Why do some entrepreneurs thrive? A network content perspective. *Journal of Business Research*, 161, 113821.