Technological Forecasting & Social Change 77 (2010) 1156–1166

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Technological Forecasting & Social Change

Social capital, ICT use and company performance: Findings from the Medicon Valley Biotech Cluster

Charles Steinfield [a], Ada Scupola [b,*], Carolina López-Nicolás [c]

[a] Department of Telecommunication, Information Studies, and Media, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MA, United States
[b] Department of Communication, Business and Information Technologies, Roskilde University, Roskilde, Denmark
[c] Department of Management and Finance, University of Murcia, Murcia, Spain

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received 29 June 2009
Received in revised form 2 December 2009
Accepted 10 March 2010

Keywords:
Social capital
ICTs
Business clusters
Biotechnology

ABSTRACT

This study explores how some uses of ICTs, as well as having social capital and other means of access to knowledge resources, are related to company performance in a knowledge-intensive business cluster. Data were collected through a survey of companies in the Medicon Valley biotech region located in Denmark and Southern Sweden. Responding companies included established producers of biotechnology-related products as well as small biotechnology start-up firms emphasizing research and development. The results suggest that when ICT use was aimed at accessing and enhancing human and intellectual capital, such as use of online databases for recruitment, intranets to enhance employee access to information and education, and collaborative tools to connect with off-premise researchers, companies reported better performance outcomes. Social capital in the form of connections to people who can provide access to information and opportunity predicted company performance, particularly for small start-up companies. The pattern of results complements prior work that establishes the importance of social capital in regional business clusters by demonstrating how certain ICT uses complement personal relationships to enhance the likelihood of success among companies in the region.

1. Introduction

Over the past several decades there has been much interest in industrial localization of economic activities as a way to explain economic growth and increase innovation and competitiveness [1–4]. Such industrial agglomeration has been referred to in a number of different ways [3,5–8]. In this paper Porter's definition of business clusters, defined as "geographic concentrations of interconnected companies and institutions in a particular field" is adopted [3, p. 78].

The effects of industrial agglomerations have been mainly explained by the interaction among the many actors located within a well-specified geographical region such as governmental organizations, universities, standards-setting agencies and trade associations [9]. Factors explaining the growth and dynamism of regional industrial clusters include the presence of supportive local institutions, the availability of specialized suppliers and service providers, access to a qualified pool of workers, pressures from local competition [4,10,11] and knowledge creation and learning processes within the region [12,13]. In addition tacit and explicit knowledge spillovers through formal and informal communication channels – indicators of a region's "social capital" – are considered to be very important, especially in knowledge and research intensive clusters such as biotechnology [14–16]. Recent literature is also investigating the benefits for cluster companies in using information and communication technologies (ICTs) to support exchange activities within and outside the cluster [9,17,18].

* Corresponding author. Department of Communication, Business and Information Technologies, Roskilde University, Box 260 K-4000 Roskilde, Denmark. Tel.: +45 46 74 25 98; fax: +45 46 74 30 80.
E-mail address: ada@ruc.dk (A. Scupola).

0040-1625/$ – see front matter © 2010 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.
doi:10.1016/j.techfore.2010.03.004

This study adds to the literature on the importance of relationships and communication in regional clusters by explicitly investigating the combination of social and relational factors, access to cluster-based resources, and specific forms of ICT use as predictors of individual firm success. We distinguish between companies primarily conducting R&D, but not yet selling products, and those selling goods and services, considering that the needs and the way of measuring success for these two types of cluster companies, might be different. Specifically, we ask: 1) Is company performance in knowledge intensive clusters dependent on possessing social capital? 2) Does use of ICTs that support both social and human capital influence company success? 3) If so, are these relationships contingent on whether a firm is mainly involved in R&D activities or is primarily a producer of goods and services for sale?

This study is motivated by several reasons and makes several contributions. First of all, the study investigates the importance of social capital for the performance of companies located in clusters, thus corroborating with a quantitative approach previous results based mostly on qualitative studies. Second, while previous studies show that ICTs cannot contribute to the social capital of a region, this study investigates and shows how ICT use complements personal relationships to enhance the likelihood of success among companies in a region. Third, the study sheds light on the importance of social capital and ICT use in a specific biotech region, the Medicon Valley Cluster, a knowledge intensive biotech cluster located in the Danish region called "Zealand" and Southern Sweden.

To answer the research questions we first build a theoretical model based on a literature review related to innovation, industrial clusters, social capital and ICTs, and supported by insights provided by a series of semi-structured interviews with key players in companies and institutions located in the Medicon Valley cluster. This model is then investigated through a survey of biotech companies located in the cluster.

The paper is organized as follows. This section has introduced the background and the research questions. Section 2 develops the research model and supporting hypotheses. In Section 3 we provide a description of the Medicon Valley biotech cluster. Section four outlines the research methods used in the study. Results are presented in Section 5. Finally, Sections 6 and 7 discuss the findings, and provide conclusions and implications of the study.

2. Theoretical model and hypotheses

As noted above, theorists have identified many factors that can help to explain the relative success of companies in industrial districts, largely stemming from the way in which company location mediates access to knowledge, labor, resources, and relationships [4,10,11]. For example, Bathelt et al. [16] discuss and emphasize the information and communication ecology created by face-to-face contacts, co-location and co-presence of people or firms within the same industry or region called "buzz" as well as the channels used in long distance interactions and global communication called "pipelines". Access to knowledge-relevant resources is particularly important in a cluster dominated by R&D activity such as biotechnology clusters [15]. In our review, we suggest that not all firms in a cluster benefit to the same degree due to differential access to cluster knowledge resources. The sections below develop arguments suggesting that cluster members richer in social capital, those having greater access to specific knowledge resources such as access to training or university research expertise, and those using ICTs to enhance access to knowledge resources will benefit the most. We also argue that it is important to control for broader organizational resource availability, e.g. size, as well as the kinds of activities in which a company is engaged. For example, in biotech regions, some biotech companies are mainly engaged in R&D, developing new compounds or diagnostic tests they hope to eventually license, while others are actually manufacturing and selling finished products [e.g. 19]. The outcomes that are relevant in these two kinds of companies are quite distinct: traditional measures of performance such as sales, customer relationships, costs, etc. are not really relevant for the former type of company, but the extent to which other companies know about them and are aware of their activities should be. These traditional performance indicators are, however, important for the latter types of companies actually producing and selling products.

2.1. Social capital in knowledge clusters

Social capital is understood roughly as the goodwill that is engendered by the fabric of social relations in which an individual is embedded, and which can be mobilized to facilitate action [20]. The concept has become increasingly popular in organizational literature [20,21] and has important implications for understanding the formation of relational networks in high growth, technology-intensive industries. In these industries, opportunities for cooperation are created by unintended spillovers and intended agreements [22]. Social capital has been invoked often to explain the vitality of clusters. Indeed, some theorists even posit that clusters characterized by rich social networks that provide the social capital of the region represent a specific type of cluster, distinct from clusters that do not have such dense networks [23].

The existence of social capital in a cluster of companies depends upon the ability of people to associate with each other and the extent to which their shared norms and values allow them to subordinate their individual interests to the larger interests of the community [24]. Interventions that may build social capital in a regional cluster include providing incentives to activate local business and civic associations or to activate new associations; requiring, or including incentives for, multiple-firm sponsorship or inter-firm collaboration or economic development grants; and increasing investments in cluster-based communications systems and in inter-firm collaboration [25]. Local business associations in Silicon Valley, for instance, also contributed to the development of the social infrastructure needed to leverage social capital [25]. In the start-up phase of a company, there may be greater dependence on social ties to identify business partners because of the limited experience in the market. More established firms

have worked with different business partners and therefore can rely on past experience to obtain needed resources. In biotechnology, for example, small startups have extensive expertise in technological innovation but lack resources in marketing and distribution possessed by large incumbents [22]. Hence, social capital may be more important for start-up firms than for those that have moved to a later phase in their development.

A significant body of literature supports the notion that less codified, and socially enacted and embedded forms of knowledge, capital and network relations have important consequences for industrial performance and innovative capacity [12,13,16]. In geographically defined business clusters, social capital can be a key element in improving firms' performance. Explanations of successful local business clusters often focus on traditional social capital explanations, such as the importance of trust and social relationships, as a catalyst for knowledge sharing and innovation across firms that may not even be trading partners [16]. Putnam [26] found in his comparative study of Northern and Southern Italy that the stock of social capital predicts economic performance, and that stock is enhanced by the dense social infrastructure. Also, social capital strengthens regional production networks [27] and Rosenfeld [25] concludes that the most effective clusters are those with specialized support and considerable social capital.

Co-located firms within related industries enhance the ability to create knowledge by benefiting from social relationships and knowledge exchange via interactions with other companies within the cluster [16]. Rosenfeld [25] found that firms in clusters take advantage of a high level of social capital that bonds cluster members and provides opportunity for informal interaction and learning. Also clusters of firms have the social infrastructure that keeps information flowing continually, sparks new ideas, generates networks, and encourages new firm start-ups. These factors may improve corporate performance in terms of innovativeness, efficiency, sales, quality of products and new market opportunities.

Other research on clusters characterized by intense internal trading relationships has similarly observed the crucial role of social embededness, noting how personal connections create advantages for trading partners that may not arise in arms-length market transactions [28]. Because suppliers and customers simply need to interact with each other in order to do business, most relationships in a cluster will be along the vertical dimension, including specialized suppliers and critical customers both of which can affect the firm's perceived market exposure. Specifically, Rosenfeld [25] found that suppliers contribute to the stock of social capital by organizing social events that bring companies' owners and employees together, thus impacting on the quality of relationships with suppliers, a component of the firm's perceived market exposure. Also, maintaining regular interactions with a firm's customers can enhance the quality of their relationships and, in turn, the firm's market outcomes. Based on the above discussion, we can posit the following:

H1. Social capital will impact the performance of a knowledge cluster company.

H2. Social capital will have a greater impact on the performance of start-up companies than mature companies in a knowledge-oriented cluster.

2.2. Access to knowledge resources

Today, knowledge is often considered a fundamental basis of competition [29] and, particularly tacit knowledge can be argued to be a source of advantage because it is unique, imperfectly mobile, imperfectly imitable, non-substitutable and personally or socially embedded [30]. Industrial districts constitute a place where knowledge is created, transferred and made accessible [16]. Knowledge, and especially tacit knowledge, flows more easily among organizations located within the same geographical area or industrial cluster [31]. The proximity between firms plays an important role in interactive learning processes [12,13] in the sense that in many cases the exchange of information and knowledge is less expensive, more reliable and easier. Short distances not only reduce transaction costs and encourage innovation [32]; they also facilitate the coordination of individual actors and stimulate the transfer of knowledge [33].

The exchange of knowledge between firms in an industrial district can be formal or informal [16]. In their research with a sample of engineers in a regional cluster of wireless communication firms in Northern Denmark, Dahl and Pedersen [34] find that the engineers in different firms share quite valuable knowledge with informal contacts, meaning that informal contacts represent an important channel of knowledge diffusion. More recently, Sammarra and Biggiero [35], based on the aerospace industrial cluster of Rome, find that technological, market and managerial knowledge are purposely exchanged between firms within the cluster for innovation. Companies in clusters can acquire knowledge from both inside and outside the region [16,28]. For instance, Owen-Smith and Powell [15] have shown in the case of the Boston biotechnology industry that access to new knowledge does not just result from local and regional interaction but is often acquired through strategic partnerships of inter-regional and international reach. Our focus is, though, on the access to knowledge resources from regional interactions within the industrial cluster.

From a global perspective, knowledge-based elements as determinants of a cluster's strength and performance have received a considerable amount of attention within qualitative and case-based research studies [36]. Economic agents are thought to gather together in close geographic proximity and establish relationships with one another in order to better perform certain economic activities. From a narrower viewpoint, inter-firm knowledge sharing is essential to be innovative, thus increasing the company's performance. This is especially important for small firms in a cluster because they lack the financial resources, human skills, and marketing capabilities [1]. On the other hand, firms operating in knowledge intensive industries, such as biotechnology, need to be flexible in order to provide products and services in a rapidly changing environment [37], where knowledge must be generated and shared continuously and organisations have to enhance their employees to be creative. Industrial clusters create a context in

which this is more likely to happen, although, as proposed earlier, not all firms will enjoy the same degree of access to the knowledge resources in a cluster. Besides, companies can create new knowledge within industrial clusters [38] by interacting with other firms, thus improving organizational and cluster innovation and performance. In summary:

H3. Access to knowledge resources will impact the performance of a knowledge cluster company.

2.3. ICTs and performance of firms in clusters

Many studies have been conducted that investigate the relationship between ICTs and clusters [39]. Generally, these studies can be classified into two main groups. The first focuses on the effects of the information and communication technology infrastructure on the agglomeration or disagglomeration of geographically localized activities [18,39]. The second focuses on adoption and diffusion of ICTs in clusters [9,17,36,40,41]. Studies that explore the effect of ICTs on the performance of firms located in clusters are rare, despite the long history of research related to ICTs and company performance [18].

Information systems researchers have found that ICTs, such as intranets, can be a source of value creation to firms by providing intra-organizational communication at reduced cost and by allowing employees to distribute and communicate their ideas more readily [42], thus positively impacting organizational performance [e.g. 43]. In addition the literature studying the business value of information technology for organizations has also recently showed that ICTs can contribute to firm performance [44–46]. Examples of ICTs value creation in firms can be in process planning and support improvement [47]; supplier linkages [48]; increase company innovativeness through e.g. new product and service enhancement [47] and finally in improving customer relationships as they can result in an increase in market share [49].

Kumar et al. [41] have argued that being based in a cluster may obviate the need for ICTs-supported transactions between firms, as personal interactions enabled by proximity and trust would substitute for more formal transaction automation. Their work, however, focused purely on inter-company transactions among small firms in the pre-Internet era. Moreover, their study did not consider the many internal applications of ICTs that can enhance company performance. Steinfield and Scupola [18] distinguish between internal and external use of ICTs in their analysis of ICT use in a biotech cluster. Internal ICTs are those that connected employees to each other and the company, including those who worked at different locations. External uses included e-commerce and other transaction support applications involving other companies or customers.

ICTs for knowledge sharing present some limitations, since they reduce the very richness of knowledge when it is codified and the management and diffusion of tacit knowledge through technologies is problematic [50]. This is a significant drawback as nowadays tacit knowledge in particular can be argued to be a source of competitive advantage because it is unique, imperfectly mobile, imperfectly imitable, non-substitutable and personally or socially embedded [30]. In a business cluster, companies may share relevant codified knowledge using ICTs, while tacit knowledge is better shared across firms having close relations among employees; that is, as a result of their social capital. Thus, for knowledge sharing within business clusters the use of ICTs and social capital may be complementary as they are appropriate for distributing codified and tacit knowledge respectively. Also, recent developments suggest that technological tools are progressively more capable of providing meaningful support for knowledge sharing, in ways at least partially responsive to these limitations [50].

Nevertheless, the specificity of the contribution that ICT tools may bring to a biotech cluster like Medicon Valley is argued to be different when compared with other industrial contexts. Broadly speaking, in the production of standardised commodities firms mainly exchange codified knowledge and therefore ICTs strongly facilitate internal and external communication [51]. Instead, there are sectors in which face-to-face interaction is required in most transactions. This is the case of the biotech companies in Medicon Valley requiring hand-touch and direct check by customers to assess quality. In similar cases rather than ICTs, 'face-to-face technologies' are necessary [52].

Given our earlier discussions about the critical importance of access to knowledge, a skilled labor force, and knowledge management in knowledge intensive clusters, it is likely that ICTs addressing these needs will be critical to success. Indeed, in unstructured and in-depth interviews with company managers in the region, interviewees often commented on their use of the Internet especially to seek out and recruit new employees. We thus focus our attention on ICTs that address the needs to enhance human capital and improve access to the kind of highly specialized workforce needed by biotechnology firms. Hence, we propose:

H4. The use of ICTs to enhance human capital will impact the performance of a knowledge cluster company.

2.4. Company characteristics

Cooperation and networking is reported as a more common aspect among large firms and those with high R&D intensity in continental Europe [53]. In a prior analysis of the Medicon Valley cluster, it was found that two types of biotechnology companies were prevalent: larger, more mature producer firms that are export oriented, and small, start-up R&D companies that may not yet have products that they manufacture or sell commercially [18]. In the former case, the lion's share of large company output is destined for markets outside the Medicon Valley cluster. These companies do not typically work very closely with companies in the region, but do connect with researchers from universities, or in the start-up companies located in Medicon Valley [18]. These small start-up companies are often formed as spin-offs from larger companies or universities, and maintain intense contacts with their prior research colleagues. They are mainly financed by venture capital. We expect that start-up companies will be more

focused on building awareness of their expertise and their research work, than on actual sales. We also expect that the extent of resources available to a company, using size in terms of the number of employees, should influence performance.

H5. The primary activities of a company (R&D vs. manufacturing and sales) will impact the performance of a cluster-based company.

H6. The resources of a company (using size as a proxy) will impact the performance of a cluster-based company.

We treat the independent variables in these final two hypotheses as control variables, and focus our attention on the extent to which the other independent variables (social capital, ICTs and access to knowledge resources) explain the two types of outcomes (market exposure and market performance). An overview of the model is provided in Fig. 1.

3. An overview of the Medicon Valley

The Medicon Valley cluster is one of the top European bioregions featuring cross-border partnerships between industry, universities, hospitals, science parks, investors and business services (see Table 1 for detailed characteristics of the region).

The Medicon Valley cluster is located in the Øresund Region. This region includes the Copenhagen area in Denmark and the southern region of Sweden called Scania. The cluster has its historical roots in the dairy producers that for several centuries have characterized the region [54,55]. Since 1997 the region has been branded as 'Medicon Valley' to reflect the region's life science competences, and today Medicon Valley attracts more foreign direct investment within life science than any other region in Europe (www.mediconvalley.com). The Medicon Valley Alliance (www.mva.org), a non-profit, fee based member organization, has a key role in the growth and branding of the cluster by creating synergies and value for local companies and by functioning as the point of entry to the cluster for international companies and investors. The cluster has seen a tremendous growth in recent years as the number of new biotechnology companies has increased significantly, with both new local companies as well as new subsidiaries of foreign biotechnology companies. The most important international competitors of this cluster are the world's leading biotech regions in Boston, San Francisco and San Diego in USA, Cambridge in the United Kingdom, Bayern in Germany, and Paris in France. According to the Medicon Valley Alliance home page (www.mediconvalley.com), the cluster attractiveness includes factors such as a high concentration of life science companies, being home to a unique network of hospitals, public research institutions, universities, industry and investors, world-class research and location in an attractive geographical region.

4. Methodology

An online survey was sent to biotechnology companies in the Medicon Valley biotechnology region in order to test the hypotheses. To define the final version of the questionnaire we used both previously tested measures as well as new qualitative scales. In fact, prior to conducting the survey, we visited 17 companies in the region to explore the nature of their interactions with other companies inside and outside the region, the types of resources that made the region attractive, the kinds of activities in which their companies were engaged, and the various ways in which they used ICTs. The interviews served as input to the construction of the survey questionnaire and are not otherwise reported in detail in this paper.

4.1. Survey approach and sample

Once constructed and tested, the survey was sent to 244 biotech companies located in Medicon Valley, which accounted for about all of the biotech companies in the cluster that we were able to identify. In fact, as in other survey studies in the



Fig. 1. A model of performance of firms located in knowledge intensive clusters.

Table 1
Characteristics of Medicon Valley.
Adapted from the MVA home page, http://www.mva.org.

Population	Ca 3 mi. inhabitants — 22% of the total population of Denmark and Sweden
Number of universities	12
Affluent population	GDP per capita is EUR 27,358 (EU average: EUR 21,990 (Eurostat, 2002)
Number of university students	140,000 of whom 2.000 are PhD students within life science
Number of researchers	10,000
International accessibility	2 international airports. Copenhagen and Malmo
Number of hospitals	26 hospitals of which 11 are university hospitals
Science Parks	6
Other Characteristics	- Fixed link between Denmark and Sweden ensures easy travel between the two countries - Beautiful nature and distinct metropolitan areas - Well educated labor force

biotechnology field [e.g., 19] one of the main problems to identify the company sample was that there are no up-to-date national statistics covering all the firms dedicated to biotechnology in Medicon Valley. Thus, we first had to produce a database of firms.

In constructing the database, we included only companies conducting biotechnology activities. This kind of companies develops biotechnology products and services in therapeutic areas for the treatment, prevention or diagnosis of illnesses such as production of vaccines, antibiotics, drugs and diagnostic kits [e.g., 19]. We did not include companies in the region offering support services such as the many accounting, ICTs services, consulting, and employment agencies that cater to the biotechnology industry. To build our database we started from the database created by Medicon Valley Alliance (www.mva.org) and supplemented it with other companies found on the web. The MVA database provided a total of 270 companies, but included a number of companies that we determined were engaged in the provision of support services. We excluded these support services companies in order to focus exclusively on companies researching, developing or selling biotechnology products. The list was supplemented with several additional biotech companies located in all the science parks of the Medicon Valley geographical region that were not accounted for in the MVA database.

An e-mail invitation to participate in the study was sent to the CEO or managing director of each company. When this person could not be found, the contact name provided on the company web page was used. In the latter case, we requested that the recipient forwarded the questionnaire to the CEO or to a senior manager with a good overview of the company to ensure that (s) he was a person in a similar role across all companies answering the questionnaire. We made it very clear in the invitation letter that this was important for the reliability of the results. Even though we do not have any proof that this has happened, we have good reasons to believe that this was the case as the respondents showed a high interests in the study and were keen to know the results. The invitation included a presentation of the study, information about confidentiality, and a link to the survey. No compensation was offered for participation; however respondents were offered a summary of the results. The questionnaire was pre-tested with several firm CEOs and directors. Few modifications were made in order to increase clarity. The survey ran over a three-week period, using the online survey hosting site Zoomerang (www.zoomerang.com). Three reminders were sent to companies that had not yet responded. Sixty companies answered the questionnaire, and after excluding two companies that we were not able to reach via email, the response rate was approximately 25%. Similarly as observed in the cluster population (www.mva.org), the sample consists of around 25–30% of R&D companies, being manufacturers the majority of the companies (70–75%).

4.2. Dependent measures

We developed two distinct outcome measures to reflect the different aspects of performance that might be relevant for R&D start-ups vs. mature companies that produce and sell products. A series of twelve performance related items based on aspects of performance over the past two years that our interviewees suggested would be important are listed in Table 2. These factored into two dimensions. The first, *market performance*, contains classic performance measures such as profitability and reductions in costs. The second, *market exposure*, contains items related to the visibility of the company to various stakeholders and its attractiveness to potential investors. Based on the interviews we expected that this latter measure would be quite relevant for R&D start-up companies. As shown in Table 2, these formed reliable scales.

4.3. Independent measures

Organizational resources were approximated by the number of employees in a respondent's company in the region. The *primary activity* of the company was determined by asking the company whether it was currently selling or distributing one or more products or services ($N=39$), or, conversely, was not selling a product or service at this time but was only engaged in R&D ($N=21$).

Given our conceptualization of social capital as being embedded in relationships, we created an index of *social capital* that focused primarily on the extent to which people in the company knew and trusted others in the region that might provide advice and access to information and opportunity. The six items proved to be unidimensional and formed a reliable scale. The individual items are provided in Table 3.

Table 2
Dependent items and scales.

Individual items and scales	Factor loadings	
	Market performance	Market exposure
Market Perform. (Cron. alpha = .90) mean = 3.17, S.D. = 0.89 [a]		
We are widely recognized as one of the leading providers of our products/services around the world [b]	.67	.35
We were able to enter new markets around the world [c]	.80	.21
We increased our sales to customers outside the Oresund region [c]	.88	−.01
We improved the quality of our goods, services, and processes [c]	.76	.15
We improved our overall profitability [c]	.78	.07
We improved the quality of our relationships with customers [c]	.71	.27
We reduced the costs per unit of good or service provided [c]	.62	.27
We introduced new or improved products, services, or processes [d]	.72	.01
Market Exposure (Cron. alpha = .71) mean = 3.50, S.D. = 0.77 [a]		
Our company is attractive to potential investors [b]	.09	.73
We improved the quality of our relationships with suppliers [c]	.28	.56
We increased the visibility of our company inside the Oresunds region [c]	−.09	.78
We increased the visibility of our company outside the Oresunds region [c]	.35	.80

[a] Principal components factor analysis with varimax rotation. Scales created by averaging across items.
[b] Item scales ranges from 1 = strong disagree to 5 = strongly agree.
[c] Questions asked about performance over the last two years, with scales ranging from 1 = strong disagree to 5 = strongly agree. Due to missing data created by some items being non-applicable to some companies, not applicable answers were recoded to the midpoint of the scale (neither agree nor disagree).
[d] Constructed by adding yes responses to three separate items: new or improved products, new or improved services, and new or improved processes.

Our measure of ICT use was derived from the interviews where respondents identified the range of ways in which they used various ICTs, including the Internet and specialized collaboration software, to gain access to labor resources, research information and partners, and training and education. We called this measure *ICT use for human capital*, since it reflected uses aimed at enhancing the stock of knowledge and knowledgeable people in the company. Items used to create this measure are shown in Table 3.

Access to knowledge resources was measured through a series of items inquiring about the ease of access to such cluster resources as research output from universities or research institutions, training and education for employees, skilled labor, and collaboration partners at universities (see Table 3). These items were often discussed as important cluster resources contributing to learning and growth of Medicon Valley in the interviews.

Table 3
Independent items and scales.

Individual items and scales	Mean	S.D.
Social Capital [a] (Cron. alpha = .83)	3.26	0.79
In this region there are often opportunities to meet people who:		
▪ can expose us to new developments in the industry		
▪ can introduce us to new business partners		
▪ are useful sources of new information relevant to our company		
Company employees have strong personal contacts in this region that:		
▪ we trust to advise us on important issues or problems faced by our company		
▪ can connect us to sources of financing or other key business transactions		
▪ we trust for help when seeking a partner in a business or research collaboration		
ICT Use for Human Capital [b] (Cronbach's alpha = .76)	2.65	1.26
Rate extent of company's use of following ICTs applications:		
▪ Connections to online services for recruitment		
▪ An intranet that supplies information/education to your employees and/or selected business partners		
▪ Group collaboration software to support project teams with member not located on your premises		
Access to knowledge Resources [c] (Cronbach's alpha = .78)	3.34	0.79
Ease of access to following resources when needed:		
▪ New knowledge generated by university or research institutions		
▪ Training and education for current employees		
▪ A highly skilled labor pool when seeking new hires		
▪ Universities or research institutions for collaboration on projects		
Primary activity		
▪ R&D	*N* = 21	35%
▪ Production and sales	*N* = 39	65%
Number of employees in the region	70.5	330.6

[a] Principal components factor analysis with varimax rotation revealed 1 factor. Item scales ranges from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree.
[b] Item scales ranged from 1 = not at all to 5 = very often.
[c] Ease of access item scales ranged from 1 = not at all easy to 5 = very easy.

5. Results

A regression analysis was run to estimate the effects of independent variables on the two measures of performance (Table 4). As expected, the primary activity of the company (R&D vs. sales) strongly influenced company outcomes, with the more mature producing companies reporting higher scores on both market exposure and market performance. The number of employees was related only to market performance, not market exposure. This is not surprising since start-up companies mainly seeking to increase their visibility to other companies that could have an interest in licensing their intellectual property or investing capital into their company can actually be quite small. Even with these control variables in the model, the amount of perceived social capital, the extent of ICT use for human capital, and the ease of access to knowledge resources all significantly predicted market exposure. Access to local knowledge resources did not predict market performance, however. This could be due to the fact that access to local knowledge resources might be perceived to be important in the initial development of the knowledge intensive companies, and less important for well established companies. Another possible explanation could be that the companies whose primary activities have been described as sales, might include companies that are mainly manufacturing branches of national or international companies, the R&D facilities of which are located elsewhere. In this case the innovations are provided by some sources outside the cluster, and therefore access to local knowledge resources does not have any impact on market performance.

In order to test H2 – that the effect of social capital would vary by type of firm – we created a dummy variable as an interaction term with the product of primary activity and social capital. In both regression equations, this variable (primary company activity) was significant as well. The shape of the interactions is shown in Fig. 2, revealing that social capital is a much more important predictor of market exposure and market performance for the R&D start-up firms than for the more mature firms usually involved in production and/or selling of biotech products and services. This could be explained by the same argument posed above for the relation between access to local knowledge resources and prediction of market performance. That is the companies mainly engaged in manufacturing are branches of national or international companies, with R&D facilities located elsewhere. In this case, the innovations and the innovation process are not related to the local social capital of the region and therefore local social capital does not influence market performance. On the other hand this could also be related to the fact that local social capital might be perceived to be vital in the initial development of the knowledge intensive companies, while it becomes less important as the companies grow and develop.

In summary, the regression models accounted for a substantial proportion of the variance in both market exposure (Adj. $R^2 = .50$) and market performance (Adj. $R^2 = .57$). H1, H2, H4, and H5 were supported fully, H3 was supported only for the market exposure outcome variable, and H6 was supported only for the market performance outcome variable. We next turn to a discussion of these findings.

6. Discussion

The results reported here reveal the extent to which personal and ICTs-facilitated access to people and knowledge resources is critical to the performance of the companies in a knowledge-oriented biotech cluster like Medicon Valley. Social capital, in the form of relationships to trusted people in the region who can connect biotechnology companies to potential partners, financial resources, advice, and other types of information and opportunities influences the likely success of companies in the cluster, especially the start-up R&D companies.

The relevance of social capital in knowledge clusters has received a great deal of attention in the literature. Our results support, at the individual company level of analysis, previous cluster studies that have found that social capital plays an important role in the economic growth of regional knowledge clusters [25–27]. The results indicate that companies located in an industrial cluster can improve their outcomes, in terms of both market exposure and market performance, by leveraging relationships and opportunities to connect to other firms in the region. Although company type (R&D type or manufacturer) has been sometimes

Table 4
Regression results predicting market exposure and market performance.

Dependent variable	Perceived market exposure		Perceived market performance	
Independent variable	Scaled estimates [a]	Std. Err	Scaled estimates	Std. Err
Constant	3.63	.08	3.12**	.08
Primary company activity [b]	0.32***	.08	0.34***	.09
Log of number of employees	0.22	.21	0.71**	.23
ICT use to enhance human capital	0.66****	.15	0.43**	.16
Social capital	0.83****	.19	0.51*	.20
Access to area knowledge resources	0.40 *	.20	−0.10	.22
Social capital by primary activity interaction	−0.52**	.19	−0.69*	.20
$N = 58$	Adj. $R^2 = .50$		Adj. $R^2 = .57$	
	$F = 10.58$		$F = 13.73$	
	$p < .0001$		$p < .0001$	

*$p<.05$, **$p<.01$, ***$p<.001$, ****$p<.0001$.

[a] Scaled estimates are similar to standardized regression coefficients, in that they are scaled to have a mean of zero and a range of −1 to 1 in order to allow for easier comparisons of effect sizes.

[b] 0 = R&D, 1 = produce and sell products.



Fig. 2. Interactions between perceived social capital and type of company on both measures of performance.

reported as not influential of firm's performance in biotech clusters [56], the results presented here support the idea that the interaction of company type with social capital further demonstrates how companies at different stages in their life cycle rely more or less on these personal relationships. The companies focused purely on R&D are smaller and have fewer resources available compared to the more established producer companies. These characteristics make R&D firms rely more on personal contacts and relationships for access to knowledge, financial investors and skilled labor, while the more mature firms in the region may simply have less need to leverage social capital to access needed resources. This result is supported by Iyer et al.'s [57] study that showed that "deep-bonding" social capital was an important impetus to the initial development of the high-tech companies located in the Cambridge area, but as the high-tech economy had expanded, this type of social capital has become less important.

As we would expect from earlier work that questions whether ICT use can substitute for personal relationships to access cluster resources [41], such a substitution effect appears to be unfounded in this data. Indeed, both personal relationships and the types of ICT uses measured here – applications that enhance a company's access to people and knowledge resources – contribute to visibility and overall market performance. Hence these two types of variables are best viewed as complementary in their effect on the success of knowledge cluster-based companies. The evidence suggests that there is value in promoting greater use of such technologies in knowledge intensive clusters. Especially ICT usage to enhance human capital, either by helping to locate and recruit new skilled workers, strengthen human capital through ICTs-enabled information access or training, or supporting collaboration with off-premise researchers, can be useful even though the types of activities such as R&D, products and services may be less amenable to such applications as e-commerce.

Access to local knowledge resources did not predict market performance, but did influence market exposure, thus supporting partially H3. Our results therefore show that companies that report easier access to these resources do feel that they are more visible to potential customers and other stakeholders. This finding may be explained by the fact that the management of knowledge resources is a long-term concern [58] with an impact on future performance [59]. Thus, a richer access to local knowledge resources may have a positive effect on market performance in the future, but not in the present. Another explanation could be, as already observed in the analysis, that the companies engaging in sales are mainly manufacturing branches of national or international companies, the R&D facilities of which are located elsewhere. In this case, access to local knowledge resources might not be relevant for the innovation activities of this type of companies. Even though this is surprising it further corroborates the results of other studies concluding that the existence of local networks should not be assumed and their importance should not

be overstated [e.g. 14, 60]. For example, Waters and Smith (2008) [60] in two English clusters especially known for bioscience found that the networks of the cluster participants more commonly extended beyond the centre of the respective clusters drawing on a more dispersed range of contacts, often located abroad.

7. Conclusions, limitations and suggestions for further research

Biotechnology clusters are good examples of knowledge-based regions, where focus is placed on innovative capacity [15] This paper makes an attempt to measure the contribution of the use of some kind of ICTs, of social capital and of other means of access to knowledge resources, to the company performance in a knowledge intensive business cluster. A preliminary focused study has been carried out to this aim and the statistical results seem to confirm some of the main qualitative theories that have been proposed in order to explain the performance of industrial clusters. In addition, a lot of new scaling has been done and using market exposure as a performance indicator is relatively new in the literature.

The results reported here confirm the value of engaging in cluster activities that can help to form and maintain relationships with professionals in the region — such as the social networking support often provided by non-profit regional associations. The results further support the hypotheses that such activities mostly benefit start-up companies by introducing the professionals working in these firms to employees in universities, research centers, support companies, and more established producers that may be clients for their intellectual property [e.g. 57].

In addition knowledge clusters may also increase ease of access to relevant knowledge resources, such as university research, training and education, skilled workers, and research collaborators. Our results show that companies that do report easier access to these resources do feel that they are more visible to potential customers and other stakeholders.

Regarding the role of ICTs in this process, the evidence suggests that there is value in promoting greater use of such technologies in knowledge intensive clusters, even though the types of activities such as R&D, products and services may be less amenable to such applications as e-commerce. Rather, it appears that ICT usage to enhance human capital – either by helping to locate and recruit new skilled workers, strengthen human capital through ICT-enabled information access or training, or supporting collaboration with off-premise researchers – can complement other personal and institutional strategies designed to improve the knowledge resources in the cluster.

This study both corroborates previous research and presents some new interesting results based on the Medicon Valley cluster. Nevertheless the study presents a number of limitations that make it difficult to generalize from these findings. These limitations mostly relate to the methodology. For example an important limitation is that it was conducted only in one cluster, with a relatively small sample size as empirical data. However the authors feel confident that these data represented accurately the number of companies located in the cluster as the database was primarily built by using the database from the Medicon Valley Association (www.mva.org), which is the main association of the cluster and in their opinion they have registered all the companies present in the region. Another important limitation of the study is the use of newly created indexes and scales. However given the exploratory character of the study this was a necessity and it has been successfully done in previous studies [31,36,53] as well. The last important limitation is reliance on self-report. This may have caused over-estimation as well as under-estimation.

Nonetheless, the results both offer new insights and support previous findings about how personal, organizational, and technology-mediated interactions might all serve to enhance the performance of companies located in knowledge clusters, usually highly dependent on innovation for success.

Finally the results of this study could also be the starting point for future research. For example it could be interesting to replicate the study in another knowledge intensive cluster or biotech cluster to see whether these results can be replicated or they are context-dependent. Especially it could be interesting to see whether access to resources and social capital predict perceived market performance and perceived market exposure in the same way it has been found in this cluster. Also it could be interesting to go much deeper in the reasons that have generated our results regarding the relationship between access to local social capital and perceived market performance. Such as study for example could investigate at an individual level in the Medicon Valley region the type of network, if any, cluster participants are involved in and whether such networks are mostly local or global in nature. This study could for example be in line with studies such as [57] or [60]. Finally another suggestion for future research could be to further investigate the extent to which ICTs complement or substitute for personal relationships both inside and outside the cluster.

References

[1] B. Asheim, A. Isaksen, Regional innovation systems: the integration of 'sticky' and global 'ubiquitous' knowledge, J. Technol. Transf. 27 (1) (2002) 77–86.
[2] P. Krugman, What's new about the new economic geography, Oxf. Rev. Econ. Policy 14 (2) (1998) 7–17.
[3] M. Porter, The Adam Smith address: location, clusters, and the "new" microeconomics of competition, Bus. Econ. 33 (1) (1998) 7–13.
[4] M. Porter, Location, competition, and economic development: local clusters in a global economy, Econ. Dev. Quart. 14 (1) (2000) 15–34.
[5] G. Becattini, M. Bellandi, G. DeiOttati, F. Sforzi, From industrial districts to local development: an itinerary of research, Edward Elgar, Cheltanham, UK, 2003.
[6] P. Cooke, Regional innovation systems, clusters, and the knowledge economy, Ind. Corp. Change 10 (4) (2001) 945–974.
[7] P. Cooke, Regional innovation systems: general findings and some new evidence from biotechnology clusters, J. Technol. Transf. 27 (1) (2002) 133–145.
[8] C. Crouch, P. LeGales, C. Trigilia, H. Voelzkow, Changing Governance of Local Economies: Responses of European Local Production Systems, University Press, Oxford, Oxford, 2004.
[9] A. Scupola, C. Steinfield, The role of a network organization and Internet-based technologies in clusters: the case of Medicon Valley, in: L. Fuglsang (Ed.), Innovation and the creative process: Towards innovation with care, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, UK, 2008, pp. 193–211.
[10] A. Saxenian, Regional Advantage: Culture and Competition in Silicon Valley and Route 128, Harvard University Press, Boston, MA, 1994.
[11] M. Storper, The resurgence of regional economies ten years later: the region as a nexus of untraded interdependencies, Eur. Urban Reg. Stud. 2 (3) (1995) 191–201.

[12] B. Lundvall, Innovation as an interactive process: from user-producer interaction to the national system of innovation, in: G. Dosi, C. Freeman, R.R. Nelson, G. Silverberg, L.L.G. Soete (Eds.), Tech. change econ. theory, Pinter, London, 1988, pp. 349–369.
[13] B. Lundvall, P. Maskell, Nation states and economic development from national systems of production to national systems of knowledge creation and learning, in: G.L. Clark, M.P. Feldman, M.S. Gertler (Eds.), The Oxford handbook of economic geography, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2000, pp. 353–372.
[14] P. Almeida, B. Kogut, Localization of knowledge and the mobility of engineers in regional networks, Manage. Sci. 45 (7) (1999) 905–917.
[15] J. Owen-Smith, W. Powell, Knowledge networks as channels and conduits: the effects of spillovers in the Boston biotechnology community, Organ. Sci. 15 (1) (2004) 5–21.
[16] H. Bathelt, A. Malmberg, P. Maskell, Clusters and knowledge: local buzz, global pipelines and the process of knowledge creation, Prog. Hum. Geogr. 28 (1) (2004) 31–56.
[17] T. Ciarli, R. Rabellotti, ICT in industrial districts: an empirical analysis on adoption, use and impact, Ind. Innov. 14 (3) (2007) 277–303.
[18] C. Steinfield, A. Scupola, Understanding the role of ICT networks in a biotechnology cluster: an exploratory study of Medicon Valley, Inf. Soc. 24 (5) (2008) p319–p333.
[19] F. García-Muiña, E. Pelechano-Barahona, J. Navas-López, Knowledge codification and technological innovation success: empirical evidence from Spanish biotech companies, Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change 76 (1) (2009) 141–153.
[20] P. Adler, S. Kwon, Social capital: prospects for a new concept, Acad. Manage. Rev. 27 (1) (2002) 17–40.
[21] J. Nahapiet, S. Ghoshal, Social capital, intellectual capital, and the organizational advantage, Acad. Manage. Rev. 23 (2) (1998) 242–266.
[22] G. Walker, B. Kogut, W. Shan, Social structure, structural holes, and the formation of an industry network, Organ. Sci. 8 (2) (1997) 109–125.
[23] I. Gordon, P. McCann, Industrial clusters: complexes, agglomeration and/or social networks, Urban Stud. 37 (3) (2000) 513–520.
[24] D. Wolfe, Social capital and cluster development in learning regions, in: J. Holbrook, D. Wolfe (Eds.), Knowledge, clusters, and regional innovation: Economic development in Canada, McGill-Queens University Press, Toronto, 2002.
[25] S. Rosenfeld, Bringing business clusters into the mainstream of economic development, Eur. Plann. Stud. 5 (1) (1997) 3–23.
[26] R. Putnam, Making democracy work: civic traditions in modern Italy, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J, 1994.
[27] F. Romo, M. Schwartz, Structural embeddedness of business decisions: a sociological assessment of the migration behavior of plants in New York State between 1960 and 1985, Am. Sociol. Rev. 60 (6) (1995) 874–907.
[28] A. Saxenian, The New Argonauts: Regional Advantage in a Global Economy, Harvard University Press, Boston, MA, 2006.
[29] M. Zack, Developing a knowledge strategy, Calif. Manage. Rev. 41 (3) (1999) 125–145.
[30] V. Ambrosini, C. Bowman, Tacit knowledge: some suggestions for operationalization, J. Manage. Stud. 38 (6) (2001) 811–829.
[31] J. He, M. Fallah, Is inventor network structure a predictor of cluster evolution? Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change 76 (1) (2009) 91–106.
[32] S. Breschi, F. Malerba, The geography of innovation and economic clustering: some introductory notes, Ind. Corp. Change 10 (4) (2001) 817–833.
[33] R. Boschma, J. Lambooy, Knowledge, market structure, and economic coordination: dynamics of industrial districts, Growth Change 33 (3) (2002) 291–311.
[34] M. Dahl, C. Pedersen, Knowledge flows through informal contacts in industrial clusters: myth or reality? Res. Policy 33 (10) (2004) 1673–1686.
[35] A. Sammarra, L. Biggiero, Heterogeneity and specificity of inter-firm knowledge flows in innovation networks, J. Manage. Stud. 45 (4) (2008) 800–829.
[36] R. Rabellotti, Recovery of a Mexican cluster: devaluation bonanza or collective efficiency? World Dev. 27 (9) (1999) 1571–1585.
[37] S. Gopalakrishnan, P. Bierly, The impact of firm size and age on knowledge strategies during product development: a study of the drug delivery industry, IEEE Trans. Eng. Manage. 53 (1) (2006) 3–16.
[38] C. Roveda, R. Veccjiato, Foresight and innovation in the context of industrial clusters: the case of some Italian districts, Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change 75 (6) (2008) 817–833.
[39] E. Leamer, M. Storper, The economic geography of the Internet age, J. Int. Bus. Stud. 32 (4) (2001) 641–665.
[40] R. Johnston, P. Lawrence, Beyond vertical integration: the rise of the value-added partnership, Harv. Bus. Rev. 66 (4) (1988) 94–101.
[41] K. Kumar, H. van Dissel, P. Bielli, The merchant of Prato — revisited: toward a third rationality of information systems, MIS Quart. 22 (2) (1998) 199–226.
[42] V. Lai, Intraorganizational communication with intranets, Commun. ACM 44 (7) (2001) 95–100.
[43] A. Meroño-Cerdan, P. Soto-Acosta, C. López-Nicolás, Analyzing collaborative technologies' effect on performance through intranet use orientations, J. Enterp. Inform. Manage. 21 (1–2) (2008) 39–51.
[44] E. Brynjolfsson, L. Hitt, Paradox lost? Firm-level evidence on the returns to information systems spending, Manage. Sci. 42 (4) (1996) 541–558.
[45] A. Scupola, Organization, strategy and business value of electronic commerce: the importance of complementarities, in: J. Mariga (Ed.), Managing e-commerce and mobile computing technologies, Idea Group, Hershey, PA, 2003.
[46] N. Shin, The impact of information technology on the financial performance of diversified firms, Decis. Support Syst. 41 (4) (2006) 698–707.
[47] A. Barua, H. Kriebel, T. Mukhopadhyay, Information technologies and business value: an analysis and empirical investigation, Inform. Syst. Res. 6 (1) (1995) 3–23.
[48] Y. Bakos, Information links and electronic marketplaces: the role of interorganizational information systems in vertical markets, J. Manage. Inform. Syst. 8 (2) (1991) 31–52.
[49] M. Porter, V. Millar, How information gives you competitive advantage, Harv. Bus. Rev. 63 (4) (1985) 149–160.
[50] A. Flanagin, The elusive benefits of the technology support of knowledge management, Manage. Commun. Q. 16 (2) (2002) 242–248.
[51] Learner, Storper, "The Economic Geography of the Internet Age", NBER Working Paper 8450, 2001.
[52] M. Storper, A.J. Venables, "Buzz: Face-to-Face Contact and the Urban Economy", DRUID Summer Conference on Creating, Sharing and Transferring Knowledge, Elsinore/Copenhagen, 2003 http://www.druid.dk.
[53] I. Álvarez, R. Marin, A. Fonfria, The role of networking in the competitiveness of firms, Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change 76 (3) (2009) 410–421.
[54] L. Lyck, 'Øresundsregionalisering — Medicon Valley', Copenhagen Business School, Centre for Tourism and Culture Management, 2006.
[55] J. Norus, 'Building regional competencies: The industrial enzymes industry', Biotech Business Working Paper 2004–007, Copenhagen 2004, 2004.
[56] M. van Geenhuizen, L. Reyes-González, Does a clustered location matter for high-technology companies' performance? The case of biotechnology in the Netherlands, Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change 74 (9) (2007) 1681–1696.
[57] S. Iyer, M. Kitson, B. Toh, Social capital, Econ. Growth Reg. Dev. Reg. Stud. 39 (8) (2005) 1015–1040.
[58] T. Hult, An integration of thoughts on knowledge management, Decis. Sci. 34 (2) (2003) 189–195.
[59] C. Dröge, C. Claycomb, R. Germain, Does knowledge mediate the effect of context on performance? Some initial evidence, Decis. Sci. 34 (3) (2003) 541–568.
[60] R. Waters, L.H. Smith, Social networks in high-technology local economies: the cases of Oxfordshire and social networks in high-technology local economies: the cases of Oxfordshire and Cambridgeshire, and Helen Lawton Smith, Eur. Urban Reg. Stud. 15 (1) (2008) 21–37.

Ada Scupola is an associate professor at the Department of Communication, Business and Information Technologies, Roskilde University, Denmark. She holds a Ph.D. in social sciences from Roskilde University, an MBA from the University of Maryland at College Park, USA and a M.Sc. from the University of Bari, Italy. She is the editor-in-chief of *The International Journal of E-Services and Mobile Applications*. Her main research interests are user driven innovation, eservices, outsourcing, ICT in supply chain, adoption and diffusion of e-commerce and e-services in SMEs, ICTs in clusters of companies. She is collaborating and has collaborated to several national and international research projects on the above subjects. Her research has been published in several international journals among which *The Journal of Information Science, International Journal of E-Services and Mobile Applications, The Information Society, Journal of Enterprise Information Management, Journal of Electronic Commerce in Organizations , The Journal of Global Information Technology Management, Scandinavian Journal of Information Systems, The Journal of Electronic Commerce in Developing Countries* and in numerous book chapters and international conferences.