

**APPENDIX E -
DATA ANALYSIS: EXAMPLE OF CROSS-CASE CODING**

The coded data below was extracted from respondent interviews (please see Appendix B) conducted between March and June 2012.

<p>Development of Dynamic Capabilities Between Firms</p>	<p>“ORG A” <i>Sub-Theme – DC Resides Between Firms</i> I think <i>it (dynamic capabilities) resides</i> between the 2 firms, there is definitely an opportunity and it is possible to innovate between public and private. I think the private side just has to be more flexible and be a little more open and be more conducive to our environment and not so corporate I guess. I think if they're in a partnership where you're not looking to make money off your partner, you look to make money together, but I felt that especially in this case, we were charged a lot more, it wasn't so much a partnership.</p> <p><i>It (dynamic capabilities) resides</i> in the strength of the collective. And I use almost like the BORG you know, in the Star Trek ... The strength of the collective – if they're both like, if they're both like-minded, you've got the two parties, they're all that type of individual that will go that extra step, the two of them together – the collective, I think, makes it more stronger to go forward. So...</p> <p>Will have a pos...anytime you need an alliance with a stronger party, it would likely result in a positive impact on our <i>ability to innovate and commercialise</i>.</p> <p>There was a part about organisations coming together -- can organisations come together and create the capability. This is where, you know, they can come together and create the capability. However, if, if their leaders are entrepreneurial, you know, dynamic, open to change, you know, they're striving for improvements to their own firms.</p>	<p>“ORG B” <i>Sub-Theme – Both Parties Required to Build DC in Innovation/Commercialisation</i> Theoretically, yes, in reality <i>its (dynamic capabilities)</i> challenging. And I'm basing what I've seen here. Is this is the context of building anew product?</p> <p>I think if it wasn't for us, our faculty, and pushing them, and getting (Org B manufacturing/engineering HQ) to wrap their heads around what they were trying to build for us <i>it (development of dynamic capabilities)</i> wouldn't work without both parties, absolutely.</p> <p>I think through this project, the linac development, it was almost a hyper-activity. We needed to get this thing done by the fall, and we needed to get things done at “Org B”, and North America, and (Org B manufacturing/engineering HQ) (UK), and Michener contract team, a whole series of teams working together, and as we discussed, a good model of innovation, a good proof of innovation, a good articulation of <i>two companies coming together to create a capability to do new things, to do new things in this capacity of innovation</i>. We have artefacts in the sense we have 2 linacs on the 9th floor, that work to the specs capacity we hoped they would, which they hadn't accomplished before, so there seems to be some good evidence there.</p> <p>The conversations (<i>development of dynamic capabilities</i>) with (Org B manufacturing/engineering HQ) were interesting. They seemed at first, to be completely honest, so when we first told them our situation, they seemed to be taken aback, that we needed to get this module and everything setup as early as I think initial plan by September. So they were a bit taken</p>
---	---	--

	<p>So, can they come together? Yes. But they can only come together if you have leaders, like-minded people who are willing to go from status quo to ... okay, I see an opportunity with strategic alliance A where I can, sort of, increase my ... get to a certain higher point and the strategic alliance partner sees us as well. See, you need the people in there...</p> <p>Sub-Theme – Creating a Separate Entity & Culture to Create DCs Between Firms Well I think that would <i>create a common culture</i>, and that would maybe get a little bit better. When I think they're separated, I think they're more politics involved, so that same thing, I want to make a basic decision about buying a laptop, who buys it, you have to argue, and its a stupid point to argue over and it slows everything down. If you become a separate entity, you say look, here's your budget, here's what you have, here's what the end goal is, and just let it run, more independent.</p> <p>Cause I really believe with something like seconding people, you need to use the people who are already here, who already have knowledge of the organisation to drive that next step up, but you need some new people to come in and back-fill.</p> <p>Sub-Theme – Collaboration & Complementary I think we, I don't want to say co-innovated but we collaborated, but I'd say it was more of a 20%/80% split, so maybe, we were trying to be 50-50, but a lot of it fell on deaf ears, and 80% of the decisions were made by "Org A", and they would only take 20% of our recommendations.</p> <p>That's a good question. I think I would like to think ideally, that the relationship is complementary, that its not just self existent and Brad's an expert in this and K is an expert in this and together we're going to be a stronger force by virtue of the fact that we have twice as much experience, but am I able to</p>	<p>aback, which was confusing to all of us, cause in the agreement, the alliance, they stated that um, I think all parties confirmed that an emulation module was going to be setup anyways, so its not like when we told them or reminded them in march, cause we were kind of keeping track from Jan to March, but when we told them that we needed to have everything by September, they seemed to be a little bit taken aback, so they were kind of caught off guard, because I think numerous things came about. I think that they didn't have as much people to help them out, manpower; that this was brand new thing they had never done any thing like this. This was completely innovative, this was I think the first I think in NA I think. So this is completely new, so everyone was a little bit, needed a bit or reassurance like, listen, you can do this right. And so I think we kind of kept track at this point with (Org B manufacturing/engineering HQ), bi-weekly meetings, and they would set-up webexs, and they would show us what they had in terms of machinery, how they could do some of the simulations, but at the same time they had difficulties because it was completely new, brand new. So I guess you could say we were a little bit nervous, on our end, and you know cause we wanted to have everything done by Sept, and then I think a month later or some time in beginning of spring, we kind of confirmed it was not going to be ready for Sept., cause it was too, it was impossible, and they had too much testing to do and with 2 units, it would have to have everything by December. So, at first it seemed like they were taken aback when they knew what they were kind of getting into.</p> <p>Sub-Theme - DCs Reside Between & Amongst Firms It's (<i>dynamic capabilities</i>) both. It's (<i>dynamic capabilities</i>) gotta be both, right. Because again, I mean, if you're looking at a public...you're looking specifically at here's a little educational institution and here's a private partner, right, or a private um, sector entity...they're always going to be bottom line driven. And they're going to wanna make a profit from whatever quality assure...whatever. So, you don't wanna be taken advantage of. There's value in our</p>
--	--	--

	<p>complement what you do and are you able to complement what I do, that would be ideal I think. Is it attainable? I don't know the answer to that question.</p> <p>But this is supposed to benefit both partners, cause we can't innovate and commercialised ourselves, which <i>with the help of these partners, but to come up together that could be commercialisable...</i></p>	<p>knowledge that we have not, as an organisation, been able to quantify.</p> <p>So your next question, do the resulting <i>dynamic capabilities reside in and/or between firms</i>. Of course, between. Between and also within too.</p> <p>Specifically it had facilitated their, our direction as to what we wanted out of them, and it was sort of like, you could make the example sort of Steve Jobs. He would sort of push his people, if they say listen, we can, I don't know if we can do this, he would say you can do this, if you put your mind to it you can do it. So I think it was a little bit of that and "Org B" at the same time confirming yes, in fact we can. So I think it was a coming together, I definitely think both parties were...it seemed at first that we had to kind of encourage them a little bit, and once they started to wrap their hands around it, they were like, wait a second, we can do this. So we were kind of like motivating and helping them out so at the end of it, <i>I think both parties were obviously essential, really came together.</i></p>
--	--	---

<p>Trust</p>	<p>“ORG A”</p> <p>I think we were at a point where we thought we had <i>trust</i>, and honesty and integrity kind of there. For that reason we were willing to cut the deal and went forward. And they didn't live up to it. And I guess the naivety that we learned from the experience we didn't build enough exit clauses into it.</p> <p>You know I think in the early days there was certainly a high degree of <i>trust</i>. And as time went on, and a belief in the honesty. But as time went on that <i>trust</i> eroded and the honesty really eroded. At the end of “A” tenure, I mean the only one I believed was A”A. I also came to believe that the rest of "ORG A" didn't believe “B”. Because he'd tell me stuff and it wouldn't happen that way at all.</p> <p>It's interesting because in some respects, I realise its changing now, in the corporate structure position a “A” and “B” hold some degree of equivalence. Very senior, great deal of responsibility, great deal of autonomy in that responsibility but there was still a reporting echelon. You know “A” to “C”, and “C” to the board. Kind of issue that's there. And much more <i>confidence</i> in “B” word being "ORG B's" word than “A” word ever being "ORG A" word. Never doubted “A” word was “A” word. But at the end wasn't even sure if it was ever "ORG A" healthcare's word, let alone "ORG A's" word. I never felt that way about "ORG B". If “B” says then he either makes sure it is, or he has enough confidence in his position and instruction to say I have the authority to say that. So that was one major difference even though structurally they may look like they're on a fair level of comparable positions in terms of the corporate authority.</p> <p>I would use similar words (<i>trust</i>, honesty, chemistry and leadership) to describe “A” at "ORG A". I would not use those words to describe "ORG A" corporate. And the representation. The difference in my mind between "ORG B" and "ORG A" is at "ORG B"; in my presence to date it has represented the corporate response, not just the personal response. "ORG A" on the other hand was exhibited in the personal</p>	<p>“ORG B”</p> <p>And I think the ultimate success of commercialisation has a higher degree of likelihood, this is in hindsight, has a higher degree of success with "ORG B" than it ever would have with "ORG A". "ORG A" we tried to conceptualise it too early. Whereas "ORG B" were only coming to commercialisation after we built a very strong as you said, creative, innovative working relationship. There is a lot of <i>trust</i> that's here; there is a lot of honesty that's here. Which I think allows us to talk about commercialisation.</p> <p>You notice one of the things with "ORG B" when we talk about commercialisation there's no questions of MDAs. Or any of that trappings that's going on. In "ORG A" we had to codify the commercialisation and lock it down and we almost negotiations almost broke down. Because of certain comments the room had made about the commercialisation. And essentially impinging the integrity of Michener and the integrity of the deal, and I said that's it. I hung the phone up. And we played a waiting game to see who was going to call back first. "ORG A" or Michener call them. And "ORG A" finally called us. Anyhow it was just you know I think different variables that are there. And again I think you know if I look at the "ORG B", could this have happened without “B1” and “B2”, I don't know? Could it have happened without you and K in the role and having built the relationship with (product 1) and impact that led you to “B1” and “B2”? Having the personality chemistry particularly between you and “B2” and the complement with “B1” that emerged. I'm not sure you could ever depend or try to replicate that in a generalisation sense.</p> <p>I think both. Those are 4 pretty strong pillars (<i>trust</i>, honesty, chemistry and leadership) in terms of working partnerships, to make them be extraordinary, which is what I consider ours to be. I think <i>trust</i> is a big part of it, it started the very first night with frank conversation</p>
---------------------	---	---

	<p>response time and time again; it was not reflected in the corporate response.</p>	<p>I think in terms of establishing the trust quickly is an understatement. I don't think I've ever had a relationship of any kind, personal or professional that got to the wood that fast, to the point that you believed the bullshit right, it was like, ok, so these guys, it was 15 minutes and we said lets go to dinner. And I was, I had a fuse of about 8 minutes that night, and you guys were the beep out of there, get lost. And it was synergistic and honest, and it just built because you...when we ask you to do a site visit or host somebody its 110%. And I think that when you stumble a little bit, the first thing we've done on both sides is that we apologise, and we get on the same side of the table and fix it right,. I think culturally and value wise its the people that are core to the relationship, they actually personally value those things. So when you value that type of relationship, and those are the ones you want to be in, you see it right away.</p>
--	--	---