

## Enhancing innovative capabilities in lagging regions

Barzotto, Mariachiara; Corradini, Carlo; Fai, Felicia; Labory, Sandrine; Tomlinson, Phil

DOI:

[10.1093/cjres/rsz003](https://doi.org/10.1093/cjres/rsz003)

License:

None: All rights reserved

*Document Version*

Peer reviewed version

*Citation for published version (Harvard):*

Barzotto, M, Corradini, C, Fai, F, Labory, S & Tomlinson, P 2019, 'Enhancing innovative capabilities in lagging regions: an extra-regional collaborative approach to RIS3', *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 213-232. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cjres/rsz003>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

### **Publisher Rights Statement:**

Checked for eligibility: 24/05/2019

This is a pre-copyedited, author-produced version of an article accepted for publication in Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society following peer review. The version of record Mariachiara Barzotto, Carlo Corradini, Felicia M Fai, Sandrine Labory, Philip R Tomlinson, Enhancing innovative capabilities in lagging regions: an extra-regional collaborative approach to RIS3, Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society, , rsz003, is available online at: <https://doi.org/10.1093/cjres/rsz003>

### **General rights**

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

### **Take down policy**

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact [UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk](mailto:UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk) providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

# **Enhancing Innovative Capabilities in Lagging Regions: An Extra-Regional Collaborative Approach to RIS3**

**Mariachiara Barzotto** ([Mariachiara.Barzotto@newcastle.ac.uk](mailto:Mariachiara.Barzotto@newcastle.ac.uk) )

*Newcastle University Business School, University of Newcastle, UK*

**Carlo Corradini** ([C.Corradini@bham.ac.uk](mailto:C.Corradini@bham.ac.uk))

*Birmingham Business School, University of Birmingham, UK*

**Felicia Fai** ([F.M.Fai@bath.ac.uk](mailto:F.M.Fai@bath.ac.uk))

*Centre for Governance, Regulation & Industrial Strategy, School of Management, University of Bath, UK*

**Sandrine Labory** ([lbrsdr@unife.it](mailto:lbrsdr@unife.it))

*Department of Economics and Management, University of Ferrara, Italy*

**Philip R Tomlinson** ([P.R.Tomlinson@bath.ac.uk](mailto:P.R.Tomlinson@bath.ac.uk))

*Centre for Governance, Regulation & Industrial Strategy, School of Management, University of Bath, UK*

**March 2019**

## **Abstract**

Smart Specialisation (S3) is a place-based industrial strategy which forms the major component of the European Union's 2020 Innovation policy (RIS3). Lagging regions, however, lack the technological capabilities and networks to fully participate and benefit from RIS3. Extra-regional collaboration offers lagging regions opportunities for technological upgrading to overcome this deficit. Using patent data for EU NUTS2 regions, we find extra-regional collaboration raises innovation in lagging regions, although collaborations based upon technological relatedness might be less effective, compared to advanced regions. This has implications for the design of policies to engender extra-regional collaboration and their alignment with RIS3 initiatives.

## **Keywords**

Extra-regional Collaborations, Lagging Regions, Smart Specialisation, RIS3, Patents, Europe.

**JEL codes:** R10, O25, N94

## **Introduction**

Smart Specialisation Strategies (S3) have been the major component of the European Union's 2020 flagship 'Innovation Union' programme (known as RIS3). S3 advocates prioritising state support for 'activities' in particular technologies, fields or domains at the regional level which have the potential for 'entrepreneurial discovery' and commercial exploitation (Foray, 2015). RIS3 seeks to achieve this by deliberately building upon a region's existing advantages and capabilities to stimulate knowledge and innovation opportunities. As such, it has been labelled as being 'place-based' and is a return to a non-neutral and more vertical (or selective) mode of industrial policy intervention. Consequently, much excitement surrounds the rhetoric about RIS3, especially its perceived potential to generate an industrial renaissance in mature industrial regions and breathe life into 'phoenix' industries<sup>1</sup> (Barca et al., 2012). However, the inherent logic of S3 may actually extenuate regional imbalances by unduly favouring leading and/or more dynamic regions, where greater entrepreneurial and technological capabilities and good networks already reside, and from which new opportunities are more likely to arise. Indeed, much of the empirical evaluation of RIS3 has so far tended to focus upon its application in more dynamic (exemplar) regional contexts. In contrast, in lagging regions with 'hollowed out' manufacturing bases these capabilities are much diminished, which weakens their ability to participate in and benefit from RIS3 initiatives (McCann and Ortega-Argilés, 2015)<sup>2</sup>.

This represents a significant challenge to the legitimacy of RIS3, especially given the difficulties in reconciling the possible adverse impacts of its implementation (for regional balance) within the context of EU's wider policy aims of building '*inclusive, innovative and reflective societies*' (European Commission, 2017b) and EU 2014-2020 Cohesion policy. However, recently there has been more consideration as to how S3 might be better tailored towards lagging regions and how they may fully participate in RIS3. In this regard, there has been a particular emphasis upon fostering *technological diversification* and *technological upgrading* that can be enhanced through extra-regional collaborative linkages, especially between lagging and more knowledge intensive regions (McCann and Ortega-Argilés, 2015, Boschma, 2015). However, the incentives for extra-regional collaboration may be asymmetric; while lagging regions' incentives to collaborate with advanced ones appear to be straightforward, the reverse might be not so obvious. Policy itself has, of course, sought to support extra-regional collaboration at various

levels through, for instance, the EU's H2020 and Interreg programmes, and at national levels via initiatives such as the UK's Knowledge Transfer Network (KTN)<sup>3</sup>. Notwithstanding, there exists little empirical support for the importance of such linkages in the context of lagging regions.

In this paper, we seek to address this research gap, by providing new empirical evidence on the potential benefits for lagging regions in establishing extra-regional collaborative linkages, within the context of RIS3. We first utilise data from the PATSTAT- CRIOS database to map changes in extra-regional collaborations (with regard to innovation) in EU NUTS2 (Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics) regions between 1985-2010. This mapping exercise is useful not only in highlighting the evolving density of extra-regional collaboration, but also in identifying idiosyncrasies across regions and where policy support (for networks) might be better targeted. Secondly, we estimate panel regression models (namely, fixed-effects regression, multilevel maximum likelihood and system generalised method of moments models) to assess the impact of these collaborative linkages upon regional innovation within weaker regions. Finally, we then re-consider the current RIS3 framework and 'place based' industrial policy to deliver balanced inclusive regional growth.

The paper has three major results. First, extra-regional collaboration has a positive impact upon innovation in lagging regions, and as such, may compensate for limited knowledge bases and the lack of critical mass of research and productive capabilities in these regions. However, and secondly, lagging regions are likely to find it difficult to attract collaboration from more advanced regions (De Noni et al., 2018), as the returns from extra-regional collaboration for regions characterised by increasing levels of internal technological competencies are found to be lower than in lagging regions. This asymmetric result may suggest that calls for lagging regions to set up partnerships with advanced regions (McCann and Ortega-Argilés, 2015, Foray, 2015, Boschma, 2015) are unlikely to become concrete, unless policy incentives are provided to actors in advanced regions so they are also able to derive some gains from such collaborations even if these are not knowledge related. Third, we observe a negative effect of technological similarity between the external knowledge accessed through collaborations and the existing knowledge base for lagging regions, suggesting that policy should not target specific sectors and

technologies in these regions but rather support the entrepreneurial discovery process across a wider set of opportunities.

The remainder of this paper is set out as follows. In Section 2, we present a review of the existing literature on S3, extra-regional collaboration and lagging regions. Section 3 introduces the PATSTAT-CRIOS dataset and provides descriptive evidence on the evolution of extra-regional collaborations on innovation across Europe, before setting out our econometric specification. Section 4 presents and discusses the econometric results, while Section 5 provides some wider consideration of RIS3 policy and the role of extra-regional collaborations for the development of lagging regions. Finally, Section 6 concludes.

## **Literature Review**

### ***Smart Specialisation and Lagging Regions***

Foray (2013) describes Smart Specialisation as one part of a broader regional and industrial policy within which ‘entrepreneurial discovery’ processes identify new *activities* in uncharted technological and/or sectoral domains, which have the potential for knowledge spill-overs, innovation, scale and agglomeration economies and market opportunities. The notion of ‘activities’ is itself quite generic and not adequately defined in the literature. In S3, they commonly refer to a granular level set of explorative actions (undertaken by regional actors) which often (but not always) arise at the interspaces of sectors – for example, an identified ‘activity’ might be to explore the processing and analysis of big data in relation to energy loss (which will have applications across multiple sectors). The rationale is RIS3 policies should support those most promising (and identified) ‘activities’ more extensively for an exploratory period after which, only those demonstrating ‘potential’ should be fostered by more traditional regional and industrial policies. In the meantime, RIS3 policies should start to identify and explore the next set of ‘activities’ signalled through entrepreneurial discovery processes. This suggests S3 would eliminate any severe troughs or downturns in a region’s potential developmental pathway, as the region’s trajectory becomes ‘smoothed’ by the multiple paths of potential growth across a range of activities that overlap over time.

The identification of ‘new activities’ advocated by S3 may be especially challenging for lagging regions. Indeed, lagging regions are typically deficient in entrepreneurial and innovation capabilities; the entrepreneurial discovery process which S3 relies upon may be absent. Lagging regions also typically exhibit weak networks, which inhibit knowledge exchange, cross-fertilisation of ideas and the emergence of new areas of market opportunities (Capello and Kroll, 2016). Nevertheless, scholars have recently begun to theoretically outline ways in which lagging regions can potentially participate more fully in, and benefit from, RIS3 initiatives. For example, by formally integrating S3 within existing economic geography frameworks and recognising that future regional trajectories are largely conditioned upon their history (Morgan, 2013). McCann and Ortega-Argilés (2015), for instance, outline an integrative S3 strategy for lagging regions, based upon the concepts of *embeddedness*, *technological diversification* and *connectivity* and which is sensitive to existing industrial structures. They advocate strengthening regional *embeddedness*, by better aligning skills enhancement programmes to meet local sectoral needs so as to reduce regional skills mismatches that hamper the ability of local firms to fully engage in global value chains. Such programmes could be flexibly tailored to ensure the region retains its competences in the face of ongoing structural changes in labour, technology and product markets (see Bailey et al., 2018).

McCann and Ortega-Argiles (2015) also point out the critical role of *technological diversification* and *relatedness* within the context of S3. These concepts highlight potential complementarities and synergies which may arise as regions diversify into technologies adjacent to their extant technological domain. This is possible where the cognitive distance between related technological fields is sufficient to allow firms to communicate with each other more effectively, and absorb and apply new knowledge in different ways (Boschma and Frenken, 2011)<sup>4</sup>. The fusion of related technologies, capabilities and expertise and the combining of knowledge can thus spur innovation and therefore the ‘entrepreneurial discovery’ process (Foray, 2015). Balland et.al (2018), for instance, find at the NUTS2 level and across the EU, ‘relatedness’ is positively associated with technological diversification i.e. regions are most likely to develop new technological specialisations that are related to their knowledge base. This can give rise to regional branching - where new industrial and technological paths emerge out of existing embedded industrial structures – and which has become a pattern in European regions (Kogler et al., 2017), offering the promise of possibilities for regional growth (Boschma and

Gianelle, 2014, Mameli et al., 2014, Neffke et al., 2011). Dynamic growth, however, depends largely on the complexity of a region's knowledge base. More complex knowledge bases (and complex technologies) are difficult to imitate and/or dislodge (in spatial terms) and hence are more valuable in they offer potentially unique opportunities for regions to carve out new competitive advantages (Balland et.al, 2018; Bailey et.al, 2018, 2019). Yet lagging regions are typically characterised by low levels of knowledge complexity and they also lack the diverse set of capabilities from which to derive their own complex technologies (Balland and Rigby, 2017). Moreover, while 'relatedness' may offer a potential route forward, there are also many instances of regions following trajectories founded in historical regional strengths which ultimately lead to 'rigid specialisation' and 'lock-in'.

The cases which support lagging regions finding a new lease of life by branching into new industries while applying their underlying historical knowledge in new directions benefit from *ex post* rationalisation. However, the *ex ante* selection of 'priority areas' for policy support is difficult, even amongst those which are signalled by entrepreneurial activities. In regions reliant upon a single industry (e.g. steel) that is mature or even in the declining phase of its lifecycle (Todtling and Trippl, 2004, Virkkala, 2007, Isaksen, 2015, Isaksen and Trippl, 2017), *ex ante* selection is difficult for two main reasons: i) there is insufficient technological diversity to select from within the region, or ii) the region's historical comparative advantage has eroded and does not offer long-term potential for economic growth given wider industry dynamics and globalisation (Foray, 2013). For regions founded on traditional industries, focusing on their *current industrial* strengths may lead them to enter the 'trap of rigid specialisation' (Grabher, 1993). Indeed, lagging regions may need to establish paths of renewal or create entirely new paths to avoid this. On this point, the S3 literature is at a tentative stage. Balland et al. (2018) have recently set out an S3 framework based upon mapping 'relatedness' and 'knowledge complexity' within regions (and targeting policy appropriately). However, on which basis regional renewal or new path creation should be founded remains largely overlooked, being merely weakly defined as 'activities' within the S3 terminology.

Finally, McCann and Ortega-Argiles (2015) also suggest enhanced regional embeddedness and technological diversification should be complemented by measures to improve *connectivity* between actors so as to foster stronger knowledge linkages and learning. Traditionally, regional

policies have focused upon strengthening intra-regional networks to foster agglomeration and innovative milieus (Crevoisier, 2004). However, it is now acknowledged knowledge networks are often delineated non-territorially, and that extra-regional links are increasingly important for widening a region's knowledge pool and in stimulating learning (Bathelt et al., 2004, Boschma and Ter Wal, 2007, Rychen and Zimmermann, 2008). Indeed, when combined with local knowledge bases, external knowledge inflows can re-energise local industrial clusters and revitalise regional growth paths (Maskell et al., 2006). We consider this further in the following section.

### ***Extra-Regional Linkages and Lagging Regions***

Collaborations facilitate the highest degree of interactive learning and knowledge transfer (Tödting et al., 2006, Tripl et al., 2009). They represent both informal networks that foster the establishment of formal collaborations and can endure even after formal collaborations are over (Owen-Smith and Powell, 2004)<sup>5</sup>. Networks can be a substitute for the benefits typically associated with regional agglomeration (Johansson and Quigley, 2004) and firms located in lagging regions may exploit collaborations with distant partners as a means to compensate for weak local linkages and a lack of local knowledge spillovers. Indeed, Grillitsch and Nilsson (2015) find in a study of Swedish firms that this is especially the case for large and high technological intensity firms located in lagging regions, who are far more likely than their counterparts in leading regions, to engage extra-regional collaborations to access external knowledge. Moreover, firms may establish research collaborations with universities located in other regions for various reasons, for example due to a lack of adequate scientific competencies in their local universities, or a lack of willingness (from their local universities) to collaborate. Again, Tödting et al.'s (2012) study of the Austrian ICT sector suggests firms located in weak regional innovation systems are more likely (compared to firms based in stronger regional innovation systems) to engage in international (and by implication, extra-regional) R&D collaborations to compensate for weak local knowledge exchange. Finally, in regions with low absorptive capacities but with a strong science base, researchers within universities may seek to collaborate with both other universities or industrial partners located outside their own region (Azagra-Caro, 2007).

From a RIS3 perspective, there is a strong case to support the development of extra-regional linkages more broadly. Knowledge networks are highly selective and largely comprise of actors with the absorptive capacities to engage in interactive learning and knowledge transfer (Giuliani, 2006, Gilsing et al., 2007). Consequently, extra-regional linkages are easier to establish, and more likely to succeed when connections are made between spatially distant actors in similar technological domains (Boschma and Iammarino, 2009). Miguelez and Moreno's (2018) study of 255 NUTS2 European regions refines this further, finding that when regional knowledge bases are similar extra-regional knowledge inflows significantly enhance incremental innovation, yet more radical innovations largely arise through extra-regional knowledge linkages based upon related and complementary (rather than similar) technologies<sup>6</sup>. However, these studies do not explicitly consider the case of lagging regions.

For lagging regions, establishing and supporting extra-regional linkages with more knowledge intensive regions can support technological upgrading and enhance the 'entrepreneurial discovery' process. Lagging regions are often dominated by low to medium tech sectors. These sectors largely rely upon practice-based innovation facilitated by learning by doing and local inter-firm collaboration, yet the regional capacity to generate and sustain local knowledge spillovers can be weak (Asheim, 2012). In their industrial upgrading efforts, extra-regional linkages could facilitate quicker access to new technologies, foster more significant skills enhancement and open up new possibilities for knowledge transfer (Asheim et al., 2011). By engaging in collaborative networks with external actors based in more knowledge rich regions (that may include other firms and/or universities or RTOs), firms located in lagging regions may not only augment their own innovative capabilities, but also the innovation capacity of their region. Indeed, there is emerging evidence that the (positive) impact on innovation in lagging regions appears to be more pronounced when firms are engaged in collaborative extra-regional networks with (more prolific) inventors from knowledge-intensive regions (De Noni et al., 2018).

Critically, within the theoretical framework of S3, the quality of extra-regional links is also crucial. For lagging regions specifically, perhaps the foci of the diversification should not be drawn too narrowly. In other words, their interpretation of 'smart specialisation' should not lead them to focus on diversifying into those technologies which are similar to what they already

possess. This strategy is likely to lead only to incremental changes and be insufficient to contribute to their industrial upgrading. Accordingly, Foray (2015) suggests the S3 process may start when regions have sufficiently developed technological specialisations. Instead, when the historically founded local technological base is narrow and offers few new opportunities for growth, regional businesses may find greater benefit from engaging in building new complementarities and synergies with different types of technologies engaging in a process of explorative technological search that may lead to new trajectories (Castaldi et al., 2015). For these reasons, in lagging regions, extra-regional collaborations based upon technological relatedness might be less effective, compared to advanced regions. Building on these issues, we now turn to our formal analysis of the impact of extra-regional linkages in different technological domains across the EU at NUTS2 level on regional innovative performance (with a particular focus on lagging regions).

## **The Impact of Extra-Regional Collaboration on Innovation Across Europe**

### ***Data***

The analysis utilises patent data from the PATSTAT-CRIOS database<sup>7</sup>. This contains harmonised data based on the European Patent Office (EPO) master database, offering information on priority date, International Patent Classification (IPC) classification, as well as NUTS2 location of inventors for all patent applications at the EPO. For this study, we refer to the priority date of patents to identify time, as this is closest to the date of invention (Hinze and Schmoch, 2004), and use the fractional count of inventors to determine location at the NUTS2 regional level, for the period 2000-2014. In the full dataset, there are 29 countries, and just over 260 NUTS2 regions. For the variables including a measure of technological class of patents, a 5-digit IPC classification, which corresponds to 635 distinct IPC classes, is used. Additional regional socio-economic indicators are taken from Eurostat.

The use of patent data for the analysis of knowledge diffusion and technological development presents some well known advantages and disadvantages. Notably, patents record the presence of a significant inventive step, as well as longitudinal information on inventors and characteristics of the invention. The major caveat is patents typically capture one specific type of knowledge base and as such, they may not fully represent all innovative activities. This may especially be the case in lagging regions. Nevertheless, they are widely considered an effective proxy for

regional innovative activities (Acs et al., 2002, Ronde and Hussler, 2005) and have been used to explore the importance of extra-regional knowledge sources (Bottazzi and Peri, 2003, Moreno et al., 2005, Miguelez and Moreno, 2018). In addition, they have been recently utilised to examine the differential impact of extra-regional linkages for different levels of regional economic development (De Noni et al., 2018). Thus, the use of patent metrics allows us to explore processes of learning and knowledge exchange in regional scientific and analytical knowledge bases, in line with previous empirical evidence on technological relatedness (Kogler et al., 2017), and to empirically explore the impact of extra-regional collaborative linkages for technological innovation in lagging regions. In doing so, we acknowledge the need to explore other types of knowledge bases (Asheim et al., 2011) and innovation to fully understand these dynamics across the broader spectrum of other skills and capabilities across regions.

### ***Variables and Empirical Model***

To measure regional innovation performance, we follow two perspectives. The first reflects a common approach in measuring new knowledge creation based on the relative number of new patents normalised by regional population (Miguelez and Moreno, 2018; De Noni et al., 2018). In this analysis, this measure of patent intensity (PINT) is defined as the number of patents (P) per 100,000 population. For this measure, all covariates are lagged one period to reduce endogeneity and simultaneity concerns. Secondly, we explore patent growth alongside patent levels, since this allows for a more effective comparison across regions with very heterogeneous innovation activities. Also, growth may be of greater interest for lagging regions (Porter et al., 2004). This second measure, labelled PGROWTH, is defined as growth in patents over a three year period, as follows:

$$PGROWTH_{rt} = \log(P_{rt+3}) - \log(P_{rt}) \quad (1)$$

which represents the continuously compounded growth rate for region  $r$  over the following three years from time  $t$ . The three-year lag for growth is used to reflect lagged effects in innovation processes, as well as to smooth out volatile year-to-year variation along growth trajectories (Coad et al., 2014). This also reduces potential bias for regions with a low patent output.

We use two variables to explore the role of collaboration in the analysis. To capture the extent of extra-regional collaboration, labelled SHARE\_COLL, we define the following measure:

$$SHARE\_COLL_{rt} = \frac{C_{rt}}{N_{rt}} \quad (2)$$

Where  $C_{rt}$  is the fractional count of inventors from other regions, and  $N_{rt}$  is the total number of patents in region  $r$  in time  $t$ . Following Boschma and Iammarino (2009) and Miguelez and Moreno (2018), we also define a measure (labelled SIM\_COLL) of similarity between the knowledge in a region and the collaboration with inventors in other regions as follows:

$$SIM\_COLL_{rt} = \log \sum_i^I P_{rt,i} Col_{rt,i} \quad (3)$$

where  $P_{rt,i}$  is the absolute number of patents in patent class  $i$  in region  $r$  in time  $t$  reflecting the regional knowledge stock in that class and  $Col_{rt,i}$  is the number of patents involving collaborating inventors from other regions in that patent class.

We also add a control for knowledge stock (K\_STOCK) to proxy technological absorptive capacities and capabilities and account for the initial patent levels of regions. This is defined in line with the literature as follows:

$$K\_STOCK_{rt} = N_{rt} + (1 - \delta)K\_stock_{rt} - 1 \quad (4)$$

where  $\delta$  is a depreciation rate set, as customary, at 15%. Finally, our measure of technological diversity within a region, labelled TECH\_DIV, is defined as an inverse Herfindhal index (Corradini and De Propris, 2015) weighted by relatedness across IPC classes as follows:

$$TECH\_DIV_{rt} = \frac{N_{rt}}{N_{rt}-1} \left( 1 - \sum_i^I p_{rt,i} \left( \frac{\sum_j^J S_{ij} p_{rt,j}}{N_{rt}} \right)^2 \right) \quad (5)$$

Where  $N_{rt}$  is the total number of patents in region  $r$  at time  $t$ ,  $p_{rt}$  represents the share of patents in the region in classes  $i$  or  $j$ , while  $S_{ij}$  is a measure of technological relatedness reflecting co-occurrence among IPC classes defined following Kogler et al. (2017). With respect to previous measures of relatedness, this index allows us to account for the bias introduced when a region has a limited number of patents, through the correction suggested by in Hall (2005) for small sample bias (i.e.  $N_{rt}/(N_{rt}-1)$ ). Finally, we include controls on per capita GDP levels, population density (PDENS) and education (EDUC) from Eurostat, together with time fixed-effects across the panel.

To assess how extra-regional collaboration and relatedness in external collaboration affect regional innovation performance ( $Y_{rt}$ ), we define:

$$\begin{aligned}
Y_{rt} = & \beta_0 + \beta_1 Kstock_{rt-1} + \beta_2 ShareColl_{rt-1} + \beta_{12} Kstock_{rt-1} ShareColl_{tr-1} \\
& + \beta_3 SimColl_{rt-1} + \beta_{13} Kstock_{rt-1} SimColl_{tr-1} + Z_{rt-1} + \delta_r + \delta_t + \epsilon_{rt}
\end{aligned}
\tag{6}$$

To test the differential effect of SHARE\_COLL and SIM\_COLL for lagging regions, the above equation includes interaction terms for both variables with K\_STOCK, allowing us to explore their impact across the distribution of knowledge capabilities of the regions in the dataset. We use regional patent stock to identify lagging regions in the analysis as this measure presents a strong correlation with GDP, whilst also capturing specific technological capabilities. Results are fully robust to the use of GDP values as threshold to identify lagging regions.

For the estimation, we follow three different approaches. We first estimate our model using fixed-effects regression (FE) with cluster robust standard errors and the full set of NUTS2 regional fixed-effects to capture any time-invariant unobserved heterogeneity. Secondly, we run a multilevel maximum likelihood (ML) model with country dummies to exploit between-variation in the panel structure. Finally, we also report results from the System Generalised Method of Moments (Sys-GMM) two-step estimator, with finite-sample correction to the two-step covariance matrix derived by Windmeijer (2005). This allows us to control for any potential dynamic effect in the model in line with an evolutionary economics perspective.

### ***Descriptive Statistics and patterns of Extra-Regional Collaboration***

Descriptive statistics and correlations for all variables are reported in Table 1. These show the well-known heterogeneity that characterise European regions across the various dimensions measured, as well as the strong correlation between GDP and regional knowledge stock (K\_STOCK). We also find a moderate negative correlation between K\_STOCK and extra-regional collaboration (SHARE\_COLL), suggesting actors in stronger regions may be less reliant upon external knowledge for innovation (see Section 2.2). Conversely, in line with the concept of S3 and the findings by Kogler et al. (2017), technological diversity (TECH\_DIV) within regions is negatively correlated with both GDP as well as K\_STOCK. Furthermore, this relationship is reinforced by a relatively strong correlation between the knowledge stock of a region (K\_STOCK) and the similarity in external collaborations (SIM\_COLL), which points to increasing specialisation as regions develop. As expected, looking at the correlaton with K\_STOCK, the

measure for regional patent intensity (PINT) shows a moderate bias towards stronger regions, while patent growth (PGROWTH) only presents a very marginal link to less developed regions.

[Insert Table 1 HERE]

In Figure 1, we can see the evolution of extra-regional collaboration across Europe, for the periods 1985-1990 and 2005-2010. We first observe an overall increase in collaboration across regions. Second, and focusing upon 2005-2010, we also note significant differences in various countries. In particular, Figure 1b highlights that several highly innovative regions such as those in northern Italy and Catalonia exhibit relatively low levels of extra-regional collaboration. Greater use of extra-regional collaboration are recorded in the weaker regions of the UK and (East) Germany as well as some of the transition economies.

[Insert Figure 1a and b here]

These trends potentially reflect two phenomena. The first is the growth in global value chains, and especially their extension into Eastern Europe, with the opening up of the transition economies in the 1990s and their subsequent entry into the Single European Market (established in 1993). While this has led to a greater outsourcing of production and integration of these economies into European production chains (Dicken, 2015), it also provides the opportunity for technological upgrading of these lagging regions and potentially, even their innovative output (as reflected by patenting activity). The second phenomenon may reflect the growth of EU programmes promoting extra-regional collaboration for innovation (see Section 5).

### ***Econometric Results***

Results for the regression analysis are reported in Table 2. In columns 1 to 3, we report results for patent intensity (PINT), with column 1 showing fixed-effects panel estimations, column 2 the maximum-likelihood results, while column 3 Sys-GMM results. In columns 4-6, we present the results for regional patent growth (PGROWTH). As expected, K\_STOCK is positive and significant across all model specifications, confirming the importance of accumulated regional technological capabilities for innovation. The key variable of interest, SHARE\_COLL, is also positively associated both in models based on PINT and PGROWTH<sup>8</sup>. This indicates the extent of extra-regional collaboration may be important in allowing for a stronger development of new technologies, reflecting the growing trend of extra-regional collaboration observed across time.

In order to ascertain the differential impact of extra-regional collaboration for lagging regions, we explore the relationship between the strength of the regional knowledge base and external collaboration by looking at the interaction term between `K_STOCK` and `SHARE_COLL`. The coefficient of the interaction term shows there is a significant and negative moderating effect of `K_STOCK` on `SHARE_COLL` in all models. This indicates the positive impact of any extra-regional collaboration falls as regions are increasingly characterised by a stronger internal knowledge base. We can examine this further by considering the marginal effects for this interaction term in Figure 2a, which shows the impact of extra-regional collaboration at different levels of regions' knowledge stock. As we move from lagging regions in the lower quartile of the `K_STOCK` distribution to regions with a higher level of knowledge stock, marginal effects for `SHARE_COLL` reduces progressively. This indicates regions with weaker knowledge capabilities may benefit more from extra-regional knowledge inputs than regions with strong knowledge capabilities (Boschma, 2015, De Noni et al., 2018), while extra-regional collaboration even has a negative impact for the strongest quartile of regions. These results are consistent with Grillitsch and Nilsson (2015, see Section 2.2), and suggest actors in lagging regions may compensate for weak local networks through extra-regional collaboration, whereas firms based in regions at the technological frontier are more likely to rely upon localised knowledge bases in order to access external knowledge.

Looking at technological similarity in extra-regional collaborations, `SIM_COLL` is both significant and negative in all models, except in Column 3. This may indicate that collaborations with other regions, in technological classes in which a region is already quite active, may actually hamper patent growth, perhaps due to lock-in effects (e.g. Capello and Kroll, 2016) and reduced combinatorial opportunities. However, this is once again dependent upon the level of regional internal knowledge stock, as evidenced by the significant positive interaction term between `SIM_COLL` and `K_STOCK`. Once again, we can test the differential impact of collaboration for lagging regions exploring the impact of `SIM_COLL` across the distribution of regional knowledge stock by looking at the average marginal effects for the interaction term between these two variables, shown in Figure 2b. In particular, we observe a negative effect of similarity in extra-regional co-inventor collaboration for lagging regions in the lower quartile of the `K_STOCK` distribution, whilst an increasingly positive effect – significant above the median value of `K_STOCK` - is present for regions that are characterised by a progressively higher stock

of accumulated technological capabilities, in line with previous findings on extra-regional knowledge inflows (Miguelez and Moreno, 2018). This again highlights the need for a more subtle application of policies associated with RIS3.

While stronger knowledge based regions focused on a particular subset of technologies (i.e. which are “smartly” specialised), will benefit from extra-regional collaborations with other regions also specialised in related technological areas, this does not hold true for lagging regions. Our findings suggest that lagging regions might benefit more by developing extra-regional collaborations with regions whose technological specialisms differ to their own, so that their own entrepreneurial discovery processes foster connections across a diverse set of opportunities – any one of which may become the basis for ‘smart specialisation’ of the region in the future. Finally, with respect to intra-regional diversity, we find an inverted U relationship (as shown by the quadratic term for TECH\_DIV). This suggests that, while a certain amount of technological diversity may allow for more recombination opportunities, there are diminishing returns to this effect in line with theoretical insights on regional cognitive proximity (Boschma, 2005). While engaging in diversification would allow lagging regions to explore possible alternative directions of development as well as reducing lock-in effects, a high level of diversification may be detrimental for them. Indeed, the cognitive distance across technologies present in these regions would become too wide to be effectively recombined (as indicated by the quadratic term result underlining the presence of decreasing returns to this effect). This provides a complementary - but consistent - view to previous studies on RIS3 (e.g. Kogler et.al, 2017, Balland et.al, 2018).

Overall, our results are robust to the models based on both patent levels (PINT) and patent growth (PGROWTH), for both FE and ML specifications<sup>9</sup>. Moving to dynamic models, in columns 3 and 6, the Hansen tests for over-identifying restrictions are insignificant confirming the validity of the instruments in our estimations. Similarly, Arellano-Bond tests for serial correlation are as expected, with negative first-order and not significant second-order serial correlations. Results are quite robust in the model for patent growth (column 6); while looking at patent intensity (column 3), we note our earlier results for technological similarity no longer hold. This seems to be due to this variable being affected by changes in the lag structure, suggesting its GMM estimate may be unstable. Interestingly, we observe a positive dynamic coefficient for patent intensity, suggesting the presence of dynamic increasing returns in

innovation as suggested by evolutionary perspectives (Breschi, 1999, Martin and Sunley, 2006), while a negative coefficient for patent growth points to a random walk in regional patent growth similar to those identified in the research on firm growth (Coad, 2009, Coad et al., 2014).

[Insert Table 2 and Figure 2 here]

### **Policy Issues for RIS3: Enhancing Extra-Regional Collaboration for Lagging Regions**

Our empirical analysis provides evidence on the importance of extra-regional collaboration in innovation for lagging regions, with important policy implications related to the specific characteristics of their knowledge base. First, as noted in Section (2.1), industrial sectors based in lagging regions may lack the scale to reach or attain a critical mass of knowledge and/or the absorptive capacity to take advantage of new technologies. In both cases, extra-regional collaboration may help bridge these gaps. Morrison et al. (2013), for instance, have demonstrated the importance of establishing such linkages for weaker regions to widen their knowledge base and improve their performance. Moreover, from a RIS3 perspective, establishing extra-regional linkages between leading and lagging regions can foster a quicker adoption of new technologies by lagging regions. In turn, these technologies can open up opportunities for further cross-sectoral collaborations, entrepreneurial discoveries, opportunities and the emergence of new regional competences and specialisms, which in due course, may facilitate S3. As such, widening the take-up of new technologies has become an important component of RIS3 (Evangelista et al., 2015).

A second implication regards technological specialisation in collaboration. Lagging regions, typically with weaker knowledge bases, should not focus upon specialisation but instead seek to diversify their technological base through encouraging their resident actors to engage in external collaborations. Opportunities for upgrading or branching into new activities by using different technologies may not be obvious *ex ante* and a period of experimentation with a wider range of technologies may be required before a potentially fruitful path for future specialisation emerges (e.g. the adoption of nano-technologies and advanced materials in the traditional textile and clothing sectors, and ICTs in tourism - see Grillitsch et al., 2018).

However, our findings also indicate that incentives to collaborate differ between more advanced and lagging regions. While actors located in lagging regions benefit from such extra-regional collaborations, those in advanced regions benefit less so. This reflects, in part, the role of actors in lagging regions utilising extra-regional collaboration - through global value chains and/or linkages with research institutions elsewhere – to offset the weaknesses of their local knowledge base. In advanced regions, local actors benefit from stronger regional innovation systems and knowledge infrastructures, enabling them to exploit local knowledge spillovers which may mean extra-regional links are less important (Tödling et.al, 2012; Grillitsch and Nilsson, 2015). Indeed, as both Fritsch (2001) and Fritsch and Franke (2004) show, the more complex knowledge interactions and learning processes - that largely arise in leading regions - tend to be located in close geographic proximity (namely local and regional).

Of course, firms in advanced regions do engage in extra-regional collaborations. With regard to advanced technological collaboration, these firms are more inclined to collaborate with like-minded actors in other advanced regions since mutually strong knowledge bases facilitate knowledge creation, exploitation and make innovation (and patenting) more likely (Bianchi and Labory, 2018). In contrast, for firms in advanced regions, the incentives to engage in extra-regional collaboration with actors in lagging regions largely revolve around the commercialisation (via licensing or direct technology sales) of their own technologies/technological competences. Firms in lagging regions can benefit from technological adoption and hitherto gain efficiencies in their existing production operations. However, the potential adaptation of these technologies - by actors in lagging regions - can also support technological diversification and the emergence of new specialisations and market opportunities from the existing industrial base (Kogler et.al, 2017). In turn, this process may enhance knowledge and technological complexity (and uniqueness) within lagging regions, on which to acquire a new competitive advantage (Balland et al., 2018)<sup>10</sup>.

In terms of policy implications, our results point to an intra-marginal Coasian type solution whereby policymakers provide incentives to actors in advanced regions to collaborate with actors in lagging ones<sup>11</sup>. Given the heterogeneity of lagging regions, there is no unique formula. One possibility, which has been stressed and implemented for many years, is fostering the development of the knowledge base of lagging regions in order to raise interest in actors located

in advanced regions to establishing an extra-regional collaboration. Thus, where firms are engaged in extra-regional collaboration on training and skills programmes and/or extra-regional temporary work teams (Grillitsch and Nilsson, 2015), the lagging region may benefit from human capital enhancement, again raising its capability to participate in S3. This point needs, of course, to be tempered with the caveat that enhancing human capital has a tendency to raise labour mobility, and while this itself is a source of knowledge spillovers (Breschi and Lissoni, 2009), it can lead to outward-migration of knowledge and skills from the lagging region (McCann and Ortega-Argilés, 2015) and extenuate regional imbalances.

Another way is to provide an institutional framework for collaboration between advanced and lagging regions. In this regard, the EU's formal programmes - such as H2020 and Interreg<sup>12</sup> - are useful and deliberate mechanisms to encourage the participation of actors from both leader and lagging regions to work together on projects. While these programmes aim to develop a world class European research base, a key element of H2020 is to foster international (and by implication, extra-regional) collaboration (European Commission, 2013). For instance, ¡VAMOS!<sup>12</sup> is a 42 month H2020 project aimed at developing an underwater, remotely controlled, environmentally viable mining system to enable the exploitation and rehabilitation of underexploited (and abandoned) European deposits of high grade minerals<sup>13</sup>. It involves 17 industrial and academic partners from 9 EU countries, several of whom are based in lagging regions, and fuses expertise from diverse fields including geology, robotics and mining. For partners based in a lagging region such as Cornwall, UK, the project has begun to open up the possibility of developing new specialisms in environmental marine mining techniques (with potential global application) that could in turn attract new investment and jobs.

Similarly, the European Regional Development and Cohesion Funds have aimed at fostering stronger European extra-regional collaboration to reduce regional disparities and enhance the integration of lagging regions. In this regard, the European Territorial Cooperation (ETC) programme, better known as Interreg has - since 1990 - been a significant vehicle (Reitel et al., 2018). Interreg projects have sought to foster synergies between RIS3, clusters and network collaboration, and industrial and social innovation (Council of European Union, 2015). For example, the V-B Adriatic-Ionian (ADRION) Interreg programme between 8 partner states of the Adriatic – Ionian area, involves collaboration between advanced (Lombardy, Emilia

Romagna in Italy, as well as regions in Slovenia) and lagging regions (e.g. Puglia). ADRION primarily aims at providing framework conditions for the development and integration of the concerned areas, focusing on building networking structures, strategy and pilot actions, as well as institutional capacity. The focus is on creating related variety (cross-fertilisations) by favouring networking between European clusters and SMEs (particularly promoting innovation agents such as fablabs, co-working spaces and innovation hubs)<sup>14</sup>. This is particularly important for a lagging region, such as Puglia which is beginning to see benefits of its involvement in the Blue-Boost project (€1.5 million for 2 years), aimed at promoting innovation and cross-fertilisations in maritime sectors (fisheries, shipbuilding, blue technologies such as green shipbuilding, robotics and new materials). Participation in such programmes is already enabling Puglia's constituent firms to develop fruitful links with technological leaders elsewhere, and it is beginning to foster a more collaborative culture (for innovation) while raising administrative capacity (to lead and manage such projects) within its own region<sup>15</sup>.

In short, these types of framework can help to facilitate a broad spectrum of extra-regional collaborations, including linkages between medium and low-tech regions, where the lower technological gap might deliver more fruitful synergies and innovation. Moreover, such networks and collaborations may endure (and deliver mutual benefits) beyond their funding cycles.

## **Conclusions**

This paper has examined the nature of extra-regional linkages for innovation, with a particular focus on lagging regions within the context of RIS3. While the academic and policy literatures have outlined the importance of extra-regional linkages for successful regional development, these claims are largely conjectural and pay insufficient attention as to whether 'one-size fit all', or whether asymmetries between lagging and advanced regions exist in the ability and incentives to engage in extra-regional collaboration; little systematic evidence exists on the type of collaborations most favourable to lagging regions. This paper has outlined some important differences across places should be taken into account in the definition and implementation of S3. In particular, this study highlights the asymmetry in incentives (and benefits) from extra-regional collaboration across lagging and advanced regions, suggesting that there might not be circular benefits for all parties involved in the process of collaboration.

Our analysis shows that whilst extra-regional collaboration assists the technological development of lagging regions in broad terms, those collaborative relationships based upon technological similarity – in contrast to those for leading regions - may be less useful. Lagging regions require a degree of diversity to explore, experiment and discover their own new specialisation. In this regard, lagging regions should perhaps favour low and medium sectors to search for new technological specialisms for their upgrading or their branching into more value-adding activities. Traditionally low or medium tech-sectors, based in lagging regions, may exploit opportunities for industrial upgrading through different (unrelated) technologies (Grillitsch et al., 2018). As noted, this may run counter to the existing RIS3 discourse, which argues for a concentration of funding in specific technological domains (McCann and Ortega-Argilés, 2015). Industrial and regional policies need to be sufficiently flexible to accommodate a range of possibilities. In this regard, there is further scope for aligning existing EU extra-regional collaborative frameworks more closely with specific (regional) RIS3 objectives and to do so in more a flexible way<sup>16</sup>.

One important consequence of our analysis is that place-based innovation and industrial policies are essential: regions are highly heterogeneous and policy actions have to be tailored to regional specificities. RIS3 has stressed the importance for regions to define specific S3 strategies, based upon analyses of regions' strengths and weaknesses. It is, of course, important to note that neither EU funded extra-regional collaborative projects nor those instigated through global value chains are sufficient to raise the innovative capacity of lagging regions. A critical adjunct for policy is to concomitantly tackle the inherent deficiencies (such as weak labour markets, or sparse local entrepreneurial networks) residing within lagging regions that inhibit innovation (Capello and Kroll, 2016). These deficiencies are not easy to address since they require a concerted effort to reverse path dependent institutional failures such as poor governance and corruption (Rodríguez-Pose and Di Cataldo, 2014, Aranguren et al., 2019). For instance, in Eastern Europe, weak local networks are an artefact of former Communist regimes, with efforts to build co-operative networks sometimes being viewed with suspicion (Spiesberger et al., 2018). A way forward is to enhance the participation of local actors in their regional innovation systems. Territorial focused skills programmes are one such vehicle, especially if they are designed not only to meet existing sectoral needs, but also to enhance transferable skills in the

local labour market (such as those linked to key enabling technologies). Such a policy can enhance a region's absorptive capacity, so as to attract new foreign investment and simultaneously foster the possibility of engagement in extra-regional collaboration.

Finally, the results presented on extra-regional linkages should be considered with the usual caveats applying to the use of patent data, which mostly reflect scientific and analytical knowledge. Particularly in the context of lagging regions, it is important to note further evidence reflecting other types of knowledge bases, including medium and low-tech capabilities and other forms of design and creativity, is required to present a more comprehensive picture of innovation in lagging regions. Moreover, there might be further dynamics defined by imbalances between economic development in advanced and lagging regions, future work should also explore the role of universities and research institutions in exerting a brokering effect in connecting lagging to advanced regions as well as analyse in more detail the potential impact of imbalances between knowledge capabilities among collaborating regions. Finally, exploring the importance of extra-regional collaborations for the development of new specialisations in the context of lagging regions may also provide important complementary insights.

### **Acknowledgements**

This research was funded by the Regional Studies Association (RSA) under the RSA Expo grant scheme (1/9/2017-28/2/2019). We are grateful for comments and suggestions from participants at the joint Centre for Governance, Regulation and Industrial Strategy (CGR&IS) – Institute for Policy Research (IPR) workshop on Industrial Policy held at the University of Bath on the 26<sup>th</sup> April 2018, and the CJRES conference on Industrial Policy held at the University of Cambridge, 12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> July, 2018. We are also grateful for comments and suggestions from the Editors and referees.

## References

- Acs, Z. J., Anselin, L. & Varga, A. 2002. Patents and innovation counts as measures of regional production of new knowledge. *Research Policy*, 31, 1069-1085.
- Amison, P. & Bailey, D. 2014. Phoenix industries and Open Innovation? The Midlands advanced automotive manufacturing and engineering industry. *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*, 7, 397-411.
- Aranguren, M. J., Magro, E., Navarro, M. & Wilson, J. R. 2019. Governance of the territorial entrepreneurial discovery process: looking under the bonnet of RIS3. *Regional Studies*, 53, 451-461.
- Asheim, B. 2012. The changing role of learning regions in the globalizing knowledge economy: A theoretical re-examination. *Regional Studies*, 46, 993-1004.
- Asheim, B. T., Boschma, R. & Cooke, P. 2011. Constructing regional advantage: Platform policies based on related variety and differentiated knowledge bases. *Regional Studies*, 45, 893-904.
- Azagra-Caro, J. M. 2007. What type of faculty member interacts with what type of firm? Some reasons for the delocalisation of university–industry interaction. *Technovation*, 27, 704-715.
- Bailey, D., Pitelis, C. & Tomlinson, P. R. 2018. A place-based developmental regional industrial strategy for sustainable capture of co-created value. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*. 42, 1521-1542.
- Bailey, D., Pitelis, C. & Tomlinson, P.R. 2019 Strategic Management and Regional Industrial Strategy: cross fertilisation to mutual advantage, *Regional Studies*
- Balland, P.A & Rigby, D.L. 2017. The geography of complex knowledge. *Economic Geography*, 93, 1-23.
- Balland, P.A, Boschma, R, Crespo, J & Rigby, D.L 2018. Smart Specialisation policy in the European Union: relatedness, knowledge complexity and regional diversification. *Regional Studies*. Doi.org/10.1080/00343404.2018.1437900
- Barca, F., McCann, P. & Rodríguez-Pose, A. 2012. The case for regional development intervention: place-based versus place-neutral approaches. *Journal of Regional Science*, 52, 134-152.
- Bathelt, H., Malmberg, A. & Maskell, P. 2004. Clusters and knowledge: local buzz, global pipelines and the process of knowledge creation. *Progress in Human Geography*, 28, 31-56.
- Bianchi, P. & Labory, S. 2018. What policies, initiatives or programmes can support attracting, embedding and reshaping GVCs in regions? OECD Broadening innovation policy: new insights for regions and cities, Topic 2: Building, embedding and reshaping global value chains. Paris: OECD.
- Boschma, R. 2005. Proximity and Innovation: A Critical Assessment. *Regional Studies*, 39, 61-74.

- Boschma, R. 2015. Smart Specialization and Regional Innovation Policy. In R. Antonietti, G. Corò & F. Gambarotto (Eds.) *Uscire dalla crisi. Città, comunità, specializzazioni intelligenti*. Milan: Franco Angeli.
- Boschma, R. & Frenken, K. 2011. Technological relatedness, related variety and economic geography. In P. Cooke, B. Asheim, R. Boschma, R. Martin, D. Schwartz & F. Todtling (eds.) *The Handbook of Regional Innovation and Growth*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Boschma, R. & Gianelle, C. 2014. Regional branching and smart specialisation policy. S3 Policy Brief Series No. 06/2014. Institute for Prospective and Technological Studies, Joint Research Centre.
- Boschma, R. & Iammarino, S. 2009. Related variety, trade linkages, and regional growth in Italy. *Economic Geography*, 85, 289-311.
- Boschma, R. A. & Ter Wal, A. L. 2007. Knowledge networks and innovative performance in an industrial district: the case of a footwear district in the South of Italy. *Industry and Innovation*, 14, 177-199.
- Bottazzi, L. & Peri, G. 2003. Innovation and spillovers in regions: Evidence from European patent data. *European Economic Review*, 47, 687-710.
- Breschi, S. 1999. Spatial patterns of innovation: evidence from patent data. In A. Gambardella, F. Malerba (eds) *The Organization of Economic Innovation in Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 71–102.
- Breschi, S. & Lissoni, F. 2009. Mobility of skilled workers and co-invention networks: an anatomy of localized knowledge flows. *Journal of Economic Geography*, 9, 439-468.
- Capello, R. & Kroll, H. 2016. From theory to practice in smart specialization strategy: emerging limits and possible future trajectories. *European Planning Studies*, 24, 1393-1406.
- Castaldi, C., Frenken, K. & Los, B. 2015. Related variety, unrelated variety and technological breakthroughs: an analysis of US state-level patenting. *Regional Studies*, 49, 767-781.
- Coad, A. 2009. *The Growth of Firms: A Survey of Theories and Empirical Evidence*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Coad, A., Daunfeldt, S.O., Johansson, D. & Wennberg, K. 2014. Whom do high-growth firms hire? *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 23, 293-327.
- Coffano, M. & Tarasconi, G. 2014. CRIOS – Patstat Database: Sources, Contents and Access Rules. Center for Research on Innovation, Organization and Strategy. CRIOS Working Paper n.1.
- Corradini, C. & De Propris, L. 2015. Technological diversification and new innovators in European regions: evidence from patent data. *Environment and Planning A*, 47, 2170-2186.
- Council of European Union 2015. Outcome of proceedings: 25 years of Interreg: its contribution to the cohesion policy goals. Brussels.

- Crevoisier, O. 2004. The innovative milieus approach: toward a territorialized understanding of the economy? *Economic Geography*, 80, 367-379.
- De Noni, I., Orsi, L. & Belussi, F. 2018. The role of collaborative networks in supporting the innovation performances of lagging-behind European regions. *Research Policy*, 47, 1-13.
- Dicken, P. 2015. *Global Shift, Mapping the Contours of the World Economy* New York: Guilford Publications.
- European Commission 2013. Fact sheet: International participation in Horizon 2020. Brussels: European Commission.
- European Commission 2017a. Economic Challenges of Lagging Regions. Final Report, Brussels.
- European Commission 2017b. Europe in a Changing World – Inclusive, innovative and reflective societies. HORIZON 2020. Brussels.
- Evangelista, R., Meliciani, V. & Vezzani, A. 2015. The specialisation of EU regions in fast growing and key enabling technologies. JRC Technical Report, Joint Research Centre (Seville site). EUR 27524 EN; doi:10.2791/844794
- Fitjar R. D., Rodríguez-Pose, A. 2011. When local interaction does not suffice: sources of firm innovation in urban Norway. *Environment and Planning A*, 43,1248–1267.
- Fritsch, M. 2004. Cooperation and the efficiency of regional R&D activities. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 28, 829–846.
- Fritsch, M. and Franke, G. 2004. Innovation, regional knowledge spillovers and R&D cooperation. *Research Policy*, 33, 245–255.
- Foray, D. 2013. The economic fundamentals of smart specialisation. *Ekonomiaz*, 83, 55-82.
- Foray, D. 2015. *Smart specialisation: Opportunities and challenges for regional innovation policy*, London: Routledge.
- Gilsing, V. A., Lemmens, C. E. & Duysters, G. 2007. Strategic alliance networks and innovation: a deterministic and voluntaristic view combined. *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management*, 19, 227-249.
- Giuliani, E. 2006. The selective nature of knowledge networks in clusters: evidence from the wine industry. *Journal of Economic Geography*, 7, 139-168.
- Grabher, G. 1993. The weakness of strong ties; the lock-in of regional development in the Ruhr Area. In G. Grabher (ed) *The Embedded Firm: On the Socioeconomics of Industrial Networks*. London & New York: Routledge, pp. 255–77.
- Grillitsch, M., Asheim, B. & Trippl, M. 2018. Unrelated knowledge combinations: the unexplored potential for regional industrial path development. *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*, 11, 257-274.


- Grillitsch, M. & Nilsson, M. 2015. Innovation in peripheral regions: Do collaborations compensate for a lack of local knowledge spillovers? *The Annals of Regional Science*, 54, 299-321.
- Hall, B. H. 2005. A note on the bias in Herfindahl-type measures based on count data. *Revue d'Economie Industrielle*, 110, 149-156.
- Hinze, S. & Schmoch, U. 2004. Opening the black box. In H.F. Moed, W. Glänzel, U. Schmoch U. (eds) *Handbook of quantitative science and technology research*. Dordrecht: Springer, pp. 215-235.
- Isaksen, A. 2015. Industrial development in thin regions: trapped in path extension? *Journal of Economic Geography*, 15, 585-600.
- Isaksen, A. & Trippel, M. 2017. Exogenously Led and Policy-Supported New Path Development in Peripheral Regions: Analytical and Synthetic Routes. *Economic Geography*, 93, 436-457.
- Johansson, B. & Quigley, J. M. 2004. Agglomeration and networks in spatial economics. *Papers in Regional Science*, 83, 165-176.
- Kogler, D. F., Essletzbichler, J. & Rigby, D. L. 2017. The evolution of specialization in the EU15 knowledge space. *Journal of Economic Geography*, 17, 345-373.
- Mameli, F., Faggian, A. & McCann, P. 2014. Estimation of local employment growth: Do sectoral aggregation and industry definition matter? *Regional Studies*, 48, 1813-1828.
- Martin, R. & Sunley, P. 2006. Path dependence and regional economic evolution. *Journal of Economic Geography*, 6, 395-437.
- Maskell, P., Bathelt, H. & Malmberg, A. 2006. Building global knowledge pipelines: the role of temporary clusters. *European Planning Studies*, 14, 997-1013.
- McCann, P. & Ortega-Argilés, R. 2015. Smart specialization, regional growth and applications to European Union cohesion policy. *Regional Studies*, 49, 1291-1302.
- Migueluez, E. & Moreno, R. 2018. Relatedness, external linkages and regional innovation in Europe. *Regional Studies*, 52, 688-701.
- Moreno, R., Paci, R. & Usai, S. 2005. Spatial spillovers and innovation activity in European regions. *Environment and Planning A*, 37, 1793-1812.
- Morgan, K. 2013. The regional state in the era of smart specialisation. *Ekonomiaz - Revista vasca de Economía*, 83, 103-126.
- Morrison, A., Rabelotti, R. & Zirulia, L. 2013. When do global pipelines enhance the diffusion of knowledge in clusters? *Economic Geography*, 89, 77-96.
- Neffke, F., Henning, M., Boschma, R., Lundquist, K.J. & Olander, L.O. 2011. The dynamics of agglomeration externalities along the life cycle of industries. *Regional Studies*, 45, 49-65.
- Nooteboom, B. 2000. *Learning and Innovation in Organisations and Economies*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Owen-Smith, J. & Powell, W. W. 2004. Knowledge networks as channels and conduits: The effects of spillovers in the Boston biotechnology community. *Organization Science*, 15, 5-21.
- Ozawa, T. 1974. *Japan's Technological Challenge to the West, 1950-1974, Motivation and Accomplishment*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press
- Ozawa, T. 2007 Institutionally driven growth and stagnation - and struggle for reform. In D. Bailey, D. Coffey & P.R. Tomlinson (Eds) *Crisis or Recovery in Japan: State and Industrial Economy*, pp. 106-132, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, UK.
- Porter, M. E., Ketels, C. H., Miller, K. & Bryden, R. 2004. Competitiveness in rural US regions: learning and research agenda. Washington, DC: US Economic Development Administration (EDA).
- Prieto, J. G., Perianez-Forte, I. & Palazuelos-Martinez, M. 2017. Capitalising on smart specialisation and Interreg, the case of energy. *Joint Research Centre (JRC) Technical Reports*. Brussels: EU Commission.
- Reitel, B., Wassenberg, B. & Peyrony, J. 2018. The INTERREG Experience in Bridging European Territories. A 30-Year Summary. In E. Medeiros (eds) *European Territorial Cooperation*. The Urban Book Series. Springer, Cham.
- Rodríguez-Pose, A. & Di Cataldo, M. 2014. Quality of government and innovative performance in the regions of Europe. *Journal of Economic Geography*, 15, 673-706.
- Ronde, P. & Hussler, C. 2005. Innovation in regions: What does really matter? *Research Policy*, 34, 1150-1172.
- Rychen, F. & Zimmermann, J.B. 2008. Clusters in the global knowledge-based economy: Knowledge gatekeepers and temporary proximity. *Regional Studies*, 42, 767-776.
- Spiesberger, M., Prieto, J. G. & Seigneur, I. 2018. Smart specialisation and social innovation: From policy relations to opportunities and challenges. JRC Working Papers JRC111371, Joint Research Centre (Seville site).
- Tödting, F., Grillitsch, M & Hoglinger, C. 2012. Knowledge sourcing and innovation in Austrian ICT companies - how does geography matter? *Industry and Innovation*, 19: 327-348.
- Tödting, F., Lehner, P. & Tripl, M. 2006. Innovation in knowledge intensive industries: The nature and geography of knowledge links. *European Planning Studies*, 14, 1035-1058.
- Tödting, F. & Tripl, M. 2004. Like phoenix from the ashes? The renewal of clusters in old industrial areas. *Urban Studies*, 41, 1175-1195.
- Tripl, M., Tödting, F. & Lengauer, L. 2009. Knowledge sourcing beyond buzz and pipelines: evidence from the Vienna software sector. *Economic Geography*, 85, 443-462.
- Virkkala, S. 2007. Innovation and networking in peripheral areas. A case study of emergence and change in rural manufacturing. *European Planning Studies*, 15, 511-529.



Windmeijer, F. 2005. A finite sample correction for the variance of linear efficient two-step GMM estimators. *Journal of Econometrics*, 126, 25-51.

## FIGURES

**Figure 1: Share of extra-regional collaboration (SHARE\_COLL) for periods 1985-1990 and 2005-2010**



**Figure 2: Average Marginal Effects for SHARE\_COLL (a) and SIM\_COLL (b) across quantiles of K\_STOCK**



## TABLES

**Table 1: Descriptive statistics and correlation matrix**

		Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
PINT	(1)	10.53	13.43	1							
PGROWTH	(2)	-0.11	0.75	0.02	1						
K_STOCK	(3)	998.62	1908.95	0.70	-0.06	1					
SHARE_COLL	(4)	0.30	0.14	-0.11	0.05	-0.15	1				
SIM_COLL	(5)	3.57	2.95	0.74	-0.12	0.64	-0.07	1			
TECH_DIV	(6)	0.08	0.19	-0.30	0.16	-0.20	0.24	-0.55	1		
GDP	(7)	46027	52914	0.33	-0.06	0.74	-0.28	0.57	-0.26	1	
EDUC	(8)	24.18	8.99	0.28	-0.33	0.25	-0.08	0.43	-0.32	0.25	1
PDENS	(9)	350.13	843.77	0.06	-0.09	0.09	0.09	0.19	-0.11	0.21	0.30

**Table 2: FE Regression, ML and Sys-GMM Estimates**

	Regional PINT			Regional PGROWTH		
	FE	ML	Sys-GMM	FE	ML	Sys-GMM
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
L.DEPVAR			1.146*** (0.114)			-0.173** (0.075)
K_STOCK	7.253*** (1.019)	7.303*** (0.406)	17.026*** (3.498)	0.337*** (0.124)	0.264*** (0.045)	1.820*** (0.509)
SHARE_COLL	15.920*** (2.735)	14.003*** (1.931)	132.926*** (45.576)	4.417*** (0.471)	3.269*** (0.247)	7.157*** (1.810)
K_STOCK X SHARE_COLL	-4.012*** (0.776)	-3.589*** (0.455)	-12.016* (6.717)	-0.672*** (0.100)	-0.465*** (0.057)	-1.023** (0.520)
SIM_COLL	-0.778*** (0.277)	-0.954*** (0.190)	1.240 (1.858)	-0.331*** (0.052)	-0.128*** (0.022)	-0.753*** (0.245)
K_STOCK X SIM_COLL	0.207*** (0.060)	0.270*** (0.030)	-1.082*** (0.228)	0.040*** (0.008)	0.007** (0.003)	0.078* (0.045)
TECH_DIV	20.315*** (3.254)	20.455*** (2.326)	-23.878 (59.488)	1.918*** (0.491)	0.968*** (0.309)	4.888** (2.199)
TECHDIV X TECHDIV	-15.355*** (2.653)	-15.379*** (2.095)	61.744 (64.477)	-1.136*** (0.439)	-0.409* (0.279)	-3.123 (2.216)
ln(GDP)	-1.318 (1.060)	-4.671*** (0.566)	3.618 (5.243)	1.351*** (0.203)	0.217*** (0.047)	-0.752 (0.945)
EDUC	-0.073 (0.059)	-0.071** (0.032)	-0.421** (0.203)	-0.021** (0.009)	-0.015*** (0.003)	-0.225*** (0.057)
ln(PDENS)	-10.500** (4.505)	-0.767** (0.344)	-4.313* (2.343)	-2.245*** (0.685)	-0.082*** (0.023)	0.241 (0.604)
_cons	42.356* (23.636)	26.367*** (4.675)	-93.698** (45.223)	-3.588 (3.826)	-2.750*** (0.407)	2.242 (7.103)
N	3107	3107	3092	2608	2608	2584
N Groups	264	264	263	260	260	258
Hansen test $X^2$ , Prob > $X^2$			119.23 (0.14)			86.91 (0.12)
AR1 test, Prob > z			-3.39 (0.00)			-4.39 (0.00)
AR2 test, Prob > z			0.84 (0.39)			-0.52 (0.61)

Robust standard errors in parentheses

\* p<0.10, \*\* p<0.05, \*\*\* p<0.01

---

<sup>1</sup> Phoenix industries are clusters of businesses - with broadly similar technologies - that arise in former industrial areas (Amison & Bailey, 2014).

<sup>2</sup> The current European Commission (EC, 2017a) definition of lagging regions categorises them as either i). low growth regions (*i.e. NUTS2 regions which have not converged with the EU average GDP per capita (in Purchasing Power Standard - PPS) between 2000 and 2013*), or ii) low income regions (*i.e. NUTS2 regions with a GDP per capita in PPS below 50% of the EU average in 2013*). Lagging regions typically have low innovative capacity.

<sup>3</sup> For Interreg see <https://www.interregeurope.eu/>, for H2020 see <https://ec.europa.eu/programmes/horizon2020/> and for the KTN, see <https://ktn-uk.co.uk/>

<sup>4</sup> Technically, cognitive distance between actors should not be too wide to preclude any form of collaboration nor too close, which could lead to 'cognitive lock-in' (Nooteboom, 2000, Boschma, 2005).

<sup>5</sup> For instance, collaborations originated within H2020 framework create links between actors taking part in the project. Such links usually outlive the formal H2020 collaboration and they can potentially be re-activated for future joint projects.

<sup>6</sup> It should also be recognized extra-regional linkages involving cross-sectoral collaborations based upon largely dissimilar knowledge bases (so called 'unrelated' variety) can and do prosper and may lead to more radical innovation. See, Grillitsch et al. (2018).

<sup>7</sup> For more information on PATSTAT-CRIOS and patent data harmonisation, see Coffano and Tarasconi (2014).

<sup>8</sup> Results are also robust when removing regions in the upper and lower decile of K\_STOCK distribution, suggesting outliers are not a significant concern in the analysis. These robustness checks are available on request.

<sup>9</sup> Results are robust to splitting the sample before and after the crisis of 2008, as well as considering only regions with a patent stock lower than the median EU value. Again, these results are available on request.

<sup>10</sup> There are similarities here with the post-World War II industrial policies of Japan, which deliberately licensed US technologies, and 'adapted' them in new ways to become technological leaders in their own right (Ozawa, 1974; 2007).

<sup>11</sup> This is feasible where the marginal gain for the lagging region (with respect to the baseline of no extra-regional collaboration with stronger regions) is greater than (any) marginal loss for the stronger region. We are grateful to an anonymous referee for this point.

<sup>12</sup> **In particular, the stable institutional framework offered by Interreg helps to overcome institutional failures of lagging regions (especially in the South of Italy).**

<sup>12</sup> Further information can be found at: <http://vamos-project.eu/>.

<sup>13</sup> The EU is a heavy user of minerals, consuming 25-30% of the world's metal production, yet it only accounts for 3% of global ore production. However, it is estimated the value of unexploited EU mineral resources at a depth of 500-1,000 metres is approximately €100 billion. The project seeks to contribute to ensuring the EU has a sustainable supply of raw materials, while developing innovations in alternative mining techniques (see <http://vamos-project.eu/partners/>).

<sup>14</sup> For further details, see [http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/en/newsroom/news/2018/05/17-05-2018-boosting-blue-growth-for-smes-in-the-adriatic-and-ionian-regions](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/en/newsroom/news/2018/05/17-05-2018-boosting-blue-growth-for-smes-in-the-adriatic-and-ionian-regions)

<sup>15</sup> For more information, see [www.adrioninterreg.eu](http://www.adrioninterreg.eu)

<sup>16</sup> For example, Prieto et al. (2017) document the potential synergies arising from existing Interreg programmes and the EU's new Smart Specialisation Platform on Energy (S3PEnergy), which is a strategic priority across the EU. In this particular case, there are opportunities for regions - especially lagging regions - to access a combination of EU Cohesion policy funding streams (*i.e.* Interreg and RIS3), to engage in extra-regional collaboration across a range of dissimilar technologies (*e.g.* marine, solar, biotech, smart-grids) and develop new territorial specialisms in renewable and sustainable energy sources.