

Cambridge University Press & Assessment  
978-0-521-81110-1 — Strategic Alliances as Social Facts  
Business, Biotechnology, and Intellectual History  
Mark De Rond , Foreword by Anne Huff  
Frontmatter  
[More Information](#)

---

## Strategic Alliances as Social Facts

*Business, Biotechnology and Intellectual History*

How can we explain a proliferation of alliances when the probability of failure is higher than success? And why have we emphasized their order, manageability, and predictability whilst acknowledging that they tend to be experienced as messy, politically charged, and unpredictable? Mark de Rond, in this provocative book, sets out to address such paradoxes. Based on in-depth case studies of three major biotechnology alliances, he suggests that we need theories to explain idiosyncrasy as well as social order. He argues that such theories must allow for social conduct to be active and self-directed but simultaneously inert and constrained, thus permitting voluntarism, determinism, and serendipity alike to explain causation in alliance life. The book offers a highly original combination of insights from social theory and intellectual history with more mainstream strategic management and organizations literature. It is a refreshing and thought-provoking analysis that will appeal to the reflective practitioner and academic researcher alike.

MARK DE ROND is University Lecturer in Strategy at the Judge Institute of Management Studies, University of Cambridge.

Cambridge University Press & Assessment  
978-0-521-81110-1 — Strategic Alliances as Social Facts  
Business, Biotechnology, and Intellectual History  
Mark De Rond , Foreword by Anne Huff  
Frontmatter  
[More Information](#)

---

# Strategic Alliances as Social Facts

*Business, Biotechnology, and Intellectual History*

---

Mark de Rond



**CAMBRIDGE**  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge University Press & Assessment  
978-0-521-81110-1 — Strategic Alliances as Social Facts  
Business, Biotechnology, and Intellectual History  
Mark De Rond , Foreword by Anne Huff  
Frontmatter  
[More Information](#)



Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge CB2 8EA, United Kingdom  
One Liberty Plaza, 20th Floor, New York, NY 10006, USA  
477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia  
314–321, 3rd Floor, Plot 3, Splendor Forum, Jasola District Centre, New Delhi – 110025, India  
103 Penang Road, #05–06/07, Visioncrest Commercial, Singapore 238467

Cambridge University Press is part of Cambridge University Press & Assessment, a department of the University of Cambridge.

We share the University's mission to contribute to society through the pursuit of education, learning and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

[www.cambridge.org](http://www.cambridge.org)

Information on this title: [www.cambridge.org/9780521811101](http://www.cambridge.org/9780521811101)

© Mark de Rond 2003

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press & Assessment.

First published 2003

Third printing 2005

*A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library*

ISBN 978-0-521-81110-1 Hardback

Cambridge University Press & Assessment has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

Cambridge University Press & Assessment  
978-0-521-81110-1 — Strategic Alliances as Social Facts  
Business, Biotechnology, and Intellectual History  
Mark De Rond , Foreword by Anne Huff  
Frontmatter  
[More Information](#)

---

## To Ed and Greetje de Rond

Strange is our situation here upon earth. However, there is one thing that we do know – man is here for the sake of other men – above all, for those upon whose smile and well-being our own happiness depends, but also for the countless unknown souls with whose fate we are connected by a bond of sympathy.

Albert Einstein

## Contents

---

<i>List of figures</i>	<i>page</i> viii
<i>Foreword</i> by Anne Sigismund Huff	ix
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	xii
Introduction	1
1 Paradoxes of alliance life	6
2 The context of drug discovery	34
3 Through the looking glass 1: Rummidgen and Plethora	55
4 Through the looking glass 2: Cambiogen and Plethora	82
5 Through the looking glass 3: Bionatura and Pflugum Courtal	103
6 Putting two and two together: revisiting theory and practice	123
7 Strategy, structure, and structuration: the general in the particular	139
8 The hedgehog and the fox: the particular in the general	156
9 The legitimacy of messiness	173
Appendix: On methodology and definitions	184
<i>References</i>	193
<i>Index</i>	209

## Figures

---

1.1	Life cycle models	<i>page</i> 24
1.2	Teleological approaches: Ring and van de Ven (1994)	26
1.3	Teleological approaches: Doz (1996)	27
1.4	Teleological approaches: Hamel and Doz (1998)	28
1.5	Four generic process paradigms: van de Ven and Poole (1995)	30
2.1	Alliances as evolving structures	49
3.1	Chronology of the Rummidgen–Plethora alliance: 1994–8	58
3.2	Evolution: 1994–6	63
3.3	Evolution: 1997	66
4.1	Chronology of the Cambiogen–Plethora alliance: 1995–9	84
4.2	Evolution: 1995–7	87
5.1	Chronology of the Bionatura–Pflugum Courtal alliance: 1991–9	104
5.2	Evolution: 1991–7	107
5.3	Evolution: 1998	108
9.1	Dialectical tensions in alliances	175
A.1	Methodology	186
A.2	Differing degrees of vertical integration (Lorange and Roos, 1992)	190
A.3	Differing degrees of interdependence (Contractor and Lorange, 1988)	190
A.4	Differentiating between alliance types in the biopharmaceutical sector	191

## Foreword

---

The contributions of this book are threefold. First, the three empirical studies of strategic alliances in biotechnology research add to an already considerable literature on the pharmaceutical industry and its evolving structure. Second, the approach to understanding these increasingly pervasive strategies exemplifies the utility of moving away from theoretic ‘silos’ towards multi-theoretic analysis. This approach can be usefully juxtaposed with contrasting arguments about how management research might achieve more depth and maturity, as outlined in more detail below. The third contribution of the book is to relate a pluralist perspective to the work of Isaiah Berlin. This section of the book not only provides a stronger ontological foundation for Mark’s effort, but introduces a philosophical depth that has been missing from most discussions of management theory around the world. All in all, this is a fresh, ambitious and welcome agenda. Though complex, the book is brief enough to be accessible to many readers; I encourage you to be one.

The empirical study begins with the puzzle of why alliances continue to flourish despite widely agreed statistics showing that at least half of previous efforts have failed, often miserably. Those interested in alliances, especially their strong role in the pharmaceutical industry, will be interested in the (disguised) descriptions of three specific connections. None of these collective efforts fulfilled its initially stated purpose; the most apparently successful was terminated the most quickly. De Rond’s analysis is compatible with Czarniawska’s (1997) argument that managers are in, and help create, never-ending dramas, in which purpose cannot be expected to match the firm expectations of textbooks and a-priori rhetoric. De Rond’s story of how and why initial objectives were modified is plausible, and brings into partial question, at least, attributions of alliance failure. It also supports a stronger interpretive strand in future work on alliances.

Alliances constitute an important strategy in an internationalizing and globalizing world, and the empirical aspect of the book is therefore useful in and of itself. The contribution that moves beyond empirical

observation is de Rond's approach to theory building. Here, the work on alliances becomes the springboard for observations that are relevant to a much wider audience.

De Rond claims that useful theory building *must* be pluralist. This is a contribution to an increasingly sophisticated discussion of the purposes of management theorizing and research. In the last fifty years, almost all business schools have increased their social science capabilities. Spurred on by ranking schemes that heavily influence acceptance by journals, there has been remarkable progress recently in relating theories from economics, psychology, sociology, anthropology, geography, and other fields to the contexts of business and other organizations. De Rond's position, however, is that analysis from a single theoretical basis, the thing that is most easily rewarded by highly regarded journals, is at best a useful intermediary. Single science perspectives cannot shed significant light on the contexts we claim to be trying to understand; in fact, they tend to obscure it.

The assertion that a pluralist perspective must now be developed can be contrasted with two other points of departure. The first of these argues that management must become more of a 'design science'; the second escalates a critical, or at least a non-managerialist, stand.

The design perspective, recently explored in a conference inaugurating the new Weatherhead School of Management building designed by Frank Gehry (<http://design.cwru.edu>), is just beginning to coalesce. My summary of this point of departure is that management must take its standing as a profession more seriously. Following colleagues in architecture, medicine and engineering, proponents for this agenda claim scholars of management should put more effort into creating a coherent language of practice and offering specific, empirically verified, templates for application. Design proponents feel we are less relevant than other professional schools; we are behind colleagues helping to fight disease or reach the stars.

A critical perspective, rooted in but now rather independent of Marxist thought, finds this highly problematic. Henry Mintzberg and others repeatedly point out that too many management theorists, especially in America, tacitly assume their job is to support managerial action, thereby ignoring larger conditions and consequences. Zald (2002) introduces a special issue of *Organization* (August 2002) with an essay suggesting that it may be time to move these concerns to a more central position if the management field is to develop. Recent events, easily signified by Enron and Andersen's debacles, have further escalated this worthy agenda. If a critical perspective were closer to centre stage, theorizing would be more firmly rooted in the humanities and in history, and place organizational activity into a more contestable frame.



De Rond's book establishes a third position. The key to his argument is that the shortcomings of management theory are more closely tied to our efforts of the past. The key issue is not that we have been standing too close (as critical theorists argue) or too far away (as most design theorists would argue), but that we have been too narrow in understanding our current ground. What our field needs, de Rond suggests, is not more theoretical variety but theories *of* variety. We need theoretical approaches that accept heterogeneity as a starting point in drawing observations from the empirical world of organizations. This is an interesting third perspective on the purpose of management theory. It is particularly attractive because it most clearly leverages our current skills as scholars, and most clearly links a management theory agenda to university and public pressures for strong science from business schools.

After establishing the logic, De Rond goes on to provide a philosophical basis for this third alternative in the works of Isaiah Berlin (1909–97), an Oxford-educated philosopher who became one of the most versatile intellectual historians of the twentieth century. Throughout his long life, Berlin remained sceptical of anything all-embracing and rational, as it denied too much of what we know to be true of social life. This depiction of Western intellectual tradition is highly relevant to the study of organizations. Management theory tends to share with much work from the social sciences, the humanities, and the sciences an unquestioned belief that to every problem there is a solution; that solutions can be found by applying reason; and that solutions found must form a coherent, all-embracing body of theory. De Rond believes that our thinking about alliances has been dominated and stunted by this tradition. Berlin's thinking supports a compelling alternative lens, a perspective that is not unknown in the field, but again one that supporters could easily claim has not been adequately explored. I believe this is an important third path to greater maturity of our field. We need a deeper and more developed pluralist tradition, even while recognizing a responsibility for design and the importance of critical distance.

As a potential reader, you may feel overwhelmed by the breadth of de Rond's agenda, and the larger debates it engages. Yet the brevity of this book is its strength. It should be read as a guidebook, rather than a definitive text. Consistent with Berlin's vision, we each must make our own extensions. Let us begin.

ANNE SIGISMUND HUFF

*Director*

*AIM – The Advanced Institute for Management  
London Business School*

## Acknowledgements

---

It remains for me to thank those who were helpful (albeit often unbeknownst to them) in shaping the ideas behind the manuscript, though the responsibility for them remains mine alone: Donizete Antunes, Patrick Baert, David Barron, Sarvapreet Bedi, Steve Casper, Chris David, Christian de Cock, Sue Dobson, David Faulkner, Elizabeth Garnsey, Mary Ann Glynn, June Grindley, Henry Hardy, Roger Hausheer, John Kay, Thomas Kern, Valerie Leroux, Sonja Marjanovic, Deirdre McCloskey, Alan Miller, Edwin Moses, John Roberts, Emmanuel Raufflet, Raymond-Alain Thietart, Richard Whittington, several anonymous reviewers, and many of my students. I appreciated the readiness of Hamid Bouchikhi, John Child, Ranjay Gulati, Duane Ireland, Ray Loveridge, and Andy van de Ven to read a first set of proofs and comment on them. I have benefited from each. I thank John Child and Raymond Loveridge in particular for suggesting I write this book in the first place. I have greatly appreciated the patience and guidance of Chris Harrison at Cambridge University Press. He is everything one expects from an editor as well as being thoroughly humane. He is a useful source also on contemporary British fiction. Kate Gentles, my copy-editor, patiently toiled away at what must have seemed, to her, a rather cluttered and confused text. She did much to improve the book. I am grateful to Ian MacMillan, Rosalie (Roz) Cohen, and the Sol. C. Snider Center for Entrepreneurship at Wharton for their generosity in providing a stimulating research environment during the spring and summer of 2001. I thank PricewaterhouseCoopers for their financial support of part of this study. I am deeply indebted also to the case study participants and interviewees. Although the names used in the cases are fictitious, the cases are anything but. ESSEC (*Ecole Supérieure des Sciences Economiques et Commerciales*) has been my intellectual home for the past three years. Its faculty were kind and patient as I stumbled, as an Anglo-Saxon, into its professional corps. Elizabeth Demars provided excellent last-minute assistance. I am especially appreciative of my colleague Hamid Bouchikhi. In Hamid I have found a compatriot in

contemplating the epistemology of organizational life. Our many conversations at *La Musarde* (a tiny but typical French crêperie), becoming increasingly more daring as the Bordeaux took its toll, have found their place in this book.

I owe much to Charles J. Stokes. His extraordinary intellect, curiosity, and spirited treatment of whatever subject happened to interest him at that time, were sources of inspiration and ambition for ten intimate years of friendship. His was a splendid capacity for finding specks of beauty in the dreary, excitement in the dull and unexciting, prospect in disappointment. I often found solace in our monthly exchange of letters. Sadly, he is no longer here to appreciate the book, parts of which he patiently read and commented on.

I am grateful also to Anne Huff for providing a Foreword to this book. I was flattered by her agreement to do this, as one would be, and have deeply appreciated her support for this effort. Her keen intellect, integrity, candidness, and dedication continue to inspire.

Last, but certainly not least, I thank my family. My wife Roxana and Shelby, my two-and-a-half-year-old, became pleasant diversions during the writing process. Repeatedly, having left my computer to pour another cup of coffee, I would return to find my screen plastered with ‘tyyulopo vvvvvvvjjjjjjjjjjjjjjjjjjjjhnmhhjnuuu, . . . . . vvbgt8u8nnnrrewwsaaa’, or worse, disappeared altogether. Fortunately computers have memories, and these distractions became sources of comfort – subtle reminders of the normality of life and the relative insignificance of one’s aspirations.

I owe everything else to my parents. It is to them that I dedicate this book.