

EFFECTOS DE LAS RELACIONES INTERORGANIZACIONALES EN EL COMPORTAMIENTO INNOVADOR, DESDE UNA PERSPECTIVA ECOLÓGICA EN EMPRESAS AGROALIMENTARIAS, EN CONTEXTOS DE BAJA CAPACIDAD DE ABSORCIÓN

Nombres y apellidos

ANDREA PAOLA BAQUERO TOBIAS

Código estudiantil: 2021155934958

Tesis Doctoral presentada como requisito para optar el título de:
Doctora en Gestión de la Tecnología y la Innovación

Tutor(es):

**PHD GLORIA NARANJO AFRICANP
PHD JAIRO SALCEDO MENDOZA**

RESUMEN

La innovación se ha consolidado como un factor esencial para el crecimiento y el éxito empresarial en un entorno globalizado y competitivo. Las empresas deben implementar productos, procesos y prácticas organizativas novedosas para mantenerse competitivas en un mercado en constante cambio. En este contexto, el comportamiento innovador se define como la capacidad de una empresa para desarrollar nuevas ideas y aprovechar oportunidades en su entorno para impulsar su desarrollo sostenible.

Particularmente, las micro, pequeñas y medianas empresas desempeñan un papel fundamental en las economías de todo el mundo, especialmente en países en desarrollo. Sin embargo, enfrentan desafíos significativos debido a recursos limitados y a una falta de investigación específica y contextualizada sobre su comportamiento innovador. A diferencia de las grandes empresas, las pymes deben abordar la innovación de manera estratégica, aprovechando al máximo sus interacciones interorganizacionales, entre otros, para obtener acceso a

conocimientos, tecnologías y recursos que les permitan competir de manera efectiva.

Desde esta perspectiva, la industria agroalimentaria surge como un sector clave para el estudio de la innovación debido a su contribución al crecimiento económico y su papel en la seguridad alimentaria. Aunque se le considera una industria tradicional y de baja tecnología, su importancia para la economía interna de muchos países no puede subestimarse. Es necesario explorar los procesos de innovación en este sector, enfocándose en las relaciones interorganizacionales que facilitan la transferencia de conocimiento y recursos, así como en los factores internos y externos que inciden en el comportamiento innovador de las pymes agroalimentarias. Este planteamiento lleva a preguntarse ¿Cuál es la incidencia de las relaciones interorganizacionales en el comportamiento innovador de las empresas agroalimentarias de yuca, desde una perspectiva ecológica, en contextos de baja capacidad de absorción? El objetivo de esta tesis doctoral es explicar el efecto de las relaciones interorganizacionales en el comportamiento innovador de empresas agroalimentarias de yuca desde una perspectiva ecológica, en contextos de baja capacidad de absorción territorial.

La investigación se desarrolló a través de un enfoque mixto, integrando métodos cuantitativos y cualitativos. En el primer caso, se identificaron y analizaron factores internos y externos que inciden en el comportamiento innovador, resultando modelos de análisis mediante técnicas multivariadas en una muestra representativa de empresas agroalimentarias, productoras y productoras-transformadoras de yuca. En el segundo caso, se tomó una muestra intencionada de empresas agroalimentarias reconocidas por sus iniciativas innovadoras, que fueron analizadas mediante un estudio de caso. La información resultante fue analizada e interpretada individualmente, para luego integrarse a través de un proceso de triangulación que permitió identificar áreas de convergencia y divergencia.

Dado que esta investigación fue realizada para empresas agroalimentarias, se utilizó como fuente de información una encuesta aplicada en el marco del proyecto de Ciencia, Tecnología e Innovación, ejecutado por la Universidad de Sucre y el Grupo PADES. La encuesta abordó a 653 productores y productores-transformadores durante el periodo de un año (diciembre de 2021 a diciembre de 2022). También se estructuró y validó una entrevista para tres empresas agroalimentarias caracterizadas por sus esfuerzos en innovación. A partir del modelo propuesto, se llevó a cabo el estudio en los diferentes capítulos de esta tesis, utilizando pruebas chi-cuadrado, análisis de correspondencias múltiples y modelos de regresión logística.

Los resultados principales revelaron factores internos y externos que inciden en el comportamiento innovador de las empresas agroalimentarias. En específico, en cuanto a los factores internos se observó una influencia positiva sobre la innovación

de producto de la tenencia de la propiedad de la tierra, el tamaño de la empresa, el tipo de producto de cultivo, y la dedicación exclusiva a una actividad en la tierra. Así mismo, se presenta relaciones positivas entre la innovación de producto y factores externos, tales como las relaciones interorganizacionales en particular la afiliación a algún tipo de asociación y el establecimiento de alianzas estratégicas que permiten obtener recursos para proyectos.

En general, las relaciones interorganizacionales se asocian con una relación directamente proporcional con la innovación de productos, mientras que las interacciones entre productores y transformadores se correlacionan con un aumento en la innovación de procesos y a la vez, se comporta a través de relaciones mutualistas que se basan en la colaboración y el beneficio mutuo entre estos dos actores de la cadena de valor agroalimentaria, existiendo de este modo relaciones simbióticas, caracterizadas por relaciones íntimas, diversidad de relaciones (mutualismo-simbiótico y depredación), interdependencia, asociación a largo plazo, evolución conjunta y transferencia de recursos y servicios.

Para estudios futuros, se recomienda continuar investigando los procesos de innovación en las empresas, especialmente en el sector agroalimentario en Colombia (Vesperi & Coppolino, 2023). Asimismo, es importante estudiar diversos tipos de relaciones interorganizacionales que se pueden presentar, así como las redes entre organizaciones agroalimentarias y otras partes interesadas, incluidas las relaciones con universidades y otras instituciones de educación superior (Avermaete, 2002; Martínez-Azúa et al., 2020; Menrad, 2004).

Se espera que esta investigación contribuya a comprender el fenómeno del comportamiento innovador, entendido desde el Doing Using and Interactive (DUI) para la toma de decisiones, brindando información útil a investigadores y administraciones públicas para el desarrollo de políticas y estrategias de fomento de la innovación en el sector primario y secundario, vitales para el desarrollo rural y regional de Colombia.

Palabras claves: Innovación, comportamiento innovador, relaciones interorganizacionales, empresas agroalimentarias, yuca.

ABSTRACT

Innovation has established itself as an essential factor for business growth and success in a globalized and competitive environment. Companies must implement novel products, processes, and organizational practices to remain competitive in an ever-changing market. In this context, innovative behavior is defined as the ability of a company to develop new ideas and take advantage of opportunities in its environment to drive its sustainable development.

Particularly, micro, small and medium-sized enterprises play a fundamental role in economies around the world, especially in developing countries. However, they face significant challenges due to limited resources and a lack of specific and contextualized research on their innovative behavior. Unlike large companies, SMEs must approach innovation strategically, making the most of their inter-organizational interactions, among others, to gain access to knowledge, technologies and resources that allow them to compete effectively.

From this perspective, the agri-food industry emerges as a key sector for the study of innovation due to its contribution to economic growth and its role in food security. Although it is considered a traditional and low-tech industry, its importance to the domestic economy of many countries cannot be underestimated. It is necessary to explore the innovation processes in this sector, focusing on the interorganizational relationships that facilitate the transfer of knowledge and resources, as well as the internal and external factors that affect the innovative behavior of agri-food SMEs. This approach leads to the question: *What is the impact of inter-organizational relationships on the innovative behavior of cassava agri-food companies, from an ecological perspective, in contexts of low absorption capacity?* interorganizational relationships on the innovative behavior of cassava agri-food companies from an ecological perspective, in contexts of low territorial absorption capacity.

The research was developed through a mixed approach, integrating quantitative and qualitative methods. In the first case, internal and external factors that affect innovative behavior were identified and analyzed, resulting in analysis models using multivariate techniques in a representative sample of agri-food companies, producers and producers-processors of cassava. In the second case, a purposive sample of agri-food companies recognized for their innovative initiatives was taken, which were analyzed through a case study. The resulting information was analyzed and interpreted individually, and then integrated through a triangulation process that allowed areas of convergence and divergence to be identified.

Since this research was carried out for agri-food companies, a survey applied within the framework of the Science, Technology and Innovation project, executed by the University of Sucre and the PADES Group, was used as a source of information. The survey addressed 653 producers and producer-processors during the period of

one year (December 2021 to December 2022). An interview was also structured and validated for three agri-food companies characterized by their efforts in innovation. Based on the proposed model, the study was carried out in the different chapters of this thesis, using chi -square tests, multiple correspondence analysis and logistic regression models.

The main results revealed internal and external factors that affect the innovative behavior of agri-food companies. Specifically, regarding internal factors, a positive influence on product innovation was observed from land ownership, the size of the company, the type of crop product, and exclusive dedication to an activity in the earth. Likewise, positive relationships are presented between product innovation and external factors, such as interorganizational relationships , in particular affiliation to some type of association and the establishment of strategic alliances that allow obtaining resources for projects.

interorganizational relationships are associated with a directly proportional relationship with product innovation, while interactions between producers and processors are correlated with an increase in process innovation and , at the same time, behave through mutualistic relationships that are based on collaboration and mutual benefit between these two actors in the agri-food value chain, thus existing symbiotic relationships, characterized by intimate relationships, diversity of relationships (symbiotic mutualism and predation), interdependence, long-term association, evolution joint and transfer of resources and services.

For future studies, it is recommended to continue investigating innovation processes in companies, especially in the agri-food sector in Colombia (Vesperi & Coppolino, 2023) . Likewise, it is important to study various types of interorganizational relationships that may arise, as well as networks between agri-food organizations and other interested parties, including relationships with universities and other higher education institutions (Avermaete, 2002; Martínez-Azúa et al., 2020; Menrad, 2004)

It is expected that this research will contribute to understanding the phenomenon of innovative behavior, understood from Doing Using and Interactive (DUI) for decision making, providing useful information to researchers and public administrations for the development of policies and strategies to promote innovation in the primary and secondary sector, vital for the rural and regional development of Colombia.

Keywords: Innovation, innovative behavior, interorganizational relationships , agri-food companies, cassava.

REFERENCIAS BIBLIOGRÁFICAS

1. (MADR). Ministerio de Agricultura y Desarrollo Sostenible. (2021). Cifras Sectoriales. Indicadores e Instrumentos del Sector productivo de yuca y ñame en Colombia. Cadena Productiva de La Yuca, <https://sioc.minagricultura.gov.co/Yuca/Pages/Documentos.aspx>.
2. Abouzeedan, A. (2011). Linköping Studies in Science and Technology SME Performance and Its Relationship to Innovation (Issue 1364). <http://liu.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:447516/FULLTEXT01.pdf> <http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:liu:diva-71349>
3. Acemoglu, D., & Autor, D. (2011). Skills, tasks and technologies: Implications for employment and earnings. In Handbook of Labor Economics (Vol. 4, Issue PART B). Elsevier B.V. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-7218\(11\)02410-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-7218(11)02410-5)
4. Acosta Mesa, R., Alean Pico, A., Prieto Flórez, J., & Tordecilla Acevedo, V. (2020). Sucre en algunas cifras y datos básicos. Construyendo Escenarios Prospectivos Para Los Desafíos Del Desarrollo Competitivo Del Departamento de Sucre, Colombia. <https://doi.org/10.21892/9789585547834.1>
5. Acs, Z., & Audretsch, D. (1988). Innovation in Large and Small Firms: An Empirical Analysis. *American Economic Review*, 78(4), 678–690.
6. Acs, Z. J., & Audretsch, D. B. (1987). Innovation, Market Structure, and Firm Size. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 69(4), 567–574. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.2307/1935950>
7. Adakuia, A. A., & Amanor-Boadu, V. (2022). Typology and performance of inter-organizational relationships among Ghanaian farmers. *International Food and Agribusiness Management Review*, 25(3), 379–390. <https://doi.org/10.22434/IFAMR2020.0170>
8. Adams, R., Bessant, J., & Phelps, R. (2006). Innovation management measurement: A review. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 8(1), 21–47. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2370.2006.00119.x>
9. Agarwal, R., & Audretsch, D. B. (2003). Does Entry Size Matter? The Impact of the Life Cycle and Technology on Firm Survival. *XLIX(1)*. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-6451.00136>
10. Aghion, P., Antonin, C., Bunel, S., Aghion, P., Antonin, C., Bunel, S., Intelligence, A., The, E., Aghion, P., Antonin, C., & Bunel, S. (2019). Artificial Intelligence , Growth and Employment : The Role of Policy. *Economie et Statistique*.
11. Agostini, L., & Nosella, A. (2019). Inter-organizational relationships involving SMEs: A bibliographic investigation into the state of the art. *Long Range Planning*, 52(1), 1–31. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2017.12.003>
12. Agronet. (2019). Comparativo de Área, Producción, Rendimiento y Participación Departamental por Cultivo. <https://www.agronet.gov.co/estadistica/Paginas/home.aspx?cod=1>

13. Águila, O., Rosa, A., & Meléndez, P. (2010). Factores determinantes de la innovación en empresas de economía social . La importancia de la formación y de la actitud estratégica Ana Rosa del Águila Obra.
14. Alarcón, S., & Sánchez, M. (2013). External and internal R&D, capital investment and business performance in the Spanish agri-food industry. *Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 64(3), 654–675. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1477-9552.12015>
15. Alhusen, H., Bennat, T., Bizer, K., Cantner, U., Horstmann, E., Kalthaus, M., Sternberg, R., & Töpfer, S. (2019). Measuring the “doing-using-interacting mode” of innovation in SMEs-A qualitative approach. 23. <http://hdl.handle.net/10419/214844>
16. Ali, J., Reed, M. R., & Saghaian, S. H. (2017). Determinants of Product Innovation in Food and Agribusiness Small and Medium enterprises: Evidence from Enterprise Survey Data of India. *International Food and Agribusiness Management Review*, 24(5), 777–796. <https://doi.org/10.22434/IFAMR2019.0210>
17. Almeida, P., & Phene, A. (2004). Subsidiaries and knowledge creation: The influence of the MNC and host country on innovation. *Strategic Management Journal*, 25(8–9), 847–864. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.388>
18. Amar-sepulveda, P. (2016). Comportamiento Innovador del sector alimentos del distrito de Barranquilla (Issue March).
19. Anderson, N., Potočnik, K., & Zhou, J. (2014). Innovation and Creativity in Organizations: A State-of-the-Science Review, Prospective Commentary, and Guiding Framework. *Journal of Management*, 40(5), 1297–1333. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206314527128>
20. Antoncic, B. (2007). Intrapreneurship: a comparative structural equation modeling study. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, 107(3), 309–325. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02635570710734244>
21. Antoncic, B., Hisrich, R. D., & Western, C. (2001). Intrapreneurship: Construct Refinement And Cross-Cultural Validation. 9026(99), 495–527.
22. Apanasovich, N. (2016a). Modes of innovation : a grounded meta-analysis (Technical report). *Journal of the Knowledge Economy*, November, 720–737. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13132-014-0237-0>
23. Apanasovich, N. (2016b). Modes of Innovation: A Grounded Meta-Analysis. *Journal of the Knowledge Economy*, 7(3), 720–737. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13132-014-0237-0>
24. Asheim, B. T., Boschma, R., & Cooke, P. (2016). Constructing Regional advantage: Platform policies based on related variety and differentiated knowledge bases. *Regional Studies*, 45(7), 893–904. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00343404.2010.543126>
25. Audretsch, D. B. (2002). The innovative advantage of US cities. *European Planning Studies*, 10(2), 165–176. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09654310120114472>

26. Audretsch, D. B., Cunningham, J. A., Kuratko, D. F., Lehmann, E. E., & Menter, M. (2019). Entrepreneurial ecosystems: economic, technological, and societal impacts. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 44(2), 313–325. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10961-018-9690-4>
27. Audretsch, D. B., & Feldman, M. P. (1996). R&D Spillovers and the Geography of Innovation and Production. *American Economic Review*, 86(3), 630–640.
28. Audretsch, D. B., & Keilbach, M. (2004). Entrepreneurship capital and economic performance. *Regional Studies*, 38(8), 949–959. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0034340042000280956>
29. Audretsch, D. B., & Keilbach, M. (2007). The theory of knowledge spillover entrepreneurship. *Journal of Management Studies*, 44(7), 1242–1254. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2007.00722.x>
30. Avermaete, T. (2002). Systems of innovation: The case of small food firms in the EU. Proceedings of the DRUID PhD Winter Conference.
31. Baldwin, J. R., & Johnson, J. (1996). Business strategies in more- and less-innovative firms in Canada. *Research Policy*, 25(5), 785–804. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0048-7333\(95\)00875-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0048-7333(95)00875-6)
32. Bansal, P., & Mcknight, B. (2009). Looking forward, pushing back and peering sideways: Analyzing the sustainability of industrial symbiosis. *Journal of Supply Chain Management*, 45(4), 26–37. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-493X.2009.03174.x>
33. Baregheh, A., Rowley, J., Sambrook, S., Davies, D. (2012). Innovation in food sector SMEs. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 19 (2), 300–321.
34. Barnett, W. P., Carroll, G. R., Barnett, W. P., & Carroll, G. R. (1987). Competition and Mutual-ism among Early Tele- phone Companies. 32(3), 400–421.
35. Bartel, A. P., & Sicherman, N. (1998). (1998). Technological change and the skill acqui- sition of young workers. 1–23.
36. Batterink, M. H., Wubben, E. F. M., Klerkx, L., & Omta, S. W. F. (2010). Orchestrating innovation networks: The case of innovation brokers in the agri- food sector. In *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* (Vol. 22, Issue 1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/08985620903220512>
37. Becheikh, N., Landry, R., & Amara, N. (2006). Lessons from innovation empirical studies in the manufacturing sector: A systematic review of the literature from 1993-2003. *Technovation*, 26(5–6), 644–664. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2005.06.016>
38. Bekkers, Victor Edelenbos, Jurian Steijn, B. (2011). Innovación en el Sector Público.
39. Benito, S., Platero, M., & Rodríguez, A. (2012). Factores determinantes de la innovación en las mcroempresas españolas: La importancia de los factores internos. *Universia Business Review*, 33, 104–121.

40. Besley, T. (1995). Property rights and investment incentives: theory and evidence from Ghana. *Journal of Political Economy*, 103(5), 903–937. <https://doi.org/10.1086/262008>
41. Bessant, J., & Tidd, J. (2011). *Managing Innovation: Integrating Technological, Market And Organizational Change*. January 2011, 1–59.
42. Bhaskaran, S. (2006). Incremental innovation and business performance: Small and medium-size food enterprises in a concentrated industry environment. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 44(1), 64–80. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-627X.2006.00154.x>
43. Bhattacharya, M., & Bloch, H. (2004). Determinants of innovation. *Small Business Economics*, 22(2), 155–162. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:SBEJ.0000014453.94445.de>
44. Bos-nehles, A., & Renkema, M. (2017). HRM and innovative work behaviour : a systematic literature review Article information : November. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-09-2016-0257>
45. Boschma, R. A., & Wenting, R. (2007). The spatial evolution of the British automobile industry: Does location matter? *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 16(2), 213–238. <https://doi.org/10.1093/icc/dtm004>
46. Boschma, R., & Frenken, K. (2011). The emerging empirics of evolutionary economic geography. *Journal of Economic Geography*, 11(2), 295–307. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jeg/lbq053>
47. Breslin, D., Kask, J., Schlaile, M., & Abatecola, G. (2021). Developing a coevolutionary account of innovation ecosystems. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 98(July), 59–68. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2021.07.016>
48. Brown, S. L., & Eisenhardt, K. M. (1997). The art of continuous change: Linking complexity theory and time-paced evolution in relentlessly shifting organizations. *Organizational Improvisation*, 42(1), 225–256. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203361603-18>
49. Bruce Traill, W., & Meulenbergh, M. (2002). Innovation in the food industry. *Agribusiness*, 18(1), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1002/agr.10002>
50. Bush, V. (1999). Ciencia, al frontera sin fin. Un informe al presidente. *Redes* 14, 89–137.
51. Calvo, J. L. (2005). ¿Son las actividades de I+D una buena aproximación a la innovación tecnológica? *Economía Industrial*, 5, 173–184.
52. Calvo Valverde, L. A., & Mena Arias, J. A. (2020). Evaluation of different text representation techniques and distance metrics using KNN for documents classification. *Tecnología En Marcha*, 33(1), 64–79.
53. Camagni, R. (2003). Incertidumbre, capital social y desarrollo local: enseñanzas para una gobernabilidad sostenible del territorio. *Investigaciones Regionales*, 31–57.
54. Camisón-Zornoza, C., Lapiedra-Alcamí, R., Segarra-Ciprés, M., & Boronat-Navarro, M. (2004). A Meta-analysis of Innovation and Organizational Size.

- Organization Studies, 25(3), 331–361.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840604040039>
55. Capitanio, F., Coppola, A., Pascucci, S. (2010). Product and process innovation in the Italian food industry. *Agribusiness*.
56. Capitanio, F., Coppola, A., & Pascucci, S. (2010). Product and process innovation in the Italian food industry. *Agribusiness*, 26(4), 503–518. <https://doi.org/10.1002/agr.20239>
57. Carmeli, A., Meitar, R., & Weisberg, J. (2006). Self-leadership skills and innovative behavior at work. *International Journal of Manpower*, 27(1), 75–90. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01437720610652853>
58. Carnahan, S., Agarwal, R., & Campbell, B. (2010). The Effect of Firm Compensation Structures on the Mobility and Entrepreneurship of Extreme Performers. *Business*, 920(October), 1–43. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj>
59. Carree, M., Diederer, B., Lokshin, B., & Veugelers, R. (2004). Heterogeneity in R & D cooperation strategies. *International Journal of Industrial Organization*, 22, 1237–1263. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijindorg.2004.08.001>
60. Carree, M., & Lokshin, B. (2004). Cooperative R & D and firm performance &. *Research Policy*, 33(May), 1477–1492. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2004.07.003>
61. Castaneda, E. H. P., & Mendizábal, G. A. (2021). Innovation behavior of salvadoran food & beverage industry firms. *Revista Finanzas y Política Económica*, 13(2), 439–472. <https://doi.org/10.14718/REVFINANZPOLITECON.2983>
62. Castillo-Valero, J. S., & García-Cortijo, M. C. (2021). Factors that determine innovation in agrifood firms. *Agronomy*, 11(5). <https://doi.org/10.3390/agronomy11050989>
63. Chaddad, F., & Rodríguez-Alcalá, M. E. (2010). Inter-Organizational relationships in agri-food systems: A transaction cost economics approach. *Agri-Food Chain Relationships*, July 2010, 45–60. <https://doi.org/10.1079/9781845936426.0045>
64. Chen, J., Chen, Y., & Vanhaverbeke, W. (2011). The influence of scope, depth, and orientation of external technology sources on the innovative performance of Chinese firms. *Technovation*, 31(8), 362–373. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2011.03.002>
65. Cheng, J. (2011). International Journal of Information Management Inter-organizational relationships and information sharing in supply chains. *International Journal of Information Management*, 31(4), 374–384. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2010.09.004>
66. Chesbrough, H. (2006). Open Innovation - Open Innovation. Harvard Business School Press, 2006(193), 1–9. <http://www.openinnovation.eu/openinnovatie.php>
67. Christensen, J. L., Rama, R., & Von Tunzelmann, N. (1996). Study on Innovation in the European Food Products and Beverages Industry. *European Innovation Monitoring System*, 153.

68. Chudnovsky, D., López, A., & Pupato, G. (2006). Innovation and productivity in developing countries: A study of Argentine manufacturing firms' behavior (1992-2001). *Research Policy*, 35(2), 266–288. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2005.10.002>
69. Ciliberti, S., Carraresi, L., & Bröring, S. (2016). Drivers of innovation in Italy: Food versus pharmaceutical industry. *British Food Journal*, 118(6), 1292–1316. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BFJ-10-2015-0405>
70. Clauss, T., & Kesting, T. (2017). How businesses should govern knowledge-intensive collaborations with universities: An empirical investigation of university professors. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 62(November), 185–198. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2016.09.001>
71. Cohen, W. M., & Levinthal, D. A. (1990). Absorptive Capacity: A New Perspective on and Innovation Learning. 35(1), 128–152.
72. Cohen, W. M., & Levinthal, D. A. (1994). Fortune Favors the Prepared Firm. September 2015.
73. Colurcio, M., Wolf, P., Kocher, P. Y., & Spena, T. R. (2012). Asymmetric relationships in networked food innovation processes. *British Food Journal*, 114(5), 702–727. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00070701211229981>
74. Comisión Económica para América Latina y el Caribe (CEPAL). (2019). Enfoque territorial y análisis dinámico de la ruralidad: alcances y límites para el diseño de políticas de desarrollo rural innovadoras en América Latina y el Caribe. Repositorio, 1–15. https://repositorio.cepal.org/bitstream/handle/11362/48052/1/S2200214_es.pdf
75. Contreras, F., Juárez, F., Cuero Acosta, Y. A., Dornberger, U., Soria-Barreto, K., Corrales-Estrada, M., Ramos-Garza, C., Steizel, S., Portalanza, A., Jauregui, K., Iwashita da Silva, L., & Yshikawa Salusse, M. A. (2020). Critical factors for innovative work behaviour in Latin American firms: Test of an exploratory model. *Cogent Business and Management*, 7(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2020.1812926>
76. Cooke, P. (2001). Regional innovation systems, clusters, and the knowledge economy. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 10(4), 945–974. <https://doi.org/10.1093/icc/10.4.945>
77. Cooper, R. B., & Zmud, R. W. (1990). Information Technology Implementation Research: A Technological Diffusion Approach. *Management Science*, 123–139. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.36.2.123>
78. Corchuelo, B., & Mesías, F. J. (2017). Disposición a innovar y competitividad en la agroindustria extremeña. *ITEA Información Técnica Económica Agraria*, 113(2), 176–191. <https://doi.org/10.12706/itea.2017.011>
79. Creswell, J. W. (2009). Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed-Methods Research. *Microbe Magazine*, 4(11), 485–485. <https://doi.org/10.1128/microbe.4.485.1>
80. Damanpour, F. (1991). Organizational Innovation: A Meta-Analysis Of Effect Of Determinants And Moderators. 34(3), 555–590.

81. Damanpour, F. (1992). Organizational Size and Innovation. *Organization Studies*, 13(3), 375–402. <https://doi.org/10.1177/017084069201300304>
82. Damanpour, F. (2010). An integration of research findings of effects of firm size and market competition on product and process innovations. *British Journal of Management*, 21(4), 996–1010. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8551.2009.00628.x>
83. Damanpour, F., & Gopalakrishnan, S. (1998). Theories of organizational structure and innovation adoption : the role of environmental change. *Journal of Engineering and Technology Management - JET-M*.
84. Damanpour, F., Walker, R. M., & Avellaneda, C. N. (2009). Combinative effects of innovation types and organizational Performance: A longitudinal study of service organizations. *Journal of Management Studies*, 46(4), 650–675. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2008.00814.x>
85. DANE. (2021a). Boletín Técnico: Encuesta de desarrollo e Innovación Tecnológica: Industria manufacturera 2019 - 2020. 1–67. <https://www.dane.gov.co/index.php/estadisticas-por-tema/tecnologia-e-innovacion/encuesta-de-desarrollo-e-innovacion-tecnologica-edit>
86. DANE. (2021b). Evaluaciones Agropecuarias Municipales EVA. <https://www.datos.gov.co/Agricultura-y-Desarrollo-Rural/Evaluaciones-Agropecuarias-Municipales-EVA/2pnw-mmge>
87. DANE. (2022). Producto Interno Bruto -PIB- nacional trimestral. <https://www.dane.gov.co/index.php/estadisticas-por-tema/cuentas-nacionales/cuentas-nacionales-trimestrales/historicos-producto-interno-bruto-pib>
88. De Noronha Vaz, M. T., Cesário, M., & Fernandes, S. (2006). Interaction between innovation in small firms and their environments: An exploratory study. *European Planning Studies*, 14(1), 95–117. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09654310500339893>
89. Demaria, F., & Zezza, A. (2020). Drivers and barriers of process innovation in the EU manufacturing food processing industry: Exploring the role of energy policies. *Bio-Based and Applied Economics*, 9(1), 25–52. <https://doi.org/10.13128/bae-9936>
90. Dembla, P., & Krishnan, B. C. (2007). Understanding the Adoption of Web-Enabled Transaction Processing by Small Businesses. *Journal of Electronic Commerce Research*, June.
91. Departamento Nacional de Planeación. (2021). Índice Departamental de Innovación para Colombia (IDIC) 2020. Departamento Nacional de Planeación, 3–335. <https://www.dnp.gov.co/programas/desarrollo-empresarial/Competitividad/Paginas/Indice-Departamental-de-Innovacion-para-Colombia.aspx>
92. Diederer, P., Van Meijl, H., Wolters, A., & Bijak, K. (2003). Innovation adoption in agriculture : innovators, early adopters and laggards. *Cahiers d'Economie et Sociologie Rurales*, 67(1), 29–50. <https://doi.org/10.3406/reae.2003.1714>

93. Do, T. H. (2014). Determinants of innovation commercialization management and anticipated returns: An exploratory typology of SMEs. *International Journal of Innovation and Technology Management*, 11(6), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1142/S0219877014500424>
94. Doran, J., & Ryan, G. (2017). The role of stimulating employees' creativity and idea generation in encouraging innovation behaviour in Irish firms. *The Irish Journal of Management*, 36(1), 32–48. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ijm-2017-0005>
95. Dosi. (1988). *Technical Change and Economic Theory*.
96. Dupuy, C., & Gilly, J. P. (1996). Collective learning and territorial dynamics: A new approach to the relations between industrial groups and territories. *Environment and Planning A*, 28(9), 1603–1616. <https://doi.org/10.1068/a281603>
97. Dyer, J. H., & Hatch, N. W. (2006). Relation-specific capabilities and barriers to knowledge transfers: Creating advantage through network relationships. *Strategic Management Journal*, 27(8), 701–719. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.543>
98. Dyer, J. H., & Singh, H. (1998). The Relational View: Cooperative Strategy and Sources of Interorganizational Competitive Advantage. *The Academy of Management Review*, 23(4), 660. <https://doi.org/10.2307/259056>
99. Ebbekink, M., & Lagendijk, A. (2013). What's Next in Researching Cluster Policy: Place-Based Governance for Effective Cluster Policy. *European Planning Studies*, 21(5), 735–753. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09654313.2013.734460>
100. Escribano, A., Fosfuri, A., & Tribó, J. A. (2009). Managing external knowledge flows: The moderating role of absorptive capacity. 38, 96–105. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2008.10.022>
101. Fanelli, R. M. (2018). Rural Small and Medium Enterprises Development in Molise (Italy). *European Countryside*, 10(4), 566–589. <https://doi.org/10.2478/euco-2018-0032>
102. FAO. (2019). El estado mundial de la agricultura y la alimentación. Progresos en la lucha contra la pérdida y el desperdicio de alimentos. In *El estado mundial de la agricultura y la alimentación 2020*.
103. FAOSTAT. (2018). Valor de la Producción Agrícola. <https://www.fao.org/faostat/es/#data/QV>.
104. Fawcett, S. E., Magnan, G. M., & McCarter, M. W. (2008). Benefits, barriers, and bridges to effective supply chain management. *Supply Chain Management*, 13(1), 35–48. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13598540810850300>
105. Fearne, A., María García Álvarez-Coque, J., López-García Usach Mercedes, T., & García, S. (2013). Innovative firms and the urban/rural divide: the case of agro-food system. *Management Decision*, 51(6), 1293–1310. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MD-12-2011-0482>
106. Feldman, M. P. (1994). The Geography of Innovation. In *Springer Países Bajos*. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-3333-5>

107. Fitjar, R. D., & Rodríguez-Pose, A. (2013). Firm collaboration and modes of innovation in Norway. *Research Policy*, 42(1), 128–138. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2012.05.009>
108. Freel, M. S. (2003). Sectoral patterns of small firm innovation , networking and proximity. *Política de Investigación*, 32, 751–770. [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S0048-7333\(02\)00084-7](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S0048-7333(02)00084-7)
109. Frenkel, A., Shefer, D., Koschatzky, K., & Walter, G. H. (2001). Firm characteristics, location and regional innovation: A comparison between Israeli and German industrial firms. *Regional Studies*, 35(5), 415–429. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00343400123360>
110. Friesenbichler, K., & Peneder, M. (2016). Innovation, competition and productivity: Firm-level evidence for Eastern Europe and Central Asia. *Economics of Transition*, 24(3), 535–580. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ecot.12100>
111. Fritsch, M., & Meschede, M. (2001). Product Innovation , Process Innovation , and Size. *Review of Industrial Organization*, February 2001. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1011856020135>
112. Fritsch, M., & Sorgner, A. (2013). Entrepreneurship and Creative Professions - A Micro-Level Analysis. *The Jena Economic Research Papers*.
113. Fuglie, K., Gautam, M., Goyal, A., & Maloney, W. F. (2019). Harvesting Prosperity: Technology and Productivity Growth in Agriculture. In *Harvesting Prosperity: Technology and Productivity Growth in Agriculture (Issue February 2021)*. <https://doi.org/10.1596/978-1-4648-1393-1>
114. Fundación Demuca. (2009). Desarrollo económico local. https://www.cepal.org/sites/default/files/guia_herramientas_municipales_demuca.pdf
115. Furman, J. L., Porter, M. E., & Stern, S. (2002). The determinants of national innovative capacity. *Research Policy*, 31(6), 899–933. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0048-7333\(01\)00152-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0048-7333(01)00152-4)
116. Galende, & Fuente. (2003). Internal factors determining a firm's innovative behaviour. *Research Policy*, 32, 715–736.
117. Galizzi, G., & Venturini, L. (1996). Product Innovation in the Food Industry: Nature, Characteristics and Determinants. 133–153. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-50001-5_8
118. Galizzi, G., & Venturini, L. (2012). *Economics of Innovation: The Case of Food Industry*. Physica-Verlag HD. <https://books.google.com.co/books?id=NBjsCAAQBAJ>
119. García-Cortijo, M. C., Castillo-Valero, J. S., & Carrasco, I. (2019). Innovation in rural Spain. What drives innovation in the rural-peripheral areas of southern Europe? *Journal of Rural Studies*, 71(July 2018), 114–124. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2019.02.027>
120. García Álvarez-Coque, J. M., López-García Usach, T., & Sanchez García, M. (2013). Territory and innovation behaviour in agri-food firms: Does rurality matter? *New Medit*, 12(3), 2–10.

121. Geroski, P. A. (1995). What do we know about entry? *International Journal of Industrial Organization*, 13(4), 421–440. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-7187\(95\)00498-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-7187(95)00498-X)
122. Ghazalian, P. L., & Fasih, A. (2017). R&D and Innovation in Food Processing Firms in Transition Countries. *Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 68(2), 427–450. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1477-9552.12186>
123. Gimeno, J. (2004). Competition within and between Networks: The Contingent Effect of Competitive Embeddedness on Alliance Formation. 47(6), 820–842.
124. Glaeser, E. L., & Kerr, W. R. (2009). Local industrial conditions and entrepreneurship: How much of the spatial distribution can we explain? *Journal of Economics and Management Strategy*, 18(3), 623–663. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1530-9134.2009.00225.x>
125. Gobernación de Sucre. (2020). Plan Departamental De Extension Agropecuaria Diputados Del Departamento De Sucre Periodo 2020-2023. 87. <https://www.minagricultura.gov.co/ministerio/direcciones/PublishingImages/Paginas/PDEA/Sucre.pdf>
126. González-Campo, C. H. (2010). Interacción teórica para la caracterización de redes empresariales. *Innovar*, 20(37), 117–132.
127. González-Pernía, J. L., Parrilli, M. D., & Peña-Legazkue, I. (2015). STI–DUI learning modes, firm–university collaboration and innovation. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 40(3), 475–492. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10961-014-9352-0>
128. Gooroochurn, N., & Hanley, A. (2007). A tale of two literatures: Transaction costs and property rights in innovation outsourcing. *Research Policy*, 36(10), 1483–1495. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2007.07.001>
129. Grimpe, C., Sofka, W., Bhargava, M., & Chatterjee, R. (2017). R&D, Marketing Innovation, and New Product Performance: A Mixed Methods Study*. 34(3), 360–383. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jpim.12366>
130. Hadjimanolis Athanasios. (2000). An investigation of innovation antecedents in small firms in the context of a small developing country. *R and D Management*, 30(3), 235–246.
131. Hall, B. H., Mairesse, J., & Mohnen, P. (2010). Measuring the returns to R&D. In *Handbook of the Economics of Innovation* (1st ed., Vol. 2, Issue 1). Elsevier B.V. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-7218\(10\)02008-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-7218(10)02008-3)
132. Hall, J. K., & Martin, M. J. C. (2005). Disruptive technologies, stakeholders and the innovation value-added chain: A framework for evaluating radical technology development. *R and D Management*, 35(3), 273–284. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9310.2005.00389.x>
133. Hawley, H. A. (1950). *Human Ecology: A Theory of Community Structure*. New York: The Ronald Press Company.

134. Helfat, C. E., & Peteraf, M. (2015). Managerial cognitive capabilities and the microfoundations of dynamic capabilities. *Strategic Management Journal*. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.2247>
135. Henderson, R. M., & Clark, K. B. (1990). Architectural Innovation: The Reconfiguration of Existing Product Technologies and the Failure of Established Firms. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35(1), 9. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2393549>
136. Hernández Sampieri, R. (2014). *Metodología de la investigación - Sexta Edición*.
137. Herstad, S. J., & Brekke, T. (2012). Globalization , Modes of Innovation and Regional Knowledge Diffusion Globalization , Modes of Innovation and Regional Knowledge Diffusion Infrastructures. *European Planning Studies*, April 2015. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09654313.2012.713334>
138. Hervas-Oliver, J. L., Albors Garrigos, J., & Gil-Pechuan, I. (2011). Making sense of innovation by R&D and non-R&D innovators in low technology contexts: A forgotten lesson for policymakers. *Technovation*, 31(9), 427–446. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2011.06.006>
139. Hervás-Oliver, J. L., Parrilli, M. D., Rodríguez-Pose, A., & Sempere-Ripoll, F. (2021). The drivers of SME innovation in the regions of the EU. *Research Policy*, 50(9). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2021.104316>
140. Hitt, L. M., & Brynjolfsson, E. (1996). Productivity, business profitability, and consumer surplus: Three different measures of information technology value. *MIS Quarterly: Management Information Systems*, 20(2), 121–142. <https://doi.org/10.2307/249475>
141. Hoffman, K., Parejo, M., Bessant, J., & Perren, L. (1998). Small firms, R&D, technology and innovation in the UK: A literature review. *Technovation*, 18(1), 39–55. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0166-4972\(97\)00102-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0166-4972(97)00102-8)
142. Huergo, Elena; Jaumandreu, J. (2004). How Does Probability of Innovation Change with Firm Age? 34(October 2004). <https://doi.org/10.1023/B>
143. Huerta, Arribas; Bayo, Moriones; García, Olaverri & Merino, D. de C. (2003). *Los desafíos de la competitividad* (p. 95).
144. Hurley, R. F., & Hult, G. T. M. (1998). Innovation, market orientation, and organizational learning: An integration and empirical examination. *Journal of Marketing*, 62(3), 42–54. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1251742>
145. Iacobucci, D., & Perugini, F. (2023). Innovation performance in traditional industries: Does proximity to universities matter. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 189(September 2022), 122340. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2023.122340>
146. Iacovou, C. L., Benbasat, I., Dexter, A. S., & Dexter, A. S. (1995). Organizations : and Impact Adoption of Technology. *MIS Quarterly*, 19(4), 465–485.
147. Isabel, M., Lovera, M. I., Castro, E., Smith, H., & Mujica, M. (2008). *Evolucionismo económico desde la perspectiva de Nelson y Winter*.

148. Isaksen, A., & Karlsen, J. (2010). Different modes of innovation and the challenge of connecting universities and industry: Case studies of two regional industries in Norway. *European Planning Studies*, 18(12), 1993–2008. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09654313.2010.516523>
149. Isasi, J. (2023). Sentiment Analysis with “syuzhet” using R. *Programming Historian*. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.46430/phen0110>
150. Janssen, O. (2000). Job demands, perceptions of effort-reward fairness and innovative work behaviour. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 73, 287–302. <https://doi.org/10.1348/096317900167038>
151. Janz, N., Löf, H., & Peters, B. (2004). Firm level innovation and productivity- Is there a common story across countries? *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 2(2), 184–204. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.416444>
152. Jaramillo, H., Lugones, G., & Salazar, M. (2001). Innovación Tecnológica en América Latina y el Caribe MANUAL DE BOGOTÁ Innovación Tecnológica en América Latina y el Caribe MANUAL DE BOGOTÁ. Red Iberoamericana de Indicadores de Ciencia y Tecnología/Organización de Estados Americanos, 102. http://www.riicyt.org/manuales/doc_view/5-manual-de-bogota
153. Jaskyte, K., & Lee, M. (2006). Interorganizational relationships. *Administration in Social Work*, 30(3), 37–41. <https://doi.org/10.1300/J147v30n03>
154. Jensen, M. B., Johnson, B., Lorenz, E., & Lundvall, B. Å. (2007). Forms of knowledge and modes of innovation. *Research Policy*, 36(5), 680–693. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2007.01.006>
155. Jiménez, J.D, Sanz, V. R. (2014). Determinantes del éxito de la innovación. *Rev. Empresa*.
156. Jörg Thomä, & Zimmermann, V. (2019). Non-R & D , interactive learning and economic performance : Revisiting innovation in small and medium enterprises. September.
157. Kafetzopoulos, D., Gotzamani, K., & Gkana, V. (2015). Relationship between quality management, innovation and competitiveness. Evidence from Greek companies. *Journal of Manufacturing Technology Management*, 26(8), 1177–1200. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMTM-02-2015-0007>
158. Kanter, R. (1996). When a Thousand Flowers Bloom: Structural, Collective, and Social Conditions for Innovation in Organizations. *Knowledge Management and Organisational Design*, 93–131. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-7506-9749-1.50010-7>
159. Kearney, C., Hisrich, R. D., & Antoncic, B. (2013). The Mediating Role Of Corporate Entrepreneurship For External Environment Effects On Performance. 14(Supplement 1). <https://doi.org/10.3846/16111699.2012.720592>
160. King, A. A., Lakhani, K. R., & King, A. A. (2011). The Contingent Effect of Absorptive Capacity : An Open Innovation Analysis.
161. Kör, B. (2016). The mediating effects of self-leadership on perceived entrepreneurial orientation and innovative work behavior in the banking sector. *SpringerPlus*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40064-016-3556-8>

162. Kostopoulos, K., Papalexandris, A., Papachroni, M., & Ioannou, G. (2011). Absorptive capacity , innovation , and financial performance. *Journal of Business Research*, 64(12), 1335–1343. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2010.12.005>
163. Krndzija, L., & Pilav-Velic, A. (2022). Innovative behavior of Small and Medium Enterprises: A comprehensive bibliometric analysis. *International Journal of Industrial Engineering and Management*, 13(3), 158–171. <https://doi.org/10.24867/IJEM-2022-3-309>
164. Kupets, O. (2018). Employer-provided training, innovation and skills in post-Soviet countries. *Economics of Transition*, 26(4), 725–768. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ecot.12162>
165. Kussainov, G. B., Saghaian, S. H., & Reed, M. R. (2021). Innovation behavior of agri-food small and medium-sized enterprises: The case of Europe’s emerging economies. *International Food and Agribusiness Management Review*, 24(2), 355–369. <https://doi.org/10.22434/IFAMR2020.0016>
166. Laforet, S. (2008). Size, strategic, and market orientation affects on innovation. *Journal of Business Research*, 61(7), 753–764. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2007.08.002>
167. Lager, T., & S-Å, H. (2002). Success factors for improvement and innovation of. *Integrated Manufacturing Systems*, May. <https://doi.org/10.1108/0957606021041660>
168. Lampe, R., & Moser, P. (2010). Do patent pools encourage innovation? Evidence from the nineteenth-century sewing machine industry. *Journal of Economic History*, 70(4), 898–920. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022050710000768>
169. Läßle, D., Renwick, A., Cullinan, J., & Thorne, F. (2016). What drives innovation in the agricultural sector? A spatial analysis of knowledge spillovers. *Land Use Policy*, 56, 238–250. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2016.04.032>
170. Lario, N. A. (2002). Contribución de las cooperativas agrarias de segundo grado a la orientación al mercado de sus cooperativas asociadas: efectos en el desempeño de la relación. *CIRIEC-España, Revista de Economía Pública, Social y Cooperativa*, 41, 139–161. http://www.ciriec-revistaeconomia.es/banco/06_Arcas_41.pdf
171. Laursen, K., & Salter, A. J. (2006). Open for Innovation : The Role of Openness in Explaining Innovation Performance Among U . K . Manufacturing Firms OPEN FOR INNOVATION : THE ROLE OF OPENNESS IN EXPLAINING INNOVATION PERFORMANCE AMONG U . K . MANUFACTURING FIRMS. October. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.507>
172. Lawson, B., & Samson, D. (2001). Developing Innovation Capability in Organisations: a Dynamic Capabilities Approach. *International Journal of Innovation Management*, 05(03), 377–400. <https://doi.org/10.1142/s1363919601000427>
173. Le, T. T., Behl, A., & Graham, G. (2023). The Role of Entrepreneurship in Successfully Achieving Circular Supply Chain Management. *Global Journal of*

- Flexible Systems Management, 24(4), 537–561. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40171-023-00353-0>
174. Lee, S., Park, G., Yoon, B., & Park, J. (2010). Open Innovation in SMEs – An Intermediated Network Model Open innovation in SMEs — An intermediated network model. *Research Policy*, 39(2), 290–300. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2009.12.009>
175. Lelo de Larrea, G., Altin, M., Koseoglu, M. A., & Okumus, F. (2021). An integrative systematic review of innovation research in hospitality and tourism. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 37(February), 100789. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2021.100789>
176. Levenburg, N., Magal, S., & Kosalge, P. (2006). An Exploratory Investigation of Organizational Factors and e-Business Motivations Among SMFOEs in the US. *Electronic Markets*, 16(1), 70–84. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10196780500491402>
177. Levinthal, D. A., & March, J. G. (1993). The myopia of learning. *Strategic Management Journal*, 14(2 S), 95–112. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.4250141009>
178. Liarte, S. (2006). Mutualisme , prédation et parasitisme : la concurrence comme critère de choix de la zone d ' implantation Mutualisme , prédation et parasitisme : la concurrence comme critère de choix de la zone d ' implantation.
179. Liebman, N., & Gergle, D. (2016). Capturing turn-by-turn lexical similarity in text-based communication. *Proceedings of the ACM Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work, CSCW*, 27, 553–559. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2818048.2820062>
180. López-García, U. T., Álvarez-Coque, J. M., & Sánchez, G. M. (2013). Comportamiento innovador del sistema agroalimentario en la Comunidad Valenciana : cadena de valor , vínculos intersectoriales y territorio. 153.
181. Lundvall, B.-Å. (1985). Product Innovation and User-Producer Interaction Product Innovation and User-Producer Interaction. In *Product Innovation and User-Producer Interaction (Issue January 1985)*. <https://library.oapen.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.12657/31613/626406.pdf#page=36>
182. MADR. (2015). Cadena de suministro de la yuca. 9. [https://sioc.minagricultura.gov.co/Yuca/Documentos/2015-09-30 Cifras Sectoriales.pdf](https://sioc.minagricultura.gov.co/Yuca/Documentos/2015-09-30_Cifras_Sectoriales.pdf)
183. MADR, M. de A. y D. R. (2017). Pectia (2017-2027). Plan Estratégico de Ciencia, Tecnología e Innovación Del Sector Agropecuario.
184. MADR, M. de A. y D. R. (2020). Subsector productivo de la Yuca. *Minagricultura*, 18. [https://sioc.minagricultura.gov.co/Yuca/Documentos/2019-06-30 Cifras Sectoriales.pdf](https://sioc.minagricultura.gov.co/Yuca/Documentos/2019-06-30_Cifras_Sectoriales.pdf)
185. Malerba, F. (2002). Sectoral systems of innovation and production. *Research Policy*, 31, 247–264.

186. Malmberg, A., & Maskell, P. (2002). The elusive concept of localization economies: Towards a knowledge-based theory of spatial clustering. *Environment and Planning A*, 34(3), 429–449. <https://doi.org/10.1068/a3457>
187. Marín Arbeláez, J. O. (2015). Análisis del sector agroalimentario en Colombia – Bogotá Una mirada retro y prospectiva del sector periodo 2004 -2014 Analysis of food industry in Colombia - Bogotá a retro and forward view to the industry for the period 2004 - 2014. 1, 1–14.
188. Marotta, G., & Nazzaro, C. (2020). Public goods production and value creation in wineries: a structural equation modelling. *British Food Journal*, 122(5), 1705–1724. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BFJ-08-2019-0656>
189. Martínez-Azúa, B. C., López-Salazar, P. E., & Sama-Berrocal, C. (2020). Determining factors of innovative performance: Case studies in extremaduran agri-food companies. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 12(21), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12219098>
190. Martínez-Filgueira, X. M., Peón, D., & López-Iglesias, E. (2022). Determinants of innovation by agri-food firms in rural Spain: an MCA PLS-SEM analysis. *International Food and Agribusiness Management Review*, 25(1), 103–119. <https://doi.org/10.22434/IFAMR2021.0015>
191. Martínez-Román, J. A., Gamero, J., & Tamayo, J. A. (2011). Analysis of innovation in SMEs using an innovative capability-based non-linear model: A study in the province of Seville (Spain). *Technovation*, 31(9), 459–475. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2011.05.005>
192. Martínez-Román, J. A., Tamayo, J. A., & Gamero, J. (2017). Innovativeness and its influence on growth and market extension in construction firms in the Andalusian region. *Journal of Engineering and Technology Management - JET-M*, 43, 19–33. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jengtecman.2016.11.002>
193. Martínez Carazo, P. C. (2006). El método de estudio de caso: Estrategia metodológica de la investigación científica. *Pensamiento y Gestión: Revista de La División de Ciencias Administrativas de La Universidad Del Norte*, 20, 165–193. <https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0029-1217568>
194. Martinez Garcia, J. (2017). Análisis de Inteligencia Competitiva de la Agroindustria en Procesados de Yuca y Posicionamiento en Mercados Nacional e Internacional. *Universitas Nusantara PGRI Kediri*, 01, 1–7. <http://www.albayan.ae>
195. Mateut, S. (2018). Subsidies, financial constraints and firm innovative activities in emerging economies. In *Small Business Economics* (Vol. 50, Issue 1). *Small Business Economics*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-017-9877-3>
196. McAdam, R., & McClelland, J. (2002). Sources of new product ideas and creativity practices in the UK textile industry. *Technovation*, 22(2), 113–121. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0166-4972\(01\)00002-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0166-4972(01)00002-5)
197. McPherson, M. (1983). An Ecology of Affiliation. *American Sociological Review*, 48(4), 519–532.

198. Mendoza Meza, D. L. (2017). Retos y oportunidades en ciencia, tecnología e innovación para la región Caribe colombiana. *Revista Prospectiva*, 15(1), 5–6.
199. Mendoza Ortega, G. P., Hernández Hernández, G. C., & Rodríguez Vergara, C. J. (2019). Cadena de suministro agroalimentaria de la yuca en el departamento de Sucre. *Apuestas Del Departamento de Sucre En Sectores Agroindustria y Minería*, 30–49. <https://doi.org/10.21892/9789585547254.2>
200. Menrad, K. (2004). Innovations in the food industry in Germany. *Research Policy*, 33(6–7), 845–878. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2004.01.012>
201. Messmann, G., & Mulder, R. H. (2011). Innovative Work Behaviour in Vocational Colleges: Understanding How and Why Innovations Are Developed. *Vocations and Learning*, 4(1), 63–84. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12186-010-9049-y>
202. Michie, J., & Sheehan, M. (2003). Labour market deregulation , ‘ flexibility ’ and innovation. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 123–143. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1093/cje/27.1.123>
203. Milesi, D., & Petelski, N. (2011). The Determinants of Innovation in Developing Countries: Evidence From Argentine Manufacturing Firms. *Merit.Unu.Edu*, 20. http://www.merit.unu.edu/MEIDE/papers/2011/1299544820_DM.pdf
204. Minagricultura. (2018). Reporte:Área, Producción y Rendimiento Nacional por Cultivo. *Agronet*. <https://www.agronet.gov.co/estadistica/Paginas/home.aspx?cod=1>
205. Minagricultura. (2021). Cadena Productiva de la Yuca.
206. Minarelli, F., Raggi, M., & Viaggi, D. (2014). Distinguishing the innovation behaviour of micro, small and medium food enterprises. *Journal on Chain and Network Science*, 14(2), 95–102. <https://doi.org/10.3920/JCNS2014.x004>
207. Minarelli, F., Raggi, M., & Viaggi, D. (2015). Innovation in European food SMEs: Determinants and links between types. *Bio-Based and Applied Economics*, 4(1), 33–53. <https://doi.org/10.13128/BAE-14705>
208. Ministerio de Agricultura y Desarrollo Rural. (2018). *Cifras Sectoriales YUCA*, 2018.
209. Mogollón, R. H., De, A., & Vaquero, C. (2016). Estudio sobre el comportamiento innovador de la empresa. *Revista de Estudios Económicos y Empresariales*. <https://doi.org/http://hdl.handle.net/10662/2689>
210. Molero, J. (1998). Patterns of internationalization of Spanish innovatory firms. *Research Policy*, 27(5), 541–558. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0048-7333\(98\)00064-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0048-7333(98)00064-X)
211. Molero, J., & Buesa, M. (1996). Patterns of technological change among Spanish innovative firms: The case of the Madrid region. *Research Policy*, 25(4), 647–663. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0048-7333\(95\)00873-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0048-7333(95)00873-X)
212. Moncaut, Nicolas;Robert, Verónica; Yoguel, G. (2017). El rol de las capacidades en la relacion entre difusión de las TIC y productividad en empresas

- manufactureras argentinas. Una revisión de la hipótesis de complementariedad. January 2018.
213. Montani, F., Odoardi, C., & Battistelli, A. (2014). Individual and contextual determinants of innovative work behaviour: Proactive goal generation matters. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 87(4), 645–670. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12066>
214. Montoya, R. L. A., & Montoya, R. I. A. (2022). Inclusive business. A biological metaphor model for the agricultural sector [Negocios inclusivos. Un modelo de metáfora biológica para el sector agropecuario]. *Retos (Ecuador)*, 12(23), 25–44. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.17163/ret.n23.2022.02>
215. Montoya Suárez, O. (2004). Schumpeter, innovación y determinismo tecnológico. *Scientia et Technica*, 10(25), 209–213.
216. Moore, J. F. (1993). *A New Ecology of Competition*. May 1999.
217. Morales Romero, A., & Duque Oliva, E. J. (2012). Formas y categorización de las relaciones entre las organizaciones sin fines de lucro y el sector privado: una revisión. *Administración & Desarrollo*, 40(55), 77–91. <https://doi.org/10.22431/25005227.130>
218. Morgan, D. L. (2014). Pragmatism as a Paradigm for Social Research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 20(8), 1045–1053. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800413513733>
219. Mowery, David C, Rosenberg, N. (1998). *Paths of Innovation: Technological Change in 20th-Century America*.
220. Mundaiz, E., & Sebast, S. (2003). El método delphi. 1–14.
221. Muñoz, G., & Espinosa, D. (2018). La innovación: baluarte fundamental para las organizaciones. *INNOVA Research Journal*, 3(10), 212–229.
222. Nassimbeni, G. (2001). Technology, innovation capacity, and the export attitude of small manufacturing firms: A logit/tobit model. *Research Policy*, 30(2), 245–262. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0048-7333\(99\)00114-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0048-7333(99)00114-6)
223. Naylor, T. D., & Florida, R. (2003). The Rise of the Creative Class: And How It's Transforming Work, Leisure, Community and Everyday Life. *Canadian Public Policy / Analyse de Politiques*, 29(3), 378. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3552294>
224. Nelson, R. R. (1991). Firms differ, and how does it matter? *Strategic Management Journal*, 12(1 991), 61–74. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.4250121006>
225. Niosi, J., & Bellon, B. (2002). The absorptive capacity of family firms. *Journal of Family Business Management*, 5(1), 73–89. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jfbm-05-2014-0012>
226. Noguera, Á. (2013). Las interacciones organizacionales desde la visión ecológica: la depredación.
227. Nunes, S., & Lopes, R. (2015). Firm Performance, Innovation Modes and Territorial Embeddedness. *European Planning Studies*, 4313(September). <https://doi.org/10.1080/09654313.2015.1021666>

228. O'Reilly, C. A., & Tushman, M. L. (2008). Ambidexterity as a dynamic capability: Resolving the innovator's dilemma. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 28, 185–206. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.riob.2008.06.002>
229. OCDE/Eurostat. (2005). Manual de Oslo. Directrices para la recogida e interpretación de información relativa a innovación. In *OECD/Comunidades Europeas (Vol. 66)*. <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264304604-en>
230. OCDE. (2005). The Measurement of scientific and technological activities: proposed ... <http://books.google.com/books?id=Q132qLPtfsQC&pgis=1>
231. OCDE. (2016). Meeting of the OECD Council at Ministerial Level OECD Innovation Strategy 2015 An Agenda For Policy Action. June, 1–2. www.oecd.org/tel/33
232. OCyT. (2021). Indicadores de Ciencia y Tecnología e Innovación Colombia 2021.
233. Oddone, N. (2016). Manual para el fortalecimiento de cadenas de valor. Cepal, Fida.
234. OECD/Eurostat. (2018). Oslo Manual 2018: Guidelines for Collecting, Reporting and Using Data on Innovation. In *The Measurement of Scientific, Technological and Innovation Activities*.
235. OECD. (2020). Innovación: Conceptos y tipos. Agencia Vasca de La Innovación, Innobasque, 6. https://www.innobasque.eus/uploads/attachment_files/conceptos-idi_v4pdf-5e1c451d5ee49.pdf
236. Ojeda Gómez, J. (2009). Interfirm cooperation as a strategy of SMEs in the environmental sector. *Estudios Gerenciales*, 25(110), 39–61. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0123-5923\(09\)70061-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0123-5923(09)70061-0)
237. Pansiri, J. (2005). Pragmatism: A methodological approach to researching strategic alliances in tourism. *Tourism and Hospitality, Planning and Development*, 2(3), 191–206. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790530500399333>
238. Park, Y. T., Kim, C. H., & Lee, J. H. (1999). On the Characteristics of Innovative Firms in Korea: the Role of R&D and Innovation Type. *International Journal of Innovation Management*, 03(01), 111–131. <https://doi.org/10.1142/s1363919699000062>
239. Parra-Peña, R., Puyana, R., & Yepes, F. (2021). Análisis De La Productividad Del Sector Agropecuario En Colombia Y Su Impacto En Temas Como: Encadenamientos Productivos, Sostenibilidad E Internacionalización, En El Marco Del Programa Colombia Más Competitiva. *Fedesarrollo*, 1, 135. <http://hdl.handle.net/11445/4092>
240. Parrilli, M. D., & Alcalde Heras, H. (2016). STI and DUI innovation modes: Scientific-technological and context-specific nuances. *Research Policy*, 45(4), 747–756. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2016.01.001>
241. Pavitt, K. and S. W. (1971). The conditions for success in technological innovation. *Organisation for Economic Co- Operation and Development*, Paris, France, 169.

242. Peneder, M. (2009). The meaning of entrepreneurship: A modular concept. *Journal of Industry, Competition and Trade*, 9(2), 77–99. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10842-009-0052-7>
243. Peraza, E., Gómez, J., & Aleixandre, G. (2016). Los factores determinantes del comportamiento innovador de las cooperativas: Un análisis para el caso de castilla y león. *REVESCO : Revista de Estudios Cooperativos*, 122, 252–284. <https://revistas.ucm.es/index.php/REVE/article/download/52025/48095/>
244. Pessoa de Matos, M. G., Borin, E., Cassiolato, J. E., de Arruda, D. R., & Sanchez Marcellino, I. (2016). La evolución de los arreglos productivos locales en una década. J. Núñez Jover & A. Alcazar Quiñores (Eds.), *Universidad y Desarrollo Local: Contribuciones Latinoamericanas*, 33–52.
245. Pilav-Velić, A., & Marjanovic, O. (2016). Integrating open innovation and business process innovation: Insights from a large-scale study on a transition economy. *Information and Management*, 53(3), 398–408. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2015.12.004>
246. Pineda Serna, L. (2009). Enfoques alrededor de la gestión estratégica de la innovación Documento de Investigación No. 57. 36 p. <http://repository.urosario.edu.co/bitstream/handle/10336/3808/01248219-2009-57.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>
247. Pippel, G. (2014). Economics of Innovation and New Technology R & D cooperation for non-technological innovations. *Economics of Innovation and New Technology*, November, 37–41. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10438599.2013.871167>
248. Porter, M. (1985). Competitive advantage of nations: creating and sustaining superior performance.
249. Porter, M. E. (1998). Clusters and the New Economics of Competition To Sell Information Work And Life: The End Of Managing Professionals. *Harvard Business Review*.
250. Porter, M. E. (2008). Clusters and Competition. *On Competition*, Updated and Expanded Edition, 213–304.
251. Porter M E. (2000). Location , Competition , and Economic Development : Local Clusters in a Global. *Economic Development Quarterly*, 14(1), 15–34.
252. Powell, W. W., Koput, K. W., & Smith-Doerr, L. (1996). Interorganizational collaboration and the locus of innovation: Networks of learning in biotechnology. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41(1), 116–145. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2393988>
253. Prahalad, C. K., & Hamel, G. (1990). The core competence of the corporation. *Knowledge and Strategy*, 41–60. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198781806.003.0017>
254. Prahalad, C. K., & Hamel, G. (1994). Strategy as a field of study: Why search for a new paradigm? *Strategic Management Journal*, 15(2 S), 5–16. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.4250151002>
255. Prajogo, D., & Olhager, J. (2012). Supply chain integration and performance: The effects of long-term relationships, information technology and sharing, and

- logistics integration. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 135(1), 514–522. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2011.09.001>
256. Premkumar, G., & Roberts, M. (1999). Adoption of new information technologies in rural small businesses. *The International Journal Management Science*, 27. [https://doi.org/Premkumar, G., & Roberts, M. \(1999\). Adoption of new information technologies in rural small businesses. Omega, 27\(4\), 467–484. doi:10.1016/s0305-0483\(98\)00071-1](https://doi.org/Premkumar, G., & Roberts, M. (1999). Adoption of new information technologies in rural small businesses. Omega, 27(4), 467–484. doi:10.1016/s0305-0483(98)00071-1)
257. Pretty, J. N., Morison, J. I. L., & Hine, R. E. (2003). Reducción de la pobreza alimentaria mediante el aumento de la sostenibilidad agrícola en los países en desarrollo. Reducing food poverty by increasing agricultural sustainability in developing countries. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment*, 95(1), 217–234.
258. Rammer, C., Czarnitzki, D., Spielkamp, A., Rammer, C., Czarnitzki, D., & Spielkamp, A. (2009). Innovation Success of Non-R & D-Performers Substituting Technology by Management in SMEs Innovation Success of Non-R & D-Performers Substituting Technology by Management in SMEs. *Small Business Economics*, 08.
259. Reardon, T., Echeverria, R., Berdegué, J., Minten, B., Liverpool-Tasie, S., Tschirley, D., & Zilberman, D. (2019). Rapid transformation of food systems in developing regions: Highlighting the role of agricultural research & innovations. *Agricultural Systems*, 172(December 2017), 47–59. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2018.01.022>
260. Revez, J., & Borges, L. C. (2018). Pragmatic Paradigm in Information Science Research: a Literature Review. *Qualitative and Quantitative Methods in Libraries*, 7(4), 583–593. <http://qqml-journal.net/index.php/qqml/article/view/504>
261. Rigby, D. L., & Essletzbichler, J. (2006). Technological variety, technological change and a geography of production techniques. *Journal of Economic Geography*, 6(1), 45–70. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jeg/lbi015>
262. Roberts, N., Galluch, P. S., Dinger, M., & Grover, V. (2012). Absortive capacity and information systems research: review, synthesis and directions for future research. *MIS Quarterly*, November 2014. <https://doi.org/10.2307/41703470>
263. Roco, L., Bravo-Ureta, B., Engler, A., & Jara-Rojas, R. (2017). The impact of climatic change adaptation on agricultural productivity in Central Chile: A stochastic production frontier approach. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 9(9). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su9091648>
264. Rogers, M. (2004). Networks, firm size and innovation. *Small Business Economics*, 141–153. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:SBEJ.0000014451.99047.69>
265. Roper, S. (1997). Product Innovation and Small Business Growth: A Comparison of the Strategies of German, U.K. and Irish Companies. *Small Business Economics*, 523–537. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICDSC.2011.6042909>

266. Rothwell, R. (1983). Innovation and Firm Size: A Case for Dynamic Complementarity; or, is Small Really so Beautiful? *Journal of General Management*, 8(3), 5–25. <https://doi.org/10.1177/030630708300800301>
267. Rotundo, G. J. Z., & Aymara Hernández Arias. (2018). Capacidad de absorción: revisión de la literatura y un modelo de sus determinantes.
268. Rubera, G., & Droge, C. (2013). Technology versus design innovation's effects on sales and tobin's Q: The moderating role of branding strategy. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 30(3), 448–464. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jpim.12012>
269. Sadowski, B. M., Maitland, C., & Dongen, J. Van. (2002). Strategic use of the Internet by small- and medium-sized companies: an exploratory study. *Information Economics and Policy*, 14, 75–93.
270. Salcedo Mendoza, J. G., & Contreras Lozano, K. P. (2017). Agroindustria de productos amiláceos I. Yuca (*Manihot esculente* Crantz) y ñame (*Dioscorea* spp.). In *Archivo Pdf* (Issue December). <https://repositorio.unisucre.edu.co/handle/001/1101>
271. Sandoval, R. R. (2016). Investigación sobre los factores determinantes de la innovación y el uso de servicios intensivos en conocimiento en la producción agraria. <https://doi.org/10.4995/thesis/10251/94623>
272. Sarrate, M. L., García, J. L., & Pérez, G. (2013). Metodología de investigación en pedagogía social (avance cualitativo y modelos mixtos). *Pedagogía Social Revista Interuniversitaria*, 1723(22), 75–89. <https://doi.org/10.7179/PSRI>
273. Schumpeter, J. A. (1996). *Biblioteca de capitalismo, socialismo y democracia (Tomo II)* (Issue Tomo II).
274. Schumpeter, J. A. (2017). *Theory of economic development: An inquiry into profits, capital, credit, interest, and the business cycle. Theory of Economic Development: An Inquiry into Profits, Capital, Credit, Interest, and the Business Cycle*, 3(2), 1–255. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315135564>
275. Schumpeter, J., & Backhaus, U. (2006). *The Theory of Economic Development. Joseph Alois Schumpeter*, 61–116. https://doi.org/10.1007/0-306-48082-4_3
276. SeelyBrown, J., & Duguid, P. (2001). *The Social Life of Information. Prensa de La Escuela de Negocios de Harvard*, 4(1), 1–23. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0016-3287\(00\)00065-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0016-3287(00)00065-3)
277. Sharma, N. (2017). Innovative Behavior of Indian Micro Small and Medium Enterprises: An Empirical Study. *International Journal of Innovation Management*, 21(7), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1142/S136391961750061X>
278. Shaw, E. (1999). A guide to the qualitative research process : evidence from a small firm study. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, 2(2), 59–70. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13522759910269973>
279. Silva, G., & Di Serio, L. C. (2021). Innovation in small businesses: Towards an owner-centered approach to innovation. *Revista Brasileira de Gestao de Negocios*, 23(3), 519–535. <https://doi.org/10.7819/RBGN.V.23I3.4117>

280. Simatupang, T. M., & Sridharan, R. (2002). The Collaborative Supply Chain. *The International Journal of Logistics Management*, 13(1), 15–30. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09574090210806333>
281. Simonton, D. K. (1984). Artistic creativity and interpersonal relationships across and within generations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 46(6), 1273–1286. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.46.6.1273>
282. Skipworth, H., Godsell, J., Wong, C. Y., Saghiri, S., & Julien, D. (2015). Supply chain alignment for improved business performance: An empirical study. *Supply Chain Management*, 20(5), 511–533. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SCM-06-2014-0188>
283. Soto, A. J., Mohammad, A., Albert, A., Islam, A., Milios, E., & Doyle, M. (2015). Similarity-based support for text reuse in technical writing. *DocEng 2015 - Proceedings of the 2015 ACM Symposium on Document Engineering*, 97–106. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2682571.2797068>
284. Stierand, M. B., & Dörfler, V. (2012). Reflecting on a phenomenological study of creativity and innovation in haute cuisine. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 24(6), 946–957. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09596111211247254>
285. Suárez, D., Yoguel, G., Robert, V., & Barletta, F. (2014). The Argentinean Innovation System Micro Determinants and Meso-Macro Disarticulation.
286. Suárez, E. M., & Lasso, M. A. O. (2017). Análisis de la Cadena Productiva y la Implementación de Tecnología en el Cultivo de la Yuca en Colombia. *Universitas Nusantara PGRI Kediri*, 01, 1–7. <http://www.albayan.ae>
287. Tang, J. T. E., Shee, D. Y., & Tang, T. I. (2001). Conceptual model for interactive buyer-supplier relationship in electronic commerce. *International Journal of Information Management*, 21(1), 49–68. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0268-4012\(00\)00050-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0268-4012(00)00050-5)
288. Teece, D. J. (1986). Profiting from technological innovation: Implications for integration, collaboration, licensing and public policy. *School of Business Administratio N*. [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/0048-7333\(86\)90027-2](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/0048-7333(86)90027-2)
289. Teece, D. J. (2007). Explicating dynamic capabilities: The nature and microfoundations of (sustainable) enterprise performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 920(August), 1319–1350. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.640>
290. Teece, D. J., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic Capabilities and Strategic Management. *The Palgrave Encyclopedia of Strategic Management*, 18(April 1991), 509–533. https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-349-94848-2_689-1
291. Tellis, G. J. (2006). Disruptive Technology or Visionary Leadership?? *Product Innovation Management*, 30(12), 34–38. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5885.2005.00179.x>
292. Tether, B. S. (2010). The sources and aims of innovation in services: Variety between and within sectors. *Economics of Innovation and New Technology*, 12(6), 481–505. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1043859022000029221>

293. Thomä, J. (2017). DUI mode learning and barriers to innovation—A case from Germany. *Research Policy*, 46(7), 1327–1339. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2017.06.004>
294. Tidd, J., & Bessant, J. (2009). *Managing Innovation: Integrating CO Managing Innovation*. January 2011, 58.
295. Tödttling, F., Lehner, P., & Kaufmann, A. (2009). Do different types of innovation rely on specific kinds of knowledge interactions? *Technovation*, 29(1), 59–71. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2008.05.002>
296. Toro, R., Peña-Sarmiento, M., Avendaño-Prieto, B. L., Mejía-Vélez, S., & Bernal-Torres, A. (2022). Empirical Analysis of Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient as a Function of Question Response Options, Sample Size and Outliers. *Revista Iberoamericana de Diagnostico y Evaluacion Psicologica*, 63(2), 17–30. <https://doi.org/10.21865/RIDEP63.2.02>
297. Tóth, J., Migliore, G., Balogh, J. M., & Rizzo, G. (2020). Exploring innovation adoption behavior for sustainable development: The case of Hungarian food sector. *Agronomy*, 10(4). <https://doi.org/10.3390/agronomy10040612>
298. Triguero, Á., & Córcoles, D. (2013). Understanding innovation: An analysis of persistence for Spanish manufacturing firms. *Research Policy*, 42(2), 340–352. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2012.08.003>
299. Trott, P., & Simms, C. (2017). An examination of product innovation in low-and medium-technology industries: Cases from the UK packaged food sector. *Research Policy*, 46(3), 605–623. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2017.01.007>
300. Tubin, D., & Levin-Rozalis, M. (2008). Interorganizational cooperation: The structural aspect of nurturing trust. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 21(7), 704–722. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09513550810904523>
301. Uddin, N. (2017). Inter-organizational relational mechanism on firm performance The case of Australian agri-food industry supply chain. *Industrial Management and Data Systems*, 117(9), 1934–1953. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IMDS-03-2016-0093>
302. Un, C. A., & Asakawa, K. (2015). Types of R&D collaborations and process innovation: The benefit of collaborating upstream in the knowledge chain. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 32(1), 138–153. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jpim.12229>
303. Un, C. A., Cuervo-cazurra, A., & Asakawa, K. (2010). R&D Collaborations and Product Innovation. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 673–689. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5885.2010.00744.x>
304. Un, C. A., Hall, H., & Avenue, H. (2016). Types of R&D Collaborations and Process Innovation: The Benefit of Collaborating Upstream in the Knowledge Chain. *Northeastern U. D'Amore-McKim School of Business Research Paper No. 2747128*, 1–26.
305. Valentim, L., Lisboa, J. V., & Franco, M. (2016). Knowledge management practices and absorptive capacity in small and medium-sized enterprises.pdf.

- R&D Management, 46(4), 711–725.
<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/radm.12108>
306. van de Vrande, V., de Jong, J. P. J., Vanhaverbeke, W., & de Rochemont, M. (2009). Open innovation in SMEs: Trends, motives and management challenges. *Technovation*, 29(6–7), 423–437.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2008.10.001>
307. Van der Borgh, M., Cloudt, M., & Romme, A. G. L. (2012). Value creation by knowledge-based ecosystems: Evidence from a field study. *R and D Management*, 42(2), 150–169. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9310.2011.00673.x>
308. Van Dijk, B., Den Hertog, R. D., Menkveld, B., & Thurik, R. (1997). Some New Evidence on the Determinants of Large- and Small-Firm Innovation. *Small Business Economics*, 9(4), 335–343. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1007995919950>
309. Van Fleet, D. D., & Albanese, R. (1985). Rational The Free Behavior Riding Groups : in. 10(2), 244–255.
310. Vega-Jurado, J., Gutiérrez-Gracia, A., Fernández-de-Lucio, I., & Manjarrés-Henríquez, L. (2008). The effect of external and internal factors on firms' product innovation. *Research Policy*, 37(4), 616–632.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2008.01.001>
311. Vesperi, W., & Coppolino, R. (2023). Inter-organizational relationships in agri-food sector: a bibliometric review and future directions. *British Food Journal*, 125(1), 82–95. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BFJ-06-2021-0712>
312. Vrgović, P., Glassman, B., Walton, A., & Vidicki, P. (2012). Open innovation for SMEs in developing countries – an intermediated communication network model for collaboration beyond obstacles (revision). *Innovation: Management, Policy & Practice*, October 2018, 587–614.
<https://doi.org/10.5172/impp.2012.587>
313. Wakelin, K. (1998). Innovation and export behaviour at the firm level. *Research Policy*, 26(7–8), 829–841. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0048-7333\(97\)00051-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0048-7333(97)00051-6)
314. Wang, E. T. G., & Wei, H. L. (2007). Interorganizational governance value creation: Coordinating for information visibility and flexibility in supply chains. *Decision Sciences*, 38(4), 647–674. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5915.2007.00173.x>
315. West, M. A., & Farr, J. L. (1990). Innovation and creativity at work: Psychological and organizational strategies. In M. A. West & J. L. Farr (Eds.), *Innovation and creativity at work: Psychological and organizational strategies*. John Wiley & Sons.
316. Wiśniewska-Paluszak, J. A., & Paluszak, G. T. (2021). Development of sustainable resource ties in the agrifood industry: The case for the Polish fruit and vegetable industry. *International Food and Agribusiness Management Review*, 24(2), 293–320. <https://doi.org/10.22434/IFAMR2019.0149>

317. Yam, R. C. M., Lo, W., Tang, E. P. Y., & Lau, A. K. W. (2011). Analysis of sources of innovation, technological innovation capabilities, and performance: An empirical study of Hong Kong manufacturing industries. *Research Policy*, 40(3), 391–402. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2010.10.013>
318. Zahra, S. A., & George, G. (2002). Absorptive Capacity: A Review, Reconceptualization, and Extension. *The Academy of Management Review*, 27(2), 185. <https://doi.org/10.2307/4134351>
319. Zingone, A., Alelio, D. D., Mazzocchi, M. G., & Sarno, D. (2017). Time series and beyond : multifaceted plankton research at a marine Mediterranean LTER site. *Nature Conservation*, 310, 273–310. <https://doi.org/10.3897/natureconservation.34.30789>