

ONLINE APPENDIX 1

Variable Operationalization

- Each sentence in the description of the scales below is the full text of the question as it appears in the questionnaire.
- Unless otherwise indicated (cf. recipient motivation, source motivation, relationship ease), answers were scored using a 5-point Likert-type scale, the default scale being (Y! Y o N N!).
- Key for the default scale: Y!="Yes!"; Y ="yes, but"; o ="no opinion", N ="no, not really", N!="No!" (numerically coded as 2, 1, 0, -1, -2)
- The overall score for each scale was computed by adding the standardized scores obtained from each question.
- Dependent and control variables were coded so that a larger numerical value represents a higher level of the respective construct.

Dependent Variable: Stickiness

Stickiness ($\alpha = 0.89$, *Items = 30*), default scale

Ranking the performance of «company»'s units on their results on «practice» was straightforward. Within «company» there existed consensus that «source» has obtained the best results with «practice». Compared to external benchmarks, «source» has obtained best-in-class results with «practice». «source» could easily explain how it obtained superior results with «practice». «source» could easily point to the key components of «practice». «source» was reluctant to share crucial knowledge and information relative to «practice». Distributing responsibility for the transfer between «source» and «recipient» generated much conflict. The transfer of «practice» from «source» to «recipient» was amply justified. «recipient» recognized «source»'s expertise on «practice». The transfer of «practice» from «source» to «recipient» disrupted «source»'s normal operations. «recipient» could not free personnel from regular operations so that it could be properly trained. Communication of transfer related information broke down within «recipient». «recipient» was able to recognize inadequacies in «source»'s offerings. «recipient» knew what questions to ask «source». «recipient» knew how to recognize its requirements for «practice». «recipient» performed unnecessary modifications to the «practice». «recipient» modified the «practice» in ways contrary to expert's advice. «source» turned out to be less knowledgeable of the «practice» than it appeared before the transfer was decided. Much of what «recipient» should have done during the transfer was eventually completed by «source». «source» understood «recipient»'s unique situation. All aspects of the transfer of «practice» from «source» to «recipient» were carefully planned. Initially «recipient» 'spoon fed' the «practice» with carefully selected personnel and raw material until it got up to speed. At first «recipient» measured performance more often than usual, sometimes reacting too briskly to transient declines in performance. Some people left «recipient» after having been trained for their new role in the «practice», forcing «recipient» to hire hastily a replacement and train it 'on the fly'. Some people turned out to be poorly qualified to perform their new role in the «practice», forcing «recipient» to hire hastily a replacement and train it 'on the fly'. The «practice» had unsatisfactory side effects which «recipient» had to correct. By altering the «practice», «recipient» created further problems which had to be solved, «recipient»'s environment turned out to be different from that of «source», forcing «recipient» to make unforeseen changes to «practice». Outside experts (from «source», other units, or external consultants) could answer questions and solve problems about their specialty but did not have an overall perspective on the «practice». Teams put together to help «recipient» to get up to speed with the «practice» disbanded because their members had to attend to other pressing tasks.

Control Variables

Source Motivation ($\alpha = .93$, *Items=13*), binary items (Yes/No coded as 1/0), scale is the sum

«source» saw benefit in: measuring its own performance; understanding its own practices; sharing this understanding with other units; sharing the limits of this understanding with other units; assessing the feasibility of the transfer; communicating with «recipient»; planning the transfer; documenting «practice» for transfer; implementing «recipient»'s support systems; training «recipient»'s personnel; helping «recipient» troubleshoot; helping resolve «recipient»'s unexpected problems; lending skilled personnel.

Source Reliability ($\alpha = 0.64$, *Items = 8*), default scale unless indicated

«source» and «recipient» have similar Key Success Factors; «source»: 1. invented the «practice», 2. was the first unit to have experience, 3. received practice from other unit, 4. «source» was able to accommodate the needs of «recipient» into «practice»; 5. «source» had a hidden agenda; 6. the superior results of the «source» were visible; remained stable; 7. «source» possessed the necessary resources to support the transfer; 8. «source» has a history of successful transfers.

Recipient Motivation ($\alpha = .93$, *Items=14*), binary items (Yes/No coded as 1/0), scale is the sum

«recipient» saw benefit in: measuring its own performance; comparing it with the performance of other units; understanding its own practices; absorbing «source»'s understanding; analyzing the feasibility of adopting «practice»; communicating its needs to «source»; planning the transfer; implementing the systems and facilities for «practice»; assigning personnel full time to the transfer; assigning personnel to be trained in «practice»; understanding the implications of the transfer; troubleshooting «practice»; ensuring that its people knew their jobs; ensuring that its people consented to keep doing their jobs.

Recipient Absorptive Capacity ($\alpha = .83$, *Items=9*), default scale

Members of «recipient» have a common language to deal with the «practice»; «recipient» had a vision of what it was trying to achieve through the transfer; «recipient» had information on the state-of-the-art of the «practice»; «recipient» had a clear division of roles and responsibilities to implement the «practice»; «recipient» had the necessary skills to implement the «practice»; «recipient» had the technical competence to absorb the «practice»; «recipient» had the managerial competence to absorb the «practice»; It is well known who can best exploit new information about the «practice» within «recipient»; It is well known who can help solve problems associated with the «practice».

Recipient Retentive Ability ($\alpha = .81$, *Items=6*), default scale

«recipient» periodically retrains existing personnel on the «practice»; «recipient» has mechanisms to detect malfunctions of the «practice»; «recipient» regularly measures performance and corrects problems as soon as these happen; «recipient»'s personnel can predict how they will be rewarded for good performance in the «practice»; «recipient»'s personnel are provided with numerous opportunities to commit freely and publicly to perform their role; At «recipient» there is a clear focal point for the «practice».

Proveness of Knowledge ($\alpha = .67$, *Items=3*), default scale unless otherwise indicated

We had solid proof that «practice» was really helpful; «practice» contributes significantly to the competitive advantage of «company»; For the success of «company», the «practice» is: 1. CRITICAL 2. VERY IMPORTANT 3. FAIRLY IMPORTANT 4. FAIRLY UNIMPORTANT 5. NOT IMPORTANT AT ALL.

Arduous Relationship ($\alpha = .71$, *Items=3*), scale as indicated below

Communication between «source» and «recipient» is 1. VERY EASY 2. FAIRLY EASY 3. FAIRLY DEMANDING 4. VERY DEMANDING; Collaboration between «source» and «recipient» 1. IS SOUGHT ACTIVELY BY «SOURCE» 2. IS WELL RECEIVED BY «SOURCE» 3. IS PREFERABLY AVOIDED BY «SOURCE» 4. OCCURS ONLY IF «SOURCE» HAS NO CHOICE; Collaboration between «SOURCE» and «recipient» 1. IS SOUGHT ACTIVELY BY «RECIPIENT» 2. IS WELL RECEIVED BY «RECIPIENT» 3. IS PREFERABLY AVOIDED BY «RECIPIENT» 4. OCCURS ONLY IF «RECIPIENT» HAS NO CHOICE.

Organizational Context ($\alpha = .77$, *Items=14*), default scale

Existing performance measures of the «practice» are detailed enough to be meaningful; Performance measures of the «practice» are taken frequently enough to be timely; Performance measures of the «practice» from different units are easily comparable; «company» enforces company-wide standard policies with respect to the «practice»; At «company» there is constant pressure to improve performance; It is easy to justify time spent visiting other units; To visit another unit, it is easy to justify travel expenses; At «company», improving performance by copying and adapting practices from other units is as legitimate as improving performance from own creativity. At «company», a unit that exposes those needs that it is unable to meet on its own loses status; At «company», a unit that exposes unresolved problems loses status; At «company», despite structural differences units can always learn from one another; Normally a best-in-class practice is most likely to be found outside «company»; At «company», managers seem to prefer to use external sources of help and support even though they are more expensive and less useful; At «company», corporate pride and values encourage managers not to look outside for help or to share with the outside.

Causal Ambiguity ($\alpha = 0.86$, *Items = 6*), default scale

The limits of the «practice» are fully specified: With the «practice», we know why a given action results in a given outcome; When a problem surfaced with the «practice», the precise reasons for failure could not be articulated even after the event; There is a precise list of the skills, resources and prerequisites necessary for successfully performing the «practice»; It is well known how the components of that list interact to produce «practice»'s output; Operating procedures for the «practice» are available; Useful manuals for the «practice» are available; Existing work manuals and operating procedures describe precisely what people working in the «practice» actually do.