Public Knowledge and Private Gain: The Effect of Spillover Networks on Firms' Innovative Performance

Erna Herlina [1*], Rusman Ali [2], Fuadi [3]

[1] Universitas Pakuan Bogor, Indonesia , [2] Universitas Langlang Buana, Indonesia, [3] Universitas Serang Jaya, Indonesia
[1] eherlina20@gmail.com
*Corresponding Author ***

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

This research cores around presenting the idea of an overflow organization, to be specific an organization of source organizations whose public information is a getting organization that can be ingested and utilized as advancement input. The review was led utilizing patent-put together information with respect to a board of semiconductor organizations somewhere in the range of 1976 and 2002. The outcomes show that the imaginative presentation of the organization will in general be higher when the overflow network is plentiful or wealthy in underlying openings. Notwithstanding, great overflow organizations and opening wealth are primary for the most part counterproductive. It is steady with information that the worth of outer information inputs relies upon the venture level assets that can be pooled. Organizations benefit from overflow networks that rely upon specific variables, specifically intraorganisasi logical force and level of incorporation into (downstream).

INTRODUCTION

Coordinated effort networks between associations are utilized as a way to ingest mechanical information from different organizations (Ahuja, 2000). Collective organizations are helpful on the grounds that they invigorate up close and personal intelligent learning (Lane and Lubatkin, 1998) and shared critical thinking among firms (Hamel, 1991). Accordingly, organizations can catch information. A few past investigations support the attestation that synergistic organizations between associations are a significant wellspring of learning and development (Powell et al., 1996), particularly for firms that are furnished with specific assets for overseeing unsaid information (Rowley, Behrens, and Krackhardt, 2000).

In view of this pool of acknowledged hypothesis and proof, there stays little uncertainty that retaining the implicit information held by corporate cooperation accomplices is a significant type of interorganizational discovering that drives efficient contrasts in firms' imaginative presentation (Ahuja, 2000; Baum, Calabrese, and Silverman, 2000). Notwithstanding the implied information caught through the association's outer overflow organization, it is additionally essential to examine a part of between hierarchical discovering that has been little investigated by past research, specifically how gaining from public innovation information created by different firms influences firm advancement. Yang et al. (2010) dissected an information pool overflow firm's(a pool of remotely created licenses based on a self-zeroed in association's licenses) to show that gaining from the public information on different firms can trigger even self-building up between authoritative learning cycles, which benefit the inventive presentation of firms recipient and source.

This article develops a new line of request trying to clarify how gaining from public innovation information produced by different organizations influences an organization's creative exhibition. Similarly, the proposed overflow network idea lays with the understanding that an association's capacity to gain from licenses created by different firms changes relying upon the degree of related knowledge that the getting firm has created with each source firm (Hoang and Rothaermel, 2005). Be that as it may, the more prominent the level of aggregation of past experience with a specific "source"

organization, the more straightforward it is to comprehend the protected information and use it as a contribution for development. Along these lines, this review is keen on inspecting which attributes of the overflow network influence the inventive exhibition of a firm and presents the idea of an overflow organization and the particular learning instruments associated with catching the overflow from the public information on different firms.

In light of a portion of the clarifications over, the point of this review is to present the idea of overflow organizations and the particular learning instruments associated with catching overflows from the public information on different organizations. Specialists foster theories, examine information and strategies, and present the consequences of the examination. Ends are made by expounding the ramifications of the review and by proposing manners by which the overflow network idea can be applied in future examination.

METHODS

The approach used in this research is a quantitative analytical approach by testing hypotheses in an effort to explain the effect of learning from public technology knowledge generated by other companies on company innovation.

The method used is hypothesis testing on a comprehensive sample of global semiconductor device companies between 1976 and 2002. To accurately capture the spillover network of companies, all US, European, and Asian companies that have patented inventions in the USPTO are used. The research sample was selected by the procedure of

a. Consulting chronicled organization profiles from approved particular market information suppliers (like Integrated Circuit Engineering Companies, Gartner Research, and the Semiconductor Industry Association) to distinguish a rundown of semiconductor organizations dynamic somewhere in the range of 1976 and 2002.

b. Using the Company Affiliate Directory to detect subsidiaries of each company in the initial list. Financial data about the companies and subsidiaries are drawn from COMPUSTAT North America, annual reports, and SEC filings for US companies and from COMPUSTAT Global, Osiris, and the Japanese Companies handbook for non-US companies.

c. Consult professional resources (Hoovers Premium, Who Owns Whom US, UK, and Asia), industry sources (ICE—Intellectual Circuit Engineering Corporation—yearly volume manuals), and past research (Hall and Ziedonis, 2001) to distinguish each organization the date of fuse and to decide if an undertaking ought to be arranged as (a) "unique hardware maker", creating semiconductor gadgets fundamentally to join them into different items; (b) "coordinated gadget producers" (IDM), that is, organizations represent considerable authority in the plan, assembling and commercialization of semiconductors; (c) "tale", that is, organizations practicing only in the plan of semiconductor gadgets; or (d) "other", for example a semiconductor specialist organization.

Gathering patent data on an example of organizations utilizing three autonomous informational indexes, in particular the National Bureau of Economic Research Patent and Patent Citation Data Set, the National University of Singapore Patent Data Set, and the Harvard Business School Patent Network Dataverse. ID of semiconductor-related licenses, utilizing the USPTO subclass list created by Macher (2006) that is, we count the quantity of licenses allowed in any of the enlisted subclasses for every one of the distinguished organizations and auxiliaries, and select organizations that hold something like one patent somewhere in the range of 1976 and 2002. The exploration test was gotten by 214 organizations during the period 1976-2002.

Spillover network modeling

This review utilizes patent information by utilizing reverse reference of licenses (the current rundown of licenses on which center licenses are worked) to follow information input from which information is drawn. Turn around reference of licenses with the more unobtrusive aspiration of longitudinally reproducing the organization's overflow organization. Research dissects total examples

of patent references across organizations to finish up how much experience each organization has collected, to a certain degree on schedule, on advancements created by other semiconductor organizations. In recreating the overflow organization of the organization, at least 3 years of patent history was done to have the option to assess the past experience so this review started to show the overflow organization of the organization in 1978 to 2002.

Dependent variable

In view of standard practice, the imaginative exhibition of the organization works out the quantity of licenses conceded to the organization, weighed by the quantity of forward references got by every one of these licenses in a given time at long term spans. Reference based evaluation is viewed as a solid and remotely approved proportion of imaginative execution and corresponds with the monetary and social worth of a company's advancement and the company's capacity to create new items and science-based developments. To decrease keeping predisposition, we determined the quantity of forward references got by each patent organization inside a long time from the date of the patent application. Thus, for instance, the organization's inventive exhibition in 1996 ascertains the quantity of fruitful patent applications recorded by the organization in 1996, weighed by the quantity of forward references got by the patent until 2001.

The independent variable

Overflow network kindness intends to catch how enormous the organization's overflow network is. In this manner working out the quantity of protected developments that each "source" firm delivered during t, weighted by the degree of involvement the earlier "beneficiary" firm had aggregated t with each source. This shows the capacity of the "getting" firm to catch overflow from the source. Adjusting the notable model "network autocorrelation", this variable is determined as follows:

$$Spillover\ Network\ Munificence_{it} = \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq j}} w_{ijt} \times Patent\ Count_{jt},$$

Patent jt is a vector demonstrating the quantity of effective patent applications documented by each organization "source" ij and wijt is a weight mirroring the gathered experience I of j a long time before t, as recently depicted.

Control

Variables A series of controlled variables are related to comprehensive factors that can affect the company's innovative performance. Control variables include: general index to control technology development, firm size, and R&D intensity.

Data were analyzed by linear regression model. The research hypothesis is /:

Hypothesis 1: The more the organization's mechanical overflow organization, the higher the organization's creative exhibition.

Hypothesis 2: The more a firm is presented to overflow networks wealthy in underlying openings, the higher its imaginative presentation.

Hypothesis 3: The development advantages of an expansive and overflow network are opening rich not exactly added substance; consequently, the more extensive the overflow organization, the less primary openings that improve the organization's creative exhibition.

Hypothesis 4a: The more prominent the logical force of an organization, the more it is situated in a mechanically useful overflow network that upgrades the organization's creative presentation.

Hypothesis 4b: The more prominent the logical power of an organization, the more presented it is to an overflow network that opening rich improves the organization's creative exhibition.

Hypothesis 5a: The more an organization is incorporated downstream, the more it is situated in a huge overflow organization will diminish the organization's creative presentation.

Hypothesis 5b: The more a firm coordinates downstream, the more it is presented to an overflow network that opening rich improves the association's inventive exhibition.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The unit of investigation of this examination is the organization time frame, and the information has a lopsided board structure. The reliant variable just takes non negative qualities. The straight relapse model isn't sufficient on the grounds that the remaining dissemination will be heteroscedastic and not ordinary. Moreover, the proportion test shows that the information are altogether fanned out, abusing the supposition that the mean of the restrictive results is equivalent to the contingent change. Hence, the negative binomial board determination is desirable over the Poisson model.

Table 1. The results of the negative binomial fixed effect panel predicting innovative performance

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6	Model 7	Model 8	Model 9	Model 10	Model 11
Spillover network munificence		0.049* (0.023)	0.127** (0.025)	0.066* (0.030)	0.070* (0.032)	0.093** (0.032)	0.154** (0.040)	0.136** (0.042)	0.113** (0.044)	0.126** (0.043)	0.087 (0.050)
Structural holes			0.404** (0.034)	0.449** (0.037)	0.450** (0.037)	0.442** (0.036)	0.437** (0.036)	0.345** (0.051)	0.344** (0.054)	0.353** (0.054)	0.267** (0.059)
Spillover network munificence × structural holes				−0.055** (0.014)	−0.055** (0.014)	−0.044** (0.015)	−0.034* (0.015)	−0.033* (0.016)	−0.046** (0.017)	−0.042* (0.017)	−0.066** (0.020)
Spillover network munificence × scientific intensity					0.013 (0.035)	0.056 (0.040)	0.05 (0.040)	0.054 (0.040)	0.049 (0.042)	0.050 (0.042)	0.040 (0.042)
Structural holes × scientific intensity						0.127** (0.034)	0.126** (0.034)	0.119** (0.034)	0.120** (0.037)	0.128** (0.037)	0.081* (0.035)
Spillover network munificence × downstream integration							−0.083* (0.034)	−0.09* (0.036)	−0.075* (0.037)	−0.085* (0.037)	−0.027 (0.041)
Structural holes × downstream integration								0.154* (0.063)	0.130 (0.067)	0.124 (0.068)	0.261** (0.075)
Collaboration structural holes									0.073** (0.022)		
Collaboration ties										0.019 (0.025)	
Internal patent law expertise											0.012 (0.013)
Scientific intensity	0.029 (0.023)	0.031 (0.023)	0.039 (0.023)	0.039 (0.023)	0.035 (0.026)	0.105** (0.031)	0.103** (0.031)	0.101** (0.031)	0.099** (0.037)	0.106** (0.037)	0.107** (0.032)
Downstream integration	−0.009 (0.084)	0.013 (0.085)	−0.007 (0.084)	0.000 (0.084)	−0.002 (0.085)	−0.001 (0.085)	0.062 (0.089)	0.135 (0.094)	0.159 (0.104)	0.171 (0.104)	0.270* (0.107)
Knowledge base size	0.125** (0.009)	0.125** (0.010)	0.107** (0.009)	0.116** (0.009)	0.116** (0.009)	0.117** (0.009)	0.118** (0.009)	0.117** (0.009)	0.110** (0.010)	0.113** (0.010)	0.115** (0.010)
Technology generality	−0.054 (0.029)	−0.038 (0.029)	0.014 (0.030)	0.025 (0.030)	0.025 (0.030)	0.024 (0.030)	0.020 (0.030)	0.019 (0.030)	−0.001 (0.035)	0.007 (0.035)	−0.034 (0.038)

(continued)

In Table 1, it is gotten that model 1 is the fundamental model which just incorporates control factors. The consequences of the examination of model 1 show that the age of the organization, the size of the information base, the variety of innovation, and the self-reference proportion have a huge constructive outcome on the organization's imaginative exhibition. In Model 2, we present the main illustrative variable, the overflow network consideration, which true to form has a positive and critical impact. Confirming Hypothesis 1, the organization's imaginative presentation increments because of the overflow network innovation efficiency (b = .049, p < .05). Model 3 presents a primary opening variable with the outcome that a firm whose overflow network is wealthy in underlying pits expands the association's creative exhibition (b = 0.404, p < .001). Model 4 presents the term communication between primary pits and overflow network generosity. The development upgrading impact of underlying openings was diminished at more elevated levels of organization liberality with a huge yield (b = − .055, p < .01). In light of the appraisals given by Model 4, for firms with a mean score of both the overflow organization and the underlying pit, an increment of one standard deviation in the primary pit increments 53.3% in the association's inventive exhibition. Anyway for firms with a huge overflow organization (that is, one standard deviation over the mean), an expansion of one standard deviation in the primary opening decreases development by 5.3%.

Models 5 and Model 6 investigate how logical force directs the impact of liberal organization plenitude and primary openings on creative execution. Supporting Hypothesis 4b, the association between underlying pits and logical power is positive and genuinely critical (b = 0.127, p < .001), demonstrating that science-based firms are better at explaining the blend of different advancement directions that portray the overflow network generosity. Speculation 4a predicts that organizations with a solid information base will be better prepared to take advantage of the learning potential innate in metropolitan overflow organizations. Albeit the indication of the coefficient of collaboration was positive true to form (b = 0.056), the coefficient was not genuinely critical at 5%. Speculations 5a and 5b foresee that downstream coordination lessens the constructive outcome of the overflow network kindheartedness and will expand the constructive outcome of primary openings. These outcomes support the hypothetical assumption that the collaboration term between downstream joining and overflow network kindheartedness is positive, but feebly critical (b = - .059, p < .10), and the connection between downstream mix and primary openings is positive and huge. The chi-square test showed that each model, with the exception of Model 5, showed a measurably critical improvement in fit vis- - vis each past model.

Table 5. Roustness Checks

	Panel Negative Binomial (Fixed Effects)	Panel Negative Binomial (Random Effects With Presample Dependent Variable)	Panel Negative Binomial (Fixed Effects, Logged Size Dependent Predictors)	Fixed Effects OLS Panel Regression	Fixed Effects AR(1) Panel Poisson (Logged Size Dependent Predictors)	Fixed Effects Quasi Maximum Likelihood Panel Poisson (Logged Size Dependent Predictors)
H1	+**	+**	+**	+*	+**	+*
H2	+**	+**	+**	+**	+**	+*
H3	−*	−†	−**	−	−**	−**
H4a	+	+	+†	+†	+*	−
H4b	+**	+**	+*	+*	−**	+
H5a	−†	−*	+	−	+	+
H5b	+*	+*	+**	+	+**	+†

†p < .10. *p < .05. **p < .01.

Table 2 sums up the outcomes identified with the theory. The table shows that the initial three theories remain emphatically upheld under every single model detail. In the balance speculation, all models seem to help the possibility that downstream incorporation and logical force decidedly influence an association's capacity to profit from overflow networks opening rich. Regarding what authoritative elements mean for a company's capacity to profit from the liberality of the organization, the outcomes are in accordance with the scientists' assumptions however are less predictable.

Discussion

In light of the aftereffects of the review, it very well may be presumed that distinctions in the nature and design of the organization's overflow network bring about efficient and enormous contrasts in the organization's inventive presentation. These outcomes hold in the wake of controlling for the qualities of the company's outer cooperation organization. The overflow network essentially works on the inventive presentation of the organization. The outcomes likewise show that creative presentation is higher for firms whose overflow networks are wealthy in primary openings. Also, the advantages of an opening rich and kind overflow network offset the added substance benefits, so an overflow network situated in a considerate and overflow network opening rich is for the most part counterproductive.

It very well may be inferred that the principle recognizing element of an information based economy is that separated from unsaid information being consumed through between firm coordinated effort, most between hierarchical learning happens through the retention of classified and freely accessible information. The organization's capacity to receive the rewards intrinsic in overflow networks relies upon certain intra authoritative variables that influence the organization's capacity to oversee information addressed in dynamic and summed up structures, for example, in licenses.

The consequences of this review are in accordance with the exploration directed by Caldas et al. (2020) where the aftereffects of the review uncover that the commitment of information overflow is more applicable for SMEs to defeat the absence of inside assets for R&D, even within the sight of a critical and positive joint effort impact with accomplices. By zeroing in the investigation on the impacts of externalities, the outcomes additionally show that outside information assumes a significant part in supplementing firms' creative endeavors, in any event, for those with lower levels of coordinated effort with accomplices and interest in R&D.

*"Where the similarities between the two journals above is regarding the **influence of spillover networks on corporate innovation.**"*

This outcome diverges from the examination directed by Audretsch et al. (2021) by uncovering that the accessibility of plentiful information obliterates the motivating forces for huge firms to put resources into information. Information overflow just works with the exchange of information to firms that don't have inner information and depend on advancement inputs. The effectiveness of data acquired by going to gatherings, through formal and casual organizations and affiliations, and getting to open distributions and licenses makes it conceivable to build the absence of interest in interior information by new companies and get a different wellspring of groundbreaking plans to be created.

CONCLUSIONS

Pros contained in this journal are 1) used various control variables that influence the influence of the spillover network on the company's innovative performance, 2) explained the implications for companies in increasing the level of downstream integration in implementing spillover network performance, 3) Explain the implications in managerial practices that companies do in gaining sustainable innovation advantages by learning from the public knowledge of other companies. Disadvantages in the journal are 1) using patent citations to represent experiences gathered by "receiving" companies vis--vis "source" companies and to calculate innovative performance measures but the collected data suffers from endogeneity issues, 2) research looks at only one specific aspect from the company's innovative performance, namely the ability to generate valuable new technological knowledge, but not the ability to convert technological knowledge into commercial value processes or products, and 3) Explanation of results in abstract away from the knowledge content captured by the company through the spillover network.

REFERENCES

Ahuja, G. 2000. Collaboration networks, structural holes, and innovation: A longitudinal study. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 45: 425-455.

Audretsch, D.B., Belitski, M., Caiazza, R. 2021. Start-ups, Innovation and Knowledge Spillovers. *The Journal of Technology Transfer.*

Baum, J. A. C., Calabrese, T., & Silverman, B. S. 2000. Don't go alone: Alliance network composition and startups' performance in Canadian biotechnology. *Strategic Management Journal*, 21: 267-294.

Caldas., L.F.D.P., Paula, F.F.O., dan Silva, J.F.D. 2021. The Effects Of Knowledge Spillovers And Alliance Portfolio Diversity On Product Innovation And Firm Growth. *International Journal of Innovation Management*. (2021):2150051.

Hamel, G. 1991. Competition for competence and inter-partner learning within international strategic alliances. *Strategic Management Journal*, 12: 83-103.

Hoang, H., & Rothaermel, F. 2005. The effect of general and partner-specific alliance experience on joint R&D project performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48: 332-345.

Lane, P. J., & Lubatkin, M. 1998. Relative absorptive capacity and interorganizational learning. *Strategic Management Journal*, 19: 461-477.

Operti, E. dan Carnabuci, G. 2014. Public Knowledge, Private Gain: The Effect Of Spillover Networks On Firms' Innovative Performance. *Journal of Management.* 40(4): 1042-1074.

Powell, W. W., Koput, K., & Smith-Doerr, L. 1996. Interorganizational learning and the locus of innovation: Networks of learning in biotechnology. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41: 116-145.

Rowley, T., Behrens, D., & Krackhardt, D. 2000. Redundant governance structures: An analysis of structural and relational embeddedness in the steel and semiconductor industries. *Strategic Management Journal*, 21: 369-386.

Yang, H., Phelps, C., & Steensma, H. K. 2010. Learning from what others have learned from you: The effects of knowledge spillovers on originating firms. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53: 371-389.