



# Politecnico di Bari

Repository Istituzionale dei Prodotti della Ricerca del Politecnico di Bari

Investigating the antecedents of general purpose technologies: A patent perspective in the green energy field

This is a pre-print of the following article

*Original Citation:*

Investigating the antecedents of general purpose technologies: A patent perspective in the green energy field / Ardito, Lorenzo; MESSENI PETRUZZELLI, Antonio; Albino, Vito. - In: JOURNAL OF ENGINEERING AND TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT. - ISSN 0923-4748. - 39:(2016), pp. 81-100. [10.1016/j.jengtecman.2016.02.002]

*Availability:*

This version is available at <http://hdl.handle.net/11589/75816> since: 2022-06-22

*Published version*

DOI:10.1016/j.jengtecman.2016.02.002

Publisher:

*Terms of use:*

(Article begins on next page)

A revised version of this manuscript has been accepted for publication in Journal of Engineering and Technology Management. It can be cited as follows: Ardito, L., Messeni Petruzzelli, A., Albino V. (2016). Investigating the antecedents of general purpose technologies: A patent perspective in the green energy field. Journal of Engineering and Technology Management, 39, 81-100.

Link: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0923474816300042?via%3Dihub>

## **Investigating the antecedents of general purpose technologies: A patent perspective in the green energy field**

### **Abstract**

This research analyzes the emergence of general purpose technologies. Specifically, we examine the relationship between how broadly organizations search across diverse knowledge domains in the invention process (i.e., their search breadth) and the technological generality of resulting inventive outcomes. Based on a sample of 88,748 patents belonging to the "Alternative energy production" and "Energy conservation" classes, we reveal that search breadth is curvilinearly related to an invention's technological generality. Furthermore, we assess if a geographically dispersed inventive team moderates the costs and benefits of searching broadly, showing that it makes organizations more able to benefit from a wider search breadth.

**Keywords:** general purpose technologies; search breadth; geographically dispersed teams; green energy technologies

### **1. Introduction**

General purpose technologies (GPTs) refer to technologies “the exploitation of which will yield benefits for a wide range of sectors of the economy and/or society” (Keenan, 2003:132), such as the steam engine, nanotechnology, and the ICT (Banerjee and Cole, 2010; Bresnahan and Trajtenberg, 1995; Shea, 2005). This characteristic is ascribed to their high level of technological generality, which indeed favors their use and spread in a broad range of industries and market applications (Bresnahan and Trajtenberg, 1995; Gambardella and Giarratana, 2013; Keenan, 2003; Thoma, 2009). GPTs have gained more and more attention across both academics and practitioners in the last years. Nevertheless, as stated by Thoma (2009:108), “our understanding of GPTs is still

1  
2  
3  
4 somewhat limited”, hence requiring more in-depth studies on how they work and emerge.  
5  
6 Particularly, this article attempts to shed more light on the emergence of GPTs.  
7

8  
9 Previous research has argued that the ability to develop more generic technologies is associated  
10 to the use of diverse technological fields in the inventing activities (eg., Argyres and Silverman,  
11 2004; Hicks and Hegde, 2005), which in turn increases the probability to make the resulting  
12  
13 inventions applicable in diverse industrial contexts (Banerjee and Cole, 2010). This drives us to the  
14  
15 research question of the present study, as what are the effects of a firm’s strategy to search for  
16  
17 knowledge across a broad range of technological domains on the creation of a GPT? Indeed, among  
18  
19 other types of search strategy, such as search depth and search scope (eg., Katila and Ahuja, 2002),  
20  
21 organizations can vary the diversity of knowledge to solve a specific technical problem, by deciding  
22  
23 to expand the breadth of their search across diverse knowledge areas. We refer to this search  
24  
25 strategy as search breadth (see also Capaldo and Messeni Petruzzelli, 2011), where the more  
26  
27 different the knowledge areas searched across, the broader the breadth of search (Subramanian and  
28  
29 Soh, 2010).  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 We argue that organizations can gain from search broadly in creating generic technologies  
37  
38 and extend this logic by suggesting also that these benefits are subjected to decreasing and negative  
39  
40 returns. Specifically, we draw on theories that support the assumption that searching in diverse  
41  
42 technological domains improves recombination possibilities and avoids cognitive myopia (Fleming,  
43  
44 2001; Levinthal and March, 1993; Maggitti et al., 2013), which may lead to the creation of  
45  
46 technologies that more easily span industry realms. However, when the number of knowledge fields  
47  
48 searched across rises beyond a certain threshold, cognitive and managerial constraints related to the  
49  
50 ability to link them together arise (Capaldo and Messeni Petruzzelli, 2011), hence suggesting an  
51  
52 inverted U-shaped relationship between search breadth and technological generality. Furthermore,  
53  
54 since people actually lie at the core of the recombinant process characterizing organizations’  
55  
56 inventing activities (Fleming, 2001), we also claim that this curvilinear relationship is moderated by  
57  
58 the degree of geographic dispersion of the inventive team, since it may alter the threshold level of  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 search breadth at which decreasing and negative returns set in. Indeed, the past literature has argued  
5  
6 that organizations' learning and recombination opportunities can be influenced by pursuing a R&D  
7  
8 internationalization strategy, as reflected by the use of geographically dispersed teams (e.g.,  
9  
10 Gajendran and Joshi, 2012; Gassmann and von Zedtwitz, 2003; O'Leary and Mortensen, 2010;  
11  
12 Susman et al., 2003). This, in turn, depends on the possibility to tap into unique bodies of  
13  
14 knowledge that reside in specific geographic locations, and acquire new relational capital and  
15  
16 problem-solving techniques (e.g., Doz and Wilson, 2013; Gajendran and Joshi, 2012; Kratzer et al.,  
17  
18 2006; Singh, 2008).  
19  
20  
21

22 The green energy sector is chosen as the research setting for the study. Indeed, related  
23  
24 inventions often arise from the recombination of multiple technological areas (OECD, 2012), and  
25  
26 their underlying knowledge is geographically dispersed (Albino et al., 2014), hence making search  
27  
28 breadth and team dispersion relevant factors to be taken into account. This choice, more  
29  
30 particularly, also follows the need to comprehend how to develop green GPTs, which has become  
31  
32 more and more as an urgent issue (Cecere et al., 2014; Pearson and Foxon, 2012). Accordingly, to  
33  
34 test our predictions, we collected 88,748 patents successfully filed at the U.S.PTO. from 1971 to  
35  
36 2009 and belonging to the "Alternative energy production" and "Energy conservation" green  
37  
38 technological classes, as identified by the International Patent Classification (IPC) Green Inventory.  
39  
40  
41

42 The key contribution of this paper consists in empirically testing the impact of an  
43  
44 organization's search breadth in the invention process on the level of an invention's technological  
45  
46 generality, and how the internationalization of the inventive team alters the benefits of a wide  
47  
48 breadth of search. In addition, we focus our attention on a novel research setting, as represented by  
49  
50 the green energy sector, hence allowing us to shed more light on the factors favoring the  
51  
52 development of green GPTs in that industry.  
53  
54  
55

56 The reminder of the paper is structured as follows. First, we provide the theoretical framework  
57  
58 and present the hypotheses. Then, we describe the sample and the research methodology.  
59  
60  
61

1  
2  
3  
4 Afterwards, we expose data analysis and results. Finally, we provide discussion and implications, as  
5  
6 well as limitations and directions for future research.  
7  
8  
9

## 10 **2. Theoretical framework and hypotheses**

### 11 **2.1. General purpose technologies**

12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17 The idea that a technical solution can be applied across multiple domains dates back to Smith  
18 (1776) in *The Wealth of Nations* and was further re-examined by Stigler (1951), who referred to it  
19 as “general specialities”. More recently, instead, the literature has focused on the concept of GPTs,  
20 which has captured the attention of many scholars and executives in the last two decades (e.g.,  
21 Bresnahan and Trajtenberg, 1995; Gambardella and Giarratana, 2013; Keenan, 2003). With the term  
22 GPTs, they mainly refer to technologies characterized by diverse technological fields, forming a  
23 knowledge base “with high levels of innovative complementarities and an ever-expanding set of  
24 new applications in a wide variety of industrial contexts” (Arikan, 2009:666). Indeed, a GPT is a  
25 pervasive technology that allows economic agents to combine existing technical solutions of  
26 different sectors with it, or build new innovative activities upon the same GPT, hence acting as a  
27 platform for subsequent complementary technological developments (Bresnahan and Trajtenberg,  
28 1995; Gambardella and McGahan, 2010). In turn, this complementary effect enhances the impact of  
29 the GPT and helps it to drive the overall technical progress and promote economic growth  
30 (Bresnahan and Trajtenberg, 1995; Helpman and Trajtenberg, 1998). Thereby, inventions can differ  
31 along a particular attribute, namely technological generality (Gambardella and Giarratana, 2013),  
32 which influences their breadth of impact (Argyres and Silverman, 2004; Banerjee and Cole, 2010),  
33 facilitating the recombination of an invention with technologically distant components and its  
34 consequent diffusion.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57

58 Recognizing the presumed role of GPTs as “engines of growth”, past studies have been long  
59 interested in the benefits and impacts of these technological solutions, thus revealing their important  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 role in creating value at both the microeconomic and macroeconomic level (Bresnahan and  
5  
6 Trajtenberg, 1995; Helpman and Trajtenberg, 1998; Rosenberg and Trajtenberg, 2004; Shane, 2004).  
7  
8 However, the commercialization and diffusion of GPTs are not straightforward, being principally  
9  
10 limited by the high adaptation efforts required to apply them in diverse industries (Gambardella and  
11  
12 Giarratana, 2013). Thereby, in the recent past, the literature has delved into the invention  
13  
14 commercialization strategies that should be adopted to make GPTs available and diffused on the  
15  
16 market (Gambardella and Giarratana, 2013; Gambardella and McGahan, 2010; Maine and Garnsey,  
17  
18 2006; Majumdar et al., 2010; Rainer and Strohmaier, 2014; Thoma, 2009). Nevertheless, only few  
19  
20 insights about the antecedents of GPTs have been offered (Thoma, 2009). Argyres and Silverman  
21  
22 (2004) first dug into this topic, proving that organizations with a centralized R&D structure, rather  
23  
24 than a R&D lab for each product division, create inventions that span industry realms. This is  
25  
26 explained by arguing that these organizations are more likely to merge different knowledge areas  
27  
28 into a single technology, since they manage diverse types of knowledge simultaneously (see also  
29  
30 Banerjee and Cole, 2010). Further, looking at the types of organization embroiled in inventive  
31  
32 activities, Hicks and Hegde (2005) suggested that serial technology suppliers are more able to  
33  
34 create GPTs. Accordingly, since their aim is to sell their inventions to as many organizations as  
35  
36 possible, these companies tend to create technical solutions whose knowledge base is highly  
37  
38 diversified, so as to allow to a number of different downstream specialized companies, both in the  
39  
40 same and other sectors, to understand the inventions' underlying knowledge and build on them. In  
41  
42 line with this reasoning, it emerges that developing technologies embodying a diversified variety of  
43  
44 knowledge may contribute to the emergence of GPTs. In other words, it increases inventions'  
45  
46 technological generality.  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

53  
54 Moreover, an invention can be considered as the result of “a process of recombinant search  
55  
56 over technology landscapes” (Fleming and Sorenson, 2001:1019). Therefore, the diversity of  
57  
58 knowledge that is searched in the inventive activities to solve a technical problem plays a key role  
59  
60 in developing general technologies. In fact, it affects the variety of technological fields that will  
61  
62

1  
2  
3  
4 characterize the subsequent invention (Ejeremo and Karlsson, 2006; Maggitti et al., 2013), hence  
5  
6 influencing the probability that a technology further spans industry boundaries and market  
7  
8 applications. Building on this argument, we more specifically analyze the costs and benefits of an  
9  
10 organization's strategy to search broadly in the invention process for the development of  
11  
12 technologically general inventive outcomes. Furthermore, we also investigate how these costs and  
13  
14 benefits may change when organizations pursue a R&D internationalization strategy, as reflected by  
15  
16 the decision to form a geographically dispersed inventive team. Indeed, relevant knowledge inputs  
17  
18 that are required to innovate in many sectors are often dispersed among diverse geographical areas  
19  
20 (Doz and Wilson, 2013; Singh, 2008). Thereby, distributed teams can favor the access and  
21  
22 acquisition of this unique body of knowledge, hence increasing the variety of the exploitable  
23  
24 knowledge (Chen et al., 2012; Hoegl et al., 2007). In addition, they are deemed to have better  
25  
26 combination capabilities and act more creatively than co-located teams, since they also tap into  
27  
28 foreign sources of know-how and relational capital (Gajendran and Joshi, 2012; Kratzer et al., 2006;  
29  
30 O'Leary and Mortensen, 2010).

## 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 **2.2. Search breadth**

39  
40 It has been suggested that the more diverse the technological domains upon which an invention  
41  
42 is based, the higher its level of technological generality and subsequent breadth of impact (Argyres  
43  
44 and Silverman, 2004; Banerjee and Cole, 2010). Thus, it is reasonable to assume a positive effect of  
45  
46 a wide search breadth on the emergence of GPTs. Indeed, enriching the diversity of knowledge  
47  
48 domains in the search process increases the number of technological pieces that will characterize an  
49  
50 invention, as well as the potential linkages and associations between the diverse technological areas  
51  
52 (Capaldo and Messeni Petruzzelli, 2011; Fleming, 2001; Kauffman, 1993; Maggitti et al., 2013;  
53  
54 Maine et al., 2014). In addition, a broad search breadth provides stimuli for cross-fertilization of  
55  
56 different knowledge fields, perspectives, and ideas (Björkdahl, 2009; Hargadon and Sutton, 1997),  
57  
58 hence favoring the use of different knowledge pieces simultaneously and their integration into a  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 comprehensive whole. In turn, this can raise the likelihood that future technological developments,  
5  
6 independently from their specific industrial context, can be built on inventions arising from search  
7  
8 efforts spanning multiple technological boundaries. Furthermore, a wide breadth of search also  
9  
10 leads to the development of new problem-solving techniques (Ahuja and Lampert, 2001) and avoid  
11  
12 cognitive myopia toward different types of commercial application (Levinthal and March, 1993;  
13  
14 Novelli, Forthcoming; Rosenkopf and Nerkar, 2001). Thereby, this contributes to reduce the risks to  
15  
16 focus on a single market, hence increasing the probability to pursue diversified objectives at the  
17  
18 same time, as well as to recognize a wider variety of potential commercial opportunities that may  
19  
20 unfold as the different knowledge areas are searched and combined. Finally, inventions resulting  
21  
22 from search efforts directed toward multiple diverse technological fields can have more chances to  
23  
24 be understood by organizations operating in different industries, hence making these technologies  
25  
26 as more widely used in many sectors (Banerjee and Cole, 2010).  
27  
28  
29  
30

31           Although the benefits of enlarging the breadth of search across several technological  
32  
33 domains for the development of GPTs can be considerable, there is a point where this search effort  
34  
35 is subjected to diminishing or even negative returns. Searching across a wide range of knowledge  
36  
37 domains extensively can in fact limit the creation of more generic solutions. At some point,  
38  
39 organizations' cognitive capabilities required to find and create useful knowledge combinations  
40  
41 drastically drop, due to the increasing probability to work with unfamiliar knowledge domains and  
42  
43 the lack of the required absorptive capacity (Cohen and Levinthal, 1990; Laursen and Salter, 2006).  
44  
45 Hence, also the organizations' ability to recognize the technological and market potential of the  
46  
47 diverse knowledge diminishes (Lin and Chang, Forthcoming). This may thus reduce the likelihood  
48  
49 to come up with a discovery of more generalizable impacts. In addition, as search breadth becomes  
50  
51 wider, the probability to conceive too many ideas respect to organizations' ability to select and  
52  
53 implement them grows (Capaldo and Messeni Petruzzelli, 2011; Koput, 1997). Thereby, they might  
54  
55 then focus on a restricted set of more familiar knowledge pieces in order to limit the number and  
56  
57 complexity of the potential knowledge combinations (Fleming, 2001), hence reducing the diversity  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 of the knowledge base characterizing inventive outcomes. Furthermore, organizations tend to  
5  
6 conduct their search processes in a path-dependent way, which are often characterized by a well-  
7  
8 established modus operandi (Nelson and Winter, 1982; Peteraf, 1993). However, since expanding  
9  
10 the search breadth needs the creation of new routines with the aim to integrate multiple knowledge  
11  
12 areas, they often face managerial constraints in performing such a task, hence limiting the effective  
13  
14 use and integration of a diversified knowledge stock (Capaldo and Messeni Petruzzelli, 2011;  
15  
16 Nelson and Winter, 1982). Finally, searching broadly comes with uncertainties regarding the future  
17  
18 value of the inventions (Messeni Petruzzelli et al., Forthcoming; Taylor and Greve, 2006). Thus,  
19  
20 economic agents' capacity to assess their worthiness, which is a central prerequisite to make a  
21  
22 technology exploited and applied across several economic sectors (Banerjee and Cole, 2010; Nelson  
23  
24 and Winter, 1977), is hampered. Therefore, on the basis of the above reasoning, we posit the  
25  
26 following hypothesis:  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33  
34 *Hypothesis 1. An organization's search breadth has a curvilinear (inverted U) effect on the level of*  
35  
36 *technological generality of the resulting invention.*  
37  
38  
39

### 40 **2.3. Team geographic dispersion and search breadth**

41  
42 We argue that organizations relying upon a geographically dispersed team of inventors have a  
43  
44 better chance of benefiting from a wider search breadth. First, the diverse knowledge inputs and  
45  
46 resource endowments that an organization can search across often reside and develop in different  
47  
48 regional clusters, such as Silicon Valley for microelectronics and Detroit for automotive equipment  
49  
50 (Doz and Wilson, 2013; Myles et al., 2000). Thereby, establishing dispersed teams lets  
51  
52 organizations get closer to these different locations in order to actually understand and acquire the  
53  
54 various specific bodies of knowledge (Gassmann and von Zedtwitz, 2003; Hsu et al., Forthcoming;  
55  
56 Singh, 2008; Penner-Hahn and Shaver, 2005). In fact, these different knowledge is usually not  
57  
58 easily transferable across geographic regions unless organizational R&D members “participate in  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 locale-specific practices” (Sole and Edmondson, 2002:S17; see also Singh, 2008). Accordingly,  
5  
6 dispersed teams may increase the organizations’ absorptive capacity and reduce the extent of coping  
7  
8 with unfamiliar knowledge when they search broadly. This may also alleviate the problems related  
9  
10 to the recognition of the technological and market potential of the diverse knowledge searched  
11  
12 across, hence favoring its integration and use for multiple commercial opportunities. Second, the  
13  
14 internationalization of the inventive team can also help organizations to identify and implement  
15  
16 potential relevant ideas, without reducing the diversity of the knowledge domains recombined to  
17  
18 develop a given invention. Indeed, members at different sites, besides having a better chance to  
19  
20 understand a particular piece of knowledge, acquire new problem-solving approaches and relational  
21  
22 capital, which allow them to generate more higher quality solutions to address a technical problem  
23  
24 (Edmondson and Nembhard, 2009; Gajendran and Joshi, 2012). In turn, this also helps them to  
25  
26 perform more creatively, and so come up with more ideas for knowledge combination (Gajendran  
27  
28 and Joshi, 2012; Polzer et al., 2006). Thereby, the cognitive limitations related to the integration of  
29  
30 different technological domains can be mitigated. Third, in an internationalized context, interactions  
31  
32 between team members are more spontaneous and characterized by variance in relational patterns  
33  
34 (Hinds and Mortensen, 2005), which let organizations using dispersed teams develop “R&D  
35  
36 capabilities through improvisational learning” (Parida et al., 2013:46). Thus, they are less subject to  
37  
38 the managerial and coordination difficulties that arise from the need to create ad-hoc routines for  
39  
40 favoring the exchange and integration of the various knowledge pieces in the invention process.  
41  
42 According to the foregoing discussion, we hypothesize:  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

52 *Hypothesis 2. Team internationalization moderates the relationship between search breadth and the*  
53 *level of technological generality of an invention, such that the threshold level of search breadth at*  
54 *which diminishing or negative returns arise will be higher for those organizations that use a*  
55 *geographically dispersed team.*  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61

1  
2  
3  
4 **3. Data and methods**  
5  
6  
7

8 **3.1. Industry setting**  
9

10 The green energy sector serves as the research setting for the study. We believe this is an  
11 appropriate setting because, first, the need to favor the shift toward more efficient low-carbon  
12 energy systems in many sectors of the society, while promoting economic growth, is more and more  
13 recognized as a an urgent issue. Hence, the relevance of green GPTs in the energy field, such as the  
14 case of insulation technologies (Sorrell, 2007), have drastically risen (Cecere et al., 2014; Pearson  
15 and Foxon, 2012). Second, technological developments in the green energy sector include solutions  
16 having origins in diverse industries (OECD, 2012). Therefore, the extent of different technologies  
17 that can be potentially recombined within the invention process is various, thus making the search  
18 effort toward diverse knowledge domains as an important factor to be considered. Third, the  
19 technical knowledge underlying the development of green energy technologies is dispersed among  
20 many countries (Albino et al., 2014). Thereby, employing a R&D internationalization strategy is  
21 seen as an effective way to tap into new knowledge and skills to develop green technical solutions  
22 (Wagner, 2007). Finally, intellectual property protection is of foremost importance in the green  
23 energy sector (OECD, 2012). Thereby, patents serve as appropriate proxies to capture the  
24 technological inventions developed in this field.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

45  
46  
47 **3.2. Sample and data**  
48

49 Following previous studies (e.g., Albino et al., 2014; Kemp and Pearson, 2008; Popp, 2006),  
50 we use patent data in order to identify inventions developed in the green energy sector. In particular,  
51 we refer to the IPC Green Inventory for patent collection (Albino et al., 2014; Shapira et al., 2014).  
52 It is a well-defined classification that was developed by an IPC Committee of experts working for  
53 the World Intellectual Property Organization in 2008. Specifically, the IPC Green Inventory allows  
54 to search for patents related to the so called Environmentally Sound Technologies (ESTs), as  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 defined in the Chapter 34 of the Agenda 21 (UN, 1992), by suggesting specific IPC codes for patent  
5  
6 retrieval. Specifically, seven green technological classes were taken into account, in turn divided  
7  
8 into a hierarchical set of subclasses<sup>1</sup>. For the purpose of this study, we limit our attention to the  
9  
10 “Alternative Energy Production” and “Energy Conservation” classes. Hence, we collected all the  
11  
12 patents successfully filed at the U.S.PTO. from 1971 to 2009 that refer to the two green  
13  
14 technological classes above mentioned. For each patent we then gathered bibliographic information  
15  
16 (i.e., backward, forward, and scientific-based citations, as well as information about the inventing  
17  
18 team and assignees). Being primarily interested in the search efforts undertaken by a given  
19  
20 organization, we limit our sample to those patents registered by just one assignee, leaving out  
21  
22 patents owned by individuals working autonomously, as well as those granted to more than one  
23  
24 organization in order to avoid network-specific effects. This procedure yielded a final sample of  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29 88,748 patents.  
30  
31  
32

### 33 **3.3. Measures**

#### 34 **3.3.1. Dependent variable**

35  
36  
37  
38 *Technological generality.* Following previous studies (e.g., Argyres and Silverman, 2004; Banerjee  
39  
40 and Cole, 2010; Gambardella and Giarratana, 2013; Hicks and Hegde, 2005), in order to  
41  
42 operationalize technological generality we refer to the generality index proposed by Hall et al.  
43  
44 (2001). In particular, this refers to a Herfindhal-type index that measures the diversity of the  
45  
46 technological classes assigned to patents that cite a focal one. The rationale behind this index is that  
47  
48 the higher the variety of technological classes of the citing patents, the higher the focal patent’s  
49  
50 technological generality. On the contrary, if citing patents are concentrated in few technological  
51  
52 fields, the focal patent’s technological generality is low. However, this measure has been revealed  
53  
54 to be biased downward when the number of forward citations is rather small (Hall, 2005; Hall et al.,  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

---

61 <sup>1</sup> See <http://www.wipo.int/classifications/ipc/en/est/>  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 2001). Hence, we correct this measure according to Hall (2005), who suggested to multiply the  
5  
6 generality index by the ratio of the number of forward citations received by a focal patent ( $F_P$ ) over  
7  
8  $F_P$  minus one. Therefore, our measure of technological generality is computed as follows:  
9

$$10 \quad \text{Technological generality} = \frac{F_P}{F_P - 1} [1 - \sum (\frac{F_{iP}}{F_P})^2],$$

11  
12  
13 where  $F_{iP}$  stands for the number of citations received by the focal patent P in the three digit U.S.  
14  
15 class i.  
16  
17

### 18 19 20 **3.3.2. Independent and moderating variables**

21  
22 *Search breadth.* To compute this variable we follow the measure of originality, as defined by Hall  
23  
24 et al. (2001) (see also Capaldo and Messeni Petruzzelli, 2011; Messeni Petruzzelli et al.,  
25  
26 Forthcoming). It is based on the same rationale of the generality measure, except for the fact that it  
27  
28 refers to a focal patents' backward citations. Thus, the more diverse the extent of technological  
29  
30 classes assigned to the patents cited by a focal one, the wider is assumed to be the breadth of search  
31  
32 (Capaldo and Messeni Petruzzelli, 2011). Specifically, search breadth is operationalized as follows:  
33  
34  
35

$$36 \quad \text{Search breadth} = 1 - \sum (\frac{B_{iP}}{B_P})^2,$$

37  
38  
39 where  $B_{iP}$  is the number of citations made by the focal patent P belonging to the three digit U.S.  
40  
41 class i, and  $B_P$  is the total number of backward citations of the focal patent P.  
42  
43  
44

45  
46 *Team dispersion.* Patent documents report information about the team involved in the creation of a  
47  
48 given invention. Particularly, for each inventor it is indicated the name and where he/she resides.  
49  
50 Based on this data, according to previous studies (e.g., Lahiri, 2010; Nielsen, 2010), we  
51  
52 operationalize the dispersion of the inventive team as follows:  
53  
54  
55

$$56 \quad \text{Team dispersion} = 1 - \sum (\frac{T_{cP}}{T_P})^2,$$

57  
58  
59 where  $T_{cP}$  is the number of inventors being part the inventing team of the focal patent P that resides  
60  
61 in the country c, and  $T_P$  is the total number of inventors of the focal patent P.  
62  
63  
64  
65

### 3.3.3. Control variables

Other factors can influence the level of technological generality of an invention. Therefore, control variables are also included in our model. First, we consider the size of the inventive team (*Team size*). It is measured by counting the number of people reported as inventors in the patent document (Singh, 2008). Second, we control for the total number of backward citations made by a focal patent (*Cited*) (Banerjee and Cole, 2010). Third, we include the number of claims, as reported in the patent document (*Claims*) (Tong and Frame, 1994). Fourth, the use of scientific knowledge in the invention process is also taken into account, by measuring the number of references made by a patent to non-patent literature (Narin et al., 1997). Fifth, to account for potential time effects, we include a set of three dummy variables to reflect four important time periods that have characterized the green energy sector (*dummy period*). Specifically, the first time period ranges from the 1971 to the 1987, year in which the Brundland report was published (WCED, 1987). The second one refers to the period between 1988 and 1997, which ends when the Kyoto protocol was signed. The third one goes from 1998 to 2002, when the Johannesburg Declaration on Sustainable Development was adopted at the World Summit on Sustainable Development (UN, 2002). The last one captures all the years after the 2002 till 2009. Sixth, we include three out of four dummy variables capturing the different types of patent assignee (*dummy assignee*), namely research centers, companies, financial institutions, and governmental organizations. Finally, in order to control for the patent's technological class, we add a dummy variable having value one if the patent belongs to the "Energy conservation" class, zero otherwise (*dummy class*).

### 3.4. Analysis

Since our aim is to assess the influence of an organization's breadth of search on the level of an invention's technological generality, the single patent is used as the unit of analysis. Our dependent variable assumes values that range from zero to one. In this case, a Tobit regression model is more appropriate for hypothesis testing (Banerjee and Cole, 2010). Indeed, an OLS regression may lead

1  
2  
3  
4 to inconsistent parameter estimates, since predictions of related models can go outside the range  
5  
6 between our dependent variable is defined (Long, 1997; Wooldridge, 2012), hence making OLS  
7  
8 less than ideal. In other words, it does not approach the "true" population parameters (Long, 1997).  
9

#### 10 11 12 13 **4. Results** 14

15 Table 1 shows descriptive statistics and pairwise correlations, presenting values below the 0.70  
16  
17 threshold (Cohen et al., 2013), hence limiting multicollinearity concerns. Results of the Tobit  
18  
19 regression models are presented in Table 2. Model 1 is the baseline model and includes the control  
20  
21 variables only. Model 2 is used to test Hypothesis 1 and includes search breadth as linear and  
22  
23 quadratic terms. Finally, Model 3 includes the moderator and its interactions with the linear and  
24  
25 squared term of search breadth.  
26  
27

28  
29 The baseline model shows that enlarging the dimension of the inventing team leads to more  
30  
31 general solutions, being the coefficient of *Team size* positive and significant ( $\beta = 0.021, p < 0.001$ ).  
32  
33 Similarly, an invention's technological generality increases with the number of citations made to  
34  
35 previous patents ( $\beta = 0.002, p < 0.001$ ) and with the number of claims ( $\beta = 0.002, p < 0.001$ ). On  
36  
37 the contrary, it decreases with the reliance on basic research ( $\beta = -0.001, p < 0.001$ ).  
38  
39

40  
41 Hypothesis 1 posits an inverted U-shaped relation between the breadth of search and the level  
42  
43 of technological generality of an invention. Our results support this prediction. Indeed, estimates of  
44  
45 Model 2 show that the linear term of *Search breadth* is positive and significant ( $\beta = 0.401, p <$   
46  
47  $0.001$ ), while its squared term is negative and significant ( $\beta = -0.249, p < 0.001$ ). Using the  
48  
49 coefficient estimates of Model 2 (Zelner, 2009) we also graph the search breadth against the  
50  
51 predicted level of technological generality (Figure 1), providing further support to our hypothesis.  
52  
53 The inflection point beyond which the impact of search breadth decreases technological generality  
54  
55 corresponds to a value of 0.807.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 Our second hypothesis refers to the moderation effect of *Team dispersion*. Consistent with  
5  
6 Hypothesis 2, both the interaction terms with the linear and squared term of *Search breadth* are  
7  
8 significant and in the expected directions ( $\beta = 0.574, p < 0.001$  and  $\beta = -0.567, p < 0.01$ ,  
9  
10 respectively). To gain further insight into the interaction effects predicted by Hypotheses 2, we  
11  
12 decompose the interaction terms and conduct simple slope analysis. We consider two levels of the  
13  
14 moderating variables - low (one standard deviation below the mean) and high (one standard  
15  
16 deviation above the mean) - and estimate the effect of *Search breadth* on *Technological generality*  
17  
18 for both levels (Hoetker, 2007; Lahiri, 2010; Poppo et al., 2008). We plot search breadth against the  
19  
20 predicted level of technological generality of an invention at both low and high level of *Team*  
21  
22 *dispersion* (Figure 2), and compute the maximum of the two resulting inverted curves. Figure 2  
23  
24 shows that when the level of *Team dispersion* is low decreasing and negative returns to *Search*  
25  
26 *breadth* set in if *Technological generality* is above the value of 0.757. Differently, at the high level  
27  
28 of *Team dispersion* negative returns arise when *Technological generality* exceeds the value of  
29  
30 0.882. In other words, the maximum of the curve describing the relation between *Search breadth*  
31  
32 and *Technological generality* shifts to the right if organizations tend to adopt a R&D  
33  
34 internationalization strategy during inventing activities. This suggests that using R&D dispersed  
35  
36 teams amplifies the benefits of a wider breadth of search.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

45 <Insert Table 1 about here>  
46  
47

48 <Insert Table 2 about here>  
49  
50

51 <Insert Figure 1 and Figure 2 about here>  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62

1  
2  
3  
4 **5. Discussion and conclusions**  
5

6       The previous literature has mainly focused on the advantages of GPTs in the economy (e.g.,  
7  
8       Bresnahan and Trajtenberg, 1995; Rosenberg and Trajtenberg, 2004), as well as on the  
9  
10       commercialization strategies that should be set to enter and diffuse them within the market  
11  
12       (Gambardella and Giarratana, 2013; Gambardella and McGahan, 2010). Yet, extant research has  
13  
14       scantly analyzed the antecedents of GPTs (Thoma, 2009). In this study, we explore the impact of an  
15  
16       organization’s strategy to search widely across diverse knowledge domains on the level of the  
17  
18       resulting invention’s technological generality, thus providing a better comprehension of the  
19  
20       emergence of GPTs. Furthermore, we also assess how a R&D internationalization strategy,  
21  
22       involving the establishment of geographically dispersed teams, moderates the costs and benefits of a  
23  
24       broad search breadth. Based on a sample of 88,748 patents belonging to the “Alternative energy  
25  
26       production” and “Energy conservation” technological classes, results indicate that when  
27  
28       organizations search across various knowledge domains technological generality increases,  
29  
30       although up to a certain threshold, thus revealing an inverted U-shaped effect. Furthermore, when  
31  
32       organizations’ inventive activity is dispersed across R&D teams, they are in a position to derive  
33  
34       greater benefit from a wider search breadth.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40       The implications for theory that arise from these results are threefold. First, we corroborate  
41  
42       findings of previous research on the emergence of GPTs, which argues that expanding the  
43  
44       knowledge base charactering an invention increases its breadth of impact in diverse industrial  
45  
46       contexts (Argyres and Silverman, 2004; Hicks and Hegde, 2005). Indeed, searching broadly across  
47  
48       multiple technological domains helps organizations in creating a wider knowledge base (Capaldo  
49  
50       and Messeni Petruzzelli, 2011; Maine et al., 2014). Moreover, it also provides advantages such as  
51  
52       the reduction of cognitive myopia, increasing recombination possibilities, and the incentive to  
53  
54       cross-fertilize different market ideas (e.g., Björkdahl, 2009; Maggitti et al., 2013). Furthermore, we  
55  
56       add to previous research by arguing that there exists a threshold level, after which a wide search  
57  
58       breadth comes with decreasing or even negative returns. In fact, the cognitive and managerial  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 limitations related to the management of a too wide body of knowledge, as represented by the lack  
5  
6 of absorptive capacity, the unfamiliarity with all knowledge domains, and the necessity to  
7  
8 coordinate knowledge integration, cannot be underestimated (e.g., Capaldo and Messeni Petruzzelli,  
9  
10 2011). Second, our study further advances our understanding of how to create GPTs when  
11  
12 organizations span multiple knowledge domains. Particularly, we demonstrate that in order to  
13  
14 relieve the diminishing and negative returns of a wide search breadth a R&D internationalization  
15  
16 strategy allows to alleviate organizations' cognitive and managerial limitations (Gajendran and  
17  
18 Joshi, 2012). Accordingly, it favors a better understanding of the diverse knowledge pieces and the  
19  
20 acquisition of new problem-solving techniques, which in turn enhances team members' creativity  
21  
22 (Hinds and Mortensen, 2005). Furthermore, it also encourages spontaneous interactions between  
23  
24 members, hence reducing the need to create ad-hoc routines for knowledge exchange. Third, ESTs  
25  
26 in the energy sector have been deemed to play an important role for enhancing economic growth  
27  
28 and environmental performance in several industries (Albino et al., 2014; Malek et al., 2014;  
29  
30 Suzuki, Forthcoming). Nevertheless, while promising, these technological solutions faced several  
31  
32 difficulties in diffusing on the market and failed to replace current carbon-based systems (Olson,  
33  
34 2014). Thereby, developing green energy technologies that can be more easily adopted and diffused  
35  
36 in different industry domains has been recognized as a relevant issue (Suzuki, Forthcoming).  
37  
38 Accordingly, our results contribute to this debate, revealing how it is possible to create green GPTs  
39  
40 in the energy sector (Cecere et al., 2014; Pearson and Foxon, 2012).

41  
42 Findings of this study inspire also some managerial implications. First, managers are  
43  
44 advised of the double-edge word of a wide search breadth for the development of GPTs. Thereby,  
45  
46 we suggest balancing the search efforts toward a wide range of knowledge domains, in order to  
47  
48 avoid the risks to incur in the inability to gain returns from those efforts. Second, establishing  
49  
50 dispersed teams may reduce the problems organizations face when they search broadly, being these  
51  
52 useful to support the acquisition and integration of a diversified body of knowledge. Third, given  
53  
54 the ever increasing need to develop more green general solutions (Cecere et al., 2014), our findings

1  
2  
3  
4 guide organizations to focus on the conditions that are most critical for creating green GPTs in the  
5  
6 energy field.

7  
8 Of course, this study presents some limitations that may however lead to new interesting  
9  
10 lines of inquiry. We only consider organizations' search breadth. Other search strategies, such as  
11  
12 search scope and search depth (Katila and Ahuja, 2002) may be investigated. Furthermore,  
13  
14 additional characteristics of the inventive team, besides their internationalization, can be considered.  
15  
16 For instance, future studies may take into account the presence of star scientists, whether team  
17  
18 members have repeated experiences within the same group, and the set of norms characterizing  
19  
20 team activities (e.g., Mathieu et al., 2013). We limit our attention to inventions developed by a  
21  
22 single organization. Analyzing potential network-specific effects on the emergence of GPTs also  
23  
24 require more in depth studies. Finally, this study has the green energy sector as its research setting.  
25  
26 Further research considering other sectors may be useful to provide further support to our findings.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

### 33 **References**

- 34  
35 Ahuja, G., Lampert, C.M., 2001. Entrepreneurship in the large corporation: a longitudinal study of  
36 how established firms create breakthrough inventions. *Strategic Management Journal* 22(6/7):  
37 521-543.  
38  
39 Albino, V., Ardito, L., Dangelico, R.M., Messeni Petruzzelli, A., 2014. Understanding the  
40 development trends of low-carbon energy technologies: A patent analysis. *Applied Energy* 135:  
41 836-854.  
42  
43 Argyres, N.S., Silverman, B.S., 2004. R&D, organization structure, and the development of  
44 corporate technological knowledge. *Strategic Management Journal* 25(8-9): 929-958.  
45  
46 Arikan, A.T., 2009. Interfirm knowledge exchanges and the knowledge creation capability of  
47 clusters. *Academy of Management Review* 34(4): 658-676.  
48  
49 Banerjee, P.M., Cole, B.M., 2010. Breadth-of-impact frontier: How firm-level decisions and  
50 selection environment dynamics generate boundary-spanning inventions. *Technovation* 30(7-  
51 8): 411-419.  
52  
53 Björkdahl, J., 2009. Technology cross-fertilization and the business model: The case of integrating  
54 ICTs in mechanical engineering products. *Research Policy* 38(9): 1468-1477.  
55  
56 Bresnahan, T.F., Trajtenberg, M., 1995. General Purpose Technologies: Engines of Growth?  
57 *Journal of Econometrics* 65: 83-108.  
58  
59 Capaldo, A., Messeni Petruzzelli, A., 2011. In search of alliance-level relational capabilities:  
60 Balancing innovation value creation and appropriability in R&D alliances. *Scandinavian  
61 Journal of Management* 27(3): 273-286.  
62  
63 Cecere, G., Corrocher, N., Gossart, C., Ozman, M., 2014. Technological pervasiveness and variety  
64 of innovators in Green ICT: A patent-based analysis. *Research Policy* 43(10): 1827-1839.  
65

- 1  
2  
3  
4 Chen, C.-J., Huang, Y.-F., Lin, B.-W., 2012. How firms innovate through RD internationalization?  
5 An S-curve hypothesis. *Research Policy* 41(9): 1544-1554.
- 6 Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S.G., Aiken, L.S., 2013. *Applied Multiple Regression/Correlation*  
7 *Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*. Taylor & Francis.
- 8 Cohen, W.M., Levinthal, D.A., 1990. Absorptive Capacity: A New Perspective on Learning and  
9 Innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 35(1): 128-152.
- 10 Doz, Y., Wilson, K., 2013. *Managing Global Innovation: Frameworks for Integrating Capabilities*  
11 *around the World*. Harvard Business Review Press.
- 12 Edmondson, A.C., Nembhard, I.M., 2009. Product Development and Learning in Project Teams:  
13 The Challenges Are the Benefits\*. *Journal of Product Innovation Management* 26(2): 123-138.
- 14 Ejermo, O., Karlsson, C., 2006. Interregional inventor networks as studied by patent  
15 coinventorships. *Research Policy* 35(3): 412-430.
- 16 Fleming, L., 2001. Recombinant Uncertainty in Technological Search. *Management Science* 47(1):  
17 117-132.
- 18 Fleming, L., Sorenson, O., 2001. Technology as a complex adaptive system: evidence from patent  
19 data. *Research Policy* 30(7): 1019-1039.
- 20 Gajendran, R.S., Joshi, A., 2012. Innovation in globally distributed teams: The role of LMX,  
21 communication frequency, and member influence on team decisions. *Journal of Applied*  
22 *Psychology* 97(6): 1252-1261.
- 23 Gambardella, A., Giarratana, M.S., 2013. General technological capabilities, product market  
24 fragmentation, and markets for technology. *Research Policy* 42(2): 315-325.
- 25 Gambardella, A., McGahan, A.M., 2010. Business-Model Innovation: General Purpose  
26 Technologies and their Implications for Industry Structure. *Long Range Planning* 43(2-3): 262-  
27 271.
- 28 Gassmann, O., von Zedtwitz, M., 2003. Trends and determinants of managing virtual R&D teams.  
29 *R&D Management* 33(3): 243-262.
- 30 Hall, B.H., 2005. A Note on the Bias in Herfindahl-Type Measures Based on Count Data. *Revue*  
31 *d'économie industrielle*: 149-156.
- 32 Hall, B.H., Jaffe, A.B., Trajtenberg, M., 2001. *The NBER Patent Citations Data File: Lessons,*  
33 *Insights and Methodological Tools*, National Bureau of Economic Research: Cambridge, MA
- 34 Hargadon, A., Sutton, R.I., 1997. Technology Brokering and Innovation in a Product Development  
35 Firm. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 42(4): 716-749.
- 36 Helpan, E., Trajtenberg, M., 1998. A Time to Sow and a Time to Reap: Growth Based on General  
37 Purpose Technologies, In: E, H. (Ed.), *General Purpose Technologies and Economic Growth*,  
38 Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, pp. 55-83.
- 39 Hicks, D., Hegde, D., 2005. Highly innovative small firms in the markets for technology. *Research*  
40 *Policy* 34(5): 703-716.
- 41 Hinds, P.J., Mortensen, M., 2005. Understanding Conflict in Geographically Distributed Teams:  
42 The Moderating Effects of Shared Identity, Shared Context, and Spontaneous Communication.  
43 *Organization Science* 16(3): 290-307.
- 44 Hoegl, M., Ernst, H., Proserpio, L., 2007. How Teamwork Matters More as Team Member  
45 Dispersion Increases\*. *Journal of Product Innovation Management* 24(2): 156-165.
- 46 Hoetker, G., 2007. The use of logit and probit models in strategic management research: Critical  
47 issues. *Strategic Management Journal* 28(4): 331-343.
- 48 Hsu, C.-W., Lien, Y.-C., Chen, H., Forthcoming. R&D internationalization and innovation  
49 performance. *International Business Review*.
- 50 Katila, R., Ahuja, G., 2002. Something old, something new: a longitudinal study of search behavior  
51 and new product introduction. *Academy of Management Journal* 45(6): 1183-1194.
- 52 Kauffman, S.A., 1993. *The Origins of Order: Self-organization and Selection in Evolution*. Oxford  
53 University Press.
- 54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

- 1  
2  
3  
4 Keenan, M., 2003. Identifying emerging generic technologies at the national level: the UK  
5 experience. *Journal of Forecasting* 22(2-3): 129-160.
- 6 Kemp, R., Pearson, P., 2008. Final report MEI project about measuring eco-innovation,  
7 Netherlands, Maastricht.
- 8 Koput, K.W., 1997. A Chaotic Model of Innovative Search: Some Answers, Many Questions.  
9 *Organization Science* 8(5): 528-542.
- 10 Kratzer, J., Leenders, R.T.A.J., Van Engelen, J.M.L., 2006. Managing creative team performance in  
11 virtual environments: an empirical study in 44 R&D teams. *Technovation* 26(1): 42-49.
- 12 Lahiri, N., 2010. Geographic distribution of r&d activity: how does it affect innovation quality?  
13 *Academy of Management Journal* 53(5): 1194-1209.
- 14 Laursen, K., Salter, A., 2006. Open for innovation: the role of openness in explaining innovation  
15 performance among U.K. manufacturing firms. *Strategic Management Journal* 27(2): 131-150.
- 16 Levinthal, D.A., March, J.G., 1993. The myopia of learning. *Strategic Management Journal* 14(S2):  
17 95-112.
- 18 Lin, C., Chang, C.-C., Forthcoming. The effect of technological diversification on organizational  
19 performance: An empirical study of S&P 500 manufacturing firms. *Technological Forecasting  
20 and Social Change*.
- 21 Long, J.S., 1997. *Regression Models for Categorical and Limited Dependent Variables*. SAGE  
22 Publications.
- 23 Maggitti, P.G., Smith, K.G., Katila, R., 2013. The complex search process of invention. *Research  
24 Policy* 42(1): 90-100.
- 25 Maine, E., Garnsey, E., 2006. Commercializing generic technology: The case of advanced materials  
26 ventures. *Research Policy* 35(3): 375-393.
- 27 Maine, E., Thomas, V.J., Utterback, J., 2014. Radical innovation from the confluence of  
28 technologies: Innovation management strategies for the emerging nanobiotechnology industry.  
29 *Journal of Engineering and Technology Management* 32: 1-25.
- 30 Majumdar, S.K., Carare, O., Chang, H., 2010. Broadband adoption and firm productivity:  
31 evaluating the benefits of general purpose technology. *Industrial and Corporate Change* 19(3):  
32 641-674.
- 33 Malek, K., Maine, E., McCarthy, I.P., 2014. A typology of clean technology commercialization  
34 accelerators. *Journal of Engineering and Technology Management* 32(0): 26-39.
- 35 Mathieu, J.E., Tannenbaum, S.I., Donsbach, J.S., Alliger, G.M., 2013. A Review and Integration of  
36 Team Composition Models: Moving Toward a Dynamic and Temporal Framework. *Journal of  
37 Management*.
- 38 Messeni Petruzzelli, A., Rotolo, D., Albino, V., Forthcoming. Determinants of patent citations in  
39 biotechnology: An analysis of patent influence across the industrial and organizational  
40 boundaries. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*.
- 41 Myles Shaver, J., Flyer, F., 2000. Agglomeration economies, firm heterogeneity, and foreign direct  
42 investment in the United States. *Strategic Management Journal* 21(12): 1175-1193.
- 43 Narin, F., Hamilton, K.S., Olivastro, D., 1997. The increasing linkage between U.S. technology and  
44 public science. *Research Policy* 26(3): 317-330.
- 45 Nelson, R., Winter, S., 1977. In *Search of a Useful Theory of Innovation*, In: Stroetmann, K. (Ed.),  
46 *Innovation, Economic Change and Technology Policies*. Birkhäuser Basel, pp. 215-245.
- 47 Nelson, R.R., Winter, S.G., 1982. *An Evolutionary Theory of Economic Change*. Harvard  
48 University Press.
- 49 Nielsen, S., 2010. Top Management Team Internationalization and Firm Performance. *Management  
50 International Review* 50(2): 185-206.
- 51 Novelli, E., Forthcoming. An examination of the antecedents and implications of patent scope.  
52 *Research Policy*.
- 53 O'Leary, M.B., Mortensen, M., 2010. Go (Con)figure: Subgroups, Imbalance, and Isolates in  
54 Geographically Dispersed Teams. *Organization Science* 21(1): 115-131.

- 1  
2  
3  
4 OECD, 2012. OECD Green Growth Studies Energy. OECD Publishing.  
5 Olson, E.L., 2014. Green Innovation Value Chain analysis of PV solar power. *Journal of Cleaner*  
6 *Production* 64: 73-80.  
7 Parida, V., Wincent, J., Kohtamäki, M., 2013. Offshoring and Improvisational Learning: Empirical  
8 Insights into Developing Global R&D Capabilities. *Industry and Innovation* 20(6): 544-562.  
9 Pearson, P.J.G., Foxon, T.J., 2012. A low carbon industrial revolution? Insights and challenges  
10 from past technological and economic transformations. *Energy Policy* 50: 117-127.  
11 Penner-Hahn, J., Shaver, J.M., 2005. Does international research and development increase patent  
12 output? An analysis of Japanese pharmaceutical firms. *Strategic Management Journal* 26(2):  
13 121-140.  
14 Peteraf, M.A., 1993. The cornerstones of competitive advantage: A resource-based view. *Strategic*  
15 *Management Journal* 14(3): 179-191.  
16 Polzer, J.T., Crisp, C.B., Jarvenpaa, S.L., Kim, J.W., 2006. Extending the Faultline Model to  
17 Geographically Dispersed Teams: How Colocated Subgroups can Impair Group Functioning.  
18 *Academy of Management Journal* 49(4): 679-692.  
19 Popp, D., 2006. Innovation in climate policy models: Implementing lessons from the economics of  
20 R&D. *Energy Economics* 28(5-6): 596-609.  
21 Poppo, L., Zhou, K.Z., Zenger, T.R., 2008. Examining the Conditional Limits of Relational  
22 Governance: Specialized Assets, Performance Ambiguity, and Long-Standing Ties. *Journal of*  
23 *Management Studies* 45(7): 1195-1216.  
24 Rainer, A., Strohmaier, R., 2014. Modeling the diffusion of general purpose technologies in an  
25 evolutionary multi-sector framework. *Empirica* 41(3): 425-444.  
26 Rosenberg, N., Trajtenberg, M., 2004. A General-Purpose Technology at Work: The Corliss Steam  
27 Engine in the Late-Nineteenth-Century United States. *The Journal of Economic History* 64(1):  
28 61-99.  
29 Rosenkopf, L., Nerkar, A., 2001. Beyond local search: boundary-spanning, exploration, and impact  
30 in the optical disk industry. *Strategic Management Journal* 22(4): 287-306.  
31 Shane, S.A., 2004. *Academic Entrepreneurship: University Spinoffs and Wealth Creation*. Edward  
32 Elgar Publishing, Incorporated.  
33 Shapira, P., Gök, A., Klochikhin, E., Sensier, M., 2014. Probing “green” industry enterprises in the  
34 UK: A new identification approach. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change* 85: 93-104.  
35 Shea, C.M., 2005. Future management research directions in nanotechnology: A case study. *Journal*  
36 *of Engineering and Technology Management* 22(3): 185-200.  
37 Singh, J., 2008. Distributed R&D, cross-regional knowledge integration and quality of innovative  
38 output. *Research Policy* 37(1): 77-96.  
39 Smith, A., 1776. *The Wealth of Nations*. Modern Library: New York.  
40 Sole, D., Edmondson, A., 2002. Situated Knowledge and Learning in Dispersed Teams. *British*  
41 *Journal of Management* 13(S2): S17-S34.  
42 Sorrell, S., 2007. The rebound effect: an assessment of the evidence for economy-wide energy  
43 savings from improved energy efficiency, In: Centre, P.R.U.E.R. (Ed.).  
44 Stigler, G.J., 1951. The Division of Labor is Limited by the Extent of the Market. *Journal of*  
45 *Political Economy* 59(3): 185-193.  
46 Subramanian, A.M., Soh, P.-H., 2010. An empirical examination of the science–technology  
47 relationship in the biotechnology industry. *Journal of Engineering and Technology*  
48 *Management* 27(3-4): 160-171.  
49 Susman, G.I., Gray, B.L., Perry, J., Blair, C.E., 2003. Recognition and reconciliation of differences  
50 in interpretation of misalignments when collaborative technologies are introduced into new  
51 product development teams. *Journal of Engineering and Technology Management* 20(1-2):  
52 141-159.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

Suzuki, M., Forthcoming. Identifying roles of international institutions in clean energy technology innovation and diffusion in the developing countries: matching barriers with roles of the institutions. *Journal of Cleaner Production*.

Taylor, A., Greve, H.R., 2006. Superman or the Fantastic Four? Knowledge Combination and Experience in Innovative Teams. *The Academy of Management Journal* 49(4): 723-740.

Thoma, G., 2009. Striving for a large market: evidence from a general purpose technology in action. *Industrial and Corporate Change* 18(1): 107-138.

Tong, X., Frame, J.D., 1994. Measuring national technological performance with patent claims data. *Research Policy* 23(2): 133-141.

UN, 1992. United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, Agenda 21, Chapter 34, Rio de Janeiro, 1992.

UN, 2002. Report of the United Nation Conference on Sustainable Development, A/CONF.199/20, United Nations publishing, New York.

Wagner, M., 2007. On the relationship between environmental management, environmental innovation and patenting: Evidence from German manufacturing firms. *Research Policy* 36(10): 1587-1602.

WCED, 1987. *Our CommonFuture: Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development*, Switzerland, 1987

Wooldridge, J., 2012. *Introductory Econometrics: A Modern Approach*. Cengage Learning.

Zelner, B.A., 2009. Using simulation to interpret results from logit, probit, and other nonlinear models. *Strategic Management Journal* 30(12): 1335-1348.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics and pairwise correlations

	Min	Max	Mean	S.D.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1-Technological generality	0	1	.360	.377	1	.258**	-.003				
2-Search breadth	0	.954	.334	.307	.258**	1	.033**				
3-Team internationalization	0	1	.017	.088	-.003	.033**	1				
4-Team size	1	27	2.300	1.684	.083**	.147**	.148**	1			
5-Scientific knowledge	0	858	5.460	22.088	-.050**	.011**	.062**	.122**	1		
6-Cited	0	1328	10.290	25.382	.094**	.177**	.011**	.080**	.311**	1	
7-Claims	1	900	11.040	16.074	.133**	.144**	.025**	.108**	.055**	.134**	1

n= 88,748; \*p<0.05; \*\*p<0.01

Table 2. Results of the Tobit regression models

	Model 1	s.e.	Model 2	s.e.	Model 3	s.e.
Technological breadth			.401***	.014	.411***	.014
Technological breadth <sup>2</sup>			-.249***	.019	-.258***	.020
Team internationalization					.037	.023
Technological breadth x Team internationalization					-.574***	.158
Technological breadth <sup>2</sup> x Team internationalization					.567**	.209
Team size	.021***	.001	.015***	.001	.015***	.001
Scientific knowledge	-.001***	.000	-.001***	.000	-.001***	.000
Cited	.002***	.000	.001***	.000	.001***	.000
Claims	.002***	.000	.002***	.000	.002***	.000
dummy class	.203***	.003	.168***	.003	.168***	.003
dummy period	Included		Included		Included	
dummy assignee	Included		Included		Included	
Constant	.006***	.003	-.041***	.003	-.042***	.003
Log likelihood	-38341.23		-36715.66		-36699.20	
Observations	88,748		88,748		88,748	

\*p<0.05; \*\*p<0.01; \*\*\*p<0.001

# Figure




Figure 1. Predicted effect of *Search breadth* on *Technological generality*




Figure 2. Moderation effect of *Team internationalization*