

Index

- 1st Five-Year Plan (China) 120
- Abraham, V. 250, 257
- “absorptive capacity” 8, 56, 58–9, 61, 67, 89, 129–30, 140–41
- “academic capabilities” 8, 15, 18, 56, 62–3, 67
- “academic entrepreneurship” 71
- Adeoti, J.O. 25, 47, 221
- “affiliated suppliers” 152, 154
- Albuquerque, E. 99, 162
- Amsden, A. 18
- ANPCyT (Agencia Nacional de Promoción Científica y Tecnológica) 100–101
- “antennae” role 14, 17
- apartheid 20, 24, 38
- APITD (Action Plan for Industrial Technology Development) 69
- applied sciences 146, 196, 210, 212–13
- AREs (academic-run enterprises) 22
- Argentina
- and Asian UILs comparison 87
 - channels of information 159–60
 - degree of success of UILs 150, 151
 - firm innovation data 148–9, 150
 - impact of UILs on universities 257
 - interaction comparisons 9
 - modes of relationship 160–61
 - “moving thresholds” data 3–4
- PRO–I interactions
- benefits from 110–14, 178, 181, 186, 187, 192
 - channels of 164–5, 169–70, 176
 - comparative analysis 107–13
 - drivers of interaction 114, 115
 - historical roots of PRO–I interactions 98, 99–101
 - methodology 106
 - study data 169
- “regimes of interaction” data 2–4, 5
- S&E matrices of interaction
- historical roots of “points of interaction” 213, 214–15, 216
 - matches and mismatches 216–18
 - matrix data 199–203
 - research methodology 197–8
 - US comparisons 210–12
 - trajectory of 2–4, 5
- Arocena, R. 56, 247
- Arza, V. 9, 10, 66, 96, 97, 166, 167, 221, 257
- Azevedo, J.G. 227
- basic sciences 212–13
- Bayh–Dole Act (1980) 72, 160
- Bekkers, R. 95, 191
- benefits from PRO–I interactions
- firms survey 178, 180–86, 192–3
 - international comparisons 191, 192–3
 - Latin American study 95–7, 106, 110–14, 117–19
 - motivations for firms and researchers 168
 - researcher survey 186–91, 193
- “bi-directional” channel of interaction
- international PRO–I comparisons 170, 172, 174, 192
 - Latin American PRO–I study 97, 98, 108–9, 112–13, 117–18
 - motivations for PRO–I interactions 167–8
- “big science” 42, 44, 90
- BIOTEC (National Center for Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology) 70, 91
- biotechnology sector 50–51
- Bodas Freitas, I.M. 95, 191
- “boomerang effect” 15
- Boschma, R.A. 59
- “branch plants” 72, 131

- Branscomb, L.M. 55–6, 75
- Brazil
 and Asian UILs comparison 87
 and “Changing Universities”
 programme 247
 channels of information 159–60
 constraints on industrialization 20
 degree of success of UILs 150, 151
 and dynamics of interactions 21
 firm innovation data 148–50
 and foreign-owned firms 221
 and global interactions 25, 232,
 233–4, 240–41, 242
 health demands 19
 impact of UILs on universities 257
 interaction comparisons 9
 modes of relationship 160–61
 “moving thresholds” data 3–4
 PRO–I interactions
 benefits from 110–14, 178, 180,
 182, 186, 188, 192
 channels of 107–9, 112–14, 164–5,
 170–71, 176–7, 191
 comparative analysis 107–13
 historical roots of PRO–I
 interactions 98, 101–2
 methodology 106–7
 study data 169
 “regimes of interaction” data 2–4, 5
 S&E matrices of interaction
 historical roots of “points of
 interaction” 213, 215–16
 matches and mismatches 216–18
 matrix data 206–10
 research methodology 197, 198–9
 US comparisons 210–13
 sources of information for
 technological innovation 152–8
 trajectory of 2–4, 5
- Callaert, J. 194
- capitalism 14, 20, 195, 229
- Carnegie Mellon Survey (CMS) 10, 12,
 18, 34, 75, 124, 127, 146, 147, 194,
 197–8, 251
- Casas, R. 99, 214
- Catalán, P. 225
- Catch Up Project 6, 17, 18
- CENIBIOT (Centro Nacional de
 Innovaciones Biotecnológicas) 103
- Chaebol firms 67–8, 74
- “Changing Universities” programme
 245–54, 258
- “channels of information” data 158–60
- channels of interaction
 and “Changing Universities”
 programme 252–3
- PRO–I interactions
 conceptual framework of study
 166–8
 firms survey 169–76, 191–2
 international comparisons 164–5,
 191–2
 and knowledge transfer 164
 Latin American study 94–7, 106,
 107–10, 112–14, 117–19
 researcher survey 176–8, 179–80,
 191–2
 study data 168–9
 and transition of UILs in China
 127–30, 138–40, 141–2
- China
 benefits from PRO–I interactions
 180–81, 183, 185, 186–7, 189,
 192
 and “Changing Universities”
 programme 253
 channels of information 159–60
 channels of PRO–I interaction
 164–5, 172–3, 174, 177–8, 179,
 191–2
 degree of success of UILs 150
 and dynamics of interactions 22
 effectiveness of UILs in catch-up
 process 90
 firm innovation data 148–9
 and foreign-owned firms 221
 and GINs 223
 global GDP share 148
 and global interactions 233–4,
 240–41
 historical roots of UILs 71–2
 interaction comparisons 8, 9
 macro-institutional arrangements
 73, 74–5
 modes of collaboration 75–6, 78
 modes of relationship 160–61
 “moving thresholds” data 3–4
 outcomes of UILs 82–3
 PRO–I interaction study data 169

- “regimes of interaction” data 2–4, 5
- regional/sectoral differences 85, 86
- sources of information for
 - technological innovation 152–8
- trajectory of 2–4, 5
- and transition of UILs
 - channels of interaction 127–30, 138–40, 141–2
 - current situation 136, 138–40
 - differing types of universities 135–6, 137
 - historical background 120–23
 - importance of universities as
 - knowledge source 131–6, 142
 - and knowledge transfer 123–4, 126–7
 - S&T field 122–3, 126–7, 140, 142
 - survey data 124–6, 127
 - and UREs 121–2, 123, 126–7, 141
- Chinese Academy of Sciences 120
- Chunyan, Z. 31
- CINVESTAV (Centro de Investigación y de Estudios Avanzados Unidad Mérida) 105
- CNEA (Comisión Nacional de Energía Atómica) 100
- CNPq (Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico) 198
- cognitive proximity 60, 81, 85
- Cohen, W.M. 1, 10–11, 21, 25, 61, 75, 128–9, 141, 152–3, 155, 160, 194–7, 199, 212–13, 252
- Colyvas, J. 194
- “commercial” channel of interaction
 - international PRO–I comparisons 170, 172, 174, 176–7, 192
 - Latin American PRO–I study 96, 107–9, 113, 117, 119
 - motivations for PRO–I interactions 167–8
- Companhia Vale do Rio Doce (Brazil) 215
- CONACYT (Consejo Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnología) 104, 105
- CONICET (Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas) 100, 102
- Costa Rica
 - and Asian UILs comparison 87
- channels of information 159–60
- degree of success of UILs 150, 151
- firm innovation data 148–9, 150
- impact of UILs on universities 257
- interaction comparisons 9
- modes of relationship 160–61
- “moving thresholds” data 3–4
- PRO–I interactions
 - benefits from interactions 110–14, 180, 182, 185, 186, 188, 192
 - channels of interaction 107–9, 112–14, 164–5, 172, 177–8
 - comparative analysis 107–13
 - drivers of interaction 114, 115
 - historical roots of PRO–I interactions 98, 102–4
 - methodology 107
 - study data 169
- “regimes of interaction” data 2–4, 5
- trajectory of 2–4, 5
- Cozzens, S. 225
- CSN (Companhia Siderúrgica Nacional) 215
- Cultural Revolution (China) 22, 121–2
- customers (as knowledge source) 131, 132, 133, 134
- danwei system (China) 72
- David, P. 56
- degree of directness (UIL scale) 64
- degree of formality (mode of interaction criteria) 166
- degree of interaction (mode of interaction criteria) 166
- Deng Xiaoping 22, 122
- “developmental universities” 247, 255
- DGP (Censo do Diretório dos Grupos de Pesquisa) 198–9
- direction of knowledge flows (mode of interaction criteria) 166
- Dosi, G. 22
- Dubr e, Auguste 215
- DUI (“doing–using–interacting”)
 - mode of knowledge acquisition 43, 44, 46
- Dunning, J. 223
- Dutr nit, G. 9, 61, 221
- dynamics of interactions 21–3

- early stages of development 15–18
 economic benefits/motivations (in PRO–I interactions) 97, 110, 112, 166, 167, 193
 Eight Letter Guideline (China) 121
 Eighth Malaysia Plan (2001–2005) 69
 EMOP (Escola de Minas – Ouro Preto) 215
 Eom, B.-Y. 62, 69, 81
 Ernst, D. 223, 224, 225, 227, 230
 Escuela de Minería (Mexico) 213–14
 Etzkowitz, H. 31
 Eun, J.-H. 8, 10, 18, 21, 22, 62, 82, 221
 Evenson, R. 17, 19
 exports 35, 37, 47, 73, 214, 216
 external environment (of firms) 60–61
- Facultad de Agronomía de Buenos Aires (Argentina) 215
 “failed states” 17, 24
 FDI (foreign direct investment) 37, 58–9, 100
 FINEP (Financiadora de Estudos e Projetos) 215–16
- firms
 “Changing Universities” programme 248–54, 258
 and dynamics of interactions 21–3
 future research directions 254–7, 258–9
 and Global Innovation Networks *see* GINs
 and global interactions 25–6, 225–31
 historical perspective on structural change 23–4
 IBM case study 234, 236–8, 242
 importance of universities as knowledge source 131–6, 142
 interaction comparisons 5–10
 and methodology of studies 11
 and multiple demands on universities and PRIs 19–20
 and NSI framework 1
 and patent data 231–41
 PRO interactions *see* PRO–I interactions
 statistics on patents and scientific papers 2
 and technological innovation 161–2
 and technological revolutions 15
 and theoretical background of studies 11–12
 and theoretical framework of studies 14
 university–industry links *see* UILs
 Foray, D. 56
 formal contract-based channels 128–30, 138–9, 142, 253
 framework of NSI 1
 Freeman, C. 1, 14, 194
 “frontier science” research 51
 Fundación UNA (Fundación Pro Ciencia, Arte y Cultura de la Universidad Nacional) 103
 FUNDATEC (Fundación Tecnológica de Costa Rica) 103
 FUNDEVI (Fundación de la Universidad de Costa Rica para la Investigación) 103
 Furtado, C. 213–14
- GDP (gross domestic product) 2, 3, 4, 147–8
 Gerschenkron, A. 20
 GINs (Global Innovation Networks) 222–4, 225–8, 231–4, 241–2
 GLF (Great Leap Forward) 120–21
 global interactions
 firm/university synthesis 225–31
 and foreign-owned firms 221–2
 and GINs 222–4, 225–8, 231–4, 241–2
 IBM case study 234, 236–8, 242
 interaction types 228–31
 and MNEs 223, 224, 225–7, 228–31, 236–8, 240
 and patents 231–41
 and R&D 222–3, 224–5, 229
 and streams of innovation 238–41
 and theoretical framework of studies 25–6
 and universities 222–4
 Gollin, D. 17
 governance mode (UIL scale) 64
 Great Leap Forward (China) 22
 GRIs (government research institutes) 55, 57, 67–8, 74, 77, 87, 90
 GRMVs (Green Revolution Modern Varieties) 17, 19
 Gutiérrez, M. 99

- Heckman model 106–7, 114
heterogeneity 19, 33–4, 52, 102
historical perspective (on structural change) 23–4
- IARCs (International Agricultural Research Centres) 17
- IBM (US multinational) 234, 236–8, 242
- IDRC (International Development Research Centre) 1, 6, 245, 247, 251–2
- Imbs, J. 34
- imports 36–7, 42, 50, 73, 93, 100–101
- INDEC (National Institute of Statistics and Censuses) 198
- India
benefits from PRO–I interactions 181, 184, 187, 190, 192
and “Changing Universities” programme 250
channels of information 159–60
channels of PRO–I interaction 164–5, 172–3, 174, 177–8, 180, 191
degree of success of UILs 150
firm innovation data 148–9
global GDP share 148
and global interactions 233–4, 240–41
health demands 19
historical roots of UILs 72–3
interaction comparisons 8, 9
macro-institutional arrangements 73, 74
modes of collaboration 75–6, 77
modes of relationship 160–61
“moving thresholds” data 3–4
outcomes of UILs 80–82
PRO–I interaction study data 169
“regimes of interaction” data 2–4
regional/sectoral differences 85, 86
research methodology 57–8
sources of information for technological innovation 152–8
trajectory of 2–4
- Indian Institutes of Technology 73, 76
- Industrial Education and Academic-Industry Cooperation Promotion Act (2003) 68–9
- informal interactions 42–3, 45–6, 107, 230–31
“informal social networks” 230–31
INGINEUS project 7, 222
innovation benefits (in PRO–I interactions) 97, 111, 113
institutional proximity 59–60
Instituto Agronómico de Santa Catalina (Argentina) 215
Instituto de Suelos (Argentina) 214
Instituto Fitotecnia (Argentina) 214
Instituto Microbiología (Argentina) 214
INTA (Instituto Nacional de Tecnología Agropecuaria) 100, 214–15
intellectual benefits/motivations (in PRO–I interactions) 97, 110, 112, 117–18, 119, 166, 167, 193
internal capabilities (of firms) 60–61
internal sources of knowledge 131–2, 133, 134
International Human Genome Sequencing Consortium 228
Internet 132–3, 134
INTI (Instituto Nacional de Tecnología Industrial) 100
IPN (Instituto Politécnico Nacional) 104–5
IPR (intellectual property rights) 64, 75, 223
IPT (Instituto de Pesquisas Tecnológicas) 213
IRPA (Intensification of Research in Priority Areas) 69
ISI (Institute for Scientific Information) 2
ITCR (Instituto Tecnológico de Costa Rica) 102, 103
ITESM (Instituto Tecnológico y de Estudios Superiores de Monterrey) 104
- Joseph, K.J. 250, 257
Journal of Development Studies 26
Juma, C. 54
- KIET (Korean Institute for Electronic Technology) 17, 18, 21
Kim, L. 18, 68, 163

- Klevorick, A. 1, 10, 25, 194, 195–7
 knowledge-based economies 31–2, 35–8, 51–2, 54, 147
 “knowledge capitalization” 247
 knowledge transfer
 and channels of PRO–I interaction 164
 PRO–I interactions 94–5, 117–19
 and transition of UILs in China 123–4, 126–7
 and UILs 55, 59–60, 64, 74, 88
 Kruss, G. 8, 221, 255
 Kuemmerle, W. 223
- Lall, S. 63
 Lam, A. 247
 late development 16
 learning systems 56
 Lee, Keun 4–5, 18, 62, 69, 81, 251
 León, C. 99, 214–15
 Levinthal, D.A. 61
 licensed technology 128, 160
 LICs (low-income countries) 8
 Liefner, I. 18
 Likert scale 169
 Liu, X. 56
 Lorentzen, J. 7, 8, 10, 222
 Losada, F. 99, 214–15
 low-level equilibrium 35–6
 Lundvall, Bengt-Åke 1
- Macaya, G. 103
 Malaysia
 benefits from PRO–I interactions 181, 184, 192
 channels of information 159–60
 channels of PRO–I interaction 164–5, 174–5, 192
 degree of success of UILs 150–51
 firm innovation data 148–9
 and foreign-owned firms 221
 historical roots of UILs 69
 interaction comparisons 8, 9
 macro-institutional arrangements 73, 74
 modes of collaboration 75–6
 modes of relationship 160–61
 “moving thresholds” data 3–4
 outcomes of UILs 80–81
 PRO–I interaction study data 169
- “regimes of interaction” data 2–4
 regional/sectoral differences 85
 research methodology 57–8
 sources of information for technological innovation 152–8
 trajectory of 2–4
- Mandel, E. 14
 Mann–Whitney U tests 133, 135, 136
 Mao Zedong 120
 Marques, S. 15
 Marx, K. 14
 materials science 195, 196, 214
 Mazzoleni, R. 55, 118
 methodology of studies 11–13
 Mexico
 and Asian UILs comparison 87
 channels of information 159–60
 degree of success of UILs 150
 and dynamics of interactions 21
 firm innovation data 148–9
 health demands 19
 impact of UILs on universities 257
 interaction comparisons 9
 modes of relationship 160–61
 “moving thresholds” data 3–4
 PRO–I interactions
 benefits from 110–14, 180, 183, 186, 189, 192
 channels of 107–9, 112–14, 164–5, 170–71, 177–8, 179, 191
 comparative analysis 107–13
 drivers of interaction 114, 115
 historical roots of PRO–I interactions 98, 104–5
 methodology 106
 study data 169
 “regimes of interaction” data 2–4, 5
 S&E matrices of interaction
 historical roots of “points of interaction” 213–14, 216
 matches and mismatches 216–18
 matrix data 203–6
 research methodology 197, 198
 US comparisons 210–12
 sources of information for technological innovation 152–8
 trajectory of 2–4, 5
- Meyer-Krahmer, F. 95

- MIGHT (Malaysia Industry–Government Group for High Technology) 69
- mining industries 37, 40–41, 213–14, 215–16
- MNEs (multinational enterprises) 223, 224, 225–7, 228–31, 236–8, 240
- modes of interaction *see* channels of interaction
- “modes of relationship” data 160–61
- Mohamed, R. 7–8, 10
- MOSTI (Ministry of Science Technology and Innovation) 69
- motivation of the academic partner (UIL scale) 64
- motivation of the industrial partner (UIL scale) 64
- motivations for PRO–I interactions 166–8
- “moving thresholds” 3–4, 5
- Mowery, D.C. 145, 146
- MTDC (Malaysian Technology Development Corporation) 69
- MTEC (National Metal and Materials Technology Center) 70, 91
- Nabudere, D.W. 254, 255
- NANOTEC (National Nanotechnology Center) 70
- Narin, F. 1, 25, 194
- NARS (National Agricultural Research Systems) 17, 19
- National Education Act (1999) 70
- National Innovation Survey (Argentina, 2007) 198
- National Innovation Survey (Mexico, 2006) 198
- NECTEC (National Electronics and Computer Technology Center) 70, 91
- Nelson, R.R. 1, 6, 7, 10, 15–16, 25, 55, 118, 224
- New Economics of Science 62
- Nigeria
- benefits from PRO–I interactions 185, 186, 192
 - challenges to knowledge-based growth 36–7
 - and “Changing Universities” programme 250
 - channels of PRO–I interaction 164–5, 174–5
 - conceptual approach of study 33–5
 - features of UILs 42–3
 - firm innovation data 148–9 and foreign-owned firms 221
 - and global context of interactions 25
 - interaction comparisons 8
 - interactive capabilities 49–50
 - “moving thresholds” data 3–4
 - policy mechanisms 47, 52, 53
 - PRO–I interaction study data 169
 - promoting UILs 53
 - “regimes of interaction” data 2–4
 - study methodology 33–5
 - trajectory of 2–4
- Noma, E. 194
- NSTDA (National Science and Technology Development Agency) 70
- Open Door policy (China) 122
- organizational capabilities 59, 61, 62–3, 65
- organizational proximity 59
- Owen-Smith, J. 160
- “passive” motivations for PRO–I interactions 166–7
- Patel, P. 224, 225, 227
- patents 2–5, 55–6, 127, 128, 160, 194, 231–41
- Pavitt, K. 227
- PECYT (Programa Especial de Ciencia y Tecnología) 105
- Pedro II, Emperor 215
- Peterson, I.-H. 154
- Pinho, M. 154
- “points of interaction” 13, 21, 197, 203, 205–7, 210–17
- PRIs (public research institutes) and dynamics of interactions 21–3 and early stages of development 15–18
- historical perspective on structural change 23–4
 - interaction comparisons 5–10 and knowledge-based economies 147
 - and methodology of studies 11
 - multiple demands on 19–20

- and NSI framework 1
- role and relevance in NSI 145–6
- sources of information for
 - technological innovation 151–6
- statistics on patents and scientific papers 2
- and theoretical background of studies 11–12
- and theoretical framework of studies 14
- “proactive” motivations for PRO–I interactions 166–7
- production benefits (in PRO–I interactions) 97, 111, 113
- PRO–I (public research organizations–industry) interactions
 - benefits from interactions
 - firms survey 178, 180–86, 192–3
 - Latin American study 95–7, 106, 110–14, 117–19
 - motivations for firms and researchers 168
 - researcher survey 186–91, 193
- channels of interaction
 - conceptual framework of study 166–8
 - firms survey 169–76, 191–2
 - international comparisons 164–5, 191–2
 - and knowledge transfer 164
 - Latin American study 94–7, 106, 107–10, 112–14, 117–19
 - researcher survey 176–8, 179–80, 191–2
 - study data 168–9
- international comparisons 191, 193
- Latin American study
 - benefits from interactions 95–7, 106, 110–14, 117–19
 - channels of interaction 94–7, 106, 107–10, 112–14, 117–19
 - comparative analysis 107–13
 - drivers of interaction 114, 115, 119
 - features of interaction 114, 116
 - historical roots of PRO–I interactions 97–105
 - and knowledge transfer 94–5, 117–19
 - methodology 105–7
 - and R&D 116
 - weakness of interactions 93–4, 98–102, 104–5
 - motivations for firms and researchers 166–8
- Project 211 (China) 86, 90
- PROs (public research organizations) and “Changing Universities” programme 246, 249, 251
- firm interactions *see* PRO–I interactions
- future research directions 259
- and impact of UILs on universities 258
- and S&E matrices of interaction 197–8
- and UILs 58, 59, 64–5, 75, 77–8, 79–84, 88–9
- “provisional end result” of studies 10
- “public science” 160
- questionnaires
 - “Changing Universities” programme 247–8, 249–50, 251–3, 254
 - Chinese UILs survey 124–6, 127
 - development of 12
 - and methodology of studies 11–12
- R&D (research and development)
 - and absorptive capacity 58–9
 - Asian UILs study 64–5, 67–8, 79–82, 85, 88–9
 - and “Changing Universities” programme 250, 253, 254
 - and dynamics of interactions 21, 23
 - and global interactions 25, 222–3, 224–5, 229
 - and internal capabilities 61
 - international PRO–I comparisons 170, 172, 174, 177
 - and Latin American PRO–I study 95, 103, 105, 116
 - and motivations for PRO–I interactions 167, 168
 - and S&E matrices of interaction 194–6, 197–8, 207, 211
 - sub-Saharan Africa UILs study 34, 39–42, 44, 45, 46
 - and transition of UILs in China 128
 - “Red Queen Effect” 5, 15

- Reddy, P. 256
- Reform policy (China) 122
- “regimes of interaction” 2–5, 18, 21
- research tools 12–13
- Resolution on the Reform of the Science and Technology System (1985) 71
- respondent bias 151
- Ribeiro, L.C. 194
- Riguzi, P. 213
- RoKS (Research on Knowledge Systems) project 3, 5, 10–11, 26, 168, 197–8
- Rosenberg, N. 1, 7, 10, 25, 145–6, 194
- Rumbelow, J. 154
- S&E (science and engineering) field and early stages of development 17
- matrices of interaction and industrialization phases 216–18
- literature background 194–7
- matrix data 199–201
- “points of interaction” 197, 203, 205–7, 210–17
- and R&D 194–6, 197–8, 207, 211
- research methodology 197–9
- research questions 197
- and strength/relevance of science 194–6
- US matrices 210–13, 216–17
- and research tools 13
- S&T (science and technology) field
- Asian UILs study 70–71, 74
- and early stages of development 17
- and global interactions 25, 234, 241
- and key role of universities 32
- PRO–I interactions 97–8, 100–101, 102, 103
- and S&E matrices of interaction 195, 213, 217
- and South Korean UIL dynamics 163
- sub-Saharan Africa UILs study 44–5, 53
- and transition of UILs in China 122–3, 126–7, 140, 142
- Sabato, Ernesto 10
- Sampat, B.N. 145, 146
- satisfaction rates 80–81, 253
- Schiller, D. 18, 66, 250
- Schmoch, U. 56, 95, 194
- Schumpeter, J. 14
- SCI (Science Citation Index) 68
- Science and Public Policy* (journal) 26, 57
- Science Policy Resolution (1958) 72
- “science push” approach 47
- scientific papers, statistics on 2–5
- scientific production 2–4, 51, 105, 165
- scope (UIL scale) 64
- “self-selection” 81
- Seoul Journal of Economics* 26, 57
- Sercovich, F. 8, 34, 52
- “service” channel of interaction
- international PRO–I comparisons 177–8, 191, 192
- Latin American PRO–I study 96, 108–9, 112–13, 117
- motivations for PRO–I interactions 167–8
- Seventh Malaysian Plan (1996–2000) 69
- short-term production activities 97, 116, 178, 180–81, 185, 192
- SMEs (small and medium enterprises) 39, 45, 67, 74, 85
- “social contracts” 71
- social proximity 59
- “socialist economic construction” 71
- SOEs (state-owned enterprises) 136
- Soete, L. 194
- South Africa
- challenges to knowledge-based growth 37–8
- conceptual approach of study 33–5
- constraints on industrialization 20
- and dynamics of interactions 21
- features of UILs 39–41
- firm innovation data 148–9, 150
- and foreign-owned firms 221
- and global interactions 233–4, 240–41
- health demands 19
- interaction comparisons 8, 9
- interactive capabilities 50–51
- “moving thresholds” data 3–4
- policy mechanisms 47–8, 52, 54
- promoting UILs 54
- “regimes of interaction” data 2–4, 5

- sources of information for
 - technological innovation 155–8
 - study methodology 33–5
 - trajectory of 2–4, 5
- South Korea
 - benefits from PRO–I interactions 181, 185, 187, 190, 192
 - and “Changing Universities” programme 254
 - channels of PRO–I interaction 164–5, 172, 174
 - degree of success of UILs 150–51
 - and dynamics of interactions 21, 163
 - and early stages of development 17, 18
 - effectiveness of UILs in catch–up process 88, 90
 - firm innovation data 148–9
 - and GINs 227
 - and global interactions 233–4
 - historical roots of UILs 67–9
 - interaction comparisons 8, 9
 - and Latin American PRO–I comparison 117
 - macro-institutional arrangements 74–5
 - modes of collaboration 75–7
 - “moving thresholds” data 3–4
 - outcomes of UILs 80, 82–3
 - PRO–I interaction study data 169
 - “regimes of interaction” data 2–5, 18, 21
 - regional/sectoral differences 85–6
 - research methodology 57–8
 - and technological revolutions 14–15
 - trajectory of 2–5
- Soviet Union 120
- spatial proximity 60
- Special Research Institute Promotion Law (1973) 68
- “spots of interaction” 13, 17
- statistics on patents and scientific papers 2–5
- structural change 23–4, 34, 36
- Sutz, J. 56, 247
- Suzigan, W. 99, 162
- technological capabilities 56, 60–61, 63, 67, 140, 147
- technological intensity 39, 151
- technological production 2–3, 5, 102
- technological revolutions 14–15, 24
- “technology market” 122–3
- technology transfer 47, 49–50, 53, 54, 194
- Technology Transfer Promotion Law (2001) 68
- Terreblanche, S. 20
- tertiary education 59
- Teubal, M. 8, 34, 52
- Thailand
 - and “Changing Universities” programme 252
 - firm innovation data 148–9, 150
 - and foreign-owned firms 221
 - historical roots of UILs 69–71
 - interaction comparisons 8, 9
 - macro-institutional arrangements 73–4
 - modes of collaboration 75–6, 77, 79
 - “moving thresholds” data 3–4
 - outcomes of UILs 80, 84
 - “regimes of interaction” data 2–4
 - regional/sectoral differences 85, 86
 - research methodology 57–8
 - trajectory of 2–4
- theoretical background of studies 10–11
- theoretical framework of studies 13–26
- time restrictions 139, 140
- TLOs (Technology Licensing Offices) 68, 69
- TNCs (transnational corporations) 15, 20, 23, 25,
- “traditional” channel of interaction
 - international PRO–I comparisons 170, 172, 174, 176–7, 191, 192
 - Latin American PRO–I study 96, 107–10, 112–13, 117–18
 - motivations for PRO–I interactions 167–8
- transaction-cost economics 10, 65
- “transition of phases” approach 8
- transnational interactions 227, 228–31
- “transnational technologies” 7, 25, 26, 221
- Triple Helix approach 10, 62
- trust 130, 142, 231

- UAM (Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana) 104–5
- UFMG (Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais) 215–16
- Uganda
- challenges to knowledge-based growth 35–6
 - and “Changing Universities” programme 250, 254
 - conceptual approach of study 33–5
 - features of UILs 43–5
 - firm innovation data 148–9
 - interaction comparisons 8
 - interactive capabilities 48–9
 - “moving thresholds” data 3–4
 - and multiple demands on universities and PRIs 19
 - policy mechanisms 46–7, 52, 53
 - promoting UILs 53
 - “regimes of interaction” data 2–4
 - study methodology 33–5
 - trajectory of 2–4
- UILs (university–industry links)
- and absorptive capacity 56, 58–9, 61, 67, 89
 - and academic capability 56, 62–3, 67
 - Asian study
 - comparison with Latin America 87–8
 - effectiveness of UILs in catch-up process 88–92
 - future research 91–2
 - historical roots of UILs 67–73
 - macro-institutional arrangements 73–5
 - modes of collaboration 64–5, 75–9
 - outcomes of UILs 65–6, 79–84
 - public-policy interventions 91
 - and R&D 64–5, 67–8, 79–82, 85, 88–9
 - regional/sectoral differences 66–7, 85–6
 - research methodology 57–8
 - “Changing Universities” programme 245–54
 - future research directions 254–7, 258–9
 - global interactions *see* global interactions
 - impact on universities 257–8
 - and knowledge-based economies 32
 - and knowledge transfer 55, 59–60, 64, 74, 88
 - and learning systems 56
 - and patents 55–6
 - and PROs 58, 59, 64–5, 75, 77–8, 79–84, 88–9
 - and proximity 59–60
 - role of universities in NSI 147
 - S&E matrices of interaction
 - and industrialization phases 216–18
 - literature background 194–7
 - matrix data 199–201
 - “points of interaction” 197, 203, 205–7, 210–17
 - and R&D 194–6, 197–8, 207, 211
 - research methodology 197–9
 - research questions 197
 - and strength/relevance of science 194–6
 - US matrices 210–13, 216–17
 - sub-Saharan Africa study
 - challenges to knowledge-based growth 35–8
 - conceptual approach 33–5
 - effectiveness of UILs 32–3
 - features of UILs 38–46
 - interactive capabilities 48–51
 - methodology 33–5
 - policy mechanisms 46–8, 51–4
 - promoting UILs 51–4
 - R&D 34, 39–42, 44, 45, 46
 - technology transfer 47, 49–50, 53, 54
 - survey exploration
 - channels of information 158–60
 - data set 147–50
 - degree of success of UILs 150–51
 - modes of relationship 160–61
 - sources of information for technological innovation 151–8
 - and technological innovation 161–2
 - and technological capability 56, 60–61, 63, 67
 - transition in China
 - channels of interaction 127–30, 138–40, 141–2

- current situation 136, 138–40
- differing types of universities 135–6, 137
- historical background 120–23
- importance of universities as knowledge source 131–6, 142
- and knowledge transfer 123–4, 126–7
- S&T field 122–3, 126–7, 140, 142
- survey data 124–6, 127
- and UREs 121–2, 123, 126–7, 141
- UNA (Universidad Nacional de Costa Rica) 102–3
- UNAM (Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México) 104–5
- UNCTAD study (2005) 227
- UNED (Universidad Estatal a Distancia) 102
- universities
 - “antennae” role of 14, 17
 - “Changing Universities” programme 245–54, 258
 - creation of 13, 16–17
 - and dynamics of interactions 21–3
 - and early stages of development 15–18
 - future research directions 254–7, 258–9
 - and GINs 222–4, 225–8, 232, 241–2
 - and global interactions 25–6, 222–4, 225–31, 232
 - historical perspective on structural change 23–4
 - impact of UILs on 257–8
 - interaction comparisons 5–10
 - and knowledge-based economies 31–2, 35–8, 147
 - as knowledge source for firms 131–6, 142
 - and Latin American PRO–I study 93–4, 98, 99, 101–4
 - and methodology of studies 11
 - multiple demands on 19–20
 - and NSI framework 1
 - role and relevance in NSI 145–7
 - sources of information for technological innovation 151–6
 - statistics on patents and scientific papers 2
 - and technological innovation 161–2
 - and technological revolutions 14–15, 24
 - and theoretical background of studies 11–12
 - and theoretical framework of studies 14
 - university–industry links *see* UILs
 - “university capabilities” 15, 18, 21
 - UREs (university-run enterprises) 8, 22, 71, 72, 74, 75, 121–2, 123, 126–7, 141
- USA (United States of America) 152–61, 210–13, 216–17, 238–41, 242
- USPTO (United States Patent and Trademark Office) 2, 99, 104, 231–2
- Vazquez, C. 167
- Verbeek, A. 194
- Viotti, E.B. 56
- “virtuous cycles” 231
- Wacziarg, R. 34
- Weesakul, B. 71
- White, S. 56
- WHO (World Health Organization) 230
- Williamson, O. 22
- “world-level challenges” 225
- Yale Survey 10, 12, 18, 146, 147, 194–5, 197–8, 251
- Zitt, M. 194