

Academia and industry

The generative and developmental roles of universities in regional innovation systems

Chrys Gunasekara

This paper explores the state of the literature on the role that universities perform in the development of regional innovation systems. The predominant focus in the literature has been on institutional analysis of university–industry technology transfer. This is important but tends to underestimate the potentially broad-based ‘third role’ of universities in regional systems, as well as exploring the nature of, and possible explanations for, differences in the roles that universities perform in different regional settings. An analytical framework is proposed for considering the nature of the role of universities in the development of regional innovation systems and explanation of variation in the roles performed by universities in different regional settings.

Chrys Gunasekara is at Queensland University of Technology School of Management, GPO Box 2434, Brisbane, Queensland 4001, Australia; Tel: +61 7 3864 2648; Fax: +61 7 3864 1313; Email: c.gunasekara@qut.edu.au

The author acknowledges the helpful feedback received from the Editor and two anonymous referees.

THERE IS GROWING POLICY interest in the drivers of regional innovation systems as engines of economic development and in strategies to promote greater opportunity for both developed and less developed regions. For some years now, and with increasing vigour, the European Union has pursued a number of key priorities that have been focused on regional renewal (EU, 1999). Institutionalised through mechanisms including the Cohesion Fund and the European Regional Development Fund, these priorities have centred on: improving regional competitiveness, promoting regional economic and social cohesion and urban and rural development. In particular, the Structural Funds have emphasised the importance of regional partnerships between public sector, business, higher and further education and business support organisations. In the UK, the Lambert Report (Lambert, 2003) and the recent Innovation Report (DTI, 2003) have both highlighted the need to strengthen the development of regional innovation systems, notably, through the development of “innovation-driven regional strategies” (DTI, 2003: 7). Canada’s Innovation Strategy (CME, 2003; Industry Canada, 2002) adopts a similar focus, though targeted towards cluster formation and supportive capability development, including the engagement [by communities] “of local leaders from the academic, private and public sectors in formulating their innovation strategies” (Industry Canada, 2002: 13).

Against this backcloth, the role of universities in the development of regional innovation systems assumes heightened importance. Specifically, the question of how we should analyse their role at a regional level becomes key, as does explaining variation in the roles performed by universities across different regional settings.

Chrys Gunasekara is in the Queensland University of Technology School of Management. His professional background includes senior executive roles in management and, more recently, an academic research career in management, with particular focus on public policy and administration. His research interests centre on science and innovation policy, the development of regional innovation systems, the role of universities in society and new expressions of the state.

Existing studies of the role of universities tend to be predicated on assumptions, not always explicit, about the role that they should play in innovation; for example, as knowledge capitalisers in growth-oriented regions. Less attention has been paid to understanding differences in the roles that universities perform in innovation systems and in explaining why these differences may arise. This paper explores the literature on the role of universities in regional systems and proposes an analytical framework for considering that issue. The proposed framework is anchored in a distinction drawn between generative and developmental and roles of universities, which are articulated with respect to four key elements of regional innovation systems. This approach problematises university roles in regional systems and enables comparative analysis of the roles that universities perform in different regional settings.

The first section of the paper recalls the nature of regional innovation systems and draws out a number of key elements that are widely acknowledged in the literature as representing the essentials of a regional system. The second section examines the major theoretical turning points in constructing the role of universities in regional systems. The third section of the paper proposes a framework for analysing universities' roles in regional innovation systems and explaining variation in the roles performed by universities in different regional settings. This framework draws on the triple helix model of university, industry, government relations, the emerging literature on university engagement and the key elements of regional systems outlined previously. The final section contains some reflections on the application of the framework.

Regional innovation systems

Writers on national systems of innovation argued that innovation systems could be analysed at several levels: supranational, national, sectoral, technological, local and regional (Edquist, 1997a, 1997b; Freeman, 1995; Lundvall, 1992; Lundvall *et al.*, 2001; Carlsson and Stankiewicz, 1995). The significance of the regional analysis of innovation has grown from a number of factors. Firstly, the integration of national, regional and technology policy since the early 1980s (Koschatzky, 2000; Rothwell and Dodgson, 1992) and the consequent importance

of the local market for innovation and competitive advantage (Lundvall *et al.*, 2001; Patel and Pavitt, 1994). As capitalism takes the form of an increasingly integrated global economic system, the region grows in significance as a meaningful site for understanding the systemic nature of innovation and for shaping the innovation environment from a policy perspective (Florida, 1998). This is due, in part, to the growing importance of regional clusters and networks, greater regional specialisation, the utilisation of 'tacit' local knowledge and the need for regions to promote flexibility and adaptation when confronted with uncertainty (ALGA/NE, 2002: 2).

Secondly, a shift from firm-centred, incentive-based, state-driven and standardised regional economic development policies to bottom-up, region-specific, longer-term and plural-actor policies (Amin, 1999; Markusen *et al.*, 1999). Thirdly, a shift in the dominant production paradigm from large, internally coherent and hierarchical organisation to a 'vertically disintegrated' and geographically concentrated organisation of production, where competition and collaboration co-exist through a variety of mechanisms, such as new kinds of sub-contracting, customer-supplier relations between large corporations and dynamic smaller firms (and also among the latter themselves) (Cooke *et al.*, 1998; Hansen, 1992). And fourthly, the so-called 'garden argument' (Pacquet, 1994): if the economy is regarded as a garden with a variety of trees and plants, for the gardener (the government) there is no simple rule likely to apply to all plants. Growth, therefore, is best orchestrated from its sources at the level of cities and regions. At this level, policymakers can better tailor policy to demand and create 'good business climates' (Nauwelaers and Wintjes, 2000; Tsipouri, 1999; Jessop, 1994).

These factors explain the increasing importance of regional innovation systems in industrial policy (OECD, 1999b, 2001; Rothwell and Dodgson, 1992) and in the academic study of regional development and innovation.

Regional innovation may be understood as innovation at a sub-national level (Edquist, 1997a). Regional innovation systems represent the intersection of the systems of innovation approach with spatial

Regional innovation may be understood as innovation at a sub-national level. Regional innovation systems represent the intersection of the systems of innovation approach with spatial agglomeration of industry in a geographically specific area

agglomeration of industry in a geographically specific area (OECD, 1999b). Cooke *et al* (1998: 24–25) has conceptualised regional innovation systems as comprising “a collective order based on microconstitutional regulation conditioned by trust, reliability, exchange and cooperative interaction” within a cohesive spatially bounded geographical area. The literature on the learning region (Cooke and Morgan, 1998; Morgan, 1997; Florida, 1995) and on the learning economy (Lundvall and Johnson, 1994) echoed this conceptualisation, emphasising the importance of spatially bounded interactive learning, in multiple modes, within inter-firm and firm–institution networks, contextualised and energised by knowledge-based competition. Interactive learning and innovation are outcomes of a regional innovation system.

Four elements are widely acknowledged in the literature as key constituents of a regional innovation system. The four key elements are: the spatial agglomeration of firms and other organisations in a bounded geographical space, in a single industry, or in complementary industries; the availability of a stock of proximate capital, particularly, human capital; an associative governance regime; and the development of cultural norms of openness to learning, trust and cooperation between firms (Cooke, 2002; Niosi and Bas, 2001; Morgan, 1997; Florida, 1995; Lundvall and Johnson, 1994). The nature of these four elements is discussed in this section. (A fifth element, interactive innovation, emerges from the effective operation of the other four elements.)

Regional agglomeration is the first key element of a regional innovation system. The literature on regional innovation systems referred to the presence of “dense networks of social, professional and community relationships” (Saxenian, 1994, 1990), “regional innovative environments” (Camagni, 1991), “geographically concentrated networks of enterprises” in industry sectors (Hansen, 1992), “regional concentrations of innovative economic activity” (Porter, 1990) and a “nexus of competencies” (Niosi and Bas, 2001) in regional, sectoral clusters. These descriptions of regional agglomeration involve spatial clustering and networking among groups of firms, in one or more industry sectors in a geographical space (OECD, 1997, 1999b, 2000). De Bresson and Amesse (1991: 349) insist that: “No firm, large or small, can innovate or survive without a network”. They point out that studies of incubator firms, spin-offs and start-ups invariably show that locational proximity and accompanying deep interaction, learning and knowledge acquisition are crucial to nurturing innovative ventures.

The existence and quality of proximity capital is a second important element of a regional innovation system (Cooke, 2002). Proximity capital, which can be hard or soft, financial or human, refers to different kinds of infrastructures that support the innovative activities of firms and other organisations (Cooke, 2002: 11; Hassink, 2002; Krugman, 1997).

These infrastructures include: venture capital, business support services, transport, telecommunications, and a skilled workforce that supports the knowledge needs of regional firms, particularly, in knowledge-based industries (Hassink, 2002). Crevoisier (1997) highlighted the importance in agglomerations (especially, involving SMEs) of localised, trust-based means of raising venture capital, perhaps through local entrepreneurs or “business angels”.

The skills base of a region that is relevant to the innovation needs of firms and other organisations (Niosi and Bas, 2001; Keeble *et al*, 1999) and the existence of appropriate communication links such as road, rail, airport and telecommunications services are regarded as “crucially important in proximity to industrial agglomerations” (Cooke, 2002: 11). Florida’s discussion of the characteristics of learning regions highlights the valence of a proximate skills base that meets regional knowledge needs, emphasising the importance of a region’s human infrastructure of knowledge workers who can apply their intelligence in production (Florida, 1995: 532). Recent studies of regional innovation systems have emphasised the importance of a proximate skilled workforce in attracting inward investment, with consequent benefits in stimulating the development of indigenous enterprises (Grimes, 2003; Castells, 2000; Dunning, 1998).

Associative regional governance is a third key element of a regional innovation system that centres on regional innovation capacity building strategy (Cooke, 2002: 11, 16; Chatterton and Goddard, 2000). Regional governance signifies a shift from state regulation to regional self-regulation (Hirst, 1994), which is underpinned by a soft infrastructure or ‘social capital’ (Putnam, 1993). Regulatory institutions of economic activity are being decentralised, in part, as national governments place increasing emphasis on regional policy (OECD, 2001; Goddard and Chatterton, 1999). Consequently, at a regional level, an array of intermediate organisations is emerging, centred on regional development and administration, that create, in any particular locality, an “institutional thickness” (Amin and Thrift, 1994). These bodies, which, typically, include local authorities, regional development agencies, other government agencies that provide innovation support programs and peak business, industry and labour groups, shape regional innovation strategy.

Cooke argues that the key function of regional governance is to develop policies and strategies that support cluster development as well as identifying and addressing gaps in innovation support infrastructure; notably, venture capital and basic and applied research (Cooke, 2002: 9, 13). To work effectively, the key institutions in the governance set-up must exhibit strong competencies in inclusivity, networking and consultation as well as having access to accurate and timely information and analysis of regional performance and, importantly, gaps in

infrastructure and emerging internal and external threats and opportunities (Cooke, 2002: 15). Thus, associative governance is defined by Cooke as “a networking propensity whereby key regional governance mechanisms, notably, regional administrative bodies, are interactive and inclusive with respect to other bodies of consequence to regional innovation” (Cooke, 2002: 11).

Openness to learning, trust and cooperation between firms are important cultural norms that lubricate interactive learning in a regional innovation system (Cooke, 2002; Cooke and Morgan, 1998; Morgan, 1997). This is the fourth key element of a regional system. Referring to the importance of cultural norms that support learning and interactive innovation, Cooke (2002: 14) points to the degree of embeddedness of a region, its institutions and its organisations as a key superstructural issue. Embeddedness is defined as:

the extent to which a social community operates in terms of shared norms of cooperation, trustful interaction, and untraded interdependencies, as distinct from competitive, individualistic, arms length exchange, and hierarchical norms. (Cooke, 2002: 14).

Lawton Smith *et al* encapsulate this element in the notion of “local cultural cohesion” (Lawton Smith *et al*, 2001: 97), echoing Keeble *et al*'s (1999) study of Oxford and Cambridge (UK), which highlighted the importance of cultural norms of openness to learning, trust and cooperation between firms and other organisations in shaping innovative environments. Niosi and Bas (2001) also refer to the propensity and capacity to cooperate with, and learn from, other institutions in the regional system such as local universities, government laboratories and venture capital firms as a core competency of a region.

These four key elements constitute what Cooke (2002: 17) describes as a “locational systemness” that marks a regional innovation system. This is echoed in Saxenian's landmark work on regional networks (Saxenian, 1994), in Porter's (1990) notion of cluster synergies in industry precincts and Kanter's (1995) notions of networker and knowledge based regions.

The role of universities

Theorisation of the role of universities in regional innovation systems has evolved in the last 20 years, from the innovation systems approach, which highlighted the importance of knowledge spillovers from the educational and research activities of universities in regional knowledge spaces towards the development of a third role performed by universities in animating regional economic and social development (Etzkowitz, 2002a, 2002b; Etzkowitz *et al*, 2000; Etzkowitz and Leydesdorff, 1999, 1997, 2000;

Universities have long been recognised as providers of basic scientific knowledge for industrial innovation through their research and related activities, where ‘industrial’ connoted the agricultural and manufacturing sectors

Leydesdorff and Etzkowitz, 1998; Holland, 2001; Chatterton and Goddard, 2000; Goddard and Chatterton, 1999).

Universities have long been recognised as providers of basic scientific knowledge for industrial innovation through their research and related activities, where ‘industrial’ connoted the agricultural and manufacturing sectors (Guston, 2000; Smith, 1990; Hart, 1988). Neoclassical economic theory explained the productive performance and competitive advantage of firms largely in terms of relative resource endowments (Hall, 1994). The role of knowledge and of institutions involved in the creation of knowledge was seen as exogenous, though not unimportant, to the production system (Freeman, 1995).

Knowledge creation, almost exclusively scientific in nature, and predominantly applying to agriculture, manufacturing and mining, was viewed similarly as an exogenous factor in a firm's production function. The development and diffusion of knowledge was viewed in linear terms, known as the science push model (Smith, 1990) in the sense that knowledge was created outside the production system, either in universities or the laboratories of large firms and then ‘pushed’ out to industry for applied development and adoption (Webster, 1999). The notion of university–industry linkage, whereby the two institutions jointly or cooperatively developed knowledge was weak, applying largely to the conduct of trials or other experiments by universities to prove concepts during research (Smith, 1990).

The emergence of the national systems of innovation approach (Freeman, 1991; Lundvall, 1992) shifted this conceptualisation of the role of universities in economic production, bringing universities ‘inside the tent’. Innovation systems were envisioned as dynamic complexes of interaction among industry, government, business support institutions, knowledge creation institutions and labour, capital and product markets, for the creation, diffusion and adoption of knowledge (Lundvall, 1992; Lundvall *et al*, 2001; Freeman and Soete, 2000; Edquist, 1997a, 1997b). In addition to an emphasis on the role of universities in supporting interactive innovation through research and education, the national systems of innovation literature highlighted the role that universities

performed in fostering regional agglomeration through knowledge spillovers resulting from their research and educational activities (OECD, 1999b, 2001; Camagni, 1991; Lawson, 1997; Lawson and Lorenz, 1999) and, over the long run, fostering the development of supportive regional cultural norms (Lawton Smith *et al.*, 1998, 2001). The innovation systems literature, therefore, re-focused the locus of action in knowledge creation, diffusion and adoption from an exogenous position (to the firm) toward a clear endogenous location within firms, networks of firms, and networks of firms and other organisations such as universities (Edquist, 1997a; Lundvall, 1992; Lundvall *et al.*, 2001; Freeman, 1997), increasingly, at a regional level.

However, the primary institutional spheres shaping regional economic development remained industry and the state (Etzkowitz, 2002b; Etzkowitz and Leydesdorff, 1999) and there were doubts expressed by some authors regarding the beneficial effect of knowledge spillovers resulting from the proximity of universities to regional clusters (Feldman and Desrochers, 2003; Malecki, 1997: 127). The conceptualisation of the role of universities in the systems of innovation approach separated academic and commercial practices (Etzkowitz, 2002b: 13). This left control of the commercial opportunities from academic research in the hands of industry. Control over the direction of research and the choice of research topic was left to the academic scientist. But, in recent years, even this choice was circumscribed by the state, through reductions in government funding, the introduction of competitive grant schemes linked to industry participation and exhortations that universities should source a larger share of revenue from industry (Garrett-Jones, 2002).

Contextualised amidst the reduction of government funding for universities and growing pressures on universities and governments to foster knowledge-based innovation in national and regional economies (Hagen, 2002), the triple helix model (Etzkowitz and Leydesdorff, 1997; Sutz, 1997) sharpened the focus on the role of universities in regional economies, pointing to the emergence of hybrid university, industry, government relationships that involved the multiplication of resources and capital formation projects (Etzkowitz, 2002b).

The objective is to multiply the value of intellectual property derived from academic research through the stock market, either directly through the formation of a new firm or indirectly through a stream of royalty income from an existing firm. (Etzkowitz, 2002b: 14)

The triple helix model conceptualised a non-linear, interactive model of innovation as a recursive overlap of interactions and negotiations among universities, industry and government — the three helices conceptualised in the model (Etzkowitz and Leydesdorff, 1997). A key insight offered by this model is the

hybrid, recursive, cross-institutional nature of relations among the three helices. The institutional spheres of the state, the university and industry were formerly separate entities that interacted across strongly defended boundaries. Increasingly, individuals and organisations within the helices are taking other roles than were traditionally ascribed to them. This results in a blurring of boundaries between academia and industry and an overlapping of the institutional spheres as one sphere “takes the role of the other” (Etzkowitz and Leydesdorff, 1999: 113, 1997; Sutz, 1997).

More recently, the literature on the engaged university (OECD, 1999a; Holland, 2001; Chatterton and Goddard, 2000) also focused on the third role of universities in regional development, but it differed from the triple helix model in its emphasis on adaptive responses by universities that embedded a stronger regional focus in their teaching and research missions. This approach does not eschew hybrid, boundary-spanning mechanisms that are generative of economic growth; rather, it takes a broader, developmental focus that covers a range of mechanisms by which universities engage with their regions. A key point is that the university engagement literature places less emphasis on academic entrepreneurialism, compared with the triple helix model.

The developmental focus in the literature on university engagement is grounded in the concept of the learning economy which emerged from studies of national systems of innovation (Lundvall and Johnson, 1994; Lundvall, 1992). Lundvall and Johnson (1994) define the learning economy as an economy where the success of individuals, firms and regions reflects the capability to learn (and forget old practices); where change is rapid and old skills become obsolete and new skills are in demand; where learning includes the building of competencies, not just increased access to information; where learning is going on in all parts of society, not just high-tech sectors; and where net job creation is in knowledge intensive sectors. The learning region depends upon network knowledge that refers not only to the skills of individuals, but also to the transfer of knowledge from one group to another to form learning systems.

Echoing these observations, Chatterton and Goddard (2000: 479–481) explain that three shifts intersect with and shape the development of regional learning systems. Firstly, they point to the increasing regionalisation of production. The geography of capitalist activity has entailed the resurgence of the region, through the integration of production at a regional level and the decentralisation of large corporations into clusters of smaller business units. At the same time, in the context of a lifelong learning agenda, learning and teaching activities have moved away from a linear model of transmission of knowledge based upon the classroom and are becoming more interactive and experiential, drawing upon new learning approaches that are locationally specific, for example, project work and work-based learning.

Learning and teaching activities have moved away from a linear model of transmission of knowledge based upon the classroom and are becoming more interactive and experiential, drawing upon new learning approaches that are locationally specific

Thirdly, in the wake of the declining regulatory capacity of the nation-state, the institutions that order economic activity are being regionalised and an array of intermediate organisations is emerging that signals a shift from state regulation to regional self-regulation. These organisations constitute the basis for associative governance (Hirst, 1994). In the light of this regionalisation of the economy, universities are confronted with new client bases in both teaching and research. Traditional relationships with large corporations and nationally based firms and research organisations are being supplemented by a new regional client base comprised of clusters of firms and regionally based supply chains of small and medium sized firms (Chatterton and Goddard, 2000: 481). These developments have important implications for the skills required of graduates, particularly by SMEs, and the management of the interface between degree courses and the labour market.

The importance of network knowledge and interactive learning, which are inherently bounded in time and space, call for university teaching and research to be more closely connected with local and regional knowledge imperatives. In particular, “the university acts as a conduit through which research of an international and national nature is transferred to specific localities through the teaching curriculum” (Chatterton and Goddard, 2000: 481). Further, as the institutions of economic regulation become more regionalised, the historical role of universities in nation-building, through the participation of academic staff in numerous public bodies, must also be adapted. Thus universities, through their resource base of people, skills and knowledge, increasingly play a significant role in regional networking and institutional capacity building. Staff, either in formal or informal capacities, may act as “regional animators” (Chatterton and Goddard, 2000: 481) through representation on outside bodies ranging from school governing boards and local authorities to local cultural organisations and development agencies. Hence, universities make an indirect contribution to the social and cultural basis of effective democratic governance. The university engagement approach, therefore, points to a developmental role performed by universities in regional economic and social

development that centres on the intersection of learning economies and the regionalisation of production and regulation.

Authors within this body of thinking appear to pay more attention to discussing the adaptation of teaching roles to reflect regional imperatives and the contribution of universities as ‘critical friends’ in regional governance, than universities as generative agents of growth.

The focus of the engaged university approach was summarised by Braskamp and Wergin (1998) as the campus being in the world and the world in the campus. Forrant (2001) argues that:

Any university intent in playing a strong role in economic development beyond simply the theoretical will have a sustained, positive impact on the regional economy only when its activities are guided by a reflective and on-going institution-wide and region-wide discourse. (Forrant, 2001: 614)

Unlike the triple helix model, this approach is not concerned, fundamentally, with the position of universities in economic regulation, relative to industry and the state; but rather with their orientation within existing institutional patterns. Hence, the university engagement literature signals that universities are adapting their educational, research and community service activities to support regional industry needs as well as the needs of other actors and individuals in their communities (Chatterton and Goddard, 2000). This involves seeking out regional partners to develop and commercialise research (Chatterton, 2000); informing their teaching role by regional needs; providing support and, perhaps, leadership in regional governance (Goddard and Chatterton, 1999) and making a broad range of contributions to civil society, for example, in cultural and community development, through voluntary work undertaken by staff and students, as well as offering public access to facilities such as libraries, museums and sports centres.

There is, therefore, a discernible line of development in the theoretical literature that has seen an increasing emphasis on the role performed by universities in animating regional innovation systems.

A conceptual framework

The contributions made by universities to the development of regional systems may be analysed using a two-dimensional matrix comprising the four key elements that define a regional innovation system and the nature of a university’s engagement with these four elements. A possible framework for analysing the role of universities in the development of regional innovation systems consists of two parts: firstly, a distinction drawn between generative and developmental roles performed by a university; and

secondly, the application of these roles to the four key elements of a regional innovation system.

The generative and developmental nature of university roles is based on the triple helix model and the university engagement approach. It was shown earlier that there are significant differences (and also, points of overlap) between the triple helix model and the university engagement literature in the conceptualisation of the third role of universities in regional economic development. These differences are summarised in Table 1. On the one hand, the triple helix model takes a generative orientation, arguing that, as primary institutional spheres, universities are key drivers of economic development through a range of boundary-spanning, knowledge capitalisation mechanisms, such as incubators, new firm formation and science parks, as well as university research centres and participation in the governance of firms. On the other hand, the university engagement literature, while acknowledging the importance of academic entrepreneurial activities in enabling technology transfer and economic growth, points to a broader, developmental role performed by universities through adapting their traditional roles in teaching and research to better support regional knowledge needs. These categories are not mutually exclusive but there are some differences between them.

Table 1 summarises the differences in the roles performed by universities in the development of regional innovation systems, based on the triple helix model and the university engagement literature.

Regional agglomeration is the first key element of a regional innovation system. The triple helix literature points to the generative role of universities in driving regional agglomeration directly, through firm formation and other capital formation projects, notably,

incubators, science parks, trilateral university research centres and technology transfer offices that animate knowledge capitalisation. These academic entrepreneurial activities, supported by industry and government, “ignite a self-generating process of firm formation, no longer tied to a particular university” (Etzkowitz, 2002a: 125). The university engagement literature takes a developmental approach, which, while accepting the importance of entrepreneurial activities as important drivers of development, points to other mechanisms through which universities foster agglomeration; notably, regionally focused teaching programs that involve workplace-based research projects and the dissemination of national and international research results to regional actors.

The second element of a regional innovation system is the existence of a stock of proximate physical, financial and human capital. In regard to universities, human capital formation is the primary focus in considering this element. The triple helix literature anchors the role of universities in firm formation. This has two key aspects. Firstly, the embedding of human capital formation in incubation activities that ‘create organisations’; and secondly, the development of generic, advanced training that supports the fluidity of employees’ career maps and the increasing level of lateral relationships between firms. The triple helix model argues that universities are increasingly in the business of ‘training organisations’. Education is now embedded in academic entrepreneurship. But, the growing importance of firm formation makes fluid the (previous) stability of firms and workforces, as firms and their people move between institutional spheres. Hence, there is a growing need for generic, advanced training that enables cross-institutional movements (Etzkowitz, 2002a; Etzkowitz and Leydesdorff, 1999).

Table 1. Analysing universities’ contribution to the development of regional innovation systems

Key element of regional innovation system	Generative role	Developmental role
Regional agglomeration, or clustering, of industry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge capitalisation and capital formation projects, centred on firm formation and co-location of new and existing firms near the university 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Entrepreneurial activities, as well as regionally focused teaching and research, not necessarily linked to capital formation projects
Human capital formation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integration of education and knowledge capitalisation activities, specifically, firm formation, through teaching incubators • Development of generic, advanced training programs to support firm formation and cross-institutional mobility by organisations and people 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stronger regional focus on student recruitment and graduate retention • Education programs developed/adapted to meet regional skills needs • Learning processes regionally informed
Associative governance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Driver of regional innovation strategy, centred on knowledge capitalisation and capital formation projects; by analysing strengths and weaknesses and bringing together industry and government to forge innovation strategy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shaping regional networking and institutional capacity, through staff participation on external bodies; provision of information and analysis to support decision-making and brokering networking between national and international contacts and key regional actors
Regional cultural norms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tradition of university/industry linkages, involving knowledge capitalisation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tradition of university/industry linkages, involving knowledge capitalisation and other research collaborations

The university engagement literature takes a developmental view of the role that universities perform in human capital formation, arguing that universities are making their teaching and research programs more responsive to regional knowledge needs

The university engagement literature takes a developmental view of the role that universities perform in human capital formation, arguing that universities are making their teaching and research programs more responsive to regional knowledge needs, in a broad sense. In doing so, it is suggested that universities undertake a number of activities: paying greater attention to student recruitment and graduate retention at a regional level; developing programs that engage with regional knowledge needs and introducing learning approaches that are more regionally focused, drawing on the characteristics of the region to aid learning (OECD, 1999a; Holland, 1999, 2001; Chatterton and Goddard, 2000).

The development of an associative governance framework in a region is the third key element of a regional innovation system. The triple helix model suggests that universities perform a driving role in identifying strengths and weaknesses in a regional innovation environment and leading, or co-leading, the development of innovation strategies based on knowledge capitalisation and other capital formation projects (Etzkowitz, 2002a, 2002b; Sutz, 1997). The university engagement literature, while accepting that universities may well perform this role, points to broader, developmental contributions made by universities to regional networking and institutional capacity, through staff participation in external bodies; the provision of information and analysis on regional issues and opportunities (Chatterton and Goddard, 2000: 490); and brokering networking between national and international contacts and key regional actors (Goddard and Chatterton, 1999; Garlick, 1998).

The development of supportive regional cultural norms of openness to learning, trust and cooperation between firms is the fourth key element of a regional innovation system that emerged from the literature. There is broad alignment between the triple helix model and the university engagement literature regarding the role that universities perform in shaping the development of supportive cultural norms in a regional innovation environment. Both bodies of literature highlight that a tradition of university–industry linkages that is focused on knowledge

transfer, through entrepreneurial activities such as incubation, firm formation and science parks, are key mechanisms that may spawn norms of inter-firm collaboration and trust (Etzkowitz, 2002b; Lawton Smith *et al.*, 2001, 1998; Keeble *et al.*, 1999; Saxenian, 1994).

As evident from this discussion, the dual categorisation of university roles is not mutually exclusive. There are points of overlap as well as some differences. At the broadest level, both the triple helix model and the university engagement literature are concerned with the role that universities perform in supporting regional economic and social development. This is core to both approaches. Furthermore, both bodies of literature accept the importance of academic entrepreneurial activities as important drivers of development. Both bodies of literature also accept that these activities may shape the development of supportive regional cultural norms. However, while there is a consistent theme of generative development driven by universities in the triple helix literature, the university engagement literature takes a broader approach to conceptualising universities' roles. Authors in the university engagement perspective highlight the importance of adaptiveness, responsiveness and engagement with regional needs. But the fundamental relationships between the state, industry and universities in economic regulation are not necessarily transformed. On the other hand, authors discussing the triple helix model point to the co-equal role of universities with industry and the state, driving development through knowledge capitalisation and capital formation projects.

This approach is generative, both within a region and in the university. It is generative of economic development in the region as well as leading to the multiplication of resources within the university through the university's and faculty members' participation in capital formation projects (Etzkowitz, 2002b: 14). While the triple helix model and the literature on university engagement are concerned with the third role of universities in regional economic development, therefore, there are differences in emphasis. This is a key basis upon which the framework proposed here is constructed.

Factors explaining universities' roles

While the framework proposed above is useful to analyse the nature of the role that a university performs in a regional system, a related and arguably, more interesting, analytical issue is the explanation of variation between universities in the contributions that they make to the development of regional innovation systems in different regions. The literature points to a number of possible explanatory factors, which are summarised in Table 2.

Table 2 indicates that there are a number of institutional and related factors that shape the role that universities perform in the development of regional

Table 2. Summary of explanations of the roles that universities perform in the development of regional innovation systems

Explanatory factor	Definition
University orientation to regional engagement	Nature of senior management commitment to regional engagement and mechanisms through which this is operationalised
History of university–region linkages	Nature of historical linkages between a university and regional actors
Complementarity of fields	Degree of alignment between the research strengths of a university and regional knowledge needs
Champions	Presence and influence of university and regional advocates of university–region/industry linkages
Nature of regional industry base	Types of industries and businesses in a region, and their demand for university knowledge linkages
Political and economic conditions	Influence of specific government policies and/or practices directed to the region and the university Influence of specific economic conditions in the region

innovation systems. These factors, which may be classified broadly as ‘university-related’ and ‘region-related’, will vary across universities and there may be additional factors that are peculiar to one or more institutions.

However, the literature has tended to focus on ‘what’ universities do rather than ‘why’ they do what they do and hence the factors distilled from the literature are, at best, indicative. Existing studies indicate that the orientation of a university’s management to regional engagement has a pervasive influence on the role that the university performs in the development of a regional innovation system (OECD, 1999a). A university with an entrepreneurial approach to engagement (Van Looy *et al.*, 2003: 211; Feldman and Desrochers, 2003), that places a strong emphasis on industry linkages, institutionalised through a focus on the commercialisation of inventions, may be expected to perform a broader role in regional agglomeration than a university that eschews or minimises the importance of knowledge capitalisation (Keeble *et al.*, 1999).

Etzkowitz contrasts the “ivory tower model” of universities, emphasising isolation, de-emphasising practical concerns and insisting upon the protection of academic freedom, with an entrepreneurial model that embraces a reverse linear model of innovation starting from societal needs as the basis for research projects (Etzkowitz, 2002b: 19, 145; Etzkowitz *et al.*, 2000). Thus, MIT was conceived as a science-based university committed to the industrial development of its region. The university pioneered the venture capital firm as a transmission-belt between academia and industry, supplying seed capital and business counsel to academic firm-founders (Etzkowitz, 2002b: 2).

The history of university–region linkages is a second university-related factor that explains the role that a university performs in the development of a regional system, notably, in regional agglomeration, human capital formation and in shaping regional cultural norms (Lawton Smith *et al.*, 1998, 2001; Klofsten *et al.*, 1999; Braczyk *et al.*, 1998; Saxenian, 1994). It is evident in the literature that some

universities are more embedded in their regions than others as a consequence of a longer historical tradition of engagement. Saxenian’s (1988, 1994) studies of Silicon Valley and Boston’s Route 128 explained variation in regional innovation, in part, by reference to the different historical trajectories of university engagement, which in turn had influenced behavioural norms in these regions differentially.

Similarly, Lawton Smith *et al.*’s (2001) comparative study of innovation in the Cambridge and Oxford regions pointed to differences in regional norms resulting from different traditions of university–region engagement in explaining the differential impacts of the universities in the development of regional innovation systems. The authors found that Cambridge University had had a deeper tradition of formal and informal engagement with regional firms compared to Oxford, where the emphasis on engagement tended to be operationalised, largely, through formal technology transfer institutions that had developed in more recent years. The historical pattern of university–industry linkages, therefore, fostered a “culture of research collaboration” (Keeble *et al.*, 1999: 323) that remained a key element in the regional innovation milieu.

History matters and may explain the influence that some universities have on regional agglomeration, human capital formation and cultural norms (Lawton Smith *et al.*, 1998, 2001; Farrant, 2001; Keeble *et al.*, 1999). However, it is important to

Firms seek out knowledge from universities that hold the most suitable expertise even though this may be outside the geographical boundaries of the region within which the firms are located

recognise that history involves more than a set of repeated individual transactions with a collection of firms and other organisations. The studies canvassed here point to a broad, deep and synergistic penetration by a university that has had the effect of transforming its proximate region and the university itself.

A third factor shaping the role that universities perform in the development of regional innovation systems is the complementarity between regional knowledge needs and the areas of research strength and expertise held by the university (Etzkowitz, 2002b; Bade and Nerlinger, 2000; Wever and Stam, 1999; Garlick, 1998). Firms seek out knowledge from universities that hold the most suitable expertise even though this may be outside the geographical boundaries of the region within which the firms are located (Bade and Nerlinger, 2000). Where there is a high degree of complementarity of fields between regional knowledge needs and the research strengths of a proximate university, it may be expected that the university will perform a broader role in fostering regional agglomeration and human capital formation. Etzkowitz's (2002b) study of MIT, for example, highlights the importance of the science-based research strengths of that university as a key explanation of its role in the development of the regional system.

The role performed by a university in regional agglomeration and associative governance is influenced by the presence of champions within the university and in the region who play a key leadership role in advocating strong university–industry/region linkages (Garlick, 1998: 63). This factor spans the university and the region. A number of studies have highlighted the importance of champions in shaping the role that a university performs in the development of a regional system (Feldman and Desrochers, 2003; Etzkowitz, 2002a, 2002b; Santoro and Chakrabarti, 2002). Santoro and Chakrabarti (2002) point to the importance of experienced and skilled champions in both the firm and the university who steer the formation and implementation of research partnerships and other linkages with regional governance, particularly involving the research role of a university. Feldman and Desrochers's (2003) study of regional engagement by Johns Hopkins University, on the other hand, highlighted that, in some cases, champions who resisted external engagement stymied the role performed by that university in the regional system. The role of champions, therefore, can enhance or contain the role that universities perform in regional agglomeration and in governance.

In his study of regional engagement by Australian universities, Garlick (2000) explored the link between the maturity of regional leadership and the contribution that universities were making to their regions. He found that stronger cases of university engagement (measured in terms of the activities that universities were undertaking in the region) tended to occur in regions with clearly articulated regional

strategies that envisaged a broad role performed by the university in the governance of the regions (Garlick, 2000: 108–109). Regional actors welcomed and championed university engagement and involved university staff in the development of regional strategies in formal and informal ways.

The industry base of a region influences the demand for, and sources of, external knowledge and hence the contribution that a university makes to agglomeration and human capital formation (Van Looy *et al.*, 2003; Niosi and Bas, 2001). The literature indicates that concentrations of knowledge-based industry sectors and, within these sectors, start-ups and SMEs in science-based industries, hold the greatest promise for university–industry linkages (Niosi, 2002; Niosi and Bas, 2001). But Van Looy *et al.* (2003) argue that the development of endogenous innovation is predicated on the presence of a critical mass of research *and* production competences, pointing to a clear link between the public institutions of higher education and the technology-output in a particular geographical area or region (Van Looy *et al.*, 2003: 210). Similarly, Castells and Hall's (1994) study of the US computer software industry found that the more an economic activity depends upon information-trained, information-oriented labour, the more the labour itself depends for its development on its continuing relationship with a creative milieu able to generate new ideas and new techniques through the spatially clustered interaction of firms and universities.

Knowledge-based high technology industries appear to exhibit a stronger demand for external knowledge than other industry sectors, including service industries within the high technology sector (Bagchi-Sen *et al.*, 2001; Sternberg, 2000a). This is evident in the predominance of innovation studies concerned with the role of universities that have focused on knowledge-based industries, such as biotechnology (Bagchi-Sen *et al.*, 2001) and, within these sectors, start-up firms and SMEs. For example, Sternberg's (2000a) study of German regional manufacturing innovation found a link between concentrations of new technology-based firms and SMEs and knowledge contribution made by public research institutions and universities, particularly in physics, chemistry and pharmaceutical sciences.

Political and economic conditions in a region influence the role that a university performs in regional agglomeration. For example, buoyant economic conditions prevailing in a region influences the demand for university–industry linkages because these conditions tend to attract industry partners that are exploring new ventures (Piergiovanni and Santarelli, 2001; Wever and Stam, 1999: 392). On the other hand, a declining regional economy may explain a poor level of engagement by a university with interactive innovation in a regional system. Political support for a region or a particular university in a region may also influence the role that a university performs in agglomeration.

The literature suggests that the influence of this factor may occur in various ways, including the proactive use of economic regulatory mechanisms that create differential incentives and opportunities (Cooke, 1992), for example, through targeted state intervention to support less favoured regions (Morgan and Nauwelaers, 1999); the availability of federal funding for knowledge creation and diffusion activity to develop the endogenous innovation potential of regions, particularly in high technology manufacturing industries (Sternberg, 2000a, 2000b); and the quality of innovation support infrastructures available in a region (Hassink, 2001, 2002). The key point made by these studies is that, at sub-central level, political and economic conditions may have differential impacts on the fortunes of regions and, by implication, on the role that universities perform in regional agglomeration. There are, therefore, a number of institutional and regional factors that influence the roles that universities perform in the development of regional innovation systems. Six factors were identified from the literature as possible explanations of the role that a university performs in a regional system.

This section has provided a systemic, holistic framework for analysing the role that universities perform in the development of regional innovation systems and for explaining variation in the roles performed by universities in different regional settings. Whereas much of the existing literature has tended to focus on particular types of transactions between universities and firms or particular types of contribution, for example, to cultural development, this framework enables a broad-based consideration of the influence that universities may exercise at a regional level. Further, whereas the emphasis hitherto has tended to be on 'what' universities do rather than 'why' they do what they do, this paper highlights the importance of institutional and regional variation in the nature of universities' roles, suggesting, from the literature, a number of possible explanatory factors.

Reflection on the framework

The strength of the proposed analytical framework turns on the robustness of the triple helix model of university, industry, government relations and the engaged university approach. Both offer important insights into the behaviour of universities at a regional level. However, there is also need for caution. The triple helix model does not have wide empirical foundations, even though the case of MIT has been explored in some detail as a landmark case of this approach in action. It is also problematic in its treatment of goal conflict across the three helices, arguably, understating the importance of differences in their core missions. Furthermore, the triple helix model does not represent fully the implications of differences in power across the three helices and in their relative capabilities to exercise influence over

There is potential to extend the framework to include other elements of regional systems and to categorise the role of universities in a more nuanced way using interpolations of the bodies of thinking upon which it is based

their environments, particularly, in regard to knowledge capitalisation and capital formation, as well as leading strategy development. To a lesser degree, the university engagement literature also underestimates the implications of power differences, as well as goal conflict and capabilities in advancing the adaptive and responsive nature of university roles. These issues warrant further investigation. There is also potential to extend the framework to include other elements of regional systems and to categorise the role of universities in a more nuanced way using interpolations of the bodies of thinking upon which it is based.

However, the framework offers a useful analytical construct to consider, in a broad-based way, both the nature of universities' contributions to the development of regional innovation systems and explanation of variation in the contributions made by universities in different regional settings. This can be done within and across regions and nations, with judicious attention to considering like with like. To some degree, it may be suggested that the categorisation of a university's role as either generative or developmental (or, tending towards one or the other) is less pertinent than turning attention to the question: Why does this university tend to adopt a stronger generative approach, for example, to human capital formation than that university in that region? This type of question is of particular relevance for policy analysis in an environment where the role of universities is being considered, increasingly, in the context of place. The framework developed in this paper makes a contribution to this level of analysis.

As policymakers and regional development institutions move beyond a general focus on the contribution of universities as animateurs of regional performance in knowledge-based competition, the framework proposed here provides an approach that can be used to analyse, in a richer and fine-grained way, why universities do what they do in regions and why universities in different regional settings appear to perform different roles. There are at least three distinctive lines of enquiry. Firstly, the framework can be used to identify and build upon the strengths in regional capabilities that arise from the type of contributions made by a university. The

heuristics of generative and developmental roles provide a basis for dialogue among regional and extra-regional stakeholders on the 'fit' between regional performance and aspirations and the role that is and could be performed by a proximate university.

Secondly, by facilitating comparative analysis of the roles by universities in different regions and possible factors explaining variation in those roles, the framework provides a basis for understanding the efficacy of current regional policy and higher education policy settings and for identifying improvements in policy design that can better target supportive interventions that address regional disparities in the roles performed by universities. And thirdly, the framework can be used to enhance university planning processes by providing a rich articulation of the nature of current initiatives in regional engagement; characterising possibilities for further action; and assisting managers to locate and analyse their universities' strategies in a broader context.

References

- ALGA/NE, Australian Local Government Association/National Economics 2002. *State of the Regions 2001*. Canberra: Australian Local Government Association/National Economics.
- Amin, A 1999. An institutional perspective on regional economic development. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, **23**, 365–378.
- Amin, A and N Thrift 1994. Living in the global. In *Globalization, Institutions, and Regional Development in Europe*, eds. A Amin and N Thrift, pp. 1–22. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bade, F and E A Nerlinger 2000. The spatial distribution of new technology-based firms: empirical results for West-Germany. *Papers in Regional Science*, **79**, 155–176.
- Bagchi-Sen, S, L Hall and L Petryshyn 2001. A study of university-industry linkages in the biotechnology industry: perspectives from Canada. *International Journal of Biotechnology*, **3**(3/4), 390–409.
- Braczyk, H, P Cooke and M Heidenreich eds. 1998. *Regional Innovation Systems: The Role of Governance in a Globalized World*. London: UCL Press.
- Braskamp, L and J Wergin 1998. Forming new social partnerships. In *The Responsive University: Restructuring for High Performance*, ed. W G Tierney, pp. 62–91. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Camagni, R ed. 1991. *Innovation Networks: Spatial Perspectives*. London: Belhaven.
- Carlsson, B and R Stankiewicz 1995. On the nature, function and composition of technological systems. In *Technological Systems and Economic Performance: The Case of Factory Automation*, ed. B Carlsson. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Castells, M 2000. *The Rise of the Network Society*, 2nd edn. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Castells, M and P Hall 1994. *Technopolis of the World: The Making of Twenty-First Century Industrial Complexes*. London: Routledge.
- Chatterton, P 2000. The cultural role of universities in the community: revisiting the university-community debate. *Environment and Planning A*, **32**, 165–181.
- Chatterton, P and J Goddard 2000. The response of higher education institutions to regional needs. *European Journal of Education*, **35**(4), 475–496.
- CME, Canadian Manufacturers and Exporters 2003. *BC's Innovation Challenge: The Road Back to World Leadership*. Toronto: CME.
- Cooke, P 1992. Regional innovation systems: competitive regulation in the new Europe. *Geoforum*, **23**, 365–382.
- Cooke, P 1998. Introduction: origins of the concept. In *Regional Innovation Systems*, eds. H Braczyk, P Cooke and M Heidenreich, pp. 2–27. London and Pennsylvania: UCL Press.
- Cooke, P 2002. Biotechnology clusters as regional, sectoral innovation systems. *International Regional Science Review*, **25**(1), 8–37.
- Cooke, P and K Morgan 1998. *The Associational Economy: Firms, Regions and Innovation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cooke, P, M G Uranga and G Etxebarria 1998. Regional systems of innovation: an evolutionary perspective. *Environment and Planning A*, **30**, 1563–1584.
- Crevoisier, O 1997. Financing regional endogenous development: the role of proximity capital in the age of globalization. *European Planning Studies*, **5**, 407–416.
- De Bresson, C and F Amesse 1991. Networks of innovators: a review and introduction to the issue. *Research Policy*, **20**(5), 363–379.
- DTI, Department of Trade and Industry 2003. *Competing in the Global Economy: The Innovation Challenge*. London: DTI.
- Dunning, J 1998. Location and the multinational enterprise: a neglected factor. *Journal of International Business Studies*, **29**(1), 45–66.
- Edquist, C ed. 1997a. *Systems of Innovation: Technologies, Institutions and Organizations*. London and Washington: Pinter.
- Edquist, C 1997b. Systems of innovation approaches — their emergence and characteristics. In *Systems of Innovation: Technologies, Institutions and Organizations*, ed. C Edquist. London and Washington: Pinter.
- Etzkowitz, H 2002a. Incubation of incubators: innovation as a triple helix of university-industry-government networks. *Science and Public Policy*, **29**(2), February, 115–128.
- Etzkowitz, H 2002b. *MIT and the Rise of Entrepreneurial Science*. London: Routledge.
- Etzkowitz, H and L Leydesdorff 1997. Introduction: universities in the global knowledge economy. In *Universities and the Global Knowledge Economy: A Triple Helix of University-Industry-Government Relations*, eds. H Etzkowitz and L Leydesdorff, pp. 1–8. London and Washington: Pinter.
- Etzkowitz, H and L Leydesdorff 1999. The future location of research and technology transfer. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, **24**, 111–123.
- Etzkowitz, H and L Leydesdorff 2000. The dynamics of innovation: from national systems and "mode 2" to a triple helix of university-industry-government relations. *Research Policy*, **29**(2–3), 109–123.
- Etzkowitz, H, A Webster, C Gebhardt and B R C Terra 2000. The future of the university and the university of the future: evolution of ivory tower to entrepreneurial paradigm. *Research Policy*, **29**(2), 313–330.
- EU, European Union 1999. *Regional Policy: Guidelines for Programmes 2000–2006*, COM (1999) 344. Brussels: EU.
- Feldman, M and P Desrochers 2003. Research universities and local economic development: lessons from the history of the Johns Hopkins University. *Industry and Innovation*, **10**(1), 5–24.
- Florida, R 1995. Toward the learning region. *Futures*, **27**(5), 527–536.
- Florida, R 1998. Calibrating the learning region. In *Local and Regional Systems of Innovation*, eds. J de la Mothe and G Pacquet, pp. 19–28. Boston, Dordrecht and London: Kluwer.
- Forrant, R 2001. Pulling together in Lowell: the university and the regional development process. *European Planning Studies*, **9**(5), 613–628.
- Freeman, C 1991. Networks of innovators: a synthesis of research issues. *Research Policy*, **20**, 499–514.
- Freeman, C 1995. The national system of innovation in historical perspective. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, **19**, 5–24.
- Freeman, C 1997. Innovation systems: city-state, national, continental and subnational. Mimeo. In Monevideo Conference. Brighton, Sussex: SPRU.
- Freeman, C and L Soete 2000. *The Economics of Industrial Innovation*, 3rd edn. New York: Continuum.
- Garlick, S 1998. 'Creative Associations in Special Places': Enhancing the Partnership Role of Universities in Building Competitive Regional Economies. Canberra: Department of Employment, Education, Training and Youth Affairs.
- Garlick, S 2000. *Engaging Universities and Regions: Knowledge Contribution to Regional Economic Development in Australia*. Canberra: Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs.
- Garrett-Jones, S 2002. From citadels to clusters: the evolution of regional innovation policies in Australia. In *Innovation, Tech-*

- nology Policy and Regional Development, eds. T Turpin, L Xielin, S Garrett-Jones and P Burns. London: Edward Elgar.
- Goddard, J and P Chatterton 1999. Regional development agencies and the knowledge economy: harnessing the potential of universities. *Environment and Planning C Government and Policy*, **17**, 685–699.
- Grimes, S 2003. Ireland's emerging information economy: recent trends and future prospects. *Regional Studies*, **37**(1), 3–14.
- Guston, D H 2000. Retiring the social contract for science. *Issues in Science and Technology*, **16**(4), 32–36.
- Hagen, R 2002. Globalization, university transformation and economic regeneration: a UK case study of public/private sector partnership. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, **15**(3), 205–219.
- Hall, P 1994. *Innovation, Economics and Evolution*. New York: Harvester Sheaf.
- Hansen, N 1992. Competition, trust, and reciprocity in the development of innovative regional milieux. *Papers in Regional Science*, **71**(2), 95–105.
- Hart, D M 1988. *Forged Consensus: Science, Technology and Economic Policy in the United States, 1921–1953*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Hassink, R 2001. Towards regionally embedded innovation support systems in South Korea? Case studies from Kyongbuk-Taegu and Kyonggi. *Urban Studies*, **38**, 1373–1395.
- Hassink, R 2002. Regional innovation support systems: recent trends in Germany and East Asia. *European Planning Studies*, **10**(2), 153–164.
- Hirst, P 1994. *Associative Democracy*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Holland, B A 1999. From murky to meaningful: the role of mission in institutional change. In *Colleges and Universities as Citizens*, eds. R G Bringle, R Games and E A Malloy, pp. 48–73. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Holland, B A 2001. Toward a definition and characterization of the engaged university. *Metropolitan Universities*, **2**(3), 20–29.
- Industry Canada 2002. *Canada's Innovation Strategy*. Toronto: Industry Canada.
- Jessop, B 1994. Post-Fordism and the State. In *Post-Fordism: A Reader*, ed. A Amin, pp. 251–279. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Kanter, R M 1995. *World Class: Thriving Locally in the Global Economy*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Keeble, D, C Lawson, B Moore and F Wilkinson 1999. Collective learning processes, networking and 'institutional thickness' in the Cambridge region. *Regional Studies*, **33**(4), 319–332.
- Klofsten, M, D Jones-Evans and C Scharberg 1999. Growing the Linköping technopole: a longitudinal study of triple helix development in Sweden. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, **24**, 125–138.
- Koschatzky, K 2000. *The Regionalization of Innovation Policy in Germany: Theoretical Foundations and Recent Experience*. Karlsruhe, Fraunhofer Institute for Systems and Innovation Research.
- Krugman, P 1997. Good news from Ireland: a geographical perspective. In *International Perspectives on the Irish Economy*, ed. A Gray. Dublin: Indecon.
- Lambert, R 2003. *Review of Business-University Collaboration*. London: HM Treasury.
- Lawson, C 1997. Territorial clustering and high technology innovation: from industrial districts to innovative milieux, Working Paper 54, ESRC Centre for Business Research, University of Cambridge, Cambridge.
- Lawson, C and E Lorenz 1999. Collective learning, tacit knowledge and regional innovative capacity. *Regional Studies*, **33**(4).
- Lawton Smith, H, D Keeble, C Lawson, B Moore and F Wilkinson 1998. Contrasting regional innovation systems in Oxford and Cambridge. In *Local and Regional Systems of Innovation*, eds. J de la Mothe and G Pacquet. Boston, Dordrecht and London: Kluwer.
- Lawton Smith, H, D Keeble, C Lawson, B Moore and F Wilkinson 2001. University-business interaction in the Oxford and Cambridge regions. *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, **92**(1), 88–99.
- Leydesdorff, L and H Etzkowitz 1998. The triple helix as a model for innovation studies. *Science and Public Policy*, **25**(3), June, 195–203.
- Lundvall, B 1992. Introduction. *National Systems of Innovation: Towards a Theory of Innovation and Interactive Learning*, ed. B Lundvall. London: Pinter.
- Lundvall, B and B Johnson 1994. The learning economy. *Journal of Industry Studies*, **1**(2), 23–42.
- Lundvall, B A, B Johnson, E S Andersen and B Dalum 2001. National systems of production, innovation, and competence building. *DRUID*. Available at <www.druid.dk>, last accessed 28 August 2002.
- Malecki, E J 1997. *Technology and Regional Development: The Dynamics of Local, Regional and National Competitiveness*. London: Pinter.
- Markusen, A, Y-S Lee and S Digiovanni eds. 1999. *Second-Tier Cities: Rapid Growth Beyond the Metropolis*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Morgan, K 1997. The learning region: institutions, innovation and regional renewal. *Regional Studies*, **31**, 491–503.
- Morgan, K and C Nauwelaers 1999. A regional perspective on innovation: from theory to strategy. In *Regional Innovation Strategies: The Challenge for Less-Favoured Regions*, eds. K Morgan and C Nauwelaers, pp. 1–18. London: The Stationery Office.
- Nauwelaers, C and R Wintjes 2000. *SME Policy and the Regional Dimension of Innovation: Towards a New Paradigm for Innovation Policy*. Maastricht: MERIT.
- Niosi, J 2002. Regional systems of innovation: market pull and government push. In *Knowledge, Clusters and Regional Innovation*, eds. A Holbrook and D Wolfe, pp. 39–58. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Niosi, J and T G Bas 2001. The competencies of regions: Canada's clusters in biotechnology. *Small Business Economics*, **17**, 31–42.
- OECD, Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development 1997. *National Systems of Innovation*. Paris: OECD.
- OECD, Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development 1999a. The Response of Higher Education Institutions to Regional Needs. Centre for Educational Research and Innovation, CER/IMHE/DG(96)10/REVI. Paris: OECD.
- OECD, Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development 1999b. *Boosting Innovation: The Cluster Approach*. Paris: OECD.
- OECD, Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development 2000. *A New Economy: The Changing Role of Innovation and Information Technology in Growth*. Paris: OECD.
- OECD, Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development 2001. *Cities and Regions in the New Learning Economy*. Paris: OECD.
- Pacquet, G 1994. Technonationalism and meso innovation systems. Draft discussion paper. Ottawa: University of Ottawa.
- Patel, P and K Pavitt 1994. National innovation systems: why they are important. *Economics of Innovation and New Technology*, **3**, 77–95.
- Piergiovanni, R and E Santarelli 2001. Patents and the geographic localization of R&D spillovers in French manufacturing. *Regional Studies*, **35**(8), 697–702.
- Porter, M E 1990. *The Competitive Advantage of Nations*. London and Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Putnam, R 1993. The prosperous community: social capital and public life. *American Prospect*, **13**, 35–42.
- Rothwell, R and M Dodgson 1992. European technology policy evolution: convergence towards SME's and regional technology transfer. *Technovation*, **12**(4), 223–238.
- Santoro, M D and A K Chakrabarti 2002. Firm size and technology centrality in industry-university interactions. *Research Policy*, **31**, 1163–1180.
- Saxenian, A 1988. Regional networks and resurgence of Silicon Valley. Working Paper no 506, Institute of Urban and Regional Development, Berkeley.
- Saxenian, A 1990. Regional networks and the resurgence of Silicon Valley. *Californian Management Review*, **33**, 89–112.
- Saxenian, A 1994. *Regional Advantage: Culture and Competition in Silicon Valley and Route 128*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Smith, B L R 1990. *American Science Policy Since World War II*. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.
- Sternberg, R 2000a. University-industry relationships in Germany and their regional consequences. In *Regional Innovation, Knowledge and Global Change*, ed. Z Acs, pp. 89–122. London and New York: Pinter.
- Sternberg, R 2000b. Innovation networks and regional development: evidence from the European Regional Innovation Survey (ERIS). *European Planning Studies*, **8**(4), 389–407.
- Sutz, J 1997. The new role of the university in the productive sector. In *Universities and the Global Knowledge Economy: A Triple Helix of University-Industry-Government Relations*, eds. H Etzkowitz and L Leydesdorff, pp. 11–20. London and

- Washington, Pinter.
- Tsipouri, L 1999. *Up-Grading Knowledge and Diffusing Technology in a Regional Context*. Paris: Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development Paris.
- Van Looy, B, K Debackere and P Andries 2003. Policies to stimulate regional innovation capabilities via university-industry collaboration: an analysis and an assessment. *R&D Management*, **33**(2), 209–229.
- Webster, A 1999. Technologies in transition, policies in transition: foresight in the risk society. *Technovation*, **19**, 413–421.
- Wever, E and E Stam 1999. Clusters of high technology SMEs: the Dutch case. *Regional Studies*, **33**(4), 391–400.