THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN

Title: **On the Role of the University in the Knowledge Economy**

By: **Pedro Conceicao and Manuel V. Heitor**

Date: February 1998

Abstract:

Argues for changes in the traditional way of viewing economic growth and questions the role that contemporary institutions, specifically universities, play in this process. Shows, empirically, the increasing importance that knowledge is assuming in economic activity in developed countries. Outlines a new conceptual approach to economic growth, in which the accumulation of knowledge acts as the fundamental driving force. Describes new economic growth theories, laying out principal concepts relevant to an analysis of the present-day role of the universities. Examines the role of the university in the context of knowledge-based economies. Concludes that while the role of the university is of renewed importance, its institutional integrity must be preserved through a strengthening of its ability to create and disseminate knowledge.

Keywords: economic growth; knowledge-based economies; universities; institutional integrity; research and development; threats and opportunities

IC² Institute Working Paper WP-1998-03-01

© IC² Institute, The University of Texas at Austin
<http://ic2.utexas.edu>

(KY)

On the Role of the University in the Knowledge Economy

by
Pedro Conceição*
and
Manuel V. Heitor†

Working Paper #98-03-01

- February 1998 -

*Pedro Conceição is a Fulbright Scholar doctoral candidate at the LBJ School of Public Affairs at The University of Texas at Austin, and a visiting scholar at IC² Institute. He is on leave from Instituto Superior Técnico in Lisbon, Portugal, where he is a lecturer.

†Manuel V. Heitor is deputy president at Instituto Superior Técnico in Lisbon, Portugal.

ON THE ROLE OF THE UNIVERSITY IN THE KNOWLEDGE ECONOMY

PEDRO CONCEIÇÃO

Instituto Superior Técnico

and

IC² Institute, The University of Texas at Austin

2815 San Gabriel

Austin, Texas 78705

pedroc@uts.cc.utexas.edu

MANUEL V. HEITOR*

Instituto Superior Técnico

Av. Rovisco Pais, N. 1

1096 Lisboa Codex, Portugal

mheitor@termcomb.ist.utl.pt

ABSTRACT

The wealth and well-being of individuals, organisations and nations is increasingly based on the creation, dissemination, and use of knowledge. This fact is reflected in the trend in developed economies towards increasing investment in advanced technology, research and development, education, and culture. Given this situation, concepts such as learning ability, creativity and sustained flexibility gain greater importance as guiding principles for the conduct of individuals, institutions, nations and regions. It is thus legitimate to argue for changes in the traditional way of viewing economic growth and to question the role that contemporary institutions play in this process. It is against this background that this paper outlines a new conceptual approach to economic growth, in which the accumulation of knowledge acts as the fundamental driving force behind this process. The role of the university is then examined in the context of the knowledge-based economies, and it is posited that, although the functions that society commonly attributes to the university are beginning to be shared among a wide range of institutions, the university is faced with demands that require a strengthening of its ability to create and disseminate knowledge.

The paper begins by describing a series of empirical indicators that demonstrate the increasing importance of knowledge in developed economies. The main concepts behind the new theories of economic growth are then presented, which seek to include knowledge as a fundamental factor in understanding the processes of development. Using these concepts as a basis, the functions of the university are analysed, primarily teaching and research, in terms of their place in the spectrum of formal and informal learning processes, and it is concluded that while the role of the university is of renewed importance, its institutional integrity must be preserved. This point is particularly important with reference to the university's research function, it being argued that the higher education system needs to diversify, with a view to increasing selectivity in research as a process of creating ideas, while extending opportunities for research as a way of developing learning skills through experimentation.

* Corresponding author

1. INTRODUCTION

Knowledge is increasingly the main strategic resource for ensuring economic growth in developed countries, as the World Bank and the OECD have argued in recent publications (World Bank, 1997; OECD, 1996). Abramovitz and David (1996), in a joint work in which they explore this idea, state that

“the expansion of the knowledge base [...] progressed to the stage of fundamentally altering the form and structure of economic growth”.

In other words, the importance of creating, distributing, and using knowledge challenges more traditional ways of understanding the process of economic development, raising new questions about not only the mechanics of that process, but also the role of institutions such as companies and universities, as well as the suitability of traditional management methods and public policies given the new reality.

This paper sets out to analyse these questions with reference to the university. As a basis for this analysis, the conceptual framework of the new economic growth theories, which have become of increasing importance in the academic world as well as in management and the formulation of public policy, has been taken as a reference.

The paper is divided into five sections. Following this introduction, the second section presents certain indicators which underlie the perception that knowledge is increasingly important in developed economies. The new economic growth theories are described in the third section, which sets out the principal concepts associated with these theories that are relevant to an analysis of the present-day role of the universities. The fourth section discusses the university's functions in terms of the current understanding of the interaction between knowledge and learning processes. The main conclusions of the paper are presented in the fifth and final section.

2. EMPIRICAL MANIFESTATIONS OF THE GROWING ECONOMIC IMPORTANCE OF KNOWLEDGE

The scarcity of empirical data on intangible economic factors makes it extremely difficult to demonstrate the growing importance of knowledge. The great majority of analyses based on quantitative data enable this importance to be established only indirectly. To a large extent, this

comes from the difficulty in using traditional economic indicators to describe current trends in economic growth and job creation. In this section, therefore, certain data are presented that indirectly demonstrate the growing importance of knowledge in developed economies.

The continuing movement of labour into the services sector, as shown in Figure 1, demonstrates the growing importance of activities in which physical goods are not produced. Figure 1 also shows that in more developed countries there is generally a higher proportion of total employment in services than is seen in less developed nations, which indicates a correlation between the proportion of labour employed in services and level of development. But the important point to make is that there is a relative increase in economic activity associated with intangible factors, compared to those associated with the production of physical goods, the exploitation of natural resources, and agriculture.

Figure 1 - Proportion of workforce employed in the services sector in 1985 and 1995.
Source: OECD.

The conclusion that the growing importance of the service sector is associated with greater emphasis on knowledge-intensive activities should, nevertheless, be analysed in more detail. There are in fact a great number of services which, although by definition associated with the production of intangibles, are not linked to knowledge in the 'higher' sense of the creation of

ideas or the use of intellectual resources. Examples are cleaning services and generally the subcontracting of low added-value services such as security, maintenance, and catering, which were previously carried out within an organisation, as well as employment in fast-food restaurant chains.

To shed light on this point, the structure of employment in the United States in recent decades is analysed, based on Wilson (1993). This analysis is also relevant in providing a more rigorous basis for issues raised in the following paragraphs concerning the role of a university education in preparing graduates for the employment market.

Figure 2 shows the proportion of workforce employed in the services sector, divided into six different categories, classified according to type of demand:

1. distribution of electricity, gas, water; telecommunications and transport (intermediate services for companies and final services for consumers);
2. services for producers, provided to companies upstream of consumers, including high added-value activities such as consultancy (legal, management, engineering, finance, accounting), insurance, and asset management;
3. retail, i.e. direct sales of finished products to consumers;
4. services to the end-consumer, similar to category 2 except that the client is the end-consumer;
5. education and health;
6. public administration.

The results show that categories 1, 4 and 6 remained at the same proportion during the period under analysis. The relative increase of workforce in services was contributed by categories 2 (from around 7% in 1967 to 13% in 1992), 3 (from 15% to 18% in the same period) and 5 (from 14% to 19%). Services to producers, and education and health, thus increased their share of employment by 11% between the end of the 1960s and the beginning of the 1990s. Both categories are primarily associated with high value-added activities, and typically require qualified personnel. It may thus be concluded that to a large extent the increased proportion of the workforce in services is effectively due to the increasing importance of knowledge in economic activity.

As Figure 2 shows, the increase in relative importance of services between 1967 and 1992 is reflected in a rise of some 14% in the proportion of the workforce in this sector, 11% of which arose from increases in employment in categories 2 and 5 and the remaining 3% from an increase in the retail sector. It is important to analyse developments in the retail sector in detail, since this also illustrates the growing importance of knowledge, albeit a kind of knowledge that is formalised and codified, in other words stored on paper or in digital form.

Figure 2 - Evolution of the structure of employment in the services sector in the United States between 1967 and 1992. Source: Wilson (1993)

In fact, a considerable proportion of the employment generated in the retail sector is in positions with low qualification requirements, from which it could be inferred that in this case the knowledge factor is less significant. However, according to Wilson (1993), growth in the retail sector has taken place in franchises, such as fast-food chains, clothing outlets, book and music shops, and department stores, in which there is a great need for codified knowledge such as sales-point instruction manuals, purchasing regulations, promotions and sales, so as to ensure uniformity between different branches of the same chain. So here also knowledge is important in

the economic activities of the firms that have created employment in the retail sector, even though this knowledge is codified.

Furthermore, the franchising companies require supervisors who are responsible for the organisation and day-to-day running of each branch, creating a demand for personnel for management positions, which again requires professional and educational qualifications. According to Wilson (1993), the proportion of total employment in the USA classified as involving management tasks rose from 7.6% in 1970 to 12.3% in 1992. As confirmation that these managers were not solely those at high decision-making levels in companies, Wilson (1993) notes that at the end of the 1960s salaries for this employment category were double the national average, while in 1992 the ratio was 1.67, against a background of increasing wage inequality in the American economy, especially during the 1980s.

To summarise, the above analysis for the case of the United States shows that it may be inferred from changes in the structure of employment in favour of services that economic activity in developed countries is increasingly associated with knowledge. A strong argument for this conclusion is the clear trend of new jobs in the service sector to favour those with higher qualifications. It can be argued from Figure 3 that this phenomenon is also at work in other developed countries. Indeed, the figures show that unemployment rates among those members of the workforce with a university education are generally half those among the total workforce in most OECD countries. This shows that the tendency to favour the employment of qualified personnel is not unique to the American economy.

Nevertheless, the data in Figure 3 do not directly confirm that this results from demand, as seems to be the case for the United States, but could instead reflect different degrees of inflexibility in the employment market for different educational levels, or the fact that the total number of people with a university education is only a small proportion of the total workforce, not to mention cultural or institutional factors. Even with these reservations, however, it is clear that from an individual perspective, those with a university education have better chances of employment than those without.

Figure 3 - Unemployment rates for workforce and for the proportion of workforce with university education. Source: OECD.

Another indicator that is relevant in establishing the growing importance of knowledge in developed economies relates to types of investment. Investment is essential for economic growth, since it generates the flows that result in the accumulation of the capital production factor. Intangible assets, or intangible capital, result mainly (though not exclusively) from investment in intangible factors. These intangible factors reflect knowledge that is codified on paper or in digital form or, in many cases, is not codified at all.

Economists have of course long been aware of the importance of this kind of intangible capital, as human capital theories show. To “measure” this kind of intangible capital, approximations or indirect indicators such as level of schooling are used. However, recently other kinds of intangible assets have been considered, such as those related to scientific production or to the level of well-being in the population, measuring expenditure respectively on R&D and on health. Table 1 shows the increases in the ratio between intangible investment and investment in physical capital. Investment in intangible assets leads to the accumulation of the above-mentioned assets, while physical capital includes natural resources, stocks, equipment, and physical infrastructure.

Table 1 - Ratios of investment in intangible assets to investment in tangible assets

	1929	1948	1973	1990
Ratio of intangible assets to tangible assets	0.535	0.731	0.992	1.15
Ratio of expenditure on education, training & R&D to GDP	3.26	3.88	4.53	5.67
Total capital	0.29	0.36	0.42	0.45

Source: Kendrick (1994)

In conclusion, the empirical data presented above confirm the perception that the creation and dissemination of knowledge are fundamental factors for the promotion of economic growth. Economic growth has traditionally been explained as being the result of increases in the labour and capital factors and technological change. However, in the light of the above empirical analysis, it is necessary to rethink how these three factors influence the process of economic development.

With regard to the contribution of the labour factor, the facts show that a quantitative increase in population is not sufficient, since developed economies produce ever more intangible factors, creating employment mainly in the service sector, in which educational and professional qualifications are required. It is thus essential for growth and job creation to develop human capital, providing access to more and better skills, particularly through education.

With regard to the contribution of capital, it can be seen that the accumulation of intangible assets is gaining in relative importance compared to physical capital. The importance of knowledge is accordingly seen not only in its contribution to technological change, a fact that has led to a rethinking of traditional ways of explaining growth. The new economic growth theories, which are analysed below, bring together many of these ideas, putting forward the message that the accumulation of knowledge, which can be understood as learning, is the most important factor in explaining the development process.

3. THE IMPORTANCE OF KNOWLEDGE FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE NEW GROWTH THEORIES

The economic importance of knowledge has been analysed in various academic disciplines and from various perspectives (for a review, see Dosi, 1996). The approach presented in this paper, which is related to the new economic growth theories, is thus far from being the only one. However, it has the advantages of being recent, of attempting to include contributions from

various disciplines, and of being increasingly accepted in the academic world as well as in the more pragmatic fields of management and public policy (see, for example, the recent book by Barro and Sala-i-Martin, 1995, which contains a detailed technical discussion of the subject, although the importance of the concepts is frequently lost in the dense mathematical formalism of their exposition).

Firstly, in sub-section 3.1 the conceptual differences between the new and traditional ways of analysing economic growth are presented. The main focus of this section is a definition of the way in which knowledge contributes towards development, which, in the new theories, results from complex interactions between physical objects and two kinds of knowledge, denominated as ideas and skills. Sub-section 3.2 analyses the differences between these two kinds of knowledge and explores how ideas and skills differ in their use, diffusion, and production. Finally, sub-section 3.3 discusses the interdependence between skills and ideas in the learning processes that lead to the accumulation of knowledge, the basis for an analysis of the role of the university in a context of sustained economic growth.

3.1 HARDWARE, SOFTWARE AND WETWARE: THE INGREDIENTS OF ECONOMIC GROWTH

We must begin by defining knowledge and establishing a taxonomy for different kinds of knowledge. Knowledge is defined by what it is not: anything that is not human is not knowledge (Nelson and Romer, 1996), where “not human” includes all physical goods, natural resources, energy, and physical infrastructure. In the literature, that which is not knowledge is termed “hardware”, to give the idea that it covers “material things”, in other words objects. This paper uses also the term “objects” to represent “hardware”. The next step is to establish a taxonomy of knowledge. It should at this point be stressed that the taxonomy used in the new growth theories is only one of several that have appeared in the literature¹. Two kinds of knowledge are distinguished:

- *software* (“*ideas*”): knowledge codified and stored outside the human brain, for example in books, CDs, records, cassettes, etc.;
- *wetware* (“*skills*”): knowledge that cannot be dissociated from an individual; stored in the brain of every human, including convictions, abilities, talents, etc.

¹ Foray and Lundvall (1996) present a review of these taxonomies and propose one of their own that may, however, be reduced to that presented here, as shown by Conceição, Gibson, Heitor and Shariq (forthcoming).

The conceptual difference between software and wetware (i.e., ideas and skills lies in the level of codification. While ideas correspond to knowledge that can be articulated in words, symbols, or other means of expression, skills cannot be formalised, but always remain in tacit form. Examples of ideas are Pythagoras' theorem, the Coca-Cola recipe, the Windows 95 operating system, the instructions for manufacturing and installing car components, a classical music CD, the crawl technique in swimming, and the Constitution of a nation. Examples of skills would be Picasso's artistic talent, Einstein's scientific genius, the manual skills of a carpenter, the knowledge of a medical specialist, or the leadership and persuasive powers of a politician. To summarise, in this taxonomy knowledge is divided into two worlds: the world of codified ideas, and the world of non-codified skills.

It may be asked at this point what this discussion has to do with economic growth and the role of the university in the emerging economy. In fact, in order to evaluate the relevance of the distinction between objects, ideas, and skills to an understanding of the development process, the traditional viewpoint mentioned above should be borne in mind. According to that tradition, growth is the result of an accumulation of labour and capital factors, together with technological change. The introduction of technology, as first shown by Solow (1956, 1957), was essential to explain empirically measured levels of growth. A simple accumulation of labour and capital factors alone was never sufficient. But technology always appeared as external to the economic process, an exogenous component, as it is termed in the literature on the subject.

In the new theories of economic growth, the viewpoint is completely different. The accumulation of capital, or (in the new terminology) of hardware, remains essential. But the one source of continued growth is knowledge: on one hand new ideas to produce new objects and to organise existing objects in ever more efficient ways, and on the other, new and better skills that enable ideas to be implemented and objects to be used. To illustrate this idea, one need go no further than Romer (1993b), the father of the new growth theories (note the comments within the quotation):

"To see how the same physical objects can be arranged in more valuable ways, consider first an example involving physical capital. The computer that I used to write this paper is about fifty times faster than the one I used just ten years ago, yet it is constructed from just about the same assortment of aluminum, copper, steel, plastic, silicon, and other raw materials. It is manufactured in about the same way and is sold for about the same price.

Now consider human capital. In my brain there are different physical connections between my neurons. These connections store the commands I need to use the new computer and new word-processing software. Just as my new computer is a more productive piece of physical equipment [the result of new ideas on how to rearrange the same objects more efficiently] I have more valuable human capital than I did ten years ago... [that is, more skills to take advantage of the productivity gained by the new ideas].”

Romer’s story has a simple moral: it is new ideas and new and better skills, that is increased knowledge, that bring about the gains in productivity and efficiency that lead to economic growth. To expand on this story, since the beginnings of civilisation humanity has been constrained by the natural resources and energy sources of the planet. There can be no human development except through the creation and accumulation of knowledge, which enables us to rearrange these resources in ever more productive ways.

Thus, in the new growth theories, knowledge firstly is not restricted to technology, and secondly is not exogenous. Instead, it corresponds to new ideas and skills, in technology as well as in social, legal, political, administrative and other areas. Figure 4 is designed to illustrate how knowledge may be considered endogenous, by showing some of the links between objects, ideas and skills which lead, as in Romer’s example, to economic growth.

Given that the accumulation of knowledge contributes most to growth, it is now necessary to analyse how this accumulation takes place. Accumulation of knowledge can also be expressed as learning, not in the narrow sense that is limited to one individual, but in a wider sense which includes learning by organisations, nations, and regions. Before moving on to this discussion, it is necessary to begin with a detailed analysis of the reasoning behind the separation of knowledge into the two kinds categorised above.

Figure 4 - Interactions between knowledge (software and wetware) and hardware (objects) or in the new economic growth theories

While the above discussion has given some pointers towards the differences that exist, these differences have far-reaching implications for the way in which the learning process is understood in the light of the new economic growth theories. Analysis of these implications is the main focus of the following sub-section.

3.2 THE USE, DIFFUSION, AND PRODUCTION OF SOFTWARE AND WETWARE

At the end of sub-section 3.1 we saw how the creation, distribution and use of knowledge is crucial to the new understanding of the process of economic growth. Nevertheless, the ways in which ideas and skills are produced, distributed, and used are in some cases profoundly different, even mutually antagonistic. These differences have important economic implications that also have an effect on public policy-making, notably with regard to the role of the university in the emerging economy.

3.2.1. The Use of Knowledge

We begin by analysing how the two kinds of knowledge may be used. Ideas have the remarkable quality of being usable by any number of people simultaneously. The fact that someone is reading a novel in no way prevents someone else from having access to it at the same time. The ideas in the novel and the benefit derived from its use may be shared at the same moment in time. Pythagoras' theorem is another example. It would not be surprising if, at this moment, millions of people were using it to solve school exercises or for practical applications. It may also be in use,

incorporated into a variety of algorithms, in thousands of computer programs. In all these cases no-one is hindering, or being hindered by, someone else using the theorem.

Skills, on the other hand, can only be used by those who possess them. It would be good to be able to reproduce Picasso's talent or Einstein's genius, but this is impossible, because skills are inextricably linked to the person who possesses them. And it is only this person who can use them, when, how, and where he or she sees fit. In terms of their use, skills are, perhaps deceptively, similar to objects, which also can only be used by one individual at a time.

Formally, this difference is related to a category used in public finance to classify goods: rivalry in use. A good is termed rival if it can only be used by one person at a time. The great majority of goods that we encounter consciously in our daily lives are objects with high levels of rivalry: if someone drives their car, no-one else can drive it, and the same is true for their computer. The same, of course, is not true of the software on the computer - literally millions of people share the ideas that make up the Windows 95 operating system. Again, Romer (1994) gives revealing examples:

"The idea behind the transistor, the principles behind internal combustion, the organizational structure of a modern corporation, the concepts of double entry bookkeeping- all these pieces of information and many more like them have the property that it is technological possible for everybody and every firm to make use of them at the same time. In the language of public finance, ordinary goods are rival goods, but ideas are nonrival."

3.2.2. The Distribution of Knowledge

Moving on to an analysis of the processes involved in distributing knowledge, the distribution of ideas (i.e., software) is, as a rule, easy and inexpensive. To communicate Pythagoras' theorem to the readers of this paper, it is sufficient to state it. Since the knowledge underlying the theorem is codified, it is easily articulated and reproduced by simple, inexpensive means. Pythagoras' theorem represents an extreme case, in which the costs of distribution are practically zero, requiring just one line of text, or ten seconds of oral communication, to transmit the idea. Other ideas are more difficult to codify and transmit, but in general the costs of disseminating ideas are extremely low, especially in comparison with the costs of producing them. Indeed, the ease, speed, and low cost of distribution are characteristic of virtually all codified knowledge.

By contrast, the transmission of skills (i.e., wetware) is complex, expensive, and slow. Again using an extreme example, the case of Picasso's artistic talent, it may even be impossible. Young artists might have learned from Picasso, but this would certainly have required a very long period of interaction, since the knowledge associated with Picasso's artistic talent is not codified. Skills result from a combination of factors, ranging from their largely innate quality, through individual experience, to formal training.

Table 2 summarises the above discussion, showing the profound differences between ideas and skills. Below, we explore the economic implications of these differences, which are seen mainly in the different modes of production of knowledge.

Table 2 - Differences in the use and distribution of ideas and skills

	SOFTWARE (IDEAS)	WETWARE (SKILLS)
USE	non-rival	rival
DISTRIBUTION	easy and inexpensive	complex and expensive

3.2.3. The Production of Knowledge

The issue that we propose to explore is that of the consequences of the differences between ideas and skills set out in Table 2, with particular reference to their production. As already stated, the rivalry associated with skills implies that, on the level of economic classification, they are similar to objects. As a consequence of this rivalry, it is clear who possesses a given object or ability, and simple to assign the corresponding property rights. On the other hand, objects and skills are scarce, being limited by material and energy resources for the former, and by people, for the latter. These two properties (ease of assigning property rights and scarcity) mean that the market functions as an efficient means of producing objects and skills, as is argued below.

In developed democratic economies, production is generally associated with the benefits which the producer foresees he will enjoy as a result of the production. One of the most important institutions in these economies is a market in which goods and services are freely transacted. So long as property rights are adequately protected, and the goods are scarce, the market provides the incentives that are necessary and sufficient for production. Indeed, with rival goods, the producer can keep all the economic benefits that result from the sale of those goods.

To return to the analysis of skills, let us think of the specific case of the skills that are required to pilot a commercial aircraft. In order to acquire these skills a considerable personal investment is

needed, in both time and money, since the skills required of the pilot can only be gained through a long process of training and accumulation of experience. The would-be pilot makes this investment in the expectation of being able to sell his or her future skills to an airline company. He or she may, if sufficiently skilled, even be able to train other pilots and receive extra benefits for doing so. And an exceptionally good pilot may become a consultant and sell his or her advice on aviation matters.

This view has been formalised as an increase in human capital. Incentives to make investments that lead to increases in this capital are associated with the expectation of receiving income from accumulated human capital in the future. This is the traditional view of the way in which the market provides the necessary incentives to invest in increasing individual skills. From the standpoint of the new growth theories, and in particular of the increasing importance of knowledge, this view needs to be re-examined. This will be dealt with in sub-section 3.3, the point for the moment being to contrast the incentives required to produce skills with those needed to produce ideas.

The non-rivalry of ideas, and their low distribution costs, mean that it is very hard to assign property rights to them and to protect those rights, on the one hand, and on the other that there is no lack of ideas. Indeed, ideas tend to be abundant, especially given advances in information technology and telecommunications, which enable codified knowledge to be easily and inexpensively used and transmitted. Terms such as “the digital economy” and “the information economy” clearly reflect this. However, it is important to note that these terms are **not** synonymous with the wider concept of a “**knowledge-based economy**”, which, as will be seen, has to do with the need for **continuous learning processes**, involving not only codified knowledge but also the skills needed to use that knowledge.

David (1993) argues explicitly that, as a consequence, the market by itself does not have adequate mechanisms for the production of ideas, and that other institutional mechanisms are required for this purpose. Indeed, as Dosi (1996) notes, the non-rivalry of ideas separates the costs of their creation from the benefits accruing to those who use them. In other words, the efforts that somebody has made to arrive at an idea may be inadequately rewarded by the beneficiaries of that idea. To return to Pythagoras’ theorem, all the effort (production cost) was borne by Pythagoras over two thousand years ago, while the benefits have been shared without cost by all succeeding generations.

Furthermore, the effort (or cost) of producing a new idea is usually high, especially in comparison to the cost of disseminating it. To make matters more complicated, making that effort does not even guarantee that an idea of any value will result; the production of ideas is highly contingent and its results are uncertain. According to Dasgupta and David (1994), Nelson (1959) was the first author to describe the economic implications of the uncertainties associated with the efforts to produce new ideas, as well as of the difficulty the creator experiences in retaining the benefits of a new idea. Specifically, Nelson studied the effort put into creating ideas represented by R&D carried out by companies. Even if a company succeeds in its R&D effort, Nelson says, the benefits of a new idea are shared by society in general. The data in Table 3, which compare the rates of individual and social return on investment in R&D, give an empirical demonstration of this argument. Rates of individual return, the benefits that the individual entity responsible for the R&D expenditure receives, are around 20-25%. Rates of social return—benefits to society in general—are around 50%.

Table 3 - Private and social rates of return on private investment in R&D in the United States

Study	Rates of Return %	
	Private	Social
Nadiri (1993)	20-30	50
Mansfield (1977)	25	56
Terleckyj (1974)	29	48-78
Sveikauskas (1981)	7-25	50
Goto e Suzuki (1989)	26	80
Bernstein e Nadiri (1988)	10-27	11-111
Scherer (1982, 1984)	29-43	64-147
Bernstein e Nadiri (1991)	15-28	20-110

Source: US Presidential Council of Economic Advisors (1996)

The figures in Table 3 confirm Nelson's hypothesis, showing that the social benefits from effort put into creating ideas are indeed considerably higher (approximately double) than the advantages that accrue to the private agents who made that effort. This phenomenon, generally known in the literature as "knowledge spillover", has been interpreted as the result of positive externalities associated with the performance of R&D. Phenomena such as externalities are identified as "shortcomings of the market", and indicate situations in which markets do not function effectively as a means of stimulating production. Using the concepts of the new growth theories, we are now in a position to reinterpret this phenomenon as the result of the non-rivalry and low transmission cost of ideas.

From this perspective, what type of incentives exist for the production of ideas? David (1993) and David and Dasgupta (1994) suggest that there are basically two alternatives. The first consists of **intervention by the state** in the production of ideas, by means of direct production (such as occurs, for instance, in state-controlled research laboratories), or by subsidising production, such as funding of university R&D. The second alternative consists of granting property rights for the creation of ideas, that is by defining regulations for **intellectual property**—specific instruments that include patents, registered trade marks and copyright.

Table 4 summarises the characteristics of these two alternatives. State intervention ensures public access to ideas, while the granting of intellectual property rights gives the author discretionary rights over such access. In the latter case, the incentive derives from the prospect of monopolistic profits arising from the granting of a patent or copyright (Schumpeter, 1911, 1943, was the first to put forward this idea). In the case of state subsidies, incentives come in the form of the prestige and reputation which, for instance, a scientist acquires through his or her creations, and which, continuing with the example of the scientific community, are reflected in professional advancement and funding (Stephan, 1996).

As Table 4 seeks to illustrate, both alternatives have their strengths and weaknesses, which are in effect complementary. Thus, while direct intervention by the State provides for rapid diffusion of and widespread access to new ideas, the granting of property rights limits this diffusion, to such an extent that monopoly rights can lead to the unwelcome effect of hindering the distribution of ideas. To illustrate the reality of this problem, Romer and Nelson (1996) ask what would have happened if the concept of the spreadsheet had been protected by law, preventing Microsoft and Borland, with their products Excel and Quattro Pro, from competing with the originator, Lotus. Naturally, the rate of technological progress in the development of spreadsheets would have been considerably slower.

Table 4 - Two alternatives for providing incentives for the production of ideas

	State intervention	Property rights
Ownership of ideas	public	private
Expected return	reputation, prestige	monopolistic profits
Advantages	free access	private incentives
Disadvantages	arbitrary, inefficient	limited diffusion

In this sub-section we have presented a detailed analysis of the differences between skills and ideas. It has been seen that the latter show distinctive economic behaviour, a result of the non-rivalry of their use and their low diffusion cost. The production of ideas accordingly requires more complex institutional mechanisms than those provided by the market. As for skills, it has been noted that they behave in a similar way to objects and, for this reason, the market provides a large proportion of the incentives needed for their production.

This sub-section has deliberately analysed each of the categories of knowledge in isolation, in order to show more clearly the differences between ideas and skills. However, as was established at the end of sub-section 3.1, it is the accumulation of knowledge as a whole that leads to economic growth, which means that the way ideas and skills are related to each other needs to be analysed. This analysis is found in the next sub-section, with a view to examining the role of the university in the knowledge economy in section 4 following.

3.3 LEARNING PROCESSES AND THE ACCUMULATION OF KNOWLEDGE: THE INTERACTION BETWEEN SOFTWARE AND WETWARE

According to Solow (1997), the formalisation of the process of economic development in the new growth theories follows the conceptual structure originally proposed by Arrow (1962). It is worth looking briefly at Arrow's analysis, as it contains the kernel of the reasoning behind the idea of economic development as a learning process. Instead of following the orthodox thinking of his time, which attributed to technological change the component of growth that could not be explained by the accumulation of labour and capital factors, Arrow argued that experience in the use of capital led to an increase in the knowledge used in production. In plainer terms, Arrow drew up a relatively simple model in which workers in a company learn by using the means of production, thereby increasing the company's productivity.

In this way learning, that is the accumulation of knowledge, appears as the driving force behind the increases in efficiency which lead to economic growth. It is interesting to note that Arrow chose an informal way of learning, learning by doing, as the basis for his reasoning. It should also be noted that in this model knowledge is accumulated only in the form of skills. The contribution of the new economic growth theories has been precisely to extend this reasoning to other types of learning, as well as to the accumulation of ideas, starting from when Romer (1986) showed the wider implications of Arrow's arguments.

Thus, Lucas (1988) also analysed the accumulation of knowledge in the form of skills, but this time putting forward education as a formal learning process. In turn, Romer (1990) and Grossman and Helpman (1991) constructed models in which the accumulation of ideas results from effort put into research, another formal learning process. In this context, Table 5 summarises how these contributions fit into a framework of possibilities which relates the accumulation of knowledge to the different kinds of learning that can lead to this accumulation. The construction of this table was also inspired by Foray and Lundvall's analysis (1996), in which they placed particular emphasis on the formation of networks of personal and professional contacts, which result from processes of social interaction, the fourth process in Table 5.

This table also illustrates three other points. First is the analysis that remains to be made in respect of the empty boxes. Secondly, examination of the dates of the contributions reveals that the emphasis at the beginning of the 1990s was on the study of the accumulation of ideas through R&D, a tendency that has become stronger in recent work (see Romer, 1993a, 1993b, 1994).

Table 5 - Accumulation of knowledge and learning processes in the new growth theories

		Learning by			
		Formal processes		Informal processes	
		Education	R&D	Experience (by-doing)	Interaction
Accumulation of	Software (Ideas)		Romer (1990) Grossman & Helpman (1991)		
	Wetwar e (Skills)	Lucas (1988)		Arrow (1962) Romer (1986)	

There are at least two reasons for this. On one hand, the study of informal learning processes is more complex and less amenable to empirical testing. We are accordingly left with the study of the accumulation of ideas through R&D, since the role of education has already been extensively researched since the theories of human capital appeared in the 1960s. On the other hand, the really striking aspect of the times in which we live is the increasing codification of knowledge, and the potential of the "digital economy" and the "information society" (Romer, 1996, Foray and Lundvall, 1996).

The third point to note is the very recent appearance of attempts to analyse the economic implications of learning processes that result from social interaction, particularly in the

“information society”. Indeed, this aspect puts forward a new vision of the university, notably with reference to the radical change from formal teaching to participatory learning, which is directly associated with continuous (lifelong) training and the need for the university to deal effectively with multiple demands and a multifaceted public. Furthermore, the fact that informal learning processes are shared between a varied range of institutions opens up new possibilities for the universities’ ability to create and disseminate knowledge in the emerging economies.

It is important to note that the potential of the “digital economy” is strongly reflected in the existence of increasing returns, which leads to phenomena such as the apparently unstoppable growth of companies that trade in ideas, such as Microsoft. Indeed, the economic value of an idea is associated with its market potential (Romer, 1996). As has been seen, it can be extremely expensive to produce ideas, but they are cheap to distribute. The first disk containing the Windows operating system cost Microsoft several million dollars (the entire cost of development), but all the rest cost less than a dollar each. Since there is a vast market and costs, after initial development, are low, the only limit to Microsoft’s growth is the size of the market itself. Arthur (1994) points out that the fact of increasing returns, besides being linked to the non-rivalry of ideas, is reinforced by the phenomenon, originally explored by David (1986), known as “lock-in”. In the case of Microsoft, “lock-in” took place when the Windows operating system became established as the virtual industry standard. As can be seen, there is much to explore concerning the impact on growth of the accumulation of ideas, but our concern at the moment is to examine the boxes in Table 5 that remain empty, particularly the interaction between ideas and skills.

It is thus time to begin moving into territory that is still being explored, which requires reference to contributions from other groups of economists concentrating on the study of economic growth. Before pursuing this theme, we should note the difficulties that have beset the new economic growth theories. The main criticism is linked to their lack of empirical evidence, despite the intellectual validity of their arguments (Pack, 1994). Mankiw (1995), in a relatively recent assessment, even suggested a return to Solow’s traditional formulation. However, according to Soete (1996), empirical difficulties should lead not to a reduction in efforts to pursue the new concepts further, but rather to a recognition that new indicators and quantitative methods must be found that are more appropriate for the knowledge-based economy.

One crucial aspect of the accumulation of knowledge is the interaction between ideas and skills, which gives rise to the learning processes in Table 5. Indeed, according to Soete (1996), ideas

and skills are no more than two sides of the same coin, two essential aspects of the accumulation of knowledge. Herbert Simon, quoted by Varian (1995), puts the argument as follows:

“What information [in the sense of ideas, according to our terminology] consumes is rather obvious: it consumes the attention of its recipients. Hence, a wealth of information [that is, of ideas] creates a poverty of attention, and a need to allocate that attention efficiently among the overabundance of information sources that might consume it”.

In other words, many good ideas are useless if the skills needed to use them do not exist. Studies by Pavitt (1987), Nelson (1996), and Rosenberg (1990) follow the same line of thinking. Nelson (1997) describes various circumstances in which individuals, companies, universities, and other institutions have made use of their skills in order to increase their accumulation of knowledge, acquiring further skills as well as ideas. The main implication of this argument is that the interdependence between ideas and skills casts doubt on the idea that the market supplies the necessary incentives for the production of skills, as was concluded in sub-section 3.2, where these were analysed in isolation. It seems, therefore, that there is greater scope in the knowledge-based economy for institutional arrangements and public policies that go beyond the logic of the market (World Bank, 1997).

Although to a great extent skills result from the innate characteristics of an individual or from the history of an institution or a country, they also depend on the learning processes (education, research, experience, social interaction) in which these entities are involved (North, 1990). Without skills, ideas may be irrelevant, and without ideas, there is no need for new and better skills, as Figure 4 seeks to show. Analysis of the interaction between ideas and skills understandably brings us to explore learning processes in a more integrated and dynamic way, beyond the mere individual accumulation of ideas and skills set out in Table 5.

To illustrate the close and complex interdependence between ideas and skills, Figure 5 seeks to enlarge the oval in Figure 4 showing the interactions between these two kinds of knowledge.

Figure 5 - Diagrammatic representation of the interaction between learning processes and the accumulation of knowledge, identifying the various aspects of university research (notably R&D, R&T, and R&L, as analysed in section 4 of this paper).

It can be seen that while skills appear as a cluster of small ovals, reflecting the individual nature of the skills of people and of institutions, ideas appear as a single oval. This represents the indivisibility of ideas (David, 1993), meaning that, once created, an idea remains at least potentially accessible everywhere, and there is no need to rediscover it—hence the common expression “There’s no need to re-invent the wheel”.

Figure 5 shows several learning processes that have been analysed in various places in the literature:

cycle 1 - codification of knowledge (Foray and Lundvall, 1996), the result of progress in information technology, telecommunications and the scientific and technological base; that is, the great number of existing ideas that are the starting point or “feedstock” for new ideas to be constructed using existing skills;

cycle 2 - interpretation of codified knowledge (OECD, 1997), using existing skills as a starting point or instrument to decode the ideas which are being studied or used, leading to improved skills.

Cycle 1 covers learning processes that result in the **codification of knowledge**, that is the generation of new ideas. Specific examples include R&D and artistic creation. In both cases, ideas are generated as a result of a **process of exploration**, in science or in search of a form of expression. This type of learning is **convergent**, meaning that on the basis of different and unique skills, ideas are generated that have the potential for common use.

Cycle 2, on the other hand, relates to learning by **assimilation of knowledge**, which results from activities such as education, experience, and social interaction. Through **interpretation** of these ideas, different skills emerge. Imagine a mathematics class: all the students are using the same book, they attend the same classes, they do the same exercises. However, the ways in which they assimilate and interpret these are different, meaning that the learning process is **divergent**.

The main conclusion of this section, as shown in Figure 5, is that the accumulation of knowledge, which is the basis for economic growth, is the result of complex processes, in which there is considerable interdependence between the accumulation of ideas and of skills. It is necessary to examine the role of the principal institutions of contemporary society and to attempt to determine how they fit into these processes. The following section examines the case of the universities and suggests possible implications for the formulation of public policy and university management practices.

4. CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE UNIVERSITY IN KNOWLEDGE-BASED ECONOMIES

The importance of the universities for economic development is well documented from a historical standpoint in, for instance, Freeman and Soete (1997), Mowery and Rosenberg (1989), and Conceição, Durão, Heitor and Santos (1998). As one would expect, in these works the main mission of universities is stated as a mission to educate and to carry out research. However, universities have recently also committed themselves to a range of additional activities, normally grouped together under the heading of “links with society” (for detailed discussions on the context of the university’s mission in Europe, see Caraça, Conceição, and Heitor, 1997-a and 1997-b, and in the United States, Christopher Lucas, 1996).

At the same time, there is a growing tendency to classify companies as “learning organisations”. Terms such as “learning management” are used more and more (e.g. Conceição et al., 1997-a, 1997-b). Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995) are perhaps the classic example of this trend, with the publication of their book *The Knowledge-Creating Company*. Against this background, is the university still the “Knowledge Factory”, as described in a recent study in *The Economist* (1997)? Or, given the profusion of activities associated with university extension, should it structure itself along business lines? At the same time, companies themselves are becoming involved in the production of knowledge, when they are not set up and run from the beginning along similar lines to a university, as is the case with Microsoft (*The Economist*, 1997). In short, will the trend towards a breakdown of the institutional boundaries between companies and universities become a fact of life in knowledge-based economies?

To a certain extent, the description already given of recent developments in companies and universities indicates that it will. This convergence is the result of two forces that come together to effect an “identification” between companies and universities. Firstly, the creation of added value and wealth is increasingly associated with the production of knowledge, as seen in section 2, so it is natural that companies look to the way universities function for inspiration on how to perform creative tasks. Secondly, the universities find themselves facing difficulties in obtaining sufficient funds for their basic tasks of teaching and research (see Caraça, Conceição, and Heitor, 1997-c), so it is also natural that they should look to companies to learn how to derive commercial benefit from their intellectual assets.

As various studies have shown, although this convergence is, to a certain extent, to be welcomed, it can also be dangerous. How are the limits of acceptability to be drawn? Rosenberg and Nelson (1996), Dasgupta and David (1994), David (1993), and Pavitt (1987) argue that whatever does not harm the institutional integrity of the university is acceptable. Companies and universities have evolved in a social context, to the point of attaining what these authors call “institutional speciality”. Thus, whereas companies are concerned to obtain private returns for the knowledge that they generate, universities have traditionally made it public. By means of this specialisation, or “division of labour”, the accumulation of knowledge has taken place at a rapid pace, as is shown by the unprecedented levels of economic growth since the end of the second world war (Rosenberg and Nelson, 1996).

This argument is analysed in detail, in the context of the knowledge-based economies, in Conceição, Heitor and Oliveira (1998). The threats to a university’s institutional integrity in fact

go beyond the extension of its activities to links with society, which, if excessive, could lead to resources being spread too thinly. This analysis is based on the more serious problems that may arise if universities take the path of privatising the ideas that they produce and the skills that they develop.

In the scope of this article, we begin by analysing the university function of **teaching**, which contributes to the accumulation of knowledge, specifically of skills, through the formal process of learning through education, or “learning by learning”. This process, following the analysis in section 3, is divergent: a university education combines the transmission of codified knowledge by the teachers with the individual characteristics of the students, in a process in which the interpretation of ideas leads to the accumulation of unique skills. Given this situation, each student can profit from these skills in the future. The university may therefore be tempted to increase the direct price to the students of their education, as a way of increasing its income.

Besides the well-known externalities associated with university education, which justify state support for education in virtually every country in the world with the possible exception of Japan (Eicher and Chevalier, 1993), analysis of the need to provide the skills necessary for the information society in which we live strengthens the arguments in favour of state support for university education. The threat of increased privatisation of teaching skills could thus cause serious problems, in that it would lead to a reduction in the resource that really is in short supply in the knowledge-based economies: the skills to use and interpret ideas. This conclusion does not cast doubt on the contributions currently made by students, but rather questions a possible trend that could jeopardise the institutional integrity of the university itself.

Moving on to **research**, it is worth noting that the great majority of the ideas that are generated in universities are of a public nature, this being the essence of the specific contribution that the university makes to the accumulation of ideas. Incentives for the production of these public ideas come from a complex system of reward and prestige within the academic community. Stephan (1996), following on from the sociological work of Robert K. Merton, describes in detail how this system operates and how it rewards creativity, flexibility and autonomy. In a recent survey of university teachers in the United States, the most satisfying factor, chosen by 86.2% of the sample, was autonomy and independence (UCLA, 1997). Again, the temptation to privatise university research results could threaten fundamental aspects of the way universities work and their essential contribution to the accumulation of ideas.

To summarise, our conclusion is that the institutional integrity of the university should be preserved, and an important point in terms of public policy is that state funding of universities should not be reduced. However, this measure by itself is not enough. From a more pragmatic viewpoint, the university should respond to the needs of society, which include rapid and unforeseeable changes in the structure of the employment market, as was seen in section 2, and the need to furnish its graduates with new skills beyond purely technical ones, in particular learning skills. Ways of responding to these two issues are dealt with below.

The response to the first issue, relating to changes in the structure of the employment market, involves public policies designed to strengthen and preserve the institutional integrity of the university. The universities cannot actually be expected to foresee the demands of the employment market five or six years in advance. If they were to try, this would certainly entail jeopardising their integrity. A solution to this problem is to develop a **diversified higher education system**, which would include various institutions with different vocations, in such a way as to promote a functional stratification of the system. This could be the way to ensure **sustained flexibility** capable of providing society with the instruments it needs to deal with instability in employment and, more generally, the inevitable changes in technology, tastes, markets and needs. This seems moreover to be the way to meet the challenge of maintaining excellence. The expansion of university education is obviously irreversible in the emerging society, but this fact cannot be allowed to stand in the way of creating centres of excellence. On the contrary, it should encourage their development, notably by means of the stratified system suggested above.

The American education system can give some pointers towards a possible path to follow. According to the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, which produces a semi-official classification of American higher education institutions, there are around ninety "research universities", being those which have generally been called simply "universities". These ninety institutions operate within a system of 3 706 institutions (not counting the 6 256 others that only provide vocational training), with a total of over fourteen million students enrolled. In this way, the diversity and functional stratification of the system as a whole helps it to respond to rapid changes in the employment market, particularly through those institutions oriented more towards teaching and with shorter graduation times, without putting undue pressure on the universities.

A diversified and stratified system also presents advantages with relation to the second issue, the need to create and promote learning skills. This conclusion is reached by analysing the function of university research. This function actually includes various sub-functions, not always clearly defined, but which should be the subject of separate public policies and forms of management, as follows:

- **R&D, Research and Development**, which aims at the accumulation of ideas through convergent learning processes, which are associated with the processes of codification represented in Figure 5. This is the commonest form of research, particularly in the context of economic development and from the standpoint of the relationship between universities and companies.
- **R&T, Research and Teaching**, in which research functions as a way of developing teaching materials, as well as of improving the teaching skills of the teaching staff, and which is also associated with the convergent processes of knowledge codification represented in Figure 5.
- **R&L, Research and Learning**, in which the value of the research is not necessarily in the creation of ideas, but in the development of skills that enhance opportunities for learning. Research thus appears as a divergent function, associated with the process of interpretation represented in Figure 5.

According to the definitions in the previous section, R&D and R&T are convergent learning processes, the purpose of which is the creation of ideas. In this context, **selectivity** is required in the choice of individuals with suitable skills for these types of activity. In turn, R&L is associated with a divergent learning process, which seeks to develop learning skills through the experience of doing research. It is important to **disseminate** these opportunities, presenting research as a cultural factor.

In these circumstances a diversified system could respond effectively to the different demands made of it in the emerging economy, by being selective in R&D and R&T, and comprehensive in R&L. Indeed, in the context of the knowledge economy, the comprehensive nature of R&T should be extended beyond the university to cover the whole education system, as a way of promoting learning skills. In this situation, it seems essential to place renewed emphasis on education and, to a certain extent, to reinvent its social and economic role. Educational institutions must rethink their relationships with the individuals, families and communities among which they find themselves, presenting themselves as vital providers of opportunities to

develop formal learning processes, while at the same time encouraging a way of life that promotes learning through social interaction.

Among the challenges facing the university and the education system in general, we should also mention the need for lifelong learning. As an essential part of the knowledge economy and facilitated by the new information and telecommunications technologies, lifelong learning should also be seen by the universities as an opportunity to implement strategies that will help maintain their sustained flexibility, and confirms the need to diversify the system, as stated above.

To sum up, rather than presenting a detailed plan of public policy options and forms of management for the universities, this section sets out to show how the concepts developed in section 3 can be used to analyse the challenges facing the university in the knowledge-based economy, and what kind of opportunities can be discerned. Among the substantive conclusions of this section are the importance of preserving the institutional integrity of the university, not only by avoiding excessive dissipation of its resources in activities related to its links with society, but most importantly by maintaining the academic character of its basic functions of teaching and research. In a situation in which education should promote learning skills, we put forward the need to identify and understand the different components of university research, so as to enhance the selectivity of the R&D and R&T sub-functions, while ensuring the widespread availability of R&L. It is argued that a diversified higher education system can free the universities of many of the pressures that they are experiencing today, by helping to ensure the preservation of their institutional integrity.

5. CONCLUSIONS

This paper has shown empirically the increasing importance that knowledge is assuming in economic activity in developed countries, and has described recent conceptual advances in efforts to understand the new dynamic of economic growth. These theories accord particular importance to the accumulation of knowledge by means of formal and informal learning processes. This accumulation takes place in the form of ideas and skills, which have different economic properties but whose interdependence in a complex process of interaction requires a rethinking of the traditional role of the university, as well as of contemporary institutions in general.

The analysis shows in the particular case of the university that preservation of its **institutional integrity** is essential in a situation of **sustained flexibility**, in which education, besides offering

a specific qualification, should ensure the assimilation of learning skills. The signs of the knowledge economy, notably the expansion in university education and the need to manage multiple demands and to ensure participative learning, point towards a **diversification of the system**, with reference to which it is particularly important to identify and understand the different components of the university's research function.

REFERENCES

- ABRAMOVITZ, M., DAVID, P. (1996). "Technological Change and the Rise of Intangible Investments: The US Economy's Growth-path in the Twentieth Century", *Employment and Growth in the Knowledge-based Economy*, Paris: OCDE.
- ARROW, K. (1962); "The Economic Implications of Learning by Doing", *Review of Economic Studies*, **28**, 155-73.
- ARTHUR, W.B. (1994). "Increasing Returns and Path Dependency in the Economy", University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor.
- BARRO, R. J.; SALA-I-MARTIN, X. (1995); *Economic Growth*; New York: McGraw-Hill.
- BERNSTEIN, J., NADIRI, I. (1988), "Interindustry Spillovers, Rates of Return, and Production in High-Tech Industries", *American Economic Review*, **78**, 429-434.
- BERNSTEIN, J., NADIRI, I. (1991), "Product Demand, Cost of Production, Spillovers, and the Social Rate of Return to R&D", NBER Working Paper Series, Working Paper No. 3625.
- CARAÇA, J., CONCEIÇÃO, P., HEITOR, M. V. (1998), "On the Definition of a Public Policy towards a Research University", *Higher Education Policy*, accepted for publication.
- CONCEIÇÃO, P., GIBSON, D. V., HEITOR, M. V., SHARIQ, S. (1998), "The Emerging Importance of Knowledge for Development: Management and Policy Implications", *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, accepted for publication.
- CONCEIÇÃO, P., HEITOR, M. V., OLIVEIRA, P. M. (1998), "Expectations for the University in the Knowledge Based Economy", *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, accepted for publication.
- CONCEIÇÃO, P., DURÃO, D.F.G., HEITOR, M. V. AND SANTOS, F. (1998),
- DASGUPTA, P., DAVID, P. (1994), "Toward a New Economics of Science", *Research Policy*, **23**, 487-521.
- DAVID, P. (1986); "Clio and the Economics of QWERTY", *American Economic Review*, **75**(2):332-337.
- DAVID, P. (1993), "Knowledge, Property, and the System Dynamics of Technological Change", in SUMMERS, L. H., SHAH, S. (eds.), *Proceedings of the World Bank Annual Conference on Development Economics 1992*, Supplement to *The World Bank Economic Review*.
- DOSI, G. (1996), "The Contribution of Economic Theory to the Understanding of a Knowledge-Based Economy", *Employment and Growth in the Knowledge-based Economy*, Paris: OCDE.
- The Economist (1997), "A Survey of Universities- The Knowledge Factory", 4 de Outubro.

- EDQUIST, C. (1997). *Systems of Innovation – Technologies, Institutions and Organizations*. Printer Publishers.
- EICHER, J. -C., CHEVALIER, T. (1993), “Rethinking the Finance of Post-Compulsory Education”, *International Journal of Educational Research*, **19**, 445-519.
- FORAY, D., LUNDVALL, B.-A. (1996), “The Knowledge-Based Economy: From the Economics of Knowledge to the Learning Economy”, *Employment and Growth in the Knowledge-based Economy*, Paris: OCDE.
- FREEMAN, C., SOETE, L. (1997), *The Economics of Industrial Innovation- Third Edition*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- GOTO, A., SUZUKI, K. (1989), “R&D Capital, Rate of Return on R&D Investment and Spillover of R&D in Japanese Manufacturing Industries”, *Review of Economics and Statistics*, **71**, 555-564.
- GROSSMAN, G.M. AND HELPMAN, E. (1991). “Innovation and Growth in the Global Economy, Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
- KENDRICK, J. W. (1994), “Total Capital and Economic Growth”, *Atlantic Economic Journal*, **22**(1), 1-18.
- LUCAS, C. (1996). *Crisis in the Academy- Rethinking Higher Education in America*, St. Martin’s Press, New York.
- LUCAS, R. E. (1988); “On the Mechanics of Economic Development”, *Journal of Monetary Economics*, **22**, 3-42.
- LUNDVALL, B.A. (1992). *National System of Innovation – Towards a Theory of Innovation and Interactive Learning*, London: Printer Publishers.
- MANKIW, N. G. (1995). “The Growth of Nations”, in BRAINARD, W. C., PERRY, G. L. (Eds), *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, **1**, Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution.
- MANSFIELD, E., RAPOPORT, J., WAGNER, S., BEARDSLEY, G. (1977), “Social and Private Rates of Return from Industrial Innovations”, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, **77**, 221-240.
- MOWERY, D. C.; ROSENBERG, N. (1989); *Technology and the Pursuit of Economic Growth*; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- NADIRI, I. (1993), “Innovations and Technological Spillovers”, NBER Working Paper Series, Working Paper No. 4423.
- NELSON, R. R. (1959); “The Simple Economics of Basic Scientific Research”, *Journal of Political Economy*, **67**, 297-306.
- NELSON, R. (1993). *National Innovation Systems*, Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

- NELSON, R. R. (1996), "What is "Commercial" and What is "Public" about Technology, and What Should Be?", in ROSENBERG, N., LANDAU, R., MOWERY, D. C. (eds.) *Technology and the Wealth of Nations*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- NELSON, R. R. (1997), "How New is Growth Theory?", *Challenge*, 40(5), 29-58.
- NELSON, R. R., ROMER, P. (1996). "Science, Economic Growth, and Public Policy", in SMITH, B. L. R., BARFIELD, C. E.; *Technology, R&D, and the Economy*, Brookings, Washington, D.C.
- NONAKA, I., TAKEUCHI, H. (1995), *The Knowledge-Creating Company*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- NORTH, D. (1990), *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance*, Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- OCDE (1996), *Employment and Growth in the Knowledge-based Economy*, Paris: OCDE.
- OCDE (1997), *Technology and Industrial Performance*, Paris: OCDE.
- PACK, H. (1994), "Endogenous Growth Theory: Intellectual Appeal and Empirical Shortcomings", *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 8(1), 55-72.
- PAVITT, K. (1987). "The Objectives of Technology Policy", *Science and Public Policy*, 14, 182-188.
- ROMER, P. M. (1986). "Increasing Returns and Long-Run Growth", *Journal of Political Economy*, 98(5), 1002-1037.
- ROMER, P. (1990); "Endogenous Technological Growth", *Journal of Political Economy*, 98(5), s71-s102.
- ROMER, P. (1993a); "Idea Gaps and Object Gaps in Economic Development", *Journal of Monetary Economics*; 32, 543-573.
- ROMER, P. (1993b); "Two Strategies for Economic Development: Using Ideas and Producing Ideas", in Summers, L. H.; Shah, S.- eds.; *Proceedings of the World Bank Annual Conference on Development Economics 1992, Supplement to the World Bank Economic Review*.
- ROMER, P. (1994); "The Origins of Endogenous Growth", *Journal of Economic Perspectives*; 8(1), 3-22.
- ROMER, P. (1996); "Why, Indeed, in America? Theory, History, and the Origins of Modern Economic Growth", *American Economic Review*; 86(2), 202-206.
- ROSENBERG, N., NELSON, R. R. (1996). "The Roles of Universities in the Advance of Industrial Technology", in Rosenbloom, R. S., Spencer, W. J., *Engines of Innovation*, Harvard Business School Press, Cambridge, MA.
- ROSENBERG, N. (1990), "Why do Companies do Basic Research with Their Own Money?", *Research Policy*, 19, 165-174.

SHCERER, F. (1984), "Using Linked Patent and R&D Data to Measure Interindustry Technology Flows", in Griliches, Z., ed. *R&D, Patents, and Productivity*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

SCHUMPETER, J. (1943); *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*.

SCHUMPETER, J. (1911); *The Theory of Economic Development*.

SOETE, L. (1996), "The Challenges of Innovation", *IPTS Report*, 7, 7-13.

SOLOW, R. M. (1957). "Technical Change and the Aggregate Production Function", *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 39 (August), 312-320.

STEPHAN, P. E. (1996). "The Economics of Science", *Journal of Economic Literature*, 34, September, 1199-1235.

SVEIKAUSKAS, L. (1981), "Technology Inputs and Multifactor Productivity Growth", *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 63, 275-282.

TERLECKYJ, N. (1974), "Effects of R&D on the Productivity Growth of Industries: An Exploration Study", National Planning Association, Washington, D.C.

WILSON, ROBERT H. (1993), *States and the Economy- Policymaking and Decentralization*, Praeger, Westport, CT.

World Bank (1997), *World Development Report 1998: Knowledge for Development*, (Annotated Outline), mimeo.

UCLA (1997), *The American College Teacher: National Norms for the 1995-95 H.E.R.I. Faculty Survey*, Higher Education Research Institute of the University of California at Los Angeles.

VARIAN, HAL R. (1995), "The Information Economy", *Scientific American*, 273(3), 200-202.