

Managing Science and Technology for a Sustainable Future

This volume explores global viewpoints on the role of science and technology in solving global problems related to sustainability. The aim is to address growing concerns for the future of our interlocked ecological, political and economic systems in a highly populated world that is characterised by major social and economic disparities.

The papers presented in this volume cover a wide geographical spectrum and different research areas.

The eleven main sections include:

- Science, Technology and Innovation
- Knowledge Management and Education
- Sustainable and Indigenous Development
- Ecotourism and Natural Resources Management
- Real Estate for Economic Development
- Gender Studies and Development
- Transport Studies and Management
- Accounting, Economics and Finance
- Business and Management
- Globalisation, International Business and Trade
- Marketing and E-Commerce

Editor:

Dr Allam Ahmed

Director MSc International Management, University of Sussex, UK

Published by:

World Association for Sustainable Development (WASD)



ISBN 978-0-9551771-5-6 (Print)

ISBN 978-0-9551771-4-9 (Online)

Cover Design: H. Tangasawi

Managing Science and Technology
for a Sustainable Future

Allam Ahmed

WORLD SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT
OUTLOOK 2008

Managing Science and Technology for a Sustainable Future



Editor
Allam Ahmed

Managing Science and Technology for a Sustainable Future

Edited by **Allam Ahmed**

2008 Conference Proceedings

**Sixth International Conference
World Association for Sustainable Development (WASD)**

**Brighton, United Kingdom
27–29 August 2008**

MANAGING SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FOR A SUSTAINABLE FUTURE
(WASD 2008 Conference Proceedings) can be ordered from WASD:

WORLD ASSOCIATION FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT (WASD),
SPRU – Science and Technology Policy Research,
The Freeman Centre, University of Sussex,
Brighton BN1 9QE, United Kingdom

Website: www.worldsustainable.org
E-mail: allam@worldsustainable.org

Copyright© 2008 World Association for Sustainable Development (WASD)

ISBN (Print) 978-0-9551771-5-6 (Print)
ISBN (ebook) 978-0-9551771-4-9 (CD)

No part of this publication may be reproduced stored or transmitted in any material form or by any means (including electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise) without the prior written permission of WASD and/or the Editor, except in accordance with the provisions of the Copyright Designs and Patents Act 1988 or under the terms of a licence issued by the Copyright Licensing Agency Ltd or the Copyright Clearance Center Inc.

No responsibility for the views expressed in this book is assumed by the Editor or WASD.

Contents

Organising Committee	ix
Conference Sponsors.....	xi
Conference Research Tracks	xiii
Track Chairs and Reviewers	xv
Keynote Speakers.....	xvii
List of Participants.....	xxi
Preface Allam Ahmed, University of Sussex, UK	xxiii

PART I: SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND INNOVATION 1

1. Why Do Researchers Collaborate with Industry? An Analysis of the Wine Sector in Chile, South Africa and Italy	3
<i>Elisa Giuliani, Università di Pisa (Italy) and University of Sussex (UK), Andrea Morrison, Utrecht University (the Netherlands) and Bocconi University (Italy), Carlo Pietrobelli, Università Roma Tre (Italy) & Roberta Rabellotti, Università del Piemonte Orientale (Italy)</i>	
2. Cellulosic Ethanol: The Evolution of Patterns of Collaboration in Research and Development (R&D)	19
<i>Pablo Catalan, Georgia Institute of Technology (USA) and Universidad de Concepción (Chile) & Elena Berger Harari, Georgia Institute of Technology (USA)</i>	
3. New Issues in Assessing Biotech Sector: Some Empirical Evidences and Policy Implications	29
<i>R. D'Amore, DISES/University of Salerno (Italy) & M. P. Vittoria, IRAT/CNR (Italy)</i>	
4. Interfacing Traditional/Local Herbalist and Global Biomedical Practitioners in Botswana.....	37
<i>B. N. Ngwenya, W. R. L. Masamba & N. Kanyenvu, University of Botswana (Botswana)</i>	
5. National Innovation Activity as a Factor of Sustainable Development – Case Study of Kazakhstan.....	47
<i>Turginbayeva Ardak Nesipbekovna, Kazakh National University (Kazakhstan)</i>	
6. Technological Innovation, Competitiveness and Sustainable Development.....	53
<i>Feride Doganer Gonel, Yildiz Technical University (Turkey)</i>	

PART II: KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT AND EDUCATION 63

7. Sustainable Development in Sub-Saharan Africa: Issues of Knowledge Development and Agenda Setting	65
<i>Sonny Nwankwo, Kazem Chaharbaghi & Derick Boyd, University of East London (UK)</i>	
8. Internationalising University of Western Sydney: Agriculture and Environmental Education.....	77
<i>Qaiyum Parvez, University of Western Sydney (Australia)</i>	
9. Research Student Supervision:Developing Reflective Practice in Higher Education	85
<i>I. Tewfik, University of Westminster (UK) & S. Tewfik, London Metropolitan University (UK)</i>	

PART III: SUSTAINABLE AND INDIGENOUS DEVELOPMENT.....	93
10. The Narrative-Textual Case Study as the Tool to Understand Sustainable Development in Developed Countries	95
<i>Adli Abouzeedan, Breyer State University (USA) & Michael Busler, The Richard Stockton College (USA)</i>	
11. The Millennium Development Goals (MDGs): What achievements in Asia?	103
<i>Moazzem Hossain, Griffith University (Australia)</i>	
12. Energy Poverty and Market Structure Characteristics: Determining the Energy Access for Rural Households in Developing Countries	111
<i>Bilal Mirza, United Nations University, MERIT (the Netherlands)</i>	
13. Assessment of Food Insecurity and Dietary Diversity in the Okavango Delta and the Potential contribution of Indigenous Foods	121
<i>M. S. Nnyepi, B. N. Ngwenya & R. Majelantle, University of Botswana (Botswana)</i>	
14. Can Community Based Natural Resources Management (CBNRM) Projects Alleviate Poverty Among Basarwa Communities?	131
<i>Lapologang Magole & Lefatshe I. Magole, University of Botswana (Botswana)</i>	
15. The Dynamics of Fishing as a Natural Safety Net in the Okavango Delta, Botswana	141
<i>G. Mmopelwa, B. N. Ngwenya & B. Sakwape, University of Botswana (Botswana)</i>	
PART IV: ECOTOURISM AND NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	153
16. Developing Performance Measurements for Ecotourism Companies.....	155
<i>Cecily Raiborn, Texas State University, San Marcos (USA), Colinne Bartel, AC Innovation GmbH (Germany) & Marc Massoud, Claremont McKenna College (USA)</i>	
17. Conserving our Natural Resources: The Rise of Ecotourism	165
<i>Siham El-Kafafi, Manukau Institute of Technology (New Zealand)</i>	
18. Local Participation in Biodiversity Conservation in the Okavango Delta, Botswana.....	175
<i>Joseph E. Mbaiwa, University of Botswana (Botswana)</i>	
19. Ethnicity and Utilization of Natural Resources in the Okavango Delta, Botswana: A Historical Perspective of Conflict and Collaboration.....	183
<i>Joseph E. Mbaiwa, B. N. Ngwenya & M. Sethora, University of Botswana (Botswana)</i>	
20. The Dynamics of Benefits Sharing in Community Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM) Among Remote Communities in Botswana.....	195
<i>Lefatshe I. Magole, Lapologang Magole & Tuelo Bapedi, University of Botswana (Botswana)</i>	
PART V: REAL ESTATE FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	207
21. An Overview of Kinship, Land, and Architecture in Urban Ghana	209
<i>R. A. Oppong & D. Dunster, University of Liverpool (UK)</i>	
22. An Analysis of Rural-Urban Differences in Stakeholders' Perceptions and Attitudes towards some Tenurial, Agricultural and Environmental Issues in North-East Ghana	217
<i>J. T. Bugri, KNUST (Ghana)</i>	

PART VI: GENDER STUDIES AND DEVELOPMENT.....	225
23. A Participatory Gender-oriented Study of Information and Learning Needs of Youth in a Rural Community in Southeastern Nigeria.....	227
<i>Williams E. Nwagwu, University of Ibadan (Nigeria)</i>	
24. Time Allocation between Paid and Unpaid Work of Married Women: A Case Study of Madurai in South India	237
<i>S. Mumtaj Begum, Lady Doak College (India)</i>	
25. Socio-Economic Status of Women Self Help Groups (SHGs) in the Metropolitan city of Chennai – Tamil Nadu, India.....	247
<i>S. Hemavathy Nithyanandhan, Mazoon College (Sultanate of Oman)</i>	
PART VII: TRANSPORT STUDIES AND MANAGEMENT.....	255
26. Creating, Funding, and Deploying the Next Generation Air Transportation System	257
<i>Dawna L. Rhoades, Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University (USA)</i>	
27. The Use of Advanced RFID Tracking Methods for Insuring the Security and Integrity of Container Shipped Cargo	265
<i>Michael J. Williams & Cheryl Cunningham, Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University (USA)</i>	
PART VIII: ACCOUNTING, ECONOMICS AND FINANCE	275
28. Implications of Money Supply and Interest Rate on Construction Flows: Evidence from a Developing Economy.....	275
<i>Mahendra Reddy & Neelesh Gounder, University of the South Pacific (Fiji)</i>	
29. Microfinancial System and Sustainable Development: Are They Compatible?.....	283
<i>Edgardo Sica & Giuseppina Testa, University of Foggia (Italy)</i>	
30. Corporate Risk Disclosure in the UK: Current Practices and Trends.....	293
<i>Bassam Rajab & Morrison Handley Schachler, Napier University (UK)</i>	
31. Demand for credit for production in the rain-fed sub-sector of the Sudan	305
<i>Babiker Idris, University of Khartoum (Sudan) & Abdel Wahab El Bashir, The Agricultural Bank of Sudan (Sudan)</i>	
32. From Gold Standard to Currency Board Arrangements: A Case of Déjà Vu?.....	313
<i>G. M. (Buks) Wessels, University of the Free State (South Africa)</i>	
33. Sustainable Adjustment of Capital Structure in the Course of Economic Development: Evidence from the Electronics Industry of Taiwan.....	321
<i>Hsien-Hung Yeh, National Pingtung University of Science and Technology (Taiwan) & Griffith University (Australia)</i>	
PART IX: BUSINESS AND MANAGEMENT	331
34. The Role of Environmental Activity Integration into R&D Department to Obtain Competitive Advantage.....	333
<i>Beatriz Junquera & Jesús Ángel del Brío, Universidad de Oviedo (Spain)</i>	

35. Dual Focus in Exploration and Exploitation: The Route to Sustainable Competitive Advantage....	343
<i>Janet K. Tinoco, Embry Riddle Aeronautical University (USA)</i>	
36. Relationship Between Personality Traits and Service Quality Perception of Logistics Personnel ...	357
<i>Young-Yei Kim, Seoul Digital University (Republic of Korea), Simon W. Tai, KIMEP (Kazakhstan) & Jung-Wan Lee, Kazakh-British Technical University (Kazakhstan)</i>	
37. Optimization of Organizing Processes for Global Sustainable Development: A Proposed Strategy.....	367
<i>Adli Abouzeedan, Breyer State University (USA) & Michael Busler, The Richard Stockton College (USA)</i>	
PART X: GLOBALISATION, INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS AND TRADE.....	375
38. The Changing Dynamics of the U.S. Auto Industry: Exploring the Impact of International Trade Policies	377
<i>Beverlee B. Anderson, California State University, San Marcos (USA) & Hyun-Sook Lee, National Autonomous University of Mexico (UNAM) (México)</i>	
39. Strategies for WTO Accession and for Economic Integration of Central Asia: A View from Kazakhstan.....	385
<i>Simon W. Tai, KIMEP (Kazakhstan), Jung-Wan Lee, Kazakh-British Technical University (Kazakhstan) & Gulzada S. Baimukhamedova, Kazakhstan Academy of Transport and Communications (Kazakhstan)</i>	
40. The Role of FDI from MNEs in Achieving National Competitiveness in Developing Countries: The Emerging Case of Kazakhstan	397
<i>Jung-Wan Lee & David Lal, Kazakh-British Technical University (Kazakhstan)</i>	
41. Impact of World Cotton Markets Liberalization on Cotton Trade of Africa: A Case Study of Sudan	407
<i>Imad Eldin E. Abdel Karim & Dieter Kirschke, University of Khartoum (Sudan)</i>	
42. Internetization Management and International Trade Theories: The Needed Connection.....	417
<i>Adli Abouzeedan, Breyer State University (USA)</i>	
PART XI: MARKETING AND E-COMMERCE	425
43. Loyalty, Repurchase, and Satisfaction: A Quantitative Review.....	427
<i>Tamilla Curtis, Nova Southeastern University (USA) & Dawna L. Rhoades, Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University (USA)</i>	
44. Customers' Personality and Brand Personality, and its Relations to Their Purchasing Intension.....	437
<i>Jung-Wan Lee, Kazakh-British Technical University (Republic of Kazakhstan), Young-Yei Kim, Seoul Digital University (Republic of Korea) & Simon W. Tai, KIMEP (Kazakhstan)</i>	
45. How a Celebrity Endorser in Advertisements can Influence the Credibility and Reliability of Information Received by Consumers	447
<i>Michael Busler, The Richard Stockton College (USA)</i>	

Organising Committee

We are grateful to all members of the conference team for making available to us their valuable time and efforts in organising this conference and most sincerely Ms Bridget Hill (Conference & Events Sales Manager, Holiday Inn) and her highly professional and dedicated staff from Holiday Inn Brighton-Seafront.

Conference Team

Allam Ahmed
University of Sussex
UK (Chair)

Judith Shaw
Newcastle
UK (Program)

Jung-Wan Lee
Kazakh-British Technical University
Kazakhstan

Mohamed Elhag
CSW Group Ltd.
UK (IT)

Lynette Louw
Rhodes University
South Africa

Beverlee B. Anderson
California State University San Marcos
USA

Patricia Ordóñez de Pablos
Universidad de Oviedo
Spain

Pranav N. Desai
Jawaharlal Nehru University
India

Qaiyum Parvez
University of Western Sydney
Australia

Feride Doganer Gonel
Yildiz Technical University
Turkey

Carlo Pietrobelli
CREI, Università Roma Tre
Italy

Hend A. Jolo
Qatar University
Qatar

Mahendra Reddy
University of the South Pacific
Fiji

Conference Sponsors

On behalf of WASD, we would like to thank the following institutions and their highly professional and dedicated staff for their generosity and full support to the 2008 Conference.

—Vikram Murthy, *Sydney, Australia*

—Holiday Inn Brighton-Seafront, *Brighton, UK*

Conference Research Tracks

- Science, Technology and Innovation
- Information Technology
- Knowledge Management
- Public Policy
- Higher Education
- Engineering and Management
- Climate Change, Renewable Energies Technologies and the Environment
- Transport Studies and Management
- Nutrition, Food Science, Medical Research and Public Health
- Agricultural Research and Technology
- International and Indigenous Development
- Real Estate for Economic Development
- Economics
- Business, Entrepreneurship and Management
- Accounting and Finance
- Employment and Human Resource Management
- International Business and Trade
- Marketing and E-Commerce
- Quality Management and Services Research

Track Chairs and Reviewers

We are grateful to our track chairs and many reviewers for graciously offering their invaluable comments that have enriched the quality of the papers in this volume and also for making available to us their valuable time and efforts.

Raymond Abdulai, *University of Wolverhampton (UK)*
Gabriel O. Adegoke, *University of Ibadan (Nigeria)*
Mohamad M. Ajlouni, *Yarmouk University (Jordan)*
Beverlee B. Anderson, *California State University San Marcos (USA)*
Abid Azhar, *University of Karachi (Pakistan)*
Mumtaj Begum, *Lady Doak College (India)*
Michael Busler, *The Richard Stockton College (USA)*
Mario Coccia, *National Research Council (Italy) & Max Planck Institute of Economics (Germany)*
Adil A. Dafa'Alla, *Airbus UK Ltd (UK)*
Pranav N. Desai, *Jawaharlal Nehru University (India)*
Siham El-Kafafi, *Manukau Institute of Technology (New Zealand)*
Ali Elkamel, *University of Waterloo (Canada)*
Birgitta Eriksson, *Karlstad University (Sweden)*
Feride D. Gonel, *Yildiz Technical University (Turkey)*
Morrison Handley-Schachler, *Napier University (UK)*
M. Anaam Hashmi, *Minnesota State University (USA)*
Samsul Huda, *University of Western Sydney (Australia)*
Babiker Idris, *University of Khartoum (Sudan)*
Hend A. Jolo, *Qatar University (Qatar)*
Patrik Larsson, *Karlstad University (Sweden)*
Jung-Wan Lee, *Kazakh-British Technical University (Kazakhstan)*
Cheng Li, *Sichuan University (China)*
Lynette Louw, *Rhodes University (South Africa)*
Lefatshe I. Magole, *University of Botswana (Botswana)*
Mohamed M. Mostafa, *Auburn University (USA)*
Barbara N. Ngwenya, *University of Botswana (Botswana)*
Williams E. Nwagwu, *University of Ibadan (Nigeria)*
Qaiyum Parvez, *University of Western Sydney (Australia)*
Ravinder Rena, *Eritrea Institute of Technology (Eritrea)*
Dawna L. Rhoades, *Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University (USA)*
Judith Shaw, *Newcastle (UK)*
Simon W. Tai, *KIMEP (Kazakhstan)*
Ihab Tewfik, *University of Westminster (UK)*
Buks Wessels, *University of the Free State (South Africa)*
Michael J. Williams, *Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University (USA)*
Sibin Wu, *University of Texas-Pan American (USA)*

Keynote Speakers

Our most sincere thanks go to all of the conference keynote speakers who shared with us their expertise and knowledge and also for making available to us their valuable time and efforts during the conference.

Wednesday 27th August 2008

H. E. John Chrysostom A. Nsambu, MP Minister of State for ICT (UGANDA)

H. E. John Nsambu is a member of the Ugandan Parliament. He joined Parliament in 2001 just two months after graduating with his MA in Political Science at the Technical University of Braunschweig, Germany. After five years of Parliamentary work, Nsambu ran again for Parliament and was re-elected in 2006. In June of the same year, Nsambu was nominated by His Excellency the President of Uganda to serve in his cabinet as the State Minister of ICT, which is his current position. Born in 1973, Nsambu is the youngest cabinet member in Uganda's history. Throughout his political carrier, Nsambu has been a strong advocate for the integration of ICT in Education. Through Microsoft employees, individuals and US schools he has enabled over 260 schools with computer labs that include educational software. He believes that school children must have access to computer technology in order for Africa to advance and have a strong hold in the technology-driven global market. The first step will be to teach Ugandan school children how to use the keyboard and hold the mouse, and from there Uganda's ICT aspirations can grow. For this reason, Nsambu has been working hard to introduce appropriate technologies which can adapt to the electrical power problems in Uganda. Through his efforts, solar and battery powered PCs have already reached Ugandan communities and can be used in any part of the country. Currently, Nsambu is spearheading a project code-named "A laptop for every one initiative". The project, expected to cost one US billion dollars, started in March and 300,000 members of the Public Service in Uganda are the initial recipients. Laptops, which normally cost \$ 1,200, only cost Ugandan citizens \$500 payable in four years. Nsambu's passion is to provide access to affordable hardware for every citizen in his country.

Professor Mike Hobday, Research Co-ordinator, SPRU University of Sussex and CENTRIM University of Brighton (UK)

Mike currently researches two fields: (a) innovation in East and South East Asia; and (b) innovation management in complex products and systems (CoPS). He has industrial experience in the semiconductor industry (Texas Instruments 1969-1978), a D.Phil. (in telecommunications in Brazil), MA Economics, and BA (Ist Hons) in Economics. Mike has published widely on how innovation in high technology, high value capital goods (called CoPS) contributes to competitiveness in the advanced countries. His book *Innovation in East Asia*, Edward Elgar, 1995, was the first detailed analysis of how East Asian firms, in countries such as Korea, Taiwan, Singapore and Hong Kong, learned to compete on the international stage. Since then he has published many articles on innovation in Korea, Malaysia, Thailand and other countries of the region. Mike has undertaken numerous consultancy projects for governments, private companies and international agencies. He has produced more than 150 publications, including five books and numerous articles and policy reports on industrial innovation and competitiveness.

Dr. Alma Swan, Director KeyPerspectives Ltd (UK)

Alma Swan has a PhD in cell biology from Southampton University and an MBA from Warwick Business School. After a lecturership at Leicester University, and senior managing editor position at Pergamon Press

(later Elsevier Science), in 1996 she jointly founded the consultancy Key Perspectives Ltd, which undertakes business development and market research work in scholarly information, with a particular emphasis on Open Access and new forms of web-based communication. Clients include academic organisations, governmental organisations, NGOs and commercial publishers. Alma is business strategy tutor on Warwick Business School's MBA programme, Visiting Researcher in the School of Electronics & Computer Science at Southampton University and Associate Fellow in the Marketing & Strategic Management Group at Warwick Business School. She is an elected member of the Governing Board of Euroscience (the European Association for the Promotion of Science and Technology) and editor of its magazine, *The Euroscientist*.

Thursday 28th August 2008

Professor Liisa Laakso, UNESCO Chair in Development and International Cooperation, University of Helsinki (FINLAND)

Liisa Laakso, Dr.Soc.Sc, is a Professor and UNESCO Chair in Development and International Cooperation at the University of Helsinki, Finland. Her areas of expertise include conflicts, democratisation, and development cooperation in Finland, the European Union and non-governmental organisations. She is co-author of Evaluation of Coordination and Coherence in the Application of Article 96 of the Cotonou Partnership Agreement (2007) and co-editor of Challenges to the Nation-state in Africa (1996), Multi-party Elections in Africa (2002) and Twenty Years of Independence in Zimbabwe, From Liberation to Authoritarianism (2003). Her articles have been published in the Journal of Modern African Studies, Journal of International Development, Journal of Commonwealth & Comparative Politics, the Round Table, International Journal of Development Issues, African Studies Quarterly, and Current Research on Peace and Violence, among others. She is a co-editor of the Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding, chair of the Advisory Group of CONCORD (European NGO Confederation for Relief and Development), member of the Executive Committee of the EADI (European Association of Development Research and Activities Training Institutes) and member of the Development Policy Committee of the Government of Finland. Professor

Professor Ahmed Obeid Hassan, UNESCO Chair in Transfer of Technology and Director General, Industrial Research & Consultancy Centre (SUDAN)

Prof. Hassan is the Regional Representative and member of the Coordinating Council of the Commission of Science and Technology for South Countries (COMSATS), member of the Coordinating Council of the Heads of the Arab Industrial Research Councils, member of the Governing Councils of the African Regional Centre for Technology Management & the African Regional Centre for Engineering Design and Manufacturing and member of the Advisory Council of Ministry of Science and Technology and the Ministry of Industry, Sudan. Prof. Hassan is the Chair of the Council for Engineering & Industrial Technologies Studies as well as Head of the Academic Committee for Post Graduate Studies in Engineering at the Sudan Academy of Sciences (SAS). He is the Co-founder of the Sudanese Society for the Development of Small Enterprises, the Sudanese Society for Incubators, the Sudanese Technology and Innovation Network for Poverty Reduction (STINPR), the Sudanese Society for Water Technology and a Member of the Sudanese Inventors Association. Hassan work experience comprises more than 25 years as researcher, lecturer and headed number of departments, Institutions and Key Posts such as Head appropriate technology research Department, Director of the Technology Research Institute, Director Interrelation and Technology Transfer Directorate, etc. Prof. Hassan obtained his postgraduate Studies in Chemical Engineering from Aston University in Birmingham and further trainings in special field such as, foresight studies, technology transfer, national innovation systems, incubators and science parks. He received merit awards for outstanding performance from National Centre for Research and Ministry of Science and Technology. Prof. Hassan has two Industrial Designs registered to his name and currently leading a team of innovators working on

other two designs. He is the Chair of editorial board of Industrial Research Journal (refereed), he was also the Director of Al Buhuth Journal. (A refereed Journal of Sudanese Research of National Centre for Research), co-author of two books and author of many refereed scientific papers. He was the editor of “young researcher” magazine, and the T.V. Programme Sudan Science Magazine.

Professor Ronald W McQuaid, Director Employment Research Institute, Napier University (UK)

Professor Ronald McQuaid is the Director of the Employment Research Institute at Napier University, Edinburgh. He has a PhD from Harvard University, an MSc (Econ) from LSE and a BA (Hons) from Lancaster University. He headed economic development at two Councils before joining Napier University in the 1990s. Ronald’s extensive research experience includes economic development, employability, training issues and related transport issues. He has worked with many colleagues across the globe, including many European countries, China, South Africa, USA etc. Research and consultancy projects have been funded by regional and local development agencies, local authorities, companies, Third Sector organisations, the Scottish Government, government departments and the European Commission and an advisor to the Scottish Parliament. He has published over 80 academic papers and is on the editorial boards of several journals, including World Review of Entrepreneurship, Management and Sustainable Development. Ronald has carried out numerous research and consultancy reports. Recent examples include: Simulating Land Use Processes - An Interactive E-Tool for Sustainable Impact Assessment (e-LUP), commissioned by EU 6th Framework with various partner institutions; How Can Parents Escape From Recurrent Poverty? Joseph Rowntree Fund; Employers’ Views of Employability, Scottish Business in the Community; The impact of educational migration and non-return on community composition and skills in Northern Ireland, Equality Commission for Northern Ireland; Evaluation of Working for Families, Scottish Executive; SMEs and recruitment, European Social Fund; Exploring Employers Skills Upgrading Needs, Sector Skills Development Agency; Approaches to Evaluation in Community Regeneration, Communities Scotland; Rural demographic change and employment, European Commission; Delivering Employability through Partnership? Best practices in inter-agency co-operation on improving employability in Europe, Department for Employment and Learning, N. Ireland; Review of Transport and Rural Economies, Countryside Agency; Demographic Change and the Role of Over 50-year Olds in the Scottish Labour Market, Scottish Economic Policy Network; The Importance of Transport in Business’ Location Decisions - Scoping Study, Department for Transport

Professor Lynette Louw, Head Department of Management, Rhodes University (SOUTH AFRICA) and Former NEPAD Council VP International Relations (USA)

Lynette Louw is the Head of Department and Raymond Ackerman Chair of Management, Department of Management, Rhodes University in Grahamstown, South Africa. She was the Chairperson of the Research, Technology and Innovation Committee in the Faculty of Business and Economic Sciences at the Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University. She is the Vice President: Public Relations, and Finance as well as the Chairperson: Commission on Socio-economic Development and Trade of NEPAD (New Partnership for Africa’s Development). She was the Chairperson for an International Conference on Trade and Investment in South Africa, 2005; the Finance Chair for the ICTe Africa 2006 conference in Nairobi, Kenya, 17-21 May 2006 and committee member of the Europe-Africa summit to be held in Hamburg, Germany in April 2008. Lynette was also a member of the MBA Higher Education Quality Committee for Council on Higher Education in South Africa (2003-2004). She is a member of the Southern Africa Institute for Management Scientists (SAIMS) and an honorary member of the Golden Keys Awards Society in recognition for national and international community/business contribution. She also has experience of being a Board member to various institutions, such as the Amatola Water Board. Lynette work experience comprises of 23 years lecturing at academic institutions and three years’ experience in business. International experience

includes lecturing at the Fachbereich Wirtschaft, the University of Applied Sciences (Germany) and guest lecturer at University of Utrecht (Netherlands), University of Applied Sciences in Osnabrueck and Shanghai Institute of Foreign Trade (SIFT) in Shanghai (China). Currently an external moderator for Makerere University, Kampala in Uganda (2005-2007). She obtained her Baccalaureus Commercii Honoures Cum Laude and Magister Commercii Cum Laude in Business Management and her Doctor Commercii (Business Management) at the University of Port Elizabeth. Her areas of speciality include Strategic management, International management, Management/Organisational Behaviour, and Cross-cultural management. She has received merit awards for outstanding performance, research merit awards (2001-2003), and one of the University of Port Elizabeth's top twenty researchers in 2003. In 2004 she received the research merit award for Business Management at the Port Elizabeth Technikon. She is also on the editorial board of rated national and international journals and is a co-author of a text book on Management: A South African perspective 1st and 2nd editions and co-author of a chapter in the book on Management and change in Africa: A cross-cultural perspective. A new book in Strategic Management: Winning in the Southern African workplace of which is a co-author and main editor has recently been published.

Friday 29th August 2008

Dr. Michael Greger, Director, Public Health and Animal Agriculture, The Humane Society of the United States (USA)

Michael Greger, M.D. is an internationally recognized lecturer, he has presented at the Conference on World Affairs, the National Institutes of Health, and the International Bird Flu Summit, and was invited as an expert witness in defense of Oprah Winfrey at the infamous U.S. "meat defamation" trial. Recent publications in Critical Reviews in Microbiology and Biosecurity and Bioterrorism explore the public health implications of industrialized animal agriculture. His latest book is Bird Flu: A Virus of Our Own Hatching, now available full-text at no cost at www.BirdFluBook.org. Dr. Greger is a graduate of the Cornell University School of Agriculture and the Tufts University School of Medicine.

List of Participants

Imad Eldin E. Abdel Karim, *University of Khartoum (Sudan)*
Adli Abouzeedan, *Breyer State University (USA)*
Allam Ahmed, *University of Sussex (UK)*
Mohamad M. Ajlouni, *Yarmouk University (Jordan)*
Mohammed Salih Ali, *Sudanese Society for Young Scientists (Sudan)*
Beverlee B. Anderson, *California State University, San Marcos (USA)*
Gulzada S. Baimukhamedova, *Kazakhstan Academy of Transport and Communications (Kazakhstan)*
Tuelo Bapedi, *University of Botswana (Botswana)*
Colinne Bartel, *AC Innovation GmbH (Germany)*
S. Mumtaj Begum, *Lady Doak College (India)*
Derick Boyd, *University of East London (UK)*
J. T. Bugri, *KNUST (Ghana)*
Michael Busler, *The Richard Stockton College (USA)*
Pablo Catalan, *Georgia Institute of Technology (USA) and Universidad de Concepción (Chile)*
Kazem Chaharbaghi, *University of East London (UK)*
Cheryl Cunningham, *Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University (USA)*
Tamilla Curtis, *Nova Southeastern University (USA)*
R. D'Amore, *DISES/University of Salerno (Italy)*
Jesús Ángel del Brío, *Universidad de Oviedo (Spain)*
D. Dunster, *University of Liverpool (UK)*
Abdel Wahab El Bashir, *The Agricultural Bank of Sudan (Sudan)*
Siham El-Kafafi, *Manukau Institute of Technology (New Zealand)*
Rania Mohammed Elnaseh, *Sudanese Society for Young Scientists (Sudan)*
Elisa Giuliani, *Università di Pisa (Italy) and University of Sussex (UK)*
Feride Doganer Gonel, *Yildiz Technical University (Turkey)*
Neelesh Gounder, *University of the South Pacific (Fiji)*
Michael Greger, *The Humane Society of the United States (USA)*
Morrison Handley-Schachler, *Napier University (UK)*
Elena Berger Harari, *Georgia Institute of Technology (USA)*
Ahmed Obeid Hassan, *Industrial Research and Consultancy Centre (Sudan)*
Mike Hobday, *University of Sussex and University of Brighton (UK)*
Moazzem Hossain, *Griffith University (Australia)*
Hend A. Jolo, *Qatar University (Qatar)*
Beatriz Junquera, *Universidad de Oviedo (Spain)*
Babiker Idris, *University of Khartoum (Sudan)*
N. Kanyenvu, *University of Botswana (Botswana)*
Young-Yei Kim, *Seoul Digital University (Republic of Korea)*
Dieter Kirschke, *University of Khartoum (Sudan)*
Liisa Laakso, *University of Helsinki (Finland)*
David Lal, *Kazakh-British Technical University (Kazakhstan)*
Hyun-Sook Lee, *National Autonomous University of Mexico (UNAM) (México)*
Jung-Wan Lee, *Kazakh-British Technical University (Kazakhstan)*

Lynette Louw, *Rhodes University (South Africa)*
Lapologang Magole, *University of Botswana (Botswana)*
Lefatshe I. Magole, *University of Botswana (Botswana)*
R. Majelantle, *University of Botswana (Botswana)*
W. R. L. Masamba, *University of Botswana (Botswana)*
Marc Massoud, *Claremont McKenna College (USA)*
Joseph E. Mbaiwa, *University of Botswana (Botswana)*
Ronald McQuaid, *Napier University (UK)*
Bilal Mirza, *United Nations University, MERIT (the Netherlands)*
G. Mmopelwa, *University of Botswana (Botswana)*
Andrea Morrison, *Utrecht University (the Netherlands) and Bocconi University (Italy)*
Turginbayeva Ardak Nesipbekovna, *Kazakh National University (Kazakhstan)*
B. N. Ngwenya, *University of Botswana (Botswana)*
S. Hemavathy Nithyanandhan, *Mazoon College (Sultanate of Oman)*
M. S. Nnyepi, *University of Botswana (Botswana)*
Williams E. Nwagwu, *University of Ibadan (Nigeria)*
Sonny Nwankwo, *University of East London (UK)*
John Chrysostom A. Nsambu, *MP Minister of State for ICT (Uganda)*
R. A. Oponng, *University of Liverpool (UK)*
Qaiyum Parvez, *University of Western Sydney (Australia)*
Carlo Pietrobelli, *Università Roma Tre (Italy)*
Roberta Rabellotti, *Università del Piemonte Orientale (Italy)*
Bassam Rajab, *Napier University (UK)*
Cecily Raiborn, *Texas State University, San Marcos (USA)*
Mahendra Reddy, *University of the South Pacific (Fiji)*
Dawna L. Rhoades, *Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University (USA)*
B. Sakwape, *University of Botswana (Botswana)*
Judith Shaw, *WASD (UK)*
Edgardo Sica, *University of Foggia (Italy)*
Alma Swam, *Key Perspectives (UK)*
Simon W. Tai, *KIMEP (Kazakhstan)*
Giuseppina Testa, *University of Foggia (Italy)*
I. Tewfik, *University of Westminster (UK)*
S. Tewfik, *London Metropolitan University (UK)*
Janet K. Tinoco, *Embry Riddle Aeronautical University (USA)*
M. P. Vittoria, *IRAT/CNR (Italy)*
G. M. (Buks) Wessels, *University of the Free State (South Africa)*
Michael J. Williams, *Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University (USA)*
Hsien-Hung Yeh, *National Pingtung University of Science and Technology (Taiwan)*
& *Griffith University (Australia)*
Hideki Yoshida, *Japan Science and Technology Agency (Japan)*

Preface

Allam Ahmed

University of Sussex, UK

We are pleased to present the proceedings of the 2008 International Conference of World Association for Sustainable Development (WASD), held in August 2008 in Brighton, United Kingdom.

The objective of this conference is to explore global viewpoints on different issues relating to Science, Technology, Innovation and Sustainable Development (SD) and why they are important, and to provoke forward thinking on the role of science and technology in solving global problems related to sustainability. The aim is to address growing concerns for the future of our interlocked ecological, political and economic systems in a highly populated world that is characterised by major social and economic disparities.

The *problematique* of managing Science Technology and Innovation (STI) for SD is strongly influenced by the institutional culture in which international discussions have taken place. Successful management of STI in the new millennium requires developing new methods and approaches to suit the challenges and opportunities of this new era of information revolution. These new approaches call for actions to create different appropriate ways of doing things and of doing new things that will be essential to solve our future problems. Systematic search for opportunities is important for helping to ameliorate the many problems facing the globe. We must therefore produce, consume and organise ourselves differently. The conference will therefore provides a framework for understanding and acting upon different proposed solutions and consensus, taking into account a variety of international, institutional and intellectual perspectives.

Moreover the gulf in the levels of science and technology (S&T) between the developed and the developing countries (DCs) will tend to widen further with the rapid expansion of the internet in the West and the speedy transition to digitalisation, and this can lead to increased brain drain and dependence on foreign aid of a different kind. Therefore DCs are posed with the challenge of either becoming an integral part of the knowledge-based global culture or face the very real danger of finding themselves on the wrong side of the digital divide. For DCs, keeping up with these changes, and involvement in research, are both vital. Developing countries recognise that much of their economic future will depend upon the understanding of the global technological forces at work and their long-term implications. There is also an urgent need for strong commitment to education and training in all countries, particularly the low income countries, as well as to the 'hard' infrastructure policies often so dominant in the past.

The conference attracted more than 100 abstracts and papers from academicians, researchers, practitioners and policy-makers from all over the world representing more than 26 countries. The papers selected after the review process for presentation in the conference (47) cover a wide geographical spectrum and different research areas.

The 11 main parts of the proceedings are:

- PART- I: Science, Technology and Innovation
- PART- II: Knowledge Management and Education
- PART- III: Sustainable and Indigenous Development
- PART- IV: Ecotourism and Natural Resources Management
- PART- V: Real Estate for Economic Development
- PART- VI: Gender Studies and Development
- PART- VII: Transport Studies and Management

- PART- VIII: Accounting, Economics and Finance
- PART- IX: Business and Management
- PART- X: Globalisation, International Business and Trade
- PART- XI: Marketing and E-Commerce

It is hoped that the ensemble of papers presented in this volume will help to stimulate debate amongst scholars, researchers and policymakers and you find this volume interesting and thought-provoking. We would like to congratulate the authors for their valuable contribution and we are grateful to our track chairs and many reviewers for graciously offering their invaluable comments that have enriched the quality of the papers in this volume and also for making available to us their valuable time and efforts. Our most sincere thanks go to all of the keynote speakers and presenters who shared with us their expertise and knowledge.

On behalf of WASD, we would like to thank Mr Vikram Murthy, Sydney, Australia for his generosity and full support to the 2008 Conference. We are also grateful to the Holiday Inn Brighton-Seafront, Brighton, UK and most sincerely Ms Bridget Hill (Conference & Events Sales Manager) and her highly professional and dedicated staff for all their help and support during the conference.

—Allam Ahmed
Brighton August 2008

PART I

Science, Technology and Innovation

Why Do Researchers Collaborate with Industry? An Analysis of the Wine Sector in Chile, South Africa and Italy

Elisa Giuliani

Università di Pisa, Italy and University of Sussex, UK

Andrea Morrison

Utrecht University, the Netherlands and Bocconi University, Italy

Carlo Pietrobelli

Università Roma Tre, Italy

Roberta Rabbellotti

Università del Piemonte Orientale, Italy

Abstract: This paper explores the determinants of the linkages between industry and research organizations – including universities. We present new evidence on three wine producing areas – Piedmont, a region of Italy, Chile, South Africa - that have successfully reacted to the recent structural changes experienced in the industry worldwide.

Based on an original data-set, we carry out an econometric exercise to study the microeconomic determinants of researchers' collaborations with industry. The evidence reveals that individual researcher characteristics, such as embeddedness in the academic system, age and sex, matter more than their publishing record or formal degrees.

Keywords: University-Industry Linkages, Innovation System, Wine Sector, Emerging Economies

1 Introduction

The wine sector has recently experienced a process of dramatic technological change and modernisation, spurred by the results of applied research from universities and research institutes, and increased interaction between researchers and the industry (Aylward, 2003; Giuliani, 2006; Morrison and Rabbellotti, 2007; Unwin, 1991). These changes are occurring worldwide, with new producing areas emerging in countries as diverse as Argentina, Australia, Chile and South Africa among others. This evidence nicely matches with the increasingly prevalent “systemic” approach to innovation: scholars, practitioners and policy-makers are acquiring greater awareness that innovation occurs within a system, where continuous interactions among the various actors play an essential role.¹

This paper contributes to one specific dimension of this literature, which is the relationship between industry and research organizations – including universities – and the determinants of these linkages. Universities and research institutes are increasingly seen as central actors in the economic development processes of countries and regions. Their role has always been crucial for the production of new ideas and knowledge and, recently, there has been much emphasis on their linkages with industry and on the importance of these relationships for economic development. Although it is true that university-industry (U-I) linkages² are not

1 See the literature on ‘National Systems of Innovation’ (e.g. Lundvall, 1992; Nelson, 1993) and its application to developing countries see, e.g.: Cassiolato *et al.*, 2003; Lall and Pietrobelli, 2005; Lundvall *et al.*, 2008; Mani, 2004; Muchie *et al.*, 2003.

2 Although in our empirical analysis there are some public research organizations which are different from universities, in the rest of this paper we use the expression University (U) – Industry (I) linkages as it is commonly accepted in the relevant literature.

per se a recent phenomenon, it is equally true that they have increased considerably in the recent past (Etzkowitz, 1998). This may be due to an increased trans-disciplinarity of the knowledge production process requiring tight and continuous interaction between science and technology (Faulkner, 1994) and to policies in both the US and Europe – and increasingly in the developing countries – aimed at promoting interaction between research institutions and industry (Geuna, 2001; Mowery et al., 2001; Velho and Saenz, 2002; van Looy et al., 2003).

Within this framework, the empirical literature on developed countries has focused predominantly on patent-driven U-I collaborations, which have been investigated from the perspective of either the firm or the university involved. There has been little work done on other forms of interaction (e.g. research collaborations) and the roles of individual researchers in this interaction. Moreover, although it is widely acknowledged that most of the networks emerging out of these linkages are highly skewed, with some *star* researchers and prestigious universities strongly connected with the business world, and others with very few or no connections, there is still little evidence on *why* this happens and *what* determines such a network configuration. In order to fill this gap in the literature, and in line with some recent contributions on U-I linkages (Bercovitz and Feldman, 2003; D’Este and Fontana, 2007; D’Este and Patel, 2007), this study focuses on U-I research collaborations from the individual researchers’ perspectives and explores their determinants. This is especially relevant as improved understanding of these mechanisms could inform policy makers about the design and implementation of public policy.

This study also contributes to the U-I literature by providing evidence on emerging economies. In particular, we provide new evidence on three wine producing contexts – Piedmont in Italy, Chile and South Africa - that have successfully reacted to the structural changes experienced in the industry worldwide. We exploit an original set of data collected by the authors through a questionnaire survey of researchers in these three wine innovation systems, and conduct an econometric analysis to study the microeconomic determinants of researchers’ collaborations with the industry.

The evidence reveals that individual researchers’ characteristics such as their embeddedness in the academic system, their sex and age matter, while their academic status, publishing record and formal education degrees are not significant. Working in a university, rather than in another type of research organizations, makes a positive difference, while other research organization characteristics do not appear to influence the emergence of U-I linkages.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 reviews the literature on U-I linkages and develops an original conceptual framework to explore the microeconomic determinants of the formation of these associations. Section 3 provides an overview of the wine industry in general and of the three specific contexts in which the research was conducted, and explains the rationale for their choice. Section 4 presents the data and the method of analysis. Section 5 presents the empirical results and Section 6 concludes.

2 Factors Influencing the Formation of U-I Linkages: A Conceptual Framework

There is substantial empirical evidence showing that interaction between university and industry can occur through multiple channels, ranging from informal meetings, to researcher involvement in consultancy commissioned by the industry, to joint research programmes, to the licensing of patents and the purchase of prototypes developed by the industry (Bonaccorsi and Piccaluga, 1994; D’Este and Patel, 2007; Schartinger et al. 2002). However, most of the attention in the literature on knowledge transfer has been devoted to patenting, licensing and start-up companies, with relatively little empirical research on the microeconomic behaviour of individual researchers in the various types of relationships with industry. And, increasingly it is becoming clear that patent-driven collaborations represent a tiny portion of a wider set of relations that researchers establish with the industry in order to gain access to a variety of outputs (e.g. access to funding, information on user needs) (D’Este and Patel, 2007; D’Este and Fontana, 2007).

D’Este and Patel (2007) identify two sets of factors that can influence the formation of U-I linkages: first, the *individual characteristics of the academic researcher* (see, among many others, Agarwal and Hen-




Figure 1 - Factors affecting the formation of U-I linkages

derson, 2002; Bercovitz and Feldman, 2003; Landry et al., 2007; Louis et al., 2001); second, the characteristics of *the institutions* – research organization, university, department - in which the researchers operate (Friedman and Silberman, 2003; Scharfing et al., 2002; Tornquist and Kallsen, 1994).³ In this paper we follow this approach, as depicted in Figure 1.

3 Why the Wine Industry and Why These Regions

Establishing the extent and depth of the U-I interaction is usually facilitated by underlying research that is applied in nature; this tends to apply more to fields such as agronomy, engineering and the life sciences, than physics and mathematics, for instance. In this paper, we focus on scientific research into wine production.

In the past, the wine industry has undergone major structural industrial and market changes, which have been accompanied by a scientific and technological shift. The recent dramatic technological change and modernization that has occurred in the wine sector, known for being a traditional, craft-based activity, has been spurred by the results of applied research conducted in universities and research institutes, and by the increased level of interaction between researchers and the industry (Aylward, 2003; Giuliani, 2006; Morrison and Rabellotti, 2007; Unwin, 1991).

Patterns of wine consumption have also changed, with market preferences shifting from quantity, non-premium wines to quality, premium wines. Production technology and grape growing and wine making techniques have undergone increased codification, which has allowed countries that formerly were not wine producers, to ‘catch up’ and emerge as exporters of fine wines. For instance, starting in the mid 1980s, countries such as Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, Chile and Argentina have become competitive in the international market, challenging ‘old world’ producers such as France, Italy and Spain (Anderson et al., 2003).

³ In addition, the extent, depth and variety of U-I linkages may also be affected by the sectoral context in which they occur. This includes the main features of the industry under analysis, such as, for example, whether industrial concentration or (perfect) competition prevails or the forms that competition may take. We do not enter into this discussion here, although we realize it could be significant in the emergence and development of U-I linkages.

Historically, public research organizations have played a central role in this industry. Institutions and researchers from the old world, primarily France but also Italy, led scientific research in this field for a long time. However, research has become increasingly international and several leading research centres in both viticulture and oenology have emerged around the world. Various authors (Aylward, 2003; Unwin, 1991) have noted that the recent process of technological renovation has been spurred by the considerable investment in new producer regions, such as California, Australia, New Zealand, Chile and South Africa. In the 1980s, some of these countries began investing in what could be defined a ‘wine system of innovation’ (Aylward, 2003) and institutions, such as the University of California at Davis and the Roseworthy College in Australia, have become key players in scientific research on wine related issues. In both old and new producing countries, the strengthening of these *wine systems of innovation* and particularly the interaction between researchers and industry have been identified as the key to competitiveness in the wine industry (Giuliani, 2006).

For all these reasons, an analysis of the factors influencing the formation of U-I linkages in the wine industry is interesting. Our study is based on data collected in three different contexts: two being significant examples of ‘new world’ producers – Chile and South Africa - and one an ‘old’, traditional producer – Italy.

3.1 Chile

Chile is considered a shining star among the so-called ‘new world’ producers, for the production and export of wine. Over the past 30 years, apart from a dip in the early 1990s, growth in Chilean production has been dramatic. Exports as a proportion of total production have risen more rapidly than in the other ‘new world’ countries, with nearly half of total production exported. This resulted in an extraordinary transformation in the structure of production and trade. However, the quality of Chilean wine did not improve until the late 1990s (Bell and Giuliani, 2007).

Chile’s success has been achieved thanks to a process of technological renovation, which has transformed an old market into a modern and dynamic, export-oriented industry - which today plays an important role in the country’s economy. Significant investments to support innovation and scientific research were undertaken by both the industry and several Chilean institutions. In the past ten years, several wine producers – mostly large-sized – have collaborated with Chilean universities, in research projects financed by the Chilean Industrial Promotion Board (*Corporación de Fomento*, CORFO) and the National S&T Council (CONICYT), through bidding schemes or competitive funds (Moguillansky et al., 2006).

Recently, there has been an explicit policy objective of strengthening Chile’s national wine research system through tight links between research organizations and the industry. In 2005, the establishment of two large technological consortia was promoted. These two consortia involve all the main business associations of wine producers and the main universities and wine related public research centres. It is the intention of the policy makers that these two consortia should play a key role in managing the research funding, selecting projects and promoting research to address very specific industry problems.

3.2 South Africa

The tradition of wine making in South Africa dates back to the 17th century. Since the end of Apartheid in 1994, the South African economy as well as its wine industry have undergone deep structural reforms. Previously, production quotas, import protection and price support were in place to prevent overproduction; moreover, regulation had the side effect of keeping prices high and distorting production towards high yields at the expense of quality. Deregulation forced a restructuring of the South African wine industry and a focus on quality rather than volume. Many producers have adapted to the international demand pattern, by planting noble international varieties and adopting advanced oenological and viticulture techniques. As a result, in the last ten years the South African wine industry has experienced a rapid boost in exports and in 2004 it accounted for 3.1% of world wine production, and was ranked 4th among the ‘new world’ producers and 9th at world level (Anderson, 2006).

Notwithstanding these very positive results, both production and exports are still dominated by cheap wines, and the restructuring of the industry is not complete. In this respect South Africa differs quite significantly from ‘new world’ producers such as Chile, which have been able to export remarkably high shares of their vintage and enter with their brands into fast growing markets (Vink et al., 2004).

In order to respond to the challenges posed by global markets, and in an attempt to reduce the gap with other new world producers, the South African wine industry recently initiated a major process of institutional renewal. This led to the establishment of the South African Wine and Brandy Company (SAWB) in 2002 representing the interests of all stakeholders (i.e. producers, farmers, workers and wholesale merchants) and focusing on different strategic areas, such as R&D, marketing, human resources and social promotion.

Within this new institutional framework, a strategic role has been assigned to various technical and scientific organizations. Within SAWB is a division, the Wine Industry Network of Expertise and Technology (Winetech), which has explicit responsibility for promoting, financing and coordinating wine research. Winetech’s main partners are universities and national research institutions, in particular the Agriculture Research Council (ARC), and the University of Stellenbosch, which can be considered the pillars of the South African wine research system absorbing more than 90% of its research funding (Winetech, 2006). Funding of wine research is competitive and projects focus on applied research aimed at industry needs. Winetech pays great attention to the dissemination of results to end-users and most of its projects explicitly require specific extension interventions. Thus, the unique structure of the South African institutional framework makes this country a particularly interesting case for the investigation of U-I relationships.

3.3 Italy (Piedmont)

Italy is a traditional wine producing country and one of the world’s leading wine producers, ranked second after France, and accounting for 18% of world production in 2004 (Anderson, 2006). Within Italy, we focus in this study on Piedmont, which produces some of the best known Italian wines (e.g. Asti Spumante, Barolo and Barbera) and is the second largest (after Veneto) exporting region in Italy, with a share of about 20 % of all Italian exports in 2005.⁴

Over the last 20 years, the Italian wine sector has undergone a deep restructuring, in reaction to changes in both the domestic and international markets. On the one hand, there has been a major decline in domestic demand and a shift in consumer preference towards higher quality wines; on the other hand, there is increasing competition in the international market from ‘new world’ wine producers. As a result, firms have been forced to modify their production strategies, and focus on quality and cost efficient production processes. Overall the wine sector is performing quite well, and holding its own in the face of external competition and changes in consumption patterns.

Due to its strong specialisation in high quality traditional wines for the international market, Piedmont provides a good case study for an investigation of the U-I linkages in the wine industry. At regional level, there are a number of research institutions participating in R&D projects in the field of oenology and viticulture, including public research organizations and universities. In addition, producers associations play a key role in disseminating technical knowledge and providing technical support to their members, and especially *Vignaioli Piemontesi*, the largest association of wine and grape producers in Italy, with more than 8,000 members. *Vignaioli Piemontesi* employs a team of technicians, mainly agronomists, who work closely with member firms and - particularly in small firms – take responsibility sometimes for the whole agronomic management of the vineyards. *Vignaioli Piemontesi* participates directly in local research projects in collaboration with university researchers, acting mainly as the technical partner for the scientific institutions involved in these projects. Morrison and Rabellotti (2007) showed that the wine innovation

4 The value of wine exports in Piedmont is US\$700 million, placing the region between Chile which exports US\$900 million and South Africa with US\$530 million (Cusmano *et al.*, 2008).

system in Piedmont is characterized by a core of R&D and extension organizations, which play a central in diffusing knowledge to a large number of firms, in an efficient manner.

4 Methodology

4.1 The Data

The study is based on original survey data collected in three areas - i.e. Piedmont (Italy), Chile and South Africa - in the period October 2005 to October 2006. The survey was carried out through personal interviews with researchers whose research agendas were based on wine-related issues, spanning a number of disciplines (e.g. viticulture, oenology, agronomy, agriculture, microbiology, genetics, chemistry, engineering). The populations of researchers with these characteristics were selected for interview with the help of local experts and informants in the area. The sample includes 40 researchers in Chile, 42 in South Africa and 53 in Piedmont (Italy) (see Table 1 for affiliations of interviewees). This sample is relatively small, but it should be noted first, that the researchers interviewed represent the universe of active researchers in wine-related research fields in the three contexts examined; and second, that our dataset provides unique and original information on researchers' characteristics and firm–university interactions. These data are not usually available from secondary sources.

The questionnaire covers many aspects related to the researcher's background and her/his personal collaborations with other researchers and people in the industry. This background information on researchers'

Table 1 Distribution of researchers according to institutional affiliation (%)

Cile		South Africa		Piedmont	
Universidad Católica (Santiago)	33%	Stellenbosch University	55%	Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche (CNR)	12%
Universidad de Chile (Santiago)	40%	Pretoria University	2%	Istituto Sperimentale per la Viticoltura	13%
Universidad de Santiago de Chile (USACH)	5%	Agricultural Research Council (ARC) Infruitec Nietvoorbij	41%	Istituto Sperimentale per l'Enologia	7%
Universidad de Talca	5%	Agricultural Research Council (ARC) Plant Protection	2%	Regione Piemonte	4%
Universidad de Concepción	3%			Azienda sperimentale "Tenuta Cannona"	4%
Universidad Federico Santa Maria	5%			Università Cattolica di Piacenza	18%
Centro de Informacion de Recursos Naturales (CIREN)	3%			Università di Milano	11%
Instituto Nacional Investigacion Agropecuaria (INIA)	5%			Università di Bologna	8%
				Università del Piemonte Orientale, Novara	4%
				Università di Torino	17%
				Institut Agricole Regional, Aosta	2%
Total N° of researchers	40		42		53

personal profiles also includes information on her/his education and work experience (e.g. age, sex, years of experience in research, position, affiliations, level of education achieved). Relational data on collaborations were gathered in a specific section of the questionnaire, in a format suitable for social network analysis (Giuliani and Rabellotti, 2008), through the so called *free recall* method (Wasserman and Faust, 1994). Specifically, two types of relational data were sought: (i) data on U-I linkages between the interviewee and professionals in the industry; and (ii) data on academic linkages between the interviewee and other researchers in their own country. Respondents were asked whether they had collaborated with a researcher and/or a professional located in their country⁵ and to specify the name and the main characteristics of the collaboration.

4.2 The Variables

The aim of the analysis was to explore the relation between researcher characteristics and the likelihood of establishing linkages with industry. This econometric analysis estimates a Poisson model by pooling the data for the three areas studied. Given that data come from three different populations of researchers, the model controls for the possibility that random disturbances in the regression are correlated within groups. The control is needed because we can expect that researchers sharing an observable characteristic, such as location, may also share unobservable characteristics that lead to spurious results when estimating the effects of aggregated variables on a single observation (Moulton, 1990). In what follows, we present the dependent and independent variables included in the model and the predictions expected, based on the evidence in the literature.

Dependent variable: *U-I Link*

The *dependent variable (U-I Link)* measures the number of linkages a researcher establishes with the industry, on the basis of the relational question reported in Appendix A.1. This variable is measured as the *Normalized degree of centrality (NDC)* of each researcher's U-I network. *U-I Link* is a continuous variable ranging from 0 to a maximum value of 3.70.

Independent variables:

We included in the model independent variables for the characteristics of both researchers and their institutions, and also country dummy variables. These are described below.

Individual researcher

(i) Demographic variables

- *Age* of researcher and age squared (*Agesq*) to test non-linear behaviour. Thus, we test a curvilinear (U-shaped) relationship between age and U-I linkages and expect that much younger and much older scholars have more linkages than scholars whose ages are between these extremes;
- *Researcher's sex* is measured as a dummy variable (Male is 0; Female is 1), with an open prediction, given the absence of previous empirical evidence on this matter;

(ii) Training variables

- *PhD*: measuring the level of education of the researcher (i.e. holding a PhD) measured with a dummy variable that takes the value 1 if the researcher has a PhD and 0 otherwise. On the basis of the empirical evidence, predictions vary, therefore we leave it open;
- *Postgrad_abroad*: this variable takes the value 1 if the researcher's post-graduate studies were undertaken abroad, 0 otherwise. Again, the prediction is open;

5 In this study we focus on linkages within the country. For an analysis of linkages with researchers and professionals outside the country see Giuliani and Rabellotti (2008).

(iii) Reputation variables

- *Position*: this variable indicates the status of the researcher - 1 if the researcher has an appointment as Full Professor or Associate Professor at a university or is a Senior Researcher in a research institute, and 0 otherwise. Our expectation is that a higher academic position is associated with a higher number of U-I linkages;
- *Total Number of Publications (TNP)*: this variable is based on the number of publications recorded in Thompson's Institute of Scientific Information (ISI) Science and Social Sciences Citation Indexes (SSSCI).⁶ The publication records were obtained by matching the names of the researchers with articles in the ISI database, for 1990 to 2007. We expect a positive relationship between U-I linkages and this variable;
- *Quality of Total Publications (QTP)*: as an indicator of quality, we consider the number of citations received by a researcher's publications, based on those recorded in the ISI-SSSCI, excluding authors' self-citations. This variable is normalized by the number of ISI publications and the number of years since publication to control for the fact that older a publications get more citations as an effect of time, rather than quality. Again, we expect a positive relationship;
- *Acad_cent*: this variable indicates the centrality of the researcher in the domestic academic network, measured as the number of research linkages established by a researcher with other scholars from her/his own country, based on the relational question on academic linkages, reported in Appendix A.1. This is measured as the normalized degree of centrality, as explained in the Appendix. We expect a positive relationship with U-I linkages;

Characteristics of institutions

- *Sizedep* and *Sizedepsq*: to test for a non-linear relationship between scale of the department, measured as the number of researchers in the department, and U-I linkages;
- *Peer effect*: for researcher i measured as the sum of the U-I linkages for the researchers in the department to which researcher i is affiliated, minus the number of U-I linkages formed by i . We expect a positive relationship with U-I linkages;
- *Type_inst*: this variable indicates the type of institution and takes the value 1 if it is a university and 0 for a research institution. This prediction is open.

Finally, we included dummy variables in the model to control for country-level specificities.

5 Empirical Results

5.1 Descriptive Comparative Analysis of U-I Linkages for Chile, South Africa and Italy

In this section we provide a descriptive analysis of the researchers involved in U-I linkages, to investigate commonalities and differences across Chile, South Africa and Italy (Table 2). First, we can see that on average Chilean researchers maintain slightly more links with industry than South African or Italian ones, although this difference is not statistically significant. Among the independent variables, most are not significantly different across countries, with the exception of training. Here, there is a substantial difference in the share of Italian researchers with a post-graduate degree, which is much lower than for Chile and South Africa.⁷ Also, for Chile international education of researchers is statistically

⁶ Using publications and citations in ISI journals as measures of output and impact provides comprehensive and consistent metrics for all researchers. However, it is equally important to stress that relying on these metrics also results in some major limitations to the study. In fact, we are potentially excluding relevant research outputs, such as books, patents, and publications in journals, not listed in the ISI database.

⁷ This is partly explained by the peculiar organization of the Italian university system that prevailed until recently. Before the 2001 reform, which introduced a system based on a 3-year first degree followed by a 2-year Masters' degree and then a Doctorate, in Italy the first degree was four-years followed by a PhD, introduced only in the 1980s.

significantly different from South Africa and Italy: 60% of Chilean researchers obtained a university degree abroad.

In terms of links with other national researchers, South African researchers, on average, have more linkages than Italian researchers, while differences with Chilean researchers are negligible. This is highlighted by the indicator for researcher centrality in the academic network (Table 2).

As we can see from Table 1, in terms of institutions to which researchers are affiliated, Chilean researchers are mainly based in universities, while in Italy and South Africa 40% of the researchers interviewed were based in other research institutions, such as the research centres related to the Ministry of Agriculture (both Italy and South Africa) and the National Research Council (Italy). The scale of departments in terms of numbers of affiliated researchers, also differs, and is larger for Chile than for Italy or South Africa. Finally, the peer effect – total number of U-I linkages formed by all the researchers in each department - is higher for South Africa than for Italy or Chile.

Table 3 shows the different types of links among researchers and the industry in the three areas. In Italy and Chile, the most frequent type of association is joint research agreement, while in South

Table 2 Descriptive statistics of dependent and independent variables in Chile, South Africa and Italy

	Dep Var	Demo-graphic		Training		Reputation				Institutions		
	<i>U-I Link</i> per re- searcher	<i>Age</i> avg.	<i>Sex</i> % male	<i>PhD</i> %	<i>Post- grad</i> <i>abroad</i> (%)	<i>Position</i> (%)	<i>TNP</i>	<i>QTP</i>	<i>Acad_</i> <i>centr</i>	<i>Sizedep</i> (avg. n°. of re- searchers)	<i>Peer</i> <i>effect</i>	<i>Type_inst</i> (% Uni- versities)
Chile	4.42	48.2	82.5	68.0	60	55.0	6,63	4,47	3.38	85.35	1.23	90%
Italy	2.66	46.5	77.8	28.0	3.7	46.0	5,11	4,69	2.78	47.5	1.49	61%
South Africa	3.07	43.0	76.2	64.0	14	36.0	6,10	2,92	4.46	18.35	6.96	57%
Bonferroni test	No sig.	No sign.					No sign	No sign	SA>It	CH>IT>SA	SA> IT>CH	
KW-T test			No sign	Sign.	Sign.	No sign						Sign.

Table 3 Different types of linkages with the industry (No. and % on total linkages for each country)

	Italy	Chile	South Africa
(i) Joint research agreements	67 (0.47)	64 (0.36)	25 (0.19)
(ii) Contract research agreements	20 (0.14)	36 (0.20)	31 (0.24)
(iii) Consultancy work	14(0.10)	31 (0.18)	24 (0.19)
(vi) Informal contacts	24 (0.17)	19 (0.11)	31 (0.24)
(v) Attendance at conferences	12 (0.08)	10 (0.06)	5 (0.04)
(vi) Participation in electronic networks	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)
(vii) Setting up of spin-off companies	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	3 (0.02)
(viii) Training of company employees	1 (0.01)	11 (0.06)	6 (0.05)
(ix) Student internship in firms	6 (0.04)	6 (0.03)	4 (0.03)
Total links	144	177	129

Africa research contracted by the industry and undertaken by the researchers, plus informal contacts are the two most frequent types of relationships. Finally, Chilean and South African researchers are more heavily involved in consultancy than their Italian counterparts. In the next section we present the econometric analysis, which highlights the characteristics of the researchers and their links with the industry.

5.2 The Econometric Analysis

5.2.1 Results

Here, we present the main results of the econometric exercises in an attempt to test the importance of the different groups of variables on the formation of U-I linkages, for Chilean, South African and Italian researchers specialised in wine related subjects. Table 4 presents different specifications of the model based on the groups of variables identified in the literature as the main factors influencing U-I linkages. Model 1 includes only demographic variables, Model 2 adds the training variables, Model 3 includes the reputation variables and Model 4 includes the variables related to the characteristics of the institutions. The main results for each set of variables are described below.

Among researchers' demographic characteristics, the variable *Age* is always statistically significant and negatively related to the number of a researcher's collaborations with industry, while *Agesq* is not significant, indicating that, in our model, the expected U-shaped relationship is not confirmed. This suggests that younger scholars are more likely to form U-I linkages compared with their older colleagues. Interestingly, women are more likely to form linkages with the industry than their male colleagues, as indicated by the positive and significant coefficient of the variable *Sex*.

None of the training effects – i.e. having a PhD and/or having undertaken post graduate studies in a foreign country – is statistically significant.⁸ Among reputation effects, centrality in the domestic academic network (*Acad_centr*) is significant and positive, but neither researcher's status (*Position*) nor her/his academic excellence (number of publications *TNP* and average number of citations *QTP*) is significant.

For institutional affiliation, Model 4 suggests that the only significant variable is the dummy distinguishing between universities and other research institutions (*Type_inst*); it seems that university researchers enter into more U-I linkages than researchers from other types of institutes. However, neither the size of the department nor the peer effect is significantly related to the formation of U-I linkages.⁹

Finally, the dummy control variables for Chile (*DCH*) and Italy (*DIT*) are both negatively and statistically significant in all four models.

5.2.2 Discussion of Results

The results of the econometric exercise allow us to draw some interesting conclusions. In general, it is the characteristics of the individual researchers, such as age and sex, that seem to determine U-I linkages, rather than educational background, academic status or publication performance. There are two plausible explanations: first, the latter aspects are not perceived or are only superficially valued by professionals in

⁸ In Models 3 and 4 the variable *Postgrad_abroad* was dropped to avoid multicollinearity with the variable *PhD*. In fact, as shown in the correlation matrix (in Appendix), these two variables have a positive and significant *phi* correlation coefficient (0.40). *Postgrad_abroad* was dropped because it is also correlated with other variables

⁹ It should be noted that *Type_Inst* absorbs the effect of *Peer*, which is significantly correlated with the dependent variable (see the correlation matrix in the Appendix). In fact, there is a strong relationship between *Type_Inst* and *Peer* (*p*-value for the ANOVA is 0.082), due to the fact that, in universities, the number of linkages to industry is generally higher than in other research organizations. This, in turn, implies that *Peer* is systematically higher in universities than in other organizations.

Table 4 The Poisson estimation of the determinants of I_U linkages

Variables	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
a) Demographic variables				
Age	-0150194*** (.00338)	-0150785*** (.00417)	-0163543*** (.00450)	-.0108003* (.00653)
Agesq.	.00013 (.00059)	-.000032 (.00066)	-.0000171 (.00076)	9.60e-06 (.00079)
Sex	.116046** (.05272)	.1116865* (.06732)	.1208809* (.07006)	.1192763 *** (.03957)
b) Training variables				
PhD		-.1263165 (.18785)	-.1286381 (.142067)	-.2496669 (.23186)
Postgrad_abroad		.1496507 (.34767)		
c) Reputation variables				
Position			.2625439 (.23793)	.1196949 (.24513)
TNP			.0108492 (.00920)	.0071591 (.00700)
QTP			-.0004341 (.0044701)	-.0053484 (.00375)
Acad_centr			.1228068*** (.03173)	.1053611** (.04298)
d) Characteristics of institutions				
Type_inst				.2008061 *** (.04218)
Sizedep				-.0035615 (.00526)
Sizedepsq				.000022 (.00002)
Peer effect				.0081867 (.00698)
e) Control variables				
DCH	-.8374153*** (.01509)	-.8963006*** (.12547)	-.8325766*** (.19019)	-.6670667 ** (.23424)
DIT	-.7186895*** (.01136)	-.7465869*** (.05900)	-.5771265*** (.19019)	-.4967342*** (.09737)
Constant	.8315451 (.19142)	-.8958582 (.24252)	-.2582145 (.35481)	.1698557 (.50804)
No. of observations	136	136	136	119
Log pseudo-L	-144.89205	-144.66386	-136.92549	-121.83999
The standard errors are reported in parentheses. Coefficients marked with ***, ** and * are significant at 0.01, 0.05 and 0.10 level respectively.				

the industry; and second, it is possible that professionals with higher academic degrees and higher scientific quality do not engage in very applied research oriented at solving the practical matters of the industry, to any great extent.

On the other hand, we find that centrality of the researcher in the national research system is highly significant. This may be because, first, centrality in the academic network might indicate an active relational propensity, which might mean that the researcher is also involved in other types of linkages. We would expect these researchers to be embedded in a dense network of research linkages, and to have higher chances of being informed about and eventually involved in projects with industry than less well connected ones. And second, because centrality in the academic system may be the way that the eminence of the researchers is signalled to industry, via word of mouth through formal or informal interaction. Hence, central researchers are more visible to professionals in the industry.

It should be remembered that the wine innovation systems being investigated are quite small and comprise a relatively small number of researchers and firms. Thus, it is plausible that the most 'central' researchers in these innovation systems also enjoy the highest standing with the industry, and that for the industry this is more prominent than are the details of their publishing performance. Furthermore, linkages with the most central researchers give firms access to a larger community of academics, which, in turn, increases their opportunities to obtain novel information and establish further research collaborations.

Finally, the characteristics of the research organisations where researchers work appear to influence U-I linkages to a lesser extent. Only working in a university shows a (positive) difference, perhaps related to the university mission of supporting regional development through applied research. This result should be read in light of the fact that, as explained before, the variable *Type_inst* absorbs the 'peer effect', that is, the degree to which the researcher's colleagues interact with the industry. Therefore, imitating the behaviour of other colleagues encourages researchers to have more interactions with the industry. With regard to the scale of the department, this does not appear to affect the likelihood of U-I linkages, confirming the results of other studies (D'Este and Patel, 2007).

Finally, the results confirm that the South Africa wine innovation system appears especially to reward strong U-I linkages. This can be explained by the organization of the South African institutional framework in the wine sector, and the purposeful establishment of Winetech with a mandate to promote, coordinate and finance research for the wine industry, which is unique among these three countries. Winetech coordinates the industry's research requirements and conveys them to the research community, selecting which research projects will be financed. The funds allocated by Winetech are the main source of finance for research on wine-related issues in South Africa.¹⁰ This specificity of the institutional setting could be justification for the strong orientation of the South African research system, towards the industry.

6 Conclusions

This paper contributes to the literature on the microeconomic determinants of U-I linkages, and therefore also to the understanding of a key dimension of national systems of innovation. Though academic research institutions have long served as a significant external source of scientific and technical knowledge for industrial firms, the intensity and variety of activities at the university–industry interface is growing, and it is crucial to improve understanding of how and why university researchers interact with firms. In this paper we develop an original, and rich conceptual framework that has the advantage that it tests how the characteristics of both the individual researcher and of her/his organization influence collaboration with industry. Also, this study focuses on developing countries and adopts a systemic approach to innovation

¹⁰ Winetech is largely financed by an export levy that applies to all exporters. In 2006 the total income was approximately RAND17 million (approximately US\$2.5 million) 80% of which came from the levy. Other funds are provided directly by SAWIT (i.e. South African Wine Industry Trust) (Winetech, 2006).

and its diffusion. There are very few similar studies in the literature. The empirical evidence leads to several important results.

First, researchers from all the regions considered here are very active in making research links with industry. Disparities across countries at different levels of development seem to matter less than the most prominent common characteristics of a specific sector, such as wine, where applied scientific research plays a central role. The three countries examined are all key players in the world market and, although, on the basis only of the investigation in this paper, we cannot conclude whether the extent, variety and depth of U-I linkages mark differences in industry or innovation performance, we can reasonably claim that their existence is a sign that both parties benefit from this interaction. Future research will further explore this in detail.

Second, researchers' individual characteristics matter more in determining U-I linkages than the context and the organization in which they operate. The most influential factors affecting collaboration of researchers with industry appear to be younger age, being female and 'centrality' in the academic system. Younger scholars show a higher 'openness' towards the professional and productive world, which in the future could possibly lead to greater fluidity of interaction between the academic and professional communities – once considered two different worlds. It would be interesting in future research to deepen the analysis of researchers' personal characteristics and careers, as this may have some influence on the intensity of their interactions with industry.

Although this analysis was on a specific sector – the wine industry – it can be generalised to any sectors that rely strongly on applied science and are undergoing substantial restructuring at global level. The analysis is interesting in terms of its implications (although preliminary and tentative) for policy design. First, promoting linkages with the industry of a few researchers with central positions in the academic network may have a positive impact on the whole system, and might help diffuse innovation through the industry. However, this also raises the question of the vulnerability of the system: these central researchers might leave the country or the sector, which would considerably weaken the whole innovation system. This would apply particularly to small research systems, involving only a few central researchers.¹¹ Second, in an applied field such as wine science, 'entrepreneurial' researchers, open to commercial interactions with industry, also maintain strong linkages within the academic community. This provides some empirical support for the idea of complementarities between academic research and industrial relationships. Thus, our findings would suggest that there is no trade-off between linkages between academic fellows and links with industry.

Third, we consider all types of U-I linkages, from research collaborations to training, without differentiating their variety. The variety of these links should be explored in future work, as the motivations underlying a U-I linkage established for joint research purposes might be different from those relating to consultancy or student internships.

7 Acknowledgments

Preliminary drafts of this paper were presented at the ALTEC Conference in Buenos Aires (2007) and the AISRE Conference in Bolzano, Italy (2007). The authors would like to thank: Massimo Pernicone and Gabriela Cares for their collaboration in the collection of data. Moreover, we are grateful to Eric Wood for his assistance in organising the field work in South Africa and for his comments on the questionnaires. In South Africa we also thank Nick Vink. In Chile, thanks go to Mario Castillo, Jimena Gonzalez Alvarado, Pablo Ugarte Cruz Coke from CORFO and to José Miguel Benavente and Graciela Moguillansky for their support in the field research. Financial support from Progetto Alfieri – Fondazione CRT is gratefully acknowledged.

¹¹ South Africa is a case in point, with the specific example of a former director of the Institute of Biotechnology at the University of Stellenbosch, who moved to Australia to become the managing director of the Australian Wine Research Institute.

References

- Anderson, K. (2006). 'Compendium of Wine Statistics', mimeo.
- Anderson, K., Norman, D. & Wittwer, G. (2003). 'Globalisation of the World's Wine Markets', *The World Economy* Vol. 26, No. 5, pp. 659-87.
- Agarwal, A. & Henderson, R. (2002). 'Putting patents in context: Exploring knowledge transfer from MIT', *Management Science* Vol. 48, No. 1, pp. 44-60.
- Aylward, D.K. (2003). 'A Documentary of Innovation Support among New World Wine Industries', *Journal of Wine Research* Vol. 14, No. 1, pp. 31-43.
- Balconi, M., Breschi, S. & Lissoni, F. (2004). 'Networks of Inventors and the Role of Academia: an Exploration of Italian Patent Data', *Research Policy* Vol. 33, pp. 127-45.
- Bell, M. & Giuliani, E. (2007). 'Catching up in the global wine industry: innovation systems, cluster knowledge networks and firm-level capabilities in Italy and Chile', *International Journal of Technology and Globalisation* Vol. 3, No. 2/3, pp. 197-223.
- Bercovitz, J. & Feldman, M. (2003). 'Technology Transfer and the Academic Department: Who Participates and Why', mimeo.
- Bonaccorsi, A. & Piccaluga, A. (1994). 'A Theoretical Framework for the Evaluation of University- Industry Relationships', *R&D Management* Vol. 24, No. 3, pp. 229-247.
- Cassiolato, J.E., Lastres, H. & Maciel, M. (Eds.) (2003). 'Systems of Innovation and Development: Evidence from Brazil', Edward Elgar, Cheltenham.
- Cole, J. & Zuckerman, H. (1984). 'The productivity puzzle: persistence and change in patterns of publications of men and women scientists', *Advances in Motivation and Achievement* Vol. 2, pp. 217-258.
- Cusmano, L., Morrison, A. & Rabellotti, R. (2008). 'Catching up in Sectoral Systems of Innovation. A Comparative Study of the Wine Sector in Chile and South Africa', Mimeo. Department of Economics and Quantitative Methods, University of Piemonte Orientale, Novara.
- D'Este, P. & Fontana, R. (2007). 'What Drives the Emergence of Entrepreneurial Academics? A Study on Collaborative Research Partnerships in the UK', *Research Evaluation* Vol. 16, No. 4, pp. 257-270.
- D'Este, P. & Patel, P. (2007). 'University - Industry linkages in the UK: what are the factors underlying the variety of interactions with industry?', *Research Policy* Vol. 36, No. 9, pp. 1295-1313.
- Etzkowitz, H. (1998). 'The Norms of Entrepreneurial Science: Cognitive Effects of the New University-Industry Linkage', *Research Policy* Vol. 27, pp. 823-833.
- Faulkner, W. (1994). 'Conceptualizing knowledge used in innovation: A second look at the science-technology distinction and industrial innovation', *Science, Technology, & Human Values* Vol. 19, No. 4, pp. 425-58.
- Friedman, J. & Silberman, J. (2003). 'University technology transfer: Do incentives, management, and location matter?', *Journal of Technology Transfer* Vol. 28, No. 1, pp. 17-30.
- Geuna, A. (2001). 'The changing rationale for European university research funding: Are there negative unintended consequences?', *Journal of Economic Issues* Vol. 35, No. 3, pp. 607-632.
- Giuliani, E. (2006). 'Efficient 'Public Research Organization-Industry' Network Structures? A Comparative Study in the Chilean and Italian Wine Industry', Series: European Forum, EUI Working Paper, RSCAS 2006/07, European University Institute, Florence.
- Giuliani, E. & Rabellotti, R. (2008). 'Academic and I-U networks in the wine industry: A comparative Analysis of Italy, Chile and South Africa', Mimeo, Department of Economics and Quantitative Methods, University of Piemonte Orientale, Novara.
- Gonzalez-Brambila, C. & Veloso, F.M. (2007). 'The determinants of research output and impact: A study of Mexican researchers', *Research Policy* Vol. 36, No. 7, pp. 1035-1051.
- Gulbrandsen, M. & Smeby, J-C. (2005). 'Industry funding and university professors' research performance', *Research Policy* Vol. 34, No. 6, pp. 932-950.
- Lall, S. & Pietrobelli, C. (2005). 'National Technology Systems in Sub-Saharan Africa', *International Journal of Technology and Globalisation* Vol. 1, No. 3/4, pp. 311-342.
- Landry, R., Amara, N. & Ouimet, M. (2007). 'Determinants of knowledge transfer: evidence from Canadian university researchers in natural sciences and engineering', *Journal of Technology Transfer* Vol. 32, No. 6, pp. 561-592.

- Levin, S. & Stephan, P. (1991). 'Research productivity over the life cycle: evidence for academic scientists', *The American Economic Review* Vol. 81, pp. 114-132.
- van Looy B., Debackere, K. & Andries, P. (2003). 'Policies to stimulate regional innovation capabilities via university-industry collaboration: an analysis and an assessment', *R&D Management* Vol. 33, No. 2, pp. 209-229.
- Louis, K.S., Jones, L.M., Anderson, M.S., Blumenthal, D. & Campbell, E.G. (2001). 'Entrepreneurship, secrecy and productivity: A comparison of clinical and non-clinical life sciences faculty', *Journal of Technology Transfer* Vol. 26, No. 3, pp. 233-245.
- Lundvall, B.Å. (1992). 'National Systems of Innovation: Towards a Theory of Innovation and Interactive Learning', Pinter, London.
- Lundvall, B.Å., Joseph, K.J., Chaminade, C. & Vang, J., (Eds.) (2008). 'Handbook on Innovation Systems and Developing Countries', Edward Elgar, Cheltenham. forthcoming.
- Mani, S. (2004). 'Government, innovation and technology policy: an international comparative analysis', *International Journal of Technology and Globalisation* Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 29-44.
- Marsden, P.V. (2005). 'Recent Developments in Network Measurement', In: P.J., Carrington, J. Scott and S. Wasserman (Eds.), *Models and Methods in Social Network Analysis*, Cambridge University Press, New York, pp. 8-30.
- Mazzoleni, R. & Nelson, R.R. (2007). 'Public research institutions and economic catch-up', *Research Policy* Vol. 26, pp. 1512-1528.
- Moguillansky, G., Salas, J.C. & Cares, G. (2006). 'Innovacion en la industria del Vino', Corfo, Santiago de Chile.
- Morrison, A. & Rabellotti, R. (2007). 'The role of research in wine: the emergence of a regional research area in an Italian wine production system', *International Journal of Technology and Globalisation* Vol. 3, No. 2/3, pp. 155-178.
- Moulton, B.R. (1990). 'Random Group Effects and the Precision of Regression Estimates', *Journal of Econometrics* Vol. 32, pp. 385-397.
- Mowery, D.C., Nelson, R.R., Sampat, B. & Ziedonis, A. (2001). 'The growth of patenting and licensing by U.S. universities: an assessment of the effects of the Bayh-Dole act of 1980', *Research Policy* Vol. 30, No. 1, pp. 99-119.
- Muchie, M., Lundvall B.Å. & Gammeltoft, P. (Eds.) (2003). 'The Making of African Innovation Systems', Aalborg University Press, Aalborg. www.globelics.org/index.php?module=htmlpages&func=display&pid=3.
- Nelson, R.R. (ed.) (1993). 'National Innovation Systems: A Comparative Analysis', Oxford University Press, New York.
- Schartinger, D., Rammer C., Fischer, M.M. & Frohlich, J. (2002). 'Knowledge interactions between universities and industry in Austria: sectoral patterns and determinants', *Research Policy* Vol. 31, No. 3, pp. 303-328.
- Tornquist, K.M. & Kallsen, L.A. (1994). 'Out of the Ivory Tower - Characteristics of Institutions Meeting the Research Needs of Industry', *Journal of Higher Education* Vol. 65, No. 5, pp. 523-539.
- Unwin, T. (1991). 'Wine and the Vine: A Historical Geography of Viticulture and the Wine Trade', Routledge, London.
- Velho, L. & Saez, W.T. (2002). 'R&D in the public and private sector in Brazil: complements or substitute?', UNU/INTECH Discussion Papers, 1564-8370.
- Vink, N., Williams, G. & Kirsten, J. (2004). 'South Africa' In: Anderson K. (Ed.), *The world wine markets: Globalization at work*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, pp. 3-37.
- Wasserman, S. & Faust, K. (1994). 'Social Network Analysis. Methods and Applications', Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Winetech (2006). Annual Report. www.winetech.co.za.
- Xie, Y. & Shauman, K. (1998). 'Sex differences in research productivity: new evidence about an old puzzle', *American Sociological Review* Vol. 63, pp. 847-870.

Appendix

Table A-1 The correlation matrix

	U-I link	Age	Agesq	Sex	PhD	Postgrad_ abroad	Position	TNP	QTP	Acad_centr	Sizedep	Sizedepsq	Peer effect	Type_inst
U-I link	1.000													
Age	-0.204 (0.017)	1.000												
Agesq	-0.014 (0.867)	0.146 (0.089)	1.000											
Sex	0.268	0.002	0.237	1.000										
PhD	(0.806)	(0.722)	(0.428)	0.062 (0.473)	1.000									
Postgrad_ abroad	(0.543)	(0.248)	(0.659)	0.077 (0.368)	0.408 (0.000)	1.000								
Position	(0.316s)	(0.010)	(0.523)	0.069 0.423	0.176 (0.040)	0.410 (0.000)	1.000							
TNP	0.060 (0.486)	0.103 (0.231)	0.020 (0.817)	(0.374)	(0.352)	(0.342)	(0.493)	1.000						
QTP	-0.036 (0.678)	0.129 (0.136)	-0.055 (0.523)	(0.268)	(0.322)	(0.099)	(0.564)	0.139 0.107	1.000					
Acad_centr	(0.000)	-0.089 (0.305)	0.054 (0.531)	(0.980)	(0.864)	(0.750)	(0.459)	-0.002 (0.978)	-0.005 (0.953)	1.000				
Sizedep	-0.258 (0.005)	0.098 (0.287)	0.046 (0.622)	(0.785)	0.630	(0.011)	(0.000)	-0.104 (0.262)	0.062 (0.503)	-0.166 (0.071)	1.000			
Sizedepsq	-0.040 (0.667)	0.108 (0.242)	0.016 (0.861)	(0.619)	(0.152)	(0.167)	(0.284)	-0.019 (0.834)	-0.015 (0.873)	-0.027 (0.770)	0.610 (0.000)	1.000		
Peer effect	0.347 (0.000)	-0.258 (0.002)	-0.014 (0.867)	(0.008)	(0.081)	(0.656)	(0.150)	-0.014 (0.867)	0.011 (0.867)	0.293 (0.001)	-0.284 (0.002)	-0.066 (0.479)	1.000	
Type_inst	(0.340)	(0.547)	(0.626)	0.032 (0.781)	0.311 (0.000)	0.303 (0.000)	0.386 (0.000)	(0.016)	(0.009)	(0.846)	(0.015)	(0.300)	(0.017)	1.000

Note: Spearman correlations, T-test and Phi-correlations are reported in the table. In the case of T-test, only the p-values are presented. Statistically significant correlations are indicated in bold.