

Contents

<i>List of Figures</i>	vii
<i>List of Tables</i>	ix
<i>Contributors</i>	xi
<i>Preface</i>	xiii
1. Introduction	1
<i>Maureen McKelvey and Magnus Holmén</i>	
2. Exploring university alliances and comparable academic cooperation structures	19
<i>Enrico Deiaco, Ana M. Gren and Göran Melin</i>	
3. Strategy to join the elite: merger and the 2015 agenda at the University of Manchester	48
<i>Luke Georghiou</i>	
4. Large-scale international facilities within the organization: MAX lab within Lund University	65
<i>Olof Hallonsten and Mats Benner</i>	
5. Division of academic labour is limited by the size of the market. Strategy and differentiation of European universities in doctoral education	90
<i>Andrea Bonaccorsi</i>	
6. Polarization of the Swedish university sector: structural characteristics and positioning	128
<i>Daniel Ljungberg, Mattias Johansson and Maureen McKelvey</i>	
7. The American experience in university technology transfer	161
<i>Maryann P. Feldman and Shiri M. Breznitz</i>	
8. Academic patenting in Europe: evidence on France, Italy and Sweden from the KEINS database	187
<i>Francesco Lissoni, Patrick Llerena, Maureen McKelvey and Bulat Sanditov</i>	
9. The forgotten individuals: attitudes and skills in academic commercialization in Sweden	219
<i>Mats Magnusson, Maureen McKelvey and Matteo Versiglioni</i>	
10. Elite European universities and the R&D subsidiaries of multinational enterprises	251
<i>Anders Broström, Maureen McKelvey and Christian Sandström</i>	

11.	Running the marathon	278
	<i>William B. Cowan, Robin Cowan and Patrick Llerena</i>	
12.	What does it mean conceptually that universities compete?	300
	<i>Enrico Deiaco, Magnus Holmén and Maureen McKelvey</i>	
13.	From social institution to knowledge business	329
	<i>Enrico Deiaco, Magnus Holmén and Maureen McKelvey</i>	
	<i>Index</i>	357

Figures

2.1	Harman's continuum of inter-institutional arrangements	22
2.2	Adapted from Harman's continuum of inter-institutional arrangements	41
3.1	World university ranking for papers in nature and science	61
5.1	Mean value and differentiation in PhD intensity of Finnish universities, 1994–2005	109
5.2	Mean value and differentiation in PhD intensity of Dutch universities, 1994–2004	111
5.3	Mean value and differentiation in PhD intensity of Swiss universities, 1994–2003	113
5.4	Mean value and differentiation in PhD intensity of British universities, 1996–2003	114
5.5	Mean value and differentiation in PhD intensity of Spanish universities, 1994–2002	116
5.6	Mean value and differentiation in PhD intensity of Italian universities, 2001–05	117
5.7	Comparative analysis of PhD intensity, all countries, 1994–2005	118
5.8	Comparative analysis of the differentiation index in PhD intensity, all countries, 1994–2005	119
6.1	Research orientation, average 2001–06	143
6.2	Density across research subjects, average 2001–06	147
6.3	Research productivity, average 2001–06	148
7.1	US universities by sources of R&D funding	165
7.2	Growth in the establishment of technology transfer offices after Bayh–Dole	168
7.3	R&D expenditures at universities and colleges funded by industry	170
7.4	Disclosures received and new US patents filed, AUTM, 2007	172
7.5	Growth of patents issued before and after Bayh–Dole	174
7.6	Highly skewed distribution of licensing revenues	176
7.7	University spinouts per year, 1993–2004	179
8.1	Academic patent applications, by country, 1978–2002	198
8.2	Technological distribution of academic patent applications, by country, 1994–2002	200

8.3a	Academic patent applications from France, Italy and Sweden, by technology and year	201
8.3b	University-owned patent applications from USA, by technology and year	202
8.4	Academic patent applications from France, Italy and Sweden, 1985–99, detail of most relevant classes	202
8.5	Academic patents as percentage of all patents by domestic inventors, 1985–99, detail of most relevant classes	203
8.6	Ownership of academic patents by domestic inventors in France, Italy, Sweden, and the USA, 1994–2001 (granted patents only)	204
8.7	Ownership of academic patents, selected technologies, 1994–2001	208
8.8	Ownership of academic patents, by year, 1981–2001	210
8.9	Weight of academic patents on total patents by domestic inventors, by country and type of ownership (1994–2001, granted patents only)	211
9.1	Conceptual model of the selection environment affecting individual researchers	222
9.2	Comparison of sample and population based on researcher categories	234
9.3	Commercialization frequency in different research fields	235
9.4a	Attitude towards commercialization, for individual and research group	236
9.4b	Attitude towards patenting, for individual and research group	237
9.4c	Attitude towards founding a company, for individual and research group	237
12.1	Four layers within the university: Who's competing?	314
12.2	Knowledge-intensive services creating open boundaries in the university	316

Tables

1.1	Emergent strategy theme	12
1.2	Differentiation and specialization theme	13
1.3	Rethinking the university–industry theme	14
2.1	Selected alliances between universities	23
2.2	Summary of alliances' significant accomplishments	36
2.3	Summary of potential motives behind the formation of ten international alliances and partnerships	40
2.4	Arguments for and against an alliance	43
5.1	The Aquameth dataset	102
6.1	Summarizing the variables, metrics and data collection	136
6.2	Overview of the Swedish HEIs, 2005	140
6.3	Number of research subjects comprising more than a specific number of researchers and professors, average 2001–06	146
6.4	External research funding and income from undergraduate education, average 2001–06	150
6.5	RCA of external research funding and income from undergraduate education, average 2001–06	152
8.1	EPO patent applications, inventors, and professors in France, Italy, and Sweden	197
8.2	Academic inventors in France, Italy, and Sweden	197
8.3a	Academic inventors as percentage of total professors, by discipline	199
8.3b	Academic inventors, percentage distribution by discipline	199
8.4	Applicants of more than 10 academic patents, 1978–2001, by country	206
8.5	Ownership of academic patents, for selected technologies, 1994–2001	209
9.1	Responses from the different research areas	233
9.2	Respondents' view on commercializing their own research	238
9.3	Formal training in business and entrepreneurship and perceived ability to start a spin-off company	238
9.4	Work experience from private firms and perceived ability to start a spin-off company	239
9.5	Interrelationship between training and commercialization of research	241

9.6	Interrelationship between working experience and commercialization of research	242
10.1	Firms interviewed, sorted by university	259
10.2	Responses of the 11 firms stating continuous relationship with university, rationale given	262
10.3	Organizational forms for collaboration	263
10.4	Managers' view on relative importance and types of benefits for collaboration	264
12.1	University services and beneficiaries: benefit to different types of customers	319
12.2	Example of metrics used by different customers in the university sector	320