

Contents

<i>List of Tables</i>	viii
<i>List of Figures</i>	xi
<i>Notes on the Contributors</i>	xii
Introduction: Advanced Research Findings and Fields for Further Research in Economics and Management of Intellectual Property	1
Part I Patent Value	
1 The Battle for Patent Rights	21
<i>Dietmar Harhoff</i>	
1.1 Introduction	21
1.2 Patent Opposition at the EPO	23
1.3 Theoretical Considerations	25
1.4 Empirical Results on the Determinants of Opposition Activity	28
1.5 Organizational Capabilities and Patent Documentation – the Internationale Dokumentationsgesellschaft für Chemie GmbH	34
1.6 Implications and Further Research	37
2 Intellectual Property, Competition and the Value of UK Firms	40
<i>Christine Greenhalgh and Mark Rogers</i>	
2.1 Introduction	40
2.2 Data Overview	41
2.3 Competitive Conditions	47
2.4 Conclusions	52
3 Business Method Patents and Venture Capital Investment Decisions	58
<i>Robert H. Pitkethly</i>	
3.1 Introduction	58
3.2 Methodology	62
3.3 Data Collection	65
3.4 Discussion	74
3.5 Conclusion	77

Part II Knowledge Transfer and Intellectual Property Systems

4	Open Science and University Patenting: A Bibliometric Analysis of the Italian Case	83
	<i>Stefano Breschi, Francesco Lissoni and Fabio Montobbio</i>	
4.1	Introduction	83
4.2	The Relationship Between Patenting and Publishing at the Individual Level	84
4.3	Data and Descriptive Evidence	85
4.4	A Panel Data Analysis of Scientists' Publication Activity: The Effect of Patenting	93
4.5	Conclusions	98
5	Brain Drain and R&D Activities of Multinationals	104
	<i>Michele Cincera</i>	
5.1	Introduction	104
5.2	R&D Activities of MNEs	105
5.3	Data and Hypotheses	108
5.4	Empirical Findings	112
5.5	Conclusion	123
6	Do Stronger Intellectual Property Rights Induce More Patents?	129
	<i>Sung Jin Kang and Hwan Joo Seo</i>	
6.1	Introduction	129
6.2	Empirical Evidence	131
6.3	Model Specification and Descriptive Statistics	132
6.4	Estimation Results of the Baseline Model	137
6.5	Estimation Results of the Extended Model	141
6.6	Conclusion	144

Part III Innovation Management and Intellectual Property Rights

7	What Is Different about Innovation in Asia?	151
	<i>Arnoud De Meyer and Sam Garg</i>	
7.1	Introduction	151
7.2	The Research Project	152
7.3	What Did We Learn From the Case Files?	153
7.4	Confirming These Hypotheses Through Large-Scale Survey	159
7.5	What Do We Do with These Results?	168

8	How Do the Speed, Science Linkage, Focus and New Entry Matter in IT Inventions?	171
	<i>Sadao Nagaoka</i>	
8.1	Introduction	171
8.2	Overview of the Firm-level R&D Performance and its Determinants	174
8.3	Econometric Specification and Data	179
8.4	Estimation Results	181
8.5	Evaluation of the Sources of the Invention Performance of Firms by Regions	189
8.6	Conclusions	191
9	Complex Innovation Strategies and Patenting Behaviour	199
	<i>Carine Peeters and Bruno van Pottelsberghe de la Potterie</i>	
9.1	Introduction	199
9.2	Literature Background	201
9.3	Theoretical Framework	203
9.4	Empirical Implementation	208
9.5	Empirical Results	213
9.6	Concluding Remarks	218
10	On the Relationship Between Patents and Venture Capital	222
	<i>Astrid Romain and Bruno van Pottelsberghe de la Potterie</i>	
10.1	Introduction	222
10.2	Literature Review	223
10.3	Modelling the Amount of Venture Capital	226
10.4	Empirical Results	230
10.5	Concluding Remarks	233
	<i>Index</i>	238

Introduction: Advanced Research Findings and Fields for Further Research in Economics and Management of Intellectual Property

*Bruno van Pottelsberghe de la Potterie
and Carine Peeters*

The role of intellectual property (IP), and more precisely the role of patents, is increasingly considered as a major issue for managers and policy-makers. At the firm level, patents are used as a legal protection means for innovative products and processes, and as a strategic tool in technological negotiations. At the country level, the patent system aims at fostering research efforts and innovation, and ultimately economic growth.

The effectiveness of IP systems, and their role in the innovation process is, however, not unanimously recognized, and is far from being well understood. The objective of this book is to shed some light on the effectiveness of patents in stimulating innovation and growth. It is composed of ten chapters that focus on a specific issue of the relationship between IPRs and innovation. The chapters originate from selected papers presented at the AEA Conference on Innovation and Intellectual Property, held in Singapore on INSEAD Campus, in July 2004.

Beside their contribution to the existing literature on intellectual property and innovation, the ten chapters are multidisciplinary in their research methodologies, units of analysis and levels of implications, and international in their scope and content. The various quantitative methods used in the studies range from survey data analysis to econometric techniques and advanced indicators. They are applied at individual, firm, sector and country levels to derive implications in terms of both management of IP and public policy. The international dimension of the book is best assessed by looking at the panel of authors and the various regions they address. Actually, the authors of the ten chapters

Table I.1 Disciplines and geographical scope of the ten chapters

Chapters	Regions studied	Survey data	Quantitative methods	Managerial implications	Policy implications	Analytical level
1	Europe		x	x		Firm/Sector
2	UK		x		x	Firm
3	UK	x		x	x	VCs
4	Italy		x		x	Inventors
5	Belgium		x		x	Sector/Macro
6	Global		x		x	Macro
7	Asia	x		x		Firm
8	Global		x	x		Macro/Firm
9	Belgium	x	x	x		Firm
10	Global		x		x	Macro

originate from eight different countries, from Hitotsubashi University in Japan to Oxford University in the UK and Duke University in the US. Their papers focus either on specific countries or regions, or use panel data including several countries. The geographical scope, research methodology, management versus public policy implications, and analytical level of the various studies are summarized in Table I.1.

The variety of all contributions makes it *a priori* difficult to provide a synthetic overview of the ten chapters. However, a closer look reveals that the different contributions complement each other to a much larger extent than would appear at first sight.

One major field of investigation in this book concerns the effectiveness of patents and the patent systems in stimulating innovation and growth. The contribution of Kang and Seo (Chapter 6) suggests that IPRs are positively and significantly related to innovation once other complementary aspects of the environment are taken into account, such as the stage of economic development, industrial structure, trade regime and institutional environment. This idea is extensively illustrated by De Meyer and Garg in the case of Asian countries (Chapter 7). The authors show that education, training, market data, IP enforcement and managerial practices constitute a different context to innovation in Asia than in the Western world. The issue put forward by Kang and Seo is further discussed by Greenhalgh and Rogers (Chapter 2), who show that the market valuation of patents depends on the type of patents considered (UK or EPO) and on the level of competition within the industrial sector. Pitkethly (Chapter 3) also argues that the patent system should not be extended to business methods inventions, as business methods patents are not valued by venture capitalists. In this respect, the macroeconomic study of Romain and van Pottelsberghe (Chapter 10) confirms that high

technological opportunities, as witnessed by a high number of triadic patents, do attract higher levels of venture capital.

A second broad field of investigation regards the innovation process and its relationship with patents. Relying on the observation that intellectual property rights are increasingly important in determining a firm's value, Harhoff (Chapter 1) provides an original behavioural analysis of oppositions filed against EPO patents and discusses how organizational capabilities in patent documentation and IP management can determine the successful opposition of rivals' patents. Nagaoka (Chapter 8) suggests that it is possible to measure the speed, focus, science base and quality of the innovation process with patent data. He demonstrates that speed, focus and the reliance on scientific knowledge translate into quantity and quality of patent applications. Concerning the business–science relationship, Breschi *et al.* (Chapter 4) find that the majority of Italian academic inventions are patented by business partners. This collaborative process seems to further stimulate the scientific productivity of academic inventors, as they seem to be more productive in terms of publications than their colleagues who are not involved in patenting. Peeters and van Pottelsberghe (Chapter 9) provide further evidence that various dimensions of an innovation strategy affect the patenting portfolio of firms. The propensity to collaborate with universities through contract research has a particularly strong and positive effect. The idea that academic research plays an increasingly important role in business innovation is validated by Cincera (Chapter 5) who shows that the R&D activities of MNEs are directed towards the host country's revealed technological advantage. The presence of such foreign R&D centres is found to reduce the importance of brain drain.

In what follows the main findings of each of the ten contributions are summarized. For each chapter we attempt to highlight the most remarkable arguments and conclusions, and make suggestions in terms of interesting issues for further research.

Firms Differ Significantly in Their Ability to Handle Patent Oppositions (Chapter 1)

Given the increasingly important role of intellectual property in building and maintaining corporate value, firms are likely to fight hard in the battle for patent rights. Dietmar Harhoff analyses several aspects of this 'battleground' and attempts to shed some light on three particular issues. The first one concerns the extent of oppositions filed against patents granted by the EPO. The second one relates to the determinants

of this opposition activity. And the third one has to do with the success factors in undertaking patent oppositions and in defending against such attacks.

The author relies on opposition data for all patents granted by the EPO between 1980 and 1995 in two main industrial sectors: cosmetics and detergents. The following results emerge from the empirical analysis:

- A total of 7.9 per cent of patents granted by the EPO between 1980 and 1995 have been opposed. About one third of opposed patents were revoked, another third was amended, and only 27 per cent of oppositions were rejected. This indicates that the EPO opposition mechanism has a strong corrector effect.
- Opposition is more likely to occur for highly valuable patents and is more frequent in more uncertain technical and market fields. Conversely, opposition is less likely in the case of firms with large patent portfolios and less frequent for independent inventors than corporate applicants.
- Some companies (e.g., Henkel) attack more frequently than other firms do, and there is no notable reduction in its opposition success that would point to a trade-off between frequency and success of opposition.
- Firms differ significantly in their ability to handle opposition to their patents. Some firms seem also better at opposition than others. The latter might be explained by differences in organizational capabilities related to patent documentation and IP management.

Further work into what particular organizational capabilities enable firms to be more successful than others in patent opposition would extend the present study in a very interesting way. In that respect, it would be relevant to investigate more deeply the pros and cons of developing large in-house documentation centres versus using end-user tools rendered largely accessible through the Internet and commercial patent databases. Timing issues in the probability, extent and success of filing patent oppositions might also open valuable areas for further research.

EPO Patents and a Low Level of Competition Improve Market Valuation (Chapter 2)

Christine Greenhalgh and Mark Rogers study the market value of intellectual property activities and investigate how the degree of competition

influences such valuations. Firms may use the IP system to temper competition, raising the value of their innovations. As a result, the level of competition, as well as the nature and efficiency of the IP system, will determine the expected value of innovations. The chapter seeks to shed some light on these issues by analysing the stock market value of R&D and IP on a sample of UK firms.

The empirical analysis relies on a new panel dataset (from the Oxford Intellectual Property Research Centre Database) on R&D and IP activities of UK production firms covering the period 1989 to 1999. The authors extend the traditional approach to analysing the market value of innovative firms in a number of ways. First, they investigate whether the market valuation of firm-level innovation varies across sectors and firms. Second, in contrast to previous studies, the analysis includes the role of both trade mark activity and UK and European Patent Office patent activity. Third, the authors build two alternative proxies of the firms' competitive environment. At the sector level they use profit persistence analysis to capture the extent of competition, a new approach in the literature on market value. At the firm level they use market share, a traditional proxy for market power and an inverse proxy for competition.

Several interesting results emerge from their empirical analyses. They can be summarized as follows:

- Using Pavitt's typology of sectors, which is based on differences in the process of technological change, large differences appear in the market valuation of R&D and IP activity across sectors.
- On average, higher R&D, EPO patenting and UK trade marking (relative to firm size) all tend to increase market value, but UK patenting does not have a straightforward impact. Although UK patenting is more prevalent than EPO patenting for UK-based firms (it is expensive to extend a patent internationally), EPO filings seem to be a better indicator of value.
- A higher market share improves the valuation of UK patent activity (although the strength and significance of such an effect varies across sectors).
- The results support Schumpeter much more than Arrow concerning the hypothetical relationship between market structure and innovation. The market valuation of R&D is indeed higher in sectors with relatively low competitive pressure.

Chapter 2 opens various avenues for further research. Among these, it would be of particular interest to take into account the international

activities of the firms included in the sample. Indeed, taking into consideration foreign sales performances might significantly affect both the measurement of market shares and the statistical relationship between market valuation and patenting activity. Another research opportunity is suggested by the authors. It consists in taking into account the spillover effects induced by the R&D activities of the science-based sector, and test whether such spillovers would affect the complex relationship between the market valuation of R&D and the competition level of a sector.

Business Methods Patents are Not Valued by Venture Capitalists (Chapter 3)

Robert Pitkethly opens his chapter with a historical review of the controversial role of patent systems. The controversy concerns in particular the effectiveness of IP systems as a policy tool used to foster investments in innovation. The author refers to Penrose's statement that uncertainty about the consequences of a patent system counsels against implementing one where none exists, as well as against abolishing any existing system. According to Robert Pitkethly, this argument which is often used in discussions on the scope of individual patents can further be applied to debates on the creation of new fields of patent protection where none have existed previously.

One such recent debate concerns the granting of patents for business methods. Currently, 'methods of doing business' are excluded from patentability under European and UK Patent Law. There are no corresponding restrictions in the Patent Law of the United States and patents are being granted on business methods. Drawing on a UK-based survey the chapter discusses implications of granting business method patents (BMPs). Rather than merely revisiting past debates, changes in patent law and the IP environment give reason enough to raise old questions in the light of new circumstances.

The effectiveness of patents as incentives to invest in R&D does after all not only depend on what the patent system can and does provide but also, at least to some extent, on what investors believe or perceive that it provides. This research investigates the effect of possession by companies seeking venture capital (VC) funding of IPRs, and in particular patents and BMPs, on the willingness of VC investors to invest in them. It is particularly informative about the benefits patents, and BMPs especially, might or might not provide to society.

The empirical implementation of the research relies on a survey addressed to executives who directly or indirectly participate in VC

investment decisions or advise those who do. The main objective of the survey was to assess whether the possession of intellectual property rights by companies seeking investment affects VC investment decisions:

- The data show quite clearly that IPRs can increase the attractiveness of an investment opportunity in the eyes of venture capital executives and those advising business angels.
- However, this attractiveness-enhancing effect differs significantly across sectors, and not just as a result of different legal environments.
- Patent applications in the chemical/pharmaceutical and biotechnology sector do substantially increase investment attractiveness.
- The overwhelming response seems to be that business method patents (BMPs) would have at most some, but in general very little, effect on investment decisions.
- These findings have implications for both firm IP management and national IP policy regarding patents, and business method patents in particular.

The quotes from two survey respondents provide some clear explanations as to why BMPs would not attract venture capitalists. One of them underlines ‘tacit knowledge’ as the most valuable form of intellectual property. The other one emphasizes much higher priorities than BMPs, such as market opportunities and a skilled team of sales, marketing and support people.

In view of his research findings about VC investment incentives and several considerations regarding the other potential benefits of BMPs, Robert Pitkethly concludes that their costs are almost inevitably going to outweigh their benefits.

Further investigation would be welcome in this promising area of research. First, such cost/benefit analysis should be performed more frequently and extended to other technological areas, such as the software industry, to cite only one. In addition, it would be legitimate to wonder whether the venture capitalist’s perception is not biased by their view of the current patent system. In this respect, a similar analysis for the US VC industry – where BMPs are allowed and frequently used – would be informative. Finally, this research focuses on later-stage investment incentives, while patent systems are designed to stimulate inventions. It would therefore also be interesting to survey the perceptions of the inventors of new business methods.

Academic Patenting Seems to Improve Publication Performance (Chapter 4)

Stefano Breschi, Francesco Lissoni and Fabio Montobbio address the issue of university patenting and its impact on the scientific activity of academic researchers. The relationship between patenting and publishing may be negative for two main reasons. First, there may be a 'publication delay' effect and/or a 'basic-applied trade-off'. Publication delays may be induced by the novelty step requirement in patent legislations: ideas that enter the common pool of knowledge through a published output are not new. In other words, academic researchers that aim to (or must) file a patent should keep their inventions secret as long as the patent application has not been filed. Second, the diversion of a researcher's attention from basic research to more applied targets may result in lower rates of publications in international scientific journals. This can exert non-negligible effects if patenting is non-occasional and if it results from business-oriented research.

The authors also provide three arguments as to why there might be no such publishing–patenting trade-off: the 'resource effect', the 'productivity-fixed effect' and the 'augmented Matthew effect'. These arguments suggest that patenting by scientists would contribute further to raise contract research (i.e., increase the level of academic research), and that patents and publications are both part of a research quality indicator and a researcher's reward and incentive system (visibility, reputation, access to further resources, financial incentives).

The issue is addressed empirically with data at the individual level. The number of scientific publications of a sample of 296 academic inventors is compared to a sample of 296 matched controls, with patenting as a treatment variable. A new longitudinal dataset of 592 Italian professors is used to compare matched pairs of patenting and non-patenting individuals. The authors enquire whether a trade-off is caused by publication delays or a shift from basic to applied research, or whether a 'resource effect' occurs, by which academic inventors access superior resources as long as they take care of IPRs over their research results.

The empirical work exploits two data sources. One contains information on Italian 'academic inventors' (available in patent data). The other is based upon the *ad hoc* collection of publication data on both these 'academic inventors' and a sample of 'non-inventor' colleagues, from the on-line version of ISI's *Science Citation Index*.

The econometric analysis leads to the following results:

- Academic inventors are highly productive scientists, even more productive than their non-inventor controls.
- The difference is particularly relevant for persistent inventors, namely those scientists who patent more than once over a long time period.
- Patents have a significantly positive impact in terms of increased number of publications within the scientist's academic career. Holding other variables constant, being an inventor improves scientific productivity by about 14 per cent.
- It is, however, not possible to exclude the existence of some 'publication delay effect'.

An important institutional specificity of the Italian case is that 75 per cent of patents signed by at least one academic inventor belong to business companies. These patents are often the result of research contracts, by which the business company retains all the intellectual property rights over the research results. The above findings suggest, therefore, that contract research may generate a positive 'resource' effect on the academic inventors' publication rate, in particular when it expands over long time periods.

The conclusions of the three authors open several fields for further research. One important research question relates to national academic systems. One might wonder to what extent these results would hold in the case of academic patents applied for by universities (as opposed to business firms). Indeed, the patenting process requires a lot of time, resources and competences, which might affect an academic inventor's behaviour. The methodology developed in Chapter 4 could be used to validate the positive publishing–patenting relationship in other countries than Italy. As suggested by the authors, another issue would be to investigate whether by patenting their research results, academic inventors reduce the accessibility of their inventions to other scientists, hence reducing the pace of innovation.

R&D Activities of Foreign MNEs Seem to Reduce the Risk of Brain Drain (Chapter 5)

Michele Cincera opens his chapter with striking evidence put forward by the European Commission about brain drain flows among industrial economies. For instance, about 75 per cent of EU-born US doctorate

recipients who graduated between 1991 and 2000 had no specific plans to return to the EU. The most important reasons which keep EU-born scientists and engineers abroad relate to the quality of work, better prospects and projects, and easier access to leading technologies.

The purpose of this chapter is to shed some light on one aspect of this international mobility of factors by examining the interactions between the emigration of highly skilled workers and the presence of subsidiaries of foreign MNEs in a small open economy like Belgium. Based on European and US patent statistics, the author performs an empirical analysis of R&D activities carried out by foreign MNEs in Belgium over the last two decades. He investigates the role of demand-pull and technology-push determinants of the MNE's decision to delocalize its R&D in a host country as well as the impact of these activities on brain drain of Belgian R&D personnel. The empirical analysis leads to four main observations:

- The scientific fields where Belgium holds comparative advantage with respect to the OECD are characterized by a strong presence of foreign firms.
- The relatively low value of patents applied for by foreign subsidiaries suggests that the main objective of MNEs' R&D units may be the transfer and adaptation of existing knowledge to the host country (i.e., Belgium).
- Higher R&D internationalization is associated with lower rates of emigration of highly educated workers across countries. In other words, the importance of brain drain is smaller in highly internationalized countries.
- There seems to be a positive 'brain gain' (higher number of new inventors in patents applied for by foreign subsidiaries and MNEs as compared to domestic firms) associated with the presence of foreign MNEs.

These results suggest that MNEs invest in R&D in Belgium mainly in order to gain access to the local science base. The presence of these companies positively affects the demand for highly skilled workers and hence reduces the importance of brain drain. Important policy implications are suggested by the author, especially regarding policies aiming at increased openness and attraction of foreign R&D laboratories.

This chapter induces several fields for further research. One of them would be to validate these results with data on other small open economies like Sweden, Finland and Switzerland. Another interesting

analysis would be to assess the extent to which foreign MNEs enter into collaborative R&D with local firms and especially with local universities.

Stronger Intellectual Property Rights Do Not Always Lead to More Innovation (Chapter 6)

There is an ongoing debate on whether stronger IPRs encourage or retard innovative activities. W. D. Nordhaus initiated the economic analysis of patent systems, showing that granting innovators temporary monopoly power for the exploitation of their inventions enhances R&D efforts and innovative activities. However, recent empirical and theoretical analyses put forward more mitigated, and sometimes opposite, conclusions.

Professors Sung Jin Kang and Hwan Joo Seo study this issue empirically over a large number of countries. Their contribution aims at testing whether the strengthening of intellectual property rights would effectively stimulate innovation. The authors argue that such empirical exercise must be performed by taking into account complementary factors such as industrial structure, social capability and trade regime.

The quantitative analysis, which relies on a long-run panel dataset of about 110 countries, draws the following conclusions:

- There is no evidence that stronger IPRs alone boost innovation, as measured by the number of patent applications.
- IPRs are positively and significantly related to innovation once other complementary aspects of the environment for innovation are taken into account, such as the stage of economic development, industrial structure, trade regime and institutional environment.
- Even when complementary conditions are taken into account, some countries are negatively affected by stronger IPRs.

These results suggest that the effectiveness of IPRs in fostering innovation varies across countries according to national economic and institutional contexts. For example, only countries with a per capita GDP above about US\$ 9,000 seem to gain from the strengthening of IPRs. The authors conclude with a discussion of the potential implications of their results for current international policy debates regarding TRIPs (Trade Related Intellectual Property).

This issue is indeed of critical importance for less developed economies. Further research would be required to shed more light on the debate. A first avenue for future empirical investigation would be to use another indicator of innovation effort than patent data. IPR regimes are

designed to spur innovation. In this respect, the number of researchers or R&D outlays might be appropriate to assess the effectiveness of IPR regimes. Another field of research would be to assess what component(s) of an IP policy design (e.g., scope, length, quality, enforcement etc.) plays the most important role in stimulating innovation.

Asian Firms have Specific Perceptions and Competences as Regards the Innovation Process (Chapter 7)

The starting point of the chapter by Arnoud De Meyer and Sam Garg originates from Asian managers' view regarding the management of innovation. These managers argue that the application of the lessons learned in the Western world may well be different in Asia. The argument is not that the lessons do not apply, but rather that the specific circumstances in East Asia are such that their implementation would be radically different.

The study presented in Chapter 7 aims at understanding how the implementation of innovation management concepts is indeed different in Asia. The research methodology consisted first in collecting data on 30 innovative firms or innovative clusters in order to specify a large number of hypotheses about innovation management in Asia. In a second step the authors developed a questionnaire that was sent to 336 senior managers in East and South Asia. Numerous observations are derived from this study. The most compelling ones can be summarized as follows:

- On top of the shortage in training, companies in Asia are confronted with a lack of quality of training.
- Asian financial markets miss the sophistication and the willingness to invest in innovation.
- The mindset of many managers in Asia drives them towards cost-reduction strategies, as opposed to the creation of new value.
- The average Asian company has a limited understanding of, or experience with, marketing. Brand building is often neglected and there is an absolute lack of reliable market data.
- The regulatory environment favourable to innovators and entrepreneurship is often lacking: innovators need good IPR protection and in particular the enforcement of these rights.
- Local governments tend to be conservative in their procurements and do not favour local innovators over well-established international brands.

A set of factors are specific to Asia and influence the implementation of innovation management practices developed in the Western world. It is worth mentioning that not all companies/respondents evaluate the factors specific to Asia in the same way. A typology of four groups of companies/respondents is put forward by the authors: the innovation starters, the tradition fighters, the poor in knowledge resources, and the stuck in the muck. The chapter extensively documents the different types of support required by the four groups. This discussion should help policy-makers and educators in the field of management to customize their action to each of their specific targets.

From this chapter it seems that our understanding of the innovation process in Asia would particularly benefit from two main fields for further research. The first one would be to conduct a similar survey in Europe, Japan and the US in order to test whether the above results are really specific to Asia. Another interesting field of investigation would be to measure the extent to which the four typologies correlate with the financial performance of surveyed firms.

Speed, Science Linkage and Focus Affect R&D Performance (Chapter 8)

Sadao Nagaoka examines how the speed, science linkage and focus of corporate R&D as well as new entry matter as determinants of R&D performance in the IT (information technology) sector. He discusses the recent R&D performance of US, Japanese and European firms from this perspective. The author relies on the number of forward patent citations per patent and the number of patents as proxies for the quality and for the quantity of innovation respectively. He uses these measures as indicators of the performance of R&D.

The two measures show that, in the 1990s, the R&D performance of US firms in the IT sector improved significantly relative to the rest of the world. Several hypotheses may explain this improvement. One is better management practices and organization of US firms (more emphasis on speed). Second, many US firms may have chosen a vertical disintegration strategy. The third reason is the increasing dependence of the IT industry innovation on scientific research. Fourth, a more entrepreneurial culture would translate into the entry of more new technology firms. The 1990s were indeed characterized by a sharp increase in the contribution of small firms to aggregate R&D outlays in the US.

Sadao Nagaoka attempts to assess quantitatively the significance and the contribution of the above four factors as determinants of R&D

performance. The speed of the innovation process is measured by the time lag between a patent and its underlying patent literature. The frequency of references made by a patent to scientific journals would provide a measure of the propensity of firms to exploit scientific knowledge. The degree of concentration of the patent portfolio of a firm is used to measure the extent to which a firm has a focused research agenda. New entrants are defined as firms that are major patentees in the most recent period (1998–2002) but do not have patents granted in the previous periods.

There is clear evidence that in IT areas patenting performance of US firms compared to Japanese firms has improved in both quantity and quality. The econometric analysis provided in Chapter 8 attempts better to understand the determinants of this improved performance. The results can be summarized as follows:

- There is a positive effect of speed on research productivity. That is, higher speed of R&D measured by citation lag improves R&D performance in terms of both the quality and the number of patents granted.
- There is a positive effect of science linkage on research productivity. That is, a stronger science base, as measured by citations to the scientific literature, improves the R&D performance of a firm in terms of both quality and number of patents granted.
- A focused research agenda tends to improve patent quality in the IT core sector, but does not lead to a higher quantity of patents. A firm that patents in a single technology domain has a patent quality indicator 11 per cent higher than a firm that patents in two technology domains.
- New entrants have higher patent quality than incumbents, only part of which can be explained by an average higher speed and stronger science linkage.

The above findings suggest that the higher performance of US firms is due to their increased R&D speed, intensification of science linkage and a substantially higher rate of new entries. This result is consistent with the idea that the increase in patenting in the US has been driven by changes in the management of innovation by US firms, which brought a real burst in innovation.

The methodology developed by Sadao Nagaoka is a good example of how quantitative analyses can be used to assess the management of R&D. Three avenues for future research can be raised to improve or

validate this methodology. First, it would clearly be interesting to extend the analysis to other sectors or technologies. Second, the robustness of the indicators presented by the author could be further tested. One important issue is whether the reliance on the United States Patents and Trademarks Office (USPTO) data might bias the results, through a potential 'home effect'. Indeed, new entrants generally lack resources to apply for patents abroad. The significance of the bias could be assessed through the use of EPO (European Patent Office) or JPO (Japanese Patent Office) data. Third, the number of forward patent citations and the lag to the first citation are two major indicators included in the empirical analysis. It would be of particular interest to separate self from non-self patent citations, to test whether the speed of innovation and its quality are determined mainly 'internally' to the firm or 'externally' as a result of strong inter-firm knowledge spillovers.

A Firm's Patenting Behaviour Strongly Depends on its Innovation Strategy (Chapter 9)

In Chapter 9, Carine Peeters and Bruno van Pottelsberghe investigate several factors that determine the patenting behaviour of firms. The theoretical model the authors rely on suggests that the patenting behaviour of firms is influenced by three types of factors: firm and sector specific variables, characteristics of the innovation strategy, and barriers to innovation and to the use of the patent system.

A central issue in the study is to assess the role played by different types of innovation strategies. Four main dimensions of an innovation strategy are taken into account. The first one differentiates R&D active from non-R&D active firms. The second one relates to the kind of R&D activities undertaken and, more particularly, the relative importance of basic and applied research on the one hand and development work on the other hand. The third one reflects the propensity of firms to enter into research partnerships with business and scientific institutions. The last dimension accounts for the orientation of the innovation strategy towards the development of new products, new processes, or both.

The database used in the empirical study is built through a survey of 148 firms operating in Belgium in 2001. The patent behaviour of these firms is proxied by two variables reflecting the existence and size of their patent portfolio. Four main findings should be highlighted:

- First, even though it sharply reduces the significance of traditional firm and sector specific variables, introducing characteristics of the

innovation strategy pursued by firms improves the general quality of the model.

- Second, entering into research partnerships with scientific institutions or competitors has a strong positive effect of the patenting behaviour of firms. This stresses that collaborative research induces a need for strong intellectual property protection.
- The importance of science-based research in determining the patenting behaviour of firms is witnessed by the positive and significant coefficient of both the share of basic and applied research in the total R&D budget, and the propensity to collaborate with universities, research institutes and public labs.
- A complex innovation strategy targeting high levels of both product and process innovation is associated with patent portfolios of intermediate size. Product innovators have the largest patent portfolios and process innovators the smallest, not significantly different from non-innovators.

This study opens the way to several avenues for further research. First, the empirical analysis could be improved by taking into account the quality of the patent portfolio (with the number of forward citations) along with the quantity of active patents. It would also be worthwhile validating the results using larger databases of firms, ideally in different countries or regions. Finally, as suggested by the authors, being able to differentiate patent portfolios as mere indicator of innovation performance from patent portfolios as strategic tools to leverage in technological negotiations or to use in building strong technological positions vis-à-vis competitors, would constitute a quantum leap in the current state of research on patenting behaviour.

Technological Opportunity Attracts More Venture Capital (Chapter 10)

Despite the wide recognition of venture capital funds as key players in the national innovation system, there are important differences across countries in the relative amounts of VC. It is, for instance, relatively high in the US and Canada but very low in Japan.

The central hypothesis tested by Astrid Romain and Bruno van Pottelsberghe is that, besides the determinants previously tested in the literature, two broad sets of factors unheard of in the existing empirical research might also contribute to explain heterogeneity of VC intensity across countries. These factors relate to the entrepreneurial environment

and to technological opportunity – intellectual property rights in particular. A theoretical model that takes into account the factors that affect the demand and supply of VC is developed. These factors include the growth of GDP, short-term and long-term interest rates, several indicators of technological opportunity (business R&D expenditures growth rate, level of business R&D capital stock, and number of triadic patents), and indicators of entrepreneurial environment.

The model is tested using a panel dataset composed of 16 countries over an 11 year period. Empirical results can be summarized as follows:

- Interest rates have a significant impact on VC intensity. Whereas short-term and long-term interest rates influence positively the relative level of VC via a strong demand-side effect, the difference between long-term and short-term interest rates has the opposite impact, revealing a stronger supply-side effect.
- VC is pro-cyclical. It follows an evolution similar to the GDP growth rate. In periods of high growth, the flow of venture capital outperforms the GDP growth rate, and vice versa.
- Indicators of technological opportunity, such as the available stock of knowledge and the number of high value patents (triadic patents), positively influence a country's investment in VC.
- The positive effect of the stock of knowledge is strongly reinforced in countries with a very high rate of entrepreneurship.

One important policy implication that emerges from these results is that in order to stimulate VC activity in a country, demand-side factors have to be taken into account. The most important factors affecting the demand of VC are the stock of knowledge, the innovative output proxied by the number of highly valued (triadic) patents, and the interest rates. The level of entrepreneurship does play an important role as well.

This empirical study of the determinants of venture capital could be improved in several ways that constitute interesting avenues for future research. A first and simple upgrade would be to reiterate similar estimates over a longer time-span that would go beyond the year 2000. Indeed, after the turn of the century a significant drop has occurred in the level of VC in most industrialized countries. It would be interesting to test the robustness of the results in this respect. Another improvement would be to include data on IPOs and stock market performance, as they reflect the effectiveness of capital markets.

This introductory chapter has highlighted that, besides significantly contributing to the current stream of research, the ten chapters of this

book open fascinating avenues for future research in the field of the economics and management of innovation and intellectual property, at the individual, firm, sector and country level, in various regions of the world, and with implications for policy-makers, business practitioners, research scholars and educators.

The research question of whether and how intellectual property ultimately fosters innovation and economic growth is definitely far from being obsolete. Through their contributions to this book, professors and research scholars from leading institutions throughout the world have pushed one step farther the frontiers of our understanding of this issue. It is our greatest hope that, as it has been for us as editors, this book will prove a valuable and inspiring experience to the readers and a fruitful source of ideas for research scholars.

Index

Notes: f = figure; n = note; t = table; **bold** = extended discussion or heading emphasized in main text.

- Aapico 156
absorptive capacity (science)
 176–7
academic inventors (Italy) 3, **8–9**,
 83–103
 ‘control’ sample 83, 85, 86, 87,
 90–3, 98
 ‘most productive scientists’ 85
 ‘non-inventor’ colleagues 83
 ‘occasional’ 87–94, 97,
 98t, 99
 ‘persistent’ 87–93, 97–8, 99
 ‘recent’ 88–93
 skewness 87, 90, 91t, 95
 ‘superstars’ 87
 ‘with few publications’ 87
accounting 46, 228
age 90, 94, 95–6, 101(n5)
Aghion, P. 135
Aghion, P., *et al.* (2002) 55(n6), 56
 Bloom, N. 56
 Blundell, R. 56
 Griffith, R. 56
 Howitt, P. 56
Agrawal, A. 101(n1)
agricultural science 116,
 117t, 123
agriculture, husbandry, food 115t,
 118t
Allison, P. D. 95, 102
Allison, P. D., *et al.* (1982) 85, 102
 Krauze, T. D. 102
 Long, J. S. 102
Anand, B. 225
Andries, P. 128
Angel, D. P. 125(n2)
anonymity **64**
Applied Econometrics Association
 (AEA, 1974–)
 Conference on Innovation and
 Intellectual Property
 (Singapore, 2004) 1, 125n,
 193
 publications i–ii
 applied research 131
 Archibugi, D. 125(n4)
 Argentina, 146t
 Arora, A. 135, 144, 203
 Arrow, K. 5, 48, 52, 201
 Arundel, A. 208, 217
 Asaba, S. 193
 ASEAN countries 151
 Asia 2t, 2, **12–13**
 Asia: innovation characteristics
 151–70
 age scale survey (testing of
 hypotheses) 159–68
 case files (lessons) 153–9
 classifying sample into groups
 166–8
 hurdles and success factors 163–5,
 166–8
 importance of innovation to
 respondents 162–3
 inadequate resources 154–5
 ineffective market input 155–6
 lack of appreciation for intangibles
 158–9
 perception of a certain ‘Asian’ness
 157–8
 policy implications 168–9
 purpose of chapter 152
 research project 152–3
 results 168–9
 shortcomings of sample 159, 161
 strong role of government hinders
 innovation 156–7
 success factors 152

- Asia: innovation characteristics –
continued
 survey data (analysis) 162
 understanding how managers differ
 in opinion 165–6
- Asian crisis (1997–9) 151
- Asian firms (specific competencies as
 regards innovation process)
 12–13, 151–70
 further research 13
- assets 51t, 51, 184
 book value 43, 44, 45–6
 current market valuation
 coefficient 43, 44
 intangible 21, 43–6
 tangible 43, 45–6, 52
 total 46t
- ‘augmented Matthew effect’ 8, 84–5
- Australia 54(n1), 101(n2), 117n,
 146t, 152, 230, 231t
- Austria 117n, 120t, 146t
- Aventis (1999–) 38(n10)
- Avnimelech, G., *et al.* (2005) 223,
 235
 Kenney, M. 235
 Teubal, M. 235
- Azoulay, P. *et al.* (2004) 97, 99,
 101(n1), 102
 Ding, W. 102
 Stuart, T. 102
- BA *see* business angels
- Baden-Fuller, C. 192, 216–17
- Badham, R. 169
- Balconi, M., *et al.* (2004) 85, 102
 Breschi, S. 102
 Lissoni, F. 102
- Baldwin, J. R., *et al.* (2002) 201, 220
 Hanel, P. 220
 Sabourin, D. 220
- Baltagi, B. H. 139
- banking sector 227
- bankruptcy procedures 222
- Banyan Tree Hotels and Resorts
 (Singapore) 153
- barriers to entry 48
- Basberg, B. L. 125(n4)
- BASF 31t, 34, 36
- Baumol, W. 201
- Bayer 34, 36
- Bayh–Dole Act (USA, 1980) 101(n1),
 130, 132
- Beine, M. 125n
- Belderbos, R. 107, 125(n2)
- BelFirst database 209, 213,
 219(n2)
- Belgian American Educational
 Foundation (BAEF) 219
- Belgian central balance sheet office
 126(n9)
- Belgium 2t, 10, 117n, 230, 231t
 brain drain and R&D activities of
 MNEs 104–28
 determinants of patenting
 behaviour (firms) 15–16
 innovation strategies and
 patenting behaviour
 199–221
 internationalization of
 technological base 112–15,
 126(n12–14)
- Benito, A. 55(n8)
- Besen, S. M. 59
- Bessen, J. 129
- Bhardwaj, S. 156
- bias 15, 55(n8), 137, 146(n2), 174,
 180, 181, 184
 contextual 205
 non-response 63
 sample selection 179
- biometric analysis 83–103
- biochemistry 116, 117t, 123
- Biocon 156
- biology 85, 86t, 87t, 90t, 91t, 94,
 96t, 96, 100t, 117t
 molecular biology 117t
- biotechnology 7, 77, 114t, 115t,
 118, 118t, 119, 172, 189
- ‘biweights’ 55(n4)
- Black, B. S. 222, 223
- Black, G. 103
- black market premium index 138
- Blomström, M. 106
- Bloom, N. 56
- Blundell, R. 56
- Blundell, R., *et al.* (1999) 50, 56
 Griffith, R. 56
 van-Reenen, J. 56

- BMPs *see* business method patents
- Boone, J. 55(n6)
- Bosworth, D. 54n, 54(n1), 57
- Bound, J., *et al.* (1984) 125(n4), 127, 203, 220
- Cummins, C. 127, 220
- Griliches, Z. 127, 220
- Hall, B. H. 127, 220
- Jaffe, A. B. 127, 220
- brain drain
- data and hypotheses 108–12, 126–7(n4–11)
- determinants of direction and magnitude 104
- emigration rate 120t, 120, 121t
- empirical findings 112–23, 126(n12–19)
- further research 124–5
- internationalization of Belgian technological base 112–15, 126(n12–14)
- market-driven versus technology-push factors 115–19, 126(n15–17)
- objectives of chapter 104–5, 110, 119, 123
- plan of chapter 105
- policy implications 124–5
- R&D activities of MNEs 3, 9–11, 104–28
- reduced 9–11, 123–4
- ‘smaller in highly internationalized countries’ 10
- brain exchange 105, 110t, 112, 121, 123, 124
- brain gain 10, 105, 110t, 111, 121, 124
- brands 12, 153, 156–8, 160t, 202
- Branstetter, L. 59, 131, 132, 196(n7–8, n10)
- Brazil 146t
- Breschi, S. xv, 3, 8–9, 102
- Breschi, S., *et al.* (2005a) 84, 90, 101(n3, n5), 102
- Lissoni, F. 102
- Montobbio, F. 102
- Breschi, S., *et al.* (2005b) 97, 102
- Lissoni, F. 102
- Montobbio, F. 102
- British Venture Capital Association (BVCA)
- data 64
- list of members 62, 63
- list of sources of business angel capital 62
- Brouwer, E. 201–2, 205, 206, 208, 216, 217, 221
- Buddhism 156
- Bulgaria 146t
- business angels (BA) 7, 62–71, 72t
- business environment 162t, 165, 167, 168, 169
- ‘competitive environment’ 159, 162–3
- see also* entrepreneurial environment
- business method patents (BMPs) 58–79
- background 60–1, 78(n2–3)
- cost-benefit analysis 7, 75–7, 78
- ‘not valued by venture capitalists’ 6–7
- business methods
- computer-implemented 77
- non-technical 71, 72t, 72, 77
- perceptions of inventors 7
- business partners 3, 84, 90, 100, 160t
- business R&D capital stock (BRD) 223, 228, 229, 230, 231t, 232t, 233
- business R&D expenditure, growth rate 223, 228, 229, 230, 231t, 232t, 234t
- BVCA *see* British Venture Capital Association
- C4 concentration ratio 210
- Caballero, R. J. 196(n10)
- Calderini, M. 101(n7)
- cameras 173, 181, 196(n1)
- Canada 16, 101(n2), 117n, 146t, 222, 230, 231t
- Cantwell, J. 125(n1)
- capital 44, 151, 204, 235(n2)
- market allocation 135
- physical 105

- capital gains tax rate (CGTR) 224t, 225
- capital goods sector 176, 191
- capital markets 17, 201
- Capron, H. 126(n15)
- Cassiman, B. 106, 207
- Cassiman, B., *et al.* (2001) 207, 220
- Pérez-Castrillo, D. 220
- Veugelers, R. 220
- CEOs (chief executive officers) 161t, 208
- cheap labour 151
- Chemical Abstracts 35
- Chemical Abstracts Service (CAS) 35, 36
- chemical companies 34
- chemical engineering 85, 86t, 87t, 90t, 91t, 94, 100t, 101(n5)
- chemicals 7, 38(n8), 43n, 77, 78(n6), 108, 115t, 115, 118, 118t, 134, 203
- chemicals/pharmaceuticals/
biotechnology sector 67t, 68–71, 73, 77, 78(n6)
- Chemie Linz AG (1973–) 36, 38(n11)
- Chemische Werke Huels 34, 36
- chemistry 23, 24t, 113, 114t, 116, 117t, 119
- half-life of knowledge 37
- Chen, H. H. 152
- Chile 146t
- CHI research 172, 173, 177, 181, 196(n5)
- China 146t, 151, 154t, 154, 156, 158, 159, 161t
- Chinese business world 158
- chip-making industry 155
- Chow test 46n
- Chung, K. 46n
- Cincera, M. xv, 3, 9–11, 125n, 126(n12, n15)
- citation lag 14, 192
- citations (*cit*) 14, 108, 110, 116–19, 126(n11, n16), 132, 173–8, 179, 180, 184, 185t, 195t, 196(n3, n9)
- backward 177
- forward 13, 15–17, 174, 176f, 178n, 181–6, 189, 192, 196(n11–12)
- half-life 101(n3)
- self-citations 111, 117–19, 123, 180, 196(n13)
- clinical medicine 116, 117t, 123
- Clorox 31t
- clusters 12, 125, 152, 162
- co-inventors 122t, 123, 124
- Cockburn, I. 177
- Code of Conduct for Recruitment of Researchers 125
- COE programme (Japan) 193
- cognitive resources 84
- Cohen, W. M. 49, 201, 202
- Cohen, W. M., *et al.* (2000) 131, 147, 201, 208, 220
- Nelson, R. R. 147, 220
- Walsh, J. P. 147, 220
- Colgate 30t, 31t
- Colombia 146t
- commerce sector 41
- commercialization 75, 202
- commoditization 75, 76
- communication equipment 173
- communications 67, 67t, 69t, 70t, 70, 71t, 114t, 115t, 116, 118, 118t, 119, 123
- companies/firms 1, 2t, 18, 59, 65, 67, 84, 87, 89, 99, 159, 203
- ability to handle patent oppositions 3–4, 21–39
- active in UK patenting (no stock market premium) 45–7
- adaptation to local circumstances 141
- age 223
- Asian 12, 156, 157, 165
- basic and applied research 8, 199, 205, 207, 210, 212t, 213, 215t, 216
- Belgian 109, 118, 121, 122t, 126(n17)
- Belgian subsidiaries of foreign MNEs 109, 111, 112t, 113, 113t, 114t, 122t, 126(n9)
- book valuation/market valuation 21
- characteristics 200, 205f, 205, 209–10, 219(n2–3)
- cross-sectional data 184

companies/firms – *continued*

- Danish and Swedish 61
- domestic 10, 106, 112, 116, 118, 125
- European (R&D performance) 13, 171, 173, 174, 175f, 189–92
- family-owned 157
- fast creation 157
- financial performance 13
- foreign 10, 109, 113–16, 118–25, 126(n17)
- German 152
- growth potential 222
- headquarters 161t, 164–5, 168
- high-technology (HT) 130, 210, 212t, 213–16, 219(n3)
- innovative 12
- intensity 162t, 162
- international 154
- international activities 5–6
- invention performance (by region) **189–91**
- Japanese (R&D performance) 13–14, 171, 173, 174, 175f, 189, 190f, 191, 192, 196(n7)
- large 43n, 47, 196(n4), 201, 208, 213, 216
- larger databases required 219
- later-stage investment 62
- local 11
- low self-perception (Asia) 158
- low technology (LT) 210, 212t, 213–16, 219(n3)
- Malaysian 152, 158
- manufacturing 42, 43n, 50, 207, 208, 219(n3)
- medium high-technology (MH) 210, 212t, 214t, 215t, 216, 219(n3)
- medium low-technology (ML) 210, 212t, 214t, 215t, 216, 219(n3)
- missing variables 180, 181–2, 186
- net output 47
- new entrants 48
- OECD classification 219(n3)
- organizational rigidities 211
- overseas 48
- parent/mother 41, 113, 117, 119, 121, 124
- patent ownership 88t, 99, 100
- patenting behaviour: depends on innovation strategy 15–16
- Pavitt technological sectors 43t
- performance 52
- propensity to enter research partnerships 15–16, 206, 207, **210–11**, 212t, 213, 215t, 216–17, 218
- propensity to exploit scientific knowledge 14
- R&D active/non-active 15, 205, 207, **210**, 212t, 213, 215t, 216
- research orientation 199, 206, 207, **211**, 212t, 213, 215t, 216, 217
- risky 130
- seeking finance 62
- service sector 54n, 208, 210, 212t, 216, 219(n3)
- size 5, 52, 179, 186, 200, 201, 205, **209**, 214t, 214, 215t, 223
- small 13, 43n, 44, 77, 130, 172, 196(n4), 201, 202, 216
- start-up 62, 66t, 66, 76, 153, 177, 222, 226, 227, 229
- subsidiary 10, 106–16, 118–19, 121–4, 126(n17), 152
- technological change and innovative activity ‘varies substantially’ 52
- Thai 158
- UK 134, 138
- university-based 172
- US 60, 130, 155
- US (R&D performance) 13, 14, 171–2, 173, 174, 175f, 189–92
- US subsidiaries 109
- wholly-owned subsidiaries 42 *see also* corporate valuation; multinational enterprises
- companies (Pavitt sectoral typology)
 - sector 1: supplier dominated (manufacturing and mining) 42, 43t, 46t, 49t, 51t

- companies (Pavitt sectoral typology) – *continued*
- sector 2: production intensive (scale intensive) 42, 46t, 49t, 51t, 51
 - sector 3: production intensive (specialist suppliers) 42, 46t, 49t, 50, 51t
 - sector 4: science-based 42, 45, 46t, 49–54
 - sector 5: supplier dominated (non-manufacturing) 42, 43t, 45, 46t, 49t, 50–3
- comparative advantage 10
 scientific 110
see also scientific revealed comparative advantage
- competence 12–13
- competition 2, 22, 38, 104, 140, 161, 171–2, 209
 intellectual property, and value of UK firms 40–57
 international 210
 low level (improves market valuation) 4–6
 perfect 48
 proxies 41
 relationship with innovation (non-monotonic) 55(n6)
 restriction 75
- Competition Commission (UK) 54
- competition intensity 202
- competitive advantage 34, 35, 71, 107, 155, 199, 204
- competitive conditions 47–52, 53, 55(n6–10)
 market share and value of innovative activities 50–2, 55(n9–10)
 profit persistence and market valuation 48–9, 55(n7–8)
- competitive intelligence 163t, 165
- competitive pressure 135, 138
- competitive strategy 151
- competitors 16, 35–7, 200, 204, 206, 208, 210, 211, 215t, 216–18
- computer chips 159
- computer peripherals 114t, 173, 181, 196(n1)
- computer science 116, 117t, 123
- computers 116, 119, 172, 173, 181, 194t, 196(n1)
 ‘Apple G4’ 62
- concurrent engineering 152
- construction sector 41
- consultants xvii, 206, 210
- consumer products 78(n6)
- consumer tastes 111
- contestable markets theory 48
- contract research 3, 8, 89, 90, 99
- ‘convergence’ 55(n4)
- Cook’s D 54(n4)
- copyright iv, 68, 78(n1)
- Coriat, B. 130
- corporate income tax rate (CITR) 228, 229, 230, 231t, 232t, 234t
- corporate tax rate (TAX) 226, 227
- corporate valuation (UK)
 ‘additional insight’ provided 50
 determinants 21
 further research 54
 intellectual property, competition, and 3, 40–57
 market value regressions 44–7
 model 42–4
 policy implications 54, 55–6(n11)
 standard approaches extended 40–1
- cosmetics 4, 37, 114t
 patent rivalry 28–34
 patenting and opposition activity 30t, 33t
- cost of capital 227, 230, 233
- cost-reduction 12, 155, 160t, 163–5, 166, 167–8
- costs 206, 211, 215t, 217
- Couchman, P. K., *et al.* (1999) 152, 169
 Badham, R. 169
 Zanko, M. 169
- countries 1, 2t, 2, 16, 18, 108, 110, 138n, 140t, 141t, 142, 143t, 144, 181, 199, 209, 212t, 213, 222–5, 229, 232t, 234t
- Court of Appeals for Federal Circuit (CAFC, USA) 60, 75, 130, 131, 132
- courts 23

- Crépon, B., *et al.* (1996) 201, 203, 205, 208, 220
 Duguet, E. 220
 Kabla, I. 220
 Crépon, B., *et al.* (1998) 201, 216, 220
 Duguet, E. 220
 Mairesse, J. 220
 cross-country analysis 132, 138, 144
 cross-sectional data 55(n10), 96t, 234t
 Cubbin, J. 48
 cultural distance 156
 culture 157–8
 Cummins, C. 127, 220
 customer base 160t, 163t
 customers 153, 163t, 207, 210, 211, 217
 trend-setting 165
 Czech Republic 146t
- data collection
 venture capital investment
 decisions 65–74
- data deficiencies 12, 64, 93, 95, 101(n3–4, n6–7), 126(n13), 135, 154, 155–6, 160t, 163t, 165, 181
- databases 4, 15, 16, 173, 177, 180, 201, 219
 BelFirst 209, 213, 219(n2)
 Dragon Web Surveys Filemaker 62
 EP-INV-DOC 85, 86n–89n, 91n–92n, 101(n4)
 ESPACE-BULLETIN 108–9
 IDC 34–7
 ISI web of science 110, 117n
 OIPRC 5, 41–2, 43n, 54n, 54(n2)
 open science and university
 patenting 83
 UNESCO 133
 VC and patents 223, 228
- De Meyer, A. xv, 2, 12–13, 152, 153, 156, 169(n1), 192
- Debackere, K. 128
 debt-to-equity ratio 44, 45–6
- decision-making i, 71, 157
- Degussa 34, 36
- Deleus, F. 128
- demand side 17, 106
- dendrograms 162
- Denmark 117n, 120t, 146t, 230, 231t
- Derwent 35, 36
- design/designers 68, 154–5, 159, 160t, 163t, 169
- detergents 4, 37
 patent office error-correction 32
 patent rivalry 28–34
 patenting and opposition activity 31t, 33t
- developing countries 129, 144
 ‘less-developed economies’ 11
 Dewick, P., *et al.* (2002) 43n, 56
 Green, K. 56
 Miozzo, M. 56
- DiMinin, A. 97, 99, 101(n1)
- Ding, W. 102
- Docquier, F. 119, 120n, 125n, 126(n18)
- Dow 31t
- downweights 55(n4)
- Dragon Web Surveys Filemaker
 database 62
- drugs [medicines] 116, 118, 118t
 ‘life-saving medicines’ 159
- due diligence 71
- Duguet, E. 201, 202, 205, 216, 220
- Duke University xvii, 2
- Dun and Bradstreet International 42
- Dunning, J. H. 125(n2)
- Duru, G. i
- dynamic panel models 55(n8)
- Dynamit Nobel 34
- e-commerce 67–71, 77
- e-mail 62, 63, 64
- East Asia 12, 151, 152
- econometrics 1, 9, 55(n8)
 firm size (effect on patent applications) 201
- information technology inventions:
 importance of speed, science linkage, focus, and new entrants 179–92, 196(n10–13)
 open science and university
 patenting 93–8, 98–9, 101(n6)
- economic development 11, 134, 144
- economic efficiency 56(n11), 145

- economic freedom 135
Economic Freedom of World: 2002 Annual Report 133
 economic growth 1, 104, 135, 139, 146(n5), 151, 199, 222
Economic Report of President (2001) 196(n4)
 economies of scale 104, 107, 201
 economies of scope 201
 Egypt 146t
 Eisenberg, R. 129
 electrical devices/goods 43n, 113–16, 118, 118t, 119, 123, 135, 173, 194t
 electrical engineering 24t
 electronics 43n, 67, 67t, 69t, 70t, 70, 71t, 85, 86t, 87t, 90t, 91t, 94, 96t, 96, 100t, 101(n5), 173, 181, 194t, 196(n1)
 empiricism
 academic sphere 100n
 brain drain and R&D activities of MNEs 112–23, 126(n12–19)
 business methods patents 6–7
 competition–innovation relationship 55(n6)
 corporate valuation 43–4, 54(n3)
 determinants of patent opposition 28–34, 38(n6–7)
 determinants of patenting behaviour 15–16
 FDI (diminution of brain drain) 105
 impact of scientific activity on patenting by universities 101(n1)
 innovation (Asia): hurdles 153–9
 innovation management 151–2
 innovation strategies (complex) and patenting behaviour 200
 IPRs: effect on innovation 11–12
 IPRs: effect on number of patents 131–2, 141–2, 145
 open science and university patenting 83
 patent citations 15
 patent opposition (ability of firms to handle) 4
 patents: determinants 200
 patents: effectiveness as incentive for innovation 131–2
 patents: and VC 222, 227–8, 230–3, 234t
 R&D activities by foreign MNEs in Belgium 10
 relationship between patenting and publishing 8–9
 scientific linkage (with industrial innovation) 196(n8)
 scientific productivity 90
 stock market value of R&D 5
 ‘strategy and industrial economics literatures’ 22
 technological opportunity and venture capital 17
 VC: determinants 224
 VC: economic impact 235(n1)
 Employee Retirement Income Securities Act (ERISA, USA, 1979) 130
 ‘prudent man rule’ 224t, 225
 employee-inventor rewards 59
 employees 36, 157, 196(n4), 222, 225
 lack of engagement for innovation 164t, 164
 new 169
 number of 202, 209, 212t
 resistance to change 211
 employers 225
 end-user tools 36
 endogeneity test 139
 endogenous growth theory 133
 Engel, D. 235(n1)
 engineering 116, 117t
 engineers 10, 105, 107, 154t, 154, 155, 160t, 163t, 169
 entrepreneurial culture 13
 entrepreneurial environment (EN) 16–17, 222, 223, 226, 228, 232t, 233
 entrepreneurs/entrepreneurship 12, 17, 157, 158, 222–30, 233, 234t, 235
 environment/ecology 117t
 EPO *see* European Patent Office
 equity (funds) 157, 225

- equity market return 224n, 224, 234t
- ESRC: Evolution of Business Knowledge Programme 54n
- Europe 2t, 13, 60, 71, 72t, 72, 78n, 83, 99, 101(n2), 151, 156, 158, 189, 190f, 225, 235(n2)
see also brain drain
- European Commission 9, 104
- European Patent Office (EPO) 2, 15, 29, 37, 40–1, 43t, 74, 85, 105, 109t, 112t, 126(n8), 229
- applications by foreign companies (1983–99) 114t
- data source 38(n1), 108
- database 112n–114n, 120n
- granting procedures 23, 38(n2)
- incidence of opposition and appeal 23–5, 38(n2)
- institutional background 23
- patent applications 120
- patent opposition mechanism 3, 6, 21–2, 23–5
- patent publications 44
- patenting 45, 53
- European Patent Office: Technical Board of Appeal 23
- European Patent Office patents 42, 46t, 47, 51t, 52, 113, 113t, 120t, 126(n7)
- improve market valuation 4–6
- OST/INPI/ISI classification 126(n14)
- European Researcher's Charter 125
- European Union 9–10, 104, 125
- patenting propensity 126(n15)
- European Union-15 (EU15) 120t, 120
- SRCA index 116, 117t
- European Venture Capital Association (EVCA) 229, 231n, 235(n2)
- Evenson, R. 131, 132–3, 138, 146(n1)
- exports/export markets 135, 138, 158
- externalities 106, 123
- F-test 138n, 140n, 141n
- factor analysis with varimax rotation 162
- family 157
- fashion 156, 158, 159
- 'clothes' 154–5
- fax 62
- FDI *see* foreign direct investment
- Fecher, F. 106
- Federal Science Policy 125
- fees 75, 212
- Feldman, M. 223
- fields
- scientific 116, 123
- technological 116
- 'fields' (Breschi, Lissoni, Montobbio) 85–90, 91t, 94, 100t, 101(n5)
- conversion table 100t
- finance 66–7, 154, 159
- financial data 41
- financial institutions 225
- financial markets 160t, 164t, 168
- Asia 12, 154
- performance 52
- financial resources 47
- access 8, 84
- lack of 211
- financial sector (USA) 130
- financial services 74
- financial systems 222, 223
- Finland 10, 101(n7), 117n, 120t, 230, 231t
- firms *see* companies
- first-mover advantage 176
- fixed-effect model 44, 120, 121t, 145t
- fixed effects 98t, 101(n6), 121t, 137–44, 145t, 184
- firm 179–82, 183t, 185t, 187t, 188t, 192
- technology 180–2, 183t, 185t, 187t, 188t, 192
- time 181, 182, 183t, 185t, 187t, 188t, 192
- FIZ Karlsruhe 36
- Flamm, K. 192–3
- Florida, R. 125(n2)
- focus (corporate R&D) 13, 14, 171, 172, 174, 177–9, 182, 184–92, 195t, 196(n13)
- Fogarty, M. S. 197

- foreign direct investment (FDI) 105,
 107, 111, 124, 130, 151
 four-digits Nace-bel code 210
 Frame, J. D. 109
 France 113, 113t, 117n, 120t, 122t,
 146t, 230, 231t
 France: Patent Office (INPI) 126(n14)
 franchising 76
 Franzoni, C. 101(n7)
 Fraser Institute 135
 fraud 135
 Fraunhofer Institute of Systems and
 Innovation Research (ISI,
 Germany) 101(n3), 126(n14)
 ISI web of science database 110,
 117n
Science Citation Index 8, 83, 90,
 91n, 91, 92n
 freedom of exchange 135
 Fulbright Commission 100n

 Gallini, N. T. 129
 Gambardella, A. 135, 144
 Garg, S. 2, 12–13, 152, 153, 169(n1)
 GDP (gross domestic product) 17,
 135, 224t, 224n, 224, 229
 GDP growth (*Y*) 223, 226, 227–8,
 230–5
 GDP per capita 11, 145
 natural log (*gdp*) 133–4, 134t,
 136–9, 140t, 142–4, 145t
 Gemünden, H. G. 206
 gender 95, 96t
 genetics 117t
 geographical distance 109, 115, 155,
 156, 160t, 164t, 164
 geosciences 117t
 German subsidiary (of European
 MNE) 152
 Germany 113, 113t, 117n, 120t,
 122t, 123, 146t, 229, 230, 231t,
 232t
 R&D internationalization 125(n2)
 Geroski, P. A. 55(n8), 134, 138
 Gilson, R. J. 222, 223
 Glazier, S. C. 204
 Glen, J., *et al.* (2001) 48, 56
 Lee, K. 56
 Singh, A. 56

 Glisman, H. H. 125(n4)
 Global Entrepreneurship Monitor
 229–30
 global perspective 2t
 globalization 77
 GLS 232t
 Goeller, S. 78n
 Goldwell 30t
 Gompers, P. 222–6, 230, 233, 234t
 goodwill [accountancy] 46
 Gould, D. M. 132, 135, 139,
 146(n5)
 government agencies 173, 176n,
 178n, 181
 patent ownership 88n
 governments 12, 107, 160t, 169,
 222, 225
 China 159
 ‘hinder innovation’ (Asia) 156–7
 negative impact (Asia) 166, 167t
 ‘unhealthy collusion’ with business
 158
 United Kingdom 55–6(n11), 77
 ‘use ends to justify means’ 74
 ‘grace period’ rule 101(n2)
 Graham, S., *et al.* (2003) 22, 38
 Hall, B. H. 38
 Harhoff, D. 38
 Mowery, D. C. 38
 Granstrand, O., *et al.* (1992) 107, 128
 Hakanson, L. 128
 Sjolander, S. 128
 Grant, R. M. 216–17
 Greece 117n, 120t, 146t
 Green, K. 56
 Greene, W. H. 219(n1)
 Greenhalgh, C. xv, 2, 4–6, 45, 47,
 48, 50, 54n, 54(n1–2)
 Greenhalgh, C., *et al.* (2003) 54(n2),
 57
 Bosworth, D. 57
 Longland, M. 57
 Greunz, L. 125n
 Griffith, R. 56
 Griliches, Z. 43, 102, 125(n4), 127,
 146(n1), 201, 203, 220
 Grossman, G. M. 133, 139
 Gruben, W. C. 132, 135, 139,
 146(n5)

- Guellec, D. 229
 Gurmu, S. 103
- Hakanson, L. 128
 Hall, B. H. 23, 29, 38(n7), 38, 54(n3),
 102, 127, 131, 220
 Hall, B. H., *et al.* (1986) 203, 205,
 220
 Griliches, Z. 220
 Hausman, J. A. 220
 Hall, B. H., *et al.* (2000) 111,
 126(n11), 128
 Jaffe, A. 128
 Trajtenberg, M. 128
 Hall, B. H., *et al.* (2001) 108,
 112n–115n, 118n, 122n,
 126(n13–14), 128
 Jaffe, A. 128
 Trajtenberg, M. 128
 Hanel, P. 220
 Harding, R. 125(n2)
 Harhoff, D. xv–xvi, 3–4, 23, 25–7,
 29, 30n, 31n, 33n, 38(n2, n7), 38,
 171
 Harhoff, D., *et al.* (2003) 26, 39,
 126(n10), 128, 196(n2), 197
 Scherer, F. M. 39, 128, 197
 Vopel, K. 39, 128, 197
 Hart, B. 78n
 Hartel, H. 34
 Harvard University xvi
 Hausman, J. A. 220
 Hausman, J. A. *et al.* (1984) 95, 102
 Griliches, Z. 102
 Hall, B. 102
 Hausman test 120, 121t, 196(n11)
 Haxel, C. 37, 38(n8)
 Heller, M. A. 129
 Hellmann, T. 223, 235(n1)
 Helpman, E. 129–30, 133, 144
 Henderson, R. 101(n1), 177
 Henderson, R., *et al.* (1998) 101(n1),
 103, 132, 147
 Jaffe, A. 102, 147
 Trajtenberg, M. 102, 147
 Henkel 4, 29–34, 36, 37
 documentation practice 38(n8)
 successful attacks on rivals' patents
 33
 'successful user of patent opposition
 system' 37
 Heshmati, A. 207
 heteroscedasticity 209
 high-technology exports: ratio to
 manufactured exports (*HT*) 134,
 134t, 135, 137t, 138t, 138–42,
 143t, 145t
 Hirshman–Herfindahl Index (HHI)
 177, 178n, 189
 Hitotsubashi University (Tokyo) xvi,
 xviii, 2, 193
 Hoechst 34, 35, 36, 38(n10)
 home base augmenting (HBA) sites
 107–8, 110t, 111, 115, 119
 'likely to be located near
 universities' 108
 home base exploiting (HBE) sites
 107–8, 110t, 111, 119
 'home effect' 15
 Hong Kong 146t, 154t, 156, 159,
 161t
 Horn, E. I. 125(n4)
 Howitt, P. 56, 135
 Hsu, C. W. 152
 Huber weights 55(n4)
 human capital 104, 106, 121
 Hungary 146t
- ICT *see* information and
 communications technology
 IMF (International Monetary Fund)
 229
 imitation/imitators 129–30, 144,
 163, 163t, 209–10, 212, 216, 223
 immunology 116, 117t
 'inadequate mindset' 155
 incentives 59, 177
 financial 8
 innovation 130, 166
 investment 7, 58–60, 71, 78(n1)
 scientific productivity 83
 taxation 107, 124
 India 146t, 151, 154t, 154, 156, 161t
 individuals 1, 18, 83, 95, 99, 135
 heterogeneity 100
 patent ownership 88t
 patenting–publishing relationship
 84–5, 101(n1–3)

- Indonesia 146t, 152, 154
- industrial classification 55(n8), 181
 - product-based 40
 - share of IT patents to total patents
 - in each sector 173, 194t
 - types with respect to IT 194t
- industrial concentration 48, 202
- industrial structure 11, 131, 135, 138, 144
- industries/industry 42, 44, 46n, 48, 55(n9), 83, 134, 161t, 203, 213
 - linkage with universities 172
- industry structure 145
- influential observation problems 55(n7)
- information 36
 - deficiencies 34–5
 - qualitative 22
 - superior 34
 - symmetrical 25
- information asymmetry 26, 157, 158
- information and communications technology (ICT) 131, 135, 145
 - diffusion 144
 - expenditure: ratio to GDP
 - (ICT) 133–5, 137t, 138t, 138–44, 145t
 - OECD definition 196(n1)
- information technology *see* IT
- initial public offering (IPO) 17, 222, 224t, 224n, 224, 233, 234t
- innovation 1, 2, 5, 6, 46, 48, 56(n11), 61, 74, 109, 232
 - appropriate management
 - methods 166, 167t
 - Asian characteristics 151–70
 - barriers 15
 - business rewards (Asia) 166
 - challenges (Asia) 162, 163, 164t, 164
 - classification (Asian respondents) 166–8
 - commercialization 130
 - division of labour 192
 - effectiveness of patents as incentive
 - (empirical evidence) 131–2
 - external rewards 166, 167t, 168
 - hurdles and success factors (Asia) 163–5
 - importance (Asian respondents) 162–3
 - lack of appreciation for intangible side 158–9
 - lack of external pressure (Asia) 166
 - management education 169
 - microdeterminants 201
 - northern rate 129
 - 'not automatically improved by stronger IPRs' 11–12, 144–5
 - pace 9
 - patent length (Japan) 132
 - quality and quantity 13
 - relationship with competition
 - (non-monotonic) 55(n6)
 - senior managers (differences in opinion) 165–6
 - value 40
- innovation function 133
- innovation management 152–3, 169(n2)
 - Asia 166, 168
 - implementation of concepts (Asia) 12
 - statements about key success factors 159, 160t
- innovation management and IPRs 149–237
 - complex innovation strategies and patenting behaviour 199–221
- innovation in Asia
 - (characteristics) 151–70
- IT inventions (importance of speed, science linkage, focus, and new entry) 171–98
- relationship between patents and venture capital 222–37
- innovation process 40
 - Asian firms (specific perceptions and competencies) 12–13, 151–70
 - relationship with patents 3
 - speed 13, 14
- innovation rents 199, 201, 203, 204, 208, 217
- protection 209

- 'innovation starters' 13, 166, 167t, 168, 169
 - innovation strategies (complex) and patenting behaviour 199–221
 - barrier perception variables 211–12, 214–16, 217
 - basic statistics 212–13
 - binary logit model 200, 208, 214t, 214, 215t, 219(n1)
 - chapter content 199
 - chapter objective 218
 - chapter structure 200
 - concluding remarks 218–19
 - data (original survey) 200
 - departure from existing empirical studies 200
 - dimensions 199
 - direction of causality 203
 - efficiency effect and replacement effect 202
 - empirical implementation 208–13, 219(n1–4)
 - empirical models 200
 - empirical results 213–17, 218
 - factor analysis 210, 212, 219(n4)
 - firm and sector characteristics 209–10, 212, 213–16, 219(n2–3)
 - further research 218–19
 - hypotheses 207, 217
 - innovation strategy variables 210–11, 219(n4)
 - literature background 201–3
 - negative binomial model 200, 209, 214t, 214, 215t
 - probit model 219(n1)
 - theoretical framework 200, 203–8
 - innovation strategy 3, 16, 223
 - firm's patenting behaviour depends on 15–16, 199–221
 - four main dimensions 15
 - innovative activity 138
 - cumulative 228
 - definition 132–3, 146(n1)
 - determinants 132
 - value 50–2, 55(n9–10)
 - 'varies substantially across firms' 52
 - INPADOC 35
 - INSEAD: Paris xv
 - INSEAD: Singapore 1
 - institutional environment (*IE*) 11, 133–45, 145t
 - see also* scientific institutions
 - instruments 24t, 43n, 84, 173, 194t
 - intellectual property *see* IP
 - Intellectual Property Institute of London 78n
 - intellectual property rights *see* IPRs
 - interaction 137, 139–40, 142
 - market share and IP activity 50–2, 53, 55(n10)
 - VC and IP 61
 - interest rates (*r*) 224t, 226, 229
 - long-term 17, 223, 228, 230, 232t, 233, 234t, 235
 - short-term 17, 223, 225, 227–8, 230, 232t, 233, 234t
 - International Conference of the Hitotsubashi COE Programme on 'Knowledge, Innovation and the Japanese Corporate System' (Hitotsubashi University) 193
 - International Patents Classification (IPC) 109t, 126(n13)
 - Internationale*
 - Dokumentationsgesellschaft für Chemie GmbH* (International Documentation Corporation for Chemistry) (IDC, 1967–97) 34–7, 38, 38(n8–11)
 - database 34, 35, 36, 37
 - dissolution (1997) 36
 - expenses 34, 36
 - history/origins 34, 38(n9)
 - running costs 34
 - special coding system 35
 - state of the art 35–6, 37
- internationalization 209, 214t, 215t
 - Internet i, 36, 77, 83, 153, 155
 - see also* websites
 - interviews 36–7, 38(n3, n9), 73, 77, 87, 152, 154, 158, 159
 - by telephone 64
 - 'inventing around' 208
 - invention
 - performance (firms, by region) 189–91
 - propensity 60

- inventions 7, 74–5
 adaptation to local markets 119
 competitive 184
 non-patented 203
 patentable 211, 218
- inventors 2t, 10, 60, 74, 76, 84
 ‘Belgian’ 108, 112, 112t–115t,
 118, 118t, 119–20, 121, 123,
 126(n17, n19)
 ‘Belgian’ (definition) 121
 country of residence 121, 122t
 domestic 121t
 foreign 123, 124
 independent 4
 new 111–12, 121, 122t, 124,
 126(n19)
 propensity to publish 95, 96t
- investment 60, 106, 225
 innovation 6
 later-stage incentives 7
 patent documentation 26
 R&D 61
- investment opportunities 70, 71, 73
- investment propensity 154
- investors 226, 230
- IP (intellectual property) 1, 58
 competition (UK) 40–57
 market value (UK firms) 40–57
 ‘no share market premia’ 49
 objective 59
 per firm 53
 policy design 12
 volatile activity 44–5
- IP management xvii, 3, 4
- IP protection 16, 109, 141, 200
 enforcement 12, 157
 inadequate 163, 164t, 165
- IPO *see* initial public offering
- IPR (intellectual property right) effect
 142
- IPR index 136, 136f, 146(n3)
- IPR system 5, 6, 50, 158–9
- IPRs (intellectual property rights) 87,
 158, 160t, 177, 223
 context (economic and
 institutional) 131
 definition 68
 ‘do not always lead to more
 innovation’ 11–12, 129–48
- economic impact 130–1
 economic impact ‘dependent on
 industrial structure or trade
 structure’ 135
 effect on innovation and economic
 growth 18
 effect on VC investment decisions
 6–7, 61–2
 effectiveness (might not be
 identical across countries)
 131, 144–5
 further research 11–12
 impact on VC funds 226
 ‘increasingly important in
 determining firm’s value’ 3
 ‘intellectual property *ratchets*’
 (alternative key to
 abbreviation) 59, 78(n1)
- inverted-U relation with
 innovations (Lerner) 132
- management perspectives 1–18
 ‘perfect’ (Arrow) 48
- protection and enforcement 12
- retained by companies 89–90
- role in investment in business
 methods 71–4
 role in VC decisions (opinions
 regarding) 68–9
- separate impact 137
- significance in VC investment
 decisions 69
- trade balance 158
- venture capital and 61–2
- IPRs: economics and management
 perspectives
 advanced research findings
 1–18
 effectiveness of patents in
 stimulating innovation 2–3
 further research 4–7, 9–18,
 34, 37–8, 54, 124–5, 192,
 218–19
- innovation process (relationship
 with patents) 3
- multidisciplinary approach 1
 objective of book 1
- IPRs: index (*IPR*) 133, 134t, 136–44
 interacted with other independent
 variables 134

- IPRs: strengthening of (effect on number of patents)
- baseline model 134, 137–41, 146(n4–5)
 - empirical evidence ‘mixed’ 131–2, 141–2, 145
 - extended model 134, 140t–141t, 141–4
 - findings 131, 144–5
 - interaction 137, 139–40, 142
 - model specification and descriptive statistics 132–7, 146(n1–3)
 - organization of paper 131
 - policy implications 145
 - purpose of paper 131
 - theoretical studies 129–31
- Ireland 117n, 120t, 146t, 230, 231t
- ISI *see* Fraunhofer Institute of Systems and Innovation Research
- Islam 156
- Israel 117n, 146t
- IT (information technology) 13
- definition 173, 196(n1, n6)
 - technology classification 173, 193t
- IT Innovation Conference (Hitotsubashi University) 193
- IT inventions: importance of speed, science linkage, focus, and new entrants 171–98
- conclusions 191–2
 - econometric specification and dataset 179–81, 196(n10)
 - endogeneity issue 173–4, 192
 - estimation results 181–9
 - evaluation of sources of invention
 - performance of firms by regions 189–91
 - findings 192
 - hypotheses (improved performance of US firms) 171–2
 - limitations and further research 192
 - objective of paper 172
 - organization of paper 174
 - overview of firm-level R&D
 - performance and its determinants 174–9
 - patent data 173
 - patent quality (forward citations per patent) 181–6, 189, 192, 196(n11–12)
 - patent quantity 186–9, 192, 196(n13)
 - performance of firms by three regions 174–6, 196(n7)
 - speed of R&D and absorptive capacity of firm to use scientific knowledge 176–7, 196(n8–9)
 - summary statistics 195t
 - three new dimensions introduced 172–3
- IT sector 67, 67t, 69t, 70t, 70, 71t
- ‘dependence on scientific research’ 172
- IT core sector 173–6, 184–6, 188t, 189–92, 194t, 195t, 196(n12)
- IT-incorporating machinery firms 173–6, 186, 191f, 191, 192, 194t, 195t
- ‘other IT-using firms’ 173, 175f, 185t, 188t, 191f, 191, 192, 194t, 195t
- Italy 2t, 3, 117n, 120t, 146t, 230, 231t
- open science and university patenting (bibliometric analysis) 83–103
 - patent ownership 88t
 - publishing–patenting relationship 8–9
- Italy: Ministry of Education (MIUR) 85, 87, 100n, 101(n4)
- Italy: National Agency for Alternative Energy (ENEA) 87
- Italy: National Research Council 87
- Itami, H. 192
- Jacquemin, A. 55(n8)
- Jaffe, A. B. 59, 102, 109, 127, 128, 147, 196(n10), 220
- Jaffe, A. B., *et al.* (2002) 196(n2), 197
- Fogarty, M. S. 197
- Trajtenberg, M. 197

- Japan xvi, 2, 13, 16, 59, 60, 117n, 146t, 151, 154t, 156, 158, 159, 169(n2), 189, 190f, 222, 230, 231t
 patent reform (1988) 132
 R&D internationalization 125(n2)
- Japanese Patent Office (JPO) 15, 229
- Jeng, L. A. 222, 223–6, 233, 234t
- joint ventures (research) 125(n3)
- journals 8, 14, 84, 91, 101(n3), 172
- Kabla, I. 201, 202, 205, 216, 217, 220
- Kamien, M. I. 55(n6)
- Kang Sung-Jin xvi, 2, 11–12, 138
- Kanwar, S. 132–3, 138, 146(n1)
- KAO 30t, 31t
- Kendall's W test 69, 69t–71t
- Kenney, M. 223, 235
- Khan Adam, M. N. 170
- Kim, W. C. 153
- Kleinknecht, A. 201–2, 205, 206, 208, 216, 217, 221
- Klerovick, A. K. 220
- knowledge
 adaptation to local markets 123
 common pool 84
 external 172, 199, 201, 206
 new 199
 superior 35
- knowledge base 111, 115, 116, 117, 135, 200, 211, 216–17, 218
- knowledge capital 104
- knowledge management 38
- knowledge resources 169
 availability 167t
 lack of some (Asia) 165, 167t, 167
- knowledge stock 17, 228
- knowledge transfer and intellectual property systems 81–148
 brain drain and R&D activities of multinationals 104–28
 intellectual property rights (effect on number of patents) 129–48
 open science and university patenting (bibliometric analysis of Italian case) 83–103
- Kokko, A. 106
- Kolb, A. 34
- Korea, Republic of (South Korea) 146t, 151, 154t, 154, 161t
- Kortum, S. 60, 61, 130, 131, 135, 144, 146(n1), 192, 232, 235(n1)
- Krauze, T. D. 102
- Kruskal–Wallis (K–W) one-way ANOVA tests 66
- Kuemmerle, W. 108
- L'Oréal 30t, 32, 33t
 'highest success in getting rivals' patents revoked' 33
 'leading patent holder' 29
 oppositions filed 29
 own patents revoked 29
- laboratories 16, 87, 88, 107, 210, 218
 patent ownership 88n
see also research institutes
- labour cost 155
- labour force/workforce 126(n18), 160t
see also personnel
- labour market 106, 110
 impact of MNEs' R&D activities 111
 legislation 225
 rigidities 222, 224t, 225, 228, 234t
- Lai, E. L.-C. 130, 139
- Lall, S. 130–1, 134
- Lambert Review of Business University Collaboration* (2003) 54
- language 91, 160t
- lead-times, industrial 125(n5), 132, 207
- Lee, K. 56
- legal environment 7
- legal protection 228
- legal structures 224
- legislation 107, 111, 225
- Lerner, J. 60, 61, 101(n1), 130, 131, 132, 135, 144, 192, 222–6, 230, 232, 233, 234t, 235(n1)
- Lev, B. 21
- Leverhulme Trust 54n
- Levin, R. C. 201, 202

- Levin, R. C., *et al.* (1987) 202, 208, 220
 Klerovick, A. K. 220
 Nelson, R. R. 220
 Winter, S. G. 220
- Levinthal, D. 49
- licences 158
- licensing 75, 76, 100, 105, 130, 204, 206, 216, 217
- Likert scales 211, 212, 213
- linearly interpolate method 135
- Lissoni, F. xvi, 8–9, 100n, 102
- litigation/court cases 22, 59
- Lockett, A., *et al.* (2002) 61, 79
 Murray, G. 79
 Wright, M. 79
- log-linear equations 133
- Long, J. S. 95, 102
- Long, J. S., *et al.* (1993) 95, 102
 Allison, P. D. 102
 McGinnis, R. 102
- Longland, M. 47, 57, 54n, 54(n1–2)
- Löf, H. 207
- Lott, J. 61
- Loury, G. 55(n6)
- Luwel, M. 128
- Luxembourg 117n, 120t, 120
- machinery 43n, 108, 135, 173, 184, 194t
- Machlup, F. 58
- macroeconomic perspective 2t, 2–3, 151, 234t
- Mairesse, J. 95, 220
- Malaysia 156, 161t
- Malaysian subsidiary (of European MNE) 152
- management 2t, 2, 73, 161t, 165, 177
 Asian approach/style 166, 167t
 perspectives on IPRs 1–18
- management (educational discipline) 13
- management buy-ins (MBIs) 65, 66t, 66–7, 235(n2)
- management buy-outs (MBOs) 65, 66t, 66–7, 235(n2)
- management practice 13, 171
- managers 155, 158–65, 166–9
 ‘innovation starters’ 13, 166, 167t, 168, 169
 ‘poor in knowledge resources’ 13, 167t, 167, 168, 169
 senior 12, 152–3, 158, 159, 161, 162
 ‘stuck in muck’ 13, 167t, 167–8, 169
 ‘tradition fighters’ 13, 167t, 167, 168, 169
- managing directors 161t
- Manila 156
- Mann–Whitney tests 68, 69, 69t–72t
- mannequins 158
- Mansfield, E. 130, 134, 144
- manufacturing 42, 43t, 43n, 46t, 49t, 50, 51t, 107, 151, 158, 207, 208, 219(n3)
- Marfouk, A. 119, 120n, 126(n18)
- market access 125(n3)
- market capitalization growth (MCG) 224n, 224, 234t
- market concentration 205, 210
- market dominance 71
- market input 155–6
- market lead 201, 212
- market opportunity 202–3, 205, 209, 214, 218
- market power 5, 41, 53, 200, 201, 202
 firm-level differences 50
- market share 6, 41, 44, 48, 50–2, 55(n9–10), 120, 160t, 202
 ‘no significant interaction with R&D’ 50
 proxy for market power 5
 threshold 53
- market size 139
- market structure 5, 145
- market understanding 166
- market value 40–57, 171
 regressions 44–7, 54–5(n4–5)
 variations across sectors 53
- marketing 12, 71, 155–6, 159, 160t, 163t, 164
- markets 42, 164t, 165
 Asian 160t

- markets – *continued*
- closed, parochial 156
 - local 107
 - local conditions 111
 - overseas 75
 - reliance on 135
 - trend-setting 155
 - Western 160t
 - world 107
- Markiewicz, K. R. 97, 99, 101(n1)
- Marti, J. 225
- Martin, C. 38, 38(n9)
- Maskin, E. 129
- Maskus, K. 109, 129, 130
- materials processing and handling 114t, 115t, 116
- materials science 116, 117t
- materials technology 85, 86t, 87t, 88t, 94, 100t
- mathematics 116, 117t
- Mauborgne, R. 153
- McGinnis, R. 102
- media/press 160t, 164t, 164, 165
- Merton, R. K. 85
- Mexico 146t
- Meyer, M. 196(n9)
- Meyer, M., *et al.* (2003) 101(n7), 102
- Siniläinen, T. 102
 - Utecht, J. T. 102
- microbiology 116, 117t
- microeconomic analysis 54
- Miozzo, M. 56
- MIT Sloan School of Management, 100n
- MNEs *see* multinational enterprises
- Mohnen, P. 221
- monopolies 47–8, 74, 75
- Montobbio, F. xvi, 8–9, 102
- Mowery, D. C. 38, 101(n1), 132
- Mowery, D. C., *et al.* (2001) 132, 148
- Sampat, B. 148
 - Ziedonis, A. 148
- MSTI 231n
- Mueller, D. C. 48
- multicollinearity 45
- multinational enterprises (MNEs)
- affiliates 105, 124
 - direct patenting in home country 115
 - foreign 11
 - headquarters 109
 - host economies 105–7, 109–11, 115, 119, 123, 124, 125
 - investment decisions 105
 - presence of subsidiaries in small open economy (Belgium) 105, 123
 - R&D 3, 104–28
 - R&D (degree of internationalization) 105, 107, 111, 112–15, 120, 121t, 121, 123–5, 126(n12–14)
 - R&D activities (main objective) 123
 - R&D ‘delocalization’ 105, 110t, 110, 112, 116, 123
 - ‘reduce risk of brain drain’ 9–11 *see also* companies
 - multivariate techniques 162
 - Munich 38(n3)
 - Murray, G. 61, 79
 - mutual investment fund 71
 - MyWeb.com 153
 - Nagaoka, S. xvi–xvii, 3, 13–15, 172
 - Nakamura, Y. 196(n7)
 - Narin, F. 196(n5)
 - Narula, R. 125(n2)
 - NASDAQ 130
 - national champions 157
 - natural resources 155
 - NBER Productivity Seminars 100n
 - Nederlandse Staatsmijnen 34
 - NEDO 193
 - Nelson, R. R. 147, 201, 220
 - Netherlands 113, 113t, 117n, 120t, 122t, 146t, 230, 231t
 - neuroscience 117t
 - new entrants 13–15, 48, 171, 174, 177–9, 181, 183t, 184, 189, 191, 192
 - cumulative effects 190f
 - definition 172–3, 177
 - performance relative to
 - incumbents 172, 177, 178f, 179, 182
 - ‘superior innovators’ 177
 - New Zealand 146t

- Nickell, S. J. 55(n8)
 Nielsen, A. O. 202
 Nlemvo, F. 103
 Nordhaus, W. D. 11, 129
 Norway 117n, 146t, 230, 231t
 nuclear and X-rays 114t, 118t
- Observatoire des Sciences et des
 Techniques (OST) 126(n14)
- OECD xviii, 10, 119, 136, 137f, 229,
 230, 231n, 232t, 235(n1)
 classification of manufacturing
 firms 219(n3)
 definition of ICT 196(n1, n6)
 'industrialized countries' 17, 112,
 156, 158, 169(n2), 222
 'North' 129
 SRCA index 116, 117t
 office equipment 173, 181, 196(n1)
 Office of Fair Trading (UK) 54
 Office of Tax Policy Research (OTPR)
 230
- OIPRC *see* Oxford Intellectual
 Property Research Centre
- OLS (ordinary least squares) 45, 46n,
 54(n4), 96t
- open economies 140–1
 open science 83–103
 'open science institutions'
 patent ownership 88t
- open science and university patenting
 (bibliometric analysis) 83–103
 academic patenting 'seems to
 improve publication
 performance' 8–9
 conclusions 98–100
 datasets 83
 further research 9
 panel data analysis of scientists'
 publication activity (effect of
 patenting) 93–8, 101(n6)
 patent data 86–90
 policy conclusion ('impossible to
 derive any') 99
 publication data 90–3
 optics 114t, 118, 118t, 173, 194t
 organic compounds 114t, 115t, 118,
 118t, 119
 organic fine chemistry 116, 119
- organizational capabilities 4, 34–7,
 38(n8–11)
- Orsi, F. 130
- Österreichische Stickstoffwerke 34,
 38(n11)
- Oxford Intellectual Property Research
 Centre (OIPRC) xv, xvii
 database 5, 41–2, 43n, 54n,
 54(n2)
 website 62, 78(n4)
- P&G (Procter & Gamble) 29–32, 33t
- Pakistan 161t
- panel data 2, 40, 44, 45, 55(n10),
 120, 121t, 131, 139, 234t
- panel data analysis
 (patenting–publishing
 relationship) 93–8, 101(n6)
 dynamic effects around the patent
 97–8, 99
 inventors versus non-inventors
 95–6
 treatment effect 97
- Papanastassiou, M. 125(n2)
- paper 113, 114t
- Park, W. G. 133
- Parr, R. L. 204
- patent activity (UK) 50–2
 UK firms 134
- patent amendment 23, 24t, 24–5
- patent applicants 112t, 118t
 categories 109
 foreign 120t, 121t
- patent applications 7, 11, 36, 59,
 71t, 74, 84, 85, 87, 101(n2), 106,
 108–9, 109t, 113, 114t, 121, 122t,
 126(n7–8), 144, 176, 201–2, 203,
 204
 country of origin 133
 foreign 123
 ownership (effect on investment
 attractiveness) 70–1
 pro-cyclical 134
 signalling effect 73
- patent claims 35, 59, 111, 117, 118t
- patent data 126(n12), 146(n2), 201
- patent density (*P*) 77, 78(n6), 133,
 134t, 137t
- patent departments (corporate) 201

- patent documentation 34–7,
 - 38(n8–11), 126(n19)
 - in-house centres 4
 - organizational capabilities 3
- Patent Documentation Group 35
- patent grants 109, 126(n8)
- patent laws 6, 58, 59, 109, 133
- ‘novelty step’ requirement 84
- patent lawyers 38(n3), 58–9
- patent opposition (opposition to
 - rivals’ patents) 3, 21–2, 35–6, 37
- aggressiveness 32
- biotechnology sector 25
- cosmetics and detergents industries
 - 28–34, 38(n6–7)
- cost 23, 25, 26, 27f, 27, 38(n5)
- defence 4
- determinants 3–4
- development of heterogeneous
 - (corporate) capabilities 3–4, 26–37
- entitled to proceed with case on its
 - own motion 23, 25
- European Patent Office 23–5,
 - 38(n1–2)
- further research 4
- incidence of opposition and appeal
 - 23–5, 38(n2)
- institutional background 23
- likelihood 25–6
- likelihood of winning 26
- multiple 29
- outcomes 23, 24t
- pharmaceutical sector 25
- probability of success 25
- proportion (of total patents) 4
- quality 26, 27f
- rejection 23, 24t, 25
- settlement negotiations 25, 38(n3)
- specialization advantages 29, 37
- strategic benefits, 27, 33–4
- success factors 4
- success rates 27
- theory 25–8, 38(n3–5)
- ‘unique research lens’ 22
- patent portfolios 14, 32, 172, 200,
 - 204, 205f, 205, 207–14, 218
- differentiation 16
- HHI index 177, 178n
- large 4
- size 16, 199, 208, 209, 213, 216, 217
- patent protection 68, 135, 211, 216
 - duration 133
 - inefficient 203
 - lack of (significance in investment decisions) 70t
 - role in VC investment decisions 69–70
 - scope 59
- patent revocation 22–34
 - benefit 38(n5)
 - detergents 32
 - probability 26, 27f
 - rate 29
 - right of appeal 23, 24t, 24, 28
- patent rights, battle for 3, 21–39
 - data 22, 37
 - determinants of opposition 21, 25–6, 28–34, 38(n6–7)
 - determinants of opposition incidence 28
 - determinants of successful defence against opposition 21
 - determinants of successful opposition 21, 34–7, 38(n8–11)
 - extent of opposition 21, 22, 23–5, 26, 29–32, 33t, 38(n2)
 - further research 34, 37–8
 - ‘lengthy process’ 23, 24t
 - organizational capabilities and patent documentation 34–7, 38(n8–11)
 - patent rivalry in cosmetics and detergents industries 28–34, 38(n6–7)
 - successful defence against opposition 22, 24t, 26
 - three questions 21
- patent system/s 7, 11, 74, 129, 201
 - boundaries 58
 - cost–benefit analysis 75
 - effectiveness in stimulating innovation 2–3
 - historical role (controversial) 6
 - limitations and inefficiencies 200, 207–8
 - motivations for use 60

- patent system/s – *continued*
 providers of incentives to invest
 58–60, 78(n1)
 social benefits sought 75
 use 15
- patent trends 136, 136f
- patent value 26, 27f, 110t, 111, 116,
 119, 123, 126(n10–11), 171
 battle for patent rights 21–39
 BMPs and VC investment decisions
 58–79
 intellectual property, competition,
 and value of UK firms 40–57
- patenting 6, 42, 50, 111, 120
 complex innovation strategies
 199–221
 determinants (traditional) 201
 panel data analysis of scientists’
 publication activity 93–8,
 101(n6)
 relationship with R&D 203
- patenting propensity 60, 108, 109,
 115, 126(n15), 189, 203, 207
- patenting–publishing relationship
 83, 84–5, 86–7, 97, 98–9,
 101(n1–3)
 ‘beneficial effect of patenting’
 97–8
 error terms 93
 panel data analysis 93–8, 101(n6)
- patents 10, 41, 68, 73, 101(n5), 119
 active 16
 claims information 35
 co-invented 112, 121
 competitors’ 204
 distribution by academic inventors
 and field (Italy) 87t
 drafting 35
 dynamic effects (Italy) 97–8
 effect of strengthened IPRs 129–48
 effectiveness 1, 2, 131–2
 enforcement mechanisms 133
 high-value 17, 232
 ‘imperfect indicators of innovation’
 204
 important 26
 incentives to invest 60
 ‘ineffectiveness for protection of
 inventions’ 131
- innovation-promoting role
 (variation by industry)
 134–5
- interaction with openness
 146(n5)
- international agreements 133
- Italian data 86–90
- Japanese 60
 lapse 25
 length 132
 macro level 59
 market valuation 2
 micro level 58–9
 monotonic increase 136, 136f
 multiple holders 38(n6)
 nineteenth century debate 58, 59
 ‘old questions, new circumstances’
 58, 59
- policy shifts (cross-country study)
 132
- portfolio size 118
- primary objective 199
- priority date 94
- priority rule 176
- propensity to oppose 27
- quality 14, 47, 60, 132, 179, 181,
 204
- quality measure 171, 173–9,
 181–6, 196(n11–12)
- quantity/number 13, 14, 60, 138,
 176, 179, 200, 212t, 223
- quantity measure 171, 173, 174,
 175f, 181, 186–9, 196(n13)
- renewal fees 25, 200, 204
- scope 61, 111, 176, 177
- specifications 126(n6)
- statistics 108, 125(n4), 203
- strategic tools 199, 204
- technological classification 116
- theoretical role 61, 71
- triadic (*PAT*) 17, 223, 228–35
- type 2
 UK 2, 51t, 52
- underlying patent literature 14
- unopposed 26
- US companies 130
- valuable 4
- venture capital 222–37
- Patents Act (UK, 1977) 76, 78(n2)

- patents granted 108–9, 126(n7), 174, 179, 180, 183t, 184–91, 195t
 citation lag 176
 USA 181
- Pavitt, K. 40–2, 43n, 52
 sector typology 5, 41, 42, 43t, 45, 46t, 48–53, 55(n7–8)
- Pearce, R. 125(n2)
- Peeters, C. xvii, 3, 15–16, 208, 212n, 213, 214n, 215n, 219(n4)
 post-doctoral fellowship 219
- Penn World Tables 134
- Penrose, E. T. 58, 74
- pension fund regulations (USA) 130
- pension funds 224t, 225, 226, 234t
- perception 12–13, 60, 165
 Asian versus Western goods 158, 163t, 164t, 164
 barriers to innovation 200, 204, 205f, 205, 207, 209, 211–12, 214–16, 217
 effectiveness of patenting system 207
 limitation of patent system 200, 204, 205f, 205, 207–8, 212, 215t, 217
 need to innovate 166, 167t, 167
- Pérez-Castrillo, D. 220
- personnel
 emigration 10, 111, 120–1
 highly qualified 10, 106, 107, 110, 111, 115, 119, 120–1, 123–4, 151
see also brain drain
- Pettersson, H. 61
- petroleum 135
- pharmaceuticals 7, 55(n9), 77, 78(n6), 114t, 115t, 115, 177, 189, 203
- pharmaceutics 134
- pharmacology 85, 86t, 87t, 90t, 91t, 94, 96t, 96, 100t, 116, 117t
- Philippines 161t
- Pianta, M. 125(n4)
- 'Pinoy2Pinoy' (De Meyer and Bhardwaj, 2003) 156
- Pitkethly, R. H. xvii, 2, 6–7, 59, 78n
- plant and animal science 116, 117t
- poisson model 209
- Poland 146t
- policy-makers 1, 13, 18, 104, 152
- 'poor in knowledge resources' 13, 167t, 167, 168, 169
- Portugal 117n, 120t, 120
- post-doctoral fellows 101(n4)
- post-dot.com boom 67, 68
- 'potentially citing patents' 174, 180
- Poterba, J. M. 225, 226
- private sector 160t
- prizes 74
- probit models 223
- process capabilities 155
- process engineering 24t
- process innovation 16, 55(n6), 158, 200, 206, 212t, 213, 215t, 217, 218
- processes 105
 adaptation to local market 107
 new 15, 151, 199, 200, 206, 207, 211, 213
- procurement 12, 157
- product innovation 16, 206, 212t, 213, 215t, 217, 218
- product innovators
 'possess largest patent portfolios' 200
- product markets 168
- product quality 140–1
- production 41, 104, 151
- productivity 54, 56(n11), 60
 R&D 126(n15), 130, 135
 R&D spillovers 106
 research 14, 131, 177, 192
 scientific 3, 83, 90, 91, 93, 97–100
- 'stronger impact of EPO than of UK patents' 47
- 'productivity fixed effect' 8, 84–5, 99
- products 105, 155, 160t
 adaptation to local markets 107, 108, 115
 innovative 158
 new 15, 48, 151, 156, 163, 163t, 164t, 199, 200, 206, 207, 211
 opportunistic adaptations to local markets (Asia) 153
 tangible 158

- 'professors' (Breschi, Lissoni, Montobbio) 101(n4)
see also 'academic inventors'
- profit persistence 5, 41, 48–9, 53, 55(n7–8)
 previous UK studies 55(n8)
- profitability 25, 48, 55(n7), 160t
- profits 41, 130
 monopoly 75
 net before tax 48
 shocks 48, 49
- project management 169
 capabilities (insufficient) 163, 163t, 164t, 165
- projects 10, 37
- property rights 135–6
- proprietary coding system 35
- proximity 107, 125(n1)
- Pruitt, S. 46n
- pseudo-maximum likelihood approach 209
- psychiatry/psychology 117t
- public policy 1, 2t, 2, 10, 54, 55–6(n11), 124–5, 145, 168–9, 235
- public sector 157, 160t
- publication 74, 75, 76
 Italian data 90–3
 panel data analysis 93–8, 101(n6)
 of technical information, 206, 207
- 'publication delay' effect 8, 84, 90, 97–9, 101(n2)
- publication performance
 further research 9
 seems to be improved by academic patenting 8–9, 83–103
- publications 3, 110, 119
 classification 116
 non-linear quadratic trend 95
- Puri, M. 223, 235(n1)
- Qualcomm 172
- quality 47, 110, 160t, 163t, 164, 165
- quality of work 10, 104
- quantitative methods 1, 2t
- questionnaires/surveys 12, 159–61
 anonymity 64
- comments and interview requests 64
- companies with IPRs (effect on VC investment decisions) 6–7
- data analysis 1, 2t
- innovation management (Asia) 152–3
- innovation strategies and patenting (Belgium) 208, 210, 212
- IPRs role in investment in business methods 71
- list of statements 160t
- non-response 63
- response rate 208
- response time 64
- tests for non-response bias 63–4
- venture capital investment decisions 61–4
- R&D (research and development) xvii, 3, 5, 40–2, 43t, 43n, 45, 48, 55(n6), 76, 130, 154t, 154, 201, 225
- collaborative agreements 105
- decentralization and internationalization 107
- domestic 106
- focus 171, 172, 174, 177–9, 182, 186, 191, 192
- global networks 107
- incentives to invest 60
- industrial and academic 224t
- inter-temporal variation 45
- internationalization 10, 107, 125(n2)
- investment propensity 60
- lagged values 52
- local capability 106
- low valuation (UK) 54
- market valuation 53
- new entrants 171, 174, 177–9, 181, 183t, 184, 189, 191, 192
- 'no significant interaction with market share' 50
- overseas 107
- portfolio diversification 177, 186
- relationship with patents 203
- returns (by Pavitt sector) 49, 49t, 50

- R&D (research and development) –
continued
 science linkage 171, 172, 174,
 176–7, 178f, 179, 182, 191, 192,
 196(n8–9)
 scope 186
 speed 14, 171–2, 173, 174, 176–7,
 179, 182, 191, 192, 196(n8–9)
 spillovers 6, 49, 106
 stock market value 5
 strategy 177
 subsidies and tax incentives 107,
 124
 R&D activities of MNEs 104–28
 demand-side factors 107
 determinants 107–8, 125(n1–3)
 environmental factors 107
 further research 10–11
 impact 106
 motives 107–8
 policy implications 10
 purpose of chapter 10
 ‘seem to reduce risk of brain drain’
 9–11
 supply-side factors 107
 R&D budget 16, 199, 205, 207
 R&D capital stock 17
 R&D expenditure/outlays 12, 13, 41,
 42, 44, 46t, 126(n15), 132, 138,
 181, 182, 192, 196(n13)
 business 17
 industrial and academic 226
 ratio to GDP/GNP 133
 USA 196(n4)
 R&D expenditure to GDP (*RD*) 133,
 134t, 136–9, 140t, 141t
 R&D investment 59, 61, 130, 132, 184
 R&D partnerships 199, 200, 210
 R&D performance 172
 determinants 13–14
 effect of speed, science linkage, and
 focus 13–15, 171–98
 further research 14–15
 Rambus 172
 Ramón, B. M. 225
 random effects 44, 120, 121t, 137,
 138t, 139, 140t, 141t, 143t, 144,
 179, 186
 firm 182, 183t
 Raskind, L. J. 59
 real estate 158
 Région de Bruxelles-Capitale 235
 regions 2t, 2, 16, 110
 regulations 217
 inappropriate 211
 pro-business 157
 regulatory environment 12, 157
 Reitzig, M. 25–6, 204
 reputation 8, 26, 223
 research
 academic 211
 basic versus applied 8, 15, 16, 84,
 101(n3), 108, 199, 205, 207,
 210, 212t, 213, 215t, 216
 hindrance 75
 publicly funded 87
 science-based/scientific 13,
 16, 202
 research and development
see R&D
 research institutes 16, 111, 115, 119,
 124, 125, 210, 218
see also laboratories
 research partnerships 15–16, 206,
 207, 210–11, 212t, 213, 215t,
 216–17, 218
 research projects 88, 97, 104, 121
 research questions, ‘focused’ 84
 researchers i, 10, 107
 demand for domestic/local 119,
 121
 industrial 87, 88
 local 111
 scientific 196(n4)
see also academic inventors
 resins 114t, 115t
 ‘resource effect’ 8, 84, 97, 98, 99
 returns to scale, non-constant 43
 reverse-engineering 206
 Rhône-Poulenc 38(n10)
 Rich, Judge 75
 Richardson, S. 170
 ‘right censoring’ 88
 risk 25, 37, 201, 206, 211,
 215t, 217
 risk capital 160t
 insufficient 164t, 164
 risk management 154

- Ritter, T. 206
- Rogers, M. xvii, 2, 4–6, 45, 48, 50, 54n, 54(n1)
- role models 160t
- Romain, A. xvii, 2, 16–17, 231n, 234t, 235, 235(n1)
- Romania 146t
- Romer, P. 133
- Rosenbloom, R. S. 172
- Ross, D. 55(n6)
- royalties 158
- Ruhrchemie 34
- Russia 146t
- S&T *see* science and technology
- Sabourin, D. 220
- Said Business School 78n
- Sakakibara, M. 59, 131, 132
- sales 41, 42, 43t, 48, 210, 219(n2), 222
foreign 6
- sales growth 44, 45, 46t
- sales team 71
- Sampat, B. 101(n1), 132, 148
- Samsung 158
- Santangelo, G. D. 125(n1)
- Savage, L. A. 125(n2)
- Scherer, F. M. 39, 55(n6), 128, 171, 197, 201, 203
- Schmookler, J. 201
- Schumpeter, J. A. 5, 201, 202
competition and innovation 47–8, 49, 54
- Schumpeter Society Conference (Milan, 2004) 100n
- Schwartz, N. L. 55(n6)
- SCI (*Science Citation Index*) *see* Fraunhofer
- science 43n, 45, 49
basic–applied trade-off 84, 101(n3)
diffusion 83, 99
'slow rate of commercial exploitation' (UK) 54
- science base 6, 10, 14, 192
local 107, 110
- science linkage (of corporate R&D) (*sci*) 13, 14, 171, 172, 174, 176–7, 178f, 179–92, 195t, 196(n8)
meanings 196(n9)
- science papers 177, 196(n9)
- science and technology (S&T) xvii, 108, 112–13, 125(n4), 126(n16)
S&T base 123
S&T collaborations 124
- scientific activity 8
- scientific base, local 116, 119
- scientific institutions 15, 16, 200, 215t, 216
- scientific revealed comparative advantage (SRCA) index 110, 116, 117t, 119, 123
- scientists 10, 84, 105, 124, 154t, 154
choice of research topic 83
'most productive' 85
- Scotchmer, S. 129
- secrecy 35, 75, 76, 84, 125(n5), 132, 203, 206, 207, 212
- sectors 1, 2t, 5, 15–16, 18, 40, 41, 44, 48, 49, 50, 157, 179, 180, 192, 199, 203, 213
characteristics 200, 205f, 205, 209–10, 219(n2–3)
competition level 6
concentration 210, 212t, 214t, 214, 215t
industrial 106
non-technical 67t, 68–71, 74
technological 108, 110t, 113, 113t, 114t, 115t, 126(n13)
variations in market valuations 53
venture capital investment
decisions 67–8, 69t, 70t, 71t, 72t
- seed finance 65, 66t, 66, 235(n2)
- semiconductors 172, 173, 181, 194t, 196(n1)
- Seo Hwan-Joo xvii, 2, 11–12, 138
- Seoul 159
- service sector 54n, 151, 160t, 161t
adaptation to local markets 115, 153
new 151, 156, 163
- Shanghai 159
- Shapiro, C. 129

- shareholders 46t, 126(n9), 228
 shares 41, 46n
 Shin satellite (Thailand) 156
 shocks 48, 49, 229
 Short Message Service (SMS) 156
 Silberston, Z. A. 59
 Singapore 1, 152–6, 161t
 ‘hub for region’ 159, 161
 Singh, A. 56
 Siniläinen, T. 102
 Sjolander, S. 128
 Slaughter, M. 106
 social capability 11, 131
 social infrastructure 135, 138
 society 22, 47, 59
 sociology of science 84, 90, 95
 software 7, 67, 67t, 69t, 70t, 71t,
 108, 158, 172, 173
 Song, J. 192
 South Africa 146t
 South Asia 12, 152
 South-East Asia 151, 154, 161
 Spain 117n, 120t, 146t, 230, 231t
 speed (corporate R&D) 14, 15,
 171–2, 173, 174, 176–7, 179, 180,
 182, 184, 186, 189, 191, 192,
 196(n8–9)
 Spencer, W. J. 172
 spillovers 6, 15, 49, 54, 105, 106,
 111, 121, 124, 201
 SPRU (Science Policy Research Unit)
 dataset 50
 SPSS 62
 spurious correlations 179
 Sri Lanka 161t
 staff capabilities 168
 standard deviation 134t, 195t, 212t,
 213
 standard error 48, 96t, 98t, 121t
 STATA reference manual 55(n4)
 State Street Bank case 61, 75, 78(n3)
 Stephan, P. A., *et al.* (2004) 99, 103
 Black, G. 103
 Gurmu, S. 103
 Sumell, A. J. 103
 Sterzi, V. 100n
 stochastic error term 133
 stock of knowledge (SBRD) 228–30,
 232–5
 stock markets
 further research 5–6
 ‘myopia’ 47
 opportunities 224t, 224n, 234t
 performance 17
 valuation ‘improved by EPO
 patents and low-level of
 competition’ 4–6, 40–57
 Stoneman, P. 57
 Strasbourg: BETA–Université Louis
 Pasteur 100n
 Stuart, T. 102
 ‘stuck in muck’ 13, 167t, 167–8,
 169
 Sullivan, P. H. 204
 Sumell, A. J. 103
 suppliers 210, 211, 217
 supply side 17
 Surlemont, B. 103
 Surlemont, F., *et al.* (2003) 101(n1),
 103
 Nlemvo, F. 103
 Surlemont, B. 103
 Sweden 10, 117n, 120t, 146t, 230,
 231t
 Switzerland 10, 117n, 146t
t-test 51t, 63, 139, 196(n12)
 tacit knowledge 7, 71, 125(n1), 177
 Taipei 156
 Taiwan 151, 152, 155, 161t
 Tang, H. K. 152
 taxation 224, 227, 228
 see also corporate income tax rate
 Taylor, C. T. 59
 technical progress 55(n6), 173
 technological advantage 3, 184
 technological capabilities 124
 technological change 36, 133, 134
 process 5
 ‘varies substantially across firms’
 52
 technological opportunity (*TO*) 60,
 200, 201, 202, 205, 210, 214, 216,
 218, 222, 223, 226, 228, 232t,
 233, 234t, 235
 ‘attracts more venture capital’
 16–17
 theory 17

- technological trajectory (Pavitt) 42
 technology/technologies 15, 124, 155, 225
 access 104
 adaptation to local markets 107, 108, 116–17
 advanced 140
 diffusion 130
 foreign 107, 123
 internationalization 126(n12)
 local 108
 non-codified activities 125(n1)
 ‘other tangible’ 68, 69t, 70t, 71t
 patented 71
 technology areas/domains 14, 179–84
 technology classification 173, 177, 193t
 technology cycle time (*tct*) 172, 176, 176f, 178n, 179, 181–9, 190f, 195t
 technology transfer 106, 107, 129, 130, 141, 169
 Teece, D. J. 204
 telecommunications 85, 86t, 87t, 90t, 91t, 94, 114t, 172, 173, 181, 194t, 196(n1)
 Tether, B. S. 206
 Teubal, M. 235
 textiles 113, 114t
 Thailand 146t, 154t, 154, 156, 158, 161t
 theft 135
 time 9, 93, 95, 98, 99, 108, 133, 174, 179–82, 184, 186, 196(n13), 204, 205, 225, 229, 232t, 234t
 time-lag 14, 15, 47, 88, 109, 139, 172, 203
 timing issues 4
 Toivanen, O., *et al.* (2002) 50, 55(n9), 57
 Bosworth, D. 57
 Stoneman, P. 57
 Tong, X. 109
 total entrepreneurial activity (TEA) 228, 229–30, 231t, 232t, 233
 toxicology 116, 117t
 trade marks 5, 40, 42, 43t, 45, 46t, 51t, 52, 53, 68
 applications 41
 trade protection 157
 trade regime 11, 131, 144
 trade shares 134, 134t, 135, 137t, 138t, 138–42, 144, 145, 145t
 trade structure 135
 Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPs) 11, 129, 145
 tradition (Asia) 166
 ‘tradition fighters’ 13, 167t, 167, 168, 169
 training 12, 105, 106, 154
 Trajtenberg, M. 102, 128, 146(n1), 147, 196(n2, n10), 197
 transaction costs 104, 177
 Turkey 146t
 Turner, L. 95
 two-stage least squares 139
 Tykvova, T. 232

 uncertainty 6, 58, 74, 75, 222
 underdog mentality 164, 165, 167t, 167, 168
 UNESCO 133
 Unilever 29–34
 United Kingdom 2t, 2, 6, 109, 113, 113t, 117n, 120t, 122t, 146t, 230, 231t
 intellectual property, competition, and value of firms 40–57
 patenting ‘does not have straightforward impact’ 52–3
 profit persistence 48–9, 55(n7–8)
 R&D internationalization 125(n2)
 venture capital investment decisions, 58–79
 United Kingdom: HM Treasury 55–6(n11)
 United Kingdom Company Analysis 41
 United Kingdom Patent Office 5, 40–1, 46, 53, 54n, 74, 75
 consultation exercise (2001) 77
 website 78(n5)

- United States of America 2, 6, 7,
13, 16, 23, 59, 60, 71, 72, 74,
75, 77, 97, 101(n2), 109,
117n, 123, 135, 146t, 151,
154t, 154, 155, 156, 172,
173, 189, 190f, 192, 222, 224t,
224, 225, 230, 231t, 234t,
235(n2)
- business method patents 78n
- EU-born doctorate-recipients 9–10,
104
- patent applications 133
- patent reforms 131
- patent registrations 146(n2)
- patenting–publishing trade-off 99
- patents 113, 113t, 115, 118,
126(n7), 132, 171, 176n, 178n,
190n
- patents: recent surge 131
- R&D internationalization
125(n2)
- United States Patents and Trademarks
Office (USPTO) 15, 105, 108,
109t, 112t, 113t, 122t, 126(n17),
133, 229
- data source 108
- patent applications (Belgian link)
114t, 115t
- Università degli Studi dell'Insubria*
(Varese) xvi, 100n
- Université Libre de Bruxelles: Solvay*
Business School xvii–xviii
- universities xv–xviii, 11, 16, 84, 108,
111, 125, 173, 176n, 177, 178n,
181, 206, 210, 218
- departmental effect 96
- institutional characteristics 93, 94,
96t, 96, 101(n6)
- Italian 85, 90, 101(n4)
- linkage with industry 3, 100, 172
- science 45, 49
- technology transfer offices
99–100
- US 132
- University of Munich: Institute for
Innovation Research (INNO-tec)
xv–xvi, 38(n9), 125n
- University of Oxford 2
- St Peter's College xv, xvii, 54n
- university patenting 83–103, 132
further research 9
'seems to improve publication
performance' 8–9
- US Patent Classification (USPC)
109t, 126(n13)
- US SIC codes 43n
- USPTO *see* United States Patents
and Trademarks Office
- Utecht, J. T. 102
- value chain 172
- value creation 12, 155, 158
- value innovation (Kim and
Mauborgne) 153
- van Ophem, H., *et al.* (2002) 201,
206, 221
- Brouwer, E. 221
- Kleinknecht, A. 221
- Mohnen, P. 221
- van Pottelsberghe de la Potterie, B.
xvii–xviii, 2, 3, 15–16, 16–17,
192, 208, 212n, 213, 214n, 215n,
219(n4), 229, 231n, 234t, 235(n1)
- van-Reenen, J. 56
- Vanden Houte, P. 106
- Venezuela 146t
- venture capital (VC) 3, 6, 130, 131
attracted by technological
opportunity 16–17, 222–37
- behavioural analysis
(microeconomic level) 223
- context (historical and
socioeconomic) 223
- cyclicality 233, 235
- data collection 235(n2)
- definitions 235(n2)
- demand-price 226, 227
- and IPRs 61–2
- macroeconomic determinants
223–4
- marginal cost 227
- marginal return 226, 227
- potential determinants 224t
- supply and demand 223, 225,
226–7, 230, 233, 235
- supply-price 226, 227
- venture capital executives 6–7, 61,
62, 63, 69, 73

- venture capital intensity 228–33
 - cross-country heterogeneity 222–3
 - determinants 233
- venture capital investment decisions (UK) 58–79
 - aim of survey 64
 - data collection 65–74
 - discussion 74–7
 - industry sectors 67–8
 - levels of finance 65–6
 - role of IPRs 67, 68–71
 - role of IPRs (investment in business methods) 71–4
 - sampling 62–3
 - stages of finance 66t, 66–7
 - survey instrument 62, 78(n4)
- venture capital and patents 222–37
 - central hypothesis 222–3
 - chapter objective 222–3, 233
 - descriptive statistics 231t
 - literature review 223–6
 - modelling the amount of VC 226–30, 235(n2)
 - panel dataset 223, 228
 - policy implication 235
 - results 223, 230–3, 234t
- venture capitalists 2, 2t
 - 'do not value BMPs' 6–7, 58–79
- Verbeek, A., *et al.* (2002) 126(n16), 128
 - Andries, P. 128
 - Debackere, K. 128
 - Deleus, F. 128
 - Luwel, M. 128
 - Zimmermann, E. 128
- vertical disintegration 13, 172
- vertical partners 206, 215t
- Veugelers, R. 106, 207, 220
- von Burg, U. 223
- Vopel, K. 39, 128, 197
- Vossen, R. 43n
- Wacker-Chemie 34
- wafer production 155
- Wagh, A. 133
- Wagner, S. 38(n2)
- Walsh, J. P. 147, 220
- Walters, C. F. 134, 138
- Waring, G. F. 48, 55(n7)
- websites 24n, 63, 102, 125–6(n6)
 - AEA i
 - business angels network directory 62
 - NBER 108–9
 - OIPRC 62, 78(n4)
 - STATA 7.0 reference manual 55(n4)
 - UK Patent Office 78(n5)
 - UNESCO 133
 - see also* Internet
- Wella 30t
- Wells, P. C. 222, 223–6, 233, 234t
- Western world 2, 12, 13, 160t
- White's procedure (heteroscedasticity) 209
- Winter, S. G. 220
- World Bank 134, 154n, 154
- World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) 133
- World Trade Organization (WTO) 145
 - GATT-WTO 129
- Wright, M. 79
- Yang, G. 130
- Yang, I. K. 139
- Yeo, K. T. 152
- Zain, M. M., *et al.* (2002) 152, 170
 - Khan Adam, M. N. 170
 - Richardson, S. 170
- Zanko, M. 169
- Ziedonis, A. 101(n1), 132, 148
- Ziedonis, R. H. 131
- Zimmermann, E. 128