39629

Zahra Mohamadpur/ Elixir Project Mgmt. 93 (2016) 39629-39637

Available online at www.elixirpublishers.com (Elixir International Journal)



**Project Management** 



© 2016 Elixir All rights reserved.

Elixir Project Mgmt. 93 (2016) 39629-39637

# Factors Explaining the Relationships between Industry and University in the Knowledge Economy

Zahra Mohamadpur

necessary data parameters were identified.

Young Researchers and Elite Club, Chalous Branch, Islamic Azad University, Chalous, Iran.

## **ARTICLE INFO**

Article history: Received: 1 June 2015; Received in revised form: 14 April 2016; Accepted: 19 April 2016;

### Keywords

Industry, University, Knowledge economy based, Functional model.

#### Introduction

Iran is a developing and growing need society and Balanced and harmonious development, which can provided Prosperity and peace and better life for its member, for this purpose it is essential that systems and various social institutions have Dynamic coordination and communication and with their interactions will pave the way to achieve balanced development. University is a main system of each society in culture and science. The university undertakes the responsibility of pedagogy and education of young people and it should try to create and develop the scientific srecialists .the specialists who should undertake the responsibility of progress and development of today's Iran.

On the other hands, Every society needs to produce and manufactured goods, machinery and various equipment and Global experience has shown that Every country wants to prosperity and security access Must be strong and support the production, Industries in which the productive economy will be. The reason it will dictate what And experience of the advanced industrial countries also confirms Implies the necessity of continuous and strong communication between these two important social institution in any society is.(fayozat,Taslimi Tehrani,267-288,1386)

General, Nowadays academic institutions and industry in the creation and development of knowledge and technology into our territories have, In addition to maintaining its independence and between them there is overlapping missions and functions Traditional boundaries of these institutions are mixed. In addition to teaching and research functions of universities, entrepreneurship and technological innovation are at the heart of its mission has.

On the other hand, the emergence and development of key technologies such as Information Technology, Biotechnology, nano-technology and intellectual technology, Expansion of knowledge and knowledge-based development activities and inclusive globalization Interact with each other leading to a paradigm shift in economic and social development has been the emergence of a new phase of the so-called knowledge economyHuynh. (Gibbons, France, 2009)

#### The main research question

academia in the Knowledge Based Economy for this purpose, a questionnaire was prepared

to read relevant literature and the industry elite, elite university After collecting the

What factors led to the creation of links between industry and academia in the Knowledge Based Economy?

#### Industry

Industry word Production is from the Arabic root, the concept of creating and building and its equivalent in English is industry. Industrial activity refers to the major activities which Change the physical, chemical materials and objects were and ultimately will lead to new products.

To make this change the tools and machines will be used. According to Michael Porter Industry consists of companies whose products are close substitutes for each other. In a classified divided into three groups: high-tech industries. In another category Light and heavy industries have been divided into two groups. Light industry production is consumed directly by end consumers while heavy manufacturing industries key to the final consumer is not directly usable Using light industry goods and should be finalized in the coming. There is a serious problem in the industry is that Due to the lack of qualified staff and strong Projects are defined generally and without staging And do all these steps are sometimes required to produce the University The University is also sometimes due to lack of experience and the time it actually leads to project failure. If any stage of the project Must be defined step by step and run an independent project Unless the Due to the nature of project work Staging does not permit such It is known that the evolution of. (Merdit, Borkel, 2008)

#### University

University is Strong social institutions that at the Iran are about eighty years old. The institution in its early stages for a long time was the only educational activities Distribution and dissemination of knowledge and missions follow them. Anzkvytz showed Based on the internal dynamics of And effects on the structures of the world outside the academic The academic revolution has occurred in the world. (Webster and others, 2000).

#### **ABSTRACT** In this study, we sought to know what led to the creation of links between industry and

Tele: E-mail address: zahra.mohamadpur@yahoo.com

<sup>© 2016</sup> Elixir All rights reserved

UNESCO World Outlook for Higher Education for the Twenty-first Century describes the new universities: "A place where entrepreneurial skills are developed in higher education In order to facilitate the ability of graduates And to become job creators." In accordance with this definition In addition to teaching and research functions of universities another important task is Educate individuals and firms that do not cause.

Graduate of individual entrepreneurs that Innovation in the workplace The best way is to make university-industry interaction The university itself is a knowledge-based entrepreneur and creator firm And create knowledge-based industries.(Talebi,1385)

#### **Knowledge Based Economy**

Knowledge Based Economy is Economic system in which the production and application of knowledge is the main source of wealth creation. Efficiency of the economic system requires the definition of mechanisms and factors Brtvlyd and applying knowledge That the association of these factors with each other, Increase the performance of other sectors is also.( Houghton,Sheehan, 2000).

Knowledge Based Economy to further elucidate the role of knowledge in economic growth and productivity indicators. Based on the organization of economic cooperation and development (OECD) Definition of knowledge based economy provides the directly and continuously distributed on the basis of economic production and application of knowledge. (Interview with Ahmed SHakiba, 1388)

#### **Typologies of research**

The aim of the present study can be considered from two angles development and application. This research is a study of development in that topic is completely new, especially in Management Studies Since the results of the analysis and findings of this study can be useful in practice this research can be applied in a study called.

This research is a descriptive research methodology is and the type of research method is correlation.

#### Select Expert

Due to the nature of the research topic and Based on the literature, the purpose of this study is available, 15 participants from industry experts and 15 participants from university experts to find the effective parameters on linking industry and academia in the Knowledge Based Economy comment and cooperate in the preparation of the report.

# Confirmatory factor analysis for construct validity (reliability)

In this section we construct validity of the scale industry and academia Confirmatory factor analysis was used and the results are shown in tables.

Confirmatory factor analysis for industry and academia show questions Factor loadings of the questions q11, q20, q40, q42, q45, q46, q58, q62, q70 is below the acceptable level so removed Resulting in the elimination of 46 questions, 9 questions and 37 questions remain.

#### **Reliability or trustworthiness**

To determine the reliability of the data gathered in this study, Cranach's alpha reliability will be used.

# University and industry

# Sex

More than 70% of the samples were males as shown in the following diagram.



Figure 1. shows the prevalence of gender-based sample Degrees

Education into two categories, namely MA and a Ph.D. split that was the highest percentage of graduate



# Figure 2. Frequency of sample-based education Work Experience

Maximum number of work experience related to the 1015 year class





The following table shows the goodness of fit test questions for industry and academia is Respectively, indicating the number of data, and the test shows a significant amount.. Given the significant level in all aspects of the test is less than 050, It can be concluded that the data distribution does not follow a normal distribution Therefore, further tests will be used binomial test.

# Hypotheses test questions, industry and academia

Given that a significant amount of test in the table for question q7, q21, q23, q24, q25, q27, q35, q36, q44, q48, q54 is less than 050, Therefore, it follows that these factors are a major factor in the relationship between industry and academia.  $\checkmark$  academic entrepreneurs in industrial sector

| Industry and university options | Load Factor | Industry and university options | Load Factor |
|---------------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------|-------------|
| q2                              | 0.35        | q36                             | 0.76        |
| q5                              | 0.55        | q39                             | 0.78        |
| q6                              | 0.71        | q40                             | 0.26        |
| q7                              | 0.47        | q42                             | 0.21        |
| q8                              | 0.66        | q44                             | 0.51        |
| q9                              | 0.69        | q45                             | 0.27        |
| q10                             | 0.52        | q46                             | 0.10        |
| q11                             | 0.16        | q48                             | 0.48        |
| q12                             | 0.31        | q49                             | 0.80        |
| q14                             | 0.33        | q50                             | 0.75        |
| q20                             | 0.00        | q52                             | 0.37        |
| q21                             | 0.50        | q53                             | 0.61        |
| q22                             | 0.43        | q54                             | 0.33        |
| q23                             | 0.71        | q57                             | 0.56        |
| q24                             | 0.33        | q58                             | 0.28        |
| q25                             | 0.66        | q60                             | 0.44        |
| q27                             | 0.31        | q61                             | 0.51        |
| q28                             | 0.50        | q62                             | 0.21        |
| q29                             | 0.58        | q64                             | 0.48        |
| q30                             | 0.76        | q66                             | 0.51        |
| q32                             | 0.42        | q67                             | 0.39        |
| q33                             | 0.51        | q68                             | 0.42        |
| q35                             | 0.34        | q70                             | 0.27        |

Table 1. Confirmatory factor analysis results for questions related to industry and academia

Number of optionsCronbach's alpha for the entire scale industry and academia370.934

#### Table 2. university-industry reliability

| Cronbach's alpha if deleted items | Options | Cronbach's alpha if deleted items | Options | Dimensions   |
|-----------------------------------|---------|-----------------------------------|---------|--------------|
| desired                           | _       | desired                           | _       |              |
| .933                              | q33     | .934                              | q2      | Industry and |
| .934                              | q35     | .932                              | q5      | university   |
| .930                              | q36     | .931                              | q6      |              |
| .930                              | q39     | .933                              | q7      |              |
| .933                              | q44     | .931                              | q8      |              |
| .933                              | q48     | .931                              | q9      |              |
| .930                              | q49     | .933                              | q10     |              |
| .931                              | q50     | .935                              | q12     |              |
| .934                              | q52     | .934                              | q14     |              |
| .932                              | q53     | .933                              | q21     |              |
| .934                              | q54     | .933                              | q22     |              |
| .932                              | q57     | .931                              | q23     |              |
| .934                              | q60     | .934                              | q24     |              |
| .933                              | q61     | .932                              | q25     |              |
| .933                              | q64     | .935                              | q27     |              |
| .933                              | q66     | .933                              | q28     |              |
| .934                              | q67     | .932                              | q29     |              |
| .934                              | q68     | .930                              | q30     |              |
|                                   |         | .933                              | q32     | ]            |

# Table 3. shows the prevalence of gender-based sample

|         | Frequency | percent |
|---------|-----------|---------|
| Males   | 22        | 73.3    |
| Females | 8         | 26.7    |
| Total   | 30        | 100     |

#### Table 4. Frequency of sample-based education

# frequency percent

| M.A   | 20 | 7.66  |
|-------|----|-------|
| PHD   | 10 | 3.33  |
| Total | 30 | 100.0 |

# Table 5. Frequency of sample based on work experience frequency percent

|               | irequency | perce |
|---------------|-----------|-------|
| Under 5 years | 0         | 0     |
| 5-10 years    | 4         | 13.3  |
| 10-15 years   | 14        | 46.7  |
| Over 15 years | 12        | 40.0  |
| Total         | 30        | 100   |

# Table 6. Results of goodness of fit test, Kolmogorov - Smirnov industry and academia to questions

|   | Sig   | numbers | questions | sig   | numbers | Questions |
|---|-------|---------|-----------|-------|---------|-----------|
|   | 0.080 | 30      | q33       | 0.204 | 30      | q2        |
|   | 0.042 | 30      | q35       | 0.061 | 30      | q5        |
|   | 0.015 | 30      | q36       | 0.138 | 30      | q6        |
|   | 0.013 | 30      | q39       | 0.076 | 30      | q7        |
| Ī | 0.181 | 30      | q44       | 0.113 | 30      | q8        |
|   | 0.007 | 30      | q48       | 0.123 | 30      | q9        |
| Ī | 0.020 | 30      | q49       | 0.061 | 30      | q10       |
|   | 0.070 | 30      | q50       | 0.193 | 30      | q12       |
|   | 0.074 | 30      | q52       | 0.047 | 30      | q14       |
|   | 0.025 | 30      | q53       | 0.009 | 30      | q21       |
|   | 0.006 | 30      | q54       | 0.109 | 30      | q22       |
|   | 0.026 | 30      | q57       | 0.011 | 30      | q23       |
|   | 0.138 | 30      | q60       | 0.011 | 30      | q24       |
|   | 0.034 | 30      | q61       | 0.046 | 30      | q25       |
|   | 0.193 | 30      | q64       | 0.041 | 30      | q27       |
|   | 0.018 | 30      | q66       | 0.043 | 30      | q28       |
|   | 0.074 | 30      | q67       | 0.083 | 30      | q29       |
|   | 0.033 | 30      | q68       | 0.031 | 30      | q30       |
| [ |       |         |           | 0.020 | 30      | q32       |

 Table 7. shows the results of binomial tests for university and industry questions.

 Binomial test

|     |         | class | Number | Than the observed | Ratio Test | sig   |
|-----|---------|-------|--------|-------------------|------------|-------|
| q2  | Group 1 | <= 3  | 12     | .40               | .50        | .362  |
| •   | Group 2 | > 3   | 18     | .60               |            |       |
|     | total   |       | 30     | 1.00              |            |       |
| q5  | Group 1 | <= 3  | 12     | .40               | .50        | .362  |
| -   | Group 2 | > 3   | 18     | .60               |            |       |
|     | total   |       | 30     | 1.00              |            |       |
| q6  | Group 1 | <= 3  | 16     | .53               | .50        | .856  |
| _   | Group 2 | > 3   | 14     | .47               |            |       |
|     | total   |       | 30     | 1.00              |            |       |
| q7  | Group 1 | <= 3  | 8      | .27               | .50        | .016  |
| _   | Group 2 | > 3   | 22     | .73               |            |       |
|     | total   |       | 30     | 1.00              |            |       |
| q8  | Group 1 | <= 3  | 11     | .37               | .50        | .200  |
|     | Group 2 | >3    | 19     | .63               |            |       |
|     | total   |       | 30     | 1.00              |            |       |
| q9  | Group 1 | <= 3  | 15     | .50               | .50        | 1.000 |
|     | Group 2 | >3    | 15     | .50               |            |       |
|     | total   |       | 30     | 1.00              |            |       |
| q10 | Group 1 | <= 3  | 12     | .40               | .50        | .362  |
|     | Group 2 | > 3   | 18     | .60               |            |       |
|     | total   |       | 30     | 1.00              |            |       |
| q12 | Group 1 | <= 3  | 10     | .33               | .50        | .099  |
|     | Group 2 | >3    | 20     | .67               |            |       |
|     | total   |       | 30     | 1.00              |            |       |
| q14 | Group 1 | <= 3  | 10     | .33               | .50        | .099  |
|     | Group 2 | >3    | 20     | .67               |            |       |
|     | total   |       | 30     | 1.00              |            |       |
| q21 | Group 1 | <= 3  | 7      | .23               | .50        | .005  |
|     | Group 2 | > 3   | 23     | .77               |            |       |
|     | total   |       | 30     | 1.00              |            |       |
| q22 | Group 1 | <= 3  | 13     | .43               | .50        | .585  |
|     | Group 2 | > 3   | 17     | .57               |            |       |
|     | total   |       | 30     | 1.00              |            |       |

| q23             | Group 1 | <= 3         | 4  | .13  | .50 | .000  |
|-----------------|---------|--------------|----|------|-----|-------|
| -               | Group 2 | > 3          | 26 | .87  |     |       |
|                 | total   |              | 30 | 1.00 |     |       |
| a24             | Group 1 | <- 3         | 3  | 10   | 50  | 000   |
| <b>4</b> 27     | Crown 2 | ~ 2          | 27 | .10  | .50 | .000  |
|                 | Group 2 | > 3          | 27 | .90  |     |       |
|                 | Total   |              | 30 | 1.00 |     |       |
| q25             | Group 1 | <= 3         | 6  | .20  | .50 | .001  |
|                 | Group 2 | > 3          | 24 | .80  |     |       |
|                 | total   |              | 30 | 1.00 |     |       |
| a27             | Group 1 | <-3          | 8  | 27   | 50  | 016   |
| 927             | Group 2 | > 3          | 22 | 73   | .50 | .010  |
|                 |         | /5           | 20 | .73  |     |       |
|                 | total   | -            | 30 | 1.00 |     |       |
| q28             | Group 1 | <= 3         | 15 | .50  | .50 | 1.000 |
|                 | Group 2 | > 3          | 15 | .50  |     |       |
|                 | total   |              | 30 | 1.00 |     |       |
| a29             | Group 1 | <= 3         | 14 | .47  | .50 | .856  |
| 1.              | Group 2 | >3           | 16 | 53   |     |       |
|                 | total   | / 5          | 20 | 1.00 |     |       |
| -20             | Crawn 1 | . 2          | 30 | 1.00 | 50  | 505   |
| q30             | Group I | <= 3         | 17 | .57  | .50 | .385  |
|                 | Group 2 | >3           | 13 | .43  |     |       |
|                 | total   |              | 30 | 1.00 |     |       |
| q32             | Group 1 | <= 3         | 17 | .57  | .50 | .585  |
| 1               | Group 2 | > 3          | 13 | .43  |     |       |
|                 | total   |              | 30 | 1.00 |     |       |
| 222             | Crown 1 | <i>(</i> - ) | 14 | 1.00 | 50  | 051   |
| q33             | Group I | <= 3         | 14 | .47  | .50 | .836  |
|                 | Group 2 | > 3          | 16 | .53  |     |       |
|                 | Total   |              | 30 | 1.00 |     |       |
| q35             | Group 1 | <= 3         | 6  | .20  | .50 | .001  |
| 1               | Group 2 | > 3          | 24 | .80  |     |       |
|                 | total   | / 5          | 30 | 1.00 |     |       |
| -26             | Crawn 1 | . 2          | 50 | 1.00 | 50  | 001   |
| q30             | Group 1 | <= 3         | 0  | .20  | .50 | .001  |
|                 | Group 2 | >3           | 24 | .80  |     |       |
|                 | total   |              | 30 | 1.00 |     |       |
| q39             | Group 1 | <= 3         | 13 | .43  | .50 | .585  |
| -               | Group 2 | > 3          | 17 | .57  |     |       |
|                 | total   |              | 30 | 1.00 |     |       |
| a44             | Croup 1 | <- 2         | 0  | 20   | 50  | 042   |
| q44             | Group I | <= 3         | 9  | .30  | .30 | .045  |
|                 | Group 2 | > 3          | 21 | ./0  |     |       |
|                 | total   |              | 30 | 1.00 |     |       |
| q48             | Group 1 | <= 3         | 3  | .10  | .50 | .000  |
|                 | Group 2 | > 3          | 27 | .90  |     |       |
|                 | total   |              | 30 | 1.00 |     |       |
| a49             | Group 1 | <- 3         | 13 | 43   | 50  | 585   |
| 442             | Crown 2 | ~ 2          | 17 | 57   | .50 | .505  |
|                 | Group 2 | > 3          | 17 | .57  |     |       |
|                 | total   |              | 30 | 1.00 |     |       |
| q50             | Group 1 | <= 3         | 14 | .47  | .50 | .856  |
|                 | Group 2 | > 3          | 16 | .53  |     |       |
|                 | total   |              | 30 | 1.00 |     |       |
| a52             | Group 1 | <= 3         | 11 | .37  | .50 | .200  |
| 452             | Group 2 | ~ 2          | 10 | 63   |     | .200  |
|                 | 010up 2 | /3           | 20 | .05  |     |       |
|                 | total   |              | 30 | 1.00 |     | 0     |
| q53             | Group 1 | <= 3         | 10 | .33  | .50 | .099  |
|                 | Group 2 | > 3          | 20 | .67  |     |       |
|                 | total   |              | 30 | 1.00 |     |       |
| a54             | Group 1 | <-3          | 7  | 23   | 50  | 005   |
| 43 <del>4</del> | Group 2 | > 2          | 22 | .23  | .50 | .005  |
|                 | 010up 2 | /3           | 20 | .//  |     |       |
|                 | total   | _            | 30 | 1.00 |     |       |
| q57             | Group 1 | <= 3         | 19 | .63  | .50 | .200  |
|                 | Group 2 | > 3          | 11 | .37  |     |       |
|                 | total   |              | 30 | 1.00 |     |       |
| 060             | Group 1 | <- 3         | 17 | 57   | 50  | 585   |
| 400             | Group 2 | ~ 2          | 13 | 13   |     | .505  |
|                 |         | >3           | 13 | .43  |     |       |
| ļ               | total   |              | 30 | 1.00 |     |       |
| q61             | Group 1 | <= 3         | 18 | .60  | .50 | .362  |
|                 | Group 2 | > 3          | 12 | .40  |     |       |
|                 | total   |              | 30 | 1.00 |     |       |
| a64             | Group 1 | <= 3         | 10 | .33  | .50 | .099  |

|     | Group 2 | > 3  | 20 | .67  |     |       |
|-----|---------|------|----|------|-----|-------|
|     | total   |      | 30 | 1.00 |     |       |
| q66 | Group 1 | <= 3 | 12 | .40  | .50 | .362  |
|     | Group 2 | > 3  | 18 | .60  |     |       |
|     | Total   |      | 30 | 1.00 |     |       |
| q67 | Group 1 | <= 3 | 11 | .37  | .50 | .200  |
|     | Group 2 | > 3  | 19 | .63  |     |       |
|     | total   |      | 30 | 1.00 |     |       |
| q68 | Group 1 | <= 3 | 15 | .50  | .50 | 1.000 |
|     | Group 2 | > 3  | 15 | .50  |     |       |
|     | total   |      | 30 | 1.00 |     |       |

Table 8 . Descriptive statistics for questions of industry and academia

| SD      | average | number | quastions | SD      | Average | number | Questions |
|---------|---------|--------|-----------|---------|---------|--------|-----------|
| .92227  | 3.6667  | 30     | q33       | .97143  | 3.7667  | 30     | q2        |
| .76112  | 4.2000  | 30     | q35       | .92227  | 3.6667  | 30     | q5        |
| .97143  | 4.2333  | 30     | q36       | .96431  | 3.3667  | 30     | q6        |
| 1.12444 | 3.3333  | 30     | q39       | .98261  | 4.0000  | 30     | q7        |
| .78784  | 4.0000  | 30     | q44       | .92476  | 3.8000  | 30     | q8        |
| .69893  | 4.1667  | 30     | q48       | 1.04221 | 3.5000  | 30     | q9        |
| .90019  | 3.5000  | 30     | q49       | .92227  | 3.6667  | 30     | q10       |
| .81368  | 3.6000  | 30     | q50       | .86834  | 3.9333  | 30     | q12       |
| .74664  | 3.8333  | 30     | q52       | .79148  | 3.8333  | 30     | q14       |
| .76112  | 3.8000  | 30     | q53       | .82768  | 3.9333  | 30     | q21       |
| .82768  | 4.2667  | 30     | q54       | .84418  | 3.6667  | 30     | q22       |
| .95893  | 3.3333  | 30     | q57       | .98786  | 4.3000  | 30     | q23       |
| .91539  | 3.3000  | 30     | q60       | .63968  | 4.2667  | 30     | q24       |
| .96847  | 3.4000  | 30     | q61       | .80301  | 4.1000  | 30     | q25       |
| .86834  | 3.9333  | 30     | q64       | .81931  | 4.1333  | 30     | q27       |
| .71116  | 3.6667  | 30     | q66       | .73108  | 3.5000  | 30     | q28       |
| .74664  | 3.8333  | 30     | q67       | 1.16264 | 3.4000  | 30     | q29       |
| .88992  | 3.3667  | 30     | q68       | 1.01483 | 3.2667  | 30     | q30       |
|         |         |        |           | .72397  | 3.4000  | 30     | q32       |

Plan on spending a sabbatical improve communication with industry and university professors in industrial units

✓ Implement Internship(This plan is generally a short-term relationship between the tripartite students, faculty members and professionals in the industry is established In this course, students in systems with multiple orientations, so familiar with the problems of industrial units, will attempt to resolve these problems)

 $\checkmark$  Implement Externship (This program allows students to closely observe and explore different career to see their future career choices open to them. The period can vary from a day to a month)

 $\checkmark$  Co-app. plan (The project is designed in such a way that Five semesters of full-time students in their education and gain experience in the industry to pay, It semester by semester, something known)

 $\checkmark$  Create Parks for knowledge transfer between industry and university investigators

 $\checkmark$  balance in supply and demand for specialists trained by the University

✓ revival Normal University and Industry Innovation

✓ open university system in basic investigators and industry

 $\checkmark$  universities move towards job creation and support

✓ Establishing Knowledge Based Companies

Conclusions

Scale industry and academia that were used in this study seventy includes components that were extracted according to the papers read. After compiling the seventies components to further investigate some of the counselors and teachers were sent Seventy question of the number of twenty-four questions that were identical in concept to the other components were removed. After a number of questions remain to be put at the disposal of industry and university leaders after collecting the responses and the results of these tests were obtained

• these factors are a major factor in the relationship between industry and academia

• academic entrepreneurs in industrial sector

• Plan on spending a sabbatical improve communication with industry and university professors in industrial units

• Implement Internship(This plan is generally a short-term relationship between the tripartite students, faculty members and professionals in the industry is established In this course, students in systems with multiple orientations, so familiar with the problems of industrial units, will attempt to resolve these problems)

• Implement Externship (This program allows students to closely observe and explore different career To see their future career choices open to them. The period can vary from a day to a month)

• Co-ap plan (The project is designed in such a way that Five semesters of full-time students in their education and gain experience in the industry to pay, It semester by semester, something known)

• Create Parks for knowledge transfer between industry and university investigators

• balance in supply and demand for specialists trained by the University

revival Normal University and Industry Innovation

open university system in basic investigators and industry

universities move towards job creation and support

Establishing Knowledge Based Companies

Reference

• Acha, V., and Martin, M., In search of the Triple Helix in China, Poland, and the Republic of Korea, In M. Martin, (eds).

(2011), In search of the Triple Helix: Academia-industrygovernment interaction in China, Poland, and the Republic of Korea, pp: 207-244. UNESCO, International Institute for Education Planning.

• Afrazeh, A. ,Bartsch, H., Hinterhuber, H.Effective Factors in Human Activities and Knowledge Sharing, in Zülc G. (Editor), (2003), "European Series in Industrial Management - Esim", Vol. 6, Shaker Verlag, Germany PP 165

• Afonso, A., Ramirez, J., Diaz Puente, j.m, Universityindustry cooperation in the education domain to foster competitiveness and employment, 2012, Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences 46, pp. 3947 – 3953

• Aggarwal, J. C., "Development and Planning of Modern Education", (2000), The learning organization, Vol.10, No.4, pp.216-27

• Aiamy, M., Keshtiaray, N, A perspective of the cooperation between university and industry at Islamic Azad University, Sanandaj Branch, and its comparison with Kingston University London, (2012), Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences 46, PP 2509 – 2513

• Baba, Y., Shichijo, N., and Sedita, S.R., How do collaborations with universities affect firms' innovative performance?, (2009), the role of "Pasteur scientists" in the advanced materials field, Research Policy, 38, pp. 756–764.

• Bailey, D., and Koney, K.M., Community based consortia: One model for creation and development, (1995), Journal of community practice, 2(1), pp. 21-42.

• Barness, T et al., Effective university-industry interaction: A multi-case evaluation of collaborative R&D project, (2002), European Management Journal, 20(3), pp. 272-285.

 Building Knowledge Economies, The World Bank Washington, D.C 2007

• Betz, F, Managing Technology: Competing through New Ventures, Innovation and Corporate Research, (1987), Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ

• Branstetter, L., Exploring the Link Between Academic Science and Industrial Innovation: The Case of California's Research Universities, (2000), Columbia Business School 813 Uris Hall.

• Brinkley, I., and The Knowledge Economy: How Knowledge is Reshaping the Economic Life of Nations. ,( 2008), http://www.workfoundation.com/assets/docs/publications/41\_ke \_life\_of\_nations.pdf

Brown, John, S., Research that Reinvents the Corporation, (1991), Harvard Business Review, January-Februart, pp102-111
Cao ,Yong, Zhao, Li, Chen, Rensong, Institutional structure and incentives of technology transfer: Some new evidence from Chinese universities ,( 2009), Journal of Technology Management Vol. 4 No. 1, pp. 67-84, available at: www.emeraldinsight.com/1746-8779.htm

• Chung, S., Academia-industry-government interaction in the Republic of Korea, In M. Martin, (eds)., (2011), In search of the Triple Helix: Academia-industry-government interaction in China, Poland, and the Republic of Korea, pp: 163-206. UNESCO, International Institute for Education Planning.

• Cooke, P., and Leydesdorff, L, Regional development in the knowledge-based economy: the construction of advantages, (2005), Journal of Technology Transfer, 31(1), pp. 5-15.

• Denison, Edward F., Trend in American Economic Growth 1929-1982: , (1985), The United States in the 1970, Bookings Institute, Washington, DC.

• Dodgson, M., The management of technological collaboration, August (1991), Engineering Management Journal, pp. 187–192.

• Dooley, L., and Kirk, D., University-industry collaboration: Grafting the entrepreneurial paradigm onto academic structures,(2007), European Journal of Innovation Management, 10(3), pp. 316-332.

• Doutriaux, J., and Sorondo, A., University-Industry Cooperation Comparing the Canadian and Uruguayan experiences, Ottawa and Montevideo, September 2005, Available online at http://www.relec.com.ar/arti/industry.pdf

Drucker Peter ,Knowledge Worker Productivity: The Biggest

• Challenge, California Management, 1999, Review, Winter (1999), PP 79-94

• Etzkowitz, H., Research groups as 'quasi-firms': the invention of the entrepreneurial university, 2003, Research Policy, 32, pp. 109–121.

• Etzkowitz, H., The Bi-Evolution of the University in the Triple Helix Era. 22-03-(2005), http://www.ie.ufrj.br/eventos/seminarios/pesquisa/a\_universidad e\_e\_o\_desenvolvimento\_regional.pdf

• Etzkowitz, H., Webster, A., Gebhardt, C., Terra, B., The future of the university and the University of the Future: evolution of ivory tower to entrepreneurial paradigm,(2000), Research Policy, 29, pp. 313–330.

• Etzkowitz,H.,and Leydesdorff,L."The dynamics of innovation" (2000), Research Policy, Vol.29, pp109-123

• European Commission., Regional Innovation Monitor Innovation Patterns and Innovation Policy in European Regions-Trends, Challenges and Perspectives, (2010) Annual Report. http://www.rim-

europa.eu/index.cfm?q=p.file&r=e217b4a942ac275dc899d3475 0b75bad

• Fombrun, C., Reputation: Realizing Value From TheCorporate Image. Harvard Business School Press, Boston, (1996.)

• Forrester, J. W, Principles of systems, 1971, Productivity Press, Cambridge.

• Franek, R, The Internship Bible, Princeton Review Publishing, Broadway, NY.Garrison, D.R.(1997), "Self-directed learning: toward a comprehensive model", Adult Education Quarterly, Vol. 48 No. 1, pp. 18-33, (2005).

• Gibbons, M., Camile, L., Helga, N, "the new production of Knowledge." 1994, London, Sage.

• Gulbrandsen, M., Mowery, C.D., and Feldman, M., Introduction to the special section: Heterogeneity and university-industry relations, (2011), Research Policy, 40, pp. 1–5.

• Houghton.J,Sheehan.P " A Primer on the Knowledge, Economy "Victoria University ,( 2000)

• Huynh,Bao & Gibbons,Mary France,Increasing Demands and Cganging Institutional Research Roles: How Technology can help, (2009), No.143

• Joseph,M,F&Mark,W,M, "The Challenge of Scientometrics", (2005), The Development,Measurement,and Selforganization of Scientific Communications,Leiden:DSWO press,Leiden university(2nd edition at<www.upublish.com

• Kirby, D., Guerrero-Cano, M. and Urbano, D., "A Litrature Review on entrepreneurial universities: An Institutional Approach"(, 2006), the 3rd Conference of Pre-communications to Congresses, Business Economic Department, Autonomous University of Barcelona. Barcelona.

• Lee, Thomas H., & Reid, Proctor P., National Interests in an Age of Global Technology, (1991), National Academy of Engineering, Washington, DC.

• Leydesdorff, L. y Etzkowitz, H. (eds.) , A triple Helix of University-Industry- Government relations, (1997), The future

location of Research, Book of Abstracts, Science Policy Institute, State University of New York.

• Leydesdorff, L., The Knowledge-Based Economy and the Triple Helix Model, (2010), (Annual Review of Information Science and Technology 44), pp. 367-417. http://arxiv.org/ftp/arxiv/papers/1201/1201.4553.pdf

• Leydesdorff, L., and Guoping, Z., University-Industry-Government Relations in China: An emergent national system of innovations, (2001), Industry and Higher Education, 15(3), pp. 179-182.

• Lundvall, B-Å., The learning economy – implications for the knowledge base of health and education systems', in OECD-CERI,( 2000), Knowledge Management in the Learning Society, Paris, OECD.

• Martin, M., Managing university-industry relations: A study of institutional practices from 12 different countries,(2000), UNESCO, International Institute for Education Planning: Paris.

• Martin, M., The Triple Helix in the making? Conceptual foundations and focus of this study, In M. Martin, (eds), (2011), In search of the Triple Helix: Academia-industry-government interaction in China, Poland, and the Republic of Korea, pp: 15-32. UNESCO, International Institute for Education Planning: Paris.

• Manning, S., Massini, S. and Lewin, A.Y, A dynamic perspective on next-generation offshoring: The global sourcing of science and engineering talent , (2008), Academy of Management Perspectives, August, pp. 35-54.

• Meredith, S., Burkle, M., Building Bridges between University and Industry: theory and practice, Education and Training, (2008), 50(3), pp. 199-215.

• Miles, M. B., Huberman, A.M, Qualitative Data Analysis; Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, (1994).

Mohammadpour,zahra,kiyakojouri,davood,karami.ali,

Histopathological evaluation and experience in effective communication between industry and academia,(1392), Fifth International Conference on Management, Tehran, Iran

• Mueller, Pamela, Exploring the knowledge filter: How entrepreneurship and university-industry relationships drive economic growth, Research Policy, 35, forthcoming, (2006).

• Mowery, D.C., University-industry collaboration and technology transfer in Hong Kong and knowledge-based economic growth, (2008), Available online at http://www.savantas.org/cmsimg/files/Research/HKIP/Report/1\_mowery.pdf

• Mowery, D.C., Sampat, B.N., Universities in National Innovation systems, in Fagenberg J, Mowery DC, Nelson RR, (eds.), (2005), Oxford Handbook of Innovation, Oxford University Press.

• Nonaka, I., Byosiere, P., Borucki, C.C., and Konno, N., Organizational knowledge creation theory: A first comprehensive test', (1994), International Business Review, 3/4, pp. 337–351.

• Nonaka, I., Amikura, H., Kanai, T., and Kavamura, T., Organizational Knowledge Creation and the Role of Middle Management,(1992), Paper presented at 1992 Annual Conference of Academy of Management.

• Novotny, Á., Academic entrepreneurship in Hungary: Can the Bayh-Dole model of university technology transfer work in an Eastern European context?, (2008), Social and Management Sciences, 16/2, pp. 71–80.

• OECD., The Knowledge-Based Economy. Paris, (1996)a, OECD.

• OECD., New Indicators for the Knowledge –Based Economy: Proposal for future work. (1996)b, DSTI/STP/NESTI?GSS/TIP/ (96) 6. Paris, OECD.

• OECD., Knowledge Management in the Learning Society, (2000), Paris, OECD.

• OECD., Public sector research - core policy instruments university-industry linkage schemes, (2011), http://www.oecd.org/document/24/0,3746,en\_21571361\_476918 21\_48186520\_1\_1\_1\_1,00.html

• Othman, R., & Omar, A, University and industry collaboration: towards a successful and sustainable partnership, (2012), Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences 31, PP 575 – 579.

• O'Toole, L.J., Treating Networks Seriously: Practical and Research-Based Agendas in Public Administration, (1997), Public Administration Review, 57(1), pp. 45-52.

Perkmann, M., King, Z., & Pavelin, S, Engaging

excellence?Effects of faculty quality on university engagement with industry ,(2011), Research Policy,40,pp 539-552

• Polanyi, M., The Tacit Dimension. Routledge & Kegan Paul,( 1966), London.

• Romero, F., Industry and Academia Networks., (2008), Copyright © 2008, IGI Global, 708-716.

• Rossi, F., The governance of university-industryknowledge transfer, (2010), European Journal of Innovation Management Vol. 13 No. 2, pp. 155-171.

• Rothman, M, Lessons learned: advice to employers from interns, (2007), Journal of Education, for Business, Vol. 82 No. 3, p. 140

• Salter, A., Bruneel, J., Investigating the factors that diminish the barriers to university-industry collaboration, (2009), Paper to be presented at the Summer Conference on CBS - Copenhagen Business School.

• Santoro, Michael D. and Chakrabarti, Alok K., Firm size and technology centrality in industry–university interactions, (2001), MIT IPC Working Paper IPC-01-001.

• Sterman, J, Business Dynamics: Systems Thinking and Modeling for a Complex World, McGraw-Hill, Maidenhead,( 2000).

• Sharif, N., and Baark, E., mobilizing technology transfer from university to industry: The experience of Hong Kong universities, (2006), Journal of Technology Management in China, 3(1), pp. 47-65.

• Sugandhavanija, P., Sukchai, S., Ketjoy,N., & Klongboonjit, S, Determination of Effective University –Industry Joint Research for Photovoltaic Technology Transfer(UIJRPTT) in Thailand, (2010), Renewable Energy, 36, 600-607.

• Turban, E., Leidner, D., Mclean, E., and Wetherbe, J., Information Technology for Management, Transforming Organizations in the Digital Economy,( 2006), 5<sup>th</sup> Edition, John Wiley & Sons Inc.

• university of Hong Kong , " Executive Summary",(2003), Available at : www.hku.hk/notice/2003207/final-report.pdf

• Thursby, J., Fuller, A., & Thursby, M, US faculty patenting: inside and outside the university,( 2009), Research Policy, 38 (1), 14–25.

• Xue, Lan., and Zhou, Ling., Academia-industry-government interaction in the Case of China, In M. Martin, (eds), (2011), In search of the Triple Helix: Academia-industry-government interaction in China, Poland, and the Republic of Korea, pp: 33-108. UNESCO, International Institute for Education Planning.

• Welsh, Rick, Glenna, Leland, Lacy, William, Biscotti, Dina, Close enough but not too far: Assessing the effects of university-industry research relationships and the rise of academic capitalism, 2008, journal homepage, Research Policy 37.

• Yirdaw, A., Innovation and its Essential Contribution to the Growth of the Private Sector and the Development of a Country,( 2008), Ethiopia Triple Helix Conference, 2008, pp. 79-85.