

# **Innovation Barriers, Indicators and Policies**

**Coevolving Concepts in the History  
of Innovation Studies**

**Other titles in Annals of Science and Technology Policy**

*Government Royalties on Sales of Pharmaceutical and Other Biomedical Products Developed with Substantial Public Funding: Illustrated with the Technology Transfer of the Drug-Eluting Coronary Stent*

Robert S. Danziger and John T. Scott

ISBN: 978-1-68083-820-6

*Case Studies of Successful Technology Transfer from Federal Laboratories*

Gretchen B. Jordan, Christopher S. Hayter, Michael Hogan,  
Manuel A. Gonzalez and Alan C. O'Connor

ISBN: 978-1-68083-808-4

*Toward More Effective Science and Technology Advice for Congress: The Historical Roots and Pathways Forward*

Peter D. Blair

ISBN: 978-1-68083-802-2

*The Globalization of the Bayh-Dole Act*

Thorsten Gores and Albert N. Link

ISBN: 978-1-68083-754-4

*Globalization and the High-Tech Policy Response*

Gregory Tassej

ISBN: 978-1-68083-690-5

*Evolution of Ireland's Industrial, Science and Technology Policy*

James A. Cunningham, Patrick Collins and Majella Giblin

ISBN: 978-1-68083-680-6

# Innovation Barriers, Indicators and Policies

## Coevolving Concepts in the History of Innovation Studies

---

**Diego R. de Moraes Silva**

Sivis Institute

Curitiba-PR

Brazil

[moraessilva.diego@gmail.com](mailto:moraessilva.diego@gmail.com)

**Nicholas S. Vonortas**

Institute for International Science and

Technology Policy and Department of Economics

The George Washington University

USA

[vonortas@gwu.edu](mailto:vonortas@gwu.edu)

**André T. Furtado**

Department of Science and Technology Policy

University of Campinas

Campinas-SP

Brazil

[afurtado@unicamp.br](mailto:afurtado@unicamp.br)

**now**

the essence of knowledge

Boston — Delft

## Annals of Science and Technology Policy

*Published, sold and distributed by:*

now Publishers Inc.  
PO Box 1024  
Hanover, MA 02339  
United States  
Tel. +1-781-985-4510  
[www.nowpublishers.com](http://www.nowpublishers.com)  
[sales@nowpublishers.com](mailto:sales@nowpublishers.com)

*Outside North America:*

now Publishers Inc.  
PO Box 179  
2600 AD Delft  
The Netherlands  
Tel. +31-6-51115274

The preferred citation for this publication is

D. R. de Moraes Silva, N. S. Vonortas, and A. T. Furtado. *Innovation Barriers, Indicators and Policies*. Annals of Science and Technology Policy, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 100–227, 2022.

ISBN: 978-1-68083-931-9

© 2022 D. R. de Moraes Silva, N. S. Vonortas, and A. T. Furtado

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission of the publishers.

Photocopying. In the USA: This journal is registered at the Copyright Clearance Center, Inc., 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923. Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use, or the internal or personal use of specific clients, is granted by now Publishers Inc for users registered with the Copyright Clearance Center (CCC). The 'services' for users can be found on the internet at: [www.copyright.com](http://www.copyright.com)

For those organizations that have been granted a photocopy license, a separate system of payment has been arranged. Authorization does not extend to other kinds of copying, such as that for general distribution, for advertising or promotional purposes, for creating new collective works, or for resale. In the rest of the world: Permission to photocopy must be obtained from the copyright owner. Please apply to now Publishers Inc., PO Box 1024, Hanover, MA 02339, USA; Tel. +1 781 871 0245; [www.nowpublishers.com](http://www.nowpublishers.com); [sales@nowpublishers.com](mailto:sales@nowpublishers.com)

now Publishers Inc. has an exclusive license to publish this material worldwide. Permission to use this content must be obtained from the copyright license holder. Please apply to now Publishers, PO Box 179, 2600 AD Delft, The Netherlands, [www.nowpublishers.com](http://www.nowpublishers.com); e-mail: [sales@nowpublishers.com](mailto:sales@nowpublishers.com)

**Annals of Science and Technology Policy**  
Volume 6, Issue 2, 2022  
**Editorial Board**

**Editor-in-Chief**

**Albert N. Link**  
University of North Carolina at Greensboro  
United States

**Editors**

David Audretsch  
*Indiana University*

William Bonvillian  
*MIT*

Barry Bozeman  
*Arizona State University*

Kaye Husbands Fealing  
*Georgia Institute of Technology*

John Hardin  
*North Carolina Board of Science and Technology*

Mariagrazia Squicciarini  
*OECD*

Wolfgang Polt  
*Joanneum Research Institute*

Nicholas Vonortas  
*The George Washington University*

## Editorial Scope

### Topics

Annals of Science and Technology Policy publishes survey and tutorial articles in the following topics:

- Literature reviews of technology and innovation policies
- Historical case studies of technology development and implementation
- Institutional histories of technology- and innovation-based organizations
- Analyses of policies attendant to technology development and adoption and diffusion
- Studies documenting the adoption and diffusion of technologies and subsequent consequences
- Studies of public and private research partnerships (cross sectional, over time, or case based)
- Assessments and evaluations of specific technology and innovation policies
- Analyses of ecosystems associated with the technology and/or innovation development
- Cross observational (e.g., cross-agency or cross-country) comparisons of technology and innovation policies

### Information for Librarians

Annals of Science and Technology Policy, 2022, Volume 6, 4 issues. ISSN paper version 2475-1820. ISSN online version 2475-1812. Also available as a combined paper and online subscription.

## Contents

---

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>The Role of the Obstacles to the Innovation Process</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1	Innovation as a Socio-Economic Phenomenon . . . . .	7
2.2	What Determines Innovation? . . . . .	26
2.3	Obstacles to Innovation . . . . .	42
<b>3</b>	<b>Measurement and Policy Responses to Innovation Barriers</b>	<b>51</b>
3.1	Innovation Measurement Over the Years: In Search of a Paradigm . . . . .	51
3.2	Evolution of the Innovation Barrier Indicators . . . . .	60
3.3	Policy Responses to Unlock Determinants of Innovation: With an Illustration from Brazil . . . . .	67
3.4	The Policy-Driven Nature of Measuring Obstacles to Innovation . . . . .	78
3.5	Mismatching Between Innovation Indicators and Policymaking . . . . .	84
<b>4</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>97</b>

<b>Acknowledgements</b>	<b>101</b>
<b>About the Authors</b>	<b>102</b>
<b>References</b>	<b>104</b>



# Innovation Barriers, Indicators and Policies

Diego R. de Moraes Silva<sup>1</sup>, Nicholas S. Vonortas<sup>2</sup> and André T. Furtado<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Sivis Institute, Curitiba-PR, Brazil; moraessilva.diego@gmail.com*

<sup>2</sup>*Institute for International Science and Technology Policy and Department of Economics, The George Washington University, USA; São Paulo Excellence Chair, University of Campinas, Campinas-SP, Brazil; Institute for Statistical Studies and Economics of Knowledge, National Research University Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russian Federation; vonortas@gwu.edu*

<sup>3</sup>*Department of Science and Technology Policy, University of Campinas, Campinas-SP, Brazil; afurtado@unicamp.br*

---

## ABSTRACT

This monograph discusses the coevolution of innovation barriers, indicators, and policies throughout the history of Innovation Studies. Our study starts with a thorough review of the theoretical and historical literature addressing the origins of these concepts to demonstrate that innovation barriers are intimately related to both the theoretical development of the innovation concept and its measurement as well as the policy-driven interest on innovation debates. The absence of a dominant epistemological paradigm in the field of Innovation Studies is arguably an important explanatory factor for the underuse of innovation indicators in policy decision-making which is in antithesis to the significant developments in the innovation measurement enterprise during

---

Diego R. de Moraes Silva, Nicholas S. Vonortas and André T. Furtado (2022), "Innovation Barriers, Indicators and Policies", *Annals of Science and Technology Policy*: Vol. 6, No. 2, pp 100–227. DOI: 10.1561/110.00000021.

©2022 D. R. de Moraes Silva, N. S. Vonortas, and A. T. Furtado

the past few decades. We conclude that, although the context of changing paradigms benefits the creative freedom for research, it also hampers the stability and standardization necessary for the absorption of innovation indicators into the policy cycle. Efforts to change such a situation continue to this date.

---

**Keywords:** innovation barriers; innovation indicators; innovation policies; innovation studies; measurement models.

# 1

---

## Introduction

---

The acknowledgment of the impact of Science, Technology, and Innovation (ST&I) on the economy after World War II ushered the advancement and progressive refinement of specific policies to address development issues (Fealing *et al.*, 2011; Freeman and Soete, 2008 [1997]). In parallel, the statistical production turned out to be crucial in the processes of designing, monitoring, and evaluating these policies (Gault, 2013; Velho, 2001). Nowadays one can easily verify the proliferation of ST&I statistics and indicators<sup>1</sup> from both national and international reputed organizations around the world such as the U.S. National Science Foundation (NSF, 2020), the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO, 2016) and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD, 2018b), just to mention a few examples.

---

<sup>1</sup>We adopt herein the definition of indicators as combinations of statistics that may come from various sources (Gault, 2011). Figuratively, statistics would be like “atoms,” while indicators would be like “molecules” (Sirilli, 2006).

The field of Innovation Studies<sup>2</sup> has witnessed remarkable development in recent years (Fagerberg *et al.*, 2013; Martin, 2012). Its activity has developed alongside lively debates among experts reflected in a broad and longstanding literature pointing out controversies and difficulties of incorporating ST&I indicators into the political and social spheres, challenging indicator legitimacy and consistency (Feller and Gamota, 2007; Godin, 2005; Jaramillo and Albornoz, 1997; Velho, 1992). Other studies have highlighted the coevolutionary processes underlying the development of our conceptual understanding of innovation during the past half century or so and of the policies (and policy waves) that have been devised to promote it (Godin, 2012; Meissner *et al.*, 2017). Yet others have pointed out systematic underutilization of innovation indicators in the policy cycle – extending to policy design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation activities – across developed and developing countries (Arundel, 2007; Baptista *et al.*, 2010; Viotti, 2013).

It is within this very active milieu that the present monograph attempts to take stock. The monograph focuses specifically on exploring the historical coevolution of three core concepts in the field: barriers,<sup>3</sup> indicators, and policies. We argue that these concepts have coevolved and reinforced each other throughout the history of Innovation Studies. It is in this sense that a somewhat detailed historical review on the general conception of innovation is warranted in order to support a clear understanding of innovation barriers, indicators, and related policies as they have been shaped and co-evolved through time. Our understanding of innovation has consistently pointed out the presence of innovation opportunities and barriers. The presence of barriers to innovation called for policies. Policies demanded indicators to be evaluated. Refined and more diverse indicators opened up opportunities for considering

---

<sup>2</sup>There is a controversy in the use of the label “Innovation Studies” since it may suggest a monopoly as if it covered all that concerns innovation, although different perspectives on innovation exist (Godin, 2012). We are not addressing this issue here, as we assume the most common use of the label that has been developed in the literature in recent years (Fagerberg *et al.*, 2013).

<sup>3</sup>Barriers have also been referred to in the literature as obstacles, constraints, and inhibitors (Hadjimanolis, 2003). Although there may be subtle differences in the meaning of these terms, we use them interchangeably herein.

alternative barriers. We naturally pay attention to how an evidence-based innovation policy movement has gained momentum worldwide throughout this coevolutionary process.

Based on the thorough review of innovation barriers undertaken herein, we conjecture that financial and non-financial obstacles do not affect the innovation output directly. Instead, they impede the effect of the innovation determinants, whether these determinants are firm-specific, network-specific, or referring to the contextual environment (Antonioli *et al.*, 2017; Kanama and Nishikawa, 2017; Moraes Silva *et al.*, 2020). For instance, the financial obstacles could be thought to reference principally the difficulties of the company to fund R&D and other innovation activities internally or to obtain such funding externally. Similarly with other determinants such as knowledge access and absorption, external networking factors, demand factors, and organizational structure. Hence, the determinants and the obstacles to innovation coexist, the former representing the enabling conditions for innovation and the latter representing the inhibitors. One might perceive the obstacles to innovation as playing a moderation role, sitting between the determinants of innovation and the innovative performance, so that barriers are not simply the “lack of determinants (or capacity/efforts)”, but actually real constraints that moderate how companies set up their innovation strategy to rely more or less on certain determinants depending on which barriers they are facing.

As we advance the discussion to innovation indicators and policies, we conceive that indicators are the products of theoretical models and cognitive interests of the actors engaged in their construction (Godin, 2005). At the same time, indicators potentially impact the perception of social reality and shape the diverse interests at play in the social and political spheres (Gault, 2011). In this sense, indicators can be seen both as “technologies” built upon perceived needs and as “interventions” designed for the purpose of changing behaviors (Gault, 2013). This reality highlights the need for increased responsibility by statisticians, as they are not only technocrats responding to demands, but also have the power to influence strategies and decisions (Sirilli, 2006). The capacity of statistics to influence policymaking and social decisions depends on several factors, including the stability provided

by an epistemological paradigm supporting the theoretical models of measurement. Our argument in this monograph is that the absence of a stable epistemological paradigm in the field of Innovation Studies explains a good part of the controversies and measurement difficulties hampering the incorporation of the innovation indicators into the policy cycle.

The rest of the monograph is organized in the following sections. Section 2 presents a thorough discussion on the historical evolution of the innovation concept and its connection to the concepts of barriers, indicators, and policies. Section 3 discusses the beginnings of the measurement of innovation barriers, as well as the linkage between the study of obstacles to innovation and a policy-driven approach towards scientific and technological progress. After presenting a brief illustration from Brazil, it also proposes the absence of an epistemological paradigm stabilizing the theoretical models within the Innovation Studies field as a powerful explanatory factor for the lack of legitimacy and the consequent underuse of innovation indicators in the policy cycle. Finally, Section 4 concludes with the main findings and avenues for future study.

## References

---

- Abramovitz, M. (1956). “Resource and output trends in the United States since 1870”. *The American Economic Review*. 46(2): 5–23.
- Adner, R. (2006). “Match your innovation strategy to your innovation ecosystem”. *Harvard Business Review*. 84(4): 98–107.
- Ahuja, G., C. M. Lampert, and V. Tandon (2008). “Moving beyond Schumpeter: Management research on the determinants of technological innovation”. *The Academy of Management Annals*. 2(1): 1–98.
- Albornoz, M. (2009). “Indicadores de innovación: Las dificultades de un concepto en evolución”. *Revista CTS*. 13(5): 9–25.
- Allen, T. (1977). *Managing the Flow of Technology*. Cambridge, USA: MIT Press.
- Álvarez, R. and G. A. Crespi (2015). “Heterogeneous effects of financial constraints on innovation: Evidence from Chile”. *Science and Public Policy*. 42(5): 711–724.
- Amara, N., P. D’Este, R. Landry, and D. David (2016). “Impacts of obstacles on innovation patterns in KIBS firms”. *Journal of Business Research*. 69(10): 4065–4073.
- Amsden, A. (2009). *A Ascensão Do ‘Resto’: Os Desafios Ao Ocidente de Economias Com Industrialização Tardia*. São Paulo, Brasil: Editora UNESP.

- Antonioli, D., A. Marzucchi, and M. Savona (2017). "Pain shared, pain halved? Cooperation as a coping strategy for innovation barriers". *Journal of Technology Transfer*. 42(4): 841–864.
- Arbix, G. (2010). "Caminhos cruzados: Rumo a Uma estratégia de desenvolvimento baseada na inovação". *Novos Estudos CEBRAP*. (87): 13–33.
- Arbix, G., M. Salerno, G. Amaral, and L. Lins (2017). "Avanços equívocos e instabilidade Das políticas de inovação no Brasil". *Novos Estudos CEBRAP*. 36(3): 9–27.
- Archibugi, D. and G. Sirilli (2000). "The direct measurement of technological innovation in business". In: *EC Conference on Innovation and Enterprise Creation*. Paris, France, Rome, Italy: National Research Council. 2–20.
- Argyrous, G. (1992). "Kuhn's paradigms and neoclassical economics". *Economics and Philosophy*. 8: 231–248.
- Ariffin, N. and P. Figueiredo (2004). "Internationalisation of innovative capabilities: Counter-evidence from the electronics industry in Malaysia and Brazil". *Oxford Development Studies*. 32(4): 559–583.
- Arora, A. and A. Gambardella (2010). "The market for technology". In: *Handbook of the Economics of Innovation*. Ed. by B. Hall and N. Rosenberg. Amsterdam, Netherlands: Elsevier B.V. 641–678.
- Arrow, K. (1962). "Economic welfare and the allocation of resources for invention". In: *The Rate and Direction of Inventive Activity*. Ed. by National Bureau of Economic Research. Princeton, USA: Princeton University Press. 609–626.
- Arthur, B. (1989). "Competing technologies, increasing returns, and lock-in by historical events". *Economic Journal*. 99: 116–131.
- Arundel, A. (2006). "Innovation survey indicators, any progress since 1996? Or how to address the 'Oslo' Paradox: We see innovation surveys everywhere but where is the impact on innovation policy?" In: *II OECD Blue Sky Conference*. Ottawa, Canada: OECD Publishing. 14.
- Arundel, A. (2007). "Innovation survey indicators: What impact on innovation policy?" In: *Science, Technology and Innovation Indicators in a Changing World: Responding to Policy Needs*. Ed. by OECD. Paris, France: OECD Publishing. 307.



- Arundel, A. and K. Smith (2013). "History of the community innovation survey". In: *Handbook of Innovation Indicators and Measurement*. Ed. by F. Gault. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar. 60–87.
- Asheim, B. and M. Gertler (2005). "The geography of innovation: Regional innovation systems". In: *The Oxford Handbook of Innovation*. Ed. by J. Fagerberg, D. Mowery, and R. Nelson. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. 291–317.
- Bach, L. and M. Matt (2005). "From economic foundations to S&T policy tools: A comparative analysis of the dominant paradigms". In: *Innovation Policy in a Knowledge-Based Economy Theory and Practice*. 17–45.
- Balconi, M., S. Brusoni, and L. Orsenigo (2010). "In defence of the linear model: An essay". *Research Policy*. 39(1): 1–13.
- Baldwin, J. and Z. Lin (2002). "Impediments to advanced technology adoption for Canadian manufacturers". *Research Policy*. 31(1): 1–18.
- Baptista, B., R. Bernheim, A. Garcé, and E. Hernández (2010). *Consulta a Tomadores de Decisión En Políticas Públicas de Ciencia, Tecnología e Innovación Sobre Sus Fuentes de Información*.
- Barnett, H. G. (1953). *Innovation: The Basis of Cultural Change*. New York, USA: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc.
- Barré, R. (2005). "S&T indicators for policy making in a changing science-society relationship". In: *Handbook of Quantitative Science and Technology Research*. Ed. by H. Moed, W. Glänzel, and U. Schmoch. New York, USA: Kluwer Academic Publishers. 115–132.
- Bell, M. and P. Figueiredo (2012). "Innovation capability building and learning mechanisms in latecomer firms: Recent empirical contributions and implications for research". *Canadian Journal of Development Studies*. 33(1): 14–40.
- Bell, M. and K. Pavitt (1995). "The development of technological capabilities". In: *Trade, Technology, and International Competitiveness*. Ed. by I. Haque, M. Bell, C. Dahlman, S. Lall, and K. Pavitt. Washington, DC, USA: The World Bank. 69–102.
- Bell, M., B. Ross-Larson, and L. Westphal (1984). "Assessing the performance of infant industries". *Journal of Development Economics*. 16(1–2): 101–128.

- Bhagat, S. and I. Welch (1995). "Corporate research and development investments: International comparisons". *Journal of Accounting and Economics*. 19(2–3): 443–470.
- Bijker, W., T. Hughes, and T. Pinch, eds. (1987). *The Social Construction of Technological Systems: New Directions in the Sociology and History of Technology*. Cambridge, USA: MIT Press.
- Blanchard, P., J. P. Huiban, A. Musolesi, and P. Sevestre (2013). "Where there is a will, there is a way? Assessing the impact of obstacles to innovation". *Industrial and Corporate Change*. 22(3): 679–710.
- Bleda, M. and P. Del Río (2013). "The market failure and the systemic failure rationales in technological innovation systems". *Research Policy*. 42(5): 1039–1052.
- Bloch, C. (2013). "Measuring innovation in the public sector". In: *Handbook of Innovation Indicators and Measurement*. Ed. by F. Gault. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar. 403–419.
- Block, F. (1996). *The Vampire State: And Other Myths and Fallacies About the U.S. Economy*. New York, USA: The New Press.
- Block, F. and M. Keller, eds. (2011). *The State of Innovation: The U.S. Government's Role in Technology Development*. Boulder, USA: Paradigm Publishers.
- Bloom, N., E. Brynjolfsson, L. Foster, R. Jarmin, M. Patnaik, I. Saporta-Eksten, and J. V. Reenen (2019). "What drives differences in management practices?" *American Economic Review*. 109(5): 1648–1683.
- Bloor, D. (1976). *Knowledge and Social Imagery*. Chicago, USA: Chicago University Press.
- Boroughs, B. (2015). "Clusters/science parks/knowledge business incubators". In: *Innovation Policy: A Practical Introduction*. Ed. by N. Vonortas, P. Rouge, and A. Aridi. New York, USA: Springer. 65–84.
- Boschma, R. A. and K. Frenken (2006). "Why is economic geography not an evolutionary science? Towards an evolutionary economic geography". *Journal of Economic Geography*. 6(3): 273–302.
- Bourdieu, P. (2000). *Les Structures Sociales de l'Économie*. Paris, France: Seuil.

- Braczyk, H.-J., P. Cooke, and M. Heidenreich, eds. (1998). *Regional Innovation Systems: The Role of Governances in a Globalized World*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Brown, J., S. Fazzari, and B. Petersen (2009). “Financing innovation and growth: Cash flow, external equity, and the 1990s R&D boom”. *The Journal of Finance*. 64(1): 151–185.
- Brown, J. and B. Petersen (2009). “Why has the investment-cash flow sensitivity declined so sharply? Rising R&D and equity market developments”. *Journal of Banking and Finance*. 33(5): 971–984.
- Burns, T. and G. M. Stalker (1961). *The Management of Innovation*. London, UK: Tavistock Publications.
- Burt, R. (1992). *Structural Holes*. Cambridge, USA: Harvard University Press.
- Bush, V. (1945). *Science: The Endless Frontier*. Washington, DC, USA.
- Canepa, A. and P. Stoneman (2008). “Financial constraints to innovation in the UK: Evidence from CIS2 and CIS3”. *Oxford Economic Papers*. 60(4): 711–730.
- Caracostas, P. (2007). “The policy-shaper anxiety at the innovation Kick: How far do innovation theories really help in the world of policy”. In: *Perspectives on Innovation*. Ed. by F. Malerba and S. Brusoni. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. 464–489.
- Carter, C. and B. Williams (1957). *Industry and Technical Progress*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Castro-Martínez, E., F. Jiménez-Sáez, and F. J. Ortega-Colomer (2009). “Science and technology policies: A tale of political use misuse and abuse of traditional R&D indicators”. *Scientometrics*. 80(3): 827–844.
- Chaminade, C. and C. Edquist (2010). “Rationales for public policy intervention in the innovation process: Systems of innovation approach”. In: *The Theory and Practice of Innovation Policy: An International Research Handbook*. Ed. by R. Smits, S. Kuhlmann, and P. Shapira. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar. 95–114.

- Chaminade, C., B.-A. Lundvall, J. Vang, and K. J. Joseph (2009). “Designing innovation policies for development: Towards a systemic experimentation-based approach”. In: *Handbook of Innovation Systems and Developing Countries*. Ed. by B.-A. Lundvall, C. Chaminade, K. J. Joseph, and J. Vang. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar. 360–379.
- Chandler, A. (1962). *Strategy and Structure: Chapters in the History of the American Industrial Enterprise*. New York, USA: Beard Books.
- Chang, H.-J. (2003). *Chutando a Escada: A Estratégia Do Desenvolvimento Em Perspectiva Histórica*. São Paulo, Brasil: Editora UNESP.
- Chen, J., X. Yin, and L. Mei (2018). “Holistic innovation: An emerging innovation paradigm”. *International Journal of Innovation Studies*. 2(1): 1–13.
- Chesbrough, H. (2003). *Open Innovation: The New Imperative for Creating and Profiting from Technology*. Boston, USA: Harvard Business Press.
- Coad, A., N. Mathew, and E. Pugliese (2020). “What’s good for the goose ain’t good for the gander: Heterogeneous innovation capabilities and the performance effects of R&D”. *Industrial and Corporate Change*. 29(3): 621–644.
- Coad, A., G. Pellegrino, and M. Savona (2016). “Barriers to innovation and firm productivity”. *Economics of Innovation and New Technology*. 25(3): 321–334.
- Cohen, W. M. (2010). “Fifty years of empirical studies of innovative activity and performance”. In: *Handbook of the Economics of Innovation*. Ed. by B. Hall and N. Rosenberg. Amsterdam, Netherlands: Elsevier B.V. 129–213.
- Cohen, W. and R. Levin (1989). “Empirical studies of innovation and market structure”. In: *Handbook of Industrial Organization*. Ed. by R. Schmalensee and R. Willig. Amsterdam, Netherlands: Elsevier. 1059–1107.
- Cohen, W. and D. Levinthal (1989). “Innovation and learning: The two faces of R&D – Implications for the analysis of R&D investment”. *Economic Journal*. 99: 569–596.
- Coleman, J. (1988). “Social capital in the creation of human capital”. *American Journal of Sociology*. 94: 95–120.

- Coleman, J., E. Katz, and H. Menzel (1957). “The diffusion of an innovation among physicians”. *Sociometry*. 20(4): 253–270.
- Cooke, P. and D. Rehfeld (2011). “Path dependence and new paths in regional evolution: In search of the role of culture”. *European Planning Studies*. 19(11): 1909–1929.
- Coombs, R., P. Saviotti, and V. Walsh (1987). *Economics and Technological Change*. Lanham, USA: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Coombs, R., P. Saviotti, and V. Walsh, eds. (1992). *Technological Change and Company Strategies: Economic and Sociological Perspectives*. San Diego, USA: Harcourt.
- Coriat, B. and O. Weinstein (1995). *Les Nouvelles Théories de l'entreprise*. Paris, France: LGF - Livre de Poche.
- Cozzens, S. (2010). “Science and innovation policy studies in the United States: Past and present”. In: *Nova Geração de Política em Ciência, Tecnologia e Inovação*. Ed. by Centro de Gestão e Estudos Estratégicos—CGEE. Brasília, Brasil: CGEE. 41–60.
- Crépon, B., E. Duguet, and J. Mairesse (1998). “Research, innovation and productivity: An econometric analysis at the firm level”. *Economics of Innovation and New Technology*. 7(2): 115–158.
- Crewe, E. and J. Young (2002). “Bridging research and policy: Context, evidence and links”. *ODI Working Paper 17333*.
- Cyert, R. and J. March (1992). *A Behavioral Theory of the Firm*. 2nd edition. Hoboken, USA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- David, P. (1993). “Intellectual property institutions and the Panda’s thumb: Patents, copyrights, and trade secrets in economic theory and history”. In: *Global Dimensions of Intellectual Property Rights in Science and Technology*. Ed. by National Research Council. Washington, DC, USA: The National Academies Press. 19–61.
- De Jong, J. and E. Von Hippel (2013). “User innovation: Business and consumers”. In: *Handbook of Innovation Indicators and Measurement*. Ed. by F. Gault. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar. 109–132.
- De Negri, F. and A. Rauen (2018). *Innovation Policies in Brazil during the 2000s: The Need for New Paths*. Brasília, Brasil. 235.

- D'Este, P., N. Amara, and J. Olmos-Peñuela (2016). "Fostering novelty while reducing failure: Balancing the twin challenges of product innovation". *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*. 113: 280–292.
- D'Este, P., S. Iammarino, M. Savona, and N. V. Tunzelmann (2012). "What hampers innovation? Revealed barriers versus deterring barriers". *Research Policy*. 41(2): 482–488.
- Dosi, G. (1988). "Sources, procedures, and microeconomic effects of innovation". *Journal of Economic Literature*. 26(3): 1120–1171.
- Dosi, G. (2006). *Mudança Técnica e Transformação Industrial: A Teoria e Uma Aplicação à Indústria Dos Semicondutores*. Campinas, Brasil: Editora UNICAMP.
- Dosi, G., M. Faillo, and L. Marengo (2008). "Organizational capabilities, patterns of knowledge accumulation and governance structures in business firms: An introduction". *Organization Studies*. 29(8–9): 1165–1185.
- Dosi, G., P. Llerena, and M. Sylos-Labini (2006). "Science-technology-industry links and the 'European paradox': Some notes on the dynamics of scientific and technological research in Europe". *Research Policy*. 35(10): 1450–1464.
- Dutrénit, G., J. M. Natera, M. P. Anyul, and A. Vera-Cruz (2019). "Development profiles and accumulation of technological capabilities in Latin America". *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*. 145: 396–412.
- Edquist, C. (2014). "Striving towards a holistic innovation policy in European countries – but linearity still prevails!" *Science Technology, and Innovation Policy Review*. 5(2): 1–19.
- Edquist, C., J. M. Zabala-Iturriagoitia, J. Barbero, and J. L. Zoffio (2018). "On the meaning of innovation performance: Is the synthetic indicator of the innovation union scoreboard flawed?" *Research Evaluation*. 27(3): 196–211.
- Engberg, R. and P. Altmann (2015). "Regulation and technology innovation: A comparison of stated and formal regulatory barriers throughout the technology innovation process". *Journal of Technology Management and Innovation*. 10(3): 85–91.

- Erber, F. (2010). *Inovação Tecnológica na Indústria Brasileira No Passado Recente Uma Resenha Da Literatura Econômica*. Brasília, Brasil. 17.
- European Commission (2020). *European Innovation Scoreboard 2020*. Luxembourg, Luxembourg.
- Evans, P. (1995). *Embedded Autonomy: States and Industrial Transformation*. Princeton, USA: Princeton University Press.
- Fagerberg, J., M. Fosaas, and K. Sapprasert (2012). “Innovation: Exploring the knowledge base”. *Research Policy*. 41: 1132–1153.
- Fagerberg, J., B. Martin, and E. Andersen, eds. (2013). *Innovation Studies: Evolution and Future Challenges*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Fagerberg, J. and B. Verspagen (2009). “Innovation studies—The emerging structure of a new scientific field”. *Research Policy*. 38: 218–233.
- Fealing, K., J. Lane, J. Marburger, and S. Shipp, eds. (2011). *The Science of Science Policy: A Handbook*. Stanford, USA: Stanford Business Books.
- Feller, I. and G. Gamota (2007). “Science indicators as reliable evidence”. *Minerva*. 45(1): 17–30.
- Fernández-Esquinas, M., M. van Oostrom, and H. Pinto (2017). “Key issues on innovation, culture and institutions: Implications for SMEs and micro firms”. *European Planning Studies*. 25(11): 1897–1907.
- Figueiredo, P. (2003). “Learning, capabilities accumulation and firms differences: Evidences from latecomer steel”. *Industrial and Corporate Change*. 12(3): 607–643.
- Figueiredo, P. (2009). *Gestão Da Inovação Conceitos, Métricas e Experiências de Empresas No Brasil*. Rio de Janeiro, Brasil: LTC.
- Fligstein, N. (2001). *The Architecture of Markets: An Economic Sociology of Twenty-First-Century Capitalist Societies*. Princeton, USA: Princeton University Press.
- Freeman, C. (1982). *The Economics of Industrial Innovation*. London, UK: Pinter Publishers.
- Freeman, C. (1987). *Technology Policy and Economic Performance: Lessons from Japan*. London, UK: Pinter Publishers.

- Freeman, C. (2008). *Systems of Innovation: Selected Essays in Evolutionary Economics*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Freeman, C., J. Clark, and L. Soete (1982). *Unemployment and Technical Innovation: A Study of Long Waves and Economic Development*. Westport, USA: Greenwood Press.
- Freeman, C. and L. Soete (2008). *A Economia Da Inovação Industrial*. Campinas, Brasil: Editora UNICAMP.
- Freeman, C. and L. Soete (2009). “Developing science, technology and innovation indicators: What we can learn from the past”. *Research Policy*. 38(4): 583–589.
- Furtado, C. (1961). *Desenvolvimento e Subdesenvolvimento*. Brasil, Fundo de Cultura: Rio de Janeiro.
- Furtado, C. (1983). *Teoria e Política Do Desenvolvimento Econômico*. São Paulo, Brasil: Abril Cultural.
- Galbraith, J. K. (2012). *American Capitalism: The Concepts of Countervailing Power*. Eastford, USA: Martino Fine Books.
- Galia, F. and D. Legros (2004). “Complementarities between obstacles to innovation: Evidence from France”. *Research Policy*. 33(8): 1185–1199.
- Garcé, A. (2011). “Estructuras Políticas y Uso de la Investigación en Las Políticas Públicas. Método e Hipótesis Para Una Agenda de Investigación”. In: *Economía Política del Uso de Investigación en las Políticas Públicas*. Ed. by E. Mendizabal and N. Aste. Lima, Peru: CIES-Universidad del Pacífico. 345–367.
- García-Quevedo, J., G. Pellegrino, and M. Savona (2017). “Reviving demand-pull perspectives: The effect of demand uncertainty and stagnancy on R&D strategy”. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*. 41(4): 1087–1122.
- Gault, F. (2011). *Social Impacts of the Development of Science Technology and Innovation Indicators*. #2011-008. Maastricht, Netherlands.
- Gault, F. ed. (2013). *Handbook of Innovation Indicators and Measurement*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Gault, F. (2014). “Where Are Innovation Indicators, and Their Applications, Going?”
- Gault, F. (2018). “Defining and measuring innovation in all sectors of the economy”. *Research Policy*. 47(3): 617–622.



- Gerschenkron, A. (1962). *Economic Backwardness in Historical Perspective: A Book of Essays*. Cambridge, USA: Harvard University Press.
- Gilfillan, S. C. (1935). *The Sociology of Invention*. Cambridge, USA: MIT Press.
- Gilfillan, S. C. (1953). "Social implications of technical advance: A review of the literature". *Current Sociology*. 1(4): 191–211.
- Godin, B. (2002). "The rise of innovation surveys: Measuring a fuzzy concept". *Working Paper N. 16*. Montreal, Canada.
- Godin, B. (2004). "Pour Une Sociologie de La Statistique de La Science et de l'innovation". (26).
- Godin, B. (2005). *Measurement and Statistics on Science and Technology*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Godin, B. (2006). "The linear model of innovation". *Science, Technology, and Human Values*. 31(6): 639–667.
- Godin, B. (2008). "In the shadow of Schumpeter: W. Rupert Maclaurin and the study of technological innovation". *Minerva*. 46(3): 343–360.
- Godin, B. (2010a). "'Innovation studies': The invention of a specialty (Part I)". *Working Paper No. 7*. Montreal, Canada.
- Godin, B. (2010b). "Innovation without the word: William F. Ogburn's contribution to the study of technological innovation". *Minerva*. 48(3): 277–307.
- Godin, B. (2012). "'Innovation studies': The invention of a specialty". *Minerva*. 50(4): 397–421.
- Godin, B. (2016). "Official statisticians as conceptual innovators". *International Review of Sociology*. 26(3): 440–456.
- Gokhberg, L., K. Fursov, I. Miles, and G. Perani (2013). "Developing and using indicators of emerging and enabling technologies". In: *Handbook of Innovation Indicators and Measurement*. Ed. by F. Gault. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar. 349–380.
- Goodhart, C. (1975). *Monetary Relationships: A View from Threadneedle Street*. Sydney, Australia.
- Granovetter, M. (1973). "The strength of weak ties". *American Journal of Sociology*. 78(6): 1360–1380.

- Granovetter, M. (1985). "Economic action and social structure: The problem of embeddedness". *American Journal of Sociology*. 91(3): 481–510.
- Griliches, Z. (1957). "Hybrid corn: An exploration in the economics of technological change". *Econometrica*. 25: 501–522.
- Grossman, G. and E. Helpman (1991). "Quality ladders in the theory of growth". *The Review of Economic Studies*. 58(1): 43–61.
- Hackett, E., O. Amsterdamska, M. Lynch, and J. Wajcman, eds. (2007). *The Handbook of Science and Technology Studies*. Cambridge, USA: MIT Press.
- Hadjimanolis, A. (2003). "The barriers approach to innovation". In: *The International Handbook on Innovation*. Elsevier Ltd. 559–573.
- Hage, J. and R. Hollingsworth (2000). "A strategy for the analysis of idea innovation networks and institutions". *Organization Studies*. 21(5): 971–1004.
- Hagedoorn, J., A. Links, and N. Vonortas (2000). "Research partnerships". *Research Policy*. 29(4–5): 567–586.
- Hall, B. (1992). "Investment and research and development at the firm level: Does the source of financing matter?" *Working Paper n. 4096*. Cambridge, USA.
- Hall, B. H. (2010). "The financing of innovative firms". *Review of Economics and Institutions*. 1(1): 1–30.
- Hall, B. H. and A. B. Jaffe (2018). "Measuring science, technology, and innovation: A review". *Annals of Science and Technology Policy*. 2(1): 1–74.
- Hall, B., J. Mairesse, L. Branstetter, and B. Crépon (1999). "Does cash flow cause investment and R&D: An exploration using panel data for French, Japanese, and United States firms in the scientific sector". In: *Innovation, Industry Evolution and Employment*. Ed. by D. Audretsch and R. Thurik. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. 330.
- Hamel, G., Y. Doz, and C. K. Prahalad (1989). "Collaborate with your competitors – and win". *Harvard Business Review*. 67(1): 133–139.
- Hansen, H. F. and O. Rieper (2009). "The evidence movement: The development and consequences of methodologies in review practices". *Evaluation*. 15(2): 141–163.

- Hansen, J. (2001). "Technological innovation indicators: A survey of historical development and current practice". In: *Innovation Policy in the Knowledge-Based Economy*. Ed. by M. Feldman and A. Link. New York, USA: Springer Science & Business Media. 73–104.
- Hicks, J. (1963). *The Theory of Wages*. 2nd edition. London, UK: Macmillan.
- Himmelberg, C. and B. Petersen (1994). "R&D and internal finance: A panel study of small firms in high-tech industries". *Review of Economics and Statistics*. 76(1): 38–51.
- Hölzl, W. and J. Janger (2014). "Distance to the frontier and the perception of innovation barriers across European countries". *Research Policy*. 43(4): 707–725.
- Hong, S., L. Oxley, and P. McCann (2012). "A survey of the innovation surveys". *Journal of Economic Surveys*. 26(3): 420–444.
- Hottenrott, H. and B. Peters (2012). "Innovative capability and financing constraints for innovation: More money more innovation?" *Review of Economics and Statistics*. 94(4): 1126–1142.
- Hulten, C. (2007). "Theory and measurement: An essay in honor of Zvi Griliches". In: *Hard-to-Measure Goods and Services: Essays in Honor of Zvi Griliches*. Ed. by E. Bendt and C. Hulten. Chicago, USA: Chicago University Press. 15–27.
- Iammarino, S., F. Sanna-Randaccio, and M. Savona (2009). "The perception of obstacles to innovation. Foreign multinationals and domestic firms in Italy". *Revue d'Economie Industrielle*. 125(1): 75–104.
- James, A. (2005). "Demystifying the role of culture in innovative regional economies". *Regional Studies*. 39(9): 1197–1216.
- Jaramillo, H. and M. Albornoz, eds. (1997). *El Universo de La Medición: La Perspectiva de La Ciencia y La Tecnología*. Bogota, Colombia: Editorial Tercer Mundo.
- Jasanoff, S., G. Markle, J. Peterson, and T. Pinch, eds. (1995). *Handbook of Science and Technology Studies*. London, UK: SAGE Publications Inc.
- Jewkes, J., D. Sawers, and R. Stillerman (1958). *The Sources of Invention*. London, UK: Macmillan.
- Kamien, M. and N. Schwartz (1982). *Market Structure and Innovation*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

- Kanama, D. and K. Nishikawa (2017). “What type of obstacles in innovation activities make firms access University knowledge? An empirical study of the use of university knowledge on innovation outcomes”. *Journal of Technology Transfer*. 42(1): 141–157.
- Kanter, R. (1983). *The Change Masters: Innovation & Entrepreneurship in the American Corporation*. New York, USA: Simon & Schuster.
- Kanter, R. (1989). “Becoming PALs: Pooling, allying, and linking across companies”. *Academy of Management Executive*. 3(3): 183–193.
- Katz, J. (1984). “Domestic technological innovations and dynamic comparative advantages”. *Journal of Development Economics*. 16(1–2): 13–37.
- Klein Woolthuis, M. L. Rosalinde, and V. Gilsing (2005). “A system failure framework for innovation policy design”. *Technovation*. 25(6): 609–619.
- Kline, S. and N. Rosenberg (1986). “An overview of innovation”. In: *The Positive Sum Strategy: Harnessing Technology for Economic Growth*. Ed. by R. Landau and N. Rosenberg. Washington, DC, USA: The National Academies Press. 275–305.
- Kogut, B. (2000). “The network as knowledge: Generative rules and the emergence of structure”. *Strategic Management Journal*. 21: 405–425.
- Kostis, P. C., K. I. Kafka, and P. E. Petrakis (2018). “Cultural change and innovation performance”. *Journal of Business Research*. 88(June 2017): 306–313.
- Kuhn, T. (2000). *The Road Since Structure: Philosophical Essays, 1970–1993*. Chicago, USA: Chicago University Press.
- Kuhn, T. (2018). *A Estrutura Das Revoluções Científicas*. São Paulo, Brasil: Perspectiva.
- Lacasa, I., A. Giebler, and S. Radosevic (2017). “Technological capabilities in central and Eastern Europe: An analysis based on priority patents”. *Scientometrics*. 111(1): 83–102.
- Lall, S. (1992). “Technological capabilities and industrialization”. *World Development*. 20(2): 165–186.
- Lam, A. (2005). “Organizational innovation”. In: *The Oxford Handbook of Innovation*. Ed. by J. Fagerberg, D. Mowery, and R. Nelson. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. 115–147.

- Landes, D. (1969). *The Unbound Prometheus: Technological Change and Industrial Development in Western Europe from 1750 to the Present*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Langrish, J., M. Gibbons, W. G. Evans, and F. R. Jevons (1972). *Wealth from Knowledge*. London, UK: Macmillan.
- Latour, B. (1987). *Science in Action*. Cambridge, USA: Harvard University Press.
- Leal-Rodríguez, A. L., J. A. Ariza-Montes, J. L. Roldán, and A. G. Leal-Millán (2014). “Absorptive capacity, innovation and cultural barriers: A conditional mediation model”. *Journal of Business Research*. 67(5): 763–768.
- Levinthal, D. (1996). “Learning and Schumpeterian dynamics”. In: *Organization and Strategy in the Evolution of the Enterprise*. Ed. by G. Dosi and F. Malerba. London, UK: Macmillan. 27–41.
- Lööf, H. and A. Heshmati (2006). “On the relationship between innovation and performance: A sensitivity analysis”. *Economics of Innovation and New Technology*. 15(4–5): 317–344.
- Lugones, G. (2006). “The Bogotá manual: Standardising innovation indicators for Latin America and the Caribbean”. In: *Measuring Innovation in OECD and Non-OECD Countries*. Ed. by W. Blankley, M. Scerri, N. Molotja, and I. Saloojee. Cape Town, South Africa: HSRC Publishing. 163–181.
- Lundvall, B.-A. ed. (1992). *National Systems of Innovation: Towards a Theory of Innovation and Interactive Learning*. London, UK: Pinter Publishers.
- MacKinnon, D. (1962). “Intellect and motive in scientific inventors: Implications for supply”. In: *The Rate and Direction of Inventive Activity*. Ed. by National Bureau of Economic Research. Princeton, USA: Princeton University Press. 361–384.
- Maclaurin, W. R. (1950). “The process of technological innovation: The launching of a new scientific industry”. *The American Economic Review*. 40(1): 90–112.
- Maclaurin, W. R. (1953). “The sequence from invention to innovation and its relation to economic growth”. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*. 67(1): 97–111.

- Mairesse, J. and P. Mohnen (2010). “Using innovation surveys for econometric analysis”. In: *Handbook of the Economics of Innovation*. Ed. by B. Hall and N. Rosenberg. Amsterdam, Netherlands: Elsevier B.V. 1129–1155.
- Malerba, F. ed. (2004). *Sectoral Systems of Innovation: Concepts, Issues and Analysis of Six Major Sectors in Europe*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Mansfield, E. (1968). *The Economics of Technological Change*. New York, USA: Norton.
- Mansfield, E., J. Rapoport, A. Romeo, S. Wagner, and G. Beardsley (1977). “Social and private rates of return from industrial innovations”. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*. 91(2): 221–240.
- Marburger, J. (2007). “The science of science and innovation policy”. In: *Science, Technology and Innovation Indicators in a Changing World: Responding to Policy Needs*. Ed. by Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development—OECD. Paris, France: OECD Publishing. 27–32.
- March, J. (1991). “Exploration and exploitation in organizational learning”. *Organization Science*. 2(1): 71–87.
- Martin, B. R. (2012). “The evolution of science policy and innovation studies”. *Research Policy*. 41(7): 1219–1239.
- Martin, B. R., P. Nightingale, and A. Yegros-Yegros (2012). “Science and technology studies: Exploring the knowledge base”. *Research Policy*. 41(7): 1182–1204.
- Marx, K. (1983). *O Capital*. São Paulo, Brasil: Abril Cultural.
- Mazzucato, M. (2013). *The Entrepreneurial State: Debunking Public vs. Private Sector Myths*. Bath, UK: Anthem Press.
- McLean, L. (2005). “Organizational culture’s influence on creativity and innovation: A review of the literature and implications for human resource development”. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*. 7(2): 226–246.
- Meissner, D., W. Polt, and N. S. Vonortas (2017). “Towards a broad understanding of innovation and its importance for innovation policy”. *Journal of Technology Transfer*. 42(5): 1184–1211.

- Miller, D., M. Fern, and L. Cardinal (2007). “The use of knowledge for technological innovation within diversified firms”. *The Academy of Management Journal*. 50(2): 308–326.
- Mitchell, W. and K. Singh (1996). “Survival of businesses using collaborative relationships to commercialize complex goods”. *Strategic Management Journal*. 17(3): 169–195.
- Modigliani, F. and M. Miller (1959). “The cost of capital, corporation finance and the theory of investment”. *The American Economic Review*. 49(4): 655–669.
- Mohnen, P. and L. H. Röller (2005). “Complementarities in innovation policy”. *European Economic Review*. 49(6): 1431–1450.
- Mokyr, J. (1990). *Twenty-Five Centuries of Technological Change: An Historical Survey*. Abingdon, UK: Taylor & Francis.
- Moraes Silva, R. D. Diego, L. O. Lucas, and N. S. Vonortas (2020). “Internal barriers to innovation and university-industry cooperation among technology-based SMEs in Brazil”. *Industry and Innovation*. 27(3): 235–263.
- Mowery, D. and N. Rosenberg (1979). “The influence of market demand upon innovation: A critical review of some recent empirical studies”. *Research Policy*. 8: 102–153.
- Mulgan, G., K. Joseph, and W. Norman (2013). “Indicators for social innovation”. In: *Handbook of Innovation Indicators and Measurement*. Ed. by F. Gault. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar. 420–438.
- Mulkay, B., B. Hall, and J. Mairesse (2001). “Firm level investment and R&D in France and the United States: A comparison”. In: *Investing Today for the World of Tomorrow*. Ed. by D. Bundesbank. Frankfurt, Germany: Springer Verlag. 229–273.
- Nederhof, A. J. and A. F. J. van Raan (1989). *The Use and Development of Science and Technology Indicators for Policy Making in Five Countries: A Comparison*. In *Science and Technology Indicators: Their Use in Science Policy and Their Role in Science Studies*. Ed. by H. F. Moed and A. F. J. Van Raan. Leiden, Netherlands: DSWO Press.
- Nelson, R. (1959). “The simple economics of basic scientific research”. *Journal of Political Economy*. 67(3): 297–306.

- Nelson, R. (1962). "Introduction". In: *The Rate and Direction of Inventive Activity*. Ed. by National Bureau of Economic Research. Princeton, USA: Princeton University Press. 646.
- Nelson, R. (1991). "Why do firms differ, and how does it matter?" *Strategic Management Journal*. 12: 61–74.
- Nelson, R., ed. (1993). *National Innovation Systems: A Comparative Study*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Nelson, R. (2006). *As Fontes Do Crescimento Econômico*. Campinas, Brasil: Editora UNICAMP.
- Nelson, R., M. Peck, and E. Kalachek (1967). *Technology, Economic Growth and Public Policy*. Washington, DC, USA: The Brookings Institution.
- Nelson, R. and S. Winter (1974). "Neoclassical vs. evolutionary theories of economic growth: Critique and prospectus". *The Economic Journal*. 84(336): 886–905.
- Nelson, R. and S. Winter (1977). "In search of useful theory of innovation". *Research Policy*. 6(1): 36–76.
- Nelson, R. and S. Winter (2005). *Uma Teoria Evolucionária Da Mudança Econômica*. Campinas, Brasil: Editora UNICAMP.
- North, D. (1990). *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- NSF (2020). *The State of the U.S. Science and Engineering*. Arlington, USA.
- Nutter, G. W. (1956). "Monopoly power, bigness, and progress". *Journal of Political Economy*. 64(6): 520–527.
- OECD (1963). *Proposed Standard Practice for Surveys on Research and Experimental Development—Frascati Manual*. Paris, France.
- OECD (1992). *Proposed Guidelines for Collecting and Interpreting Technological Innovation Data—Oslo Manual*. Paris, France.
- OECD (2005). *Guidelines for Collecting and Interpreting Innovation Data—Oslo Manual*. Paris, France.
- OECD (2018a). *Guidelines for Collecting, Reporting and Using Data on Innovation—Oslo Manual*. Paris, France.
- OECD (2018b). *Science, Technology and Innovation Outlook 2018*. Paris, France.



- Ogburn, W. (1928). "Inventions and discoveries". *American Journal of Sociology*. 34(1): 25–39.
- Ogburn, W. (1937). "The influence of inventions on American social institutions in the future". *American Journal of Sociology*. 63(3): 365–376.
- Ogburn, W. (1947). "How technology changes society". *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. 249: 81–88.
- Pacheco, C. A. (2007). *As Reformas Da Política Nacional de Ciência Tecnologia e Inovação No Brasil (1999–2002)*. Santiago, Chile.
- Pacheco, C. A. and S. Corder (2010). *Mapeamento Institucional e de Medidas de Política Com Impacto Sobre a Inovação Produtiva e a Diversificação Das Exportações*. Santiago, Chile.
- Pellegrino, G. and M. Savona (2017). "No money, no honey? Financial versus knowledge and demand constraints on innovation". *Research Policy*. 46(2): 510–521.
- Penrose, E. (2006). *A Teoria Do Crescimento Da Firma*. Campinas, Brasil: Editora UNICAMP.
- Pigou, A. C. (2013). *The Economics of Welfare*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pinch, T. and R. Swedberg, eds. (2008). *Living in a Material World: Economic Sociology Meets Science and Technology Studies*. Cambridge, USA: MIT Press.
- Powell, W. and S. Grodal (2005). "Networks of innovators". In: *The Oxford Handbook of Innovation*. Ed. by J. Fagerberg, D. Mowery, and R. Nelson. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. 56–85.
- Powell, W., K. Koput, and L. Smith-Doerr (1996). "Interorganizational collaboration and the locus of innovation: Networks of learning in biotechnology". *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 41(1): 116–145.
- Prebisch, R. (1950). *Crecimiento, Desequilibrio y Disparidades: Interpretación Del Proceso de Desarrollo Económico*. Santiago, Chile.
- Ramella, F. (2015). *Sociology of Economic Innovation*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Rammer, C., V. Behrens, T. Doherr, B. Krieger, B. Peters, T. Schubert, M. Trunschke, and J. Burg (2020). *Innovationen in Der Deutschen Wirtschaft*. Mannheim, Germany.

- Rasiah, R. (2009). “Technological capabilities of automotive firms in Indonesia and Malaysia”. *Asian Economic Papers*. 8(1): 151–169.
- Rauen, C. and L. Velho (2010). “Integrando Abordagens da Economia e da Sociologia em Análises da Produção Tecnológica”. *Sociedade e Estado*. 25(1): 71–92.
- Resende, M., E. Strube, and R. Zeidan (2014). “Complementarity of innovation policies in Brazilian industry: An econometric study”. *International Journal of Production Economics*. 158: 9–17.
- Robinson, J. (1938). “The classification of inventions”. *Review of Economic Studies*. 5(2): 139–142.
- Rogers, E. (1983). *Diffusion of Innovations*. 3rd edition. New York, USA: The Free Press.
- Romer, P. (1986). “Increasing returns and long-run growth”. *Journal of Political Economy*. 94(5): 1002–1037.
- Romer, P. M. (1990). “Endogenous technological change”. *Journal of Political Economy*. 98(5): S71–102.
- Rosegger, G. (1996). *The Economics of Production and Innovation: An Industrial Perspective*. Oxford, UK: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Rosenberg, N. (1976). *Perspectives on Technology*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Rosenberg, N. (2006). *Por Dentro Da Caixa-Preta: Tecnologia e Economia*. Campinas, Brasil: Editora UNICAMP.
- Rossman, J. (1931). “The motives of inventors”. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*. 45(3): 522–528.
- Rothwell, R. (1994). “Towards the fifth-generation innovation process”. *International Marketing Review*. 11(1): 7–31.
- Roud, V. (2018). “Understanding the heterogeneity of innovation modes: Performance effects, barriers, and demand for state support”. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*. 133(May): 238–253.
- Ruttan, V. (1959). “Usher and Schumpeter on invention, innovation, and technological change”. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*. 73(4): 596–606.
- Ryan, B. and N. Gross (1943). “The diffusion of hybrid seed corn in two Iowa communities”. *Rural Sociology*. 8: 15–24.
- Sadun, R., N. Bloom, and J. V. Reenen (2017). “Why do we undervalue competent management?” *Harvard Business Review*. 95(5): 120–127.

- Sah, R. and J. Stiglitz (1986). “The architecture of economic system: Hierarchies and polyarchies”. *American Economic Review*. 76: 716–727.
- Salazar, M. and A. Holbrook (2004). “A debate on innovation surveys”. *Science and Public Policy*. 31(4): 254–266.
- Sandberg, B. and L. Aarikka-Stenroos (2014). “What makes it so difficult? A systematic review on barriers to radical innovation”. *Industrial Marketing Management*. 43(8): 1293–1305.
- Sanderson, I. (2002). “Evaluation, policy learning and evidence-based policy making”. *Public Administration*. 80(1): 1–22.
- Santiago, F., C. De Fuentes, G. Dutrénit, and N. Gras (2017). “What hinders innovation performance of services and manufacturing firms in Mexico?” *Economics of Innovation and New Technology*. 26(3): 247–268.
- Savignac, F. (2008). “Impact of financial constraints on innovation: What can be learned from a direct measure?” *Economics of Innovation and New Technology*. 17(6): 553–569.
- Saxenian, A. (1994). *Regional Advantage: Culture and Competition in Silicon Valley and Route 128*. Cambridge, USA: Harvard University Press.
- Scerri, M. (2006). “The conceptual fluidity of national innovation systems: Implications for innovation measures”. In: *Measuring Innovation in OECD and Non-OECD Countries*. Ed. by W. Blankley, M. Scerri, N. Molotja, and I. Saloojee. Cape Town, South Africa: HSRC Publishing. 9–19.
- Scherer, F. and D. Ross (1990). *Industrial Market Structure and Economic Performance*. Boston, USA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Schmookler, J. (1962). “Changes in industry and in the state of knowledge as determinants of industrial invention”. In: *The Rate and Direction of Inventive Activity*, edited by National Bureau of Economic Research. Princeton, USA: Princeton University Press. 195–232.
- Schmookler, J. (1966). *Invention and Economic Growth*. Cambridge, USA: Harvard University Press.
- Schumpeter, J. (1982). *A Teoria Do Desenvolvimento Econômico*. São Paulo, Brasil: Abril Cultural.

- Schumpeter, J. (2008). *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*. New York, USA: Harper Perennial.
- Schumpeter, J. (2012). *Economic Doctrine and Method: An Historical Sketch*. Eastford, USA: Martino Fine Books.
- Schumpeter, J. (2017). *Business Cycles: A Theoretical, Historical, and Statistical Analysis of the Capitalist Process*. Eastford, USA: Martino Fine Books.
- Segarra-Blasco, A., J. Garcia-Quevedo, and M. Teruel-Carrizosa (2008). “Barriers to innovation and public policy in catalonia”. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*. 4(4): 431–451.
- Silva, D. R. d. M. and A. T. Furtado (2017). “Modelos Teóricos e Interesses de Mensuração no Surgimento da Pesquisa de Inovação Brasileira (Pintec)”. *Revista Brasileira de Inovação*. 16(1): 97.
- Simon, H. (1991). “Bounded rationality and organization learning”. *Organization Science*. 2(1): 125–134.
- Sirilli, G. (2006). “Developing science and technology indicators at the OECD: The NESTI network”. In: *1st PRIME Indicators Conference*. Lugano, Switzerland: ISSiRFA. 16.
- Sloan, B. (2006). “Developing the linkage between policy and innovation measurement”. In: *Measuring Innovation in OECD and Non-OECD Countries*. Ed. by W. Blankley, M. Scerri, N. Molotja, and I. Saloojee. Cape Town, South Africa: HSRC Publishing. 43–58.
- Smith, A. (2016). *A Riqueza Das Nações*. 3a edition. São Paulo, Brasil: Martins Fontes.
- Smith, G. E., B. Malinowski, H. Spinden, and A. Goldenweiser (1927). *Culture: The Diffusion Controversy*. New York, USA: W.W. Norton & Co.
- Smith, K. (2000). “Innovation as a systemic phenomenon: Rethinking the role of policy”. *Enterprise and Innovation Management Studies*. 1(1): 73–102.
- Smith, K. (2005). “Measuring innovation”. In: *The Oxford Handbook of Innovation*. Ed. by J. Fagerberg, D. Mowery, and R. Nelson. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. 148–179.
- Soete, L., B. Verspagen, and B. T. Weel (2010). “Systems of innovation”. In: *Handbook of the Economics of Innovation*. Ed. by B. Hall and N. Rosenberg. Amsterdam, Netherlands: Elsevier B.V. 1159–1180.

- Solow, R. (1957). "Technical change and the aggregate production function". *The Review of Economics and Statistics*. 39(3): 312–320.
- Spiegel-Rösing, I. and D. de Solla Price, eds. (1977). *Science, Technology and Society: A Cross Disciplinary Perspective*. London, UK: SAGE Publications Inc.
- Steinmueller, W. E. (2013). "Innovation studies at maturity". In: *Innovation Studies: Evolution and Future Challenges*. Ed. by J. Fagerberg, B. Martin, and E. Andersen. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. 147–167.
- Stokes, D. (2005). *O Quadrante de Pasteur: A Ciência Básica e a Inovação Tecnológica*. Campinas, Brasil: Editora UNICAMP.
- Storper, M. and R. Walker (1989). *The Capitalist Imperative: Territory, Technology and Industrial Growth*. Cambridge, UK: Blackwell Publishers.
- Sutton, J. (1998). *Technology and Market Structure*. Cambridge, USA: MIT Press.
- Suzigan, W. and J. Furtado (2006). "Política Industrial e Desenvolvimento". *Revista de Economia Política*. 26(2): 163–185.
- Swedberg, R. (1991). *Schumpeter: A Biography*. Princeton, USA: Princeton University Press.
- Swedberg, R. (2004). "Sociologia Econômica: Hoje e Amanhã". *Tempo Social*. 16(2): 7–34.
- Tarde, G. (1903). *The Laws of Imitation*. New York, USA: Henry Holt and Company.
- Teece, D. (1986). "Profiting from technological innovation—Implications for integration, collaboration, licensing and public policy". *Research Policy*. 15(6): 285–305.
- Teece, D. J. (2019). "A capability theory of the firm: An economics and (strategic) management perspective". *New Zealand Economic Papers*. 53(1): 1–43.
- Teece, D., G. Pisano, and A. Shuen (1997). "Dynamic capabilities and strategic management". *Strategic Management Journal*. 18(7): 509–533.
- Teece, D., R. Rumelt, G. Dosi, and S. Winter (1994). "Understanding corporate coherence: Theory and evidence". *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organizations*. 23(1): 1–30.

- Teich, A. (2018). “In search of evidence-based science policy: From the endless frontier to SciSIP”. *Annals of Science and Technology Policy*. 2(2): 75–199.
- Thomä, J. (2017). “DUI mode learning and barriers to innovation—A case from Germany”. *Research Policy*. 46(7): 1327–1339.
- Thomas, W. and F. Znaniecki (1927). *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America*. New York, USA: Knopf.
- Tidd, J., J. Bessant, and K. Pavitt (2005). *Managing Innovation: Integrating Technological, Market and Organizational Change*. 3rd edition. Hoboken, USA: John Wiley and Sons.
- Tourigny, D. and C. D. Le (2004). “Impediments to innovation faced by Canadian manufacturing firms”. *Economics of Innovation and New Technology*. 13(3): 217–250.
- UNESCO (2016). *UNESCO Science Report: Towards 2030*. Paris, France.
- Usher, A. P. (1954). *A History of Mechanical Inventions*. 2nd edition. Cambridge, USA: Harvard University Press.
- Utterback, J. and W. Abernathy (1975). “A dynamic model of process and product innovation”. *Omega*. 3(6): 639–656.
- Veblen, T. (1898). “Why is economics not an evolutionary science?” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*. 12(4): 373–397.
- Vega-Jurado, J., A. Gutiérrez-Gracia, I. Fernández-de-Lucio, and L. Manjarrés-Henríquez (2008). “The effect of external and internal factors on firms’ product innovation”. *Research Policy*. 37(4): 616–632.
- Velho, L. (1992). “Indicadores de C&T e Seu Uso Em Política Científica”. *Sociedade e Estado*. 7(1): 63–77.
- Velho, L. (2001). “Estratégias Para um Sistema de Indicadores de C&T no Brasil”. *Parcerias Estratégicas*. 13: 109–121.
- Velho, L. (2011). “Conceitos de Ciência e a Política Científica, Tecnológica e de Inovação”. *Sociologias*. 26: 128–153.
- Viotti, E. (2003). “Fundamentos e Evolução dos Indicadores de CT&I”. In: *Indicadores de Ciência, Tecnologia e Inovação no Brasil*. Ed. by E. Viotti and M. Macedo. Campinas, Brasil: Editora UNICAMP. 45–87.

- Viotti, E. (2008). “Brasil: De Política de C&T Para Política de Inovação? Evolução e Desafios Das Políticas Brasileiras de Ciência, Tecnologia e Inovação”. In: *Avaliação de Políticas de Ciência, Tecnologia e Inovação: diálogo entre experiências internacionais e brasileiras*. Ed. by Centro de Gestão e Estudos Estratégicos – CGEE. Brasília, Brasil: CGEE. 138–174.
- Viotti, E. (2013). “Novo Indicador de Meta-Síntese Para a Política de Inovação”. *Parcerias Estratégicas*. 18(36): 151–173.
- Vonortas, N. (1991). *Cooperative Research in R&D-Intensive Industries*. Beatty, USA: Avebury Academic Publishers.
- Vonortas, N. (1997). *Cooperation in Research and Development*. Berlin, Germany: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Vonortas, N. (2009). “Innovation networks in industry”. In: *Innovation Networks in Industries*. Ed. by F. Malerba and N. Vonortas. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar. 27–44.
- Vonortas, N. and L. Zirulia (2015). “Strategic technology alliances and networks”. *Economics of Innovation and New Technology*. 24(5): 490–509.
- WEF (2019). *The Global Competitiveness Report 2019*. Geneva, Switzerland.
- Wieczorek, A. and M. Hekkert (2012). “Systemic instruments for systemic innovation problems: A framework for policy makers and innovation scholars”. *Science and Public Policy*. 39(1): 74–87.
- Williams, J. and A. Aridi (2015). “Intellectual property, standards”. In: *Innovation Policy: A Practical Introduction*. Ed. by N. Vonortas, P. Rouge, and A. Aridi. New York, USA: Springer. 107–119.
- Williamson, O. (1985). *The Economic Institutions of Capitalism: Firms, Markets, Relational Contracting*. New York, USA: The Free Press.
- WIPO (2020). *Global Innovation Index 2020 Who Will Finance Innovation?* Geneva, Switzerland.
- Woodward, J. (1958). *Management and Technology: Problems and Progress in Technology*. London, UK: HMSO.
- Yannopoulos, P., N. Gorish, and M. Kefalaki (2011). “Mental models as barriers to innovation”. *Journal of Business and Policy Research*. 6(3): 115–124.