



INNOVATION IQTISODIYOT

Ilmiy-amaliy elektron jurnal

2026

№5

ИННОВАЦИОННАЯ ЭКОНОМИКА

Научно-практический электронный журнал

INNOVATIVE ECONOMY

Scientific and practical electronic journal



Indexlanadigan bazalar:  Google Scholar  Crossref  OpenAIRE  CYBERLENIKA



INNOVATION IQTISODIYOT

ILMIY-AMALIY
ELEKTRON JURNAL

5-jild
5-son
May, 2026

May, 2026
Volume 5
Number 5

ИННОВАЦИОННАЯ
ЭКОНОМИКА
Научно-практический
электронный журнал

INNOVATIVE ECONOMY
Electronic scientific and
practical journal



INNOVATSION IQTISODIYOT

ILMIY-AMALIY ELEKTRON JURNAL

ISSN: 3030-315X

ojs.kstu.uz

Muassis:

Qarshi davlat texnika universiteti

Tahririyat Kengashi raisi:

R.X.Ergashev, iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori, professor

Tahririyat Kengashi raisi o‘rinbosari:

S.N.Xamrayeva, iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori, professor

Mas’ul muharrir:

N.A.Ochilova, PhD, dotsent

Texnik muharrir:

S.J.Qulmurotov

Jurnal har oyda bir marotaba elektron shaklda jurnalning rasmiy sayti orqali nashr etiladi.

Tahririyat manzili:

180100, Qarshi shahri, Mustaqillik ko‘chasi 225-uy Tel.: +998 (75) 221 09 23

+998 (93) 902 72 63

Faks: +998 (75) 221 1395

innoeconomic@kstu.uz

“Innovatsion iqtisodiyot” ilmiy - amaliy elektron jurnali O‘zbekiston Respublikasi Oliy ta’lim, fan va innovatsiyalar vazirligi huzuridagi **Oliy attestatsiya komissiyasi rayosatining 2025-yil 5-apreldagi 369-sonli qarori** bilan milliy ilmiy nashrlar ro‘yxatiga kiritilgan.

Jurnalda quyidagi ruknlar asosida maqolalar nashr etiladi:

1. Nazariya va metodologiya
2. Raqamli iqtisodiyot
3. Mintaqa va tarmoqlar iqtisodiyoti
4. Kichik biznes va xususiy tadbirkorlik
5. Inson kapitali iqtisodiyoti
6. Menejment va marketing
7. Buxgalteriya hisobi, iqtisodiy tahlil va audit
8. Moliya, kredit va investitsiya
9. Ekonometrika va statistika
10. Xizmat ko‘rsatish va turizm sohasi

TAHRIRIYAT KENGASHI:

Tahririyat Kengashining xalqaro a'zolari:

Ovchinnikov Viktor Nikolayevich - i.f.d., professor, akademik (Janubiy Federal Universitet, Rossiya)
Solodovnikov Sergiy Yurevich - i.f.d., professor (Belorussiya milliy texnika universiteti)
Sidorov Viktor Aleksandrovich - i.f.d., professor, (Kuban davlat universiteti)
Shevchenko Igor Viktorovich - i.f.d., professor (Kuban davlat universiteti, Rossiya)
Kusainov Xalel Xaymullievich - i.f.d., professor, akademik (Qozog‘iston Respublikasi Milliy fanlar akademiyasi)
Samandarzoda Iskandar Hakim - Iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori (Sh.Shotemur nomidagi Tojikiston agrar universiteti)
Gibadullin Artur Arturovich - i.f.n. dotsent (Milliy tadqiqot universiteti, Moskva energetika instituti, Rossiya)
Sergey Aleksandrovich Voynash - ilmiy xodim (P.Lumumbi nomidagi Rossiya xalqlar do‘stligi universiteti)
Valentina Nikolayevna Pulyayeva - iqtisod fanlari nomzodi, dotsent (Rossiya Federatsiyasi hukumati qoshidagi Moliya universiteti)
Dmitriy Evgenievich Morkovkin, iqtisod fanlari nomzodi, dotsent (Moliya universiteti, Rossiya Federatsiyasi hukumati)
Sadriddinov Manuchehr Islomiddinovich - i.f.d., professor, (Tojikiston Respublikasi Milliy fanlar Akademiyasi)
Perskaya Viktoriya Vadimovna - i.f.d., professor, (Rossiya Federatsiyasi hukumati huzuridagi Moliya universiteti)
Molchanov Igor Nikolayevich - i.f.d., professor, (Lomonosov nomidagi Moskva davlat universiteti)
Basova Mariya Mixaylovna - i.f.d., professor, (Rossiya Federatsiyasi hukumati huzuridagi Moliya universiteti)
Aleksandr Leonidovich Chupin, iqtisod fanlari nomzodi (P.Lumumbi nomidagi Rossiya xalqlar do‘stligi universiteti)
Nezamaykin Valeriy Nikolayevich - i.f.d., professor, (Rossiya davlat gumanitar universiteti)
Nikonorova Alla Vladimirovna - i.f.n., dotsent, (Rossiya Federatsiyasi hukumati huzuridagi Moliya universiteti)
Dmitriyeva Olga Aleksandrovna - i.f.n., dotsent, (Rossiya Federatsiyasi hukumati huzuridagi Moliya universiteti)
Shvets Yuriy Yuryevich - i.f.n., dotsent, (Rossiya Fanlar akademiyasining Nazorat fanlari instituti)
Kolossova Yelena Valeryevna - i.f.n., dotsent, (Plexanov nomidagi Rossiya iqtisodiyot universiteti)

Tahririyat Kengashi a'zolari:

Gulyamov Saidaxror Saidaxmedovich - i.f.d., professor, akademik
Pardayev Mamayunus Qarshiboyevich - i.f.d., professor
Navruz-zoda Baxtiyor Negmatovich - i.f.d., professor
Xatamov Ochildi Qurbonovich - i.f.d., professor
Fayziyeva Shirin Shodmonovna - i.f.n., professor
Jumayeva Gulrux Jo‘raqulovna - i.f.n., professor
Egamberdiyeva Salima Raimovna - i.f.n., dotsent
Erkayeva Gulbahor Panjiyevna - i.f.n., professor
Yakubova Shamshinur Shuxratovna - i.f.d., (DSc) dotsent
Amirqulov Shuhrat Olimovich - i.f.f.d., (PhD), dotsent
Samiyeva Gulnoza Toxirovna - i.f.f.d., (PhD), dotsent
Aliqulov Azamat Tuyg‘unovich - i.f.f.d., (PhD), dotsent
Aminov Fazlitdin Baxadirovich - i.f.n., dotsent
Xo‘jaqulova Nigora Rustamovna - i.f.f.d., (PhD), dotsent
Turobov Sherzod Alisherovich - i.f.f.d., (PhD), dotsent
Alimova Munisa Yulchiyevna - i.f.f.d. (PhD) dotsent
Ergasheva Nasiba Raxmatullayevna - i.f.d., (DSc), dotsent
Boboqulov Sanjar Baxromkulovich - i.f.f.d., (PhD), dotsent
Djalilov Raxmonkul Hamidovich - i.f.f.d., (PhD), dotsent
Nomazov Baxrom Bobomurodovich - i.f.f.d. (PhD) dotsent
Alimxanova Nigora Alimxanovna - i.f.f.d. (PhD) dotsent
Jonuzokov Mirzabek Kulmamatovich - i.f.f.d. (PhD), dotsent
Muxammadiyeva Yulduz Yusupovna - i.f.f.d. (PhD)
Tursunova Aziza Xoshimovna - i.f.f.d. (PhD)
Xolliyev Sherali Baxtiyorovich - i.f.f.d. (PhD)
Panjiyev Samijon Aliqulovich - PhD, dotsent



ИННОВАЦИОННАЯ ЭКОНОМИКА

Научно-практический электронный журнал

ISSN: 3030-315X

ojs.kstu.uz

Учредитель:

Каршинский государственный технический университет

Председатель редакционного совета:

Р.Х.Эргашев, доктор экономических наук, профессор

Заместитель председателя редакционного совета:

С.Н.Хамраева, доктор экономических наук, профессор

Ответственный редактор:

Н.А.Очилова, PhD, доцент

Технический редактор:

С.Ж.Кулмуротов

Журнал издается один раз в месяц в электронной форме и публикуется через официальный сайт журнала.

Адрес редакции:

180100, г. Карши, ул. Мустакиллик, дом 225

Тел: +998 (75) 221 09 23

+998 (93) 902 72 63

Факс: +998 (75) 221 1395

E-mail: innoeconomic@kstu.uz

Научно-практический электронный журнал «Инновационная экономика» включён в перечень национальных научных изданий на основании решения Президиума Высшей аттестационной комиссии при Министерстве высшего образования, науки и инноваций Республики Узбекистан от 5 апреля 2025 года № 369.

В журнале публикуются статьи по следующим рубрикам:

1. Теория и методология
2. Цифровая экономика
3. Экономика регионов и отраслей
4. Малый бизнес и частное предпринимательство
5. Экономика человеческого капитала
6. Менеджмент и маркетинг
7. Бухгалтерский учет, экономический анализ и аудит
8. Финансы, кредит и инвестиции
9. Эконометрика и статистика
10. Сфера услуг и туризм

Редакционная коллегия:

Международные члены Совета редколлегии:

Овчинников Виктор Николаевич - д.э.н., профессор, академик (Южный федеральный университет, Россия)

Солодовников Сергей Юрьевич - д.э.н., профессор (Белорусский национальный технический университет)

Виктор Александрович Сидоров - д.э.н., профессор, (Кубанский государственный университет)

Шевченко Игорь Викторович - д.э.н., профессор (Кубанский государственный университет)

Кусаинов Халел Хаймуллович - д.э.н., профессор, академик (НААН Республика Казахстан)

Самандарзода Искандар Хаким - д.э.н., профессор (Таджикистанский аграрный университет им. Ш. Шотемура)

Гибатуллин Артур Артурович - к.э.н., доцент (Национальный исследовательский университет «Московский энергетический институт»)

Войнаш Сергей Александрович - научный сотрудник (Российского университета дружбы народов имени П.Лумумби)

Пуляева Валентина Николаевна - к.э.н., доцент (Финансовый университет при Правительстве РФ)

Морковкин Дмитрий Евгеньевич - к.э.н., доцент (Финансовый университет Правительство РФ)

Садриддинов Манучехр Исламиддинович - д.э.н., профессор (Национальная академия наук Республики Таджикистан)

Перская Виктория Вадимовна - д.э.н., профессор (Финансовый университет при Правительстве РФ)

Молчанов Игорь Николаевич - д.э.н., профессор (Московский государственный университет имени М.В. Ломоносова)

Басова Мария Михайловна - д.э.н., профессор (Финансового университета Российской Федерации)

Чупин Александр Леонидович - к.э.н. (Российского университета дружбы народов имени П. Лумумби)

Незаймакин Валерий Николаевич - д.э.н., профессор (РГТУ)

Никонорова Алла Владимировна - к.э.н., доцент (Финансового университета Российской Федерации)

Дмитриева Ольга Александровна - к.э.н., доцент (Финансового университета Российской Федерации)

Швец Юрий Юрьевич - к.э.н., доцент (Институт проблем управления РАН)

Колосова Елена Валерьевна - к.э.н., доцент (Российский экономический университет имени Г.В. Плеханова)

Члены Совета редколлегии:

Гулямов Саидхорр Саидхмедович - д.э.н., профессор, академик

Пардаев Мамаюнус Каршибоевич - д.э.н., профессор

Навруз-зода Бахтиёр Негматович - д.э.н., профессор

Хатамов Очилди Курбанович - д.э.н., профессор

Файзиева Ширин Шодмоновна - к.э.н., профессор

Жумаева Гулрух Журакуловна - к.э.н., профессор

Эгамбердиева Салима Раимовна - к.э.н., доцент

Еркаева Гулбахор Панжиевна - к.э.н., профессор

Якубова Шамина Шухратовна - д.э.н., (DSc), доцент

Амиркулов Шухрат Олимович - д.ф.э.н., (PhD), доцент

Самиева Гулноза Тохировна - д.ф.э.наук., (PhD), доцент

Алигулов Азамат Туйгунович - д.ф.э.н., (PhD), доцент

Аминов Фазлитдин Бахадирович - к.э.н., доцент

Хужакулова Нигора Рустамовна - д.ф.э.н., (PhD), доцент

Туробов Шерзод Алишерович - д.ф.э.н., (PhD), доцент

Алимова Муниса Юльчиевна - д.ф.э.н., (PhD), доцент

Эрашьева Насиба Рахматуллаевна - д.э.н., (DSc), доцент

Бобокулов Санжар Бахромкулович - д.ф.э.н., (PhD), доцент

Джалилов Рахмонкул Хамидович - д.ф.э., (PhD), доцент

Номазов Бахром Бобомуродович - д.ф.э.н., (PhD), доцент

Алимханова Нигора Алимхановна - д.ф.э.н., (PhD), доцент

Джанузакон Мирзабек Кулмаматович - д.ф.э.н., (PhD), доцент

Мухаммадиева Юлдуз Юсуповна - д.ф.э.н., (PhD)

Турсунова Азиза Хошимовна - д.ф.э.н., (PhD)

Холлиев Шерали Бахтиёрович - д.ф.э.н., (PhD)

Панджиев Самиджон Аликулич - PhD, доцент



Ekonometrika va statistika
Econometrics and statistics
Эконометрика и статистика



THEORETICAL MODELS AND INSTITUTIONAL MECHANISMS, FORMS AND STRUCTURES OF COOPERATION BETWEEN EDUCATION AND MANUFACTURE

Navruzova Gulrukh Uktamovna

TA'LIM VA ISHLAB CHIQRARISH O'RTASIDAGI HAMKORLIKNING NAZARIY MODELLARI, INSTITUTIONAL MECHANISMLARI, SHAKLLARI VA TUZILMALARI

Navruzova Gulrux O'ktamovna

ТЕОРЕТИЧЕСКИЕ МОДЕЛИ, ИНСТИТУЦИОНАЛЬНЫЕ МЕХАНИЗМЫ, ФОРМЫ И СТРУКТУРЫ СОТРУДНИЧЕСТВА МЕЖДУ ОБРАЗОВАНИЕМ И ПРОИЗВОДСТВОМ

Наврузова Гулрух Уктамовна

Received: May 18, 2026 May: May 22, 2026 May: May 25, 2026 Published: June 1, 2026

Abstract: The integration of higher education and production constitutes one of the central problems of contemporary education economics, innovation studies, and science-and-technology policy. This article reviews and systematizes the principal approaches developed by leading international scholars to the forms and structures through which universities and the productive sector are linked. Four comparative tables classify the dominant theoretical models, the principal forms of integration, the intermediary structures that sustain them, and the major national models of the United States, Germany, Japan, the Nordic countries, and the East Asian developmental states. The analysis shows that no single model is universally superior; rather, effective integration depends on the alignment between the chosen form, the governing structure, and the surrounding institutional context.

Keywords: higher education; industry; university-industry collaboration; Triple Helix; national innovation systems; entrepreneurial university; technology transfer; dual education.

Аннотация: Интеграция высшего образования и производства является одной из центральных проблем современной экономики образования, исследований инноваций и политики в области науки и техники. В данной статье рассматриваются и систематизируются основные подходы, разработанные ведущими международными учеными, к формам и структурам, посредством которых университеты и производственный сектор связаны между собой. Четыре сравнительные таблицы классифицируют доминирующие теоретические модели, основные формы интеграции, посреднические структуры, которые их поддерживают, и основные национальные модели США, Германии, Японии, скандинавских стран и восточноазиатских развивающихся государств. Анализ показывает, что ни одна модель не является универсально превосходной; скорее, эффективная интеграция зависит от согласованности между выбранной формой, структурой управления и окружающим институциональным контекстом.

Ключевые слова: высшее образование; промышленность; сотрудничество университета и производства; модель тройной спирали; национальные инновационные системы; предпринимательский университет; трансфер технологий; дуальное образование.

Annotatsiya: Oliy ta'lim va ishlab chiqarishning integratsiyasi zamonaviy ta'lim iqtisodiyoti, innovatsion tadqiqotlar va fan-texnika siyosatining markaziy muammolaridan birini tashkil etadi. Ushbu maqolada nufuzli xalqaro olimlar tomonidan universitetlar va ishlab chiqarish sektori bog'langan shakl va tuzilmalarga oid asosiy yondashuvlar ko'rib chiqiladi va tizimlashtiriladi. To'rtta qiyosiy jadvalda dominant nazariy modellar, integratsiyaning asosiy shakllari, ularni qo'llab-quvvatlovchi vositachi tuzilmalar hamda AQSh, Germaniya, Yaponiya, Shimoliy va Sharqiy



Osiyo rivojlanish davlatlarining asosiy milliy modellari tasniflanadi. Tahlil shuni ko'rsatadiki, hech bir model universal darajada ustun emas; aksincha, samarali integratsiya tanlangan shakl, boshqaruv tuzilmasi va uning atrofidagi institutsional kontekst o'rtasidagi uyg'unlikka bog'liq.

Kalit so'zlar: oliy ta'lim; sanoat; universitet va ishlab chiqarish hamkorligi; Uch spiral modeli; milliy innovatsion tizimlar; tadbirkorlik universiteti; texnologiyalar transferi; dual ta'lim.

INTRODUCTION

The relationship between higher education and the productive sector has moved, over the past half-century, from the periphery to the centre of policy and academic debate. Whereas the classical Humboldtian university was conceived primarily as a site for the disinterested pursuit of knowledge and the cultivation of the individual, the contemporary university is increasingly expected to contribute directly to economic competitiveness, regional development, and technological renewal. This expectation is captured by the notion of the “third mission” of higher education, which complements the traditional missions of teaching and research with an explicit commitment to engagement with industry and society.

The reasons for this shift are well documented in the literature. The acceleration of technological change has shortened the distance between scientific discovery and commercial application, making the boundary between “basic” and “applied” research increasingly porous. At the same time, the rise of the knowledge economy has made human capital and innovative capacity the principal sources of competitive advantage, placing universities at the heart of value creation. Governments, facing fiscal constraints and rising expectations, have come to view universities as instruments of innovation policy and have introduced funding mechanisms, legal reforms, and incentive structures designed to strengthen the links between academia and industry.

In response, scholars from several disciplines—economics of innovation, sociology of science, organizational theory, and higher-education studies—have proposed a rich variety of conceptual frameworks to describe and explain how universities and firms cooperate. These frameworks differ in their unit of analysis, their causal emphasis, and their normative implications, yet they share a common concern: how to design the forms and structures of integration so that knowledge flows productively between the educational and the productive spheres without compromising the distinctive functions of each.

This article pursues three objectives. First, it reviews and compares the principal theoretical approaches that international scholars have advanced to conceptualize higher-education-production integration. Second, it constructs a typology of the concrete forms that such integration takes and of the organizational structures that govern them. Third, it situates these forms and structures within the major national models, drawing comparative lessons. The argument is organized around the claim that forms and structures are analytically separable: the same functional form (for example, collaborative research) can be embedded in very different structures (a bilateral contract, a consortium, or an open platform), and the choice among these structures has

significant consequences for the durability and scope of the linkage.

The scholarly literature on the integration of higher education and production is organized around a small number of influential paradigms. Although they overlap and have cross-fertilized one another, each emphasizes a distinct logic of interaction. This section reviews the six approaches that have exerted the greatest influence on both research and policy.

The national innovation systems (NIS) tradition, associated with Christopher Freeman, Bengt-Åke Lundvall, and Richard Nelson, frames the university as one node in a wider system of institutions whose interactions determine a country's innovative performance. In this view, integration with production is not an isolated transaction between a single university and a single firm but a systemic property emerging from the density and quality of the linkages among universities, firms, public research organizations, financial institutions, and government agencies. The NIS approach directs attention to the institutional and regulatory environment—intellectual-property regimes, labour-market institutions, education and training systems—that conditions the propensity of actors to cooperate.

The Triple Helix Model

The Triple Helix model, developed by Henry Etzkowitz and Loet Leydesdorff, has arguably been the most influential framework in the field. It conceives innovation as the product of evolving, overlapping relations among three institutional spheres—university, industry, and government—each of which increasingly takes on the role of the others. Universities engage in entrepreneurial activity, firms undertake training and research traditionally associated with academia, and governments act as venture capitalists. The model's central insight is that sustained innovation arises in the “overlap” zones where the three spheres interpenetrate, generating hybrid organizations such as technology-transfer offices, incubators, and joint research centres. The Triple Helix thus shifts the analytical focus from the individual institution to the relations among institutions.

Mode 2 Knowledge Production

Michael Gibbons and colleagues distinguished a new mode of knowledge production, “Mode 2,” from the traditional disciplinary, university-based “Mode 1.” Mode 2 knowledge is produced in the context of application, is transdisciplinary, is generated in heterogeneous and transient configurations of actors, and is subject to broader social accountability. The thesis implies that the boundaries of the university are becoming permeable and that significant knowledge production now occurs in distributed networks that include firms, government laboratories, and consultancies. For the question of integration, Mode 2 suggests that the relevant unit is the temporary, problem-



focused collaboration rather than the permanent institution.

The Entrepreneurial University

Burton Clark's comparative study of "entrepreneurial" universities and Etzkowitz's parallel work identified an institutional transformation by which universities develop a strengthened steering core, an expanded developmental periphery of boundary-spanning units, a diversified funding base, a stimulated academic heartland, and an integrated entrepreneurial culture. The entrepreneurial university actively seeks to capitalize on its knowledge through patenting, licensing, and the creation of spin-off firms. This approach locates the engine of integration inside the university itself, in its governance, incentives, and capacity to act as a strategic organization.

Open Innovation

Henry Chesbrough's open-innovation paradigm shifts the analytical lens to the firm. It argues that firms can and should use external ideas as readily as internal ones, and external as well as internal paths to market, as they seek to advance their technology. Universities become essential sources of external knowledge in inbound open innovation, and recipients of underused corporate knowledge in outbound open innovation. The paradigm reframes university-industry integration as a deliberate strategy of managing knowledge flows across organizational boundaries, mediated by intermediaries, intellectual-property markets, and collaborative platforms.

Table 1.

Principal theoretical approaches to the integration of higher education and production

Approach	Key scholars	Unit of analysis / central logic	Implication for integration
National Innovation Systems	Freeman; Lundvall; Nelson	The national system of institutions and their linkages	Integration is a systemic property shaped by the institutional environment
Triple Helix	Etzkowitz; Leydesdorff	Overlapping relations among university, industry, government	Innovation emerges in hybrid organizations at the spheres' overlap
Mode 2 Knowledge Production	Gibbons et al.	Transient, application-oriented, transdisciplinary networks	The collaboration, not the institution, is the relevant unit
Entrepreneurial University	Clark; Etzkowitz	Internal governance and capabilities of the university	Integration is driven by the university's strategic transformation
Open Innovation	Chesbrough	The firm's management of inbound and outbound knowledge flows	Universities are deliberate sources and recipients of knowledge
Quadruple / Quintuple Helix	Carayannis; Campbell	University-industry-government plus society and environment	Integration must serve social and ecological as well as economic goals

Note. The six approaches are complementary rather than mutually exclusive. They differ chiefly in their unit of analysis: the NIS and helix models adopt a systemic perspective, the entrepreneurial-university approach is institution-centred, the open-innovation

paradigm is firm-centred, and the Mode 2 thesis is collaboration-centred. Together they provide the conceptual vocabulary used in the subsequent classification of forms and structures

Table 2.

A functional typology of the forms of higher-education-production integration

Functional category	Representative forms	Primary flow	Theoretical home
Educational / human capital	Internships; cooperative and dual education; joint curricula; industrial PhDs; sponsored scholarships	People and tacit skills	Human-capital theory; NIS
Research / knowledge transfer	Contract research; collaborative R&D; joint laboratories; patent licensing; academic consultancy	Codified and tacit knowledge	Triple Helix; Open Innovation; Mode 2
Entrepreneurial	Spin-offs and start-ups; patenting and commercialization; university venture funds; student entrepreneurship	New ventures and capital	Entrepreneurial university
Infrastructural / proximity	Science and technology parks; incubators and accelerators; clusters; shared facilities; endowed chairs	Co-location and resources	Regional innovation; clusters



Note. The categories are ordered by the principal object of exchange. In practice a single arrangement frequently combines several forms—for example, a science park (infrastructural) typically hosts joint laboratories (research) and incubates spin-offs (entrepreneurial) while offering placements to students (educational). The “theoretical home” column indicates the framework from Table 1 that most directly illuminates each category.

Whereas the previous section classified integration by its functional form, this section classifies it by the organizational structure that governs the relationship. The same form—say, collaborative research—may be organized very differently, and the structure determines the durability, the scale, and the governance of the linkage. Three principal structures can be distinguished, increasing in their degree of openness and the number of participants.

Bilateral structures link a single university (or department or laboratory) with a single firm through a direct relationship governed by a contract or memorandum. Contract research, consultancy, sponsored chairs, and licensing agreements typically take this form. Bilateral structures offer clarity of ownership and confidentiality but are limited in scope and vulnerable to the loss of a single partner.

Network structures connect several universities and several firms, often together with public agencies, in a more or less durable consortium. Competence centres, cooperative research centres, public-private research programmes, and industry-association partnerships exemplify this structure. Networks distribute risk and cost, assemble complementary capabilities, and create the hybrid “overlap” organizations central to the Triple Helix; their challenge is the governance of shared intellectual property and the alignment of heterogeneous partners.

4.3. Platform and ecosystem structures

Platform structures organize integration around a shared infrastructure or set of rules that many actors can join with relatively low barriers to entry. Science and technology parks, open-innovation platforms, regional clusters, and innovation ecosystems exemplify this structure. Platforms maximize the diversity of participants and the potential for unanticipated combinations, consistent with the open-innovation and Quadruple Helix perspectives, but require an intermediary or orchestrator to maintain the common rules and to sustain trust among participants.

Across all three structures, intermediary or boundary-spanning organizations play a decisive role. Technology-transfer offices, knowledge-transfer partnerships, contract-research organizations, cluster-management bodies, and incubator managers translate between the differing languages, time-horizons, and incentive systems of academia and industry. The literature consistently identifies the capacity and professionalism of these intermediaries as a critical determinant of successful integration.

The forms and structures described above are combined in distinctive ways in different national contexts, reflecting variations in institutional history, the structure of the economy, and the role of the state.

<https://ojs.kstu.uz/index.php/ej>

Comparative scholarship has identified several archetypal models, each associated with a characteristic balance of forms and structures.

The United States exemplifies a market-oriented model in which strong, autonomous, and well-resourced research universities interact with a dynamic venture-capital market. The 1980 Bayh-Dole Act, by allowing universities to retain title to inventions made with federal funding, catalysed the growth of technology-transfer offices and academic patenting. Iconic regional ecosystems such as Silicon Valley around Stanford University and the Route 128 corridor around the Massachusetts Institute of Technology illustrate the platform structure and the entrepreneurial forms in their most developed expression.

Germany combines a celebrated dual vocational and dual study system—strong educational forms embedded in bilateral firm-school relationships—with a powerful applied-research infrastructure. The Fraunhofer Society operates a network of institutes that conduct contract and collaborative research for industry, functioning as a national-scale intermediary. The model is distinguished by close coordination among employers' associations, chambers of commerce, and universities of applied sciences.

Japan and the East Asian developmental states (notably South Korea, Taiwan, and Singapore) display a coordinated model in which government plays a strong steering role. Historically characterized by strong in-house corporate research and comparatively weaker formal university-industry links, Japan reformed its system from the late 1990s to encourage academic patenting and collaboration. The developmental-state economies have used public funding, science parks, and targeted programmes to build university-industry linkages rapidly as part of catch-up industrialization.

The Nordic countries combine strong public funding of universities with dense, trust-based collaboration among the state, employers, and labour. Competence centres jointly funded by government, universities, and firms are a characteristic network structure. The so-called “professor's privilege,” under which academic inventors rather than universities held title to their inventions, distinguished the region historically, although several countries have since moved toward institutional ownership.

CONCLUSION

This article has reviewed the principal approaches of international scholars to the forms and structures of integration between higher education and production. It has shown that the field is organized around six influential theoretical frameworks—national innovation systems, the Triple Helix, Mode 2 knowledge production, the entrepreneurial university, open innovation, and the Quadruple and Quintuple Helix—which together supply a multi-level conceptual vocabulary. Building on these frameworks, the article proposed a typology that distinguishes the functional forms of integration (educational, research-related, entrepreneurial, and infrastructural) from the organizational structures that govern them (bilateral, network, and platform), and it located both within the major national models.



The central conclusion is that the design of effective integration is a problem of alignment. Effective integration requires consistency among the chosen form, the governing structure, the capacity of intermediary organizations, the incentives facing academic actors, and the surrounding institutional context. Because these elements are configured differently across countries, the international experience offers not a single template to be copied but a repertoire of options to be combined judiciously in light of national conditions. For policymakers and university leaders, the practical implication is to begin from a clear strategic objective, to select the form and structure that fit that objective, and to invest in the intermediary capacity and incentive alignment that allow the chosen arrangement to endure.

Muallif haqida / Сведения об авторе / Author details

Navruzova Gulrukh Uktamovna the teacher of Asia International University, Bukhara, Uzbekistan / Navruzova Gulrukh O'ktamovna Asia International University, Buxoro, O'zbekiston o'qituvchisi / Наврузова Гулрух Уктамовна преподаватель Asia International University, Бухара, Узбекистан
Email: gulrukh_514@gmail.com
ORCID: 0009-0006-4982-490X

REFERENCES:

1. Carayannis, E. G., & Campbell, D. F. J. (2009). "Mode 3" and "Quadruple Helix": Toward a 21st century fractal innovation ecosystem. *International Journal of Technology Management*, 46(3-4), 201-234.
2. Carayannis, E. G., & Campbell, D. F. J. (2010). Triple Helix, Quadruple Helix and Quintuple Helix and how do knowledge, innovation and the environment relate to each other? *International Journal of Social Ecology and Sustainable Development*, 1(1), 41-69.
3. Chesbrough, H. W. (2003). *Open Innovation: The New Imperative for Creating and Profiting from Technology*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
4. Etzkowitz, H., & Leydesdorff, L. (2000). The dynamics of innovation: From National Systems and "Mode 2" to a Triple Helix of university-industry-government relations. *Research Policy*, 29(2), 109-123.
5. Uktamovna, N. G. (2024). STRATEGIES TO IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF HIGHER EDUCATION SYSTEM. *Web of Teachers: Inderscience Research*, 2(5), 223-228.
6. Uktamovna, N. G. (2025). THE INTERCONNECTION OF EDUCATION, ECONOMIC GROWTH, AND SOCIAL STABILITY. *JOURNAL OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH, MODERN VIEWS AND INNOVATIONS*, 1(3), 68-71.
7. Uktamovna, N. G. (2025). IMPLEMENTATION AND ADVANTAGES OF THE DUAL EDUCATION SYSTEM IN UZBEKISTAN. *Modern education and development*, 20(4), 14-19.
8. Uktamovna, N. G. (2025). THE CONCEPT, CONTENT AND ESSENCE OF COLLABORATION BETWEEN HIGHER EDUCATION, SCIENCE AND PRODUCTION. *Modern education and development*, 22(4), 320-325.
9. Navruzova, G. U. (2024). INNOVATION MANAGEMENT: IMPLEMENTING A SUCCESSFUL STRATEGY. *American Journal of Modern World Sciences*, 1(2), 28-36.
10. Navruzova, G. U. (2024). ECONOMIC INDICATORS AND FACTORS IN SUSTAINABILITY. CONCEPTS, BASIC PRINCIPLES AND TYPES OF ECONOMIES. *American Journal of Modern World Sciences*, 1(3), 12-22.
11. Navruzova, G., & Ramazonova, S. (2025). UNLOCK YOUR POTENTIAL: MASTERING LANGUAGE SKILLS. *Modern Science and Research*, 4(4), 655-660.
12. Navruzova, G. (2025). DISPARITIES AND ISSUES BETWEEN THE EDUCATION SYSTEM AND INDUSTRY. *Modern Science and Research*, 4(4), 1937-1943.
13. Navruzova, G., & Murodova, D. (2025). INNOVATIVE METHODS OF LEARNING FOREIGN LANGUAGES. *Modern Science and Research*, 4(4), 649-654.
14. O'ktamovna, N. Z. G. (2023). CHARACTERISTICS AND SPECIAL FEATURES OF CHILDREN'S LITERATURE. *International Journal Of Literature And Languages*, 3(02), 49-56.
15. Navruzova, G., & Murodova, D. (2025). AN ACADEMIC ANALYSIS OF EFFECTIVE METHODS IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION AND SKILL DEVELOPMENT. *Modern Science and Research*, 4(5), 851-856.
16. Navruzova, G., & Qushshayeva, S. (2025). BUILDING ENGLISH SKILLS STEP BY STEP: LISTENING, SPEAKING, READING, AND WRITING. *Modern Science and Research*, 4(5), 847-850.
17. Navruzova, G. (2025). COMPARATIVE STUDY OF FOREIGN AND NATIONAL EXPERIENCES IN ORGANIZING THE INTEGRATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION, SCIENCE AND PRODUCTION. *Modern Science and Research*, 4(5), 1555-1559.



INNOVATION
IQTISODIYOT
ILMIY-AMALIY ELEKTRON
JURNAL

ISSN: 3030-315X



t.me/kstu_uz



Qarshi shahri,
Mustaqillik ko'chasi 225



www.kstu.uz
www.ojs.kstu.uz