INDUSTRY-UNIVERSITY COLLABORATIONS IN EMERGING ECONOMIES: A LEGITIMACY PERSPECTIVE

ABSTRACT

The need for universities to increasingly commercialise academic knowledge in addition to the two traditional core missions of research and teaching, has increased the relevance of industry-university collaboration (IUCs). Although research on IUCs has produced a significant body of knowledge explaining different factors that can enable or inhibit the success of IUCs, the nature of IUCs continues to remain poorly understood in emerging economies. The primary purpose of this paper was to extend our cumulative understanding of IUCs and how universities in emerging economies, can successfully make a transition to entrepreneurial universities. We drew upon insights from two streams of literature – legitimacy and industry-university collaboration (IUCs) – to develop an informed understanding of the phenomenon of IUCs and entrepreneurial university emergence in emerging economies of Africa. In particular, we apply the four typologies - personal, consequential, structural, and procedural - of the moral legitimacy perspective to IUCs and entrepreneurial university emergence. We propose how they can yield insights about the antecedents for successful IUCs in Africa emerging economies and the processes that can lead to the emergence of legitimate entrepreneurial universities. In highlighting the paper’s contributions to theory and practice, we suggest that just as research on IUCs benefits from applying organisational legitimacy perspective, so is organisational legitimacy informed by research arising within the field of IUCs studies.

MANAGERIAL RELEVANCE STATEMENT

The paper extends our understanding of the phenomenon of IUCs and entrepreneurial university emergence in emerging economies. Focussing on the Africa region, we suggest that just as research on IUCs benefits from applying organisational legitimacy perspective, so is organisational legitimacy informed by research arising within the field of IUCs studies. As such, the paper offers solutions to how universities can resolve the hindrance to a successful collaboration with industrial firms and offers guidelines on how universities can become entrepreneurial. In this regard, the paper highlights the need for universities to create a perception of legitimacy across levels – individual, organisation, the environment, and the process - as industry firms will consider them to be more meaningful, more predictable, and more trustworthy, and thus more likely to collaborate with them. In short, legitimacy can provide the means by which IUCs increases and a university becomes entrepreneurial in African emerging economies. This can, in turn, be a powerful engine for open innovation and socio-economic development of African emerging economies.
I. INTRODUCTION

The need for universities to increasingly commercialise academic knowledge in addition to the two traditional core missions of research and teaching, has increased the relevance of industry-university collaborations (henceforth, IUCs) [76], [103]. By collaborating with industrial firms, universities gain access to additional funds, particularly for research [120], test the practical applications of their research on real-world problems, foster links with knowledge users and facilitate technology transfer [29]. Not only is the IUCs beneficial for universities but also beneficial for industrial firms. For example, IUCs help industrial firms to gain access to knowledge, expertise and techniques that are not available inhouse. These benefits suggest that IUCs are an important mechanism for generating open innovation and also contribute positively to achieving economic growth in today’s knowledge-based societies [107], [120].

Prior research on IUCs has been somewhat limited in its focus. In a recent review, [118] identified factors that can enable or inhibit the success of the IUCs process. According to these authors, IUCs success factors can be studied from four distinct categories. The first is the institutional factors, which refer to the participating institutions. The second is the relationship factors, which refer to the linking between those partners. The third is the output factors relating to the desired results of the collaboration. Finally, the fourth is the framework factors referring to environmental aspects. Although research in each of these categories has produced a significant body of knowledge explaining different factors that can enable or inhibit the success of IUCs, the nature of IUCs continues to remain poorly understood in emerging economies. Thus, [84] and [119] have noted that current studies on IUCs in emerging economies, especially in Africa mostly consist of grey literature in the form of reports and conference publications of various national, regional and international organisations, e.g. [1], [78], [139]. Even in the existing literature, studies on IUCs have mainly focused on technologically developed countries, e.g. [47], [101]. Because these linkages usually involve sophisticated research and innovation, universities in emerging
economies, and Africa in particular, are thought to lack the ability to engage more actively with firms [84], [119].

An important motive for universities to link with industrial firms are informed by benefits, such as fostering the commercialisation of research outcomes and technology transfer [72]. This motive underscores what has come to be known as ‘entrepreneurial university’ – a university that is able to translate research results into intellectual property and economic activity [29]. Most universities, especially in the developed world, in their effort to become an entrepreneurial university, shift their research interests and emphasis away from a sole focus on developing knowledge to a dual focus on advancing knowledge and their commercialisation [30]. The Entrepreneurial university has therefore become an especially propitious site for the commercialisation of academic knowledge and technology transfer due to its basic features as a natural incubator, providing a support structure for academics to initiate new ventures through collaborations with industrial firms. In this regard, IUCs can provide a means for universities to become entrepreneurial. While most of the successful commercialisation of academic knowledge has focused on developed countries, little is known about how universities in emerging economies of Africa can successfully commercialise academic knowledge and become entrepreneurial. This gap is worth investigating because of the poorly funded state of most universities, especially in emerging economies of Africa and commercialisation can be a prime example for generating funding.

The primary purpose of this paper is to extend our cumulative understanding of IUCs and how universities in emerging economies, can successfully make a transition to entrepreneurial universities (a process called “entrepreneurial university emergence”). Given the importance of IUCs in emerging economies as well as the current difficulties associated with respect to its adequate understanding, we believe that knowledge about IUCs and entrepreneurial universities emergence stands to gain substantially if researchers import appropriate frameworks, perspectives, and theoretical paradigms from allied fields to suitably inform and enhance their overall
understanding of the phenomenon. In this regard, we seek to understand IUCs and entrepreneurial university emergence in emerging economies of Africa by adopting a ‘legitimacy’ perspective – defined as “a generalised perception or assumption that the actions of an entity are socially desirable, proper or appropriate within some socially constructed system of norms, value, beliefs and definitions” [97, p. 574]. We believe that the absence or lack of legitimacy can be a great hindrance to universities successful collaboration with industrial firms and entrepreneurial university emergence. [119] found that the factors that facilitate or inhibit stronger IUCs emerge from the cultural divide between both sectors, which generates a lack of confidence on the part of an industry on universities as potential partners. This seems to suggest that successful IUCs and entrepreneurial university emergence in African emerging economies are intricately connected to legitimacy. To develop our arguments, we draw upon insights from [134] – personal, consequential, structural, and procedural – typologies of moral legitimacy and [40] (individual, the organisation, the environment and the process) organisational emergence. By doing so, we indicate how each of the four typologies of moral legitimacy and four dimensions of organisation emergence yields insights about the antecedents for successful IUCs in Africa emerging economies and the processes that can lead to the emergence of legitimate entrepreneurial universities. The foremost strength of our approach is that it adopts a legitimacy perspective to IUCs in Africa and organisational emergence perspective to an entrepreneurial university emergence. Within the context of IUCs, it recognises that creating a perception of legitimacy is important in that universities will be considered by the industry to be more meaningful, more predictable, and more trustworthy [134]. We argue that when a university gains legitimacy, it should find it easier to attract and collaborate with industrial firms successfully. In short, legitimacy can provide the means by which IUCs increases and a university becomes entrepreneurial in African emerging economies. Therefore, in using the legitimacy perspective as a theoretical lens, we are able to understand IUCs and how legitimacy can contribute to entrepreneurial university emergence in African emerging economies.
Our conceptual paper contributes and responds to the call by IUCs researchers to identify specific antecedents that contribute to a university's legitimacy and in turn its ability to successfully collaborate with industry [20], [108], [109] and to incorporate context into our understanding [71], [102]. Insights from legitimacy and organisational emergence help us to develop a broader, “understanding” of IUCs and entrepreneurial university emergence in emerging economies. We contend that even though research on IUCs in African emerging economies remains somewhat underdeveloped, a wealth of insight about it may be obtained from the related field of legitimacy. At the same time, legitimacy as a field of research stands to gain immeasurably provided that they give cognisance to some of the dynamic aspects of IUCs recorded in the literature. We, therefore, take our analysis further by attempting to build a bridge between IUCs and legitimacy in this paper by indicating how research insights from one field can suitably enhance our understanding about the other. Overall, our paper bears on one of the main themes of this special issue: Is there a particular nature of industry-university collaboration in emerging economies? What are the challenges of creating entrepreneurial universities in the context of emerging economies?

Our paper is structured as follows: We begin with a brief review of the literature on IUCs. This discussion allows us to summarise insights and indicate where research on this subject provides hints as to how a legitimacy - focused approach to the subject might be developed. Next, we introduce the concept of legitimacy and relate theoretical arguments about legitimacy to the success of IUCs in Africa and entrepreneurial university emergence process. Having established this background, we then use the legitimacy perspective to study IUCs, thus developing conceptual insights for its many attributes noted in the African emerging economies context. This section of the paper enables us to develop several propositions elaborating the nature of the phenomenon, essentially treating it as a series of antecedents that facilitate IUCs in African emerging economies. Finally, the last section of the paper provides a discussion of the lessons learnt, in terms of the paper’s contribution to theory building on IUCs and the field of legitimacy, as well as an additional contribution to managerial practice.
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE ON INDUSTRY-UNIVERSITY COLLABORATIONS AND ENTREPRENEURIAL UNIVERSITY

The literature on IUCs and the entrepreneurial university is vast and has been reviewed in details elsewhere see [77], [118], [130], [131]. The discussion that follows is intended simply to indicate where research on this subject provides hints as to how a legitimacy - focused approach to the subject might be developed within the context of emerging economies.

First, the literature has highlighted the different forms of IUCs ranging from traditional forms of engagement such as internships, and publications of results to more holistic forms of engagement such as Joint Industry Projects (JIP) and research consultancies. In particular, [120] note that IUCs usually encompass four major interrelated components: research support, cooperative research, knowledge transfer, and technology transfer. Similarly, [103] indicate that IUCs is varied and includes collaborative research, contract research, consulting and other forms of knowledge exchange [22]. All these different forms of collaboration point to the fact that universities can serve the various facets of the industry depending on the magnitude of the business involved. The involvement can range from small and medium enterprises (SME) or consultants/turnkey contractors who leverage on the universities’ capabilities and facilities in design and execution [22]. Industrial firms, on the other hand, may leverage universities to provide talent pools in operational optimisation while the university can stand to gain tremendously in terms of sharing and strengthening of networking ties [100], [86].

Second, another area of research focus on IUCs is the motives for collaboration. The motives for IUCs perhaps is that individual academic in the universities collaborate for purely financial - e.g. the academic may work for a fee - or non-financial benefits - e.g. access to technology, knowledge and materials or data for academic research projects [6], [9], [100]. Also, individual academics in the university can collaborate with industrial firms to pursue goals that are broader such as offering expertise to provide new ideas on application-oriented issues, solve
problems and develop new products and processes. To corroborate this, research has shown that up to 10 per cent of new products or processes are based on the contribution of academic research [10]. As such, [118] note that universities collaboration with industrial firms has become an inevitable part of university funding and the funds from international organisations and business enterprises for R&D in the higher education sector nowadays represent a ‘significant source’ in many countries [96], [118]. Additionally, industrial firms can benefit from highly qualified human resources such as researchers or students [90].

Third, several scholars have studied the benefits of IUCs, most of which coalesces around the benefits gained by both universities and industrial firms. For example, [72], note that IUCs has provided a significant platform for universities to transfer technology, rejuvenate research and improve the curriculum on top of eventually possibly being a prime avenue for the sustainability of the research faculties. On the industry front, benefits can be derived primarily in the form of business/economic development, market impact, human capital development and even political leveraging [72]. The literature also pointed to the fact that IUCs has also expanded the relevance of research carried out in public institutions, foster the commercialisation of public R&D outcomes, and increase the mobility of labour between public and private sectors [46], [69].

Fourth, the literature on IUCs also offer important insights into the success factors for the implementation of IUCs - see [118] for a more comprehensive review. The literature identified factors such as resources e.g. [17], communication e.g. [20], [52], commitment e.g. [5], [7], trust e.g. [9], [11], culture e.g. [49], geographical distance e.g. [22], [90], [38], support e.g. [31], [54], [141], social capital e.g. [5], [133], quality [32], knowledge and technology transfer e.g. [105], university spinoff e.g. [33], [103]. These studies produce consistent findings on the need to ensure a successful implementation and management of IUCs to realize the advantages on both the university and industrial firms.

The link between the antecedents of IUC and entrepreneurial university emergence has also been clearly defined in the literature. From the entrepreneurial university perspective, the
literature attempts to address the antecedents and consequences of entrepreneurial universities and their associated determinants. In this regard, the literature focuses on explaining the roles of the university as a catalyst for regional economic and societal development via exploration and exploitation of entrepreneurial opportunities [15], [19], [45]. This stream of literature also focuses on understanding the nature and key activities of an entrepreneurial university, especially after the inclusion of the third mission, to engage in research commercialisation, besides education and research activities [37]. The Entrepreneurial university has now become an especially propitious site for commercialisation of academic knowledge and technology transfer due to its basic features as a natural incubator, providing a support structure for academics to initiate new ventures through collaborations with industrial firms [29], [30]. In this regard, IUCs can provide a means for universities to become entrepreneurial [16]. For example, [126] point to the need for entrepreneurial universities to prioritise the following goals: development of entrepreneurial competencies by attracting and educating human capital, engagement in technology transfer and innovation as well as engagement in social and regional developments. To achieve these goals, [106], [131] note that entrepreneurial universities need to undertake a list of activities, such as research, patenting/licensing, consulting, creation of technology parks, education, contract research activities, industry training, and grant application.

Considering the literature on IUCs and entrepreneurial universities in Africa, research has coalesced around the drivers of, and conditions for IUCs. Some studies address the surrounding structural conditions, including science, technology and innovation policies [3], [58], [59], [70], [91] and indicators [79], [80], [98]. Some studies also examine the conditions, drivers and capabilities of universities to engage in IUCs [21], [61], [62]. Some studies address how the characteristics of academics shape IUCs [41], [42], [81]. Some papers have also examined the modes and patterns of interaction between universities and firms [64], [65], [66], [67], [68], [144], and outcomes of interaction [63], [142]. Overall, these studies show that scholars focus on the
internal capabilities of universities and firms in enabling them to foster IUCs and then become entrepreneurial.

In sum, the literature has produced a significant body of knowledge explaining the forms, motives, benefits, and success factors in the IUCs process as well as antecedents and consequences of an entrepreneurial university. However, the literature tends to focus on technologically developed countries (mostly, North American and European countries). It has not systematically developed a strong theoretical foundation for IUCs in other geographical contexts [102]. In a recent review, [150] note that there is still underrepresentation of IUCs in Africa in the global literature. Majority of studies on IUCs in Africa often focus on very few countries where South Africa happens to be the largest researched African country [150]. We note that authors mention this gap in their research articles, but apparently, research is still limited [150]. For example, [84] and [150] note that factors that enable the successful implementation and management of IUCs in emerging economies such as Africa are still under-researched and deserves further examination. Moreover, [131] note that studies that address the processes associated with the development of strategies, structures, and culture that lead to entrepreneurial university emergence are still minimal. Based on the foregoing, we focus on emerging economies, and Africa in particular, and draw on the literature on organisational legitimacy to examine the antecedent factors that are likely to give rise to successful IUCs and entrepreneurial university emergence.

III. UNDERSTANDING INDUSTRY-UNIVERSITY COLLABORATIONS IN AFRICA: EMERGING ECONOMIES: DOES LEGITIMACY MATTER?

In this section, we attempt to identify and examine the antecedents of IUCs in emerging economies with a focus on universities. This is because universities are thought to lack the ability to engage more actively with firms [84], [119]. To understand the antecedent factors, we adopt a legitimacy perspective because legitimacy has been suggested to be a great hindrance to universities successful collaboration with industrial firms. For example, [119] found that the
factors that facilitate or inhibit stronger IUCs emerge from the cultural divide between both sectors which generates a lack of confidence on the part of industrial firms on universities as potential partners. This seems to suggest that successful IUCs in African emerging economies is intricately connected to legitimacy. To facilitate such a research agenda, first, we put Africa and its countries into an institutional perspective to justify the geographical delimitation of the pertinence of our proposed legitimacy-building model to strengthen IUCs in African emerging economies. Second, we draw on research in legitimacy to underscore the role of legitimacy in IUCs in emerging economies of Africa. Our goal is to set the stage for our theoretical arguments and propositions that follow.

A. Africa Emerging Economies in Perspective

When it comes to classifying emerging economies, scholars have proposed a broad array of classification such as GDP, infrastructure, levels of income, quality of financial systems, etc. However, there is still a lack of consensus concerning different aspects of emerging economies contexts [94]. [53] note that emerging economies are not homogeneous, even within the same geographic region. They note that Latin America, East Asia, Africa/Middle East, and Central and Eastern Europe, taken as four groups, have manifestly different starting points, but even within these regions/countries differ markedly.

[53] define emerging economies as countries experiencing rapid economic development that is stimulated by transitioning institutional policies favouring and supporting private enterprise. This definition reflects the pervasive role of institutions in stimulating high economic growth in emerging economies. Institutions refer to “the humanly devised constraints that shape human interaction” [95, p. 3]. Formal institutions refer to economic, legal, and political constraints that define legitimacy within regulations, laws and supporting apparatuses. Informal institutions refer to what is legitimate or socially desirable within the system of rules, norms, values, and beliefs [134]. The extent to which formal and informal institutions are aligned to increases the stability of the overall economic system. However, weak institutions have been the norm in many emerging
economies. The weak institutions have been brought forth as causes of slow economic growth in emerging economies such as Africa.

Africa is a diverse continent with distinct historical evolution and different levels of institutions. The weak institutions in emerging economies such as Africa have significant implications for developing an environment that can facilitate successful IUCs [118]. The environment in which the collaboration is to take place affects the dynamics of IUCs Africa emerging economies. For example, the lack of regional support structures [127] can have a negative impact on collaboration. Research has shown that good institutions (e.g. governmental support) are often necessary to establish a collaboration between universities and industrial firms, e.g., [23], [24], [89], [123]. As such, successful IUCs are marked by interdependencies between IUCs and institutions, which affect other characteristics, such as the nature and structure of IUCs, the degree of IUCs, and the perceptions of universities and industries in IUCs. Hence, we would expect that IUCs will be less constrained in African countries with stronger institutions that have led to high growth in the economy. Indeed, a strong institution is a critical determinant of IUCs as it tends to establish how universities may legitimately facilitate IUCs [49], [115].

To allow for a more fine-grained distinction of the heterogeneity of institutions in African emerging economies, we adopted [140] identification of 28 strong-growth African countries achieving a growth rate of 4% or higher and considered them as African emerging economies.¹ Toh’s classification of African emerging economies is similar to those [112] considered as emerging economies, except Senegal. Toh posits that this growth is linked with improved economic fundamentals and sound policies and institutions rather than just the luck of favourable commodity prices and more international aid. Thus, we define African emerging economies as African countries experiencing rapid economic development that is stimulated by strong

¹ There is one exception. South Africa, with a growth rate of 3.2%, is added to the group of emerging economies because it has already been universally considered an emerging market economy.
institutional policies favouring and supporting private enterprise. We consider the following countries as African emerging economies - Angola, Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Chad, Congo, Ethiopia, Equatorial Guinea, Ghana, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mozambique, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia. This classification is suitable for this paper because it groups countries with comparable economic fundamentals and sound policies and institutions [53], [94].

B. The Legitimacy Perspective

[134] defines legitimacy as “a generalised perception or assumption that the actions of an entity are socially desirable, proper or appropriate within some socially constructed system of norms, value, beliefs and definitions” (p. 574). According to [153], the environment is comprised of universal understandings and expectations of appropriate organisational form. These understandings are generally taken for granted as connoting legitimacy, a social judgment of acceptance, appropriateness, and desirability [28]. As such, early works on organisational legitimacy, indicate that those organisations that best conformed to such understandings would be deemed legitimate by association [28], [124], [82].

Moral legitimacy offers value to explain the antecedents of IUCs and the emergence of entrepreneurial universities in Africa. Moral legitimacy refers to legitimacy that is normative and based on an evaluation of whether an activity of a focal organisation is the proper one (relative to external norms) rather than whether it specifically benefits those who are making the evaluation [4], [99], [134]. Within the context of IUCs, moral legitimacy refers to a generalised perception or assumption that universities activities are desirable, proper, or appropriate within some socially constructed system of norms, values, beliefs, and definitions. In recent years, emerging economic nations, and in particular Africa, have experienced limited collaboration between universities and industrial firms. We stated earlier that one crucial factor that contributes to this emerges from the cultural divide between both sectors, which generates a lack of confidence in universities as potential partners. The cultural divide indicates that universities in Africa have insufficient ability
to collaborate with industrial firms since they are not conceived as reservoirs of codified knowledge and expertise to be tapped by industrial firms [46], [113], [119]. If industrial firms do not trust and perceive universities in Africa as reservoirs of codified knowledge and expertise and their lack of collaboration with universities has become dominant, then it follows that universities need to gain legitimacy by changing this perception. Thus, the moral legitimacy of universities in Africa can be understood because of the consonance between universities and the perception of universities as non-reservoirs of codified knowledge and expertise, an ideology that has become dominant among the broader industrial firms.

[139] identify four typology of moral legitimacy – personal, consequential, structural, and procedural. We use Suchman’s typology of moral legitimacy suggesting explanations and implications for successful IUCs and the emergence of entrepreneurial universities. Thus, we argue that universities are likely to obtain legitimacy via these approaches. In particular, we argue that, for industrial firms to collaborate with universities and for entrepreneurial universities to emerge in Africa, universities may need to rely on some combination of characteristics deemed by the industrial firms as typical of a morally legitimate organisation and or behaviour that adhere to or change the expectations of legitimate organisations in the eyes of industrial firms. The next section will develop the relevance of this typology of legitimacy to the success of IUC and the emergence of entrepreneurial universities in emerging economies of Africa.

C. \textit{Legitimacy, IUCs and Entrepreneurial University Emergence}

In this section, we demonstrate that the use of the moral legitimacy perspective as an analytical lens and relate theoretical arguments about legitimacy to IUCs and entrepreneurial university emergence process. Here, we argue that since moral legitimacy is a perception held by an organisation’s external audience, legitimacy will be inferred on universities through the actions of industrial firms [152]. For example, [99] suggests that legitimacy can be assessed by the existence of economic transactions between organisations. Following this logic, we focus on
personal, consequential, structural, and procedural, that can be derived from a university’s most immediate audiences (herein industrial firms) and can be inferred by their engagement in voluntary resource/knowledge exchanges with them [139].

Given this conceptualisation of legitimacy, how might IUCs in emerging economies be successful by way of a personal, consequential, structural, and procedural? And how does legitimacy for IUCs relate to entrepreneurial university emergence? To address the first question, we argue that to identify the characteristics and behaviours that may confer moral legitimacy to universities, we focus on the four dimensions of organisations as outlined by [40]: the individual, the organisation, the environment, and the process. We follow [40] to argue that it is not possible to understand IUCs unless all of these dimensions are analysed. Thus, it is through these dimensions that we will attempt to address how universities might be perceived as legitimate in their quest to foster collaboration with industrial firms. To address the second question, we argue that while legitimacy represents the means to foster collaboration between industrial firms and universities, entrepreneurial university emergence may occur via university entrepreneurship, that is the focus of a university with the objective to commercially exploit a research outcome or patent for financial gains [56], [128]. Thus, we argue that there are important links and overlaps between both types of activity. In fact, entrepreneurial university emergence is often an outcome or follow-on activity, whether intended or unintended, of legitimacy. Gaining legitimacy to collaborate with industrial firms on various projects may provide universities with insights into what ideas may be commercially valuable, and hence the opportunity to develop or co-develop inventions that can be patented, licensed or enable a university start-up. In other words, the legitimacy for IUCs often precedes entrepreneurial university emergence in time and can hence be regarded as an input factor to the latter.

1) **Personal legitimacy and the Individual Academic Researcher:** The moral legitimacy perspective recognises that a critical part of IUCs occurs when academics develop insights based on their characteristics in ascribing legitimacy to universities. In other words, personal legitimacy,
which is the first type of moral legitimacy rests on the charisma of individuals within an organisation. In this regard, we argue that for industrial firms to collaborate with individual academic researchers, they need to exhibit some form of personal legitimacy. The literature offers numerous assertions that individual within an organisation can play a substantial role in disrupting old institutions [146], and in initiating new ones [27]. For example, whether valid or not, the perception that charismatic individual academics can transcend and reorder established ways of collaboration with industrial firms can foster IUCs and allow entrepreneurial universities to emerge.

Two conditions with regards to charisma must be satisfied for industrial firms to collaborate with an academic researcher; first, that the academic researcher has the skills and abilities to accomplish the organising task and, second, that the academic researcher is trustworthy [49], [11]. Recent findings in the organisation studies literature suggest that one such way in which industrial firms evaluate legitimacy in this sense is via the individual’s personal characteristics [41], [42], [81]. For example, research has shown that individual academics’ scientific productivity is generally positively related to engagement with industrial firms [10]. In addition, some studies have also shown that individual academic researchers’ ability to mobilise resources for their research is also positively linked to collaboration with industrial firms [12], [73]. Also, [90] and [119], note that an individual’s characteristics, such as PhD training and qualifications, and expertise, were significantly correlated with the likelihood of IUCs in Africa. Thus, we contend that a similar trend exists for universities in Africa; that is, the legitimacy conferred by industrial firms will be at least in part a function of the individual academic’s abilities and skills to be productive [25], [116], [145], [148].

Furthermore, many authors note that trust is an important factor in fostering collaboration between industry and universities, e.g., [7], [118]. [9] find in their study that maintaining personal contacts at the beginning of a new partnership and the leadership in IUCs can set an example and send positive signals for building trust. Past experiences in working together, historical
experiences in collaborating, or undertaking smaller projects in order to maintain personal contacts at the beginning of a new partnership have been known in the literature to facilitate trust [9]. [49] find that creating strong ties with industrial firms can help build trust and foster IUCs. Similarly, [88] in their study of IUCs in Ghana find that individual academics characteristics such as trust, and communication help foster collaboration with industrial firms.

Thus, it seems that moral legitimacy ascribed to universities by industrial firms are to some degree attributable to the individual academic’s characteristics [11]. This legitimacy is likely increased by the factors outlined above because industrial firms view these attributes as beneficial in overcoming non-anticipated problems and or capitalising on new opportunities during the IUCs process and beyond [39]. Therefore, those individual academics that conform to the institutionalised expectations of industrial firms regarding what level of trust, skills and abilities is legitimate will likely be successful in collaborating with industrial firms and thus leading to the emergence of entrepreneurial universities.

**Proposition 1a:** Trust, skills and abilities are associated with personal legitimacy

**Proposition 1b:** Personal legitimacy of individual academics can foster IUCs in emerging economies of Africa

**Proposition 1c:** Entrepreneurial universities emergence is strongly associated with personal legitimacy of individual academics.

2) The Organisation and Consequential Legitimacy: Here, we argue that while individual-level attributes are important in the legitimisation process, they are not sufficient. Because most universities are comprised of multiple individuals, organisational-level characteristics also play an important role in its perceived legitimacy [74]. Concerning IUCs, we contend that one-way universities in Africa can demonstrate desirability is by having legitimacy consequentially. Consequential legitimacy refers to when an organisation is judged by what they accomplish or can accomplish [83], [134]. As such, we argue that universities need to provide evidence of their
objectives in terms of research, competence in terms of knowledge and technology transfer, human resource development, and management team’s credentials for industrial firms to perceive them as legitimate [15], [37], [44], [57]. Thus, the charter of universities should centre on outputs that can be seen by industrial firms.

Indeed, there is a growing body of empirical evidence that the composition of universities output is an important legitimating characteristic upon which a university might rely in order to conform to expectations of industrial firms. [119] find in their study of IUCs that a clear objective in terms of scientific productivity has a positive and significant impact on IUCs. Scientific productivity such as publications in the form of scientific literature, scientific texts, prototypes and patents that focus on solving industry problems (e.g. designing a new and innovative product) can help universities gain legitimacy from industrial firms. In support, [114] note that when universities signal their orientation towards the industrial environment by providing solutions and innovative ideas that can be utilised by industrial firms, industrial firms are more willing to collaborate with them. [105] and [51], find that when universities have experience of effective transfer of knowledge and technology, industrial firms will collaborate with them. An intense transfer can help universities gain legitimacy from industrial firms [18], [33], [103]. [6], [44] find that IUCs success was positively correlated with the top management team’s education and experience. [43] provide evidence that industrial firms often consider the characteristics of university management when collaborating with universities.

In summary, it seems that a university legitimacy may be at least in part determined by the collective ability of its management team, or its organisational capital. To engage successfully in exchanges with industrial firms, universities in Africa may need to possess management teams with significant educational and professional experience [50]. Without conforming to these institutionalised expectations, a university may find it difficult to get industrial firms to collaborate with them and become entrepreneurial.
**Proposition 2a:** Outputs in terms of scientific research, knowledge and technology transfer, and management team’s credentials are associated with consequential legitimacy

**Proposition 2b:** Consequential legitimacy of universities can foster IUCs in emerging economies of Africa

**Proposition 2c:** Entrepreneurial universities emergence is strongly associated with their consequential legitimacy.

3) **The University Environment and Structural Legitimacy:** The context in which IUCs emerge is an important consideration because studies have long established that environment can also have an impact on IUCs [12], [26], [103]. Here we argue that environmental characteristics also play an important role in universities perceived legitimacy by industrial firms [136]. In this regard, we contend that one-way universities in Africa can demonstrate desirability is by having structural legitimacy. Structural legitimacy which is the third type of moral legitimacy refers to when industrial firms see the university as valuable and worthy of support because its structural characteristics locate it within a morally favoured taxonomic category [125]. The structural characteristics could include indicators that a university’s socially constructed capacity to identify the market potential and or commercialise research outcomes [124], [125]. [83] assert that institutionally prescribed structures convey the message that an organisation "is acting on collectively valued purposes in a proper and adequate manner." (p. 50)

In this regard, we argue that universities need to have structural legitimacy which focuses on the general university features that arise when entire systems of activity recur consistently over time (e.g., "Does the university have a research institute or centre; can they commercialise research outcomes?). As [134] suggested, structural characteristics can become markers of organisational form, locating the organisation within a larger institutional ecology and thereby determining from whom it will draw support cf. [135]. As such, we contend that a structurally legitimate university can become a repository of industrial firms’ confidence because it is "the right organisation for the
job". Universities, for example, can demonstrate that they are “right for the job” by displaying the structural traits of a "modern R&D centre”, showing the market potential and commercialisation of research results [6], [9], [71]. This sense of rightness has more to do with symbols of organisational identity than with demonstrations of organisational competence.

To be perceived as legitimate, a university must convince industrial firms that it has identified a market potential of the research result or innovation [18], [149]. In other words, by identifying the market potential of their research result or innovation product, a university may signal to industrial firms that there is an opportunity for the new innovative products to compete successfully in the existing market [13], [46]. Thus, universities may induce potential industrial firms to collaborate with them by merely conveying to them that the characteristics of the university environment are one that fosters the commercialisation of research outcomes, which conform to those that would be expected of an entrepreneurial university by industrial firms [2], [51]. Therefore, we suggest that:

**Proposition 3a:** A university’s ability to identify the market potential and or commercialise research outcomes is associated with structural legitimacy

**Proposition 3b:** Structural legitimacy of universities can foster IUCs in emerging economies of Africa

**Proposition 3c:** Entrepreneurial universities emergence is strongly associated with their structural legitimacy.

4) The Process and Procedural Legitimacy: Here, we argue that universities can also garner procedural legitimacy by embracing socially accepted techniques and procedures [125]. Procedural legitimacy focuses on routines that can be viewed in isolation (e.g., "Does the university engage in active research?). In particular, procedural legitimacy becomes most significant in the absence of clear outcome measures [124], when "sound practices" may serve to
demonstrate that the organisation is making a reasonable-faith effort to achieve valued, albeit invisible, ends. We see this as reflecting some certain behaviours in entrepreneurial universities that want industrial firms to collaborate with them. Thus, we argue that behaviour can enable the acquisition of legitimacy to the extent that it increases a university’s actual or perceived compliance to institutionalised expectations from industrial firms [48], [104].

Universities may strategically attain legitimacy by engaging in at least two types of behaviour. First, universities may acquire legitimacy by engaging in “acting-as-if” behaviour, or behaviour that makes the university seem more like a full research-oriented university that has earned a reputation collaborating with industrial firms. Because the idea of what constitutes a research-oriented university is socially constructed [111], university management can make an effort in such ways that their universities look to industrial firms as if they are entrepreneurial when in fact they may not be. We follow [22] and [128] to note that the engagement in these types of activities, to which they refer as “legitimising behaviours”, will significantly increase the likelihood that industrial firms will collaborate with them. Such legitimising behaviour could include outputs that are more tangible to industrial firms, such as filing patent application [22], going for industry fairs, presenting at conferences, scientific research [67], [139], [143], [151]. Universities may succeed in convincing industrial firms that they are legitimate, in that they are research-oriented and providing seed funding for research and commercialisation which is what industrial firms are looking for to collaborate [134], [137]. The result of these “impression management” tactics is that industrial firms will perceive those universities that engage in such behaviour to be more legitimate and willing to collaborate with them [122].

Second, we argue that universities need to have networking behaviour which can help them in the attainment of legitimacy because it enables universities to actually manipulate the perceptions held by industrial firms [104]. Indeed, [20] suggest that engagement in multidimensional exchange relationships with industrial firms is often necessary for IUCs. This argument has gained empirical support recently as [36] and [87] have found that networking with
potential industrial firms, such as informal meetings, engaging the public in setting out research agenda, and by asking for funds for R&D signal potential for collaboration [96], [117], [144], [151]. Therefore, we contend that, to the extent that university management interacts with industrial firms, they may increase their opportunities to convince industrial firms that the university is legitimate and subsequently collaborate with them. Therefore, we suggest that:

**Proposition 4a:** Networking and ‘acting-as-if’ behaviour are associated with procedural legitimacy

**Proposition 4b:** Procedural legitimacy of universities can foster IUCs in emerging economies of Africa

**Proposition 4c:** Entrepreneurial universities emergence is strongly associated with their procedural legitimacy.

### IV. DISCUSSION

At the outset of this paper, we had noted that prior research on IUCs on African emerging economies has been somewhat limited in its focus. Given the importance of IUCs in emerging economies as well as the current difficulties associated with respect to its adequate understanding, we believe that knowledge about IUCs stand to gain substantially if researchers import appropriate frameworks and theoretical paradigms from allied fields to suitably inform and enhance their overall understanding of the phenomenon. In this paper, we have suggested that the legitimacy perspective offers a useful way in understanding the antecedents to the success of IUCs and the emergence of entrepreneurial universities in African emerging economies. The application of the legitimacy perspective to the IUCs and the emergence of entrepreneurial university have also allowed us to perform a “levels-of-analysis” of the phenomenon and to draw its links to what is noticed in practice. By treating IUCs as a legitimate process that involves the personal, consequential, structural, and procedural legitimacy at multiple levels (e.g., individual, the organisation, the environment and the process), we believe that we have been able to provide a
richer theoretical exposition on IUCs and entrepreneurial university emergence in emerging economies of Africa.

We contribute to the literature in the following ways. First, we contribute to the IUCs literature by identifying specific antecedents associated to a university legitimacy and in turn the willingness for industrial firms to successfully collaborate with them [20], [108], [109], [118]. We show that the moral legitimacy perspective can offer insightful explanations into the success of IUCs and how entrepreneurial university emergence can occur in African emerging economies. IUCs and the emergence of entrepreneurial universities in African emerging economies is rooted in the characteristics and behaviours that may confer legitimacy to universities (across the four dimensions of organisations). The moral legitimacy perspective takes the four dimensions of organisations as being important. In this regard, IUCs and entrepreneurial university emergence have an element of legitimacy associated with it – in being able to create a perception of legitimacy to successfully attract and collaborate with industrial firms successfully. Essentially, the four typologies of moral legitimacy provide a way for universities to gain legitimacy in individual academic, the university organisation, the environment and the process. It thus incorporates within itself a dynamic interplay of legitimacy across these different levels of a university organisation. [153], suggest that an organisational environment is comprised of universal understandings and expectations of appropriate organisational form. These understandings are known to connote legitimacy, a social judgment of acceptance, appropriateness, and desirability [28]. To identify the characteristics and behaviours that may confer legitimacy to universities, the four typologies of moral legitimacy offer useful insights and allows us to recognise the many nuances of successful IUCs in African emerging economies and enable us to provide a more compelling explanation of the phenomenon that had not been possible in prior research.

Second, much of the existing literature on success factors for IUCs have been overly concerned at the level of individual academic departments rather than the level of a school or the entire university [118]. In a recent review of IUCs literature, [118] noted the need to identify
specific factors that can contribute to the success of IUCs at different organisation levels. This is where the application of the four typologies of moral legitimacy provides us with an improved understanding of how successful IUCs transcend the individual academic department to other different organisational levels of the university. In this regard, the typology of moral legitimacy - personal, consequential, structural, and procedural – allows us to explain how universities can gain legitimacy at the organisation, environment and process levels in addition to the individual level. Thus, moral legitimacy provides us with an expanded conceptualisation of IUCs in African emerging economies. It suggests that the development of university legitimacy encompass and depend upon the different organisational dimensions’ synergies. We believe that for industrial firms to collaborate with universities in Africa, universities need to gain legitimacy across different organisational levels within the university [120].

Lastly, while the existing literature on IUCs has mainly focused on technologically developed countries, e.g. [47], [101] and current studies on IUCs in emerging economies of Africa mostly consist of grey literature in the form of reports and conference publications of various national, regional and international organisations [84]. Our paper contributes to the literature by offering theoretical insights on several aspects of IUCs in emerging economies of Africa as a phenomenon, e.g., (1) how different organisational level attributes vis-à-vis personal, consequential, structural, and procedural legitimacy contribute to IUCs; (2) how entrepreneurial universities can emerge; and (3) why is it comparatively more difficult for industrial firms to collaborate with universities in emerging economies of Africa.

V. INSIGHTS FOR THEORY: BRIDGING IUC AND ORGANISATIONAL LEGITIMACY RESEARCH

Our paper also offers a theoretical contribution by bridging the IUCs and legitimacy research. We argue that beyond an application of the legitimacy perspective to the phenomenon of IUCs, there are additional benefits if these fields collaborate and inform each other.
Going beyond the four topologies of moral legitimacy, legitimacy in general offers other useful insights for the theory of IUCs. One consideration relates to the time frame or the duration of the IUCs itself. The IUCs literature does not explicitly address how universities can manage the different dynamics associated with the IUCs life cycle. At the same time, most research on organisational legitimacy suggests that legitimacy has a life cycle associated with them, not only through time but also across different organisational levels [134]. A predominant view is that IUCs in Africa occur when industrial firms see universities as reservoirs of codified knowledge and expertise to be tapped from them. We suggest that if universities do not have a well-developed legitimacy – management strategies throughout the lifecycle of the IUCs and across different organisational levels, the potential for IUCs may be non-existent. This suggests that university legitimacy in IUCs and the resulting courses of action must take into cognisance the different organisation levels and time-dependent nature of the IUCs process. Thus, future research in IUCs must incorporate the time dimension into its models and must explicitly recognise that some of the legitimacy processes and mechanisms will be more short-lived or transitory as compared to others.

Similarly, a knowledge of the IUCs research offers highly useful insights that can expand our understanding of legitimacy. To demonstrate this, we draw upon insights from the IUCs literature in two specific areas— communication and trust— and apply them to organisational legitimacy. In identifying the essential factors for industry collaborations with university partners, [147] find that, consistent with individual factors that explain successful IUCs, these traits should not only include management level but must be on the operational level too. Specifically, individual attributes such as communication, and trust on the part of the individual academics increases the chances of successful IUCs. While these individual qualities must be affecting many aspects of the university organisation, it is reasonable to assume that they would guide the legitimacy efforts of individuals within the university as well. For instance, [9] find that leaders can foster trust, conduct an honest communication and have a strong role model effect. At the same time leaders and managers can engage in various tasks such as the provision and allocation of
resources or the establishment of incentives or rules to increase knowledge sharing of staff members [123]. However, staff members are often required to maintain frequent communication using different communication channels such as e-mail, telephone, meetings, etc. between the workforce [52], or have to find a mutual language between academic and business staff [8]. This seems to indicate that leaders and staff members have differences in the way that they facilitate successful IUCs. When we apply these insights to the context of organisational legitimacy, we begin to see that the IUCs theory has much to contribute to our current understanding of legitimacy. For instance, gaining legitimacy is not about the characteristics of the organisation only but also involve the characteristics of different members of the organisation [74]. Empirical studies have reinforced the suggestions that organisations indeed approach their legitimacy efforts, incorporating the aspects of management level and individual staff in their legitimacy strategy [129], [152]. Given that legitimacy occurs at multiple levels within the universities and with individual academic staff playing a critical role, it is reasonable to assume that many of the individual characteristics associated with relationship factors will affect the gaining of legitimacy. This has been explicitly recognised in the organisational legitimacy literature.

VI. INSIGHTS FOR PRACTICE

Our paper offers several insights for practitioners. First, it suggests that IUCs may be usefully analysed based on either of the four dimensions of organisations—individual, the organisation, the environment, and the process—provided that we adopt a legitimacy perspective and that we recognise the critical role of legitimacy in the IUCs and emergence of entrepreneurial universities. Analysis of the four dimensions of organisations has continued to exist in prior research, we believe, makes it possible to develop a more expanded understanding of the IUCs and emergence of entrepreneurial universities that is rooted in practice. Second, our paper delineates how gaining legitimacy goes beyond the university to include other dimensions of the organisation. This, we believe, provide universities in Africa with an instrument view of IUCs and
entrepreneurial universities emergence in African emerging economies. We suggest that gaining legitimacy from industrial firms involves the university not only as an organisation but also necessarily as a recognition of the multiple dimensions of the universities and the different moral legitimacy they can exhibit. We suggest that once universities in Africa adopt this expanded view of IUCs that cross multiple levels of analysis, they stand to benefit immensely by engaging in proactive associations with other dimensions of the university organisation. Finally, by developing a set of indicative propositions, our paper is able to offers solutions to how universities can resolve the hindrance for a fruitful collaboration with industrial firms. We believe that this has important implications for universities in African emerging economies to successfully attract and collaborate with industrial firms and offers guidelines on how to become an entrepreneurial university.

VII. LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

Understanding IUCs and how universities in African emerging economies, can successfully make a transition to entrepreneurial universities using our proposed legitimacy perspective may raise more questions than it answers. However, this is not surprising given the nature of scientific research. Attempting to answer these questions points to the next steps to elucidate the distinct frame of references and the contributions of our legitimacy perspective in understanding IUCs and entrepreneurial university emergence in African emerging economies.

First, our proposed legitimacy perspective does not consider all emerging economies contexts and African countries. Considering other emerging economies, contexts and other African countries can deepen our understanding of the legitimacy perspective concept. A legitimacy-building approach in fostering closer IUCs may differ for different emerging economy contexts and other categories of African countries. Is our legitimacy-building approach exclusively true in an emerging economy context and across all African countries [53]? Different institutional factors in different other emerging economies and African countries can result in unique ways of building legitimacy. In this regard, it is important to acknowledge that the dissimilarities of institutional
factors among countries likely relates to their respective universities approach to legitimacy building. A possible moderator of legitimacy could be the different categories of emerging economies and African countries in any useful classification system, e.g. [14], [55], [75], [85], [92], [112].

Second, our legitimacy perspective does not explore how a legitimacy-building approach can be used in fostering closer IUCs in developed economies. We argue that IUCs have evolved differently between emerging and developed economies, and as such, our legitimacy perspective may not be entirely applicable to developed economies. This is because the majority of emerging economies have experienced rare IUCs until quite recently due to institutional and historical evolution of universities as higher education institutions with limited resources for research [60]. As a result, most universities in emerging economies are still catching up with their rivals from developed economies and just starting to build their research skills. Even with this recent development, universities in emerging economies still struggle to manage IUCs professionally and fully reap their potential benefits due to weak institutions (e.g. ‘low trust’ culture) inherent in emerging economies. However, in developed economies, strong IUCs have emerged much longer compared to emerging economies [86]. For example, in developed economies like the US, IUCs is attributed to be the main driver for the development of high technology clusters such as Silicon Valley [121] or the biotechnology cluster in Massachusetts [97]. Consequently, universities in developed economies like the US commonly have the legitimacy to collaborate successfully with industrial firms due to much stronger institutions. Nevertheless, the question of legitimacy in developed economies still needs a theoretical and empirical study. A promising avenue for future research on legitimacy perspective to IUCs and entrepreneurial university emergence in developed economies could examine the theoretical assumptions of legitimacy as universities construct unique combinations of legitimacy typologies critical to facilitating IUCs.

Third, our legitimacy perspective does not incorporate the roles of government and industry as important actors in fostering IUCs in emerging economies of Africa. Do government and industrial
firms’ legitimacy foster IUCs in emerging economies of Africa? The government and industrial firms’ legitimacy are an influential power that can either enhance or harm IUCs. On the one hand, legitimacy of strong institutions such as government policies [59], regional innovation initiatives [35], [58], [70], [91], public funding [34], [54], [110] and government support [23], [24], [49], [89], [90], [93], [123], [132] can facilitate IUCs. On the other hand, the legitimacy of industrial firms such as financial support [141], [149], internships [18], [138] can facilitate IUCs. Accordingly, a strong emphasis on the legitimacy of government and industrial firms may increase our knowledge on the importance of these actors in facilitating IUCs in emerging economies. We believe that the legitimacy of government and industrial firms increase universities motivation and willingness to collaborate with industrial firms only to the extent that universities deemed the activities of government and industrial firm as legitimate and consistent with their goal of becoming entrepreneurial.

VIII. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, our attempt in this paper has been to bring together two streams of literature—IUCs and legitimacy—to understand IUCs and how entrepreneurial universities can emerge through a process of legitimacy involving the different dimensions of the university organisation. In this paper, we demonstrated that the application of the legitimacy perspective as a theoretical lens helps provide an understanding to IUCs, and in particular, explain how universities can successfully collaborate with industrial firms and how they can become entrepreneurial. In other words, applying research insights from the field of legitimacy to IUCs helps us to make the critical leap required to broaden the ambit of IUCs in Africa: to treat collaboration with industrial firms as going beyond the university organisation and to include in the overall process the influence of individual academic researchers, process as well as the environment. We suggested that creating a perception of legitimacy across levels – individual, organisation, the environment, and the process - is vital in that universities will be considered by industrial firms to be more meaningful, more predictable, and more trustworthy, and thus more
likely to collaborate with them. In short, moral legitimacy can provide the means by which IUCs increases and a university becomes entrepreneurial in African emerging economies. This can, in turn, be a powerful engine for open innovation and socio-economic development of African emerging economies.
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