IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM)
e-ISSN:2278-487X, p-ISSN: 2319-7668. Volume 26, Issue 7. Ser. 8 (July. 2024), PP 12-18
www.iosrjournals.org

Theoretical Models Of Innovation And Socioeconomic Development: A Comparative Analysis Between The Triple Helix Model And The Sábato Triangle

Edson Nogueira Da Silva [1], Ednaldo Ferreira E Silva [2], Fernando Diniz Abreu Silva [3], Francisca Amália Castelo Branco [4], Francisco Regilson Pinho De Matos [51], José Carlos Beker [6], Marcelo Da Silva Neto [7], Marco Aurélio Amaral De Castro [8], Nathália Viana De Miranda [9], Sandileno Alves Santiago [10]

[1](Facultad Interamericana De Ciências Sociales/ Paraguay)
[2](Miami University, Eua)
[3](Facultad Interamericana De Ciências Sociales/ Paraguay)
[5](Facultad Interamericana De Ciências Sociales/ Paraguay)
[6](Facultad Interamericana De Ciências Sociales/ Paraguay)
[7] (Miami University, Eua)
[8](Facultad Interamericana De Ciências Sociales/ Paraguay)
[9](Facultad Interamericana De Ciências Sociales/ Paraguay)
[10] (Miami University, Eua)

Abstract:
Background: *In recent years, theoretical models promoting innovation and development have been discussed and gained prominence in different contexts around the world. In Brazil, a country recognized for its cultural richness and socioeconomic challenges, this discussion becomes essential. The search for approaches that effectively integrate knowledge, technology, and innovation to drive economic and social growth is fundamental to addressing the complexities and opportunities of the 21st century. This study aims to conduct a comparative analysis between the Sabato Triangle and the Triple Helix, as these models not only offer valuable theoretical perspectives but also shed light on how they can be adapted and applied to meet the specific needs of Brazil as an emerging country.*
Materials and Methods*: This qualitative study is based on a systematic review of the literature on the Sabato Triangle and the Triple Helix, focusing on their theoretical origins, fundamental principles, practical applications, and criticisms. The methodology included a comparative analysis of case studies and examples of the implementation of these models in different countries and regions, aiming to understand how each approach influenced innovation policies, collaborations between academia, industry, and government, and sustainable economic development.*
Results: *The review highlighted that both models offer unique perspectives on the interaction between science, technology, and society. The Sabato Triangle emphasizes the strategic interaction between government, academia, and industry, while the Triple Helix explores the collaboration between universities, the private sector, and government. The practical application of these models has shown significant variations due to institutional and public policy differences in Latin America.*
Conclusion: *The comparative analysis suggests that while both models have their strengths and limitations, they provide valuable insights for formulating innovation policies, particularly in contexts where structured and incentivized interaction between the three sectors can be achieved efficiently. The study concludes that integrating elements of both models may offer a more comprehensive approach to fostering innovation and socioeconomic development in Brazil.*
Keywords*: Sabato Triangle; Triple Helix; innovation; socioeconomic development; public policies; science and technology.*

Date of Submission: 13-07-2024 Date of Acceptance: 23-07-2024

I. Introduction

In recent years, theoretical models that promote innovation and development have been discussed and gained prominence in different contexts around the world. In Brazil, a country recognized for its cultural richness and socioeconomic challenges, this discussion becomes essential. The search for approaches that effectively

integrate knowledge, technology, and innovation to drive economic and social growth is critical to addressing the complexities and opportunities of the twenty-first century. In this context, this paper aims to conduct a comparative analysis between the Sábato Triangle and the Triple Helix, as the models not only offer a valuable theoretical perspective, but also shed light on how they can be adapted and applied to meet the specific needs of Brazil as an emerging country.

The comparison between the "Sábato Triangle" and the concept of the "Triple Helix" provides an enriching analysis of the dynamics between science, technology and society. Each model offers a unique perspective on how these elements interact with and influence the socioeconomic and cultural development of a region or country. While the Sábato Triangle highlights the interplay between science, policy, and industrial production in Latin America, the Triple Helix explores collaboration between universities, the private sector, and government to drive innovation and economic growth in global contexts. This comparative analysis aims to identify similarities, differences, and practical applicability of these theoretical models in different socioeconomic contexts.

II. Material And Methods

This comparative and systematic study is a qualitative research based on a literature review on the theoretical models of the Sábato Triangle and the Triple Helix. The review was carried out using academic articles, case studies and examples of implementation of these models in different countries and regions.

Study Design: Qualitative, exploratory research with systematic literature review.

Study Location: This review was conducted using the Web of Science and CAPES Journals databases.

Duration of Study: The study was conducted over a one-year period, from July 2023 to July 2024.

Sample Size: The review included 120 relevant articles and studies, selected using specific inclusion and exclusion criteria.

Sample Size Calculation: The sample of 120 studies was considered sufficient to capture a comprehensive view of the theoretical models of the Sábato Triangle and the Triple Helix. The selection was based on the relevance, impact and applicability of the studies to the contexts analyzed.

Method of Selection and Selection of Subjects: The studies were selected from a systematic search in the Web of Science databases and CAPES Journals. Keywords in Portuguese and English were used, such as "Triângulo de Sábato", "Tríplice Hélice", "inovação", "desenvolvimento socioeconômico", "políticas públicas de ciência e tecnologia", "Sabato Triangle", "Triple Helix", "innovation", "socioeconomic development", e "science and technology public policies".

Floating Reading Mechanism: To define the most relevant articles, a floating reading mechanism performed manually was used. This method consisted of a quick initial reading of the titles and abstracts of the articles identified in the searches. The articles that appeared to be relevant were then submitted to a more detailed reading to confirm their relevance to the study, of which 120 were selected the 26 with the most relevant topics.

Inclusion Criteria:
1. Studies on the Sábato Triangle and the Triple Helix.
2. Peer-reviewed articles.
3. Case studies with empirical data.
4. Publications between 1990 and 2023.
5. Studies that address public policies for science, technology and innovation.

Exclusion Criteria:
1. Non-peer-reviewed publications.
2. Studies with insufficient or inconsistent data.
3. Articles outside the scope of the theoretical models analyzed.
4. Studies published before 1990.

Methodological Procedure: After selecting the studies based on the above-mentioned criteria, a well-designed questionnaire was used to collect data from the reviewed articles. The questionnaire included characteristics of

the contexts studied, such as the interaction between government, industry and academia, public policies involved and the results obtained in terms of innovation and socioeconomic development.

The analysis parameters included the effectiveness of intersectoral collaboration, public policies implemented, results of technological innovation, and impact on economic and social development. All analyses were performed using qualitative analysis tools to ensure the accuracy and reliability of the results.

Qualitative Analysis: The data were analyzed qualitatively through the identification of recurring patterns and themes in the selected studies. The analysis was focused on understanding the interaction between the different agents (government, industry and academia), the public policies implemented and the results obtained in terms of innovation and socioeconomic development.

III. Results

The review highlighted that both models offer unique perspectives on the interaction between science, technology, and society. The Sábato Triangle emphasizes the strategic interaction between government, academia, and industry, while the Triple Helix explores collaboration between universities, the private sector, and government. The practical application of these models showed significant variations due to institutional and public policy differences in Latin America. Thus, we have put together the following comparative table:

Table 1: Comparative Literature

Points of Comparison	Sábato Triangle	Tríplice Hélice	References
Main Focus	Strategic interaction between government, academia and industry	Collaboration between universities, the private sector, and government	[12], [15]
Theoretical Origin	Latin America	Global	[12], [15]
Fundamental Principles	Promoting innovation through coordination between the three sectors	Integration of the three sectors to foster innovation and economic growth	[1], [3], [4], [16]
Applicability	Greater emphasis on Latin American countries	Adaptable to different national and regional contexts	[2], [6], [15], [16]
Challenges	Reliance on a robust institutional infrastructure and strong government commitment	Need for synergy and strong collaboration between the three sectors	[6], [7], [10], [18], [19]
Observed Results	Significant varieties due to institutional differences and public policies	Variable success depending on context, but generally promotes innovation and economic growth	[2], [3], [4], [18], [19]
Implementation Examples	Cases in Latin America showing the importance of well-structured government policies and coordination between sectors	Global application highlighting the need for collaboration between universities, industry, and government	[2], [4], [17], [20], [21], [23], [24], [25]

Comments

The comparative analysis reveals that both models have different approaches to foster innovation and socioeconomic development. The Sábato Triangle, with its focus on the strategic interaction between government, academia and industry, is particularly relevant to Latin America, where public policies and institutional structures play a crucial role. Studies highlight the importance of adapting the model to the specific conditions of each country, underscoring the need for strong government commitment to its success.

On the other hand, the Triple Helix, with its emphasis on collaboration between universities, the private sector, and government, presents a more flexible approach that is adaptable to different national and regional contexts. The literature indicates that this model is effective in promoting innovation and economic growth, especially when there is synergy and strong collaboration between the three sectors.

These differences highlight the importance of considering the specific context when applying these models. In contexts where government institutions are robust and committed, the Sábato Triangle can be particularly effective. By contrast, in environments where collaboration between university, industry, and government is well established, the Triple Helix can deliver more significant results.

Comparison of Models

The Sábato Triangle and Triple Helix models have several similarities and differences in their theoretical and practical approaches. Both highlight the importance of collaboration between different sectors to promote innovation. However, while the Sábato Triangle focuses on government coordination and industrial development in Latin America, the Triple Helix emphasizes tripartite collaboration in global contexts [22].

According to Chang López, the Triple Helix proposes that universities act as research and innovation centers, promoting dynamic interactions with the private sector and the government to create a favorable

environment for innovation. This model is seen as more adaptable to global contexts, while the Sábato Triangle is more specific to the needs and realities of Latin America [5].

Convergences and Complementarities

The potential for integration between the concepts of the Sábato Triangle and the Triple Helix can create synergies to promote sustainable innovation and global competitiveness. Future challenges and opportunities for the evolution of these models in a context of rapid technological and social change must be considered.

IV. Dicussion

Contextualization of Theoretical Models

The journey of knowledge and innovation has been the driving force behind global economic and technological development. Schumpeter introduced the idea of "creative destruction," emphasizing how disruptive innovations are crucial to the economic life cycle, leading not only to new products and services but also to the obsolescence of old ones [24]. Following this theory, Freeman expanded the concept by linking innovation cycles with national innovation systems, highlighting the role of government policies and collaboration between research and industry in facilitating innovation [10].

Sábato Triangle

Sábato and Botana suggest that technological development in Latin American countries depends on the strategic interaction between government, academia and the industrial sector [21]. Arocena and Sutz emphasize that adaptation to the specific conditions of each developing country is necessary, highlighting that the interaction between government, academia and industry can be fundamental to promote technological innovation [1].

According to Saravia, in Sábato's model, the government should lead high-tech projects, contributing financial and structural resources, while universities and research centers would provide qualified personnel to support these projects and companies involved. In addition, this interaction should be tripartite so that science and technology can act as catalysts for social change, promoting efficiency in the assimilation of technology and in the export of goods with higher added value [23].

Freeman, in his analysis of national innovation systems, also emphasizes the importance of institutional interactions for technological development, suggesting that adequate support structures are vital for the implementation of the model [10].

On the other hand, Cassiolato and Lastres point out that the practical application of this model in Latin America has shown significant variations due to institutional and public policy diferences[4]. Cimoli, Dosi and Stiglitz (2009) corroborate this opinion by analyzing cases in Latin America, showing how well-structured government policies can effectively direct industrial innovation, corroborating the view that the State plays a crucial role in facilitating this process [6].

For Dutrenit, Katz and Stumpo , when analyzing the model in Mexico, highlighted how the coordination between the three sectors was fundamental for technological advances, despite the economic challenges. It was observed that, even in the face of economic instabilities and structural limitations, the interaction between government, academia and industry managed to promote an environment more conducive to innovation. In addition, they showed that the implementation of collaborative strategies has helped to overcome institutional barriers and strengthen the national innovation system in Mexico, allowing for more sustainable and competitive growth [8].However, Lundvall reinforces the idea that, without a robust institutional infrastructure, Latin American countries have difficulty implementing the Sábato Triangle effectively [14].

In the same vein, Malerba argues that, although the model offers a valuable framework for understanding the dynamics of innovation, it faces significant limitations in countries with low institutional capacity and low investments in R&D [15]. Metcalfe argues that the Sábato Triangle is crucial for emerging countries, as it offers a path for integration between different sectors of the economy, promoting a more balanced and sustainable development. He points out that the synergy between government, academia and industry can generate positive results, as long as there are adequate support policies [18].

Nelson and Winter question the universal applicability of the model, arguing that it may be overly idealistic by not sufficiently considering the political and economic differences between countries. Pietrobelli and Rabellotti (2006) also corroborate the criticism of the model for underestimating the complexity of technological innovation, which often depends on factors that are not controllable by government policies [19].

Saltos et al indicate that the Sábato Triangle model and other Latin American innovation systems require a strong institutional environment and effective public policies to overcome structural barriers and promote sustainable innovation [22].

Finally, Viotti and Mazzoleni and Nelson argue that, despite the criticisms, the Sábato Triangle model still offers valuable contributions to the formulation of innovation policies, especially in contexts where the interaction between the three sectors can be structured and encouraged in an efficient way. Saravia (2005) points

out that the implementation of the Sábato Triangle model can improve efficiency in the assimilation of technology and in the export of goods with higher added value, contributing significantly to the socioeconomic development of Latin America [23] [27].

For Chang López (2020), innovation models, including the Sábato Triangle, were fundamental for the evolution of innovation systems in Latin America. He highlights that collaboration between government, academia and industry is essential for the creation of a robust innovation ecosystem [5].

Tríplice Hélice

The Triple Helix model, proposed by Etzkowitz and Leydesdorff, highlights the collaboration between university, industry, and government to promote innovation and economic growth. This model suggests that the university is the center of research and development activities, while the government creates public policies that encourage these interactions to promote economic development [5].

According to Costa and Severo, the arrangements established by the interaction between University, Industry and Government (U-I-G) allow the creation of synergies that help overcome technological delays. These actors should promote innovation at the regional and national levels in the field of science and technology. In addition, these synergies generate new sources of knowledge that can streamline and renew institutions, revealing new trends for institutional development [7] [25].

According to Etzkowitz and Leydesdorff, the Triple Helix, composed of government, industry and academia, is considered a key element for innovation in the twentieth century, both nationally and multinationally [9].

For Mello observes that there is a direct relationship between the development of organizations and society. Technological, economic, and productive development within an organization can generate positive impacts on the society in which it operates. On the other hand, social evolution offers a return to companies through the supply of qualified labor [17].

Araújo summarizes the pillars of action of the three agents in this interaction: universities, through training and dissemination of knowledge; companies, for the allocation of resources and application of this knowledge; and the government, through the creation of regulations and also by providing resources [2].

In this way, the Triple Helix model is a useful instrument to verify how knowledge can be capitalized, in addition to providing the tools and bases to support the process [3].

Liu and Huang highlight that universities can contribute as sources of learning and innovative know-how, essential for regional development, through the training of students, professors, and researchers. Entrepreneurial universities with strong corporate ties can create dynamic environments and play a significant role in the globalization of less developed regions and industries [12] [26].

The last axis of the helix is represented by the government, which acts as a benefactor, either directly, by supporting innovation, or indirectly, by financing research centers [13].

Guerrero and Urbano discuss that several public policy makers seek to encourage universities and research centers to transform science and engineering into crucial elements for companies. In developed countries, this is usually done through public policy programs that provide resources for projects involving universities and industries. In emerging countries, it is common for the government to encourage innovation by promoting partnerships between universities and industry through subsidies [11].

We can illustrate the model graphically as shown in figure 1.

Figure 1. Triple Helix and its three propellers.

Figure 1. Triple Helix and its three propellers.

In summary, both the Sábato Triangle and Triple Helix models offer valuable frameworks for understanding and promoting innovation and socioeconomic development. The Sábato Triangle is particularly suited to the Latin American context, where strong government involvement and coordination are crucial. It emphasizes the strategic interaction between government, academia, and industry to drive technological advancement and economic growth. On the other hand, the Triple Helix model provides a more flexible and globally adaptable approach, focusing on the synergistic collaboration between universities, the private sector, and government. This model is effective in fostering innovation through dynamic and cooperative interactions among the three sectors. The comparative analysis of these models suggests that integrating elements of both can offer a more comprehensive strategy for fostering innovation and development, particularly in emerging economies like Brazil.

V. Conclusion

The relevance of both concepts for socioeconomic and technological development in different contexts. The Sábato Triangle, with its emphasis on the interaction between government, academia and the industrial sector, is especially pertinent for Latin American countries, where state coordination is crucial to overcome structural challenges and promote innovation. On the other hand, the Triple Helix stands out for its more flexible and adaptable approach, favoring the creation of collaborative environments between universities, companies, and governments, which can be observed in several global economies.

The systematic review of the literature reveals that, while the Sábato Triangle has a more specific focus on public policies and state regulation to foster innovation, the Triple Helix promotes greater synergy between sectors, encouraging the active participation of all those involved in the innovation process. The case studies analyzed demonstrate that, although there are criticisms and challenges in the implementation of both models, their practical applications have generated positive results in terms of economic development, sustainability and technological advances.

Therefore, for the Brazilian context, the integration of the principles of the Sábato Triangle with the flexibility of the Triple Helix can provide a robust and effective approach to promote innovation and socioeconomic development. The combination of these strategies can help overcome institutional and cultural barriers, strengthening Brazil's ability to compete on the global stage. The adoption of public policies that encourage collaboration between government, academia, and industry, combined with efficient management of resources and the creation of an environment conducive to innovation, is essential to achieve sustainable and inclusive growth in the country.

References

[1]. Arocena R, Sutz J. Changing Knowledge Production And Latin American Universities. Research Policy. 2003;32(8):1293-1306.
[2]. Araújo Ra. Triple Helix As A Tool For Knowledge Capitalization. Journal Of Technology Management & Innovation. 2015;10(1).
[3]. Cai Y, Amaral M. The Triple Helix Model And The Sustainability Of Innovation: A Study Of Public Policies And Strategies In Brazil And China. Journal Of Cleaner Production. 2021;287:125272.
[4]. Cassiolato Je, Lastres Hm. Local, National And Global Linkages In The Brazilian System Of Innovation. Idrc. 1999.
[5]. Chang López R. Universities As A Fundamental Component Of Innovation Systems. European Public & Social Innovation Review. 2020;5(1).
[6]. Cimoli M, Dosi G, Stiglitz Je. Industrial Policy And Development: The Political Economy Of Capabilities Accumulation. Oxford University Press. 2009.
[7]. Costa Cm. A Inovação No Setor Público: Estudo De Caso No Contexto Brasileiro. Revista De Administração Pública. 2019;53(2):310-329.
[8]. Dutrenit G, Katz J, Stumpo G. Innovation, Industrial Dynamics And The Evolution Of Markets: The Mexican Experience. Oxford University Press. 2010.
[9]. Etzkowitz H, Leydesdorff L. The Dynamics Of Innovation: From National Systems And “Mode 2” To A Triple Helix Of University–Industry–Government Relations. Research Policy. 2000;29(2):109-123.
[10]. Freeman C. The 'National System Of Innovation' In Historical Perspective. Cambridge Journal Of Economics. 1995;19(1):5-24.
[11]. Guerrero M, Urbano D. The Impact Of Triple Helix Agents On Entrepreneurial Innovations’ Performance: An Inside Look At Enterprises Located In An Emerging Economy. Technological Forecasting And Social Change. 2017;119:294-309.
[12]. Liu J, Huang J. University Capability As A Micro-Foundation For The Triple Helix Model: The Case Of China. Technovation. 2018;76-77:40-50.
[13]. Luengo Ja, Obeso M. Triple Helix And The Evolution Of Ecosystems Of Innovation: The Case Of The Basque Country. International Journal Of Technology Management & Sustainable Development. 2013;12(1):29-47.
[14]. Lundvall Ba. National Systems Of Innovation: Towards A Theory Of Innovation And Interactive Learning. Anthem Press. 1992.
[15]. Malerba F. Sectoral Systems Of Innovation And Production. Research Policy. 2002;31(2):247-264.
[16]. Mazzoleni R, Nelson Rr. Public Research Institutions And Economic Catch-Up. Research Policy. 2007;36(10):1512-1528.
[17]. Mello P. Relação Entre Desenvolvimento Organizacional E Inovação Social. Revista De Gestão Social E Ambiental. 2016;10(2).
[18]. Metcalfe Js. Systems Failure And The Case For Innovation Policy. In: Innovation Policy In A Knowledge-Based Economy. Routledge. 2005.
[19]. Nelson Rr, Winter Sg. An Evolutionary Theory Of Economic Change. Belknap Press. 1982.
[20]. Pietrobelli C, Rabellotti R. Upgrading To Compete: Global Value Chains, Clusters, And Smes In Latin America. Harvard University Press. 2006.
[21]. Sábato Ja, Botana N. La Ciencia Y La Tecnología En El Desarrollo Futuro De América Latina. Revista De La Integración. 1968;3(3):15-36.

[22]. Saltos G, Odriozola S, Ortiz M. La Vinculación Universidad-Empresa-Gobierno: Una Visión Histórica E Conceptual. Revista Eca Sinergia. 2018;9(2).
[23]. Saravia E. Uma Homenagem A Jorge Sábato: Um Pioneiro Do Estudo Da Inovação Tecnológica Na América Latina. Cadernos Ebape.Br, Edição Especial 2005. Fundação Getulio Vargas. Disponível Em: Http://Www.Ebape.Fgv.Br/Cadernosebape.
[24]. Schumpeter Ja. The Theory Of Economic Development: An Inquiry Into Profits, Capital, Credit, Interest, And The Business Cycle. Harvard University Press. 1934.
[25]. Severo Ea, De Guimarães Jcf, Dorion Ech. Cleaner Production, Social Responsibility And Eco-Innovation: Generations' Perception For A Sustainable Future. Journal Of Cleaner Production. 2020;251:119591.
[26]. Simões Vcf, Moreira Ab, Mendes Dias M. The Entrepreneurial University: From Concept To Action. Fep Working Papers. 2020;619.
[27]. Viotti Eb. National Learning Systems: A New Approach On Technological Change In Late Industrializing Economies And Evidences From The Cases Of Brazil And South Korea. Technological Forecasting And Social Change. 2002;69(7):653-680.