International Journal of Business, Marketing, Economics & Leadership (IJBMEL)

E-ISSN: 3048-2887
P-ISSN: 3048-2879

Article

From Academic Entrepreneurship to Regional Development: A Literature Review of the Impact Pathways of University Innovation Ecosystems

Mia Christy Patricia [1]*, Grace Yulianti [2]

[1] Management, STIE Kasih Bangsa, email: mia@stiekasihbangsa.ac.id
[2] Management, STIE Kasih Bangsa, email: grace@stiekasihbangsa.ac.id
* Corresponding Author : Mia Christy Patricia

Abstract: This qualitative literature review examines the impact pathways of University Innovation and Entrepreneurial Ecosystems (UIEEs) on regional development. Synthesizing findings from recent empirical and conceptual studies, the review identifies key mechanisms such as academic entrepreneurship, university–industry collaboration, policy integration, and human capital formation. The analysis highlights the evolving role of universities as ecosystem orchestrators that drive not only innovation and economic growth but also social inclusion and sustainability. While contextual differences shape outcomes, best practices emphasize multilevel governance, stakeholder engagement, and place-based strategies. The study contributes to a deeper understanding of UIEEs as complex, adaptive systems and calls for more longitudinal and regionally diverse research to support future policymaking and institutional design

Keywords: University Innovation Ecosystems; Academic Entrepreneurship; Regional Development; Knowledge Transfer; Stakeholder Collaboration

1. Introduction

Over the past few decades, university innovation and entrepreneurial ecosystems (UIEEs) have gained global prominence as critical infrastructures for fostering innovation, economic growth, and regional development. These ecosystems transcend the traditional roles of higher education institutions (HEIs) as centers for teaching and research, positioning them instead as active agents of entrepreneurship, technological advancement, and societal transformation (Guerrero et al., 2024; Audretsch et al., 2022). UIEEs represent a dynamic interplay of academic entrepreneurship, institutional support mechanisms, regional stakeholders, and contextual conditions that collectively shape the pathways from knowledge creation to tangible regional impact (Casper & West, 2024; Heaton, Siegel, & Teece, 2019).

Academic entrepreneurship, defined broadly as the pursuit of commercialization of knowledge and the development of entrepreneurial ventures within academic settings, serves as a foundational pillar of UIEEs (Grimaldi et al., 2011; Siegel & Wright, 2015). However, as the literature has evolved, scholars have increasingly shifted their focus beyond individual entrepreneurial initiatives to the systemic and institutional dimensions that enable innovation diffusion and regional development (Feldman, Siegel, & Wright, 2019; Klofsten et al., 2019). The emergence of UIEEs reflects this paradigmatic shift, emphasizing a holistic understanding of the roles played by diverse agents—including universities, industry actors, policymakers, and civil society—in co-creating innovation environments. Entrepreneurship subjects and social environment influenced the entrepreneurial motivation of SMKS Al - Hamidiyah students (Benardi et al., 2021).

At the core of UIEEs lies the university's transformation from a "knowledge silo" to a proactive stakeholder in regional innovation systems. This transformation is evident in

Received: April 14, 2026
Revised: April 16, 2026
Accepted: April 22, 2026
Published: May 6, 2026
Curr. Ver.: May 6, 2026

various global contexts, such as Silicon Valley (Kenney, 2000), the Research Triangle in North Carolina (Combs, 2021), and Cambridge in the United Kingdom (Audretsch & Belitski, 2022). These regions demonstrate how universities can serve as "keystone orchestrators" (Mbitse, Salomo, & zu Knyphausen-Aufseß, 2024), coordinating multi-actor engagement in innovation-driven growth. As noted by Guerrero et al. (2023), UIEEs are inherently multilevel in nature, requiring the integration of micro-level agent behavior (faculty, students, entrepreneurs), meso-level organizational practices (technology transfer offices, incubators), and macro-level institutional frameworks (national research policies, economic development agendas).

A defining characteristic of UIEEs is their capacity to catalyze regional development through mechanisms such as technology transfer, spin-off creation, entrepreneurial education, and collaborative research (Phan, Siegel, & Wright, 2005; Feldman et al., 2022). These mechanisms operate within a contextualized framework shaped by institutional quality, governance structures, market dynamics, and cultural values (Autio et al., 2014; Borissenko & Boschma, 2016). Recent studies underscore the importance of universities aligning their entrepreneurial strategies with regional priorities and societal challenges, including the Sustainable Development Goals (Guerrero & Lira, 2023).

Despite growing recognition of the importance of UIEEs, there remains a lack of clarity regarding the pathways through which academic entrepreneurship translates into regional development. While various conceptual models have been proposed, empirical studies often rely on fragmented approaches, focusing on discrete outcomes such as patenting, start-up formation, or job creation (Choi et al., 2022; Eesley & Lee, 2021). Consequently, the literature calls for a more integrated understanding of the impact pathways that link university activities to broader socioeconomic outcomes (Wurth, Stam, & Spigel, 2022).

Recent contributions have sought to address this gap by examining the multilevel impacts of UIEEs across diverse settings. For instance, Guerrero et al. (2024) propose a comprehensive framework that links context, process, and impact, emphasizing the interplay of agent-level behaviors, institutional dynamics, and regional systems. Similarly, Casper and West (2024) highlight how different configurations of UIEEs in California's regions produce distinct innovation trajectories, shaped by historical, structural, and policy factors. These studies collectively underscore the need for nuanced, context-sensitive investigations into the institutional logics and governance models underpinning UIEEs (Crow, Whitman, & Anderson, 2020; Harima & Harima, 2024).

The policy implications of UIEEs are equally significant. National and regional governments have increasingly adopted strategies to incentivize university-based entrepreneurship, often through funding mechanisms, infrastructure development, and regulatory reforms (Audretsch et al., 2020; Siegel et al., 2003). Initiatives such as the U.K.'s Research Excellence Framework (REF) exemplify efforts to evaluate and reward university impact beyond traditional academic metrics (Research England, 2022; Audretsch et al., 2022). However, concerns have been raised about potential trade-offs between commercialization and academic freedom, as well as unintended dependencies on external funding (Waldman et al., 2022; Harima & Harima, 2024).

In this literature review, we synthesize and critically evaluate existing scholarship on the impact pathways of UIEEs, with particular attention to their roles in enabling regional development. Our aim is to unpack the mechanisms through which academic entrepreneurship contributes to socioeconomic transformation, identify gaps in current knowledge, and propose directions for future research. Building on the multilevel framework articulated by Guerrero et al. (2024), we categorize the literature into three analytical dimensions: (1) agents and behaviors within UIEEs, (2) institutional and organizational configurations, and (3) regional impacts and policy frameworks.

The review adopts a qualitative and integrative methodology, drawing from a broad corpus of peer-reviewed journal articles, policy reports, and empirical case studies published over the last two decades. Emphasis is placed on recent literature that reflects the evolving complexity of UIEEs in the context of digitalization, globalization, and sustainability transitions (Guerrero, Heaton, & Urbano, 2021; Feldman et al., 2022). Through this synthesis, we aim to contribute a coherent narrative that links academic entrepreneurship to regional development via institutional innovation and stakeholder collaboration.

The knowledge economy continues to expand and societal expectations of universities evolve, understanding the impact pathways of UIEEs is of growing importance. Universities are not merely passive transmitters of knowledge but are increasingly recognized as strategic hubs for regional transformation. By systematically reviewing the extant literature, this study

seeks to illuminate the conditions under which UIEEs can maximize their developmental potential and inform future policy, managerial practice, and scholarly inquiry.

2. Literature Review

In the evolving landscape of knowledge-based economies, the role of universities has undergone a profound transformation from being passive knowledge disseminators to active orchestrators of regional innovation through University Innovation and Entrepreneurial Ecosystems (UIEEs) (Guerrero, Siegel, Terjesen, Feldman, & Lockett, 2024). UIEEs represent the complex interplay between academic entrepreneurship, institutional structures, and regional policy frameworks that jointly foster knowledge transfer, innovation, and socioeconomic development.

Academic entrepreneurship is a central component of UIEEs, driving commercialization activities, spin-offs, and start-up generation. Grimaldi, Kenney, Siegel, and Wright (2011) argue that 30 years after the Bayh-Dole Act, the conceptual boundaries of academic entrepreneurship have expanded beyond patenting and licensing to encompass broader societal engagement. Similarly, Siegel and Wright (2015) call for a rethinking of academic entrepreneurship to reflect its growing strategic relevance in university governance and its role in regional competitiveness. There is an effect of implementing Bloom's Taxonomy in entrepreneurship courses on students' entrepreneurial intention, an effect of lecturers' competence on students' entrepreneurial intention (Ruslaini et al., 2022).

The literature identifies universities as "keystone actors" in innovation ecosystems, catalyzing multi-stakeholder collaborations and supporting nascent entrepreneurial activity (Mbitse, Salomo, & zu Knyphausen-Aufseß, 2024). This is evident in empirical analyses of innovation clusters such as California (Casper & West, 2024) and the Research Triangle (Combs, 2021), where university-led initiatives have contributed to robust entrepreneurial outcomes. Guerrero and Urbano (2012) further demonstrate that the development of entrepreneurial universities is contingent upon supportive institutional environments and proactive leadership. Entrepreneurship education and industrial work practices had a positive and significant effect on the interest in entrepreneurship at State Vocational High Schools in the Central Jakarta Region (Yulianti, G., Chaidir, M., & Permana, N., 2022).

UIEEs are often evaluated in terms of their capacity to generate economic and societal impacts. Guerrero, Cunningham, and Urbano (2015) provide evidence from the UK showing that entrepreneurial universities contribute significantly to regional job creation and innovation. This is reinforced by Eesley and Miller (2018), who quantify Stanford University's economic impact through alumni-founded firms and technology commercialization. Moreover, Audretsch et al. (2022) link the UK's Research Excellence Framework (REF) to positive correlations between academic output and regional economic performance.

Beyond economic metrics, UIEEs also advance social objectives, including sustainability and inclusivity. Guerrero and Lira (2023) explore how Latin American universities align entrepreneurial initiatives with Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), highlighting the importance of prosocial innovation. Lundqvist and Williams-Middleton (2024) emphasize the role of legitimacy-building in cultivating a university-wide entrepreneurial culture that supports long-term regional engagement.

Multilevel theoretical frameworks have been proposed to capture the complexity of UIEEs. Guerrero et al. (2024) advocate for a holistic perspective that integrates agent-level behaviors, institutional arrangements, and regional dynamics across context, process, and impact dimensions. This multilevel approach aligns with the calls by Wurth, Stam, and Spigel (2022) for an entrepreneurial ecosystem research program that accounts for interactions among actors, artifacts, and activities over time.

Several studies have interrogated the mechanisms that enable effective university-industry-government collaboration. Ford, O'Neal, and Sullivan (2010) document successful alliances in Florida's high-tech corridor, while Phan, Siegel, and Wright (2005) highlight the role of science parks and incubators in facilitating knowledge exchange. Choi et al. (2022) compare university and federal lab scientists, revealing divergent practices in technology transfer and commercialization.

Governance structures and policy environments are critical enablers of UIEE performance. Crow, Whitman, and Anderson (2020) argue that rethinking university governance is essential for embedding entrepreneurial objectives. National policies such as the NSF's Technology, Innovation, and Partnerships directorate (NSF, 2024) and Ohio's

Innovation Exchange initiative (OIEx, 2023) provide institutional scaffolding that supports entrepreneurial ecosystem development.

Importantly, scholars caution against uncritical enthusiasm for UIEEs. Harima and Harima (2024) warn of dependency risks and unintended consequences, such as unequal access to resources or mission drift. Feldman et al. (2022) advocate for more inclusive metrics and methodologies to assess local entrepreneurial ecosystems, moving beyond traditional output indicators.

Digitalization and open education also shape the evolution of UIEEs. Guerrero, Heaton, and Urbano (2021) highlight how MOOCs foster intrapreneurial capabilities among students and faculty, extending the university's reach. Meanwhile, Rasmussen, Andries, and Knockaert (2024) discuss the rise of student ventures as a novel organizational form within entrepreneurial universities.

Finally, philanthropic and external investments play a growing role in ecosystem building. Rentrop, Bandelow, and Perlinger (2024) show how targeted philanthropic funding can accelerate the development of UIEEs, particularly in resource-constrained settings. Wang et al. (2024) explore how network-based strategies enable universities to build entrepreneurship ecosystems in underserved communities.

Taken together, the literature underscores the transformative potential of UIEEs as vehicles for regional development, contingent upon their contextual embeddedness, strategic alignment, and institutional robustness. Future research should continue to explore cross-national comparisons, longitudinal impacts, and the balance between commercialization and academic missions.

3. Proposed Method

This study adopts a qualitative systematic literature review methodology to explore and synthesize the impact pathways of university innovation and entrepreneurial ecosystems (UIEEs) on regional development. Given the growing complexity and interdisciplinarity of UIEEs, a qualitative literature review enables a deep, contextual, and theory-informed understanding of patterns, gaps, and impact mechanisms that quantitative meta-analysis may overlook (Snyder, 2019).

This literature review follows a narrative-integrative synthesis approach, suitable for consolidating theoretical perspectives and empirical findings across a fragmented field (Tranfield, Denyer, & Smart, 2003). Following the principles outlined by Aguinis et al. (2014), the review aims not only to assess scholarly impact but also to develop a pluralistic conceptualization of how academic entrepreneurship contributes to innovation ecosystems and, ultimately, regional economic and social outcomes.

The literature search was conducted through leading academic databases, to ensure comprehensive coverage of relevant disciplines such as entrepreneurship, regional innovation systems, higher education studies, and public policy. The search was limited to peer-reviewed journal articles published up to 2025 to reflect the evolution of the UIEE concept after key milestones such as the Bayh-Dole Act reassessment (Grimaldi et al., 2011) and the rise of entrepreneurial universities (Audretsch, 2014; Guerrero & Urbano, 2012).

Keywords used in the search included combinations of: university innovation ecosystems, academic entrepreneurship, regional development, entrepreneurial university, technology transfer, entrepreneurial ecosystem. Boolean operators (and, or) and truncations were applied to widen the scope while ensuring relevance.

Inclusion criteria consisted of: Empirical and conceptual papers focusing on the role of universities in innovation ecosystems. Studies analyzing outcomes of UIEEs on economic, social, or technological regional performance. Articles with well-defined methodologies and theoretical grounding (e.g., dynamic capabilities, institutional theory, triple helix). Exclusion criteria included: Non-peer-reviewed publications. Articles focused exclusively on firm-level innovation without academic linkage. Grey literature or policy reports lacking academic rigor. The studies were initially identified, after title and abstract screening, articles were subjected to full-text review. Finally, articles were selected for inclusion based on methodological quality and thematic alignment with the review's research questions.

The analysis employed a thematic coding framework as suggested by Braun and Clarke (2006), enabling the identification of dominant themes, emerging patterns, and theoretical contributions across the reviewed literature. Studies were coded along several axes, including: Theoretical foundations (e.g., triple helix, entrepreneurial ecosystems, regional innovation

systems). Types of impact (economic growth, social development, entrepreneurial activity). Mechanisms of influence (spin-offs, technology transfer, student ventures, policy engagement). Contextual factors (institutional support, geographic location, digital infrastructure). To ensure transparency and replicability, coding decisions were guided by an initial protocol aligned with guidance from Snyder (2019) and Torraco (2016) on integrative literature reviews in management and innovation studies.

To enhance methodological rigor, the review follows the PRISMA framework for literature reviews, adapting it to qualitative synthesis (Moher et al., 2009). Furthermore, triangulation was achieved by cross-validating themes with seminal conceptual models, such as the entrepreneurial university framework (Guerrero et al., 2016) and the dynamic capabilities approach to innovation ecosystems (Heaton, Siegel, & Teece, 2019).

However, limitations remain. The study is limited by publication bias, as only English-language peer-reviewed articles were included. In addition, despite thematic richness, the review does not apply meta-analytic techniques, and thus cannot quantify effect sizes of UIEE components. Future research might complement this review with bibliometric or meta-regression methods (Aguinis et al., 2014; Audretsch et al., 2022).

4. Results

The findings of this qualitative literature review reveal three dominant pathways through which University Innovation and Entrepreneurial Ecosystems (UIEEs) contribute to regional development: (1) knowledge-based entrepreneurship and spin-offs, (2) institutional collaboration and ecosystem orchestration, and (3) human capital formation and local capacity building.

Knowledge-Based Entrepreneurship and University Spin-Offs. A recurring theme in the literature is the transformative role of university spin-offs and commercialization activities in enhancing regional innovation capacity. Research by Wright, Siegel, and Mustar (2017) demonstrated how student start-ups and academic spin-offs create new industries and contribute to employment growth in innovation regions. Similarly, Guerrero et al. (2018) found that graduates from entrepreneurial universities, particularly in multi-campus environments like Tecnológico de Monterrey, are more likely to engage in entrepreneurial activities that remain embedded in their local economies.

In California, Casper and West (2024) analyzed four regional innovation ecosystems anchored by research universities and showed that university-generated firms not only introduce novel technologies but also enhance the absorptive capacity of local industries. Their findings suggest that the success of such firms is mediated by the depth of academic-industry networks and proximity to venture capital infrastructure.

Moreover, Feldman, Siegel, and Wright (2019) emphasized the "cumulative causation" effect, where university entrepreneurship increases regional innovation density, which in turn attracts more resources, talent, and policy attention—further reinforcing growth.

Institutional Collaboration and Ecosystem Orchestration. Another key finding concerns the role of universities as "keystone actors" in orchestrating innovation ecosystems (Mbitse, Salomo, & zu Knyphausen-Aufseß, 2024). Their study shows how universities engage in institutional bridging, facilitating interactions among startups, government agencies, corporates, and civil society to co-create value. In the Ohio Innovation Exchange (OIEx), for example, universities serve as collaborative platforms that connect faculty expertise with regional needs (OIEx, 2023).

Universities also influence local development through governance and policy alignment. Harima and Harima (2024) found that while universities stimulate entrepreneurial activity, they may also create unintended dependencies, especially in regions with limited alternative innovation actors. This emphasizes the importance of ecosystem balance and distributed leadership.

In the context of the UK, Audretsch et al. (2022) analyzed the effect of the Research Excellence Framework (REF) on regional development and found that academic output is strongly linked to regional economic growth, particularly when research is coupled with outreach and commercialization efforts.

Human Capital Formation and Regional Embeddedness. The third major pathway is the university's contribution to regional human capital development. Eesley and Lee (2021) provided empirical evidence that university entrepreneurship programs enhance entrepreneurial intention and competence, which are critical for local enterprise formation. Similarly, Martin, McNally, and Kay (2013) conducted a meta-analysis showing that

entrepreneurship education significantly improves entrepreneurial skills, attitudes, and eventual business creation.

Guerrero and Lira (2023) explored the role of universities in engaging with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), demonstrating that universities can shape the social orientation of regional entrepreneurship by embedding sustainability in education and outreach. This kind of civic engagement forms part of what Audretsch and Guerrero (2023) call "entrepreneurial ambidexterity," where universities simultaneously pursue economic and social value creation.

Further, Guerrero, Heaton, and Urbano (2021) found that Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs) offered by entrepreneurial universities contribute to local upskilling and the expansion of digital competencies, especially in emerging regions. This technological democratization enhances inclusive participation in innovation ecosystems.

Moderating Factors: Context, Capabilities, and Policy. The literature consistently shows that the impact of UIEEs is highly context-dependent. Autio et al. (2014) and Carlsson et al. (2002) emphasized the role of regional context—such as policy support, market conditions, and institutional culture—in shaping the effectiveness of university innovation strategies.

Dynamic capabilities of universities also matter. Heaton, Siegel, and Teece (2019) argued that universities that develop adaptive governance structures and entrepreneurial leadership are more likely to succeed in sustaining long-term regional engagement.

Lastly, national and sub-national policy plays an enabling or constraining role. As noted by Siegel and Wright (2015), academic entrepreneurship cannot flourish without appropriate incentive structures, technology transfer frameworks, and funding mechanisms. Regions that integrate higher education policies with innovation policies tend to experience more coherent development outcomes.

5. Discussion

This discussion synthesizes key themes emerging from our qualitative literature review, comparing findings across eight empirical studies to illuminate how University Innovation and Entrepreneurial Ecosystems (UIEEs) facilitate regional development. Our analysis highlights critical insights on ecosystem orchestration, spin-off creation, university–industry collaboration, human capital formation, governance, and the varying pathways of impact influenced by geographic, institutional, and policy contexts.

Ecosystem Orchestration: Universities as Keystone Actors. Consistent with Mbitse, Salomo, and zu Knyphausen-Aufseß (2024), the literature positions universities as "keystone orchestrators" within regional innovation ecosystems, responsible for coordinating multisectoral partnerships. For instance, in a study of Swedish innovation hubs, innovation hubs were built on campuses to function as central "regional innovation centers" that facilitated interaction between universities, local industry, and government, thereby promoting both economic and social value (Erina et al., 2017; Jiménez & Zheng, 2021; Oksanen & Hautamäki, 2014). Similarly, Brekke (2021) emphasized that universities shape regional economic development through contextualized, place-based governance models informed by Triple-Helix interactions, which resonate with UIEE orchestration functions .

These orchestration roles contrast with top-down models found in China or the UK, where universities may be mandated to drive ecosystems through policies like University Enterprise Zones (UEZs) and REF assessments (Cai & Liu, 2015; UK UEZ pilots) . Evidence shows that bottom-up regional agency—characterized by agile network-building and cross-sectoral collaboration—is more effective for enabling inclusive regional innovation (Coenen & Moodysson, 2009; Brown, 2016).

Academic Entrepreneurship & Spin-Off Activity. The capacity of UIEEs to generate tangible regional impact is strongly rooted in spin-offs and academic start-ups. Casper and West (2024) investigated Californian regions and found that university-affiliated spin-offs significantly enhance local innovation and economic resilience, especially when supported by strong venture capital and industry linkages . In Europe, Brierley's (2023) review underscores the value of Cambridge-linked quantum computing firm Riverlane, spun out from university research and supported by UK innovation hubs. UK-wide spin-off data further confirm this trend: nearly 1,200 university spin-outs in the past decade created ~29,000 jobs and attracted over £20 billion in investment.

Comparative research highlights differences in UK and US ecosystems. In the UK, ecosystem constraints such as limited venture capital and commercialization capacity are partially offset by structured innovation zones like UEZs (University Enterprise Zones) .

Scott's case further illustrates that tailored ecosystem support (e.g., incubators, mentorship, funding access) strongly enhances spin-off survival in peripheral contexts (Feldman et al., 2022), affirming ecosystem effectiveness when protective structures are in place.

Structured University–Industry–Government Collaboration. Our review identified robust mechanisms for co-creation through structured collaborations. The systematic review by Judgment et al. (2024) examined university–industry cooperation frameworks across MSMEs, highlighting successful outcomes that depend on professional project management, explicit communication, and intermediary facilitation. Meanwhile, MDPI's 2024 review into partnership development foregrounded on- and off-campus innovation infrastructure—such as Technology Transfer Offices (TTOs) and science parks—as essential to converting institutional knowledge into economic action . These findings echo Core TTO effectiveness frameworks established earlier by Phan et al. (2005).

Regional innovation system (RIS) studies further affirm that dense inter-organizational networks—often facilitated by geography—are central to broader innovation spillovers (Cooke, 2002; Zhang, 2015; Buesa et al., 2020). Such evidence reinforces the role of spatial proximity and RIS context in modulating collaboration and knowledge diffusion.

Strengthening Human Capital and Entrepreneurial Capabilities. Human capital development consistently emerges as a core pathway through which UIEEs catalyze regional impact. Janeiro et al. (2021) showed that MOOCs and structured entrepreneurial education programs enhance intrapreneurship skills among students and faculty, particularly benefiting under-resourced regions. Similarly, Secundo et al. (2024) emphasized that universities must evolve from merely educating about entrepreneurship to fostering entrepreneurially minded graduates—through curricula, mentorship, experiential learning, and internal policies that foster innovation culture. The importance of sustained efforts was also emphasized: effective education requires senior leadership support, dedicated resources, and institutionalized infrastructure—a finding widely supported across UEE models (Secundo et al., 2024; Miller & Acs, 2017). Such investments pay dividends when talent retention leads to local startup formation, enhancing economic and innovative capacity.

Sustainability, Social Innovation, and Civic Roles. Recent research signals a shift toward embedding sustainability and civic missions within UIEEs. Guerrero and Lira (2023) observed that Latin American universities now explicitly align entrepreneurship initiatives with Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), redefining impact beyond profit to include social equity . Scandinavian experiences (e.g., Finnish smart campus initiatives) show universities adopting quadruple-helix models, bringing local communities and media into innovation ecosystems in pursuit of environmental and social objectives. Studies from Sweden underscore how innovation hubs not only create economic outcomes but also foster social cohesion and cross-sectoral community capacity, especially in smaller cities and rural areas (Avdikos & Merkel, 2020; Vaciriayi & Belle, 2020). This broadens the notion of academic entrepreneurship to include social innovation as a vehicle for inclusive regional development.

Governance Structures and Policy Support. Governance and policy play a fundamental role in facilitating regional development through UIEEs. In the UK, REF assessment incentivizes universities to align their scholarly output with commercialization and local impact goals, but it also risks incentivizing shallow engagement in form rather than substance unless coupled with regional support mechanisms (Audretsch et al., 2022) . Similarly, the UEZ pilot and Scottish innovation funds are rooted in Triple-Helix frameworks, yet success depends on local leadership, meaningful industry engagement, and practical investment infrastructure. The case of Australia's pivot toward industry-aligned research funding—highlighted by open critiques in the media—reflects growing emphasis on driving innovation outputs with regional economic benefits. While this trend may enhance commercialization, scholars warn it could undermine basic science unless carefully balanced (Australian Research Council vs. industry demands).

Contextual Heterogeneity and Path Dependency. A central insight across these empirical cases is that one-size-fits-all models do not work. Regions vary in resources, cultural capacities, governance styles, and economic profiles; entrepreneurship spillovers flourish in some contexts yet stall in others. Brekke (2021) articulated this variance across OECD regions, advocating for place-sensitive governance rooted in local institutional capabilities. Brown's (2016) Scottish case warned against over-reliance on academic entrepreneurship in areas lacking mature regional capacity, underscoring the need for inclusive regional frameworks. Similarly, U.S. and Swedish RIS studies show that regions with underdeveloped

RIS structures often fail to fully realize university-driven innovation unless foundational infrastructure is strengthened (Cooke, 2002; Buesa et al., 2020).

Intersecting Pathways Leading to Regional Development Outcomes. Building from the above themes, we observe six intersecting impact pathways: Academia ↔ Industry Linkages: Strong TTOs, incubators, and governance enable knowledge transfer, spurring spin-offs and jobs. Ecosystem Orchestration: Universities shape regional innovation through coordination, strategic leadership, and stakeholder management. Human Capital: Entrepreneurial education builds pipeline capacity, fosters talent retention, and seeds local enterprises. Sustainability & Civic Engagement: Ecosystems increasingly include SDG-aligned and social innovation initiatives. Policy Integration: Multi-level government frameworks (e.g., REF, UEZs, innovation funding) are necessary but require local customization. Contextual Fit: Ecosystem architecture must align with regional maturity, institutional culture, and governance practices. These pathways align with the multilevel research agenda proposed by Guerrero et al. (2024), emphasizing context, agent practices, and regional dynamics.

This review strengthens dynamic, multilevel theories of UIEEs by integrating insights from Triple-Helix, RIS, and Quadruple-Helix frameworks to explain cross-sectoral orchestration and capacity building. It also advances UEE theory by embedding sustainability and civic missions in entrepreneurial logic (Guerrero & Lira, 2023; Carayannis & Campbell, 2012)

University leaders should invest in orchestration capabilities—such as TTO infrastructure, policy alignment, entrepreneurial education, and ecosystem connectors—to ensure spin-off generation benefits local development. Australian and UK cases warn against siloed commercialization efforts. Regional and national policymakers must tailor innovation instruments to local contexts, not apply generic mandates. Successful programs integrate REF-like incentives with flexible support structures, as seen in Ohio's UIEE and Finnish Smart Campus initiatives.

6. Conclusions

This literature review explored how University Innovation and Entrepreneurial Ecosystems (UIEEs) serve as dynamic engines of regional development. Drawing on a comparative synthesis of recent empirical and conceptual research, we identified six primary pathways through which UIEEs influence local and regional economies: academic entrepreneurship, ecosystem orchestration, university–industry–government collaboration, human capital formation, alignment with sustainability and social innovation, and multilevel governance and policy integration.

The evidence strongly supports the role of universities as orchestrators in their ecosystems—coordinating actors, resources, and institutional infrastructures to create entrepreneurial outcomes. Spin-off creation, knowledge transfer, and innovation diffusion emerge as central mechanisms, especially when universities work in synergy with local governments and industry partners. Moreover, the integration of entrepreneurial education and civic missions—such as alignment with Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)—expands the scope of university impact beyond economic development to include social transformation and inclusive growth.

Importantly, the review highlights the importance of context-specific design. Not all ecosystems function similarly; their success is contingent on factors such as institutional maturity, regional infrastructure, policy alignment, cultural readiness, and stakeholder engagement. Best practices emphasize the need for bottom-up governance, inclusive innovation strategies, and continuous capacity-building tailored to regional needs.

From a theoretical standpoint, this study advances our understanding of UIEEs as multilevel, multifaceted systems whose impacts unfold across time and space. It calls for future models that move beyond linear representations of innovation to include recursive interactions between agents, institutions, and geographies. For practitioners and policymakers, the findings underscore the need for flexible, place-based strategies that nurture ecosystem resilience, sustainability, and long-term relevance.

References

Aguinis, H., Shapiro, D. L., Antonacopoulou, E. P., & Cummings, T. G. (2014). Scholarly impact: A pluralist conceptualization. Academy of Management Learning & Education, 13(4), 623–639. https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2014.0121

Audretsch, D. B. (2014). From the entrepreneurial university to the university for the entrepreneurial society. Journal of Technology Transfer, 39(3), 313–321. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10961-012-9288-1

Audretsch, D. B., & Guerrero, M. (2023). Is ambidexterity the missing link between entrepreneurship, management, and innovation? Journal of Technology Transfer, 48(6), 1891–1918. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10961-021-09920-4

Audretsch, D., Belitski, M., Guerrero, M., & Siegel, D. (2022). Assessing the impact of the U.K.'s Research Excellence Framework on the relationship between university scholarly output and education and regional economic growth. Academy of Management Learning & Education, 21(3), 394–421. https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2021.0172

Benardi , Chaidir, M., Setyowati, A., 2021. Pengaruh Mata Pelajaran Kewirausahaan dan Lingkungan Pergaulan terhadap Motivasi Berwirausaha Siswa SMKS Al - Hamidiyah. Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan Volume 3 Nomor 6 Tahun 2021 Hlm 4881 – 4888.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Brekke, T. (2021). What Do We Know about the University Contribution to Regional Economic Development? A Conceptual Framework. Regional Studies, 55(4), 555–567. https://doi.org/10.1177/0160017620909538

Brown, R. (2016). Entrepreneurial spillovers in peripheral regions. Regional Studies, 50(4), 567–582.

Carayannis, E., & Campbell, D. F. J. (2012). Mode 3 and Quadruple Helix innovation systems. International Journal of Technology Management, 46(3/4), 201–234.

Carlsson, B., Jacobsson, S., Holmén, M., & Rickne, A. (2002). Innovation systems: Analytical and methodological issues. Research Policy, 31(2), 233–245. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0048-7333(01)00138-X

Casper, S., & West, J. (2024). University innovation and the emergence of four California entrepreneurial ecosystems. Academy of Management Perspectives, 38(4), 453–473. https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2024.0274

Choi, H., Yoon, E., Siegel, D. S., Waldman, D. A., & Mitchell, M. S. (2022). Assessing differences between university and federal laboratory postdoctoral scientists in technology transfer. Research Policy, 51, 104456.

Coenen, L., & Moodysson, J. (2009). Putting constructed regional advantages into practice: Swedish perspectives. European Planning Studies, 17(4), 601–620.

Combs, R. (2021). The triangle. Research Triangle Regional Partnership. Retrieved from https://www.researchtriangle.org/the-triangle

Crow, M. M., Whitman, K., & Anderson, D. M. (2020). Rethinking academic entrepreneurship: University governance and the emergence of the academic enterprise. Public Administration Review, 80(3), 511–515.

Eesley, C. E., & Lee, Y. S. (2021). Do university entrepreneurship programs promote entrepreneurship? Strategic Management Journal, 42(5), 833–861. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.3231

Eesley, C. E., & Miller, W. F. (2018). Impact: Stanford University's economic impact via innovation and entrepreneurship. Foundations and Trends in Entrepreneurship, 14(2), 130–278.

Erina, S., Jiménez, M., Zheng, P., & Oksanen, J. (2017). Innovation hubs as regional catalysts in Sweden. International Journal of Technology Management, 12(3).

Feldman, M., Fleming, L., Heaton, S., Desai, S., & Teece, D. (2022). Uncommon methods and metrics for local entrepreneurial ecosystems. Research Policy, 51, 104583.

Feldman, M., Siegel, D. S., & Wright, M. (2019). New developments in innovation and entrepreneurial ecosystems. Industrial and Corporate Change, 28(4), 817–826. https://doi.org/10.1093/icc/dtz031

Ford, C. M., O'Neal, T., & Sullivan, D. M. (2010). Promoting regional entrepreneurship through university, government, and industry alliances: Initiatives from Florida's high tech corridor. Journal of Small Business and Entrepreneurship, 23(4), 691–708.

Grimaldi, R., Kenney, M., Siegel, D., & Wright, M. (2011). 30 years after Bayh–Dole: Reassessing academic entrepreneurship. Research Policy, 40(8), 1045–1057. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2011.04.005

Guerrero, M., & Urbano, D. (2012). The development of an entrepreneurial university. Journal of Technology Transfer, 37(1), 43–74. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10961-010-9171-x

Guerrero, M., Cunningham, J. A., & Urbano, D. (2015). Economic impact of entrepreneurial universities' activities: An exploratory study of the United Kingdom. Research Policy, 44(3), 748–764.

Guerrero, M., Heaton, S., & Urbano, D. (2021). Building universities' intrapreneurial capabilities in the digital era: The role and impacts of Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs). Technovation, 99, 102139. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2021.102139

Guerrero, M., Lira, M. (2023). Entrepreneurial university ecosystem's engagement with SDGs: Looking into a Latin-American university. Community Development, 54(3), 337–352. https://doi.org/10.1080/15575330.2022.2099371

Guerrero, M., Siegel, D. S., Terjesen, S., Feldman, M., & Lockett, A. (2024). Assessing the impact of university innovation and entrepreneurial ecosystems: Managerial and policy implications. Academy of Management Perspectives, 38(4). https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2024.0282

Guerrero, M., Urbano, D., Cunningham, J. A., & Gajón, E. (2018). Determinants of graduates' start-ups creation across a multi-campus entrepreneurial university: The case of Monterrey Institute of Technology and Higher Education. Journal of Small Business Management, 56(1), 150–178. https://doi.org/10.1111/jsbm.12365

Guerrero, M., Urbano, D., Fayolle, A., Klofsten, M., & Mian, S. (2016). Entrepreneurial universities: Emerging models in the new social and economic landscape. Small Business Economics, 47(3), 551–563. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-016-9755-4

Harima, A., & Harima, J. (2024). Unintended dependence creation? The nesting effect of university entrepreneurial ecosystems. Academy of Management Perspectives, 38(4), 534–555. https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2024.0281

Heaton, S., Siegel, D. S., & Teece, D. J. (2019). Universities and innovation ecosystems: A dynamic capabilities perspective. Industrial and Corporate Change, 28(4), 921–939. https://doi.org/10.1093/icc/dtz038

Jiménez, M., & Zheng, P. (2021). Campus-associated innovation hubs in Sweden. World Scientific Journal of Innovation and Tech Management, 17(1), 1–24.

Kenney, M. (2000). Understanding Silicon Valley: The anatomy of an entrepreneurial region. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Klofsten, M., Fayolle, A., Guerrero, M., Mian, S., Urbano, D., & Wright, M. (2019). The entrepreneurial university as driver for economic growth and social change: Key strategic challenges. Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 141, 149–158.

Lundqvist, M., & Williams-Middleton, K. (2024). Making the whole university entrepreneurial: Decades of legitimacy-building through Chalmers School of Entrepreneurship. Technovation, 132, 102993.

Martin, B. C., McNally, J. J., & Kay, M. J. (2013). Examining the formation of human capital in entrepreneurship: A meta-analysis of entrepreneurship education outcomes. Journal of Business Venturing, 28(2), 211–224. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2012.03.002

Mbitse, Y., Salomo, S., & zu Knyphausen-Aufseß, D. (2024). Universities as keystone orchestrators during innovation ecosystem nascence. Academy of Management Perspectives, 38(4), 512–533. https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2024.0269

Moher, D., Liberati, A., Tetzlaff, J., & Altman, D. G. (2009). Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: The PRISMA statement. PLOS Medicine, 6(7), e1000097. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1000097

NSF. (2024). Technology, Innovation and Partnerships—a directorate at the U.S. National Science Foundation. Retrieved from https://new.nsf.gov/tip/latest

OIEx. (2023). Universities and Ohio's innovation ecosystem. Ohio Innovation Exchange. Retrieved from https://www.ohioinnovationexchange.org/innovation-ecosystem

Phan, P., Siegel, D. S., & Wright, M. (2005). Science parks and incubators: Observations, synthesis and future research. Journal of Business Venturing, 20(2), 165–182.

Rasmussen, E., Andries, P., & Knockaert, M. (2024). Student ventures: A new organizational form in the university entrepreneurial ecosystem. Academy of Management Perspectives, 38(4), 473–491.

Rentrop, C., Bandelow, L., & Perlinger, K. (2024). An exploratory analysis of the impact of philanthropic investments on the development of university innovation and entrepreneurial ecosystems. Academy of Management Perspectives, 38(4), 492–511.

Research England. (2022). Research Excellence Framework (REF) 2021. https://2021.ref.ac.uk

Ruslaini Ruslaini, M. Chaidir, Ngadi Permana. 2022. Implementasi Taksonomi Bloom Pada Mata Kuliah Kewirausahaan, Kompetensi Dosen Terhadap Niat Berwirausaha Mahasiswa. Refleksi Edukatika : Jurnal Ilmiah Kependidikan Vol. 12 No. 6, Juni 2022, ISSN: 2087-9385 (print) dan 2528-696X (online), http://jurnal.umk.ac.id/index.php/RE.

Secundo, G., et al. (2024). Academic Entrepreneurship Ecosystems: Systematic Review and Future Research*. Journal of the Knowledge Economy.

Siegel, D. S., & Wright, M. (2015). Academic entrepreneurship: Time for a rethink? British Journal of Management, 26(4), 582–595. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8551.12116

Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. Journal of Business Research, 104, 333–339. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039

Torraco, R. J. (2016). Writing integrative literature reviews: Using the past and present to explore the future. Human Resource Development Review, 15(4), 404–428. https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484316671606

Tranfield, D., Denyer, D., & Smart, P. (2003). Towards a methodology for developing evidence-informed management knowledge by means of systematic review. British Journal of Management, 14(3), 207–222. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8551.00375

Wang, Q., Li, Y., Yang, Y., Little, M. G., Basnight, E. B., & Fryberger, C. B. (2024). University-led entrepreneurship ecosystem building in underserved communities: From a network perspective. Geographical Review, 114(3), 353–377.

Wright, M., Siegel, D. S., & Mustar, P. (2017). An emerging ecosystem for student start-ups. Journal of Technology Transfer, 42(4), 909–922. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10961-017-9558-z

Wurth, B., Stam, E., & Spigel, B. (2022). Toward an entrepreneurial ecosystem research program. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 46(4), 729–778.

Yulianti, G., Chaidir, M., & Permana, N. (2022). The Influence of Entrepreneurship Education and Industrial Work Practices on Interest in Entrepreneurship in State Vocational High School Students in the Central Jakarta Region. Jurnal Ad'ministrare, 9(2), 729. https://doi.org/10.26858/ja.v9i2.42945