

Conceptualizing academic entrepreneurship ecosystems: a review, analysis and extension of the literature

Christopher S. Hayter¹ · Andrew J. Nelson² · Stephanie Zayed³ · Alan C. O'Connor³

© Springer Science+Business Media, LLC, part of Springer Nature 2018

Abstract Policy-related discussions increasingly view universities as so-called “engines of economic growth”. Recognizing that the economic impact of universities is dependent, at least in part, on the success of university-affiliated entrepreneurial ventures, this paper reviews the extant literature to understand how academic entrepreneurship is conceptualized and the extent to which it adopts an ecosystem approach. We find that scholars have largely focused on individual ecosystem elements and characteristics, eschewing strategic and systemic conceptualizations of entrepreneurship ecosystems. As a result, we argue that the ecosystem perspective has not been fully leveraged to influence policy decisions. We conclude by offering several concrete recommendations on future research directions that, if pursued, would further enhance our understanding of the economic impact of universities.

Keywords Academic entrepreneurship · Ecosystems · Technology transfer · Entrepreneurship policy · Economic development

JEL Classification L31 · O31 · O32 · O34 · O38

1 Introduction

Academic entrepreneurship—the establishment of new spinoff companies by faculty, post-docs, students, or affiliated personnel based on university technology—is a critical vehicle for economic and social development (Rothaermel et al. 2007; Shane 2004; Wright et al.

✉ Christopher S. Hayter
chayter@asu.edu

¹ Center for Organization Research and Design, School of Public Affairs, Arizona State University, Phoenix, AZ 85004, USA

² Lundquist College of Business, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403, USA

³ RTI International, Research Triangle Park, NC 27709, USA

2007a). While a considerable body of literature investigates individual and firm-level characteristics associated with the success of university spinoffs, recent work emphasizes the importance of context to entrepreneurial innovation writ large (Autio et al. 2014). Specifically, Autio et al. (2014) focus on the potential of ecosystems, among other perspectives, to simultaneously provide both a more nuanced and a more complex understanding of entrepreneurial performance.

Scholars have, of course, long employed ecosystem perspectives to understand industrial dynamics (Moore 1993). Although early conceptualizations emerged within the management (e.g., Iansiti and Levien 2004) and economic geography (Bahrami and Evans 2000; Kenney and von Burg 1999; Saxenian 1994) literatures, ecosystem perspectives have been recently applied within the context of academic entrepreneurship to, for example, examine the structure and effectiveness of support programs (e.g., Clarysse et al. 2014; Swamidass 2013).

Ecosystems can vary by technology, network intensity and organizational variety. However, ecosystem conceptualizations generally focus on the role of networks and their ability to provide firms with resources and information to navigate a constantly changing competitive environment (Adner and Kapoor 2010; Iansiti and Levien 2004; Moore 1993; Zahra and Nambisan 2012). Similarly, within the context of academic entrepreneurship, Hayter (2016b) posits that the efficacy of academic entrepreneurship ecosystems depends on the interconnectivity of constituent elements and their collective ability to provide information and resources important for firm success (Powell et al. 2009; Whittington et al. 2009).

Although the term ecosystem has only recently been used within the context of academic entrepreneurship, earlier reviews do anticipate the emergence of ecosystem perspectives, focusing on the role of individual and inter-organizational networks. O'Shea et al. (2004, p. 23) write, for example, "Past models and research of spin-offs has underestimated the role that the social setting of the institution plays in the spin-off process. This is despite evidence ... that spin-off rates can only be understood within the context of the social environment". Similarly, Rothaermel et al. (2007, p. 740) posit that future research "... can clearly benefit from a more holistic systems perspective across different levels of analysis, rather than its current focus on distinct subsystems, which is a reflection of its fragmented and embryonic state". Unfortunately, we lack a systematic review of the academic entrepreneurship literature that reflects emergent network-centric conceptualizations. Most notably, existing work fails to account holistically for the many influences on academic entrepreneurship and—perhaps most importantly, given emerging conceptualizations of ecosystems—their interconnectivity, thus providing an incomplete view of this critical phenomenon.

The goal of this article is to address this gap by inductively reviewing the extant literature since the year 2000 to understand to what extent it illuminates academic entrepreneurship ecosystem elements and their interconnectivity. The remainder of the paper is structured as follows. Section 2 explains our methodological approach. The third section provides an overview of publication patterns. The fourth and fifth sections offer analyses of the independent and dependent variables identified in prior work, accordingly. Section 6 considers these different variables in tandem through a network analysis of the prevalence and relationship between themes. Finally, we offer a synthesis of our findings and discusses implications for management practice and theory and recommends a future research agenda.

2 Methodology and data

2.1 Research approach

This paper employs a grounded-theory systematic approach (Petticrew and Roberts 2005; Wolfswinkel et al. 2013) to review the extant empirical literature. Although the general purpose of a systematic literature review is to establish the current state of knowledge in a field (Tranfield et al. 2003), the grounded theory method relies on inductivity, emphasizing thorough and relevant analyses resulting in insights otherwise overlooked. Relevant to conceptualizations of academic entrepreneurship ecosystems, a grounded theory approach focuses on interrelationships and dependencies within and beyond a body of literature (Wolfswinkel et al. 2013).

We implemented the following procedures in our review. First, we selected all journals included in the *Financial Times* May 2016 ranking of the top 50 research journals (FT50), supplemented by the *Journal of Technology Transfer*, *Technovation*, and *Small Business Economics*—journals with significant representation in prior relevant literature reviews on academic entrepreneurship (e.g. Rothaermel et al. 2007). The FT50 journals were selected in an effort to understand the extent to which top management journals focus on academic entrepreneurship, while the primary-area journals were selected for their depth of coverage.

Using a series of previously-identified keywords (“Appendix A”), we searched for articles published in these journals between 2000 and January 2017 (including articles available in pre-print form). This procedure yielded 253 results. After filtering the list to ensure that articles were empirical and focused on ways to improve academic entrepreneurship and/or its impact, we identified 209 publications for analysis.

We then read and synthesized each of these articles, compiling the information in tabular form: author, affiliation, country of affiliation, countries of interest, definition of academic entrepreneurship, variables, data used, and findings. Once we completed the synthesis, we inductively coded the definitions of academic entrepreneurship and study variables following the process recommended by Saldana (2012) and Wolfswinkel et al. (2013), including iterative open, axial, and selective coding.¹ Coding steps were undertaken iteratively, with researchers going back-and-forth between publications and emergent themes and subthemes.

Finally, to further assess the relationships between article themes, we performed a network analysis of the subthemes we identified. Thus, we began with an adjacency matrix consisting of articles on one dimension and subthemes on the other. We then transformed this two-mode matrix into a one-mode matrix with subthemes on both axes and cell values indicating the degree of overlap between subcategories. For visualization, we loaded this matrix into SocNetV, an open-source network analysis package. We employed the Kamada–Kawai algorithm for initial layout and then adjusted the layout as described in Sect. 6 of the findings.

¹ According to Wolfswinkel et al. (2013), the purpose of open coding is to identify, label or re-label, and build insights—categories—based on inductions from articles included in the review. The purpose of axial coding is to analyze and understand the relationship among subcategories within a respective category. Selective coding is the process of identifying and developing relationships between the main categories.




Fig. 1 Publication journal frequency (n = 209)




Fig. 2 Year of publication frequency (n = 209)

3 Findings: description of articles

We identified articles matching our criteria in 11 of the 53 journals reviewed. Illustrated in Fig. 1, 38-percent (80) of the articles were published in *Journal of Technology Transfer*, followed by *Research Policy* (57), which accounted for 27-percent. While these two journals accounted for about two-thirds of articles reviewed, the remaining articles were split among nine other journals. An initial surprising finding, therefore, is that the vast majority of FT50 journals—the top outlets in the field of management—have not published work in academic entrepreneurship since 2000, despite broad overall increases in the phenomenon and related articles (see Fig. 2 below). Observing a similar pattern, Rothaermel et al.




Fig. 3 Distribution of authors by the number of publications authored or co-authored ($n = 353$)

(2007) suggest that the focus of top journals on theory as the key publication criteria, rather than novel or important empirical contexts, may explain this pattern. Our results show that the situation has not changed in the decade since Rothaermel and colleagues' observation.

Figure 2 illustrates the number of articles published each year. Although there are several substantial year-to-year dips, the figure illustrates that an average of 0.85 additional articles are published each year. Because our list of journals is consistent over this time period and because these journals had relatively consistent page counts, on average, this finding indicates that a growing proportion of scholarship in these journals is focused on academic entrepreneurship.

Figure 3 illustrates the distribution of publications by author. There were 353 unique authors represented by publications in our review. Most individuals authored or co-authored one (276 authors or 78-percent of the total) or two (47 authors or 13-percent of the total) publications. Thirty authors (9-percent) contributed to three or more publications. Mike Wright is an author or co-author for nearly 14-percent of articles reviewed, followed by Andy Lockett with 5-percent (see Fig. 4). Of the 30 authors in Fig. 4, 83-percent are in business schools, with the remainder stemming from programs such as public policy, economics and education. This finding reflects, in part, our selection of journals. Yet it also suggests that work on academic entrepreneurship is a focus of business-school-based scholars, especially. The skewed nature of authorship as well as the fact that two journals account for a high proportion of articles suggests that academic entrepreneurship remains a niche topic within the fields of entrepreneurship and management, despite the significant and increasing public attention to this phenomenon.

Turning to author affiliation, represented in Fig. 5, we see that Imperial College leads the list with 12 authors affiliated with publications in the review, followed by Nottingham




Fig. 4 Authors that authored or co-authored at least three publications ($n = 353$). A total of 323 authors have fewer than three publications

University (9) and University of Bologna (8).² Notably, these are all European universities. One line of inquiry might pursue whether universities that are more innovative also produce the greatest amount of academic entrepreneurship research. For instance, Imperial College was ranked second in the Reuters Top 100 European Most Innovative Universities 2016 ranking.³ Yet the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Stanford University in the US, which are widely recognized as perhaps the most entrepreneurial universities in the world, rank only fifth and eleventh respectively. It is worth noting, too, that the top ten universities on our list all have a department, institute or program dedicated exclusively to innovation or entrepreneurship.

Figure 6 illustrates the country affiliation of each author.⁴ Thirty-three percent of authors have US affiliations, followed by the UK, with 13-percent. Of the 15 countries that had at least two different affiliations, only four are outside of Europe; only Singapore and Israel represent Asia; and no institutions in Latin America, Africa, or Australia had multiple authors represented.

Finally, we examine which countries are the focus of academic entrepreneurship research. Illustrated in Fig. 7, we find that research focused on the U.S. and U.K. account for 28 percent (79 representations) and 12 percent (35 representations) of the 287 country

² Affiliations were only counted once per author per university, preventing authors who appear multiple times under the same affiliation to disproportionately skew the distribution.

³ See <http://www.reuters.com/most-innovative-universities-europe>.

⁴ Author affiliations that appeared multiple times under one same author were again counted only once, thus N in Fig. 5 is 193 rather than 353.




Fig. 5 Author affiliation at time of publication, frequency (n = 380). The review also included 23 institutions with three author affiliations each, 40 institutions with two affiliations, and 109 institutions with one affiliation each

representations among publications within our review, respectively.⁵ Moreover, of the 43 countries represented in the review, 77-percent are European countries. Thus, a relative lack of representation from Asia, Africa, the Middle East and South America characterizes both authors and empirical contexts in this literature, suggesting that current conclusions may be culturally specific.

4 Findings: independent variables

Turning our attention to the factors that articles consider, Table 1 lists the eight categories of independent variables that emerged from our analysis: (1) characteristics of academic entrepreneurs, (2) human capital, (3) social networks, (4) entrepreneurial environment, (5) financial resources, (6) scientific, technical, and product characteristics, (7) academic entrepreneurship programs, and (8) university management and policies. The sections below discuss these independent variables and associated themes and subthemes.

⁵ Note that 34 publications study university entrepreneurship in more than one country.




Fig. 6 Country of author affiliation at time of publication frequency ($n = 194$). The following countries had 2 author affiliations: Israel, Singapore, Switzerland. The following countries had one author affiliation each: Australia, Austria, Chile, China, Cyprus, Denmark, Greece, Hong Kong, Mexico, New Zealand, Portugal, Russia, Slovenia

4.1 Characteristics of academic entrepreneurs

4.1.1 Individual characteristics

Academic entrepreneurs make the decision to commercialize their technology individually or within the context of a team; research shows that myriad characteristics affects their ability to establish and grow a university spinoff company. First, basic demographic characteristics such as age, gender, race, family background, and citizenship are important. For example, family background, including having an entrepreneurial parent (Bergmann et al. 2016), entrepreneurial family member (Criaco et al. 2014), or history of entrepreneurship in their family, is predictive of engagement in academic entrepreneurship.

A number of studies focus on age, with most studies showing that academic entrepreneurship increases alongside age (e.g., Aldridge and Audretsch 2011; Ambos et al. 2008; Bergmann et al. 2016; Grimm and Jaenicke 2012; Haeussler and Colyvas 2011; Müller 2010; Oehler et al. 2015), which is related to academic rank (Clarysse et al. 2011a RP) and seniority (Rasmussen et al. 2014). In other words, with age and academic experience, university researchers likely have the flexibility, contacts, and knowledge to participate in entrepreneurial activities (Haeussler and Colyvas 2011; Huyghe et al. 2016b). Notable exceptions include Bercovitz and Feldman (2008), who find that faculty not involved in entrepreneurial activities early in their career are less likely to later embrace entrepreneurship, and Karlsson and Wigren (2012), who find that older university personnel are less likely to establish a company.




Fig. 7 Country of study of publications in review ($n = 286$). Although some publications studied more than one country, each country was counted once. Publications that had no specific country of study or that did not specify the countries within the region studied are not included. The following countries were the subject of two articles included in the review: Austria, Croatia, Denmark, Georgia, Greece, Hungary, Luxembourg, Portugal. The following countries were the subject of one article included in the review: Albania, Argentina, Bulgaria, Chile, Czech Republic, Estonia, Iceland, Israel, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, New Zealand, Romania, Russia, Slovakia, Turkey, Venezuela

Hsu et al. (2007) also find that the average age for establishing a company is decreasing over time, though their focus for this finding is white males who hold U.S. citizenship—the group they determine most likely to be involved in academic entrepreneurship. Other studies, too, find that academic entrepreneurship is nearly always a male-centric enterprise (Aldridge and Audretsch 2011; Bergmann et al. 2016; Karlsson and Wigren 2012; Shane et al. 2015). Abreu and Grindvich (2013), Clarysse et al. (2011a, b), and Haeussler and Colyvas (2011) similarly find that female gender correlates negatively with entrepreneurial behavior. In terms of nationality, however, the number of individuals from other countries, especially Latin America, who participate in entrepreneurial activities is increasing. Similarly, having a Chinese name is a predictive factor for attracting academic support from TTOs (Shane et al. 2015).

Finally, the eminence or prestige of faculty and the quality of their research is associated with entrepreneurship and improved entrepreneurial performance (DiGregorio and Shane 2003; O'Shea et al. 2005; Powers and McDougall 2005b). Similarly, the involvement of so-called “star scientists” in entrepreneurial activities is associated with improved product and employment outcomes (Zucker et al. 2002) and the likelihood that a spinoff will undertake an IPO (Fuller and Rothaermel (2012). Further, the prestige of the department (Perkmann et al. 2011) and university (Sine et al. 2003) in which an individual scientist is embedded is predictive of engagement in academic entrepreneurship.

Table 1 Academic entrepreneurship independent variables and associated themes and subthemes

Themes	Subthemes	Independent variables	Num-ber of articles
Characteristics of academic entrepreneurs (47)	Individual characteristics	Age	25
		Academic rank	
		Capability	
		Citizenship	
		Eminence/prestige	
		Family background	
		Gender	
		Market knowledge	
		Race	
		Self-identity	
Human capital (78)	Motivations and self efficacy	Academic motivations	24
		Entrepreneurial motivations	
		Financial motivations	
		Identity	
		Scientific motivations	
		Self-efficacy	
		Technology development motivations	
		Academic experience	
		Education/academic experience	
		Entrepreneurial experience	
	Academic entrepreneurs	Faculty role	67
		Industry experience	
		Patenting experience	
		Product development experience	
		Publication experience	
		Role of students and Postdocs	
		Surrogate/professional management	
		Board composition	
		Spinoff team composition	
			17

Table 1 (continued)

Themes	Subthemes	Independent variables	Num-ber of articles
Social networks (43)	Individual social networks	Constrain Non-academic contacts Provide advice and mentoring Resource provision	31
	Organizational networks and entrepreneurship support	Can enable (or constrain) entrepreneurship support programs	15
Entrepreneurial environment (49)	Culture	Culture Entrepreneurs as role models National environment Peer support Regional environment	30
	Locational factors	Economic characteristics of region Industry presence University generates economic impact VC in region	23
	R&D funding	Total R&D funding Industry R&D funding	15
	Early-stage venture funding	VC Other sources	16
Scientific, technical, and product characteristics (22)	Research discipline	Biotechnology Engineering Information technology Life sciences Physics	12
	Technology	Broad technology scope Patenting and licensing versus spinoff	10

Table 1 (continued)

Themes	Subthemes	Independent variables	Number of articles
Academic entrepreneurship support programs (99)	Technology transfer offices	Advice and support	39
		IP protection may detract from entrepreneurship	
	University entrepreneurship programs	Needs capabilities and resources	58
		Structure	
		Business plan competitions	
		Early-stage seed funds	
University management and policies (50)	National programs and policies	Incubators	16
		Industry research centers	
		Proof-of-concept centers	
		Science parks	
	Management	Entrepreneurship support programs	26
		IP policy frameworks	
		Legislation	
		Tax benefits and regulatory reform	
	Incentives and policy	Administration	33
		Decentralized, integrated initiatives	
		University mission	
		Conflict of interest	
		Disclosure and IP-related incentives	
		Equity policies	
		IP ownership	

4.1.2 Motivations and self-efficacy

A critical factor in entrepreneurial activities is the motivations of individual university scientists, postdoctoral fellows, and students themselves. Otherwise known as entrepreneurial motivation (Oehler et al. 2015; O'Shea et al. et al. 2008), entrepreneurial orientation (Diáñez-González and Camelo-Ordaz, 2016; Kalar and Antoncic, 2015; Walter et al. 2006a, b), entrepreneurial passion (Huyghe et al. 2016a), or the desire to explore commercial opportunities (Toole and Czarnitzki 2009), research shows that motivations determine the extent to which university scientists participate in entrepreneurial activities, including spinoff establishment (e.g. O'Shea et al. 2008), patenting (e.g. Walter et al. 2006) and commercialization activities writ large (e.g. Renault 2006). Hayter (2011) and Lowe et al. (2006) also examine post-establishment entrepreneurial motivations related to spinoff growth; Schillo (2018) examines firm-level ambitions and strategies.

D'Este and Perkmann (2011) find that university scientists who patent and establish spinoff companies are driven by commercialization motivations, a theme resonating among other scholars. Owen-Smith and Powell (2001), for example find that scientists patent for so-called personal benefits, while Rizzo (2015) finds that PhDs found companies out of financial necessity. While Hayter (2011, 2015) and Lam (2011) similarly find that financial gain is an important motivation, they also find that academic entrepreneurs are motivated by many other personal and professional reasons. Hayter (2011, 2015) finds, for example, that faculty seek to develop their respective technologies that may or may not include plans for commercialization; Kolb and Wagner (2015) find that faculty may be “overly-motivated” by scientific and technical issues.

Studies also find that university scientists are usually motivated by academic rationales, at times conflicting with commercial- and growth-minded motivations (Huyghe et al. 2016a; Toole and Czarnitzki 2009). Specifically, scientists often view academic entrepreneurship—along with joint research with industry and consulting (D'Este and Perkmann 2011)—as a way to obtain financial resources in support of their research agenda and in advancement of their academic career (Fini et al. 2009; Hayter 2011, 2015; Lam 2011; O'Gorman et al. 2008; Owen-Smith and Powell 2001). Further, faculty sometimes see their spinoff companies as a way to provide jobs to students, just as PhD students see it as a way to provide jobs to themselves (Hayter 2011; Rizzo 2015).

While conceptually different from professional and entrepreneurial motivations, identity and self-efficacy among individual academic entrepreneurs are also important considerations for academic entrepreneurship. Self-efficacy is one's perception of their own ability to successfully undertake entrepreneurship (Huyghe et al. 2016a), also known as self-perceptions of entrepreneurial capability (Guerrero and Urbano 2014). Self-efficacy and motivations may both be related to identity; Jain et al. (2009) find that most academic entrepreneurs see themselves first as scientists and, second, entrepreneurs.

4.2 Human capital

4.2.1 Academic entrepreneurs

Human capital refers to the general knowledge of individuals obtained through formal education and experience. Following traditional human capital views, scholars find that technical education levels (Åstebro et al. 2012; Hsu et al. 2007; Sideri and Panagopoulos 2016) and research excellence are predictive of entrepreneurial activity. Research excellence

may be associated with star scientists (Fuller and Rothaermel 2012; Zucker et al. 2002) or research groups (Rasmussen and Wright 2015). According to Bercovitz and Feldman (2008), where the university scientist was trained matters, too; scientists trained at a university with high levels of entrepreneurial activity are more likely to become academic entrepreneurs.

Researchers also have linked publishing, a proxy for the role of human capital in the production of new knowledge, to positive entrepreneurial outcomes (Haeussler and Colyvas 2011; Horta et al. 2015; Karlsson and Wigren 2012; Mindruta 2013; Van Looy et al. 2011)—especially co-publication with industry researchers (Aldridge and Audretsch 2011). The experiential basis of human capital—non-academic experience (Grimm and Jaenicke 2012) and engagement (Tartari et al. 2014), especially experience working with industry—is generally predictive of entrepreneurial activity among university scientists (e.g., Aldridge and Audretsch 2011; Criaco et al. 2014; Knockaert et al. 2011; Lavie and Drori 2012; Rasmussen et al. 2014; Shane et al. 2015; Todorovic et al. 2011; Wennberg and Wiklund 2011; Wright et al. 2004). Industry relationships include pre-founding links with industry (Swamidass and Vulasa 2009), total hours spent working with industry (Agrawal 2006), industry consulting (D’Este and Perkmann 2011; Gassol 2007) and department-level industry connections (Rasmussen et al. 2014). Consulting with government agencies can also be important (Perkmann et al. 2011).

Entrepreneurial experience, including patenting (D’Este et al. 2012; Niosi 2006; Kolympiris and Klein 2017), product development (Karlsson and Wigren 2012), and prior spinoff involvement (Abreu and Grinevich 2013; Algieri et al. 2013; Clarysse et al. 2011a; Karlsson and Wigren 2012; Muscio et al. 2016; Rasmussen et al. 2011; Scholten et al. 2015), is also predictive of future entrepreneurship activity. The logic is that these experiences allow university scientists to develop the ability to recognize market opportunities and increase their level of entrepreneurial knowledge (Clarysse et al. 2011a; Davey et al. 2015; Oehler et al. 2015). Further, human capital oriented toward exploring commercial opportunities, as opposed to human capital oriented toward science, significantly improves the performance of spinoff firms (Toole and Czarnitzki 2009).

While research shows that the involvement of founding academic entrepreneurs is critical to academic entrepreneurship success, the tradeoff is that founding scientists tend to maintain their academic identity and inhibit spinoff development (Clarysse and Moray 2004; Franklin et al. 2001; Friedman and Silberman 2003; Hayter 2011; Johansson et al. 2005; Markman et al. 2005a). Scholars thus posit that spinoff development is dependent upon the presence of a professional manager or “surrogate entrepreneur” (Bray and Lee 2000; Carayannis et al. 2016; Clarysse and Moray 2004; Franklin et al. 2001; Lockett et al. 2003; Lundqvist 2014; Vanaelst et al. 2006; Vohora et al. 2004; Würmseher 2017) who provides leadership, experience, and connections to funders. Yet while the presence of a surrogate entrepreneur is a critical developmental milestone (e.g. Vohora et al. 2004), these individuals might not possess the capability to understand the technology associated with a spinoff or the credibility and influence required to work with university scientists (Franklin et al. 2001; Knockaert et al. 2010a).

While most scholarship has focused on the role of faculty as academic entrepreneurs, a modest literature also focuses on the role of students and postdocs (Boh et al. 2016; Rasmussen and Wright 2015; Pirnay et al. 2003). The focus on students-as-entrepreneurs flowed from the emergence of entrepreneurship education programs within universities (Rasmussen and Sørheim 2006; Souitaris et al. 2007). More recent research, however, examines the role of PhDs and postdoc entrepreneurs in the establishment of new spinoff companies, as well as challenges to their success (Hayter et al. 2017).

4.2.2 *Founding teams*

Scholars assume that non-academic members of founding spinoff teams are critical to entrepreneurship activities under the assumption that the limited commercial experience of founding university scientists eventually constrains spinoff development (Bathelt et al. 2010; Diáñez-González and Camelo-Ordaz 2016; Ensley and Hmieleski 2005; Rasmussen et al. 2011; Visintin and Pittino 2014). Other team-related factors include the number and technical experience of inventors (Knockaert et al. 2010), clarity of team-member roles (Clarysse and Moray 2004; Grandi and Grimaldi 2003), and levels of trust and familiarity among team members (Grandi and Grimaldi 2005; Knockaert et al. 2010). Spinoff teams also must evolve over time to include individuals with relevant business and commercialization experience (Vanaelst et al. 2006; van Geenhuizen and Soetanto 2009). Similarly, Bjørnåli and Gulbrandsen (2010) and Aldridge and Audretsch (2011) focus the role of spinoff boards, especially the evolution from academic representation to one that enables connections to financial resources, entrepreneurial advice, and other resources important to spinoff performance.

4.3 Social networks

4.3.1 *Individual social networks*

Given the limited commercial experience of university faculty, networks with outside contacts are crucial to motivate entrepreneurial activities as well as their success (e.g., Agarwal and Shah 2014; Druilhe and Garnsey 2004; Fini et al. 2011; Grandi and Grimaldi 2003, 2005; Guerrero et al. 2014; Hebllich and Slavtchev 2014; Hunter et al. 2011; Jefferson et al. 2017; Lockett et al. 2003; Nicolaou and Birley 2003a, b; Nilsson et al. 2010; O’Gorman et al. 2008; Scholten et al. 2015; Soetanto and van Geenhuizen 2015; Vohora et al. 2004). Specifically, social networks are important sources of informal advice and mentoring (Abreu and Grindvich 2013; Boh et al. 2016; Müller 2010), technical and managerial expertise (Huyghe et al. 2014), and early stage funding, such as venture capital (Huyghe et al. 2014; Shane and Stuart 2002). Thus, university spinoffs with structural holes (missing connections to important contacts) or homophilous networks (networks dominated by other academics) are constrained in their ability to evolve (Johansson et al. 2005; Mosey and Wright 2007; Wright et al. 2004).

4.3.2 *Organizational networks and entrepreneurship support*

Given the importance of networks, the efficacy of universities’ efforts to support entrepreneurship depends on the diversity and quality of their organizational networks. Rasmussen and Borsch (2010) and Rasmussen et al. (2011), for example, emphasize the role of organizational intermediaries and their role in connecting (or not) academic entrepreneurs to contacts with valuable resources. Unfortunately, research shows that the networks of TTOs—often a critical point of exposure to commercial resources (Clarysse et al. 2011b; Comacchio et al. 2011)—are generally limited (Clarysse et al. 2014; Pérez and Sánchez 2003). Networks associated with university incubators (Cooper et al. 2012; Peters et al. 2004), science parks (Zou and Zhao 2014), alumni networking events (Levie 2014), engineering research centers (Boardman and Corley 2008) and PoCCs (Gulbranson and

Audretsch 2008; Maia and Claro 2013) also play an enabling (or constraining) role for academic entrepreneurs and their spinoffs.

4.4 Entrepreneurial environment

4.4.1 Culture

Research shows that culture—otherwise termed subjective entrepreneurial norms (Guerero and Urbano 2014)—is critical for academic entrepreneurship and is manifest at the departmental (Ambos et al. 2008; Bercovitz and Feldman 2008; Clarysse et al. 2011a, b; Kalar and Antonicic 2015; Kenney and Richard Goe 2004; Jong 2008; O’Shea et al. 2008; Rasmussen et al. 2014), university (Colyvas 2007; Clarysse et al. 2011a, b; Owen-Smith and Powell 2001), regional (Clarysse et al. 2014), and national levels (Carayannis et al. 2016; Davey et al. 2016; Gassol 2007; Jefferson et al. 2017).

University-centric views also include the culture of associated sub-units such as medical schools (Bercovitz and Feldman 2008); specialized research centers (Nelson 2014), including engineering research centers (Boardman and Corley 2008; Feller et al. 2002; Hunter et al. 2011); and science parks (Zou and Zhao 2014). Studies also focus on the cultural context related to student entrepreneurship (Bergmann et al. 2016) as well as scenarios whereby university culture presents a barrier to business engagement (Siegel et al. 2003).

The basis of an entrepreneurial culture is academic peers, both at the university and within an entrepreneur’s academic discipline (Bercovitz and Feldman 2008). Specifically, peers potentially increase (or constrain) the propensity of their colleagues to engage with industry (Tartari et al. 2014), patent (Haeussler and Colyvas 2011; Owen-Smith and Powell 2001) and establish spinoff companies (Bergmann et al. 2016; Hayter 2011). Further, entrepreneurial activity generally reinforces culture as successful academic entrepreneurs become role models for their departments, universities, and regions (Steffensen et al. 2000).

4.4.2 Locational factors

A symbiotic relationship potentially exists between entrepreneurial universities and the regions in which they are embedded. Policymakers have focused on increasing the regional economic impact of universities through students’ “externships” (Bramwell and Wolfe 2008), industrial engagement by faculty and students (Tartari et al. 2014), spinoff company establishment (Steffensen et al. 2000), and “non-traditional” university policy and outreach services (Breznitz and Feldman 2012).

Scholars have similarly focused on the impact of regions on academic entrepreneurship; high tech regions, especially those in which other spinoffs have been established (Zhang 2009), often provide valuable resources and networks critical to academic entrepreneurship (Alegieri et al. 2013; Degroof and Roberts 2004; Friedman and Silberman 2003; Heblich and Slavtchev 2014; Shah and Pahnke 2014; Sternberg 2014), especially venture capital (Powers and McDougall 2005b; Samilla and Sorenson 2010) and connections to relevant industries (Casper 2013; Nilsson et al. 2010). Regional environments influence university entrepreneurship strategies (McAdam et al. 2016; Powers and McDougall 2005a) and how universities organize and manage their TTOs (Brescia et al. 2016). Further, entrepreneurial regions may influence academic entrepreneurs to bypass their TTOs and patent their invention on their own or with assistance from a company in the region (Gianodis et al. 2016).

Regional entrepreneurial services and facilities beyond those provided by universities—such as science parks (Link and Scott 2005; Zou and Zhao 2014), incubators, service providers (Rasmussen et al. 2006), and other forms of entrepreneurial support (O’Shea et al. 2008; Powers and McDougall 2005a)—can be helpful to early-stage spinoffs.

Other scholars have focused on the explanatory importance of regional economic characteristics such as consumer confidence and unemployment (Horta et al. 2015), regional prosperity (Bergman et al. 2015), and R&D expenditures (Fini et al. 2009; Van Looy et al. 2011).

4.5 Financial resources

4.5.1 R&D funding

The basis for university spinoff technologies is R&D support. Thus, scholars attribute entrepreneurship activity, including number of spinoffs and IP outputs, to total university R&D expenditures (Algieri et al. 2013; Davey et al. 2016; Link and Scott 2005; Markman et al. 2004; Meoli and Vismara 2016; O’Shea et al. 2005). Interestingly, entrepreneurial activity not only allows universities to potentially generate revenue from licensing, but also enables universities to increase their reputation and thus obtain higher levels of R&D funding (Pitsakis et al. 2015).

Federal R&D funding constitutes the bulk of this funding. Specific funding agencies, such as the (U.S.) Department of Defense and National Science Foundation, have a higher likelihood of leading to entrepreneurial behavior (Samilla and Sorenson 2010). Defense-related funding, however, may also come with security-related constraints on its dissemination, thus limiting its economic impact (Plummer and Gilbert 2015).

Non-government R&D funding, especially from industry, is especially important; not only does industrial R&D support lead to increasing levels of entrepreneurial activity among universities (Powers and McDougall 2005b; O’Shea et al. 2005), it also provides researchers with valuable opportunities to interact with company researchers and gain commercial experience (Karlsson and Wigren 2012; O’Shea et al. 2008; Renault 2006). Further, Feldman et al. (2002) find that industry funding is associated with higher levels of equity involvement among universities. Wu (2010), however, warns that there may be a tradeoff between increasing levels of industry support and the number of spinoffs generated from a university.

Philanthropic foundations are also playing an increasingly important role in funding R&D in an attempt to find novel solutions to, for example, chronic disease, though concern exists about lower overhead rates and potential “over-involvement” associated with foundations (Feldman and Graddy-Reed 2014).

4.5.2 Early-stage venture funding

While early-stage public and university funding programs are discussed below, scholars have long investigated the role of early-stage venture funding in university spinoff success (Algieri et al. 2013; Degroof and Roberts 2004; Druilhe and Garnsey 2004; Huyghe et al. 2014; Rasmussen et al. 2006; Rasmussen 2008). Scholars have primarily focused on the importance of venture capital (VC) and its role in entrepreneurial development (Fini et al. 2009; Bray and Lee 2000; O’Shea et al. 2008; Zucker et al. 2002), such as achieving an IPO (Shane and Stuart 2002). As mentioned, the availability of VC within regions where

spinoffs are located is important to their success (Powers and McDougall 2005b; Samilla and Sorenson 2010). Venture capitalists complement financial resources by also providing academic entrepreneurs with credibility (Fernández-Alles et al. 2015), technical and managerial advice (Hayter 2016a; Knockaert et al. 2010), and connections with industry (Vohora et al. 2004).

4.6 Scientific, technical, and product characteristics

4.6.1 Research discipline

Similar to the role of research *funding* discussed above, research *focus* is likely just as important to entrepreneurship outcomes. IP outputs (patents) are closely associated with the life sciences (Fini et al. 2010; Kenney and Patton 2011) and biotechnology (Kolympiris and Klein 2017), though other scholars include the physical sciences (Owen-Smith and Powell 2001). While the life sciences and biotechnology are also associated the establishment of spinoffs (Abreu and Grindvich 2013; Fini et al. 2009; Kalar and Antoncic 2015; Zhang 2009), other relevant disciplines include physics, engineering, information and communication technologies (Abreu and Grindvich 2013; Haeussler and Colyvas 2011; Hsu et al. 2007; Knockaert et al. 2011; Nelson 2014). Although Karlsson and Wigren (2012) associate law and social sciences, too, with entrepreneurial behavior, Kalar and Antoncic (2015) do not.

4.6.2 Technology

Scholars contend that technologies underlying commercial behavior are an important consideration for academic entrepreneurship. The nature of knowledge, codified and tacit, underlies a technology (Pirnay et al. 2003). University technology-transfer operations generally favor codified knowledge because it may be easily patented and licensed by large companies, thus generating revenue (Meyer 2006). However, patent-centric views overlook the value of tacit knowledge, which is critical to spinoff companies (Karnani 2013; Wood 2009). Technology maturity is a related consideration with well-developed technology sometimes better suited for licensing (Agrawal 2006), while the scope and pioneering nature of a technology is associated with its commercialization (Nerkar and Shane 2003). In contrast, Colyvas et al. (2002) posit that patents are important for embryonic technologies.

Finally, Lowe et al. (2006) find that spinoffs hold onto unsuccessful technologies longer than other types of firms. Thus, spinoffs have a better chance of success when they develop a broader scope of technologies and focus on commercialization as opposed to advancing a specific technology (Clarysse et al. 2011a, b; D'Este et al. 2012).

4.7 Academic entrepreneurship support programs

4.7.1 Technology transfer offices

Technology Transfer Offices (TTOs) have received substantial attention in the literature, with most scholars considering their presence to be a critical element of an academic entrepreneurship ecosystem (Fini et al. 2011; Degroof and Roberts 2004; Hsu et al. 2007; Jacob et al. 2003; Jefferson et al. 2017; O'Gorman et al. 2008). TTOs provide management

support to early spinoff teams (Fernández-Alles et al. 2015) as well as financial support, technical expertise, and connections to other researchers and companies (Huyghe et al. 2014).

However, scholars have raised doubts about the ability to TTOs to provide entrepreneurial assistance beyond initial spinoff establishment (Hayter 2016b; Mosey and Wright 2007; Rasmussen and Wright 2015). One concern is that TTOs' IP protection mission prioritizes revenue generation over entrepreneurial activity (Finì et al. 2009, 2017; Markman et al. 2004; Swamidass and Vulasa 2009), industry engagement (Perkmann et al. 2013) and relationship-building between universities and industry (Clarysse et al. 2014). Interactions with TTOs also constitute a significant investment in time, detracting from other important scientific and commercial activities (Owen-Smith and Powell 2001).

The effectiveness of TTOs in academic entrepreneurship is also impacted by the TTO's access to resources (O'Shea et al. 2005, 2008), its size (number of employees) (Algieri et al. 2013; Horta et al. 2015; Kolympiris and Klein 2017; Markman et al. 2005a), its age (Kolympiris and Klein 2017; Powers and McDougall 2005b), its hiring and compensation practices (Markman et al. 2004; Siegel et al. 2003; Swamidass and Vulasa 2009), as well as its equity involvement in spinoffs (Feldman et al. 2002). Further, TTO legitimacy (O'Kane et al. 2015); management and business development capabilities (Bercovitz et al. 2001; Lockett and Wright 2005); resources spent on IP protection (Lockett and Wright 2005), for-profit structure (Markman et al. 2005b); ability to connect to bridge important social networks (Clarysse et al. 2011b; Comacchio et al. 2011; Markman et al. 2005a); and awareness levels among faculty of its existence (Huyghe et al. 2016b—SBE) are also determinant. TTO efficacy is also seen as a function of its organizational form (Brescia et al. 2016), especially the degree to which it is decentralized (Carayannis et al. 2016). Due to frustration, perceived TTO ineffectiveness, the discipline of their technology, or illicit behavior, faculty may choose to bypass their TTO (Finì et al. 2010; Gianodis et al. 2016).

4.7.2 University entrepreneurship programs

Beyond TTOs, a diverse literature explores the role and, at times, the efficacy of various university entrepreneurship support programs and infrastructures (Ndonzuau et al. 2001; Powers and McDougall 2005a). These elements include incubators (e.g., Barbero et al. 2014; Boh et al. 2016; Cooper et al. 2012; Kolympiris and Klein 2017; Lundqvist 2014; McAdam and McAdam 2008; McAdam et al. 2016; Mustar and Wright 2010; Peters et al. 2004; Rothaermel and Thursby 2005) and science parks (Link and Scott 2005; Wright et al. 2007; Zou and Zhao 2014)—or both (Fernández-Alles et al. 2015; Phan et al. 2005; Salvador 2011). These studies focus on the role these elements play in providing physical space, technical and financial resources, access to important networks, and coaching to academic entrepreneurs. [V]an Geenhuizen and Soetanto (2009) contend, however, that physical space (the focus of many incubator and science park initiatives) does not generally seem to be a problem for successful spinoffs and is thus of marginal value relative to, for example, assistance in putting together effective entrepreneurial teams. Further, these studies collectively show that science parks and incubators produce mixed results. Thus, their role in academic entrepreneurship is likely dependent on myriad contextual factors.

University seed funds are also recognized as a critical entrepreneurship ecosystem element (Algieri et al. 2013; Degroof and Roberts 2004; Guerrero et al. 2014; Jacob et al. 2003; Jefferson et al. 2017; Mustar and Wright 2010; O'Shea et al. 2005; Rasmussen et al. 2006; Rasmussen 2008; Swamidass 2013). Wright et al. (2006) posit that these funds are needed because venture capitalists do not invest in early stage companies. Moreover, the

funds provide an important signal to outside investors; they support intangible goals of the university (e.g. building an entrepreneurial culture); and they help strengthen networks with regional stakeholders (Gubitta et al. 2016; Munari et al. 2015). Munari et al. (2015), however, find that spinoffs receiving university seed funds have a lower likelihood of IPO. Croce et al. (2014) find that university funds in the U.S. seem to be outperforming those in Europe, perhaps due to their disciplinary and later-stage spinoff focus.

Entrepreneurship education, either as part of a degree program or extra-curricular offering, can provide students and faculty knowledge important to encourage and support entrepreneurial endeavors (Bergmann et al. 2016; Boh et al. 2016; Carayannis et al. 2016; Criaco et al. 2014; Guerrero et al. 2014; Jacob et al. 2003; Jefferson et al. 2017; Levie 2014; Oehler et al. 2015; Rasmussen 2008; Souitaris et al. 2007; Swamidass 2013). However, Åstebro et al. (2012) contends that science and engineering education among students is far more important to their long-term entrepreneurial contributions compared to the growing emphasis on entrepreneurship classes.

Rasmussen et al. (2006) contends that entrepreneurship education should fit within an overall commercialization strategy of a university, and be conceptualized as a suite of educational offerings, programs, and policies that will enable students to undertake entrepreneurial activity. Entrepreneurship education can be incorporated into ongoing entrepreneurship support efforts, such as the NSF iCorps program (Huang-Saad et al. 2017), as well as proof-of-concept centers (Maia and Claro 2013), just as MBA students can support academic entrepreneurship by training them in IP negotiation (with the TTO), market analysis, technology evaluation, and technology feasibility analysis (Nelson and Monsen 2014; Phan 2014).

Proof-of-concept centers (PoCCs) have emerged as a promising academic entrepreneurship support mechanism that combines entrepreneurship education, mentoring, networking, and technology development services, often in combination with modest levels of funding to support entrepreneurial activities (Bradley et al. 2013b; Gulbranson and Audretsch 2008; Maia and Claro 2013; Munari et al. 2016). While the efficacy of these programs has not been evaluated, Hayter and Link (2015) find that universities with PoCCs tend to produce higher number of spinoffs.

Industry research centers—such as the (U.S.) NSF-sponsored Engineering Research Centers (ERCs)—not only encourage faculty to work with industry, but also promote collaboration within and among universities (Boardman and Corley 2008; Feller et al. 2002). Youtie and Shapira (2008) industry research centers at Georgia Tech which, with federal and state support, focus on promoting innovation within traditional and advanced industries.

Recent research focuses on the emergence of university business plan competitions (Boh et al. 2016; Hsu et al. 2007; Jefferson et al. 2017), such as the MIT 100 k challenge (Swamidass 2013). These competitions encourage students and faculty to think in terms of market demand and the steps that their business must take to respond. Scholars have similarly focused on the importance of business plan assistance services (Rasmussen et al. 2006), management services (Bray and Lee 2000), marketing services (Colyvas et al. 2002; Soetanto and Jack 2016), networking support (Soetanto and Jack 2016), student entrepreneurship support organizations (Rasmussen et al. 2006), the provision of “consumables” (Rasmussen et al. 2014), and shared laboratory space and research services for spinoffs and other industrial partners (Gassol 2007).

Finally, hackathons offer students an opportunity to focus on quickly developing applications, such as phone apps, that provide the basis for entrepreneurship activity (Shah and Pahnke 2014). Technology competitions similarly bring diverse groups to address a

specific technological need and attract public attention (Eesley et al. 2016; Mustar and Wright 2010).

4.8 National programs and policies

Limited attention has been placed on the role of national programs and policies and their role critical role supporting academic entrepreneurship. What research exists focuses on the emergence of national intellectual policy frameworks (Fini et al. 2011; Muscio et al. 2016), such as the Bayh-Dole Act in the U.S. and its impact on the scientific and entrepreneurial behavior of universities (Mowery et al. 2001). Other countries, such as France, have introduced national legislation that authorize university employees—whose commercial activities were once limited—to establish spinoff companies (Mustar and Wright 2010).

Other research has focused on national entrepreneurship support programs, such as Germany's EXIST program (Ayoub et al. 2017), Canada's industrial assistance grant program (Niosi 2006), and the U.S. iCorps program (Huang-Saad et al. 2017), and their role in academic entrepreneurship. Scholars have also used data from national programs, such as the (U.S.) SBIR program to understand academic entrepreneurship and entrepreneurship writ large (e.g. Toole and Czarnitzki 2009; Siegel and Wessner 2012). Mustar and Wright (2010) examine government attempts to establish seed capital funds and innovation agencies within the U.K. and France. Similarly, national government funding has been used to support some of the aforementioned university-level programs, including science parks (Zou and Zhao 2014), entrepreneurship education (Rasmussen and Sørheim 2006), innovation awards (Eesley et al. 2016), and engineering research centers (Boardman and Corley 2008).

Scholars recommend that entrepreneurship support programs be supplemented by tax benefits to assist spinoff firms (Henrekson and Rosenberg 2001; Patzelt and Shepherd 2009). Further, regulation and excessive bureaucracy can stifle entrepreneurship (Henrekson and Rosenberg 2001; Zou and Zhao 2014). Thus, national regulation reform initiatives are complementary to entrepreneurship efforts (Goldfarb and Henrekson 2003; Klofsten and Jones-Evans 2000).

4.9 University management and policy

4.9.1 University management

Although scholars have examined the impact on academic entrepreneurship of university characteristics such as size (Horta et al. 2015; Van Looy et al. 2011) and the presence of a medical school (Feldman et al. 2002), far more attention has been given to management practices and policies. Scholars emphasize the foundational role of a clear entrepreneurship-focused university mission (Davey et al. 2016; Friedman and Silberman 2003; Guerrero and Urbano 2014; Jefferson et al. 2017; Levie 2014; Nilsson et al. 2010; O'Shea et al. et al. 2008); Breznitz and Feldman (2012) favor defining the university economic development mission broadly to include myriad services including real estate development and policy advice.

Scholars also have focused on the positive role or inadequacy of university administration (Meoli and Vismara 2016; Rasmussen and Wright 2015). For example, university administrators generally focus on top-down academic entrepreneurship initiatives; yet decentralized, integrative initiatives are not only more effective, but also more closely

aligned with the decentralized nature of science (Carayannis et al. 2016; Debackere and Veugelers 2005; Hayter 2016b; Henrekson and Rosenberg 2001; Philpott et al. 2011; Rasmussen and Borch 2010; Todorovic et al. 2011). Similarly, Colyvas (2007) recommend that universities focus on the co-evolution of systems to fit both academic and commercial goals. Carayannis et al. (2016) recommend that universities focus on integrated ecosystem approaches which might include funding and other incentives for different units to work together (Debackere and Veugelers 2005; Jefferson et al. 2017). Such actions might provide a university-wide entrepreneurship focus and might, for example, better align the efforts of business schools in support of academic entrepreneurship (Wright et al. 2009).

4.9.2 *Incentives and policy*

Given that many universities have adopted economic development missions, scholars have taken an interest in incentives and policies that encourage and support academic entrepreneurship (Degroof and Roberts 2004; Wright et al. 2009). Research shows that incentives increase university-level licensing and revenue (Siegel et al. 2003) and spinoff activity (Muscio et al. 2016), though Markman et al. (2004) show incentives discourage commercial behavior. Walter et al. (2013) posit that university incentives are needed to encourage technology disclosure and patenting, while Rasmussen et al. (2006, 2008) posit that departmental incentives are critical—though faculty may respond differently to different incentives (Colyvas 2007).

University IP policies have been of particular interest to scholars. While Baldini et al. (2006) shows that the adoption of university patent regulations can spur industrial engagement, Karnani (2013) posits that universities overvalue patents. University IP policies that prioritize patenting may reduce scientific collaboration (Feller et al. 2002), the knowledge available for future research (Mowery et al. 2001), and publishing (Walter et al. 2013). Colyvas et al. (2002) contend that patents are not valuable for well-developed technologies except for revenue generation for the university. At worst, patent-centric IP policies are often not linked with the entrepreneurial goals and support mechanisms of a university (Markman et al. 2005b) and may hinder entrepreneurial outcomes (Fini et al. 2017).

Conversely, university policies favoring equity approaches to IP are generally supportive of academic entrepreneurship (Bray and Lee 2000; DiGregorio and Shane 2003; Lockett et al. 2003; Markman et al. 2005b; Rasmussen et al. 2006; Rasmussen 2008), though Shane (2002) finds—in the case of spinoffs—that licensing back to an inventor reduces the likelihood of commercialization.

Payout to the inventor (Friedman and Silberman 2003) and other revenue-sharing agreements stimulate entrepreneurial behavior (Renault 2006), though DiGregorio and Shane (2003) find that keeping the revenue share low increases propensity of inventors to establish a company. Further, Bramwell and Wolfe (2008) posit that the inventor-ownership policies at University of Waterloo (Canada) are an important aspect of its entrepreneurial impact; Kenney and Patton (2011) find that Waterloo has spun off far more companies with far less R&D spending compared to other prominent universities in the U.S., and they attribute this fact to the university's IP ownership policy.

Beyond IP policies, scholars also have examined conflict of interest policies. Jefferson et al. (2017), Meoli and Vismara (2016) and Rasmussen and Borch (2010) find that conflict-of-interest policies are important for encouraging entrepreneurial activity, while Renault (2006) and Nelson (2014) find that these policies can diminish entrepreneurial behavior by adding to administrative red tape or prohibiting certain roles.

4.10 Findings: dependent variables

Table 2 presents dependent variables from reviewed publications grouped by academic entrepreneurship themes, sub-themes, and the number of corresponding articles. Three dependent variable themes are emergent: (1) spinoffs, (2) university role, and (3) IP outputs. The sections below review the literature affiliated with each of these categories, highlighting the main themes.

4.11 University spinoffs

A majority of articles in our review (135) frame academic or university entrepreneurship in terms of establishment and outcomes of spinoff companies. Traditional definitions of spinoffs have focused on the role of faculty establishing a company based on a technology licensing agreement with their home university (e.g. Shane 2004). However, scholars have broadened their definition of university spinoff to include companies that do not necessarily have a formal licensing agreement with a university (e.g. Fini et al. 2010), as well as the establishment of spinoffs by individuals other than faculty, including postdocs and graduate students (e.g. Hayter et al. 2017). The following section describes the dependent variables used in reviewed publications categorized by subtheme.

4.11.1 Startup decision

Several studies focus on the decision to establish a spinoff. These studies typically focus on individual-level factors, the most common of which are entrepreneurial motivations (O’Gorman et al. 2008; Rizzo 2015), post-establishment growth ambitions (Hayter 2011, 2015), start-up intentions (Guerrero and Urbano 2014; Huyghe et al. 2016a), entrepreneurial propensity (Aldridge and Audretsch 2011), determinants of new venture formation (Fini et al. 2017; Karlsson and Wigren 2012), and role identity as a precursor to entrepreneurial behavior (Jain et al. 2009).

While Davey et al. (2016) examines individual-level determinants of academic entrepreneurship within different national contexts, Dianez-Gonzalez and Camelo-Ordaz (2016) proxy the entrepreneurial orientation of individual spinoff companies based on the proportion of the founding team comprised by non-academics.

Although most studies focus on university faculty, Oehler et al. (2015) investigate entrepreneurial understanding among university students under the assumption that knowledge predicts entrepreneurial action. Bergmann et al. (2016) similarly investigate factors that motivate students to become entrepreneurs. Hsu et al. (2007) examine startup intentions among university alumni. Müller (2010) investigates the speed of establishing a spinoff firm among students, graduates, and researchers after leaving academia.

Other studies examine university-level factors that shape the decision to establish a spinoff. Kenney and Goe (2004), for example, examine the role of university departments in encouraging academic entrepreneurship, just as Kalar and Antoncic (2015) examine the entrepreneurial orientation of individual departments. Markman et al. (2005a, b) and Shane et al. (2015) investigate factors that shape when a TTO encourages faculty to start a company versus license their technology to an existing company. Huyghe et al. (2014) similarly examine the role of TTOs during the early phases spinoff company establishment.

Table 2 Academic entrepreneurship dependent variables, themes and subthemes

Themes	Subthemes	dependent variables	Number of articles
Spinoffs (135)	Startup decision	Individual, department, university and policy factors shaping startup decisions	41
	Counts of spinoffs	Counts of spinoffs established	25
	Intermediate outcomes	Founding team; team composition	25
		Funding	
		Business ideas and knowledge	
University activity (58)	Outcomes	Networks	
		Survival	53
		Development stages	
	Support programs and policies	Performance outcomes, such as revenues, profits, employment, growth, and IPO	
		TTOs	25
		Incubators	
		Science parks	
	University impact	Proof-of-concept centers	
		Education programs	
		IP policies	
IP outputs (46)	Impact on traditional academic outputs	Revenues	16
		Economic and social impact	
		Descriptions of role on entrepreneurial activity	
	Industry engagement	Publication	8
		Degree or amount of disclosure	
		Sponsored research	
	Activity	Industry engagement and collaboration	9
		Departmental activity and change	
		Number of disclosures	19
	IP rationales	Number of patents	
		Number of licenses	
		Motivations	14
		Out-the-back-door behavior	

Table 2 (continued)

Themes	Subthemes	dependent variables	Number of articles
	Outcomes	Licensing revenue Likelihood of patenting success Citations	11
	Utilization	Degree to which knowledge is transferred Where patents are used	4

4.11.2 *Counts of spinoffs*

Other studies focus not on the decision to spinoff a company, but rather on tracking actual spinoffs. Several publications focus on the number of spinoff companies established by universities. The oldest of these publications (Di Gregorio and Shane 2003; O'Shea et al. 2005) use data from the Association of University Technology Managers (AUTM) to examine university-level factors that help explain spinoff establishment. Similarly, Hayter and Link (2015) use AUTM data to explain spinoff differences among universities with proof-of-concept centers and those without. Kenney and Patton (2011) use hand-collected spinoff data from six universities (five from the U.S. and one from Canada), while Link and Scott (2005) employ a survey of U.S. science parks to explain how many affiliated organizations are spinoff companies. Kolb and Wagner (2015) investigate spinoff propensities among those employed at a university compared to those who are not.

Several studies focuses on spinoff establishment examine the Italian context, specifically (Algieri et al. 2013; Fini et al. 2011; Horta et al. 2016; Meoli and Vismara 2016; Muscio et al. 2016). Still other articles use a combination of number of spinoffs and number of IP outputs (Ambos et al. 2008; Friedman and Silberman 2003; Grimm and Jaenicke 2012; Guerrero et al. 2014; Markman et al. 2004; McAdam et al. 2016; Powers and McDougall 2005a; Samilla and Sorenson 2010) to assess academic entrepreneurship.

4.11.3 *Intermediate spinoff outcomes*

Instead of focusing on the establishment of spinoffs, other scholars focus on various milestones in the development of a spinoff company—what we term “intermediate outcomes”. Our review identified four categories of intermediate spinoff outcomes, including founding teams, funding, business ideas and knowledge, and social networks.

The composition and dynamism of founding teams is of critical importance, from early formation to organization sustainability. For example, Würmseher (2017) conceptualizes three different roles of faculty founders and the relationships of these roles to future spinoff success. Franklin et al. (2001) focus on the importance of surrogate entrepreneurs, professional, non-academic managers, relative to faculty founders, while Bjørnåli and Gulbrandsen (2010) focus on the composition of the spinoff board of directors and the importance of their networks for obtaining resources and technical resources for the spinoff. Finally, Grandi and Grimaldi (2003) focus on the developmental dynamics of a founding team.

Other studies focus on financial resources as development milestones. Soetanto and van Geenhuizen (2015) use early-stage funding from all sources, while Fini et al. (2017), Lockett and Wright (2005), Knockaert et al. (2011), and Wright et al. (2006) and focus on venture capital as an important proxy of spinoff success. Gubitta et al. (2016) focus on university gap funding, suggesting that it serves as an important signal to outside investors. Bercovitz et al. (2001) focus on sponsored research, while Toole and Czarnitski (2009) examine the US Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) awards.

Grandi and Gramaldi (2005) were among the first scholars to examine the role of business ideas as an intermediate outcome. Similarly, Karnani (2013) creates a typology of business knowledge as an intermediate outcome while Walter et al. (2016) use patenting propensity to proxy for knowledge creation. (Note that we separate this perspective from articles that focus on IP outputs for their own sake.)

Finally, six articles in our review use social networks as an intermediate outcome for spinoff development. Steffensen et al. (2000), for example, examine networks between

spinoffs and their respective home university in terms of conflict and entrepreneurial support. Nicolaou and Birley (2003a) create a categorization of social networks among spinoff founders while Mosey and Wright (2007) examine challenges within networks related to spinoff development among academic entrepreneurs. Cooper et al. (2012) use networking within the context of an incubator as a proxy for spinoff development. Nicolaou and Birley (2003b) and Pérez and Sánchez (2003) examine the evolution of spinoff social networks, the latter focusing on the transformation of networks from those focused on academic contacts to those focused on existing and potential customers.

4.11.4 *Spinoff outcomes*

Fifty-three articles focused on spinoffs examine longer-term outcomes. Our analysis divided spinoff outcomes into three types of dependent variables: survival, development, and performance outcomes. Only a handful of studies in our review examine spinoff survival (Criaco et al. 2014; Schillo 2018; Zhang 2009). More commonly, articles use various measures of development, especially developmental frameworks, to proxy spinoff outcomes (Degroof and Roberts 2004; Johansson et al. 2005; Ndonzuau et al. 2002; Pirnay et al. 2003; Rasmussen and Borch 2010; Salvador 2011; van Geenhuizen and Soetanto 2009). McAdam and McAdam (2008), for example, construct what they term a lifecycle model that includes various stages of entrepreneurial growth. Clarysse and Moray (2004) construct a developmental model that includes spinoff establishment, including project, pre-startup, start-up, and post-start-up phases. Argawal and Shah (2014) incorporate spinoff survival into their developmental framework while Fuller and Rothaermel (2012) include firm failure, along with acquisition and initial public offering (IPO) outcomes. Uniquely, Rasmussen and Wright (2015) base their developmental framework on entrepreneurial competencies, including opportunity development, championing, and resource acquisition.

At least four studies (Hayter 2016a, b; Rasmussen et al. 2011, 2014) utilize the developmental model constructed by Vohora et al. (2004) and Wright et al. (2004), which includes four developmental stages: opportunity recognition, entrepreneurial commitment, credibility, and sustainability. Boh et al. (2016) associate developmental paths with specific types of founding teams; Vanaelst et al. (2006) approximate development by examining differences among founding teams during pre- and post-spinoff phases.

Peters et al. (2004) use incubator graduation as a proxy for spinoff development and to understand the effectiveness of incubator support. Patzelt and Shepherd (2009) compare perceptions of the efficacy of national academic entrepreneurship support programs among academic entrepreneurs with the development of their spinoff.

Sixteen studies use performance outcomes to proxy spinoff success. Spinoff revenue is a common measure in this category, typically used in combination with sales growth (Lundqvist 2014), employment growth (Clarysse et al. 2011a, b; Niosi 2006; Visintin and Pittino 2014), employment growth and survival (Wennberg and Wiklund 2011), employment and profit (Sternberg 2014), or profit and market share (Soetanto and Jack 2016). Scholten et al. (2015) and Wright et al. (2007) focus on spinoff employment growth, Niosi (2006) focuses on sales and employment growth, and Ensley and Hmieleski (2005) focus on sales growth and net cash flow among spinoffs in comparison to other types of entrepreneurial firms.

Aside from Shane and Stuart (2002), who use IPO as their proxy, the remaining publications use amalgams of dependent variables to represent spinoff outcomes. Ayoub et al. (2017) likely employ the most elaborate combination of dependent variables, including

initial number of employees, average number of employees, relative employment growth since start-up, annual profit/deficit, relative annual profit growth, total assets, return on equity and on total capital employed, debt ratio, leverage, and credit rating, and likelihood of closure. Walter et al. (2006) use sales growth, sales per employee, profit, survival, and customer relationship quality, while Lowe et al. (2006) use the likelihood of achieving commercial sales, likelihood of terminating a development effort, and university licensing revenues generated by invention developed by a spinoff. Bathelt et al. (2010) examine the extent to which faculty and/or students are involved in the spinoff team, the IP relationships with a university as well as formal research agreements with the university. Finally, Siegel and Wessner (2012) also use sales and number of employees as well as copyright filings, trademarks, patents, and licensing agreements.

4.12 University activity

Fifty-eight articles have dependent variables related to university programs and behaviors. We categorized these articles into four subthemes, including support programs and policies, university impact, impact on traditional academic outputs, and industry engagement.

4.12.1 Support programs and policies

Twenty-five articles investigate, often through descriptive analysis, factors that shape the establishment of university-based programs and policies in support of academic entrepreneurship. For example, Bradley et al. (2013a), Brescia et al. (2016), Comacchio et al. (2012), and Huyghe et al. (2016a, b) examine the role of TTOs in supporting entrepreneurial universities, while O’Kane et al. (2015) examine factors that affect the legitimacy of TTOs and thus their efficacy.

Studies also focus on the establishment and role of incubators (Barbero et al. 2014; Rothaermel and Thursby 2005), science parks (Phan et al. 2005; Zou and Zhao 2014), engineering research centers (Feller et al. 2002), and proof-of-concept centers (Bradley et al. 2013b; Gulbranson and Audretsch 2008; Maia and Claro 2013; Munari et al. 2016). Other studies focus on university seed funds (Croce et al. 2014; Munari et al. 2015) or on the adoption of IP policies (Baldini et al. 2006). Scholars also have focused on entrepreneurship education programs (Souitaris et al. 2007), both in collaboration with business schools (Phan 2014) or in failing to spur collaboration with business schools (Wright et al. 2009). The recent establishment of the (U.S.) iCorps program, which is designed to enable the formation and development of commercialization-minded startup teams (Huang-Saad et al. 2017), has spurred additional research on entrepreneurship education.

Finally, several studies have offered case studies of single institutions, including Waterloo University (Bramwell and Wolfe 2008), Chalmers University (Jacob et al. 2003), Universidad de Simon Bolivar (Gassol 2007), Strathclyde University (Levie 2014), the University of British Columbia (Rasmussen 2008), Stanford University (Shah and Pahnke 2014), and Georgia Tech (Youtie and Shapira 2008). Other authors have compared the emergence of multi-level academic entrepreneurship initiatives *among* universities in the U.S. (Swamidass 2013), multiple European countries (Rasmussen et al. 2006), and China (Eesley et al. 2016). Almost all of these studies focus on multiple support programs and policies, and the ways in which they work in tandem at a given university.

4.12.2 Overall university impact

Scholars have used a variety of approaches to examine the overall entrepreneurial impact of research universities that differ from the aforementioned discussions relating to number of spinoffs and, separately, patents. Bray and Lee (2000), for example, use commercialization revenues as a gauge of entrepreneurial impact while Todorovic et al. (2011) examine factors that predict university entrepreneurial impact. Lockett et al. (2003) investigate factors that contribute to the impact of so-called V10 universities, research institutions that have produced the highest number of spinoffs that have received external (non-university) funding in the UK.

Philpott et al. (2011) investigate university-level factors associated with the ‘entrepreneurial ideal’, which they define as the recognition of a wide range of entrepreneurial activities beyond patenting and spinoff company establishment. Breznitz and Feldman (2012) similarly examine other university mechanisms for economic and social impact beyond patenting, licensing, and spinoff companies. Feldman and Graddy-Reed (2014) examine the growing role of philanthropic foundations in support of the research and development goals universities.

Although Plummer and Gilbert (2015) is the only paper in our review that examines the (U.S.) county-level impact of entrepreneurial universities, a handful of publications examine institutional and nation-level contextual issues that affect the entrepreneurial impact of universities. Three of these studies focus on the Swedish context (Goldfarb and Henrekson 2003), including comparisons with the United States (Henrekson and Rosenberg 2001) and Ireland (Klofsten and Jones-Evans 2000). Mustar and Wright (2010) examine national-level policies in the U.K. and France, while Jefferson et al. (2017) compare university and national policies in the U.S., Chile, and Argentina. Wu (2010) examines university impact within the context of Chinese national policies.

4.12.3 Impact of academic entrepreneurship on traditional academic outputs

Eight articles in our review examine the impact of entrepreneurship on traditional academic outputs of the university. Lowe and Gonzalez-Brambila (2007) examine the publication rate among academic entrepreneurs after spinoff establishment, finding that publication productivity does not diminish. Walsh and Huang (2014) also examine the impact of academic patenting on publication productivity among U.S. and Japanese scientists, finding that scientists are more secretive after they patent. Barbieri et al. (2018) examine the propensity among faculty to co-publish and co-patent with industry scientists after establishing a company, finding that scientists publish less but patent the same after firm founding. Pitsakis et al. (2015) examine the impact of spinoff company establishment on total sponsored research funding. Finally, Nelson (2016) finds that the effect and approach pursued depend on both timing and scientific field.

4.12.4 Industry engagement

Several studies focus on industry engagement among faculty, students, and program staff. Boardman and Corley (2008), for example, examine the collaborative behavior of individuals affiliated with university research centers, defining collaboration as working with individuals of different backgrounds and organizations; Debackere and Veugelers (2005) examine managerial impact on industry-science links, especially through the TTO. Jong

(2008) examines sees industry engagement as a harbinger for departmental evolution toward a more entrepreneurial mindset.

While Perkmann et al. (2011) and Tartari et al. (2014) examine determinants of industry engagement, Perkman et al. (2013) review the literature focused on engagement outside the university broadly defined. Similarly, Mindruta (2013) focuses on factors that predict faculty collaboration with small firms, especially in terms of publication and patenting.

Haeussler and Colyvas (2011) investigate the determinants of what they term commercial engagement, which they define as consulting, patenting, and establishing a company. Van Looy et al. (2011) also include total contract research receipts; D’Este and Perkmann (2011) includes consulting, contract research, and joint research activities.

4.13 University IP outputs

Our search yielded 46 articles that defined academic or university entrepreneurship within the context of IP outputs. Thus, these articles share similarity with some themes above, such as intermediary outputs or university impact, yet place primary emphasis on IP itself.

4.13.1 *IP output activity*

Similar to studies that use number of spinoffs to proxy entrepreneurial activity, nineteen publications use the number of university IP outputs as a measure of entrepreneurial behavior. Bercovitz and Feldman (2008) and Colyvas (2007), for example, use invention disclosures, while Hunter et al. (2011) use disclosures and patenting. Carayannis et al. (2016) similarly use patenting and licensing, while Sine et al. (2003) use number of licensing agreements. Markman et al. (2005a, b) examine factors that predict the speed of patenting, licensing, and spinoff formation.


4.13.2 *IP rationales*

Fourteen articles examine the factors that shape invention disclosures and patents. Thus, these articles place emphasis on what drives disclosure and patenting decisions rather than on the *count* of disclosures and patents. Owen-Smith and Powell (2001), for example, focus on patent rationales, including costs and benefits. Gianiodis et al. (2016) examine the tendency for university scientists to generate patents but not assign them to their home university, so-called “out the back door” behavior.

4.13.3 *IP output outcomes*

Eleven articles measure the outcomes of IP outputs in various ways, including the first sale and revenue associated with a specific university technology (Nerkar and Shane 2007) as well as the likelihood of commercialization (sales) success (Agrawal 2006). Siegel et al. (2003) use number of technology licenses combined with licensing revenue, while Swamidass and Vulasa (2009) focus on licensing revenue. Shane (2002) similarly focuses on patenting, licensing, and licensing revenue. Kolympiris and Klein (2017) examine not only patent-linked revenue, but also patent citations.

Fig. 8 Number of independent-variable subthemes addressed by articles ($n = 209$)



4.13.4 IP output utilization

Finally, four articles examine the utilization of IP. Colyvas et al. (2002), for example, explore how university technologies get into practice, especially through patent and copyright licenses. Meyer (2006) investigates how patents are utilized, while Knockaert et al. (2010) seek to understand the extent to which knowledge created in universities is transferred to a firm.

5 Analysis: ecosystem elements and their connectivity

Ecosystems, by definition, include a variety of different elements working in harmony. Accordingly, our next analyses consider how many different elements are present in the articles that we review and how these elements are connected. Beginning with the independent variable (IV) subthemes, Fig. 8 illustrates how many subthemes appear in the various articles. Most commonly, an article considers just one subtheme and on average, an article considers 2.2 IV subthemes. Fully 87-percent of articles consider three or fewer IV subthemes. This finding provides an initial indication that articles, by and large, are not considering the full array of factors that shape academic entrepreneurship.

Next, we analyze the relationship between subthemes through network images. Network conceptualizations—the consideration of the structure that connects a multitude of individual elements—lie at the heart of an ecosystem perspective. In the network images that follow, each “node” is a subtheme and the size of the node corresponds to the number of articles that include that subtheme. Two subthemes are connected with a line if a given article considers both subthemes. Thicker lines indicate a greater number of articles that include a given combination. (To facilitate a cleaner display, the figures do not depict connections of two or fewer instances.)

As Fig. 9 illustrates, “Human capital: entrepreneur”, “TTOs,” and “Entrepreneur support programs” are both the most common subthemes and the most connected ones, with 14, 11, and 10 ties respectively. By contrast, “Technology” (pictured in the lower-right) is never considered alongside other subthemes. Similarly, “National Programs and Policies” and “Organizational Networks” are rarely considered alongside other subthemes. “Human Capital: Team” and “Individual Characteristics” have two connections each and “Motivation and Self Efficacy” and “Research Discipline” have three connections each. All of these





Fig. 9 Network of independent-variable subthemes

Fig. 10 Number of dependent-variable subthemes addressed by articles ($n = 209$)



cases suggest as-yet-untapped opportunities to consider these independent variable subthemes alongside other subthemes. For example, future research might fruitfully explore how organizational networks interact with individual characteristics and/or locational factors to shape outcomes of interest. Similarly, future research might consider how national programs and policies interact with technology. In other words, each unconnected node represents a research opportunity that nudges closer to an ecosystem perspective.

Turning to the dependent variable (DV) subthemes, Fig. 10 illustrates that the vast majority of articles consider just one subtheme. On average, an article considers 1.2 DV subthemes and only two-percent of articles consider DVs across three subthemes. (Recall that we identified 13 total DV subthemes.) This finding provides further evidence that




Fig. 11 Network of dependent-variable subthemes

articles are focusing on specific factors of interest, following a typical empirical approach of picking a single DV (or a set of closely-related DVs that fall under the same subtheme) and a somewhat larger set of IVs, and then analyzing and reporting results accordingly. As argued above, this approach provides specific insights but does not reflect an ecosystem conceptualization of the phenomenon.

Indeed, only a handful articles have attempted to provide a conceptual foundation for multi-program and multi-level university-centric approaches. O'Shea et al. (2008), for example, take a multi-resource, multi-program, and multi-level approach to conceptualizing the role of universities (and regions) in academic entrepreneurship. Similarly, Clarysse et al. (2014) conceptualize business ecosystems and knowledge ecosystems, defining knowledge ecosystems as public research institutions, including research universities, as well as TTOs and regional public venture capital funds intended to link to the two ecosystem types. Yet such articles are the clear exceptions in the literature.

These patterns become even more apparent when viewed from a network perspective. As Fig. 11 illustrates, "Spinoff outcomes," "Startup decisions," "Intermediate outcomes," and "Number established" are the most common dependent-variable subthemes. The most *connected* subtheme, by contrast, is "IP Activity—Number," with links to four other subthemes. By contrast, "Economic and innovation impact" and "IP utilization" are never considered alongside other subthemes. Similarly, studies that focus on "Industry engagement" and "Support programs and policies" only consider these outcomes in relation to one other subtheme ("Intermediate outcomes" and "Startup decisions," respectively). In general, the network depicted in Fig. 11 is sparse, meaning that most subthemes are not connected to one another and, by extension, most articles do not consider multiple subthemes simultaneously.

As with the IV subthemes, drawing a "line" between unconnected subthemes can thus suggest several future research opportunities. For example, future work might consider




Fig. 12 Network of independent- and dependent-variable subthemes. In this figure, ties between independent variables and ties between dependent variables are omitted, in order to more clearly show the connections between independent and dependent variables

startup decisions and spinoff outcomes simultaneously. Similarly, studies could consider industry engagement alongside support programs and policies, or alongside impact on traditional academic outputs.

Finally, we consider which IVs are tied to which DVs across the full set of studies. Figure 12 illustrates these connections, with IVs on the left-hand side of the figure and DVs on the right-hand side. Not surprisingly, the most common IV subthemes (“Human capital: entrepreneur” and “Entrepreneur support programs”) are linked to the widest array of DV subthemes, while the most common DV subthemes (“Spinoff outcomes” and “Startup decisions”) are linked to the widest array of IV subthemes. The more provocative aspect of this illustration concerns the missing linkages. The average IV subtheme connects to 8.8 DV subthemes (out of a possible 13). Yet the variance is wide, ranging from 4 (“Human capital: team”) to 13 (“Human capital: entrepreneur”). As before, missing links are suggestive of future research opportunities. For example, although prior work connects “Human capital: team” to startup decisions, spinoff outcomes, intermediate outcomes, and IP utilization, we have no work that explicitly connects this construct to economic and innovation impact, industry engagement, or support programs and policies (as DV subthemes).

Examining the picture from the perspective of DV subthemes, the average DV subtheme connects to 11.5 IV subthemes (out of a possible 17). Again, the variance is wide, ranging from 5 (“IP utilization”) to 16 (“Spinoff outcomes”). Here, future work might connect DV subthemes of interest, such as IP utilization, to a wider range of IVs and IV subthemes in order to provide a more comprehensive understanding of what is driving these DVs.

Similarly, future work might connect national programs and policies not only to startup decisions and spinoff outcomes, where the literature has focused, but also to outcomes such as industry engagement.

6 Discussion

A recent study discussed in *Science* (Mervis 2016) tied a decreasing number of academic spinoffs in Norway to a policy change that shifted a portion of associated revenues from the academic-inventor to his or her institution. Reacting to the study, Lita Nelsen, the long-time head of MIT's Technology Licensing Office, commented: "I would guess that something else is in play besides the fraction of royalties that inventors receive" (Mervis 2016, p. 396). In other words, Nelsen suggests that challenging or controversial results demand consideration of a wide range of possible influences and relationships. Our analysis supports this message, encouraging scholars to consider the wide array of characteristics and elements tied to academic entrepreneurship from an ecosystem perspective. Specifically, our review finds that most research focuses on individual, university, and firm-level outcomes and their relationship to specific characteristics. Yet researchers have yet to make "vertical connections" between micro-level phenomena to macro-level outcomes, not to mention frame these connections in terms of complex interactions.

On the basis of our analysis, researchers also would be well-advised to eschew research conceptualizations that rely upon the linear, patent-focused technology transfer context (see also Bradley et al. 2013a, b) in favor of conceptualizing academic entrepreneurship as a process of co-evolution among myriad agents. Co-evolution is a critical tenet of systems and complexity-oriented theories (e.g. Byrne and Callaghan 2013) and is likely at play within a multi-level systems context such as academic entrepreneurship, including within and among individual, organizational, and regional levels.

As an initial step, scholars can focus on meso-level academic entrepreneurship research as a precursor to multi-level ecosystem views. Certainly, scholars have mapped academic entrepreneurship resources within individual universities and the regions where they are located (e.g. Rasmussen 2008; Youtie and Sharpira 2008) and, more recently, compared entrepreneurship support programs among universities (e.g. Swamidass 2013). However, these studies are typically descriptive in nature and do not examine the interaction of ecosystem characteristics, including programmatic interventions, as it relates to their efficacy. Hayter (2016b) examines the evolution of social networks among individual academic entrepreneurs using them as a vehicle to explain how different universities support entrepreneurship through various intermediaries. Future research might combine the two approaches—mapping and network interactions—to examine how academic entrepreneurs think about and utilize services and, most importantly, how various characteristics co-evolve toward a specific outcome.

Finally, it is worth reemphasizing that a diversity of perspectives can only help to further these goals. Indeed, although the academic entrepreneurship literature has expanded steadily since 2000, most papers are published by a relatively small group of scholars from business schools located primarily in the U.S. and U.K. Most top-ranked management journals have overlooked academic entrepreneurship entirely, while papers in field-area journals such as *Research Policy* and *Journal of Technology Transfer* rarely focus on contexts beyond the U.S. and Europe. Scholars wishing to make an immediate contribution to the literature would do well to focus on international contexts, and especially on emergent trends and models in the developing world.

In short, excellent opportunities remain for scholars to contribute to the evolving academic entrepreneurship literature. The promise, of course, is that future scholarship will not only rest firmly “on the shoulders of giants,” but it can also provide useful guidance to policymakers and, ultimately, shape outcomes to the benefit of universities, businesses, and society at large.

Appendix A: Keyword combinations used in literature search

- a. “University”, “academi”, or “faculty”
- b. “Entrepreneurship”, “commercialization”, “technology development”, “spinoff”, “startup”, or “spinout”
- c. Other search terms
 1. Ecosystem
 2. Support
 3. Assistance
 4. Advising
 5. Services
 6. Technology transfer office
 7. Proof of concept center
 8. Accelerator
 9. Incubator
 10. Entrepreneurship education
 11. Science park
 12. Fund
 13. Venture fund
 14. Industry research center
 15. Networking
 16. Federal programs (e.g. Small Business Innovation Research Program and Engineering Research Centers *only* as they relate to the commercialization of university technologies or supporting university spinoffs)

References

0.1 (*) Indicates articles cited but not included in our review

- Abreu, M., & Grinevich, V. (2013). The nature of academic entrepreneurship in the UK: Widening the focus on entrepreneurial activities. *Research Policy*, 42, 408–422.
- (*) Adner, R., & Kapoor, R. (2010). Value creation in innovation ecosystems: How the structure of technological interdependence affects firm performance in new technology generations. *Strategic Management Journal*, 31, 306–333.
- Agarwal, R., & Shah, S. K. (2014). Knowledge sources of entrepreneurship: Firm formation by academic, user and employee innovators. *Research Policy*, 43, 1109–1133.
- Agrawal, A. (2006). Engaging the inventor: Exploring licensing strategies for university inventions and the role of latent knowledge. *Strategic Management Journal*, 27, 63–79.
- Aldridge, T. T., & Audretsch, D. (2011). The Bayh–Dole Act and scientist entrepreneurship. *Research Policy*, 40, 1058–1067.

- Algieri, B., Aquino, A., & Succurro, M. (2013). Technology transfer offices and academic spin-off creation: The case of Italy. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 38, 382–400.
- Ambos, T. C., Mäkelä, K., Birkinshaw, J., & D'Este, P. (2008). When does university research get commercialized? Creating ambidexterity in research institutions. *Journal of Management Studies*, 45, 1424–1447.
- Åstebro, T., Bazzazian, N., & Braguinsky, S. (2012). Startups by recent university graduates and their faculty: Implications for university entrepreneurship policy. *Research Policy*, 41, 663–677.
- (*) Autio, E., Kenney, M., Mustard, P., Siegel, D., & Wright, M. (2014). Entrepreneurial innovation: The importance of context. *Research Policy*, 43, 1097–1108.
- Ayoub, M. R., Gottschalk, S., & Müller, B. (2017). Impact of public seed-funding on academic spin-offs. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 42, 1100–1124.
- (*) Bahrami, H., & Evans, S. (2000). Flexible recycling and high-technology entrepreneurship. In M. Kenney (Ed.), *Understanding silicon valley* (pp. 165–189). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Baldini, N., Grimaldi, R., & Sobrero, M. (2006). Institutional changes and the commercialization of academic knowledge: A study of Italian universities' patenting activities between 1965 and 2002. *Research Policy*, 35, 518–532.
- Barbero, J. L., Casillas, J. C., Wright, M., Ramos Garcia, A., Barbero, J. L., Casillas, J. C., et al. (2014). Do different types of incubators produce different types of innovations? *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 39, 151–168.
- Barbieri, E., Rubini, L., Pollio, C., & Micozzi, A. (2018). What are the trade-offs of academic entrepreneurship? An investigation on the Italian case. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 43, 198–221.
- Bathelt, H., Kogler, D. F., & Munro, A. K. (2010). A knowledge-based typology of university spin-offs in the context of regional economic development. *Technovation*, 30, 519–532.
- Bercovitz, J., & Feldman, M. (2008). Academic entrepreneurs: Organizational change at the individual level. *Organization Science*, 19, 69–89.
- Bercovitz, J., Feldman, M., Feller, I., & Burton, R. (2001). Organizational structure as a determinant of academic patent and licensing behavior: An exploratory study of Duke, Johns Hopkins, and Pennsylvania State Universities. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 26, 21–35.
- Bergmann, H., Hundt, C., & Sternberg, R. (2016). What makes student entrepreneurs? On the relevance (and irrelevance) of the university and the regional context for student start-ups. *Small Business Economics*, 47, 53–76.
- Bjørnåli, E. S., & Gulbrandsen, M. (2010). Exploring board formation and evolution of board composition in academic spin-offs. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 35, 92–112.
- Boardman, P. C., & Corley, E. A. (2008). University research centers and the composition of research collaborations. *Research Policy*, 37, 900–913.
- Boh, W. F., De-Haan, U., & Strom, R. (2016). University technology transfer through entrepreneurship: Faculty and students in spinoffs. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 41, 661–669.
- (*) Bradley, S., Hayter, C. S., & Link, A. N. (2013a). Methods and models of university technology transfer. *Foundations and Trends in Entrepreneurship*, 9, 571–650.
- Bradley, S. R., Hayter, C. S., & Link, A. N. (2013b). Proof of Concept centers in the United States: An exploratory look. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 38, 349–381.
- Bramwell, A., & Wolfe, D. A. (2008). Universities and regional economic development: The entrepreneurial University of Waterloo. *Research Policy*, 37, 1175–1187.
- Bray, M. J., & Lee, J. N. (2000). University revenues from technology transfer: Licensing fees vs. equity positions. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 15, 385–392.
- Brescia, F., Colombo, G., & Landoni, P. (2016). Organizational structures of Knowledge Transfer Offices: An analysis of the world's top-ranked universities. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 41, 132–151.
- Breznitz, S. M., & Feldman, M. P. (2012). The engaged university. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 37, 139–157.
- (*) Byrne, D., & Callaghan, G. (2013). *Complexity theory and the social sciences: The state of the art*. New York: Routledge.
- Carayannis, E. G., Cherepovitsyn, A. Y., & Ilinova, A. A. (2016). Technology commercialization in entrepreneurial universities: The US and Russian experience. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 41, 1135–1147.
- Casper, S. (2013). The spill-over theory reversed: The impact of regional economies on the commercialization of university science. *Research Policy*, 42, 1313–1324.
- Clarysse, B., & Moray, N. (2004). A process study of entrepreneurial team formation: The case of a research-based spin-off. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 19, 55–79.
- Clarysse, B., Tartari, V., & Salter, A. (2011a). The impact of entrepreneurial capacity, experience and organizational support on academic entrepreneurship. *Research Policy*, 40, 1084–1093.

- Clarysse, B., Wright, M., Bruneel, J., & Mahajan, A. (2014). Creating value in ecosystems: Crossing the chasm between knowledge and business ecosystems. *Research Policy*, 43, 1164–1176.
- Clarysse, B., Wright, M., & Van de Velde, E. (2011b). Entrepreneurial origin, technological knowledge, and the growth of spin-off companies. *Journal of Management Studies*, 48, 1420–1442.
- Colyvas, J. A. (2007). From divergent meanings to common practices: The early institutionalization of technology transfer in the life sciences at Stanford University. *Research Policy*, 36, 456–476.
- Colyvas, J., Crow, M., Gelijns, A., Mazzoleni, R., Nelson, R. R., Rosenberg, N., et al. (2002). How do university inventions get into practice? *Management Science*, 48, 61–72.
- Comacchio, A., Bonesso, S., & Pizzi, C. (2012). Boundary spanning between industry and university: The role of Technology Transfer Centres. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 37, 943–966.
- Cooper, C. E., Hamel, S. A., & Connaughton, S. L. (2012). Motivations and obstacles to networking in a university business incubator. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 37, 433–453.
- Criaco, G., Minola, T., Migliorini, P., & Serarols-Tarrés, C. (2014). “To have and have not”: Founders’ human capital and university start-up survival. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 39, 567–593.
- Croce, A., Grilli, L., & Murtinu, S. (2014). Venture capital enters academia: An analysis of university-managed funds. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 39, 688–715.
- D’Este, P., Mahdi, S., Neely, A., & Rentocchini, F. (2012). Inventors and entrepreneurs in academia: What types of skills and experience matter? *Technovation*, 32, 293–303.
- D’Este, P., & Perkmann, M. (2011). Why do academics engage with industry? The entrepreneurial university and individual motivations. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 36, 316–339.
- Davey, T., Rossano, S., & van der Sijde, P. (2016). Does context matter in academic entrepreneurship? The role of barriers and drivers in the regional and national context. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 41, 1457–1482.
- Debackere, K., & Veugelers, R. (2005). The role of academic technology transfer organizations in improving industry science links. *Research Policy*, 34, 321–342.
- Degroof, J.-J., & Roberts, E. B. (2004). Overcoming weak entrepreneurial infrastructures for academic spin-off ventures. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 29, 327–352.
- Di Gregorio, D., & Shane, S. (2003). Why do some universities generate more start-ups than others? *Research Policy*, 32, 209–227.
- Diáñez-González, J. P., & Camelo-Ordaz, C. (2016). How management team composition affects academic spin-offs’ entrepreneurial orientation: The mediating role of conflict. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 41, 530–557.
- Druilhe, C., & Garnsey, E. (2004). Do academic spin-outs differ and does it matter? *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 29, 269–285.
- Eesley, C., Li, J. B., & Yang, D. (2016). Does institutional change in universities influence high-tech entrepreneurship? Evidence from China’s Project 985. *Organization Science*, 27, 446–461.
- Ensley, M. D., & Hmieleski, K. M. (2005). A comparative study of new venture top management team composition, dynamics and performance between university-based and independent start-ups. *Research Policy*, 34, 1091–1105.
- Feldman, M., Feller, I., Bercovitz, J., & Burton, R. (2002). Equity and the technology transfer strategies of American research universities. *Management Science*, 48, 105–121.
- Feldman, M. P., & Graddy-Reed, A. (2014). Accelerating commercialization: A new model of strategic foundation funding. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 39, 503–523.
- Feller, I., Ailes, C. P., & Roessner, J. D. (2002). Impacts of research universities on technological innovation in industry: Evidence from engineering research centers. *Research Policy*, 31, 457–474.
- Fernández-Alles, M., Camelo-Ordaz, C., & Franco-Leal, N. (2015). Key resources and actors for the evolution of academic spin-offs. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 40, 976–1002.
- Fini, R., Fu, K., Mathisen, M. T., Rasmussen, E., & Wright, M. (2017). Institutional determinants of university spin-off quantity and quality: a longitudinal, multilevel, cross-country study. *Small Business Economics*, 48(2), 361–391.
- Fini, R., Grimaldi, R., & Sobrero, M. (2009). Factors fostering academics to start up new ventures: An assessment of Italian founders’ incentives. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 34, 380–402.
- Fini, R., Lacetera, N., & Shane, S. (2010). Inside or outside the IP system? Business creation in academia. *Research Policy*, 39, 1060–1069.
- Fini, R., Santoni, S., & Sobrero, M. (2011). Complements or substitutes? The role of universities and local context in supporting the creation of academic spin-offs. *Research Policy*, 40, 1113–1127.
- Franklin, S. J., Wright, M., & Lockett, A. (2001). Academic and surrogate entrepreneurs in university spin-out companies. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 26, 127–141.
- Friedman, J., & Silberman, J. (2003). University technology transfer: do incentives, management, and location matter? *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 28, 17–30.

- Fuller, A. W., & Rothaermel, F. T. (2012). When stars shine: The effects of faculty founders on new technology ventures. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 6, 220–235.
- Gassol, J. H. (2007). The effect of university culture and stakeholders' perceptions on university–business linking activities. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 32, 489–507.
- Gianiodis, P. T., Markman, G. D., & Panagopoulos, A. (2016). Entrepreneurial universities and overt opportunism. *Small Business Economics*, 47, 609–631.
- Goldfarb, B., & Henrekson, M. (2003). Bottom-up versus top-down policies towards the commercialization of university intellectual property. *Research Policy*, 32, 639–658.
- Grandi, A., & Grimaldi, R. (2003). Exploring the networking characteristics of new venture founding teams: A study of Italian academic spin-off. *Small Business Economics*, 21, 329–341.
- Grandi, A., & Grimaldi, R. (2005). Academics' organizational characteristics and the generation of successful business ideas. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 20, 821–845.
- Grimm, H. M., & Jaenicke, J. (2012). What drives patenting and commercialisation activity at East German universities? The role of new public policy, institutional environment and individual prior knowledge. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 37, 454–477.
- Gubitta, P., Tognazzo, A., & Destro, F. (2016). Signaling in academic ventures: The role of technology transfer offices and university funds. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 41, 368–393.
- Guerrero, M., & Urbano, D. (2014). Academics' start-up intentions and knowledge filters: An individual perspective of the knowledge spillover theory of entrepreneurship. *Small Business Economics*, 43, 57–74.
- Guerrero, M., Urbano, D., Cunningham, J., & Organ, D. (2014). Entrepreneurial universities in two European regions: A case study comparison. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 39, 415–434.
- Gulbranson, C. A., & Audretsch, D. B. (2008). Proof of concept centers: Accelerating the commercialization of university innovation. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 33, 249–258.
- Haeussler, C., & Colyvas, J. A. (2011). Breaking the ivory tower: Academic entrepreneurship in the life sciences in UK and Germany. *Research Policy*, 40, 41–54.
- Hayter, C. S. (2011). In search of the profit-maximizing actor: Motivations and definitions of success from nascent academic entrepreneurs. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 36, 340–352.
- Hayter, C. S. (2015). Public or private entrepreneurship? Revisiting motivations and definitions of success among academic entrepreneurs. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 40, 1003–1015.
- Hayter, C. S. (2016a). Constraining entrepreneurial development: A knowledge-based view of social networks among academic entrepreneurs. *Research Policy*, 45, 475–490.
- Hayter, C. S. (2016b). A trajectory of early-stage spinoff success: The role of knowledge intermediaries within an entrepreneurial university ecosystem. *Small Business Economics*, 47, 633–656.
- Hayter, C. S., & Link, A. N. (2015). On the economic impact of university proof of concept centers. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 40, 178–183.
- Hayter, C. S., Lubynsky, R., & Maroulis, S. (2017). Who is the academic entrepreneur? The role of graduate students in the development of university spinoffs. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 42, 1–18.
- Heblrich, S., & Slavtchev, V. (2014). Parent universities and the location of academic startups. *Small Business Economics*, 42, 1–15.
- Henrekson, M., & Rosenberg, N. (2001). Designing efficient institutions for science-based entrepreneurship: Lessons from the US and Sweden. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 26, 207–231.
- Horta, H., Meoli, M., & Vismara, S. (2016). Skilled unemployment and the creation of academic spin-offs: A recession-push hypothesis. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 41, 798–817.
- Hsu, D. H., Roberts, E. B., & Eesley, C. E. (2007). Entrepreneurs from technology-based universities: Evidence from MIT. *Research Policy*, 36, 768–788.
- Huang-Saad, A., Fay, J., & Sheridan, L. (2017). Closing the divide: Accelerating technology commercialization by catalyzing the university entrepreneurial ecosystem with I-Corps™. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 42, 1466–1486.
- Hunter, E. M., Perry, S. J., & Currall, S. C. (2011). Inside multi-disciplinary science and engineering research centers: The impact of organizational climate on invention disclosures and patents. *Research Policy*, 40, 1226–1239.
- Huyghe, A., Knockaert, M., & Obschonka, M. (2016a). Unraveling the “passion orchestra” in academia. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 31, 344–364.
- Huyghe, A., Knockaert, M., Piva, E., & Wright, M. (2016b). Are researchers deliberately bypassing the technology transfer office? An analysis of TTO awareness. *Small Business Economics*, 47, 589–607.
- Huyghe, A., Knockaert, M., Wright, M., & Piva, E. (2014). Technology transfer offices as boundary spanners in the pre-spin-off process: The case of a hybrid model. *Small Business Economics*, 43, 289–307.
- (*) Iansiti, M., & Levien, R. (2004). *The keystone advantage: What the new dynamics of business ecosystems mean for strategy, innovation and sustainability*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

- Jacob, M., Lundqvist, M., & Hellsmark, H. (2003). Entrepreneurial transformations in the Swedish university system: The case of Chalmers University of Technology. *Research Policy*, 32, 1555–1568.
- Jain, S., George, G., & Maltarich, M. (2009). Academics or entrepreneurs? Investigating role identity modification of university scientists involved in commercialization activity. *Research Policy*, 38, 922–935.
- Jefferson, D. J., Maida, M., Farkas, A., Alandete-Saez, M., & Bennett, A. B. (2017). Technology transfer in the Americas: Common and divergent practices among major research universities and public sector institutions. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 42, 1307–1333.
- Johansson, M., Jacob, M., & Hellström, T. (2005). The strength of strong ties: University spin-offs and the significance of historical relations. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 30, 271–286.
- Jong, S. (2008). Academic organizations and new industrial fields: Berkeley and Stanford after the rise of biotechnology. *Research Policy*, 37, 1267–1282.
- Kalar, B., & Antoncic, B. (2015). The entrepreneurial university, academic activities and technology and knowledge transfer in four European countries. *Technovation*, 36, 1–11.
- Karlsson, T., & Wigren, C. (2012). Start-ups among university employees: The influence of legitimacy, human capital and social capital. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 37, 297–312.
- Karnani, F. (2013). The university's unknown knowledge: Tacit knowledge, technology transfer and university spin-offs findings from an empirical study based on the theory of knowledge. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 38, 235–250.
- Kenney, M., & Patton, D. (2011). Does inventor ownership encourage university research-derived entrepreneurship? A six university comparison. *Research Policy*, 40, 1100–1112.
- Kenney, M., & Richard Goe, W. (2004). The role of social embeddedness in professorial entrepreneurship: a comparison of electrical engineering and computer science at UC Berkeley and Stanford. *Research Policy*, 33, 691–707.
- (*) Kenney, M., & von Burg, U. (1999). Technology and path dependence: The divergence between Silicon Valley and Route 128. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 8, 67–103.
- Klofsten, M., & Jones-Evans, D. (2000). Comparing academic entrepreneurship in Europe—The case of Sweden and Ireland. *Small Business Economics*, 14, 299–309.
- Knockaert, M., Ucbasaran, D., Wright, M., & Clarysse, B. (2011). The relationship between knowledge transfer, top management team composition, and performance: The case of science-based entrepreneurial firms. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 35, 777–803.
- Knockaert, M., Wright, M., Clarysse, B., & Lockett, A. (2010). Agency and similarity effects and the VC's attitude towards academic spin-out investing. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 35, 567–584.
- Kolb, C., & Wagner, M. (2015). Crowding in or crowding out: The link between academic entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial traits. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 40, 387–408.
- Kolympiris, C., & Klein, P. G. (2017). The effects of academic incubators on university innovation. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 11, 145–170.
- Lam, A. (2011). What motivates academic scientists to engage in research commercialization: “Gold”, “ribbon” or “puzzle”? *Research Policy*, 40, 1354–1368.
- Lavie, D., & Drori, I. (2012). Collaborating for knowledge creation and application: The case of nanotechnology research programs. *Organization Science*, 23, 704–724.
- Levie, J. (2014). The university is the classroom: Teaching and learning technology commercialization at a technological university. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 39, 793–808.
- Link, A. N., & Scott, J. T. (2005). Opening the ivory tower's door: An analysis of the determinants of the formation of U.S. university spin-off companies. *Research Policy*, 34, 1106–1112.
- Lockett, A., & Wright, M. (2005). Resources, capabilities, risk capital and the creation of university spin-out companies. *Research Policy*, 34, 1043–1057.
- Lockett, A., Wright, M., & Franklin, S. (2003). Technology transfer and universities' spin-out strategies. *Small Business Economics*, 20, 185–200.
- Lowe, R. A., & Gonzalez-Brambila, C. (2007). Faculty entrepreneurs and research productivity. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 32, 173–194.
- Lowe, R. A., Ziedonis, A. A., & Ross, S. M. (2006). Overoptimism and the performance of entrepreneurial firms. *Management Science*, 52, 173–186.
- Lundqvist, M. A. (2014). The importance of surrogate entrepreneurship for incubated Swedish technology ventures. *Technovation*, 34, 93–100.
- Maia, C., & Claro, J. (2013). The role of a Proof of Concept Center in a university ecosystem: An exploratory study. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 38, 641–650.
- Markman, G. D., Gianiodis, P. T., Phan, P. H., & Balkin, D. B. (2004). Entrepreneurship from the ivory tower: Do incentive systems matter? *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 29, 353–364.
- Markman, G. D., Gianiodis, P. T., Phan, P. H., & Balkin, D. B. (2005a). Innovation speed: Transferring university technology to market. *Research Policy*, 34, 1058–1075.

- Markman, G. D., Phan, P. H., Balkin, D. B., & Gianiodis, P. T. (2005b). Entrepreneurship and university-based technology transfer. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 20, 241–263.
- McAdam, M., & McAdam, R. (2008). High tech start-ups in University Science Park incubators: The relationship between the start-up's lifecycle progression and use of the incubator's resources. *Technovation*, 28, 277–290.
- McAdam, M., Miller, K., & McAdam, R. (2016). Situated regional university incubation: A multi-level stakeholder perspective. *Technovation*, 50, 69–78.
- Meoli, M., & Vismara, S. (2016). University support and the creation of technology and non-technology academic spin-offs. *Small Business Economics*, 47, 345–362.
- (*) Mervis, J. (2016). When the payoff for academics drops, commercialization suffers. *Science*, 352(6284), 396.
- Meyer, M. (2006). Academic inventiveness and entrepreneurship: On the importance of start-up companies in commercializing academic patents. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 31, 501–510.
- Mindruta, D. (2013). Value creation in university-firm research collaborations: A matching approach. *Strategic Management Journal*, 34, 644–665.
- (*) Moore, J. F. (1993). Predators and prey: A new ecology of competition. *Harvard Business Review*, 71, 75–86.
- Mosey, S., & Wright, M. (2007). From human capital to social capital: A longitudinal study of technology-based academic entrepreneurs. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 31, 909–935.
- Mowery, D. C., Nelson, R. R., Sampat, B. N., & Ziedonis, A. A. (2001). The growth of patenting and licensing by U.S. universities: An assessment of the effects of the Bayh–Dole act of 1980. *Research Policy*, 30, 99–119.
- Müller, K. (2010). Academic spin-off's transfer speed—Analyzing the time from leaving university to venture. *Research Policy*, 39, 189–199.
- Munari, F., Pasquini, M., & Toschi, L. (2015). From the lab to the stock market? The characteristics and impact of university-oriented seed funds in Europe. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 40, 948–975.
- Munari, F., Rasmussen, E., Toschi, L., & Villani, E. (2016). Determinants of the university technology transfer policy-mix: A cross-national analysis of gap-funding instruments. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 41, 1377–1405.
- Muscio, A., Quaglione, D., & Ramaciotti, L. (2016). The effects of university rules on spinoff creation: The case of academia in Italy. *Research Policy*, 45, 1386–1396.
- Mustar, P., & Wright, M. (2010). Convergence or path dependency in policies to foster the creation of university spin-off firms? A comparison of France and the United Kingdom. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 35, 42–65.
- Ndonzuau, F. N., Pirnay, F., & Surlemont, B. (2002). A stage model of academic spin-off creation. *Technovation*, 22, 281–289.
- Nelson, A. J. (2014). From the ivory tower to the startup garage: Organizational context and commercialization processes. *Research Policy*, 43, 1144–1156.
- Nelson, A. J. (2016). How to share “a really good secret”: Managing sharing/secret tensions around scientific knowledge disclosure. *Organization Science*, 27, 265–285.
- Nelson, A. J., & Monsen, E. (2014). Teaching technology commercialization: Introduction to the special section. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 39, 774–779.
- Nerkar, A., & Shane, S. (2007). Determinants of invention commercialization: An empirical examination of academically sourced inventions. *Strategic Management Journal*, 28, 1155–1166.
- Nicolaou, N., & Birley, S. (2003a). Social networks in organizational emergence: The university spinout phenomenon. *Management Science*, 49, 1702–1725.
- Nicolaou, N., & Birley, S. (2003b). Academic networks in a trichotomous categorisation of university spinouts. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 18, 333–359.
- Nilsson, A. S., Rickne, A., & Bengtsson, L. (2010). Transfer of academic research: Uncovering the grey zone. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 35, 617–636.
- Niosi, J. (2006). Success factors in Canadian academic spin-offs. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 31, 451–457.
- O’Gorman, C., Byrne, O., & Pandya, D. (2008). How scientists commercialise new knowledge via entrepreneurship. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 33, 23–43.
- O’Kane, C., Mangematin, V., Geoghegan, W., & Fitzgerald, C. (2015). University technology transfer offices: The search for identity to build legitimacy. *Research Policy*, 44, 421–437.
- O’Shea, R. P., Allen, T. J., Chevalier, A., & Roche, F. (2005). Entrepreneurial orientation, technology transfer and spinoff performance of U.S. universities. *Research Policy*, 34, 994–1009.
- (*) O’Shea, R. P., Allen, T. J., O’Gorman, C., & Roche, F. (2004). Universities technology transfer: A review of academic entrepreneurship literature. *Irish Journal of Management*, 25, 11–29.

- O'Shea, R. P., Chugh, H., & Allen, T. J. (2008). Determinants and consequences of university spinoff activity: A conceptual framework. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 33, 653–666.
- Oehler, A., Höfer, A., & Schalkowski, H. (2015). Entrepreneurial education and knowledge: Empirical evidence on a sample of German undergraduate students. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 40, 536–557.
- Owen-Smith, J., & Powell, W. W. (2001). To patent or not: Faculty decisions and institutional success at technology transfer. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 26, 99–114.
- Patzelt, H., & Shepherd, D. A. (2009). Strategic entrepreneurship at universities: academic entrepreneurs' assessment of policy programs. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 33, 319–340.
- Pérez, M. P., & Sánchez, A. M. (2003). The development of university spin-offs: Early dynamics of technology transfer and networking. *Technovation*, 23, 823–831.
- Perkmann, M., King, Z., & Pavelin, S. (2011). Engaging excellence? Effects of faculty quality on university engagement with industry. *Research Policy*, 40, 539–552.
- Perkmann, M., Tartari, V., McKelvey, M., Autio, E., Broström, A., D'Este, P., et al. (2013). Academic engagement and commercialisation: A review of the literature on university–industry relations. *Research Policy*, 42, 423–442.
- Peters, L., Rice, M., & Sundararajan, M. (2004). The role of incubators in the entrepreneurial process. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 29, 83–91.
- (*) Petticrew, M., & Roberts, H. (2005). *Systematic reviews in the social sciences: A practical guide*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Phan, P. H. (2014). The business of translation: The Johns Hopkins University Discovery to Market program. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 39, 809–817.
- Phan, P. H., Siegel, D. S., & Wright, M. (2005). Science parks and incubators: Observations, synthesis and future research. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 20, 165–182.
- Philpott, K., Dooley, L., O'Reilly, C., & Lupton, G. (2011). The entrepreneurial university: Examining the underlying academic tensions. *Technovation*, 31, 161–170.
- Pirnay, F., Surlmont, B., & Nlemvo, F. (2003). Toward a typology of university spin-offs. *Small Business Economics*, 21, 355–369.
- Pitsakis, K., Souitaris, V., & Nicolaou, N. (2015). The peripheral halo effect: Do academic spinoffs influence universities' research income? *Journal of Management Studies*, 52, 321–353.
- Plummer, L. A., & Gilbert, B. A. (2015). The effect of defense agency funding of university research on regional new venture creation. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 9, 136–152.
- (*) Powell, W., Packalen, K., & Whittington, K. (2009). Organizational and institutional genesis: The emergence of high-tech clusters in the life sciences. In J. Padgett & W. Powell (Eds.), *The emergence of organizations and markets*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Powers, J. B., & McDougall, P. (2005a). Policy orientation effects on performance with licensing to startups and small companies. *Research Policy*, 34, 1028–1042.
- Powers, J. B., & McDougall, P. P. (2005b). University start-up formation and technology licensing with firms that go public: A resource-based view of academic entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 20, 291–311.
- Rasmussen, E. (2008). Government instruments to support the commercialization of university research: Lessons from Canada. *Technovation*, 28, 506–517.
- Rasmussen, E., & Borch, O. J. (2010). University capabilities in facilitating entrepreneurship: A longitudinal study of spin-off ventures at mid-range universities. *Research Policy*, 39, 602–612.
- Rasmussen, E., Moen, Ø., & Gulbrandsen, M. (2006). Initiatives to promote commercialization of university knowledge. *Technovation*, 26, 518–533.
- Rasmussen, E., Mosey, S., & Wright, M. (2011). The evolution of entrepreneurial competencies: A longitudinal study of university spin-off venture emergence. *Journal of Management Studies*, 48, 1314–1345.
- Rasmussen, E., Mosey, S., & Wright, M. (2014). The influence of university departments on the evolution of entrepreneurial competencies in spin-off ventures. *Research Policy*, 43, 92–106.
- Rasmussen, E. A., & Sørheim, R. (2006). Action-based entrepreneurship education. *Technovation*, 26, 185–194.
- Rasmussen, E., & Wright, M. (2015). How can universities facilitate academic spin-offs? An entrepreneurial competency perspective. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 40, 782–799.
- Renault, C. S. (2006). Academic capitalism and university incentives for faculty entrepreneurship. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 31, 227–239.
- Rizzo, U. (2015). Why do scientists create academic spin-offs? The influence of the context. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 40, 198–226.
- (*) Rothaermel, F. T., Agung, S. D., & Jiang, L. (2007). University entrepreneurship: A taxonomy of the literature. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 16, 691–791.

- Rothaermel, F. T., & Thursby, M. (2005). University-incubator firm knowledge flows: Assessing their impact on incubator firm performance. *Research Policy*, 34, 305–320.
- (*) Saldana, J. (2012). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Salvador, E. (2011). Are science parks and incubators good “brand names” for spin-offs? The case study of Turin. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 36, 203–232.
- Samila, S., & Sorenson, O. (2010). Venture capital as a catalyst to commercialization. *Research Policy*, 39, 1348–1360.
- (*) Saxenian, A. (1994). *Regional advantage*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Schillo, R. S. (2018). Research-based spin-offs as agents in the entrepreneurial ecosystem. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 43, 222–239.
- Scholten, V., Omta, O., Kemp, R., & Elfring, T. (2015). Bridging ties and the role of research and start-up experience on the early growth of Dutch academic spin-offs. *Technovation*, 45, 40–51.
- Shah, S. K., & Pahnke, E. C. (2014). Parting the ivory curtain: Understanding how universities support a diverse set of startups. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 39, 780–792.
- Shane, S. (2002). Selling university technology: Patterns from MIT. *Management Science*, 48, 122–137.
- (*) Shane, S. (2004). *Academic entrepreneurship: University spinoffs and wealth creation*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.
- Shane, S., Dolmans, S. A. M., Jankowski, J., Reymen, I. M. M. J., Georges, A., & Romme, L. (2015). Academic entrepreneurship: Which inventors do technology licensing officers prefer for spinoffs? *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 40, 273–292.
- Shane, S., & Stuart, T. (2002). Organizational endowments and the performance of university start-ups. *Management Science*, 48, 154–170.
- Sideri, K., & Panagopoulos, A. (2016). Setting up a technology commercialization office at a non-entrepreneurial university: An insider’s look at practices and culture. *Journal of Technology Transfer*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10961-016-9526-z>.
- Siegel, D. S., Waldman, D., & Link, A. (2003). Assessing the impact of organizational practices on the relative productivity of university technology transfer offices: An exploratory study. *Research Policy*, 32, 27–48.
- Siegel, D. S., & Wessner, C. (2012). Universities and the success of entrepreneurial ventures: Evidence from the small business innovation research program. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 37, 404–415.
- Sine, W. D., Shane, S., & Gregorio, D. Di. (2003). The halo effect and technology licensing: The influence of institutional prestige on the licensing of university inventions. *Management Science*, 49, 478–496.
- Soetanto, D., & Jack, S. (2016). The impact of university-based incubation support on the innovation strategy of academic spin-offs. *Technovation*, 50, 25–40.
- Soetanto, D., & van Geenhuizen, M. (2015). Getting the right balance: University networks’ influence on spin-offs’ attraction of funding for innovation. *Technovation*, 36, 26–38.
- Souitaris, V., Zerbinati, S., & Al-Laham, A. (2007). Do entrepreneurship programmes raise entrepreneurial intention of science and engineering students? The effect of learning, inspiration and resources. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 22, 566–591.
- Steffens, M., Rogers, E. M., & Speakman, K. (2000). Spin-offs from research centers at a research university. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 15, 93–111.
- Sternberg, R. (2014). Success factors of university-spin-offs: Regional government support programs versus regional environment. *Technovation*, 34, 137–148.
- Swamidass, P. M. (2013). University startups as a commercialization alternative: Lessons from three contrasting case studies. *Journal of Technological Transfer*, 38, 788–808.
- Swamidass, P. M., & Vulasa, V. (2009). Why university inventions rarely produce income? Bottlenecks in university technology transfer. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 34, 343–363.
- Tartari, V., Perkmann, M., & Salter, A. (2014). In good company: The influence of peers on industry engagement by academic scientists. *Research Policy*, 43, 1189–1203.
- Todorovic, Z. W., McNaughton, R. B., & Guild, P. (2011). ENTRE-U: An entrepreneurial orientation scale for universities. *Technovation*, 31, 128–137.
- Toole, A. A., & Czarnitzki, D. (2009). Exploring the relationship between scientist human capital and firm performance: The case of biomedical academic entrepreneurs in the SBIR program. *Management Science*, 55, 101–114.
- (*) Tranfield, D. R., Denyer, D., & Smart, P. (2003). Towards a methodology for developing evidence-informed management knowledge by means of systematic review. *British Journal of Management*, 14, 207–222.
- van Geenhuizen, M., & Soetanto, D. P. (2009). Academic spin-offs at different ages: A case study in search of key obstacles to growth. *Technovation*, 29, 671–681.

- Van Looy, B., Landoni, P., Callaert, J., van Pottelsberghe, B., Sapsalis, E., & Debackere, K. (2011). Entrepreneurial effectiveness of European universities: An empirical assessment of antecedents and trade-offs. *Research Policy*, 40, 553–564.
- Vanaelst, I., Clarysse, B., Wright, M., Lockett, A., Moray, N., & S'Jegers, R. (2006). Entrepreneurial team development in academic spinouts: An examination of team heterogeneity. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 30, 249–271.
- Visintin, F., & Pittino, D. (2014). Founding team composition and early performance of university—Based spin-off companies. *Technovation*, 34, 31–43.
- Vohora, A., Wright, M., & Lockett, A. (2004). Critical junctures in the development of university high-tech spinout companies. *Research Policy*, 33, 147–175.
- Walsh, J. P., & Huang, H. (2014). Local context, academic entrepreneurship and open science: Publication secrecy and commercial activity among Japanese and US scientists. *Research Policy*, 43, 245–260.
- Walter, A., Auer, M., & Ritter, T. (2006). The impact of network capabilities and entrepreneurial orientation on university spin-off performance. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 21, 541–567.
- Walter, T., Ihl, C., Maurer, R., Brettel, M. (2013). Grace, gold, or glory? Exploring incentives for invention disclosure in the university context. *Journal of Technology Transfer*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10961-013-9303-1>.
- Walter, S. G., Schmidt, A., & Walter, A. (2016). Patenting rationales of academic entrepreneurs in weak and strong organizational regimes. *Research Policy*, 45, 533–545.
- Wennberg, K., & Wiklund, J. (2011). The effectiveness of university knowledge spillovers: Performance differences between university spinoffs and corporate spinoffs. *Research Policy*, 40, 1128–1143.
- (*) Whittington, K., Owen-smith, J., & Powell, W. (2009). Networks, propinquity and innovation in knowledge-intensive industries. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 54, 90–122.
- (*) Wolfswinkel, J. F., Furtmueller, E., & Wilderom, C. P. M. (2013). Using grounded theory as a method for rigorously reviewing literature. *European Journal of Information Systems*, 22, 45–55.
- Wood, M. S. (2009). Does one size fit all? The multiple organizational forms leading to successful academic entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 3, 929–947.
- (*) Wright, M., Clarysse, B., Mustar, P., & Lockett, A. (2007). *Academic entrepreneurship in Europe*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.
- Wright, M., Liu, X., Buck, T., & Filatotchev, I. (2007). Returnee entrepreneurs, science park location choice and performance: An analysis of high-technology SMEs in China. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 32, 131–155.
- Wright, M., Lockett, A., Clarysse, B., & Binks, M. (2006). University spin-out companies and venture capital. *Research Policy*, 35, 481–501.
- Wright, M., Piva, E., Mosey, S., & Lockett, A. (2009). Academic entrepreneurship and business schools. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 34, 560–587.
- Wright, M., Vohora, A., & Lockett, A. (2004). The formation of high-tech university spinouts: The role of joint ventures and venture capital investors. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 29, 287–310.
- Wu, W. (2010). Managing and incentivizing research commercialization in Chinese Universities. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 35, 203–224.
- Würmseher, M. (2017). To each his own: Matching different entrepreneurial models to the academic scientist's individual needs. *Technovation*, 59, 1–17.
- Youtie, J., & Shapira, P. (2008). Building an innovation hub: A case study of the transformation of university roles in regional technological and economic development. *Research Policy*, 37, 1188–1204.
- (*) Zahra, S. A., & Nambisan, S. (2012). Entrepreneurship and strategic thinking in business ecosystems. *Business Horizons*, 55, 219–229.
- Zhang, J. (2009). The performance of university spin-offs: An exploratory analysis using venture capital data. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 34, 255–285.
- Zou, Y., & Zhao, W. (2014). Anatomy of Tsinghua University Science Park in China: Institutional evolution and assessment. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 39, 663–674.
- Zucker, L. G., Darby, M. R., & Armstrong, J. S. (2002). Commercializing knowledge: University science, knowledge capture, and firm performance in biotechnology. *Management Science*, 48, 138–153.