

Part I

Academic Tendencies

Maribel Guerrero and David Urbano

“Good reviews do not just summarize the literature but provide unique contributions on theory testing, theory development, the identification of research gaps, and suggestions for future research.”

– Rauch (2020, p.1)

Schumpeter’s (1942) seminal work about “creative destruction” recognized the strong relationship between entrepreneurship and innovation. Interestingly, four decades later, a visionary group promoted the Bayh-Dole Act as an incentive for universities to establish a TTO and position themselves for formally transferring faculty inventions through patent licensing (Link and van Hasselt 2019). Despite these efforts, academic literature continues to stimulate entrepreneurship and innovation analysis as two independent phenomena over the last four decades.

This gap inspired the following two chapters’ collaborators to examine the accumulation of literature published from 1970 to 2019 by adopting two perspectives. The first perspective was oriented towards the convergence of entrepreneurship and innovation activities due to technology transfer policy frameworks. Particularly, Chap. 1 provides insights into the role of policies in the emergence of entrepreneurial innovations in different research settings. The second perspective was focused on identifying the leading research trends in technology transfer. Particularly, Chap. 2

M. Guerrero (✉)

Facultad de Economía y Negocios, Universidad del Desarrollo, Santiago, Chile

Centre for Innovation Research (CIRCLE), Lund University, Lund, Sweden

Northumbria Centre for Innovation, Regional Transformation and Entrepreneurship (iNCITE), Newcastle Business School, Northumbria University, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK
e-mail: maribel.guerrero@northumbria.ac.uk

D. Urbano

Department of Business and Centre for Entrepreneurship and Social Innovation Research (CREIS), Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Bellaterra, Spain
e-mail: david.urbano@uab.cat

provides insights into the most influential studies published in one of the outstanding journals in this field.

Undoubtedly, both chapters represent an exhaustive compilation of the accumulated knowledge useful for readers interested in understanding these topics. Indeed, both chapters highlight the non-conclusive empirical evidence about the effectiveness of related policy frameworks to entrepreneurship and innovation, as well as the under-representativeness of studies in the context of transition and emerging economies. In this vein, both chapters outline a research agenda with several implications for researchers and stakeholders.

We also invite readers to reflect on these insights into the current unexpected events related to the COVID-19 pandemic (Siegel and Guerrero 2021). In other words, the great value of generating and transferring knowledge among the agents enrolled in entrepreneurial innovation ecosystems. The development of entrepreneurial innovations has allowed a rapid response to healthy and societal challenges globally (e.g., COVID-19 tests, vaccines, follow-up applications, medical instruments). We should explore the public policy tendencies in stimulating entrepreneurial innovations, intellectual property, and knowledge transfer for socio-economic recovery post-COVID-19 pandemic.

References

- Link, A. N., & van Hasselt, M. (2019). On the transfer of technology from universities: The impact of the Bayh–Dole Act of 1980 on the institutionalization of university research. *European Economic Review*, 119, 472–481.
- Rauch, A. (2020). Opportunities and threats in reviewing entrepreneurship theory and practice. In *Entrepreneurship theory and practice*.
- Schumpeter, J. A. (1942). *Capitalism, socialism and democracy*. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers.
- Siegel, D. S., & Guerrero, M. (2021). The impact of quarantines, lockdowns, and ‘reopenings’ on the commercialization of science: micro and macro issues. *Journal of Management Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12692>.