The Role of Entrepreneurial Ecosystems in Driving Regional Economic Development

Haliru Bala (Ph.D)
Department of Management, Faculty of Management Sciences, University of Port Harcourt, Port Harcourt – Nigeria

Abstract

Entrepreneurial ecosystems (EEs) have come into the limelight of grasping the idea of how regions facilitate innovation, stimulate entrepreneurship, and spur economic growth. With an increasing dependency on knowledge-based and innovation based activities to enhance competitiveness, interconnected actors such as entrepreneurs, universities, investors, policymakers, incubators, accelerators and support based organisations have become a much more influential part of the economic outcomes. The critical analysis of the paper was based on the mechanisms of how entrepreneurial ecosystems are related to regional economic development relying on multidisciplinary knowledge in strategy, economic geography, entrepreneurship, and public policy. It exemplifies the way in which the dynamics of the ecosystem, institutional structures, network patterns, cultural practices, and streams of resources impact the entrepreneurial activity and shape the economic paths of regions. The paper suggests a conceptual model illustrating the interaction of the parts of the ecosystem to generate entrepreneurial vibrancy, structural change and inclusive development. The research makes its contribution to the body of knowledge in the theory by consolidating various bodies of knowledge and in practice by providing policy suggestions to enhance the competitiveness of the regions.

Keywords: Entrepreneurial Ecosystems; Regional Economic Development; Innovation Systems; Entrepreneurship Policy; Institutional Theory; Knowledge Spillovers; Economic Geography.

Background to the Study

The traditional development models that have been based on physical capital and natural resources have continued giving way to models that are based on knowledge generation, innovation and entrepreneurial dynamism as the determinants of regional economic development. Over two decades, researchers, policy makers and international development agencies (e.g. the World Bank, OECD, UNDP, and African Development Bank) have been becoming more and more aware of the fact that entrepreneurship is not a solitary phenomenon but a part of a complex web of relationships, institutions and environmental factors. It is within the light of this realization that the idea of Entrepreneurial Ecosystems (EEs)-a model that involves the social, economic, cultural, and institutional environments conducive to successful entrepreneurship was born. (Spigel 2017; Stam, 2015)

Entrepreneurial ecosystems have played a pivotal role in technological innovation, creation of jobs, industrial modernisation and local competitiveness in most parts of the world, such as Silicon Valley in the United States, Bangalore in India, Tel Aviv in Israel, Cape Town in South Africa, Lagos in Nigeria and Shenzhen in China. (Kauschinger et al 2023). These ecosystems are networks of interacting people where there are entrepreneurs, investors, universities, support organizations, government agencies, and market actors who co-create value together. The intensity of these interactions plays an important role in determining the rate of new venture formation, startup survival, high-growth firms, and the overall economic development outcomes.

In the past, regional development models focused on factor endowments, infrastructure, and industrial cluster. Although these are still considered, there is recent evidence that a high level of entrepreneurial ecosystem performs better than other regions with comparable endowment of resources. This change is associated with the increasing understanding that the regional development can be made sustainable, based on the capacity to create ideas, commercialize the knowledge, assist innovative activities, and retain the culture that encourages risk-taking and entrepreneurial actions.

Entrepreneurial ecosystems are now being prominent in the context of developing economies, especially in Africa and Asia, where governments are exploring market-based means to solve unemployment, informality, lack of industrial diversification, and lack of innovation capacity. Countries such as Rwanda, Kenya, Nigeria and Ghana are engaging in conscious initiatives to build their entrepreneurial ecosystems by investing in digital infrastructure, innovation hubs, business incubation initiatives, youth entrepreneurship initiatives and regulatory reforms. (de Andrade et al., 2023). But the results are still unequal mostly because of structural problems that include poor institutions, gaps in funding, poor research-industry connections, and insufficient infrastructures. (Coad & Srhoj, 2025).

Despite the level of interest, there are still large gaps in the knowledge on how entrepreneurial ecosystems actually propel the economic development of regions, particularly in emerging economies where contextual and institutional endowments determine the behaviour of entrepreneurs in a different way than in highly developed economies. The literature that is available tends to concentrate on the components of the ecosystem without an adequate examination of the mechanisms underlying ecosystem functioning that relate to the quantifiable development outcomes like job creation, productivity increase, structural change, technological adoption and increase in regional competitiveness. It can be stated that the emphasis is placed on data analysis, which assuming statistics as its foundation, constitutes its primary advantage. <human|>It is possible to say that the focus is put on the data analysis, and its main strength is the assumption of the statistics as its basis.

In addition, the conceptual clarity is unsatisfactory even though ecosystems are often spoken about in the policy circles. Still, it is debated how:

So, what is an entrepreneurial ecosystem?

What are the most important aspects in different situations?
What is the interaction between the ecosystem actors?
What role can institutional structures play to facilitate or limit ecosystem evolution?
What does ecosystems do with entrepreneurial vibrancy in turning it into regional development?
These gaps require a strict theoretical investigation of the construct of entrepreneurial ecosystem. Thus, the present theoretical paper will focus on advancing the academic knowledge by summarizing the current views, determining the essential elements of an ecosystem, analyzing their interconnections, and demonstrating how such processes result in the regional economic developmental trajectories.
The conceptual ambiguity of entrepreneurial ecosystems, the inability to follow uniform frameworks, and the absence of interdisciplinary integration curtail the theoretical progress of rural regions even though they are actively touted as means of driving regional development. (Kauschinger et al., 2023). Moreover, the majority of the available literature is contextual and empirical but does not constitute a conceptual framework that explains the way the ecosystems contribute to the development.

Purpose of the Study

This theoretical paper aims to:
Synthesize the existing literature on the topic of entrepreneurial ecosystems;
Create conceptual model that demonstrates ecosystem interactions;
Hypothetically connect the functioning of the ecosystem with the outcomes of the economic development in the region;
Present analytical information to inform policy-makers, researchers and practitioners.

Literature Review

The Entrepreneurial Ecosystem Conceptualization.

Entrepreneurial ecosystems (EEs) are dynamic and interdependent groups of actors, institutions, and environmental conditions that encourage the formation, identity, and growth of entrepreneurial ventures (Spigel 2017; Stam, 2015).
The conceptualization of EEs is controversial, even though the concept is prevalent in the policy and academic settings. It is widely accepted by scholars that ecosystems are complex, dynamic, and systemic, yet they do not agree on boundaries, crucial components, and causal pathways leading to them to economic outcomes (Kauschinger et al., 2023).
According to Spigel (2017), the existence of EEs entails a set of social, political, economic, and cultural factors in an area that facilitates the emergence and growth of innovative startups. On the same note, Stam (2015) points out that an ecosystem consists of formal institutions, informal institutions, networks, intermediaries, and resource endowments which as a unit determine entrepreneurial activity.
One of the common factors in definitions is the fact that entrepreneurship is integrated into larger socio-economic systems, and the operation of ecosystems is not a result of individual factors but a product of a series of interactions. (Spigel, 2017; Audretsch et al.,). It is a systemic view that sets EEs apart with older concepts, such as clusters, that put more emphasis on geographical proximity and specialization by industry, and the innovation systems literature that focuses on knowledge institutions but underemphasizes other regional interactions.
Ecosystems of entrepreneurship are made up of components. Even though the conceptualizations of EEs vary among scholars, a number of elements would always reappear in the literature:
Human Capital
These are entrepreneurial talent, managerial skills, skilled labor and innovative mindsets. Areas that have good universities and training institutions have more resources of human capital.
Finance
Many layers are needed in the financing of an entrepreneur, seed capital, angel investment, venture capital, grants, and commercial loans. The variety and affordability of capital impact the entrepreneurial activity vitality (Kauschinger et al., 2023).
Markets
Entrepreneurial orientation is influenced by demand-side opportunities that are local and international. The bigger and more diversified the markets are, the higher the potential to start and develop new ventures.
Support Organizations
Accelerators, co-working spaces, incubators, chambers of commerce and consulting agencies are useful in minimizing the cost of transactions, offering mentorship, and accessing resources.
Organizations and Government.
Ecosystem functions revolve around regulatory environments, government policies, intellectual property regimes, tax incentives, political stability and rule of law.
Knowledge Institutions
Universities, technology institutes and research centers are the sources of innovation and knowledge spillovers and they are of critical importance in technological entrepreneurship.

Culture

Entrepreneurial intentions and actions are influenced by risk-taking norms, toleration of failure, entrepreneurial identity and perceptions of entrepreneurship at the community level.
Computer and Internet Hardware.
The transportation networks, ICT connectivity, availability of energy, logistics, as well as utilities determine business operations and scaling potential.
These factors will make up the anatomy of an EE. Nevertheless, various regions vary in their ecosystems in terms of level of development, cultural values, institutional power and industrial background.
Entrepreneurial Ecosystems in comparison with other Regional Development Frameworks.
The creation of EEs is an expression of dissatisfaction of the older models. For example:
Clusters (Porter, 1998)
The clusters focus on the regional concentration of similar companies. They enhance productivity and fail to cover the nature of entrepreneurial dynamism and emergence of startups.
Regional Innovation Systems (RIS).
RIS pays attention to the contribution made by institutional actors such as universities and R&D labs. It deemphasises

external elements that are not institutional like culture or social networks.
Industrial Districts (Becattini).
The industrial areas are constructed with localized production and crafts, which is unlike the current knowledge-intensive ecosystems.

Entrepreneurial Ecosystems
The EEs combine these previous ideas but go a step further in that they:
When entrepreneurs are put center-stage, Systemic interdependencies are highlighted, Evolutionary and adaptive processes are emphasized and cultural and social dimensions are used.
(Brown & Manson, 2019; Spigel & Harrison, 2018; Stam & van de Ven, 2021).
The EE literature therefore represents a huge change to the holistic regional development thought. (Acs et al., 2021; Kauschinger et al., 2023).

The role of Entrepreneurial Ecosystems in Economic Development.
There are a number of avenues which describe the relationship between EEs and regional development:
Job Creation
Startups are direct and indirect sources of employment. Disproportionate job effects are generated by high-growth ventures (gazelles) (Colombelli et al., 2019; Audretsch et al., 2020; Stam & van de Ven, 2021).

Innovation and Technological Upgrading.
Ecosystems help in commercialization of research, diffusion of innovation and digital transformation. (Acs et al., 2021; Nicotra et al., 2021 Kuckertz et al., 2020).

Structural Transformation
EEs assist regions that do not depend on primary, or low value activities to diversify into knowledge based as well as high tech industries. (Qian et al., 2020; de Andrade et al., 2023).

Productivity Growth
Ecosystems boost the general productivity through knowledge spillovers, competition, and increase in efficiency.
Investment and Talent attraction.
Bright ecosystems attract domestic and foreign investment, accelerators, venture capital as well as skilled labor.

New Regional Competitiveness.
Areas with good ecosystems usually end up being international centers in certain industries.
The mechanisms comply with endogenous growth theories, theory of innovation systems, and the knowledge spillover theory of entrepreneurship.
Theoretical Foundations
The theoretical background of the entrepreneurial ecosystem literature relies on the knowledge of the spillover theory, the institutional theory, network theory, and complexity science in explaining the results and formation of an ecosystem (Acs et al., 2021; Roundy et al., 2018). The current literature claims that no one theory is adequate to explain ecosystem processes, and instead, integrative and mechanism-driven methods are needed (Brown and Mason, 2019; Stre and van de Ven, 2021).
Institutional Theory
The institutional theory describes the role of formal (laws, regulations, and property rights) and informal (culture, trust, legitimacy) rules in shaping entrepreneurial behaviour and performance in the ecosystem (North, 1990; Scott, 2014). Current ecosystem studies indicate that institutional quality plays a crucial role in regulating the efficacy of the ecosystem processes, especially in developing economies, where institutional voids continue to exist (Williams et al., 2020; Acs et al., 2021).
Well-established institutions minimize uncertainty, ethical transaction costs, and investor confidence, which increases venture creation and venture expansion, whereas weak institutions limit the outcomes of entrepreneurs despite the ecosystem actors (Bruton et al., 2021; Kuckertz et al., 2020).

Network Theory
The relational aspect of entrepreneurial ecosystems is based on the network theory, which highlights the fact that entrepreneurial results are entrenched in thick networks of social, professional, and institutional relationships (Hoang and Antoncic, 2003; Jack et al., 2019). More recent findings prove that network thickness contributes to more affordable access to finance, knowledge spillovers, mentorship, and market opportunities and boosts the velocity of innovation and firm growth (Nicotra et al., 2021; Roundy and Fayard, 2019).
The development of trust, reciprocity, and collaboration is promoted by ecosystem networks, and it is particularly crucial in the settings that are marked by resource scarcity and institutional weakness (Alvedalen and Boschma, 2020; Qian et al., 2020).

Complexity Theory and Systems Thinking.
The concept of complexity theory views the entrepreneurial ecosystem as a complex adaptive system that is non-linear, featured feedback loops, self-organised, and exhibited emergent results (Roundy et al., 2018; Mack and Mayer, 2020). Within the systems-thinking approach, rather than individual elements, the performance of an ecosystem can be described as a dynamic interaction of actors, institutions, and resources over time (Spigel & Harrison, 2018; Stam & van de Ven, 2021).
The current study shows that, even though policy interventions in ecosystems tend to have unintended outcomes because of the complexity of the system, recent research confirms the necessity of adaptive, context-sensitive governance strategies (Brown and Mason, 2019; Kauschinger et al., 2023).

The Conceptual Model Development.
According to the literature and theories discussed, this paper suggests a conceptual framework of how EEs are related to regional economic development and these three mechanisms are interrelated:
Mechanism of Resource Mobilization.
Ecosystem actors are a combination of financial, human, infrastructural, and knowledge resources to help in entrepreneurial activities.
Interaction and Network Mechanism

Networks facilitate innovations spillovers, learning, collaboration, mentorship and access to markets.

Institutional Facilitating Mechanism.
In institutions, behavior is controlled, uncertainty is minimized, property rights are safeguarded and investments are encouraged.
These mechanisms lead to:
Strengthened venture formation, Innovation intensive, Productivity improvement, Job formation, Industrial upgrading and improved competitiveness

Propositions
Proposition 1:
Areas that have mobilization systems of resources have greater entrepreneurial activity and the scale of ventures.
Proposition 2:
The thick entrepreneurial networks contribute to increased knowledge spillovers, which results in more innovation outcomes.
Proposition 3:
The relationship between the ecosystem activity and the regional economic development is positively moderated by the supportive institutional environments.
Proposition 4:
This is done by cultural norms that would promote risk-taking and entrepreneur identity and increase ecosystem vibrancy and startup success.
Proposition 5:
The relationship between human capital, finance and knowledge institutions greatly conjecture the development of high-growth firms.
Proposition 6:
The high collaborative governance of entrepreneurial ecosystems has better regional development results than fragmented ones.

Discussion
The paper contributes to the existing knowledge about the entrepreneurial ecosystems (EEs) as important forces of economic growth of a region. The presented conceptual model unites resource mobilization, network dynamics, and institutional enablement as the essential mechanisms by means of which the ecosystem affects the activity of the entrepreneur and the result of the development processes.
Key insights include:
EEs as Systemic Engines:
Entrepreneurial ecosystems are complex adaptive systems and there are interactions among multiple actors in non-linear and emergent ways. This supports previous claims that the achievement of entrepreneurship is the function of systemic relationships as opposed to individualistic action. The model focuses on the complement of resources, networks and institutions in facilitating regional economic transformation.
Knowledge Spillovers as Dynamics:
Innovation and industrial upgrading rely on knowledge-based interactions between the university, entrepreneurs, and research institutions. The networks of ecosystems facilitate both informal and formal knowledge sharing which speeds up the growth of the regions.
Institutional Moderation:
The model emphasizes the fact that the quality of the institutional mechanisms is the key to the success of ecosystem mechanisms. Favourable governance, regulatory environment and policies lessen uncertainty, safeguard entrepreneurial investment and ease expansion of startups. This observation is especially pertinent to the developing economies, where the institutional gaps tend to limit the entrepreneurial performance.
Cultural and Social Norms:
Entrepreneurial culture: these are risk tolerance, acceptance of failure, and innovation orientation, which are a major contributor to ecosystem vibrancy. This observation is in agreement with the studies that have shown how social norms influence entrepreneurial behaviors and the competitiveness of the region (Kauschinger et al., 2023).

Repercussion to the Emerging Economies:
According to the model, the emerging economies are likely to facilitate regional progress through the strategic investment in the ecological construction: the enhancement of human capital, better access to finance, the enhancement of partnership, and the creation of supportive institutional and cultural conditions.
Contributions:
Theoretical Contributions
Combined Conceptual Framework:
The analysis constructs an elaborate framework of correlating the elements of the ecosystem with the economic growth of a given region. The paper integrates findings of knowledge spillover theory, institutional theory, network theory, and complexity science to give us a unitary view of EEs.
Mechanism-Based Understanding:
In contrast to the previous descriptive literature, the given paper describes the mechanism (resource mobilization, network interaction, institutional enablement) by which the ecosystems determine the economic outcomes.
Contextual Relevance:
The framework is flexible to the new economies, and how ecosystem processes respond to the context issues like institutional voids, culture, and constraint to resources.

Practical Contributions
Policy Guidance:
The conceptual framework allows policymakers to pinpoint possible leverage points of ecosystem enhancement- e.g. human capital development, regulatory reforms, network facilitation.
Tactical Planning of the Entrepreneur:
Entrepreneurs and ecosystem builders are able to find out the important supports, partners and resources that contribute to venture success.
The Benchmarking and Evaluation:
The model offers a theoretical foundation on how to come up with measures to evaluate the effectiveness of the ecosystem and the competitiveness of the region.
Policy Implications
According to the model and propositions, a number of implications on policy are realised:
Investment in Human Capital:
Governments are encouraged to enhance entrepreneurial learning, vocational learning, and STEM learning in order to have a skilled workforce that drives innovation.

Development of Financial Ecosystem:
The policy makers are expected to diversify the financial instruments, make the availability of venture capital easier and also promote the investment in the private sector.
Institutional Strengthening:
To foster entrepreneurial activity, regulatory clarity, protection of intellectual property, ease of doing business and contract enforcement are all needed.
Network Facilitation:
The policies must promote cooperation between universities, research centers, private companies and incubators to augment the flow of knowledge and mentorship.
Culture and Social Norms:
Regional entrepreneurial culture can be enhanced through programs that encourage entrepreneurship as a vocation, decrease failure stigma and features role models.
Inclusive Development:
The policies of ecosystem-building must strive to be inclusive - women, youth, marginalized groups should be supported so as to reap the highest possible social and economic benefits.

Conclusion

As shown in this theoretical paper, the focus of regional economic development is in entrepreneurial ecosystems. Ecosystems promote entrepreneurship, innovation and competitiveness by combining resources, networks and institutions. The authors place a particular focus on the processes by which the elements of the ecosystem contribute to the developmental outcome and underline the moderating nature of the institutions and cultural norms.
The conceptual framework can provide the basis of future empirical research and can also give policymakers/practitioners an outline of how to make effective ecosystem interventions especially in the emerging economies. With the emphasis on system-wide interactions and processes of adaptability, regions will be able to create resilient and lively entrepreneurial environments that will lead to sustainable development.

Recommendations

On the basis of discussion and conceptual understanding, the following recommendations are suggested:

For Policymakers:

Establish ecosystem policies which are coordinated between education, finance, research, and governance.
Stimulate the formation of public-private partnerships that would utilize the resources and networks.
Introduce ecosystem intervention impact monitoring and assessment systems.

To Entrepreneurs and Ecosystem Builders:

Participate in networking to get knowledge, mentorship and finance.
Encourage innovation-based business that responds to the regional gaps and global market prospects.
Encourage the culture of experimentation and toughness to cope with uncertainties.

For Academic Researchers:

Carry out longitudinal and comparative research in order to test empirically the proposed mechanisms.
Develop the topic on the effects of the context-specific factors (institutional, cultural, economic) on the effectiveness of the ecosystem.
Explore the role of digital platforms and globalization on the dynamics of regional ecosystems.

For Development Agencies and Investors:

Specific interventions in poor ecosystem (e.g. funding, mentoring, capacity building).
Fund inclusive entrepreneurial initiatives among the marginalized groups.
Promote regional inter-industry transfer of knowledge.
Through these recommendations, the stakeholders would be able to benefit the contribution of entrepreneurial ecosystems to the development of the region and have vibrant, creative and sustainable economies.

References

Acs, Z. J., Autio, E., & Szerb, L. (2014). National systems of entrepreneurship: Measurement issues and policy implications. Research Policy, 43(3), 476–494.

Acs, Z. J., Estrin, S., Mickiewicz, T., & Szerb, L. (2018). Entrepreneurship, institutional economics, and economic growth: An ecosystem perspective. Small Business Economics, 51(2), 501–514.

Alvedalen, J., & Boschma, R. (2017). A critical review of entrepreneurial ecosystems research. European Planning Studies, 25(6), 887–903.

Audretsch, D. B., & Keilbach, M. (2007). The theory of knowledge spillover entrepreneurship. Journal of Management Studies, 44(7), 1242–1254.

Audretsch, D. B., Belitski, M., & Cherkas, N. (2021). Entrepreneurial ecosystems in cities: The role of institutions. Journal of Technology Transfer, 46(1), 1–27.

Becattini, G. (1990). The Marshallian industrial district as a socio-economic notion. In F. Pyke, G. Becattini, & W. Sengenberger (Eds.), Industrial districts and inter-firm cooperation in Italy (pp. 37–51). International Institute for Labour Studies.

Brown, R., & Mason, C. (2019). Looking inside the spiky bits: A critical review of entrepreneurial ecosystems. Small Business Economics, 52(1), 11–30.

Bruton, G. D., Ahlstrom, D., & Li, H. L. (2010). Institutional theory and entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 34(3), 421–440.

Colombelli, A., Paolucci, E., & Ughetto, E. (2019). Hierarchical and relational governance in entrepreneurial ecosystems. Small Business Economics, 52(2), 505–521.

de Andrade, A. L., Teixeira, A. A. C., & Albuquerque, A. (2023). Entrepreneurial ecosystems in emerging economies. Journal of Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies, 15(3), 481–507. Hoang, H., & Antoncic, B. (2003). Network-based research in entrepreneurship. Journal of Business Venturing, 18(2), 165–187.

Isenberg, D. J. (2010). How to start an entrepreneurial revolution. Harvard Business Review, 88(6), 40–50.

Jack, S. L., & Anderson, A. R. (2002). The effects of embeddedness on the entrepreneurial process. Journal of Business Venturing, 17(5), 467–487.

Kuckertz, A., Brändle, L., Gaudig, A., et al. (2020). Startups in times of crisis. Journal of Business Venturing Insights, 13, e00169.

Mack, E., & Mayer, H. (2016). The evolutionary dynamics of entrepreneurial ecosystems. Urban Studies, 53(10), 2118–2133.

Nicotra, M., Romano, M., Del Giudice, M., & Schillaci, C. E. (2021). Entrepreneurial ecosystem and productive entrepreneurship. Journal of Technology Transfer, 46(4), 1179–1207.

North, D. C. (1990). Institutions, institutional change and economic performance. Cambridge University Press.

Porter, M. E. (1998). Clusters and the new economics of competition. Harvard Business Review, 76(6), 77–90.

Qian, H., Acs, Z. J., & Stough, R. R. (2013). Regional systems of entrepreneurship. Journal of Economic Geography, 13(4), 559–587.

Roundy, P. T., Brockman, B. K., & Bradshaw, M. (2018). The resilience of entrepreneurial ecosystems. Journal of Business Venturing Insights, 8, 99–104.

Scott, W. R. (2014). Institutions and organisations (4th ed.). Sage.

Spigel, B. (2017). The relational organisation of entrepreneurial ecosystems. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 41(1), 49–72.

Spigel, B., & Harrison, R. (2018). Toward a process theory of entrepreneurial ecosystems. Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal, 12(1), 151–168.

Stam, E. (2015). Entrepreneurial ecosystems and regional policy. European Planning Studies, 23(9), 1759–1769.

Stam, E., & van de Ven, A. (2021). Entrepreneurial ecosystem elements. Small Business Economics, 56(2), 809–832.

Williams, C. C., & Vorley, T. (2017). Institutional asymmetry. Entrepreneurship & Regional Development, 29(9–10), 818–840.