

Determinantes de éxito y de fracaso en el desempeño innovador para la creación de empresas de base tecnológica en territorios de baja intensidad de I+D

Nombres y apellidos

Yazmín Patricia Jiménez Celín

Código estudiantil: 2017247988540

Tesis Doctoral presentada como requisito para optar el título de:
Doctor en Administración

Tutor(es):

Paola Amar Sepúlveda

Liney Manjarrés Henríquez

RESUMEN

El desempeño en innovación de las empresas de base tecnológica (EBT) es crucial para el desarrollo económico, especialmente en regiones con baja intensidad en investigación y desarrollo (I+D). Este estudio analiza los determinantes del éxito y el fracaso de estas empresas, centrándose en variables como el acceso al capital de riesgo, las redes de contactos, la infraestructura tecnológica, el apoyo político, el talento humano y las capacidades de

investigación a partir de la percepción de las empresas de base tecnológica que fueron muestra de la investigación. En este sentido, utilizando un enfoque cuantitativo y un modelo de ecuaciones estructurales (SEM), se valida un modelo que identifica las relaciones causales entre estos factores y el desempeño de innovación de las EBT. Los resultados revelan que el acceso al capital riesgo, las redes de contacto y la capacidad de investigación son los principales determinantes del éxito de la innovación. Estos hallazgos tienen implicaciones importantes para las políticas públicas y el diseño de estrategias que promuevan el emprendimiento innovador en regiones con recursos limitados de I+D.

Palabras clave: Empresas de base tecnológica (EBT); determinantes del éxito de la innovación; baja intensidad de I+D.

ABSTRACT

The innovation performance of technology-based firms (TBFs) is crucial for economic development, especially in regions with low research and development (R&D) intensity. This study analyzes the determinants of success and failure in these firms, focusing on variables such as access to venture capital, contact networks, technological infrastructure, political support, human talent, and research capabilities. Using a quantitative approach and structural equation modeling (SEM), a model is validated that identifies the causal relationships between these factors and the innovation performance of TBFs. The results reveal

that access to venture capital, contact networks, and research capacity are the main determinants of innovation success. These findings have important implications for public policies and the design of strategies that promote innovative entrepreneurship in regions with limited R&D resources.

KeyWords: Technology-Based Firms (TBFs); Determinants of innovation success;
Low R&D Intensity

REFERENCIAS BIBLIOGRÁFICAS

1. Acs, Z. J., Braunerhjelm, P., Audretsch, D. B., & Carlsson, B. (2009). The knowledge spillover theory of entrepreneurship. *Small Business Economics*, 32(1), 15–30. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-008-9157-3>
2. Álvarez, X. (2012). Factores de éxito de las pymes “caso comparativo entre Seimalsa y Calzado Confort.” *Res Non Verba*, 61–92.
3. Aminullah, E., Fizzanty, T., Indraprahasta, G. S., & Asmara, I. J. (2015). Technological convergence in Indonesian firms: cases of biobased chemical product innovation. *Asian Journal of Technology Innovation*, 23(August 2015), 9–25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19761597.2015.1011259>
4. Ahn, S.; Kim, K.-S.; Lee, K.-H. Technological Capabilities, Entrepreneurship and Innovation of Technology-Based Start-Ups: The Resource-Based View. *J. Open Innov. Technol. Mark. Complex.* 2022, 8, 156. <https://doi.org/10.3390/joitmc8030156>
5. Audretsch, David & Belitski, Maksim. (2021). Towards an entrepreneurial ecosystem typology for regional economic development: the role of creative class and entrepreneurship. *Regional Studies.* 55. 1-22. 10.1080/00343404.2020.1854711.
6. Audretsch, D., Colombelli, A., Grilli, L., Minola, T., & Rasmussen, E. (2020). Innovative start-ups and policy initiatives. *Research Policy*, 49(10), 104027. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2020.104027>
7. Barclay, D., Higgins, C., & Thompson, R. (1995). The partial least squares (PLS) approach to causal modeling: Personal computer adoption and use as an illustration. *Technology Studies*, 2(2), 285–309.
8. Bentler, P. M. (1990). Comparative fit indexes in structural models. *Psychological Bulletin*, 107(2), 238–246. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.107.2.238>
9. Bull, I., & Willard, G. E. (1993). Towards a theory of entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 8(3), 183–195. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0883-9026\(93\)90026-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0883-9026(93)90026-2)
10. Chin, W. W. (1998). The Partial Least Squares Approach to Structural Equation Modeling. In *Modern methods for business research* (Vol. 1, pp. 295–334).
11. City, Q., Amara, N., City, Q., Rherrad, I., & Laciak, B. (n.d.). *Paper ID : A 067 The determinants of university spin-offs : evidence from Canadian universities Key Words : University Spin-offs , Entrepreneurial vs . traditional university , Determinants of university spin-offs creation Abstract The aim of this paper i.*
12. Cocorullo, A. (2017). *University Fourth Mission . Spin-offs and Academic Entrepreneurship : a theoretical review through the variety of definitions.* April, 30–31.

13. Comrey, A. L., & Lee, H. B. (1992). A First Course in Factor Analysis. In *A First Course in Factor Analysis* (2nd ed., Vol. 1). Psychology Press. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315827506>
14. Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, *16*(3), 297–334. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02310555/METRICS>
15. Dash, G., & Paul, J. (2021). CB-SEM vs PLS-SEM methods for research in social sciences and technology forecasting. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, *173*, 121092. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.TECHFORE.2021.121092>
16. Di Gregorio, D., & Shane, S. (2003). Why do some universities generate more start-ups than others? *Research Policy*, *32*(2 SPEC.), 209–227. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0048-7333\(02\)00097-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0048-7333(02)00097-5)
17. Diamantopoulos, A., Sarstedt, M., Fuchs, C., Wilczynski, P., & Kaiser, S. (2012). Guidelines for choosing between multi-item and single-item scales for construct measurement: A predictive validity perspective. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, *40*(3), 434–449. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S11747-011-0300-3/FIGURES/4>
18. Diamantopoulos, A., & Winklhofer, H. (2001). Index construction with formative indicators: an alternative to scale development. *Market Res*, *38*(2), 269–277.
19. Dijkstra, T. K. (2010). Latent Variables and Indices: Herman Wold's Basic Design and Partial Least Squares. *Handbook of Partial Least Squares*, 23–46. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-32827-8_2
20. Dijkstra, T. K., & Henseler, J. (2015). Consistent partial least squares path modeling. *MIS Quarterly = Management Information Systems Quarterly*, *39*(2), 297–316.
21. Fabrigar, L. R., MacCallum, R. C., Wegener, D. T., & Strahan, E. J. (1999). Evaluating the use of exploratory factor analysis in psychological research. *Psychological Methods*, *4*(3), 272–299. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1082-989X.4.3.272>
22. Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating Structural Equation Models with Unobservable Variables and Measurement Error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *18*(1), 39. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3151312>
23. Fuster, E., Padilla-Meléndez, A., Lockett, N., & del-Águila-Obra, A. R. (2019). The emerging role of university spin-off companies in developing regional entrepreneurial university ecosystems: The case of Andalusia. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, *141*(July 2017), 219–231. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2018.10.020>

24. García, M. J. M., & Castro, A. M. P. (2017). La investigación en educación. *Notas Teórico-Metodológicas de Pesquisas Em Educação: Concepções e Trajetórias*, 13–40. <https://doi.org/10.7476/9788574554938.001>
25. Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. (1998). *Multivariate data analysis*. 1998. *Upper Saddle River*.
26. Hair, J. F., Black, W., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2014). *Multivariate Data Analysis* (7th ed.).
27. Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2017). *A Primer on Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM)*. Thousand Oaks. Sage, 165.
28. Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., Sarstedt, M., Danks, N. P., & Ray, S. (2021). *Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) Using R*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-80519-7>
29. Hair, J. F., Sarstedt, M., & Ringle, C. M. (2019). Rethinking some of the rethinking of partial least squares. *European Journal of Marketing*, 53(4), 566–584. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJM-10-2018-0665/FULL/XML>
30. Henseler, J. (2010). On the convergence of the partial least squares path modeling algorithm. *Springer*, 25, 107–120. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00180-009-0164-x>
31. Henseler, J., Hubona, G., & Ray, P. A. (2016). Using PLS path modeling in new technology research: Updated guidelines. *Industrial Management and Data Systems*, 116(1), 2–20. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IMDS-09-2015-0382>
32. Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2015). A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 43(1), 115–135. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S11747-014-0403-8/FIGURES/8>
33. Hoffmann, A. F., Stover, J. B., & Liporace, M. F. (n.d.). *CORRELACIONES POLICÓRICAS Y TETRACÓRICAS EN ESTUDIOS FACTORIALES EXPLORATORIOS Y CONFIRMATORIOS POLYCHORIC AND TETRACHORIC CORRELATIONS IN EXPLORATORY AND CONFIRMATORY FACTORIAL STUDIES*.
34. Ishibuchi, H., & Tanaka, H. (1990). Multiobjective programming in optimization of the interval objective function. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 48(2), 219–225. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0377-2217\(90\)90375-L](https://doi.org/10.1016/0377-2217(90)90375-L)
35. Jöreskog, K. G. (1971). Simultaneous factor analysis in several populations. *Psychometrika*, 36(4), 409–426. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02291366/METRICS>

36. Kaiser, H. F. (1974). An index of factorial simplicity. *Psychometrika*, 39(1), 31–36
<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02291575/METRICS>
37. Khojasteh, J. (2022). Review of An Introduction to Modern Modeling Methods. *https://Doi.Org/10.1080/10705511.2022.2087078*, 1–2.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10705511.2022.2087078>
38. Klofsten, M., & Jones, D. (2000). Comparing Academic Entrepreneurship in Europe. *Small Business Economics*, 14(4), 199–309.
39. Leonard, W. N. (1973). Research and Development in Industrial Growth: Reply. *Journal of Political Economy*, 81(5), 1249–1252. <https://doi.org/10.1086/260120>
40. Lohmöller, J.-B. (1989). Latent Variable Path Modeling with Partial Least Squares. *Latent Variable Path Modeling with Partial Least Squares*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-52512-4>
41. Mathisen, M. T., & Rasmussen, E. (2019). The development, growth, and performance of university spin-offs: a critical review. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 44(6), 1891–1938. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10961-018-09714-9>
42. McDonald, R. P. (1999). Test theory: A unified treatment. In *Test Theory: A Unified Treatment* (1st Edition, Vol. 1). Taylor and Francis. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410601087/TEST-THEORY-RODERICK-MCDONALD>
43. Merino Moreno, C., & Villar Mártil, L. (2007). Factores de éxito en los procesos de creación de empresas de base tecnológica. *Economía Industrial*, 366, 147–167.
44. Mooi, E., & Sarstedt, M. (2011). A Concise Guide to Market Research. *A Concise Guide to Market Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-12541-6>
45. Mustapha, N., & Kondlo, L. (2019). A new approach to R&D intensity classes illustrated on manufacturing industries in South Africa. *International Journal of Technological Learning, Innovation and Development*, 11(2), 97–118. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJTLID.2019.099224>
46. Navarro, J. C., Crespi, G., & Zuñiga, P. (2010). *Ciencia, Tecnología e Innovación en América Latina y el Caribe. Un compendio estadístico de indicadores División*. 115.
47. Newsom, J. T., Hachem, Z. A., Granger, A. M., & Denning, E. C. (2022). Where Did I Go Wrong with My Model? Ten Tips for Getting Results in SEM. *https://Doi.Org/10.1080/10705511.2022.2101113*, 1–10.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10705511.2022.2101113>
48. Nunnally, J. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2nd ed.).

49. Park, H., Park, J. H., Lee, S., & Hahn, H. (2021). A study on the impact of r&d intensity on business performance: evidence from south korea. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*, 7(2). <https://doi.org/10.3390/joitmc7020135>
50. Ramos, M., & Plata, W. (2015). Correlación policórica en el análisis de factores con variables ordinales. *Matemática*, 13(1), 27–42.
51. Ramos-Galarza, C. (2015). Investigación científica - Scientific research paradigms. *Av.Psicol.*, 23(1), 9–17.
52. Roberts, E. B., & Malone, D. E. (1996). Policies and structures for spinning off new companies from research and development organizations. *R and D Management*, 26(1), 17–48. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9310.1996.tb00927.x>
53. Rosseel, Y. (2012). Lavaan: An R package for structural equation modeling. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 48. <https://doi.org/10.18637/JSS.V048.I02>
54. Rotundo, G. J. Z. (2009). *Modelo Teórico Conceptual De La Estructura Organizativa*. 618–640.
55. Sánchez, A. R., Charry, G. P., & Burbano-Vallejo, E. L. (2024). Exploring the entrepreneurial landscape of university-industry collaboration on public university spin-off creation: A systematic literature review. *Heliyon*, 10(February), e27258. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e27258>
56. Shane, S., & Venkataraman, S. (2012). Reading for Lecture 2: Note As a the Promise of Entrepreneurship. *The Academy of Management Review*, 25(1), 217–226.
57. Shmueli, G., & Koppius, O. R. (2011). Predictive analytics in information systems research. *MIS Quarterly: Management Information Systems*, 35(3), 553–572. <https://doi.org/10.2307/23042796>
58. Smith, A., Ricardo, D., Weber, M., & Suárez, O. M. (2004). *Schumpeter, innovación y determinismo tecnológico*. 25, 209–213.
59. Song, M., Podoyntsyna, K., Bij, H., & Halman, J. I. M. (2008). Success Factors in New Ventures. *A MEta-Analzsis*, 25, 7–27. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5885.2007.00280.x>
60. Spigel, B. (2017). The Relational Organization of Entrepreneurial Ecosystems. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, 41(1), 49–72. <https://doi.org/10.1111/etap.12167>

61. Streiner, D. L. (2010). Starting at the Beginning: An Introduction to Coefficient Alpha and Internal Consistency. *https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327752JPA8001_18*, 80(1), 99–103. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327752JPA8001_18
62. Streukens, S., & Leroi-Werelds, S. (2016). Bootstrapping and PLS-SEM: A step-by-step guide to get more out of your bootstrap results. *European Management Journal*, 34(6), 618–632. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.EMJ.2016.06.003>
63. Szerb, László & Lafuente, Esteban & Horváth, Krisztina & Páger, Balázs. (2019). The relevance of quantity and quality entrepreneurship for regional performance: the moderating role of the entrepreneurial ecosystem. *Regional Studies*. 53. 1308-1320. 10.1080/00343404.2018.1510481.
64. Talero, J. (2020). Análisis de Causas del Éxito de Empresas de Base Tecnológica en Colombia. Monografía de Análisis de Experiencias. Escuela de Ciencias Administrativas, Contables, Económicas y de Negocios ECACEN. Universidad Nacional Abierta y a Distancia.
65. Tomy, S., & Pardede, E. (2018). From uncertainties to successful start ups: A data analytic approach to predict success in technological entrepreneurship. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 10(3). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su10030602>
66. Triono et al. (2021). Factors Affecting Start-up Performance: A Literature Review. Conference: 6th Global Conference on Business, Management, and Entrepreneurship (GCBME 2021). Enero 2022. DOI: [10.2991/aebmr.k.220701.097](https://doi.org/10.2991/aebmr.k.220701.097)
67. Ullman, J. B. (1996). Structural Equation Modeling. In *Using Multivariate Statistics* (3rd ed., pp. 709–819). Scientific Research Publishing.
68. Vesga, R. (n.d.). *2012 Emprendimiento e innovación en Colombia Qué nos está haciendo falta*. 1–16.
69. Vesga, R. (2009). Emprendimiento e Innovación en Colombia. *Universidad de Los Andes*, 1–16.
70. Vos Saz, A. (2013). *Creación, crecimiento y expansión internacional de las nuevas empresas: influencia del emprendedor y del equipo de emprendedores*.
71. Wetzels, M., Odekerken-Schröder, G., & Van Oppen, C. (2009). Using PLS path modeling for assessing hierarchical construct models: Guidelines and empirical illustration. *MIS Quarterly: Management Information Systems*, 33(1), 177–196. <https://doi.org/10.2307/20650284>
72. Williams, L. J., Vandenberg, R. J., & Edwards, J. R. (2009). 12 structural equation modeling in management research: a guide for improved analysis. *Academy of Management Annals*, 3(1), 543–604.

73. Wold, H. (1980). Model construction and evaluation when theoretical knowledge is scarce: Theory and application of partial least squares. In *Evaluation of econometric models* (pp. 47–74). Elsevier.
74. Rosa M. Yagüe-Perales., Isidre March-Chorda., Héctor López-Paredes (2024). Assessing the impact of seed accelerators in start-ups from emerging entrepreneurial ecosystems. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 20:1323–1345, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11365-024-00956-8>
75. Zemplerová, A., & Hromádková, E. (2012). Determinants of Firm's Innovation. *Prague Economic Papers*, 21(4), 487–503. <https://doi.org/10.18267/j.pep.436>
76. Ziaee Bigdeli, A., Li, F., & Shi, X. (2016). Sustainability and scalability of university spinouts: A business model perspective. *R and D Management*, 46(3), 504–518. <https://doi.org/10.1111/radm.12167>
77. Zumbo, B. D., Gadermann, A. M., & Zeisser, C. (2007). Ordinal Versions of Coefficients Alpha and Theta for Likert Rating Scales. *Journal of Modern Applied Statistical Methods*, 6(1), 4. <https://doi.org/10.22237/jmasm/1177992180>