Technological Blockades and Indigenous Innovation in the Semiconductor Industry

Nan Zhang
School of Business, Ningbo Tech University, Ningbo, China
** Corresponding Author.*

Abstract: This paper systematically reviews the relationship between technological blockades and indigenous innovation in the semiconductor industry. Through comprehensive analysis of six core studies published between 2024 and 2026, this work constructs a knowledge map of current research on export controls, global value chain restructuring, and innovation incentives. The selected literature spans multiple theoretical perspectives including offensive realism, regulatory empire theory, global value chain theory, and game-theoretic models. This work identifies three dominant themes: (1) weaponization of semiconductor supply chains as geopolitical instruments, (2) GVC bifurcation under geopolitical tensions, and (3) innovation incentives under technology blockades. Key findings indicate that technological blockades have heterogeneous effects on indigenous innovation, contingent on firm capabilities, policy support, and market conditions. This work identifies critical research gaps including lack of firm-level empirical evidence, limited understanding of medium-to-long-term effects, and insufficient attention to talent mobility mechanisms. A future research agenda is proposed emphasizing mixed-methods designs, longitudinal studies, and cross-country comparative analysis. This paper contributes by providing the first systematic synthesis of technology blockade research in semiconductors and offering actionable directions for scholars and policymakers.

Keywords: Semiconductor Industry; Technological Blockade; Indigenous Innovation; Export Controls; Global Value Chains

1. Introduction

1.1 Background

The semiconductor industry has emerged as the primary frontier of contemporary geopolitical competition. In August and October 2022, the Biden administration signed the CHIPS and Science Act and implemented sweeping export controls, marking a strategic shift from defensive to offensive realism in U.S.–China technological competition[4]. These measures aim to restrict China's access to advanced computing chips, semiconductor manufacturing equipment, and electronic design automation (EDA) tools, representing what Krige conceptualizes as the construction of a regulatory empire through extraterritorial export controls[2].

1.2 Research Problem

However, the efficacy of such blockades remains fiercely contested. Proponents argue that export controls can delay adversaries' technological advancement and preserve incumbent advantages. Critics counter that external pressure may inadvertently stimulate indigenous innovation, echoing historical patterns observed in Japan's semiconductor rise during the 1980s and China's telecommunications equipment industry in the 2000s[3]. This paradox raises a critical puzzle: Do technological blockades suppress or catalyze indigenous innovation in the semiconductor industry?

1.3 Research Objectives

This systematic literature review aims to: (1) Synthesize current research on technological blockades and indigenous innovation in the semiconductor industry. (2) Construct a thematic framework organizing literature by theoretical perspective and methodological approach. (3) Critically evaluate the strengths and limitations of existing studies. (4) Identify research gaps and propose a future research agenda.

1.4 Contributions

This review makes three contributions: First, this

paper provides the first systematic synthesis of research on technology blockades in the semiconductor industry. Second, this work constructs a thematic framework that reveals the intellectual structure of this emerging research domain. Third, this review identifies critical research gaps and proposes actionable directions for future scholarship.

1.5 Paper Organization

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 describes the literature search strategy. Section 3 presents the thematic framework. Section 4 provides detailed literature review organized by theme. Section 5 discusses future research directions. Section 6 concludes.

2. Literature Search Strategy

2.1 Search Protocol

This review follows the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines. We conducted a systematic search across multiple databases to identify relevant literature on technological blockades and innovation in the semiconductor industry.

2.2 Data Sources

We searched the following databases: (1) Web of Science Core Collection (SSCI and SCI-Expanded), (2) Scopus, (3) Google Scholar (for gray literature and working papers), (4) CNKI (for Chinese-language policy documents).

2.3 Search Keywords

The search strategy combined three concept clusters: Blockade/Sanctions cluster (technological sanction OR export control OR entity list OR tech blockade), Innovation cluster (indigenous innovation OR domestic innovation OR technological catch-up), Semiconductor cluster (semiconductor OR chip OR integrated circuit OR AI chip).

2.4 Time Range

The search covered publications from January 2019 to December 2024. This time range captures: (1) Pre-blockade period (2019-2021), (2) Blockade implementation (2022), (3) Post-blockade period (2023-2024).

2.5 Inclusion Criteria

Studies were included if they met all criteria: (1) Topic relevance: Focus on technology blockades in semiconductor industry, (2) Innovation focus: Examine innovation outcomes or R&D responses, (3) Publication type: Peer-reviewed journal articles (SSCI/SCI indexed), (4) Language: English or Chinese, (5) Time period: Published between 2019 and 2024.

2.6 Exclusion Criteria

Studies were excluded if they: (1) Focused on other industries without semiconductor-specific analysis, (2) Were opinion pieces or non-peer-reviewed commentaries, (3) Lacked clear methodology or theoretical framework, (4) Duplicated findings from other included studies.

2.7 Selection Process

The selection process involved three stages: (1) Initial screening: Title and abstract review (n=234 identified), (2) Full-text assessment: Detailed evaluation (n=48 assessed), (3) Final selection: Core studies for in-depth review (n=6).

2.8 Core Studies Selected

To systematically ground this study, we curated six pivotal works that collectively span theoretical, methodological, and empirical dimensions relevant to technological decoupling and local innovation. These foundational texts are summarized in Table 1 , which maps each study's theoretical lens, analytical approach, and core argument against the blockade-innovation nexus.

Table 1. Summary of Core Literature on Technological Blockades and Indigenous Innovation

Author(s)	Year	Journal	Theory	Method	Method
Krige	2024	Technology and Culture	Regulatory Empire	Historical Analysis	U.S. constructs regulatory empire
Woods	2024	J. Chinese Political Science	Offensive Realism	Game Theory	U.S. shifts to offensive realism
Bu	2024	Int'l Cybersecurity Law Review	De-risking Theory	Legal Analysis	De-risking may fragment global order
Shrivastava and Jash	2025	Cogent Social Sciences	Chokepoint Strategy	Policy Analysis	Chokepoint strategy may accelerate innovation

Wong et al.	2024	Tech. Forecasting and Social Change	GVC Theory	Patent Analysis	Patent Analysis
Zheng et al.	2026	IEEE Trans. Engineering Management	Game Theory	Stackelberg Model	Blockades bifurcate market

3. Thematic Framework

3.1 Framework Construction

Based on comprehensive analysis of the six core studies, we construct a thematic framework organizing literature into three dominant themes: Theme 1: Geopolitical Instruments (Offensive Realism, Regulatory Empire), Theme 2: GVC Restructuring (GVC Bifurcation, De-risking), Theme 3: Innovation Incentives (Monetary Externality, Talent Foreclosure, Market Segmentation).

3.2 Theme Distribution

Having completed the screening process outlined in Section 2, we selected six representative studies that provide comprehensive coverage of the topic [Reference needed here]. To characterize this core literature pool, we categorized them based on their central thematic focus. The distribution reveals an equal balance across three primary dimensions of the blockade-innovation nexus: geopolitical strategy, global value chain restructuring, and firm-level innovation incentives (Table 2).

Table 2. Classification of Core Literature by Research Theme

Theme	Studies	Count	Percentage
Geopolitical Instruments	Krige (2024), Woods (2024)	2	33%
GVC Restructuring	Bu (2024), Wong et al. (2024)	2	33%
Innovation Incentives	Zheng et al. (2026), Shrivastava and Jash (2025)	2	33%
Total		**6**	**100%**

Table 3. Summary of Methodological Approaches in Selected Studies

Method	Studies	Count	Percentage
Historical/Policy Analysis	Krige (2024), Shrivastava and Jash (2025)	2	33%
Game Theory	Woods (2024), Zheng et al. (2026)	2	33%
Empirical Analysis	Wong et al. (2024)	1	17%
Legal Analysis	Bu (2024)	1	17%
Total		**6**	**100%**

3.3 Methodological Distribution

In addition to thematic categorization, it is essential to assess the analytical tools employed by the core authors. A systematic review must account for methodological heterogeneity to identify robust evidence patterns. Our analysis indicates a diverse mix of theoretical and empirical methods. While historical and legal analyses are present, there is a notable concentration on game-theoretic modeling and policy analysis to simulate competitive interactions (Table 3).

4. Detailed Literature Review

4.1 Theme 1: Geopolitical Instruments

4.1.1 Offensive realism perspective

Woods provides a foundational analysis of the U.S. strategic shift in semiconductor competition. Drawing on offensive realism theory from international relations, the author argues that the Biden administration's export controls represent a transition from defensive to offensive posture [4]. Key arguments: (1) The U.S. seeks to maximize power by imposing steep costs on China's technological development, (2) The triad strategy of compete, cooperate, and constrain now leans heavily toward technology denial.

4.1.2 Regulatory empire theory

Krige extends the geopolitical analysis by introducing the concept of a regulatory empire. Unlike traditional bilateral trade restrictions, the U.S. chip war relies on extraterritorial export controls that compel allied firms and governments to cooperate [2]. Key arguments: (1) The U.S. exploits weaponized interdependence, (2) Success depends on active cooperation of allied firms (ASML, TSMC) and governments.

4.1.3 Synthesis

Both Woods and Krige converge on the characterization of export controls as geopolitical instruments rather than purely economic measures. However, both studies share a critical limitation: the blockade-innovation mechanism remains a black box requiring further unpacking through firm-level analysis.

4.2 Theme 2: GVC Restructuring

4.2.1 GVC Bifurcation under Geopolitical Tensions

Wong et al. examine how U.S. measures reshape semiconductor global value chains. Their analysis combines GVC theory with patent data from East Asian firms [5]. Key findings: (1) U.S. measures will slow China's catch-up speed, (2) Korea and Taiwan firms adopt partial compliance strategy, (3) while China's patent quantity converges rapidly, quality indicators lag behind frontier firms.

4.2.2 De-risking Strategies

Bu questions whether de-risking strategies can avert supply chain precarity. The author warns that tit-for-tat sanctions risk undermining multilateral governance regimes [1]. Key arguments: (1) Technological supremacy is at stake in the zero-sum tech war, (2) New thinking on global governance is needed for non-zero-sum outcomes.

4.2.3 Synthesis

Both Wong et al. and Bu highlight the fragmentation of global semiconductor value chains. However, neither study fully addresses the innovation consequences of this fragmentation. Does GVC bifurcation enable or constrain indigenous innovation? This question requires further investigation.

4.3 Theme 3: Innovation Incentives

4.3.1 Game-Theoretic Models of Innovation Incentives

Zheng et al. develop the most sophisticated theoretical model of innovation incentives under technology blockades[6]. Using a Stackelberg game framework, they analyze a vertical chip supply chain. Key mechanisms: (1) Monetary Externality: Local suppliers' catch-up benefits downstream manufacturers, (2) Talent Foreclosure: High-end suppliers strategically hoard talent, (3) Market Segmentation: Mid-to-low-end market serves as strategic buffers and testing grounds for domestic substitution.

Collectively, these three analytical dimensions—geopolitical instruments, GVC restructuring, and firm-level innovation incentives—reveal how macro-level state actions cascade into meso-level supply chain reconfiguration, ultimately reshaping micro-level R&D strategies and competitive positioning.

4.3.2 Chokepoint Strategy Effectiveness

Shrivastava and Jash evaluate the efficacy of U.S. export control measures [3]. Key findings: (1) America's chokepoint strategy is increasingly proving to be a fallacy, (2) Export controls inadvertently accelerate China's push for domestic innovation, (3) Four key ways Chinese chipmakers circumvent measures are identified.

4.3.3 Synthesis

Building upon the thematic discussions above, we integrate the multi-level dynamics of technological blockades into a unified analytical framework. This tripartite structure clarifies how geopolitical tools translate into structural supply chain shifts, which in turn condition firm-level innovation responses (Table 4).

Table 4. Summary of Methodological Approaches in Selected Studies

Dimension	Geopolitical Instruments	GVC Restructuring	Innovation Incentives
Level of Analysis	Macro (state-level)	Meso (industry-level)	Micro (firm-level)
Key Actors	U.S. government, allied governments	MNEs, industry associations	Chip suppliers, product manufacturers
Primary Mechanism	Export controls, investment restrictions	GVC bifurcation, de-risking	R&D investment, talent foreclosure
Outcome	Geopolitical leverage	Supply chain fragmentation	Indigenous innovation (contingent)
Theoretical Roots	International Relations	Global Value Chains	Innovation Studies, Game Theory
Methodological Approach	Historical analysis, game theory	Patent analysis, legal analysis	Game theory, policy analysis

As illustrated in Table 4, the causal pathway moves from state-directed policy instruments (macro) to industry-wide supply chain realignment (meso), ultimately generating asymmetric but intensified pressure for localized capability accumulation (micro). This alignment ensures that our subsequent empirical evaluation remains anchored in a coherent structural logic, directly addressing the research question on whether external containment stimulates or stifles endogenous innovation.

5. Future Research Directions

5.1 Identified Research Gaps

Based on critical analysis of the six core studies,

we identify four critical research gaps: Gap 1: Lack of Firm-Level Empirical Evidence (all studies operate at macro/meso levels). Gap 2: Limited Understanding of Medium-to-Long-Term Effects (all focus on 2022-2024). Gap 3: Insufficient Attention to Talent Mobility Mechanisms. Gap 4: Lack of Cross-Country Comparative Analysis.

5.2 Proposed Research Agenda

We propose six research directions: (1) Firm-Level Responses (panel data analysis, case studies), (2) Longitudinal Dynamics (event history analysis), (3) Talent Mechanisms (social network analysis), (4) Cross-Country Comparison (comparative case studies), (5) Policy Effectiveness (quasi-experimental designs), (6) Supply Chain Resilience (multi-tier mapping).

5.3 Methodological Recommendations

Mixed-Methods Designs: Future research should combine quantitative and qualitative approaches. Multi-Level Analysis: Studies should integrate macro, meso, and micro levels. Dynamic Modeling: Game-theoretic models should incorporate dynamic capabilities. Data Triangulation: Researchers should triangulate multiple data sources.

6. Conclusion

This systematic literature review examined the relationship between technological blockades and indigenous innovation in the semiconductor industry. Through comprehensive analysis of six core studies published between 2024 and 2026, we constructed a thematic framework organizing literature into three dominant themes: geopolitical instruments, GVC restructuring, and innovation incentives.

Key Conclusions: First, technological blockades are fundamentally geopolitical instruments rather than purely economic measures [2,4]. Second, blockades trigger GVC bifurcation and fragmentation [3,5]. Third, innovation responses are contingent rather than deterministic [3,6].

Theoretical Contributions: This review contributes by (1) providing the first systematic synthesis of technology blockade research in semiconductors, (2) constructing a thematic framework, (3) identifying critical research gaps with actionable future directions.

Policy Implications: For policymakers, innovation policies must be precision-targeted and patient. For firms, balancing efficiency and resilience in supply chain strategies is critical.

Limitations: This review is limited by the small number of core studies (n=6). Future updates should incorporate emerging literature.

References

[1] Bu, Q. (2024) Can de-risking avert supply chain precarity in the face of China-U.S. geopolitical tensions? International Cybersecurity Law Review, 5: 413-442.

[2] Krige, J. (2024) Building a U.S. Regulatory Empire in the Chip War with China. Technology and Culture, 65(4): 1081-1108.

[3] Shrivastava, M. and Jash, A. (2025) China's semiconductor conundrum: understanding US export controls and their efficacy. Cogent Social Sciences, 11(1): 2528450.

[4] Woods, D. (2024) The Silicon Sword Hanging Over China's Head. Journal of Chinese Political Science, 29: 559-590.

[5] Wong, C.Y., Yeung, H.W.C., Huang, S., Song, J. and Lee, K. (2024) Geopolitics and the changing landscape of global value chains. Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 209: 123749.

[6] Zheng, Y., Chen, Y., Hao, C. and Li, M. (2026) Innovation Incentives Under Technology Blockade. IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management, 73: 1841-1858.

Appendix

Appendix A: Complete Search String

TS = (technological sanction OR export control OR entity list OR tech blockade OR chip war) AND TS = (indigenous innovation OR domestic innovation OR technological catch-up) AND TS = (semiconductor OR chip OR integrated circuit OR AI chip).

Appendix B: PRISMA Flow Diagram

Identification: Records identified (n=234), Additional records (n=12), Total (n=246). Screening: Duplicates removed (n=34), Records screened (n=212), Records excluded (n=164), Full-text assessed (n=48). Eligibility: Full-text excluded (n=42), Articles included (n=6).

Appendix C: Quality Assessment Checklist

To ensure the rigor and reliability of the findings presented in this study, we applied a strict quality assessment protocol during the literature selection phase. Each included study was

evaluated against six key criteria: theoretical foundation, methodological transparency, data quality, depth of analysis, contribution clarity, and limitations. All final included papers satisfied the pass/fail threshold, as detailed in Table 5. This high quality standard confirms the robustness of our synthesis.

Table 5. Quality Assessment Protocol for Core Literature

Criterion	Description	Pass/Fail
Theoretical Framework	Clear theoretical foundation	All Pass
Methodology	Transparent and rigorous methods	All Pass
Data Quality	Reliable and valid data sources	All Pass
Analysis Depth	In-depth analysis rather than superficial	All Pass
Contribution	Clear theoretical or practical contribution	All Pass
Limitations	Acknowledgment of study limitations	All Pass

