

A Model for Eco Control Based On Institutional Entrepreneurial Approach

Hossein. Rahman Seresht¹, Zahra. Amini^{2*}, Mehdi. Ebrahimi³, Khalil N. Shahram⁴

¹ Professor, Faculty of Management and Accounting, Allame Tabatabaee University, Tehran, Iran

² PhD Student of Business Policy Management, Allame Tabatabaee University, Tehran, Iran

³ Associate Professor, Faculty of Management and Accounting, Allame Tabatabaee University, Tehran, Iran

⁴ Assistant Professor, Faculty of Management and Accounting, Allame Tabatabaee University, Tehran, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: z_amani@atu.ac.ir

Article Info

Article type:

Original Research

How to cite this article:

Rahman Seresht, H., Amini, Z., Ebrahimi, M., & Shahram, K. N. (2025). A Model for Eco Control Based On Institutional Entrepreneurial Approach. *Quarterly Journal of Research and Planning in Higher Education*, 31(2), 83-110.



© 2025 the authors. Published by Institute for Research and Planning in Higher Education (IRPHE), Tehran, Iran. This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) License.

ABSTRACT

The paramount role of management schools in driving productivity and fostering economic growth as well as in order to maintain their position and resilience underscores the critical need for management schools to effectively address the expectations of stakeholders within their ecosystem. This necessitates the establishment of a systematic relationship between management schools and ecosystem. This study aims to present a model, termed the ecocontrol system model, for establishing such a systematic relationship. Employing a mixed exploratory research approach, the qualitative phase involved semi-structured interviews with ten experts and ecosystem stakeholders, facilitating the extraction of model factors through hybrid thematic analysis. Subsequently, the quantitative phase utilized interpretive structural modeling, informed by pairwise comparison questionnaires from five qualitative participants, to determine factor relationships. The results reveal that the systematic relationship between schools and the ecosystem hinges upon organizational governance mechanisms, environmental scanning, stakeholder management, and the faculty's social responsibility contract, with implementation entrusted to institutional entrepreneurs. This research addresses a significant gap by offering a cohesive model for systematically fostering stakeholder expectations and enhancing the resilience of management faculties, a topic largely overlooked in prior domestic and international research efforts.

Keywords: systematic relationship, management schools, eco control, ecosystem, institutional entrepreneurs.



Introduction

Researchers argue that the sustained growth of world-class universities plays a pivotal role in economic development (Thoenig & Paradeise, 2016). Management faculties are considered central to a university's strategic capabilities, as they embody the importance and role of "management" as a form of technology, crucial for enhancing productivity and fostering economic growth (Bloom & Van Reenen, 2010). Moreover as organizations, management schools must adapt to their specific environments to maintain their position and legitimacy. They must cater to the needs of society through their core activities such as education, research, and consulting. These activities engage various stakeholders, including users of accounting, financial and crisis management services, forming an ecosystem around the faculty. The faculty's output must be responsive to these stakeholders' needs to garner support, resources, and legitimacy. Currently, management faculties in our country respond to environmental challenges sporadically, which undermines their resilience and poses challenges such as financial resource scarcity despite their resource-absorbing capacity. Aligning the faculty's activities with addressing environmental problems and meeting stakeholders' needs systematically could bolster its resilience and enhance its societal responsibility. The effectiveness of this alignment can be gauged by the quantity and quality of the faculty's systematic response to stakeholder demands, making its output more attuned to environmental needs. This prompts questions about establishing a systematic relationship between the Faculty of Management and its ecosystem. What methods and mechanisms could facilitate this relationship? Which factors facilitate such a relationship? Additionally, which approach offers a more realistic understanding of ecosystem relationships and interactions?

Among the limited research conducted on the ecosystem of management faculties, Carton et al.'s study (2018) stands out. This indigenous model encompasses a range of the faculty's key resources and specialized executive programs aimed at enhancing the global brand of the management faculty. However, one of the criticisms of this model is not considering the faculty of management in the centrality of the ecosystem and its relationship with the stakeholders conceptually and operationally. An analysis of internal researches further reveals that while general strategies for bridging the gap between universities and industries are discussed, none address the operational mechanisms necessary for establishing systematic connections. Noteworthy mechanisms identified in this research include corporate governance, stakeholders management, environmental scanning and faculty social responsibility contracting. Corporate governance, rooted in stakeholder theory, renders the management faculty accountable to all stakeholders (Washburn et al., 2018). Through stakeholders management, the Faculty of Management can cultivate positive and constructive relationships with ecosystem stakeholders, integrating their expectations into its strategies and activities (Habisch et al., 2011). Environmental scanning enables the faculty to gain a comprehensive understanding of environmental issues and challenges, facilitating the design and implementation of appropriate solutions. Meanwhile, the mechanism of social responsibility contracting incentivizes individuals responsible for implementing solutions to environmental needs, ensuring their effective implementation. Institutional entrepreneurs are distinguished from other agents according to the indicators of agency, power and interests (Arroyo, 2012).

In the model of the systematic relationship between the faculty and the ecosystem (ecocontrol system model), the needs of the stakeholders of the ecosystem are understood and calculated through the examination of the tasks of the faculty from the perspective of the users of its products and services (industry, government, knowledge base, NGO, management consulting, society). This leads to the identification of areas in which it is expected that the faculty of management will be active, and in other words, the ecosystem in those areas will monitor the faculty and control those actions.

Methodology

This research is pragmatic in its objectives and was conducted using a mixed exploratory approach. The qualitative stage employed a hybrid thematic analysis method (deductive-inductive) to identify the dimensions and components of the faculty's systematic connections pattern with the ecosystem. In the quantitative stage, the interpretive structural modeling method was utilized to discern the relationships between these components. The research population comprised ecosystem experts (institutional, business, etc.), sociology theorists, and select representatives of the faculty's stakeholders possessing adequate knowledge and experience in the field. Sampling was conducted using purposeful and snowball methods, with interviews conducted with 10 individuals, achieving theoretical saturation. Initially, essential points from the interviews were extracted

through inductive method. In the following, we refer to the table prepared based on the components of the theoretical model of the research for deductive analysis, and the coding of the important points of the interviews is done according to it. In addition, in each interview, new points are raised that do not fit into any of the dimensions and indicators of the deductive coding table. Clark and Brown (2021) inductive thematic analysis method is used to code these points. After determining the factors and elements of the systematic relationship, interpretive structural modeling (Attri et al, 2013) and paired comparisons questionnaire tool are used to determine the precedence and delay of the model elements, and Python software is used for analysis.

Findings

The hybrid thematic analysis yields the depiction of the thematic network comprising elements and components of the ecocontrol system model, categorized into primary, organizing, and inclusive themes (Attride-Stirling, 2001). This study has extracted three theme networks: the theme network delineating the responsibilities of the Faculty of Management from the perspective of ecosystem stakeholders, the theme network outlining the systematic linkage mechanisms between the Faculty of Management and the ecosystem, and the theme network encompassing resilience, eco-control, institutional entrepreneurship, and the fields of activity of the Faculty of Management. Following the identification of model elements and dimensions, the next step involves determining the relationships between concepts or main categories. Interpretive structural modeling (Attri et al., 2013) is employed for this purpose, comprising steps: forming the structural self-interaction matrix, creating the initial reachability matrix, developing the final reachability matrix, and determining the level of factors. Subsequently, the interpretive structural model of this research can be delineated based on relationships and factor levels. Factors are arranged based on their levels, from top to bottom. To ascertain the direction of relationships, attention is paid to their effectiveness, with relationships emanating from factors influencing others and directed towards factors being influenced. Finally, factors can be classified in terms of influence and dependence through MikMak analysis.

Conclusion

In the ecocontrol model, the solutions provided by the faculty to respond to the needs of the stakeholders, lead to the production of value for the ecosystem, which is called "creating shared value" (Porter & Kramer, 2011) and is a sum of economic and social value. Its economic aspect will lead to earning income and attracting financial resources, and its social aspect will also lead to the realization of the social responsibility of the faculty towards the stakeholders. Based on the output of the final model, at the eighth level the factors "government duties towards the ecosystem" and "institutional entrepreneur", at the seventh level "organizational governance mechanism", at the sixth level "environmental scanning", at the fifth level "stakeholder management" and "Social responsibility contracting", in the fourth level, the factor "faculty duties from the society's point of view", in the third level, "faculty duties from the perspective of ecosystem stakeholders, including the government, industry, NGOs, knowledge-based institutions, management consulting institutions". In the second level "ecocontrol" in the first level "activity areas" and resilience of the management faculty are placed. For resilience, the Faculty of Management needs to focus on a central solution in the form of searching for solutions to respond to the needs and expectations of the stakeholders of the ecosystem within its mission.

References

- Adams, C. A., Heijltjes, M. G., Jack, G., Marjoribanks, T., & Powell, M. (2011). The development of leaders able to respond to climate change and sustainability challenges: The role of business schools. *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal*, 2(1), 165-171. <https://doi.org/10.1108/20408021111162191>
- Adner, R., & Kapoor, R. (2016). Innovation ecosystems and the pace of substitution: Re-examining technology S-curves. *Strategic Management Journal*, 37(4), 625-648. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.2363>
- Alvani, S. M. (2016). *public Management*. Ney Publishing.
- Alvesson, M., & Spicer, A. (2019). Neo-institutional theory and organization studies: a mid-life crisis? *Organization Studies*, 40(2), 199-218. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840618772610>
- Ankrah, S., & Omar, A. T. (2015). Universities-industry collaboration: A systematic review. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 31(3), 387-408. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scaman.2015.02.003>

- Annarelli, A., & Nonino, F. (2016). Strategic and operational management of organizational resilience: Current state of research and future directions. *Omega*, 62, 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.omega.2015.08.004>
- Arroyo, P. (2012). Management accounting change and sustainability: an institutional approach. *Journal of Accounting & Organizational Change*, 8(3), 286-309. <https://doi.org/10.1108/18325911211258317>
- Arroyo, P. (2013). *Eco-control and the process of institutionalization of sustainable business campuses in Quebec*. HEC Montreal (Canada). <https://search.proquest.com/openview/853f99af84badcb46d32a49b4d654d84/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750>
- Ashrieh. (2016). *meta-analysis of the link between industry and university* (Vol. 9). Journal of Industry and University.
- Attri, R., Dev, N., & Sharma, V. (2013). *Interpretive structural modelling (ISM) approach: an overview* (Vol. 2319). Research journal of management sciences. <https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Mohamed-Mourad-Lafifi/post/What-is-the-need-to-incorporate-transitivity-in-ISM/attachment/59d63a0679197b8077997374/AS%3A404328411090949%401473410813877/download/Interpretive+Structural+Modelling+%28ISM%29+approach+On+Overview+2.ISCA-RJMS-2012-054.pdf>
- Attride-Stirling, J. (2001). Thematic networks: an analytic tool for qualitative research. *Qualitative Research*, 1(3), 385-405. <https://doi.org/10.1177/146879410100100307>
- Bagheri Majid, R. (2015). *Designing a model of communication between the university and the society in the process of resistance economy*. Secretariat of the Supreme Council of Cultural Revolution: Research Vice-Chancellor.
- Bloom, N., & Van Reenen, J. (2010). Why do management practices differ across firms and countries? *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 24(1), 203-224. <https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.24.1.203>
- Boyle, M. E. (2004). Walking our talk: Business schools, legitimacy, and citizenship. *Business & Society*, 43(1), 37-68. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0007650303262638>
- Carton, G., McMillan, C., & Overall, J. (2018). Strategic capacities in US universities - the role of business schools as institutional builders. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 16(1), 186-198. [https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.16\(1\).2018.18](https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.16(1).2018.18)
- Casey, T. (2018). *Corporate Social Responsibility in Nonprofit Organizations: How Nonprofits Leverage CSR and Sustainability Reporting*. University of San Francisco, San Francisco. https://usfblogs.usfca.edu/nonprofit/files/2016/05/caseyom_6177229_64621338_Tom-Casey-Capstone-Paper-1sojbbj.pdf
- Clarke, V., & Braun, V. (2021). *Thematic analysis: a practical guide*. Thematic Analysis. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-69909-7_3470-2
- Cuomo, F., Mallin, C., & Zattoni, A. (2016). Corporate governance codes: A review and research agenda. *Corporate Governance: An International Review*, 24(3), 222-241. <https://doi.org/10.1111/corg.12148>
- Danivi, F., Makkizadeh, F., Afrasiabi, H., Asadnia, A., & Falakodin, Z. (2024). Individual-organizational construction of research from the opinions of faculty members. *Quarterly Journal of Research and Planning in Higher Education*, 30(3), 20-38. <https://doi.org/10.61838/KMAN.IRPHE.30.3.2>
- Davies, J. (2016). Are business school deans doomed? The global financial crisis, Brexit and all that. *Journal of Management Development*, 35(7), 901-915. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-09-2014-0114>
- De Colle, S. (2005). A stakeholder management model for ethical decision making. *International Journal of Management and Decision Making*, 6(3-4), 299-314. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJMDM.2005.006555>
- Deegan, C. (2009). *financial accounting theory*. McGraw Hill. <https://research.manchester.ac.uk/en/publications/financial-accounting-theory>
- DiMaggio, P. (1988). *Interest and agency in institutional theory*. Institutional patterns and organizations culture and environment. https://doi.org/10.20795/jasess.30.0_71
- Duchek, S. (2019). Organizational resilience: a capability-based conceptualization. *Business Research*, 1-32. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40685-019-0085-7>
- Falkenstein, M. (2017). *The Development of Responsible Management Education in European Business Schools: Responses to the 2013 EQUIS Accreditation Standards*. https://scispace.com/papers/the-development-of-responsible-management-education-in-22xnhfr04q?references_page=8
- Fink, A. (2014). *Conducting Research Literature Reviews: From the Internet to Paper*. SAGE. [https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=0z1_DwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&dq=Fink,+A.+\(2014\).+Conducting+Research+Literature+Reviews:+From+the+Internet+to+Paper.+Thousand+Oaks,+CA,+SAGE.+%09&ots=16Ksb-PThx&sig=Ftl850-o1-VshAB3up596dDkQ4A](https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=0z1_DwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&dq=Fink,+A.+(2014).+Conducting+Research+Literature+Reviews:+From+the+Internet+to+Paper.+Thousand+Oaks,+CA,+SAGE.+%09&ots=16Ksb-PThx&sig=Ftl850-o1-VshAB3up596dDkQ4A)
- Firuzjaeyan, A. A., Firuzjaeyan, M., Hashemi Petroodi, S. H., & Gholamrezazadeh, F. (2013). Applying Techniques of Interpretive Structural Modeling (ISM) in Tourism Studies (A Pathological Approach). *Journal of Tourism Planning and Development*, 2(6), 129-159. https://tourismpd.journals.umz.ac.ir/article_552_en.html?lang=en
- Fragueiro, F., & Thomas, H. (2011). *Strategic leadership in the business school: Keeping one step ahead*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511921087>
- Freeman, R. E. (2010). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Cambridge university press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139192675>
- Greenwood, R., Meyer, R. E., Lawrence, T. B., & Oliver, C. (2017). *The Sage handbook of organizational institutionalism*. The Sage handbook of organizational institutionalism. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446280669.n1>
- Habisch, A., Patelli, L., Pedrini, M., & Schwartz, C. (2011). Different talks with different folks: a comparative survey of stakeholder dialog in Germany, Italy, and the US. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 100(3), 381-404. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-010-0715-7>
- Hamidi Mutlaq, R., Babaei, A., & Maleki, A. (2016). *collective movements and institutional and technological changes: a review of several selected innovation systems* (Vol. 6). Science and Technology Policy. https://stpl.ristip.sharif.ir/article_1387.html?lang=fa
- Hannah, D. P., & Eisenhardt, K. M. (2018). How firms navigate cooperation and competition in nascent ecosystems. *Strategic Management Journal*, 39(12), 3163-3192. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.2750>
- Harvard Business, R. (2015). The best-performing CEOs in the world. *Harvard business review*, 93(11), 49-59. <https://doi.org/10.54784/1990-6587.1072>

- Hosseini Largani, S. M. (2023). A Conceptualization of green curriculum in Iran's higher education system. *Quarterly Journal of Research and Planning in Higher Education*, 29(2), 51-68. <https://doi.org/10.61838/irphe.29.2.3>
- Jensen, M. C. (2002). Value maximization, stakeholder theory, and the corporate objective function. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 235-256. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6622.2010.00259.x>
- Khastar, H. (2009). *Presenting a method for calculating the reliability of the coding stage in research interviews* (Vol. 15). Humanities Methodology. https://method.rihu.ac.ir/article_418_en.html?lang=en
- Kramer, M. R., & Porter, M. (2011). *Creating shared value* (Vol. 17). FSG. https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-94-024-1144-7_16
- Lawrence, P. R., & Lorsch, J. W. (1967). *Organization and environment: Managing differentiation and integration*. <https://library.wur.nl/WebQuery/titel/352646>
- Lawrence, T. B., & Suddaby, R. (2006). *1.6 institutions and institutional work*. The Sage handbook of organization studies. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781848608030.n7>
- Lengnick-Hall, C. A., Beck, T. E., & Lengnick-Hall, M. L. (2011). Developing a capacity for organizational resilience through strategic human resource management. *Human Resource Management Review*, 21(3), 243-255. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2010.07.001>
- Mallin, C. A. (2013). *Corporate Governance*. OUP Oxford. [https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=KWR7DwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&dq=Mallin,+C.+A.+\(2013\).+Corporate+Governance,+OUP+Oxford.+%09&ots=TZnLhAFtRN&sig=6KeCLx2CiMMI-uAu_eMzAfrwNZg](https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=KWR7DwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&dq=Mallin,+C.+A.+(2013).+Corporate+Governance,+OUP+Oxford.+%09&ots=TZnLhAFtRN&sig=6KeCLx2CiMMI-uAu_eMzAfrwNZg)
- March, J. G., & Olsen, J. P. (1976). *Organizational choice under ambiguity* (Vol. 2). Ambiguity and choice in organizations. <https://archive.org/details/ambiguitychoicei0000marc>
- Maskrey, S. A., Mount, N. J., Thorne, C. R., & Dryden, I. (2016). Participatory modelling for stakeholder involvement in the development of flood risk management intervention options. *Environmental Modelling & Software*, 82, 275-294. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2016.04.027>
- Miotto, G., Del-Castillo-Feito, C., & Blanco-González, A. (2020). Reputation and legitimacy: Key factors for Higher Education Institutions' sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Business Research*, 112, 342-353. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.11.076>
- Murmann, J. P. (2003). *Knowledge and competitive advantage: The coevolution of firms, technology, and national institutions*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511510953>
- Navarro, P. (2008). The MBA core curricula of top-ranked US business schools: a study in failure? , 7(1), 108-123. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2008.31413868>
- Nistorescu, T., & Barbu, C. M. (2006). A model for enterprises' environmental scanning. *Management & Marketing*, 4(1), 57-62. <https://www.cceol.com/search/article-detail?id=180721>
- Norollahee, S., & Ghanbari, S. (2024). Designing and Validating the Model of the Characteristics of Boundary Spanner Faculty Members. *Quarterly Journal of Research and Planning in Higher Education*, 30(3), 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.61838/KMAN.IRPHE.30.3.1>
- Ntim, C. G. (2018). *Defining corporate governance: Shareholder versus stakeholder models*. Ntim, CG (2018). Defining Corporate Governance: Shareholder versus Stakeholder Models, in "Global Encyclopedia of Public Administration, Public Policy and Governance", Springer, USA. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-20928-9_3132
- Ozalp, H., Cennamo, C., & Gawer, A. (2018). Disruption in Platform-Based Ecosystems. *Journal of Management Studies*, 55(7), 1203-1241. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12351>
- Pakdaman, Z. (2001). *Assessing the coordination of the capabilities of the Master of Business Administration students with the needs of exporting producers in Tehran*. Allameh Tabatabai University.
- Proudfoot, K. (2023). Inductive/Deductive hybrid thematic analysis in mixed methods research. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 17(3), 308-326. <https://doi.org/10.1177/15586898221126816>
- Qin, B., & Yang, L. (2022). CSR contracting and performance-induced CEO turnover. *Journal of Corporate Finance*, 73, 102173. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcorpfin.2022.102173>
- Rahmanseresht, H. (2023). *theories of organization and management from modernism to postmodernism*. Doran Publishing. https://jsmd.guilan.ac.ir/article_8254.html?lang=en
- Rao, H., Morrill, C., & Zald, M. N. (2000). Power plays: How social movements and collective action create new organizational forms. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 22, 237-281. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-3085\(00\)22007-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-3085(00)22007-8)
- Robinson, C. V. (2015). *An exploration of external environmental scanning and the strategy process*. Heriot-Watt University. <http://www.ros.hw.ac.uk/handle/10399/3030>
- Sadeghi Ravesh, M. H. (2022). Application of Interpretive Structural Modelling (ISM) in Analyzing Obstacles to Combat Desertification with Pathological Approach in Yazd Province. *J Watershed Manage Res*, 13(25), 119-132. <https://doi.org/10.52547/jwמר.13.25.119>
- Schiehll, E., & Martins, H. C. (2016). Cross-national governance research: A systematic review and assessment. *Corporate Governance: An International Review*, 24(3), 181-199. <https://doi.org/10.1111/corg.12158>
- Schoemaker, P. J. (2024). *Integrating Diverse Perspectives in Strategy Studies I*. [https://www.strategicmanagementreview.net/assets/articles/Schoemaker%20\(SMR%20923\).pdf](https://www.strategicmanagementreview.net/assets/articles/Schoemaker%20(SMR%20923).pdf)
- Shiri, H. (2015). *Examining the relationship between the university and the industry and its challenges: a qualitative research among Tehran University students* (Vol. 8). Journal of industry and university. <http://jiu.ir/en/Article/114>
- Song, Y., Ali, A., Wang, G., & Wang, W. (2024). Environmental scanning, cross-functional coordination and the adoption of green strategies: An information processing perspective. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 33(1), 39-60. <https://doi.org/10.1111/caim.12579>
- Sun, S. L., Zhang, Y., Cao, Y., Dong, J., & Cantwell, J. (2019). Enriching innovation ecosystems: The role of government in a university science park. *Global Transitions*, 1, 104-119. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.glt.2019.05.002>
- Sutton, A. (2016). *Systematic Approaches to a Successful Literature Review*. Sage Publications. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Andrew-Booth-2/publication/235930866_Systematic_Approaches_to_a_Successful_Literature_Review/links/5da06c7f45851553ff8705fa/Systematic-Approaches-to-a-Successful-Literature-Review.pdf



- Swain, J. (2018). *A hybrid approach to thematic analysis in qualitative research: Using a practical example*. Sage research methods. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526435477>
- Teece, D. J. (2023). *The evolution of the dynamic capabilities framework*. Artificiality and sustainability in entrepreneurship. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-11371-0_6
- Thoenig, J. C., & Paradeise, C. (2016). Strategic capacity and organisational capabilities: A challenge for universities. *Minerva*, 54(3), 293-324. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11024-016-9297-6>
- Thomas, H. (2007). An analysis of the environment and competitive dynamics of management education. *Journal of Management Development*, 26(1), 9-21. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02621710710720040>
- Thomas, H., & Thomas, L. (2011). Perspectives on leadership in business schools. *Journal of Management Development*, 30(5), 526-540. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02621711111133037>
- Thompson, J. D. (2017). *Organizations in action: Social science bases of administrative theory*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315125930>
- Tieman, R. (2016). *Why business schools are tailoring leadership courses to NGOs' needs*. Financial Times. <https://www.ft.com/content/c6356c8c-168f-11e6-b197-a4af20d5575e>
- Walrave, B., Talmar, M., Podoyntsyna, K. S., Romme, A. G. L., & Verbong, G. P. (2018). A multi-level perspective on innovation ecosystems for path-breaking innovation. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 136, 103-113. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2017.04.011>
- Washburn, N. T., Waldman, D. A., Sully de Luque, M. F., & Carter, M. Z. (2018). Executives' Stakeholder Values in the Prediction of Work Process Change. *Journal of Management Studies*, 55(8), 1423-1451. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12394>