The International Journal of Management Education 20 (2022) 100661

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

The International Journal of Management Education

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/ijme

Anatomy of entrepreneurship: Using key competencies to drive social capital acquisition and develop social entrepreneurship practices in MBA education

Jackson Ver Steeg Jr. [a,b,c,*]

[a] Science, Business & Innovation (SBI), Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, the Netherlands
[b] International Graduate Program of Education and Human Development (IGPEHD), National Sun Yat-sen University, Kaohsiung, Taiwan
[c] Wenzao Ursuline University of Languages, Kaohsiung, Taiwan

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:
Social entrepreneurship
Key competencies
Social capital
Education for sustainable development

ABSTRACT

This research produces a content analysis of a U.S. social entrepreneurship (SE)–focused graduate management program which examines the intersection of SE key competencies and SE practices that produce avenues of accessibility for SE MBA students. This paper puts previously proposed SE key competencies in dialogue with theories of practice, identifying how curricular and practicum practices are performed through an examination of public-facing program documentation, which includes websites, social media, and curricula. Results show that social capitals are manifest in SE practices that work both internally and externally to define the SE field and foster meaningful SE education. Four patterns of practice are crucial to creating accessibility and engaging multiple stakeholders: institutional practices which instill an active and outward-facing institutional presence, practices of a student-centered organization that bridge and link entrepreneurs, valuation practices incorporating sustainability, and persistent external engagements. These findings provide a roadmap to guide management programs in creating knowledgeable and effective social entrepreneurs, and suggest that this multi-pronged approach to creating SE pathways of practice addresses the complex and pluralistic problems that lie at the core of social innovation projects.

1. Introduction

In an attempt to address the continuing global economic, environmental, and social issues that threaten all inhabitants of the Earth, the United Nations in 2015 proposed the 17 sustainable development goals (SDGs) that address issues such as inequality and poverty, climate and environmental degradation, and social justice. The deadline for these 17 SDGs is in 2030, and progress is regularly monitored. In November of 2019, an op-ed appeared in the *Financial Times* by secretary-general of the United Nations António Guterres, who noted that that progress is lagging far behind the necessary goals. While some progress has been made in extreme poverty and child mortality, Guterres notes that we are far behind in issues such as healthcare, basic education, and gender equality (Guterres, 2019). What the secretary-general sees as a crucial missing element is the participation of the business community and the finance that it brings to sustainable development (SD) issues, noting that "We need private investment to fill the gap, so the UN is working with the financial sector. This is a critical moment for business and finance, and their relationship with public policy"

* Science, Business & Innovation (SBI), Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, the Netherlands.
E-mail addresses: 93132@mail.wzu.edu.tw, jacksonversteeg@gmail.com.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2022.100661
Received 28 April 2021; Received in revised form 3 May 2022; Accepted 15 May 2022
Available online 28 May 2022
1472-8117/© 2022 The Author. Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

(Guterres, 2019).

The world of business has always been seen as an effective locale to foment change regarding SD issues. Corporate social responsibility (CSR), as a movement designed to provoke social responsibility from business entities, has managed to do just that, to such a degree that CSR policies and training are embedded within many businesses' core practices. In terms of educational entities, university social responsibility (USR) serves a similar function in allowing educational institutions to reflect on the environmental, economic, and social sustainability of their practices. But universities, as the entities who educate future actors and stakeholders, can also affect change that extends beyond their own doors. Education for sustainable development (ESD) is an attempt to empower today's students with attitudes, abilities and the responsibility for creating a sustainable future. Although there is no one specific definition for ESD, a well-considered one would be expressed similar to this definition from UNESCO Bangkok, which defines ESD as:

> a learning process (or approach to teaching) based on the ideals and principles that underlie sustainability and is concerned with all levels and types of learning to provide quality education and foster sustainable human development – learning to know, learning to be, learning to live together, learning to do and learning to transform oneself and society. (UNESCO Bangkok)

A great power for this transformation lies at the intersection of education, as outlined in SDG 4, and business. The business leaders of tomorrow are the students of today, and embody a significant power for change. As Guterres notes, "No one business can afford to ignore this effort, and there is no global goal that cannot benefit from private sector investment" (2019). For most graduate business students, enrolling in a Master of Business Administration (MBA) program to further their education includes studying entrepreneurship, and recent changes in ESD at the graduate management level have introduced *social entrepreneurship* (SE), into MBA curricula. Management education that includes ESD trains students to envision business solutions or contributions toward the progress of SDGs. While some progress comes from aligning existing businesses toward those goals, further progress comes from entrepreneurship that specifically has as its goal a social good, and is most commonly termed *social entrepreneurship* or *social innovation*. Though its definition is complex and contested (Choi & Majumdar, 2014), SE is generally understood to combine both SD issues and profit.

SE education has previously been explored for its ability to develop business ethics through programs such as the social innovation-based transformative learning (SIBTL) pedagogical approach (Fernando, 2011) and through place-based (Elmes, Jiusto, Whiteman, Hersh, & Guthey, 2012; Yu, Bansal, & Arjalies, 2020) and literary-based (Montiel, Antolin-Lopez, & Gallo, 2018) methodologies. Indeed, multiple dimensions in the field of SE itself have been explored for their production of ethical behavior in business, including social agency (Dey & Steyaert, 2016; Haugh & Talwar, 2016) as well as the perceptions (Bacq, Hartog, & Hoogendoorn, 2016), and roles (André & Pache, 2016; Waddock & Steckler, 2016) of entrepreneurs. There is also a public dimension to the rise of SE, as "over the past decade governments, academics and practitioners have begun to place greater emphasis on social entrepreneurship" especially in post-recession times which reflect an economic imperative for growth. (Chell, Spence, Perrini, & Harris, 2016, p. 619).

Among the challenges in Dennis Tourish's recent thought-provoking critique of management education comes an evocation to present research that develop "compelling new theories that matter" (Tourish, 2020, p. 99). Indeed, SE holds the promise for great change and new theories that matter, especially when directed at local issues. Accordingly, educating a cohort of entrepreneurship-savvy individuals with a sustainable development outlook is crucial for helping achieve the SDGs. The attitudes, practices, and outcomes of such entrepreneurial education within the scope of management education are therefore of great interest.

This paper looks at MBA education with a specific eye to how the key competencies of SE introduced into management education function to develop an SE field of practice in MBA students, rendered through social capital. Although this research is concerned with MBA education, ESD, in the specific form of SE, appears in several forms at the graduate and undergraduate level, and this research also acts to inform those modes of education. Different SE delivery methods, within our primary concern of U.S. programs, are as follows. 1) SE certificate programs exist at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, and offer a series of courses designed to augment other coursework. Certificates vary in how many semester hours of credit they require, and offer no other formal degree. 2) Many traditional MBA programs have begun to include some amount of SE training, and they take several permutations. They most commonly have an SE concentration or track within the traditional MBA curriculum, which may or may not be required. At Denver University, for example, a required SE module comprises a quarter of the curriculum, and is a major element of the MBA process. In contrast, at Yale University, their Program on Social Enterprise is an elective track to add into traditional MBA training. 3) Some traditional MBA programs work closely with associated SE research centers. These centers take different structures within their network, and may or may not have much control over the curriculum or offer coursework. At the least, they do serve to focus more attention on the issue. At their best, they may offer a clearinghouse for innovation discussion and ideas, as well as offering funding or investment sources for their students. The program considered in this study, that of New York University (NYU)'s Stern Business School, fits this model. 4) One growing area is that of the "impact" or "good" MBA, where SE is the central focus of the program, and all curricular studies are modified to emphasize sustainability, such as at the University of Vermont. A similar and notable program outside the U.S. is at Rotterdam School of Management at Erasmus University, which seeks to horizontally integrate SD content into each course. Tables A1-A4 present non-exhaustive lists of example programs from each of these four categories.

This research is a revelatory content analysis examining how SE key competencies influence the educational focus of MBA programs such as those listed above, and how they correspond to theories of practice such as those developed by Bourdieu (1972, 1977, 1992), Coleman (1988), Giddens (1979, 1984), and Schatzki (2001, 2012) to produce patterns of practice that define and reify SE as a field for both practitioners and students. This study draws from the online documentation of one key MBA program and uses these many data points to examine our main research questions, which are:

RQ 1). How does this social entrepreneurship (SE) program incorporate SE key competencies as part of the SE educational experience?

RQ 2). How do SE key competencies guide this SE program in developing SE practices as part of the SE educational experience?

RQ 3). How do these key competencies and nexus of practices intersect?

To this end, all relevant documentary evidence, including social media, will be used to elucidate how these key competences invoke social capital exchanges that produce the SE patterns of practice that are developed by MBA education for SE.

This paper proceeds by introducing the relevant theoretical background for SE key competencies, followed by the elements of theories of practices, and the incorporation of theories of practice into entrepreneurship studies. Section 3 provides detail of the study's methodology. Results of the content analysis are then presented in Section 4, followed by discussion and integration in Section 5. Finally, Section 6 presents implications for future research and study limitations.

2. Theoretical framework

2.1. Education for sustainable development through social entrepreneurship

Businesses for a number of years have recognized the importance of corporate social responsibility (CSR), and many larger corporations have adopted some set of CSR practices. That is to say, the integration of sustainability concepts into business ventures is well established. The goals of social entrepreneurship (SE), however, go one step further. by combining the missions of financial sustainability and social purpose. Research into SE has addressesed a number of issues. A study of those areas by Sassmannshausen and Volkmann (2018) indicates that many research resources are concerned with definitions and constructs, social impacts, and support and financing. A scant 6.3% of SE research, however, concerns itself with SE education (Sassmannhausen & Volkmann, 2018, p. 260). This highlights the need for greater understanding of the methods and practices of SE education. Accordingly, this research investigates how SE practices are developed within the social entrepreneurship track of the NYU Stern School of Business MBA.

Common to all MBA programs like Stern's are curricula designed to teach the basics of SE. What constitutes the basic required attitudes, knowledge and skills for SE, however, is still being formulated and re-formulated, especially after the 2015 release of the 17 SDGs. Before 2015, attempts at determining how management education could incorporate ESD were somewhat more scattershot. Prior to the development and popularization of the SDGs, principles for responsible management education (PRME) was developed as a focus for general business education, and centered on human rights, labor, environment, and anti-corruption. This led to researchers debating the usefulness of PRME (Rasche & Escudero, 2009) or more generally ESD in management education (Lourenço, Jones, &

Table 1
Key competencies for sustainability and social entrepreneurship.

Key competencies for sustainability	Key competencies for social entrepreneurship
Systems thinking competency: the abilities to recognize and understand relationships; to analyze complex systems; to think of how systems are embedded within different domains and different scales; and to deal with uncertainty.	**Systems thinking competence**: The ability to identify and analyze all relevant (sub)systems across different domains (people, planet, profit) and disciplines, including their boundaries (Wiek, Withycombe, & Redman, 2011).
Anticipatory competency: the abilities to understand and evaluate multiple futures – possible, probable and desirable; to create one's own visions for the future; to apply the precautionary principle; to assess the consequences of actions; and to deal with risks and changes	**Embracing diversity and interdisciplinary competence**: The ability to structure relationships, spot issues, and recognize the legitimacy of other viewpoints in business decision making processes; be it about environmental, social, and/or economic issues (De Haan, 2006; Ellis & Weekes, 2008).
Normative competency: the abilities to understand and reflect on the norms and values that underlie one's actions; and to negotiate sustainability values, principles, goals, and targets, in a context of conflicts of interests and trade-offs, uncertain knowledge and contradictions.	**Foresighted thinking competence**: The ability to collectively analyze, evaluate, and craft "pictures" of the future in which the impact of local and/or short-term decisions on environmental, social, and economic issues is viewed on a global/cosmopolitan scale and in the long term (Wiek et al., 2011).
Strategic competency: the abilities to collectively develop and implement innovative actions that further sustainability at the local level and further afield.	**Normative competence**: The ability to map, apply, and reconcile sustainability values, principles, and targets with internal and external stakeholders, without embracing any given norm but based on the good character of the one who is involved in sustainability issues (Blok, Gremmen, & Wesselink, 2015; Wiek et al., 2011).
Collaboration competency: the abilities to learn from others; to understand and respect the needs, perspectives and actions of others (empathy); to understand, relate to and be sensitive to others (empathic leadership); to deal with conflicts in a group; and to facilitate collaborative and participatory problem solving.	**Action competence**: The ability to actively involve oneself in responsible actions for the improvement of the sustainability of social–ecological systems (De Haan, 2006; Mogensen & Schnack, 2010; Schnack, 1996).
Critical thinking competency: the ability to question norms, practices and opinions; to reflect on own one's values, perceptions and actions; and to take a position in the sustainability discourse.	**Interpersonal competence**: The ability to motivate, enable, and facilitate collaborative and participatory sustainability activities and research (Schlange, 2009; Wiek et al., 2011).
Self-awareness competency: the ability to reflect on one's own role in the local community and (global) society; to continually evaluate and further motivate one's actions; and to deal with one's feelings and desires.	**Strategic management competence**: The ability to collectively design projects, implement interventions, transitions, and strategies for sustainable development practices (De Haan, 2006; Wiek et al., 2011).
Integrated problem-solving competency: the overarching ability to apply different problem-solving frameworks to complex sustainability problems and develop viable, inclusive and equitable solution options that promote sustainable development, integrating the abovementioned competences.	

(Left panel) Sustainability key competencies from UNESCO: ***Education for Sustainable Development Goals Learning Objectives***. (Paris, 2017:10). (Right panel) Social entrepreneurship key competencies, developed by Lans, Blok, and Wesselink (2014), as presented in Ploum, Blok, Lans, and Omta (2018).

Jayawarna, 2013). The popularization of the U.N.'s comprehensive SDGs became a major organizing principle as researchers considered methods to accomplish both better introduction of ESD into management education more generally (Adomβent et al., 2014; Figueiró, Bittencourt, & Schutel, 2016; Lambrechts, Mulà, Ceulemans, Molderez, & Gaeremynck, 2013) and to develop a set of competencies for sustainable entrepreneurship specifically.

2.2. Social entrepreneurship key competencies

Effective SE training requires an understanding and development of SD issues alongside business training, and SE key competencies have been developed in over a.

decade's worth of work by numerous working groups. Again, a notable shift in the discourse of SE key competencies occurred with the introduction of the SDGs in 2015, when performance and learning objectives became substantially codified, as ESD competencies such as systems thinking ability and a normative competency were introduced alongside the SDGs (UNESCO, 2017, p. 10), and are shown in Table 1 (left). To these have been added entrepreneurial competencies in a synthesis of SE key competencies. (Table 1, right).

Although the choice of competencies reflect slight differences depending on the research group and work experience, concepts developed for sustainability competencies (Barth, Godemann, Rieckman, & Stoltenberg, 2007; De Haan, 2006; Rieckmann, 2012; Wiek et al., 2011) were extended into SE competencies (Biberhofer, Lintner, Bernhardt, & Rieckmann, 2019; Hesselbarth & Schaltegger, 2014; Lans et al., 2014; Osagie, Wesselink, Blok, Lans, & Mulder, 2016; Wesselink, Blok, van Leur, Lans, & Dentoni, 2015). A modified and validated model which combines this previous scholarship on SE competencies was achieved by Ploum et al. (2018), and this study uses this recently updated and validated set.

These key competencies represent a social capital structure that guides—implicitly or explicitly—the development of SE as practiced and as transferred through SE education. It is therefore the genesis of how social capital movement acts to define SE as a field and describe its practice and boundaries in an SE MBA education.

2.3. Theories of practice: social capital

The successes of the NYU program occur via avenues of social capital creation and transmission, and it is therefore necessary to first situate the social capital identified here through the works of Bourdieu, Coleman, Uphoff, and Putnam, all of which have offered unique contributions to its conceptualization. This study finds the most relevant formulation of social capital in the works of Coleman and Uphoff, whose work best describe how key competencies can be re-conceptualized as social capital, the expression of which is in the performance of practices within the field of social entrepreneurship.

Though the origins of the term social capital reach back to the 19th century, sociologist Pierre Bourdieu's 1972, p. 16 *Outline of a Theory of Practice* moved the concept toward more formal codification. *Capital* is a construct used by Bourdieu to describe social and cultural assets and how they can ultimately by transferred through functioning in one of four forms: economic, cultural, social, and symbolic capital. *Economic capital* refers to financial wealth in forms like income, savings and property. *Cultural capital* takes the form of non-financial assets like objects, skills, or talents: "everything profitable that is socially learned, ranging from school knowledge to social manners and cultural taste" (Wilterdink, 2017, p. 24) and is composed of *embodied*, *objectivized*, and *institutionalized* forms. *Embodied* comprises qualities of the person, and is often transferred from parent to child (knowledge, abilities, manners). *Institutionalized* forms include diplomas and certificates, while *objectivized* refers to cultural goods in the form of objects, like books, instruments, or machines (Bourdieu, 1986). *Social capital* refers to relationships between individuals as well as between an individual and groups, taking the form of personal relationships and group memberships that help produce other forms of capital. Finally, *symbolic* capital is often not considered a distinct form of capital, but rather a way to acknowledge field-specific markers and act to legitimize participants and actions within a field through establishing and connecting power relationships and status (Hill, 2018, p. 5), enabling the transfer of capital, especially social capital. For an understanding of how key competencies direct social capital, it is crucial to understand that capital itself is non-existent without a field in which to understand it (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). Here, that field is social entrepreneurship.

Following Bourdieu, James Coleman contributed to the formulation of social capital by considering it as a product of individual choice as well as of societal background, and is a result of actions which are created or destroyed as by-products of other activities. (Coleman, 1988, p. S118). This is the essence of why theories of practice become ideal to investigate social capital, as these actions which create capital are in fact the performance of practices that define SE as presented in SE education. Portes notes that, when considering social capital as envisioned by Coleman, we distinguish among: the possessors of social capital (those making demands), the sources of social capital (those agreeing to these demands), and the resources themselves (Portes, 1998, p. 6). This study hopes to accomplish this by identifying the practices which act to tie together different actors within the SE ecosystem, from novice students (those making demands) to professors and experts in the field (those agreeing to the demands).

Norman Uphoff contributes to the conceptualization of social capital, and it is here that we find further justification for social capitals as expressions of key competencies. Key competencies concern themselves with both sets of actions and skills as well as attitudes and behaviors, and this matches well with Uphoff's formulation of social capital, which is concerned with two expressions of phenomena, the *structural*, which includes kinds of social organization such as roles, rules, precedents and procedures, and the *cognitive*, which includes mental processes expressed as norms, values, attitudes and beliefs. (Uphoff, 2000, p. 218). These structures that comprise fields of practice are delimited and formalized at many levels of education, not exclusive to MBA education. That is, the roles and structures that guide your participation in SE as well as what you do and say and the behaviors you learn in an MBA program will differ from an MS in Chemistry program because those behaviors have been defined by, and are defining, their respective fields of

study. An SE MBA program further differentiates its students from a standard MBA program by introducing the incorporation of social innovation measures as cognitive social capital norms and values—e.g., ways of thinking about entrepreneurship that prioritize sustainability, novel evaluation constructs that account for social good, and unique forms of resource gathering that identify like-minded social entrepreneurs and other agents involved in SE ventures. Uphoff identifies, through this categorization of cognitive social capital, the all-important set of entrepreneurial behaviors that are developed in SE MBA programs.

Uphoff, like Coleman, also prioritizes in essence the performance of practices and their results, noting that understanding social capital is understanding its constituent *elements,* the *connections* that exist among these elements, and the *consequences* that can be attributed to these elements and their interaction (Uphoff, 2000, p. 216-17). For SE MBA students, consequences such as achieving funding for a venture may be a result of the constituent elements of, for instance, opportunity recognition and thorough financial documentation—skills learned from others in the SE field—as well as the performative aspects of presentation, such as using strong imagery and active and persuasive language, behaviors modeled after other successful social entrepreneurs.

Robert Putnam, in *Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital* (2000), acknowledges social capital's four main functions: providing information and knowledge, connecting for future gain (reciprocity), collective action, and identity and solidarity. Social capital is notably important in education, and hence SE education and training, in its function of transmitting the knowledge held by human capital through the connections between individuals through their social networks as well as the established norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness that accompany these connections (Putnam, 2000, p. 19). Putnam also identified different types of social capital: *bridging social capital* establishes new connections among people from otherwise quite different groups (as a bowling league might bring together participants from across the socioeconomic spectrum that might not otherwise connect) while *bonding social capital* reaffirms connections between likewise communities (Putnam, 2000). Within an SE MBA education, the ties binding those who choose a sustainable development element to their entrepreneurship describe bonding social capital; they share the same general desire and this links them. Bridging social capital binds many of the different actors who wish to see a venture fulfilled, including the social entrepreneur, local community contacts, and the beneficiaries of the project, all of whom benefit by the establishment of the venture.

Linking social capital, subsequently hypothesized, is different in its verticality, as it connects "people who are interacting across explicit, formal or institutionalized power or authority gradients in society (Szreter & Woolcock, 2004, p. 655), and is clearly at work in practices that identify practitioners of different levels of knowledge. Linking social capital helps to emphasize differences between the ways in which a seasoned social entrepreneur and a SE student practice SE. This occurs in SE MBA education through the inclusion of experts in the field into the SE MBA experience in guest lectures, roundtable discussions, and other activities which place these experienced and nascent social entrepreneurs into conversation such that the variation in their practices becomes clear through recognition of the underlying power gradient that produces "distinctions that articulate and evaluate variations within a practice." (Hui, 2016, p. 56).

2.4. Field and habitus

Bourdieu's theories of social and cultural reproduction have proven to be illustrative when used to examine how resources are distributed and redistributed in societies. The central constructs of *capital*, *field* and *habitus* are noteworthy in reference to entrepreneurial communities. These multilayered concepts are connected in that, within an institutional *field*, individual actors compete for *capital (economic*, *cultural*, *social* and *symbolic)* in order to gain dominance, with their actions being described by a socially-shaped and socially-shaping *habitus* (Pret et al., 2016) which is best understood as "the way in which a culture is embodied in an individual" (Harker, 1984).

Bourdieu's construct of *field* references a space of performance that encompasses "the totality of actors and organizations in an arena of social or cultural production and the dynamic relationships among them" (DiMaggio, 1979) and which are governed by an established set of understood truths known as *doxa* (Bourdieu, 1972, p. 16). Bourdieu uses the concept of field to describe a structured place of actions and positions, where all who participate in the field are subject to consecration within the field itself. For entrepreneurs, the field of entrepreneurship is that set of rules and practices, *doxa*, which are determinate of the relationship of the individual with the field. To describe what an entrepreneur is, one needs to examine the field comprised of entrepreneurial practices; to what extent an individual participates in that field describes his or her "strategic fit" with that field as a form of "entrepreneurial readiness" (Hill, 2018; as cited in; Reid, 2021, p. 631). In terms of the entrepreneurial field, increasing one's capital allows an entrepreneur to improve his or her position within the social field of entrepreneurship; habitus provides the structural framework where various forms of capital gain value and are given meaning in the entrepreneurial context (Patel & Conklin, 2009).

Alison Hui's work supports the use of variation as a lens to utilize practice theory, which can be applied to investigate the practices of SE education within that SE field. She notes that the characteristics of variation within practices are that a) every practice will inherently involve some variation in its performance, b) these variations themselves are the source of articulated differences in practices and practitioners which demarcate the limits of the practices, and c) much flexibility exists in the constituent elements of a particular practice (Hui, 2016). Better understanding of the variations in SE field practices provides a better understanding of how SE education is not theoretical only, but is in fact inculcation into the SE practices that both define and are defined by SE practitioners and novice SE MBA students through their social capital exchanges.

For the NYU SE MBA students, engaging with cultural capital takes the form of developing skills through practices such as coursework, case study and other competitions, presentations, participating in roundtable discussions and a multitude of other activities designed to develop entrepreneurship skills, and SE skills specifically. In the course of pursuing the degree diploma—an institutionalized form of cultural capital—they develop the embodied cultural capital expressed by Upham as the cognitive social capitals of an

entrepreneurial style, personality, and set of skills and practices. As most MBA students would acknowledge, institutional forms of cultural capital (i.e., a degree) can be instrumental in an exchange for economic capital through landing a post-graduation job. For SE students, exchanging cultural capital for economic capital through business ownership may also input additional capital gain through improving their social standing within the SE field. It is social capital, however, that allows for much of the development and transfer of embodied cultural capital. As SE students move through classes and participate in MBA associated activities, they contact and learn from others in the SE field, gathering both skills and a catalog of resources for future problems. For example, a group team member can present a particularly thorough business plan, transferring that knowledge and skill to team members. A guest speaker can help an individual identify an SE opportunity through her speech. A member of the alumni network can connect an expert in a field with a nascent entrepreneur student for advice about funding. Project collaborators can be found through social connections within the MBA program or from recent graduates. Social capital development such as these are a crucial part of SE and SE education, and an MBA program that fails to provide such development might be seen by some as missed opportunity for the students who partook in the program.

2.5. *Theories of practice and entrepreneurship as practice (EAP)*

A significant body of literature exists which uses various theories of practice as lenses for the study of entrepreneurship, primarily drawing on the scholarship of Bourdieu (Bourdieu, 1972, p. 16), Giddens (1984), and Schatzki (2012), among others, with a more thorough investigation of their interplay described by Nicolini (2012). Teague, Tunstall, Champenois, and Gartner (2021) presents a genealogy of definitions of practice, ranging from Bourdieu (1977) to Schmidt (2017), with Reckwitz (2002) providing one of the most explicit explanations as "forms of bodily activities, forms of mental activities, 'things' and their use, a background knowledge in the form of understanding, know-how, states of emotion and motivational knowledge" (p. 249). As it applies to entrepreneurship specifically, Thompson, Verduijn, and Gartner (2020) note that practice here is not limited to a simple description of what entrepreneurs think and do, but instead encompasses such cognitive actions as meaning-making, identity-forming and order-producing actions. (Chia & Holt, 2006; Nicolini, 2009; as cited in; Thompson et al., 2020, p. 247). This movement towards using practices aligns more with social behaviorist point of view (Engel, Kaandorp, & Elfring, 2017; Kaandorp, Van Burg, & Karlsson, 2020). The advantage of this stance is that numerous social phenomena can be understood within their positions in a "nexus of practice" (Hui, Schatzki, & Shove, 2017), emphasizing practices and connections rather than identities or structures. The degree to which studies have embraced theories of practice ranges from considering it as a methodological lens (Kallia & Cutts, 2021) to examining the conversion of capital (Pret, Shaw, & Drakopoulou Dodd, 2016; Turnbull, Meissel, Locke, & O'neale, 2020) to recognizing the interplay of a number of Bourdieu's larger constructs (Reid, 2021), including capital, with Hill (2018) presenting a thorough list of entrepreneurship studies focusing on capital from 2001 to 2017.

Most recently, this has evolved into entrepreneurship-as-practice (EAP), an methodological practice and lens (Claire, Lefebvre, & Ronteau, 2020) that establishes entrepreneurial practice as a way to highlight the degree to which an entrepreneur's actions match with an imagined entrepreneurial terrain being emblematic of his or her strategic fit with entrepreneurial behavior, functioning as a form of entrepreneurial readiness. (Hill, 2021; as cited in; Reid, 2021, p. 631). The extant scholarship on EAP considers data appropriate to claim EAP status with some strictness, and while EAP is a valuable stance for future work, the present study does not attempt to produce an EAP positioning, but instead relies on the transference of Bourdieu's economic, social, cultural and symbolic capitals, somewhat echoing Karataş-Özkan's (2011) examination of how entrepreneurs develop entrepreneurial skills, know-how and "know-who" as a part of their entrepreneurial learning and thereby attain different forms of capital (2011, p. 878). It is this acquisition of capital by developing *social* entrepreneurial skills that is the focus of this paper, and which has been up to now, an elision in the literature.

3. Methodology

This research investigates the best practices of SE education through identifying principal practices that bind the SE MBA student community to the professional community, developing student strategic fit with SE and affirming their entrepreneurial readiness. In order to offer recommended practices for universities developing an MBA degree that incorporate SE as a major element, we perform a revelatory case study of one university, New York University's Stern Business School, selected for its perceived program strength and comprehensive breadth. This qualitative study examines the documentary evidence from the Stern MBA available online, and includes: webpages, course descriptions, videos, and syllabi, as well as social media Twitter and Youtube accounts (we were unable to access other platforms such as Facebook or LinkedIn). This study examines a number of centers and programs that are affiliated with the NYU MBA Social Entrepreneurship track: the Center for Sustainable Business (CSB), the Center for Business and Human Rights (CBHR), the NYU Impact Investment Fund (NIIF), the Social Impact Internship Fund (SIIF), and the Social Impact and Sustainability Association (SISA). The online search was conducted of all relevant and public web pages for each entity, including curriculum materials such as syllabi, sourced from course websites. Programs reaching beyond the bounds of the NYU site, for example, the Aspen Institute's Business & Society International MBA Case Competition, were also mined for potential qualitative data if the source was from the SE track at NYU Stern. Weblogs and "journals" from SIIF and SISA participants were also used, as although they were hosted in an external server, they were clearly linked to the practices and training obtained through the program.

Following the qualitative methodology from Yin (2015), the study proceeded through the steps of compiling, disassembling, reassembling, interpreting and concluding. At the beginning of the study, documentary evidence was collected in Nvivo 12 software and analyzed for the patterns and categories existent in this documentary production. Items were dis/reassembled and patterns and

characteristics of practices useful for better understanding of the strengths of the NYU program were identified. Results were then interpreted and a conceptual model based on those observations was proposed, following previous research methodologies (Bengtsson, 2016; Elo & Kyngäs, 2008; Vaismoradi, Jones, Turunen, & Snelgrove, 2016).

4. Results

The key competencies outlined in the literature section can be seen operating throughout the institutions and organizations comprising the student experience of the Social Entrepreneurship track of the NYU Stern MBA. These key competencies are manifest as social capital in *structural* modes of roles, rules, precedents and procedures and *cognitive* norms, values, attitudes and beliefs. (Uphoff, 2000, p. 218), and are performed as entrepreneurship as practice (EAP). The following are observations of the incidences of key competencies manifest as social capitals as they are evident in a number of pertinent areas. Unless otherwise noted, direct quotations are taken from specific program or center webpages, online course syllabi, and other documentary evidence.

4.1. Center for Sustainable Business (CSB)

The CSB is the strongest locus to realize the key competency of **embracing diversity and interdisciplinarity** by promoting a number of partnerships focused on sustainability issues, encompassing science, law, public service, and engineering. Currently, these partnerships include: the Department of Environmental Studies; the Guarini Center on Environment, Energy, and Land Use Law; The Center for Global Public Service and Social Impact; and the Urban Future Lab at NYU Tandon School of Engineering. The center also develops **systems thinking** and **normative competency** by training students the skills necessary to "embed sustainability in core business strategy" with the stated goals of "mainstreaming sustainability into corporate strategy, finance, operational efficiency, supply chain management, and consumer engagement–thereby driving improved financial performance."

The EAP practices performed by CSB prioritize recognizing the value in an issue from multiple sustainability standpoints. That is, they embrace the variation of practices identified by Hui (2016, p. 60) and more specifically the overlapping of practices identified by Schatzki. These cognitive training practices as performed by separate but linked institutions perform how a specific action might belong to two or more practices in that they express components of these different practices' organizations (Schatzki, 2001, p. 87).

4.2. Center for Business and Human Rights (CBHR)

The center promotes **interpersonal and action competency** through its coursework. There are several features of courses that fulfill this through the practices found in EAP:

- Students complete team projects, by either developing their own sustainable venture or a by working for a social enterprise client.
- Other courses incubate a series of social ventures that have the potential to be viable businesses and positively impact social or environmental outcomes.
- Like most MBA programs, the NYU Stern program fosters interpersonal development through many group projects over the course of the degree.

Several practices are at work in these activities by working within a nexus of practices, intersecting in what Hui (2016) identifies as variations in spatio-temporal and practitioner/material practices. First, the linking of student groups to clients affirms what Hui identifies as shared rhythms, paths, and sites (p. 60) that bind SE performance. Second, elements of practices manifest in sustainable valuation procedures used by both students and clients serve to affirm elements that act as connection points between them.

Many courses embrace both **interdisciplinarity** and **foresighted thinking**, such as in courses addressing a financial approach to climate change, where students learn how "agents might use asset allocation choices or financial contracts to hedge their exposure to climate change risk." Courses are also offered that "intertwine history, economic ideas, and literature" and which draw students from across different graduate divisions. The Center also takes **foresighted thinking** as part of its goal, stating that there is a focus on "research and teaching for the next generation of students with greater focus on sustainability, ethics and social purpose."

Students' **normative competencies** and **systems thinking** are developed primarily through coursework, and are explicitly characterized in their course descriptions as the need for students to understand:

- the economy-wide energy transitions that are needed in the United States to help curb climate change
- corporate social responsibility activities (CSR)
- how societies improve and solve problems and the role of business in these changes.
- the role of markets and business in "issues of civic good, justice, equality, education, environment, health or collective action."
- the "essential conceptual frameworks and tools for creating successful social entrepreneurial ventures, initiatives, programs or partnerships that seek to tackle global poverty and collective action problems."
- the impact of governance issues on important global trends and challenges, and the interplay of global forces and local norms, as well as normative differences
- how businesses must address human rights challenges in their core business operations

In addition, training in **systems thinking** is introduced in courses that emphasize linkages between systems and risks, the interplay

of local factors in global issues, and courses which engage students in SE and social ventures along the entire life cycle, as well as seeing the changes necessary to address climate change from a business perspective. Courses also work to train students to "play the role of change agents in the social sector, by adopting a mission to create and sustain social value (not just private value)."

One important feature of the Stern SE educational experience begins to become clear here. Much of the learning about **normative competencies** comes in the classroom, but is reinforced at other engagement points in internships and experiential learning. This reinforcement was specifically noted by one internship participant, who noted that she performed practices such as apply[ing] skills from various prior experiences in ways I did not envision possible. Specifically, I leverage my prior role … in developing frameworks, creating presentations and thinking about firm strategy. I apply skills from NYU coursework such as Stern's *Strategy* courses and Wagner's *Managing the Financial and Social Returns of the Social Enterprises*. I apply financial and analytical skills from last summer's banking internship as I think through the quantitative and financial considerations related to [the company's] strategy (, 2019Valner).

This exemplifies the way that normative considerations of SD issues can be extended from the classroom into practice as **strategic management efficacy**.

The EAP practices performed by the coursework elements of the CBHR train a cognitive approach that prioritizes the non-monetary valuing of an issue from a sustainability standpoint. This occurs in several ways. First, students act in classes to develop working relationships with diverse thinkers by cognitively balancing conflicting opinions and at least for a time subjugating ones' own opinion. Second, students participate in valuing an issue from how it aligns or deviates from sustainability norms, considering the systemic effects of an action. These occur on the individual level in the silent workings of each student mind, as well as in group work by the listening, sharing and re-conceptualizing of problems and solutions. A number of student testimonies referenced such a reconceptualization, such as one who "appl[ied] skills from various prior experiences in ways I did not envision possible" in the course of participatory action at CSB courses. (Valner, 2019).

4.3. Student groups: Social Impact and Sustainability Association (SISA)

A student's experience in the NYU MBA social entrepreneur track is guided by two factions, the CSB and the student group SISA, the Social Impact and Sustainability Association. SISA is composed of current students, alumni, and professionals who join together to address SD issues. One of its main functions is promoting the engagement of students in SD issues through participation in both case study competitions and the Sustainable Innovation Symposium (SIS). In the former, student groups work together to propose forward-looking sustainable solutions for business problems, thereby engaging with a number of key competencies: **strategic management efficacy, normative competency, systems thinking, foresighted thinking,** and **interpersonal and action competency.** The latter, where outside experts from the field work together with students to discuss current SD issues, engages students in **normative competency, systems thinking,** and **foresighted thinking** while also promoting **interdisciplinarity.** In its role as an organizer of student experiences that reach beyond the program, SISA is instrumental in driving social entrepreneurship into advocacy and action. SISA is a constant source of interdisciplinary idea sharing and engagement with professionals in the field, through industry speaker panels and student/alumni panels, workshops, and roundtable discussions, including both the SIS as well as their Executives-in-Residence Speaker Series, both of which sponsor speakers who bring social impact ideas from a "diverse array of industries, countries, and backgrounds to inspire new generations of change-makers."

Here again, participation in this MBA program entails expanding the field of entrepreneurship by developing an outward facing presence and set of practices that establish chains of interactions that exist at different practitioner levels, echoing Hui's identification of how materials (and similarly practitioners) are wrapped up in chains of action, inputs, and outputs (Hui, 2016, p. 62); these connections to experts in the field, alumni, industry speakers, roundtable/workshop participants are methods to affirm the similarity in these chains at multiple practitioner levels, and serve to both define and reify entrepreneurial fields of practice. In the NYU program, students enact the entrepreneurial practice of contacting individuals with little or no point of introduction in order to enroll support for projects and discussions—a practice which presages the networking necessary to gain backers and investors for entrepreneurial ventures.

4.4. Case study competitions

The promotion of case study competitions falls under the purview of both the CSB and SISA. As SISA's function is to "develop a network of people interested in SD issues (students, alumni, and industry professionals) with like-minded interests," they may find solutions in such things as the case study competitions that are actively promoted to students. In terms of demonstrating key competencies in SE, the NYU team has had consistently good results in the prestigious national Aspen Institute's Business & Society International MBA Case Competition, placing 3rd in 2017 and 2019, and winning outright in 2013 and 2018, confirming that the program helps develop the key competencies of **strategic management efficacy, normative competency, systems thinking, foresighted thinking,** and **interpersonal and action competency.**

The practices honed in such competitions are in preparing (with a team) to understand and outline the elements of what Rittel and Webber (1973) termed a "wicked problem" which consists of a complex issue interwoven with other issues. Student teams then present a complex and sustainable solution addressing multiple facets of the original issue. The team must also prepare to address questions, drawing upon practice identifying and explaining system-wide effects.

Case study participants specifically identified practices that bridged the gap between being a nascent SE student and acting as an SE practitioner. Students accessed systems thinking to perform several practices. One student noted that "this competition let us think through systems change in a thoughtful and aspirational way" (NYU Stern, 2018). Another group of participants noted recognizing

"the complexity of business challenges with multiple stakeholders," of analyzing business opportunity ecosystems, of "synthesizing massive amounts of information", of "forming, testing and iterating on our hypotheses," and of accessing adaptability and intuition. One student even remarked on the relative value of case study competitions, noting "this case was a remarkable crucible for honing these skills" (Stern Stories, 2013).

4.5. Experiential learning

Another opportunity to extend the forums for learning is in the "Doing Business in …" (DBi) Program that provides students with the opportunity to gain international experience in a rapidly expanding global economy. DBi courses are offered in intensive format over the traditional break periods, where classes are taught at foreign locations in a total immersion environment. Though this program is not always focused on SE or SD issues directly, the experience targets the **embracing diversity and interdisciplinarity** competency. In this particular SE education, the curriculum is generously supplemented with methods to enhance student capacity for creating social ventures via all the social entrepreneurship key competencies. This comes through mid-program courses like DBi, or in Stern Signature Projects where noteworthy MBA social ventures overseas are identified for funding, rewarding those who have particularly well-developed **interpersonal and action competency**.

Practices here come in the form of "on-the-ground" problem solving, where students must draw upon entrepreneurial and cultural knowledge, building solutions and support that engage with different cultural factors, including people, practices, and materials. Students specifically identified a number of specific practices such as improving their knowledge of business norms and practices in other parts of the globe, learning to conceptualize problems in different ways, networking in different cultures, identifying issues experienced by individuals in other cultures and how that affects business (NYU Stern, 2017). These skills are valuable for SE practitioners as well, as they develop ventures for cultures where they must gather information about how to best modify projects based on the specifics of each country.

4.6. Valuation and investment structure

The NYU program offers two significant SD-related elements, one valuation tool and one funding source. The Return on Sustainable Investment (ROSI™) methodology, developed by the CSB, identifies a valuation method that can be used by students and Chief Financial Officers to approximate the value of sustainability to their projects or companies. The CSB notes that "sustainability-related issues are no longer siloed as special projects or limited to efficiency-related sustainability efforts. Using the ROSI™ methodology, companies can clearly quantify the full range of costs and benefits, including intangibles" (Center for Sustainable Business,). The use of the methodology in student projects likely positively affects both **normative competency** and **systems thinking**. The second financial element developed by the CSB is the NYU Impact Investment Fund (NIIF), which is designed to provide financial support for worthy student projects. As such, the NIIF is instrumental in building the capacity of students to create actual social ventures, and by doing so encourages **all the key competencies**.

As for developing practices, they are similar to those identified by EAP as necessary for entrepreneurs to learn but with a critical difference. Using the ROSI™ methodology, as students and their consultant clients do, places the valuation of entrepreneurial ventures within the context of sustainability, which also carries a valuation itself. When considered for NIIF funding, projects are considered with such valuations in mind. Accordingly, SE students at Stern develop a set of practices to internally assign sustainability value as well as, externally, to persuade others outside the program of its use value, so by gathering adherents and investors using the same

Table 2
Developing linking capital through social media.

Twitter Account	Exporting linking capital (function; *hashtags*)	% of hashtags	Importing linking capital (function; *hashtags*)	% of hashtags
Center for Sustainable Business (CSB), *(Nov. 2013-Jan. 2019. N = 2397)*	Identifying potential applications of SE for students	36.09	Connecting students to professionals	6.39
	sustainability	*25.87*	*CSB Practice forum*	*6.39*
	sustainable businesses	*10.22*		
	circular economy	*2.24*		
	Application of student SE competencies	9.27		
	CSB Practice forum	*6.39*		
	Aspen Case Competition	*1.60*		
	Patagonia Case Competition	*1.28*		
Sustainable Innovation Student Association (SISA) *(Nov. 2011-Jan. 2019. N = 1017).*	Identifying impact areas	5.32	Connecting students to professionals	39.73
	philanthropy, social impact, impact, social good, housing for all	*5.32*	*NYU Sustainable Innovation Symposium (SIS)*	*31.56*
			Social Entrepreneurship	*8.17*
Center for Business and Human Rights (CBHR) *(April 2016-Jan. 2019. N = 613).*	Identifying potential applications of SE for students	61.54	Connecting students to professionals	1.63
	business and human rights	*38.18*	*Business forum*	*1.63*
	specific issues: Rana Plaza, Bangladesh	*16.76*		
	sustainable supply chains	*6.6*		

Table 3
Alignments of key competencies with social capital acquisition and SE education practices.

SE competency	Human Capital	Bonding Social Capital	Bridging Social Capital	Linking Social Capital
(a) Systems thinking competence	Center for Business and Human Rights (CBHR) develops necessary SE knowledge and skill expertise through curriculum emphasizing systems thinking		Developing understanding of how different domains and disciplines share similarities or divergences in SE goals and practices; supported by internship and practicum opportunities	Learning to work through hierarchical structures to achieve goals
(b) Embracing diversity and interdisciplinary competence	CBHR curriculum structures knowledge across disciplines	CBHR curriculum promotes recognizing differences in opinions and methods to achieve shared goals	Recognizing differences in resources and methods to achieve shared goals supported by CSB and SISA activities (Panelists/speakers/experts-in-field/Sustainable Innovation Symposium (SIS))	CSB promotes persistent communication of engagement with SE businesses and SE job opportunities SISA imports linking social capital through Panelists/speakers/experts-in-field/Sustainable Innovation Symposium (SIS)
(c) Foresighted thinking competence	Developed by CBHR curriculum; SISA promotes case study competitions as a pedagogical method	CSB-promoted case study competitors collectively evaluate problems and propose solutions	CSB and SISA invite innovative professionals in symposia who have demonstrated competency	CSB and SISA invite innovative professionals in symposia who have demonstrated competency
(d) Normative competence	Students gain ability to use sustainable business valuation methodology through CBHR curriculum		NYU ROSI© valuation method can be applied by stakeholders in multiple domains and circumstances; NYU Impact Investment Fund (NIIF) supports student SE projects	NYU ROSI© valuation method links with external corporate entities
(e) Action competence	SE skill development in CBHR curriculum provides foundation for subsequent involvement.	Curricular and extracurricular activities develop an understanding of mutual effectiveness	CBHR curricular practice of framing questions from point of view of alternate stakeholders; SISA Fellowship allows for application of competencies; persistent engagement developed by CSB initiatives provides avenues to achieve competency	Persistent engagement developed by CSB initiatives provides avenues to achieve competency
(f) Interpersonal competence	CBHR curricular and extracurricular work develop necessary collaborative SE skills	CBHR curricular social innovation projects rely exercise of interpersonal competency	CBHR curricular social innovation projects require resources from multiple stakeholders and developing partnerships; CSB develops understanding of necessary competence.	Expertise from SISA-sponsored activity participants is demonstrative and can be leveraged by students
(g) Strategic management competence	Curricular group project design and case competitions develop ability to progress through project development stages		SISA fellowship and practicum opportunities provide avenues to apply competency	SISA fellowship and practicum opportunities provide avenues to apply competency

SE Education Practices. *Parenthetical letters correspond to multiple SE competencies manifest in each practice*

BLUE = SE Education Practices

Structural

· embrace the variation of practices identified by Hui (2016) (abg)
· define and reify SE fields of practice (cdf)
· engage in cognitive training that reflects overlapping organizational practices (Schatzki, b00a, p. 8g). (ab)

(*continued on next page*)

Table 3 (*continued*)

- establish "chains of interactions" that operate at different practitioner levels (bcef)
- develop frameworks, create presentations and develop firm strategy (dg)
- expand participants in the field of SE (abcf)
- affirm the similarity in SE chains at multiple practitioner levels (bcde)

Evaluative

- apply previously-trained financial and analytical skills (bg)
- consider the systemic effects of an action (acg)
- prioritize the non-monetary valuing of an issue from a sustainability standpoint. (cd)
- value an issue from how it aligns with or deviates from sustainability norms (dg)
- recognize the values in an issue from multiple sustainability standpoints. (abcdg)
- develop project goals within prioritized sustainability needs (acdg)

Performative

- develop working relationships with diverse thinkers (bef)
- cognitively balance conflicting opinions, subjugating ones' own opinion (bf)
- listen, share and re-conceptualize problems and solutions in group work (bef)
- apply skills from various prior experiences in ways not previously envisioned (beg)
- prepare explanations of projects (eg)
- present complex and sustainable solutions addressing multiple facets of the original issue (acdefg)
- prepare to address questions on proposed project solutions (ceg)

Disseminative

- identify and contact potential allies and backers (def)
- modify projects for different system relationships in different locales (acd)
- develop acceptance for materials (ROSI™) at different practitioner levels (abdef)
- encourage debate at roundtable discussions (aef)
- persuade others outside the program of ROSI™'s use value (cdef)
- develop adherents and investors for ROSI™ valuation practices (cdf)

Analytic

- access ability to identify and explain system-wide effects (acg)
- recognize complex system of multiple stakeholders (abcd)
- analyze business opportunity ecosystems (acdg)
- synthesize massive amounts of information (ag)
- form, test and iterate hypotheses (eg)
- assign sustainability value through ROSI™ (acdg)
- perform acts of adaptability and intuition (aceg)
- access prior cultural knowledge (bceg)
- learn to conceptualize problems "in different ways" (abcg)

(*continued on next page*)

Table 3 (*continued*)

Cross-cultural
· identify business opportunities pertinent to different countries (abcdg)
· improve knowledge of business norms and practices in other parts of the world (acd)
· build solutions and support that engage with different cultural factors, including people, practices, and materials (acdeg)
· network in different cultures (bef)
· identify issues experienced by individuals in other cultures (acdg)
· understand systems operations in other countries (acdg)
· modify projects based on the specifics of each country (acdg)
· modify projects for different local regions (abcg)
Functional
· contact individuals with little or no point of introduction to enroll support for projects (bef)
· perform digital practices for initiating contacts (ef)
· perform digital networking practices (bcef)
· perform digital promotion practices (bef)
· perform digital practices geared toward identifying and developing allies (abcde)
· perform digital practices geared toward identifying and developing investors (def)

valuation practices. In this way SE practices for this program differs significantly from the traditional valuation and funding opportunities experienced by traditional MBA students.

4.7. Social media

The content of Twitter social media accounts for the CSB, the CBHR, and SISA were analyzed for triangulating points of support for what the program documentation provides, as well as how the SIIF fellows explain the value of their education. Table 2 presents hashtag counts for each Twitter account usage, and illustrates how linking capital is developed by these different centers through the performance of digital networking practices. The total number of collected hashtags was 4027 for all three accounts, over more than seven years.

As might be expected, the two clearest drivers of SE education at Stern—the CSB and SISA—were by far the most active on Twitter. The numerous hashtags confirm the role of the CSB and SISA in promoting social capital linkages. For the CSB, it is mainly in the promotion of sustainable businesses, sustainable programs and opportunities existing outside its borders. Thus, it is exporting the linking social capital that makes the program so successful.

Supplementing this is the CSB Practice Forum, an invitation event, which hosts a group of 180 business leaders for discussion of a pertinent SD issue—this seems to be acting more like what the SISA organization more often functions to do: initiate imported linking social capital by hosting and guiding roundtable discussions, workshops, the Sustainable Innovation Symposium, and the Executive-in-Residence series. The promotion of these type of events can be seen in Table 2, where over 46% of the CSB hashtags identified areas where their students can apply their SE competencies. SISA, in contrast, spends a near equal amount—39% of their hashtags—importing linking capital. The Twitter account for the Center for Business and Human Rights, as shown in Table 2, spends the majority of its work (62%) in the practice of promoting specific and individual human rights and sustainability issues where students practice developing linking social capital with activists and knowledgeable professionals; by doing so, the CBHR reflects and confirms its role in enhancing **normative competency** (among others) for Stern students.

5. Discussion

The greatest strengths of the NYU Stern program are in its synthesis of systematic multifaceted internal modes of development and external applications of varying modes which function to transfer the human capital of ESD into internal and external bonding and bridging social capitals, as well as externally-located linking social capital, through SE practices. Internally, this takes the form of a dedicated research center which acts as the point of diffusion for practices involving financial instruments and funding, as well as the contact point for practices which produce cooperative ventures. This is supported by the close ties with CSB as the curriculum development center, which is the point of engagement for student life, both while at Stern and after, as well as operating to develop "co-present interaction and shared performances."(Hui, 2016, p. 64) through shared curriculum coursework. The expertise that is developed in the CSB is applied in case study competitions and by allowing for field and experiential learning through three different venues. The workings of the research center and the unified SISA student/alumni group, by creating multiple linkages of people and ideas, has the effect of driving the SE education outward into practice.

Table 3 presents a matrix of how human and social capitals serve to provide the multiple avenues of support which work together to cultivate the key competencies which drive social capital acquisition by developing SE practices for a meaningful SE education. The specific, first-order practices identified within the program are listed, and are grouped loosely the second-order functional categories of structural, evaluative, performative, disseminative, analytic, cross-cultural, and functional. It is crucial to note that any first-order function may be fulfilling more than one of the second-order categories, and that each of the first-order functions reflect multiple SE key competences, which are noted parenthetically for each. The social capital produced by the NYU Stern experience for students is manifest through SE practices. Students have ample opportunity to practice and hone that expertise and those practices, both during and after the Stern experience. In that sense, this SE education is a persistent use of social capital in the development of an SE field of practice. Bonding social capital occurs among like-minded students with interests in SE, who perform similar practices in accomplishing their social ventures. Bridging social capital is at play in the many places where expertise gets shared with others who have similar goals but different perspectives on those goals. This interplay of social capital forms the nexus of SE field practices. For example, the student group SISA connects both students and alumni with similar SE interests, but with one group as students and the other as practitioners, all of whom perform the practices of SE.

Finally, linking social capital, a vertical movement, works to connect students with the experts and activists (at a higher level of authority) who offer ideas and instruction. It is exported most clearly on the program's social media, where a constant stream of posting serves to call attention to successful social ventures and opportunities to use what SE skills students have learned. Imported linking social capital occurs in the numerous ways that the CSB finds to introduce issues and challenges to students through conversations with experts, as in the Sustainable Innovation Symposium.

For any one of these social capitals to occur, however, it is necessary to perform several of the practices listed. Inviting an expert SE practitioner to participate in a roundtable discussion may involve, for example, initiating (digital or otherwise) a known or unknown contact, inviting that person to speak, promoting the roundtable discussion, moderating the roundtable discussion, discussing valuation practices for that particular discussion, discussing how to get others involved with the project (digital or in person), and acknowledging the factors shared by the educational experience and the expert practitioner. Just this speech, then, may involve this series of practices*: contact individuals with little or no point of introduction to enroll* support *for projects, perform digital practices for initiating contacts, perform digital promotion practices, perform digital practices geared toward identifying and developing allies, identify and contact*

potential allies and backers, modify projects for different system relationships in different locales, develop acceptance for materials (ROSI™) at different practitioner levels, encourage debate at roundtable discussions, develop adherents and investors for ROSI™ valuation practices, and *establish "chains of interactions" that operate at different practitioner levels.* This series of practices engages several key competencies in order to achieve this activity. As can be seen here, any action may involve numerous practices, and as shown in Table 3, each practice engages multiple key competencies.

5.1. Integration

This research has developed the idea that key competencies, when manifest in SE MBA education, act as social capital actions through the performance of practices in the nexus that comprises the field of entrepreneurship. A summary of major points follows.

1) Studies of SE education, whether formal or informal, should prioritize understanding of the constituent groups of the educational field. Accordingly, all aspects comprising the nexus of practices informing SE education should be investigated. This has been emphasized in previous research; as reported in Fuller (2007), Lave and Wenger (1991) suggest that it is necessary for learning to be situated within and as an outcome of a range of shared practices … and that learning is relational and therefore needs to be studied by attending to collectives or groups rather than individuals (Lave & Wenger, 1991). In this sense, investigation of the SE MBA education in this program, in as much as it pursues a wide range of practitioners, fulfills this directive. Avenues of social capital transfer are created through blended practices tying current students with seasoned industry experts, roundtable/workshop participants, partners in experiential learning, case study expert judges, and through SISA, both recently-graduated alumni reflecting on their education and more seasoned graduates. These avenues are created at NYU through the interdisciplinary links of the CSB, the Executive-in-Residence program, the DBi program, and the Sustainable Innovation Symposium (SIS). Practice-wise, this is accomplished by student groups establishing lines of communication with experts and knowledgeable entrepreneurs through face-to-face and digital networking, practices which are shared with SE working on private ventures, connecting through "a consideration of what multiple practices require of the same person" (Hui, 2016, p. 61), which act to confirm shared rhythms, paths, [and] sites.
2) NYU Stern School's SE program prioritizes numerous avenues where students experience and participate in practices engaging cognitive training through re-imagining issues from a sustainability aspect, collaborative problem solving through presenting, subjugating, listening, and responding to opinions in group work, valuation using sustainability measures such as ROSI™, in what is identified by Hui as co-present interaction and shared performance (Hui, 2016, p. 64). Though these practices are similar to other practices produced by group work generally, in this SE educational setting, they are persistently linked to professional expert practices, which produce similar practices in the practices of SE.

2) This persistent outward-facing relationship linking students with experts in the field, involved in many different forums, act to create a nexus of practices that, through their repetition, create and define the field of SE. In Hui's discussion of how variations in practices serve to produce a field of practices, she notes as an example that groups of 'birders' or 'birdwatchers' are given meaning through such things as blogs, websites, and birding books and are performed by groups of co-present birders, but are rarely defined or recognized in these terms by either non-birdwatchers or by formal institutions (2017a, p. 65). At NYU's SE MBA, this constant dialogue of co-present and co-invested participants and practitioners helps define the field of SE itself through this persistent intermingling of constituent actors (experts, academics, new graduates, and current students). Unlike the birder example, however, these shared practices of SE undergo formal recognition and concretization by the educational regime itself.

Another substantial shared practice persistent throughout practices performed both in coursework, and shared with expert practitioners and in case study competitions is the practice of performing valuations which incorporate sustainability. In the case of NYU, it is through the use of their in-house valuation tool ROSI™ developed by the CSB. This material component is used among students, with clients, and by outside experts invited to participate. This mirrors Reckwitz, who notes that such materials and practices link the practitioners and materials that are shared between them such that "the individual is the unique crossing point of practices" (2002, p. 256). Shared usage occurs in such places as NYU's Practice Forum, which combines academic and in-field practitioners in practices such as informational presentations and workshops which disseminate ROSI™ as a valuation practice.

The presence of an in-house investment fund, the NYU Impact Investment Fund (NIIF), has a definite impact on practices, as students learn to formulate entrepreneurial behaviors that are relevant to obtaining funding for entrepreneurial ventures. In combination with NYU's focus in case study competitions, students participate in SE entrepreneurship field with extensive time creating, practicing, and giving persuasive presentations designed to win adherents to ideas as well as to gain funding, as evidenced throughout the documentary evidence available through NYU Stern.

6. Implications for program development

This research provides an analysis of how many elements and practices work together to create an apparently successful SE MBA education experience. The many places where students and graduates can both apply the skills they have learned as well as obtain funding to realize social ventures provide a strong base, one which similar MBA programs should consider as they seek to promote a more sustainable outlook in the business world.

While the key competencies are evident in the NYU program as a focus, following their application allowed for this exploratory research to discover the movement that transformed the program's internal strengths to a *persistent external engagement*, in effect from

curricular to empirical, inducing a critical shift in practices. The implications for other programs wishing to strengthen their effectiveness are:

1) The many systematic multifaceted internal modes of development and external applications of the program function to transfer the human capital of SE into bonding and bridging social capitals, as well as externally-located linking social capital. In practice, this internal/external balance develops the practices of SE that students and entrepreneurial practitioners require.
2) Internally, this takes the form of a dedicated research center which acts as the point of diffusion of both financial instruments and funding, as well as being the contact point for cooperative ventures. The CSB is a major point of engagement for student life, both while at Stern and after, and this strong central point of engagement should be emulated in order to effectively create and sustain social capitals.
3) Expertise developed in the CSB is applied through practices in case study competitions and by allowing for field and experiential learning through three different venues. The multiple avenues to translate curricular ideas into experience is a prime example of effective transfer of capital and development of crucial SE practices.
4) The combination of an active outward-facing central research center and a unified student/alumni group (SISA) creates linkages of people and ideas that drives SE education outward into practice. This tandem of institution and people are instrumental in producing the *persistent external engagement.*

The necessity for social entrepreneurs to develop substantial social networks has been echoed by Philips, Alexander and Lee, who note that such social engagement is seen as an imperative to be developed in the early stages of social innovation ventures, while in the later stages of implementation, those same entrepreneurs "often fail to harness knowledge and expertise from their partners" (Phillips, Alexander, & Lee, 2019, p. 315). The persistent social capital exchange identified in this paper may help to extend the active period of social networks and concomitant set of SE practices, thereby ameliorating this shortfall.

6.1. Limitations and future research

The clearest limitation of this revelatory study is that it looks at only one MBA program, albeit one with a breadth of approach, substantial documentary evidence, and ability to engage partners in SE education and implementation. Subsequent research could incorporate other MBA programs for comparison, perhaps a "good" MBA program such as the ones at Colorado State University or the University of Vermont. Additionally, a comparison of SE education could be made with a similar program found in Europe, particularly the University of Oxford's Said Business School's program, which has many of the same elements as NYU's program. Much of the revelatory findings from this study could be further triangulated by interviews with students and alumni to support these exploratory qualitative analysis perspectives. A mixed methods approach could also be attempted by administering a quantitatively-based survey instrument to those students and alumni. Further, an issue for social practice research exists. In a sense, this research observes social practices "from 10,000 feet" due to the content analysis methodology. While this allows for a useful breath of vision and a certain freedom of scope, an improved understanding of the SE education field of practice would be gained by incorporating more observational "on-the-ground" research. The strengths of the SE education offered by the NYU MBA program is in its persistent external engagement, and further research can help to elucidate how that engagement is manifest in the social practices that comprise the SE field transmitted through an SE MBA education.

Author statement

Jackson Ver Steeg Jr. was responsible for all aspects of this research.

Appendix 1. Selected Representative Social Entrepreneur Education Programs

Table A1
Sustainable Entrepreneurship Graduate Certificate Programs

School	Discipline	Certificate
Arizona State University	Business	Social Entrepreneurship and Community Development certificate
Indiana University	Business	Social Entrepreneurship
Pennsylvania State University	Business	Humanitarian Engineering and Social Entrepreneurship program
Stanford University	Business/Public Policy	Public Management and Social Innovation certificate
University of California-Los Angeles (UCLA)	Business	Social Sustainability

Table A2
MBA programs with sustainable entrepreneurship tracks

School	Track
Brandeis University	Socially Responsible Business
Harvard University	Social Enterprise Program
Jewish University	Social Entrepreneurship in a Diverse World
Northwestern University	Social Impact Pathway (MBA)
Yale University	Program on Social Enterprise (PSE)

Table A3
MBA programs with sustainable entrepreneurship research centers

School	MBA/track	SE Center
Duke University	MBA Track: Social Entrepreneurship	Center for the Advancement of Social Entrepreneurship (CASE)
University of Michigan	MBA	Center for Social Impact
Cornell University	MBA	Center for Transformative Action
Babson University	MBA	The Lewis Institute
Boston College	MBA Track: Social Innovation and Leadership Program	Center for Social Innovation (CSI)
New York University	MBA: Track: Social Innovation and Impact	Center for Sustainable Business Center for Business and Human Rights
Carnegie Mellon University		Institute for Social Innovation
Georgetown University	MBA	Beeck Center of Social Impact + Innovation
Lynn University		Social Impact Lab
University of California-Berkeley	MBA	Centre for Social Sector Leadership

Table A4
Impact MBA programs

School	MBA program
Colorado State University	Impact MBA
University of Vermont	Sustainable Innovation MBA
Memorial University of Newfoundland	MBA in Social Enterprise and Entrepreneurship (MBA-SEE)

References

Adomßent, M., Fischer, D., Godemann, J., Herzig, C., Otte, I., Rieckmann, M., et al. (2014). Emerging areas in research on higher education for sustainable development–management education, sustainable consumption and perspectives from Central and Eastern Europe. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 62*, 1–7.

André, K., & Pache, A. (2016). From caring entrepreneur to caring enterprise: Addressing the ethical challenges of scaling up social enterprises. *Journal of Business Ethics, 133*(4), 659–675. Retrieved December 18, 2020, from http://www.jstor.org/stable/24703745.

Bacq, S., Hartog, C., & Hoogendoorn, B. (2016). Beyond the moral portrayal of social entrepreneurs: An empirical approach to who they are and what drives them. *Journal of Business Ethics, 133*(4), 703–718. Retrieved December 18, 2020, from http://www.jstor.org/stable/24703748.

Barth, M., Godemann, J., Rieckman, M., & Stoltenberg, U. (2007). Developing key competences for sustainable development in higher education. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education, 8*, 416–430.

Bengtsson, M. (2016). How to plan and perform a qualitative study using content analysis. *NursingPlus Open, 2*, 8–14.

Biberhofer, P., Lintner, C., Bernhardt, J., & Rieckmann, M. (2019). Facilitating work performance of sustainability-driven entrepreneurs through higher education: The relevance of competencies, values, worldviews and opportunities. *The International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation, 20*(1), 21–38.

Blok, V., Gremmen, B., & Wesselink, R. (2015). Dealing with the wicked problem of sustainable development: The necessity virtuous competence. *Business and Professional Ethics Journal, 34*, 297–327.

Bourdieu, P. (1972). *Outline of a theory of practice*. Translated by Richard Nice. *Cambridge studies in social anthropology*.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice, 16*. Cambridge university press.

Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. *Cultural theory: An anthology, 1*, 81–93.

Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. (1992). *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Center for Sustainable Business. CSB ROSI™ methodology. Retrieved from https://www.stern.nyu.edu/experience-stern/about/departments-centers-initiatives/centers-of-research/center-sustainable-business/research/csb-monetization-methodology 1/6/2020.

Chell, E., Spence, L. J., Perrini, F., & Harris, J. D. (2016). Social entrepreneurship and business ethics: Does social equal ethical? *Journal of Business Ethics, 133*(4), 619–625.

Chia, R., & Holt, R. (2006). Strategy as practical coping: A Heideggerian perspective. *Organization Studies, 27*(5), 635–655.

Choi, N., & Majumdar, S. (2014). Social entrepreneurship as an essentially contested concept: Opening a new avenue for systematic future research. *Journal of Business Venturing, 29*(3), 363–376.

Claire, C., Lefebvre, V., & Ronteau, S. (2020). Entrepreneurship as practice: Systematic literature review of a nascent field. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development, 32*(3–4), 281–312.

Coleman, J. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology, 94/Supplement*, S95–S120.

De Haan, G. (2006). The BLK '21'programme in Germany: A 'Gestaltungskompetenz'-based model for education for sustainable development. *Environmental Education Research, 12*(1), 19–32.

Dey, P., & Steyaert, C. (2016). Rethinking the space of ethics in social entrepreneurship: Power, subjectivity, and practices of freedom. *Journal of Business Ethics, 133*(4), 627–641. Retrieved December 18, 2020, from http://www.jstor.org/stable/24703743.

DiMaggio, P. (1979). *On pierre bourdieu*.

Ellis, G., & Weekes, T. (2008). Making sustainability "real": Using group-enquiry to promote education for sustainable development. *Environmental Education Research, 14*, 482–500.
Elmes, M. B., Jiusto, S., Whiteman, G., Hersh, R., & Guthey, G. T. (2012). Teaching social entrepreneurship and innovation from the perspective of place and place making. *The Academy of Management Learning and Education, 11*(4), 533–554.
Elo, S., & Kyngäs, H. (2008). The qualitative content analysis process. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 62*(1), 107–115.
Engel, Y., Kaandorp, M., & Elfring, T. (2017). Toward a dynamic process model of entrepreneurial networking under uncertainty. *Journal of Business Venturing, 32*(1), 35–51.
Fernando, M. (2011). A social innovation based transformative learning approach to teaching business ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics Education, 8*(1), 119–138.
Figueiró, P. S., Bittencourt, B. A., & Schutel, S. (2016). Education for sustainability in business schools by practicing social learning. *Brazilian Journal of Science and Technology, 3*(1), 11.
Fuller, A. (2007). Critiquing theories of learning and communities of practice. In J. Hughes, N. Jewson, & L. Unwin (Eds.), *Communities of practice: Critical perspectives* (pp. 17–29). New York: Routledge.
Giddens, A. (1979). *Central problems in social theory. Action, structure, and contradiction in social analysis*. Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press.
Giddens, A. (1984). *The constitution of society: Outline of the theory of structuration*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
Guterres, A. (2019). *November 4. Progress toward sustainable development is seriously off-track*. The Financial Times. Retrieved from https://www.ft.com/content/0c0eadc6-f739-11e9-bbe1-4db3476c5ff0.
Harker, R. K. (1984). On reproduction, habitus and education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 5*(2), 117–127.
Haugh, H., & Talwar, A. (2016). Linking social entrepreneurship and social change: The mediating role of empowerment. *Journal of Business Ethics, 133*(4), 643–658. Retrieved December 18, 2020, from http://www.jstor.org/stable/24703744.
Hesselbarth, C., & Schaltegger, S. (2014). Educating change agents for sustainability–learnings from the first sustainability management master of business administration. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 62*, 24–36.
Hill, I. (2018). How did you get up and running? Taking a Bourdieuan perspective towards a framework for negotiating strategic fit. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development, 30*(5–6), 662–696.
Hill, I. R. (2021). Spotlight on UK artisan entrepreneurs' situated collaborations: Through the lens of entrepreneurial capitals and their conversion. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research, 27*(1), 99–121. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEBR-11-2019-0642
Hui, A. (2016). Variation and the intersection of practices. In *The nexus of practices* (pp. 64–79). Routledge.
Hui, A., Schatzki, T., & Shove, E. (2017). *The nexus of practices. Connections, constellations, practitioners*. London, New YorN: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315560816
Kaandorp, M., Van Burg, E., & Karlsson, T. (2020). Initial networking processes of student entrepreneurs: The role of action and evaluation. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice, 44*(3), 527–556.
Kallia, M., & Cutts, Q. (2021, August). Re-examining inequalities in computer science participation from a Bourdieusian sociological perspective. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM Conference on international computing education research* (pp. 379–392).
Karataş-Özkan, M. (2011). Understanding relational qualities of entrepreneurial learning: Towards a multi-layered approach. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development, 23*(9–10), 877–906.
Lambrechts, W., Mulà, I., Ceulemans, K., Molderez, I., & Gaeremynck, V. (2013). The integration of competences for sustainable development in higher education: An analysis of bachelor programs in management. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 48*, 65–73.
Lans, T., Blok, V., & Wesselink, R. (2014). Learning apart and together: Towards an integrated competence framework for sustainable entrepreneurship in higher education. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 62*, 37–47.
Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Lourenço, F., Jones, O., & Jayawarna, D. (2013). Promoting sustainable development: The role of entrepreneurship education. *International Small Business Journal, 31*(8), 841–865.
Mogensen, F., & Schnack, K. (2010). The action competence approach and the "new" discourses of education for sustainable development, competence and quality criteria. *Environmental Education Research, 16*, 59–74.
Montiel, I., Antolin-Lopez, R., & Gallo, P. J. (2018). Emotions and sustainability: A literary genre-based framework for environmental sustainability management education. *The Academy of Management Learning and Education, 17*(2), 155–183.
Nicolini, D. (2009). Zooming in and out: Studying practices by switching theoretical lenses and trailing connections. *Organization Studies, 30*(12), 1391–1418.
Nicolini, D. (2012). *Practice theory, work, and organization: An introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Osagie, E. R., Wesselink, R., Blok, V., Lans, T., & Mulder, M. (2016). Individual competencies for corporate social responsibility: A literature and practice perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics, 135*(2), 233–252.
Patel, P. C., & Conklin, B. (2009). The balancing act: The role of transnational habitus and social networks in balancing transnational entrepreneurial activities. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice, 33*(5), 1045–1078.
Phillips, W., Alexander, E. A., & Lee, H. (2019). Going it alone won't work! the relational imperative for social innovation in social enterprises. *Journal of Business Ethics, 156*(2), 315–331.
Ploum, L., Blok, V., Lans, T., & Omta, O. (2018). Toward a validated competence framework for sustainable entrepreneurship. *Organization & Environment, 31*(2), 113–132.
Portes, A. (1998). Social capital: Its origins and applications in modern sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24, 1998, 1.
Pret, T., Shaw, E., & Drakopoulou Dodd, S. (2016). Painting the full picture: The conversion of economic, cultural, social and symbolic capital. *International Small Business Journal, 34*(8), 1004–1027.
Putnam, R. D. (2000). Bowling alone: America's declining social capital. In *Culture and politics* (pp. 223–234). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
Rasche, A., & Escudero, M. (2009). Leading change–The role of the principles for responsible management education. *zfwu Zeitschrift für Wirtschafts-und Unternehmensethik, 10*(2), 244–250.
Reckwitz, A. (2002). Toward a theory of social practices: A development in culturalist theorizing. *European Journal of Social Theory, 5*(2), 243–263.
Reid, S. (2021). The generative principles of lifestyle enterprising: Dialectic entanglements of capital-habitus-field. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research, 27*(3), 629–647. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEBR-10-2018-0688
Rieckmann, M. (2012). Future-oriented higher education: Which key competencies should be fostered through university teaching and learning? *Futures, 44*(2), 127–135.
Rittel, H. W., & Webber, M. M. (1973). Dilemmas in a general theory of planning. *Policy Sciences, 4*(2), 155–169.
Sassmannshausen, S. P., & Volkmann, C. (2018). The scientometrics of social entrepreneurship and its establishment as an academic field. *Journal of Small Business Management, 56*(2), 251–273.
Schatzki, T. R. (2001). *Practice theory. The practice turn in contemporary theory*.
Schatzki, T. R. (2012). A primer on practices: Theory and research. In *Practice-based education* (pp. 13–26). Brill Sense.
Schlange, L. E. (2009). Stakeholder identification in sustainability entrepreneurship. *Greener Management International, 55*, 13–32.
Schmidt, R. (2017). Sociology of social practices: Theory or modus operandi of empirical research?. In *Methodological reflections on practice oriented theories* (pp. 3–17). Cham: Springer.
Stern, Stories (2013, April 19). *Celebrate possible: The NYU Stern MBA team takes first place at this year's Aspen Business & Society International Case Competition*. https://www.stern.nyu.edu/experience-stern/tales-in-possible/aspen-case-competition-2013.
Schnack, K. (1996). Internationalisation, democracy and environmental education. In S. Breiting, & K. Nielsen (Eds.), *Environmental Education Research in the Nordic Countries: Proceedings from the Research Centre for Environmental and Health Education* (pp. 7–19). Copenhagen: The Royal Danish School for Educational Studies.
Stern, N. Y. U. (2017, September 14). What makes stern's "doing business in. *" courses invaluable?* [Video] Youtube https://youtu.be/wVLnOMDEgYw.

Stern, N. Y. U. (2018, May 4). NYU stern students win first place in the aspen institute's 2018 business & society international MBA case competition. https://www.stern.nyu.edu/experience-stern/news-events/nyu-stern-students-win-first-place-aspen-institute-s-2018-business-society-international-mba-case.

Szreter, S., & Woolcock, M. (2004). Health by association? Social capital, social theory, and the political economy of public health. *International Journal of Epidemiology, 33*(4), 650–667.

Teague, B., Tunstall, R., Champenois, C., & Gartner, W. B. (2021). An introduction to entrepreneurship as practice (EAP). *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior and Research, 27*(3), 569–578.

Thompson, N. A., Verduijn, K., & Gartner, W. B. (2020). Entrepreneurship-as-practice: Grounding contemporary theories of practice into entrepreneurship studies. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development, 32*(3–4), 247–256.

Tourish, D. (2020). The triumph of nonsense in management studies. *The Academy of Management Learning and Education, 19*(1), 99–109.

Turnbull, S. M., Meissel, K., Locke, K., & O'neale, D. R. (2020). The impact of science capital on self-concept in science: A study of university students in New Zealand. *Frontiers in Education, 5*, 27. Frontiers.

UNESCO. (2017). In *Education for sustainable development goals learning objectives*. Paris.

UNESCO Bangkok. Definition of ESD (n.d. http://www.unescobkk.org/education/esd-unit/definition-of-esd/. Retrieved on November 17, 2018, from

Uphoff, N. (2000). Understanding social capital: Learning from the analysis and experience of participation. In P. Dasgupta, & I. Serageldin (Eds.), *Social capital: A multifaceted perspective*. Washington DC: The World Bank.

Vaismoradi, M., Jones, J., Turunen, H., & Snelgrove, S. (2016). *Theme development in qualitative content analysis and thematic analysis*.

Valner, S. (2019 July 22). *Where business meets impact"*. Retrieved January 6, 2020 from https://sternsiiffellows.wordpress.com/.

Waddock, S., & Steckler, E. (2016). Visionaries and Wayfinders: Deliberate and emergent pathways to vision in social entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Ethics, 133* (4), 719–734. Retrieved December 18, 2020, from http://www.jstor.org/stable/24703749.

Wesselink, R., Blok, V., van Leur, S., Lans, T., & Dentoni, D. (2015). Individual competencies for managers engaged in corporate sustainable management practices. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 106*, 497–506.

Wiek, A., Withycombe, L., & Redman, C. L. (2011). Key competencies in sustainability: A reference framework for academic program development. *Sustainability Science, 6*(2), 203–218.

Wilterdink, N. (2017). The dynamics of inequality and habitus formation. Elias, Bourdieu, and the rise of nationalist populism. In *Historical social research/Historische Sozialforschung* (pp. 22–42). Guilford Publications. Yin, R. K. 2015. *Qualitative research from start to finish*.

Yin, R. K. (2015). *Qualitative research from start to finish*. Guilford publications.

Yu, H., Bansal, P., & Arjalies, D. L. (2020). A place for sustainable development: Managing place-based resources on the Tibetan plateau. In *Academy of management proceedings, 2020* p. 12096). Academy of Management. No. 1, Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510.