**INSTITUTIONAL ENTREPRENEURS' SKILLS: A MULTI-DIMENSIONAL
CONCEPT**

Emamdeen Fohim
University of St. Gallen

Author Accepted Manuscript

**Fohim, E. (2019), "Institutional Entrepreneurs' Skills: A Multi-Dimensional Concept",
Haack, P., Sieweke, J. and Wessel, L. (Ed.) Microfoundations of Institutions (Research
in the Sociology of Organizations, Vol. 65B), Emerald Publishing Limited, pp. 169-192.**

ABSTRACT

Microfoundational research increasingly strives to examine the interlinkages between various higher- and lower-level structures. To better capture microfounded change processes, I develop the multi-dimensional concept of institutional entrepreneurs' skills that defines actors' abilities to enhance institutional change. By a systematic literature review on institutional entrepreneurship, I identify seven institutional entrepreneurs' skill dimensions: (i) analytical skills, (ii) empathic skills, (iii) framing skills, (iv) translational skills, (v) organizational skills, (vi) tactical skills, and (vii) timing skills. The established concept provides opportunities for future microfoundational research by examining the formation and the application of the seven skill dimensions.

Keywords: Institutional change; institutional contradictions; institutional entrepreneurship; microfoundations of institutions; new institutional theory; social skills

Scholars have increasingly applied a microfoundational approach to holistically understand institutional change processes (Chandler & Hwang, 2015; Creed, DeJordy & Lok, 2010; Furnari, 2014; Thornton, Ocasio & Lounsbury, 2012). Using a microfoundational approach, scholars seek reasons for macro outcomes at a lower level of analysis (Coleman, 1986). Hence, institutional theorists want to identify causes for institutional change by diving deeper into the micro level.

Current debates comprehend microfoundations of institutions as more than just a simple bottom-up approach such as methodological individualism (Felin, Foss & Ployhart, 2015; Harmon, Haack & Roulet, 2018). The researchers note that future research in microfoundations of institutions should instead address the "micro-macro challenge", meaning further examining the interlinkages between different concerned multiple levels of analysis (Haack, Sieweke & Wessel, 2019). In this regard, future approaches should overcome an exclusive two-level perspective (macro and micro) and expand the levels of analysis (such as on a meso-level). (Jepperson & Meyer, 2011; Harmon et al., forthcoming).

Considering such a multi-level approach, what should scholars envisage when diving deeper into examining causes of institutional change? Some scholars suggest focussing on micro processes to identify the influence of these processes on macro structures (Powell & Colyvas, 2008; Powell & Rerup, 2017; Smets, Morris & Greenwood, 2012). Other scholars propose investigating involved change agents and recommend studying these agents' responses to constraining, enabling, or even orienting macro conditions (Battilana, Leca & Boxenbaum, 2009; Cardinale, 2018). Nevertheless, both approaches do not fully address a multi-level approach in microfoundations of institutions; it remains vague how the concepts relate to multiple levels of analysis in addition to the examined macro structure.

To address a multi-level approach in microfoundations of institutions, I propose to develop a concept that is shaped by and shapes higher- and lower-level structures simultaneously. Specifically, I advocate delving into institutional entrepreneurs' skills when

examining institutional change. Institutional entrepreneurs' skills enable actors to advance institutional change processes. Skills are a suitable concept to capture microfounded processes, as skills are shaped by various higher- and lower-level conditions (Attewell, 1990; Bryson, 2017) and as the application of skills can simultaneously influence the outcome of institutional settings (Garud, Jain & Kumaraswami, 2002; Perkmann & Spicer, 2007).

In this essay, I concretize the concept of institutional entrepreneurs' skills by a systematic literature review on institutional entrepreneurship. On this basis, I develop a three-phase model containing seven dimensions of institutional entrepreneurs' skills. The identified skill dimensions are (i) analytical skills (the ability to perceive opportunities for change), (ii) empathic skills (the ability to put oneself into different positions), (iii) framing skills (the ability to design institutional projects in accordance with the audience's knowledge), (iv) translational skills (the ability to speak the language of diverse actors), (v) organizational skills (the ability to establish instruments that ensure the implementation of new practices and/or rules), (vi) tactical skills (the ability to counter power struggles), and (vii) timing skills (the ability to identify the proper moments to induce change).

A CONCEPT FOR MICROFOUNDATIONAL RESEARCH

As discussed in the introductory chapter of this volume, current debates suggest examining the interlinkages between different levels of analysis to enhance research on microfoundations of institutions (Haack et al., 2019). Therefore, institutional theorists should not only remain focused on micro-level studies. Instead, scholars should investigate how different levels of analysis are interrelated to each other and thus support or hamper each other (Harmon et al., forthcoming). Building on this assertion, future approaches in microfoundations of institutions should extend beyond a two-layer model that contains only the micro and the macro levels, as everything is connected to something on a higher- and lower-level structure

(Harmon et al., forthcoming; Jepperson & Meyer, 2011). Thus, such a multi-level approach in microfoundations of institutions can better capture the complexity of institutional processes.

Using such a multi-level approach, what should scholars envisage at a lower-level of analysis when studying institutional change processes? I propose to seek institutional entrepreneurs' skills. As I will argue, these skills enable actors to advance institutional change processes. Consequently, the application of institutional entrepreneurs' skills can be one relevant aspect – in addition to many others – that can influence the outcome of institutional settings.

Utilizing skills when applying a microfoundational approach is useful because skills are always caused by conditions that can be located both at higher- and lower-level structures. For instance, skills can be the outcome of previous socialization processes (Berger & Luckmann, 1966; Bryson, 2017) – thus of a higher-level cause. However, one can also imagine that the formation of skills depends on specific brain activities – a lower-level cause. Additionally, skills can be consolidated when individuals join forces and establish a common interest group (Dorado, 2013) – a same-level cause. As skills are always triggered by various aspects and can impact different settings that are located at different levels of analysis (Attewell, 1990), institutional entrepreneurs' skills are a suitable concept for a multi-level approach in microfoundations of institutions.

To make the concept of institutional entrepreneurs' skills for microfoundational research usable, I want to specify the term. Fligstein (1997, 2001) indeed defined specific skills that enable actors to initiate change. However, he groups these different abilities together under the concept of social skills. Nevertheless, skills are multi-dimensional in nature (Riggio, 1986). Similar to baseball skills that are both offensive and defensive (Curran & Mariotto, 1980), institutional entrepreneurs' skills range from passive to more active qualities. Hence, only with a precise definition of the concept's various facets can future scholars apply upon it a microfoundational approach. On this basis, these scholars can inquire about specific conditions

that form certain institutional entrepreneurs' skill dimensions, or they can investigate how the application of specific skill dimensions influences an institutional outcome accordingly. In accordance with the call to clarify concepts in institutional theory (Alvesson & Spicer, 2018), I want to accurately define the various dimensions of institutional entrepreneurs' skills.

METHODOLOGY

To determine relevant dimensions of institutional entrepreneurs' skills, I undertook a systematic literature review on institutional entrepreneurship. Thus, I focused on studies that illustrate how so-called institutional entrepreneurs (DiMaggio, 1988) – individuals, groups, or organizations with resources and an interest to initiate change – had been capable of altering institutions. Consequently, I developed essential dimensions of institutional entrepreneurs' skills from the existing literature on institutional entrepreneurship.

In accordance with Webster and Watson's (2002) methodological guidelines, my review focused on top management peer-reviewed journals. I focused on the top 60 management journals according to Web of Science's Journal Citation Reports for 2018. Within these journals, I screened for papers that included the term *institutional entrepreneur** in the title, in the abstract, and/or among the keywords. I included papers from 1988 onwards, as current management literature on institutional entrepreneurship usually refers to DiMaggio's (1988) essay of that year. Additionally, I screened the fifty most cited publications (based on Web of Science's Science Citation Index for the year 2018) that contain the term *institutional entrepreneur** in the title, in the abstract, and/or among the keywords. Accordingly, I wanted to ensure a complete set of relevant literature on institutional entrepreneurship regardless of the respective journal.

Corresponding to this approach, I shortlisted 81 papers (28 theoretical papers, 53 empirical papers). The papers had been published in 23 different peer-reviewed journals. Among these journals were well-known management titles with frequent contributions to

institutional theory such as *Journal of Management*, *Academy of Management Journal*, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *Organization Studies*, or *Organization Science*. The selection also included a wide range of management journals with specific research areas such as *Journal of International Business Studies*, *Research Policy*, or *Organization and Environment*. The additional applied selection procedure (based on a high citation rate) similarly ensured the inclusion of the relevant sociology paper *American Journal of Sociology*.

For the literature review, I exclusively analysed the 53 shortlisted empirical papers. I read all the papers. Subsequently, I established relevant dimensions of institutional entrepreneurs' skills from the findings of each study by applying an abductive research approach – as proposed, inter alia, by Shepherd and Sutcliffe (2011).

UNPACKING INSTITUTIONAL ENTREPRENEURS' SKILLS

Figure 1 combines the developed institutional entrepreneurs' skills (see Appendix A for the systematic derivation). I allocated the skill dimensions along three phases of an institutional change process. In a *preliminary phase* – before a new institution has been established – I foresee the need of two skill dimensions to initiate change: *analytical skills* (the ability to perceive opportunities for change) and *empathic skills* (the ability to put oneself into different positions). During the actual phase of establishing an institution – the *initiation phase* – I argue that *framing skills* (the ability to design institutional projects in accordance with the audience's knowledge) and *translational skills* (the ability to speak the language of diverse actors) are necessary skill dimensions to advance change. During the final *implementation phase*, I presume that *organizational skills* (the ability to establish instruments that ensure the implementation of new practices and/or rules) and *tactical skills* (the ability to counter power struggles) are the most central skill dimensions to consolidate new institutions. Finally, I imply that *timing skills* (the ability to identify the proper moments to induce change) are another skill dimension to ensure the fluidity of an institutional change process.

I do not argue that all skill dimensions are equally required to advance institutional change. Instead, I assert that the respective context fosters some skill dimensions more than others – see discussion hereinafter. Correspondingly, I foresee that the various skill dimensions will not appear one after another as illustrated in this figure. The described phases of an institutional change process might overlap and/or iterate, which is why certain skill dimensions will most likely emerge as closely connected. Hence, the developed figure is to be understood as a panoply of institutional entrepreneurs' skill dimensions that actors can apply when advancing an institutional change process.

Take in Figure 1

Analytical Skills

Research has shown that institutional entrepreneurs recognize windows of opportunities for change (Alexandrescu, Martinát, Klusácek & Bartke, 2014; Lawrence & Philipps, 2004; Mutch, 2007). Such opportunities emerge during ambiguous situations (Wallin & Fuglsang, 2017), which are caused, amongst others, by the clash of diverging logics (Friedland & Alford, 1991) – “socially constructed, historical patterns of material practices, assumptions, values, beliefs, and rules” (Thornton & Ocasio, 1999, p. 804). These situations raise so-called institutional contradictions, which are incompatible institutional arrangements (Seo & Creed, 2002). Actors can take advantage of these situations (Bartley, 2007; Tracey, Philipps & Jarvis, 2011) to modify or even change existing institutions (Battilana et al., 2009; Delbridge & Edwards, 2008; Hardy & Maguire, 2017).

To take advantage of such contradicting situations, actors must actually recognize these opportunities. Hence, these actors must be capable of perceiving institutional contradictions. Therefore, I argue that actors who initiate change require *analytical skills*. I assert that actors

with such skills are able to actively notice contradicting circumstances that challenge previous institutions. Hence, I claim that actors with *analytical skills* will more likely advance an institutional change process to remedy the identified contradictions.

Mair and Marti (2009) discuss the importance of *analytical skills* in the example of the NGO BRAC that acted as an institutional entrepreneur by introducing a microfinance programme for ultra-poor in Bangladesh. The NGO realized that the initial implementation of a microfinance programme had failed, as the traditional institutional elements of rural Bangladesh clashed with the aligned market rules of the proposed microfinance programme. Only when the NGO realized these contradictions, which the scholars define as institutional voids, could it use them as an opportunity space. By acting as a bricoleur, while combining selected elements of the initially clashing institutions, the NGO could establish a successful microfinance programme that worked for the ultra-poor. Consequently, BRAC's *analytical skills* was an essential criterion to achieve the NGO's mission and thus to initiate institutional change.

Empathic Skills

Previous studies have identified that institutional entrepreneurs have wide networks of diverse actors (David, Sine & Haveman, 2013; Heinze & Weber, 2016; Hung & Whittington, 2011). Such networks function as valuable assets when attempting to gather allies behind new institutions (Maguire, Hardy & Lawrence, 2004; Qureshi, Kistruck & Bhatt, 2016); allies adopt and spread new institutions such that they become standard across a social field (Canales, 2016). Therefore, actors who want to change institutions depend on other actors to advance an institutional project.

To gather allies more easily, I argue that actors targeting initiating change need *empathic skills*. If potential allies feel seriously understood by upcoming institutional entrepreneurs, I assume that these allies will trust and thus support the entrepreneurs' innovative projects. I

foresee that actors with truly *empathic skills* will thus more likely gather diverse allies behind a newly created vision for change.

For instance, in Argyris and Ransbotham's (2016) case study, we experience that the presented institutional entrepreneur, Victoria, had *empathic skills* that supported her in institutionalizing new wiki-based management practices in a media company. As the organization experienced a high employee turnover rate, Victoria developed a knowledge management system to allow newcomers an easy start in their work tasks. She easily found allies, as she could empathize with her colleagues: "We were all struggling with the same issues..." (ibid., p. 234). She could create a sense of togetherness, whereby she was able to easily build a core team that supported her idea. Thus, it is also thanks to her *empathic skills* that colleagues helped her in writing as well as in expanding the content for the suggested management tool, and thus in institutionalizing her project.

Framing Skills

Various studies have shown that institutional entrepreneurs frame an institutional project in accordance with the audience's knowledge to advance an innovative idea (Etzion & Ferraro, 2010; Durand & McGuire, 2005; Lounsbury & Crumley, 2007; Munir & Phillips, 2005). As institutional entrepreneurs depend on other actors' support, they attempt to illustrate the value of a potential innovation as well as possible (Benner & Ranganathan, 2017; King & Soule, 2007). This approach works best if a project has been designed with features that are familiar to the targeted audience (Ahrens & Ferry, 2018; Lo, 2015). If the project has not, a new idea might appear overly alien for potential allies (Heusinkveld & Reijers, 2009; Van Dijk, Berends, Jelinek, Romme & Weggeman, 2011).

Actors who want to establish an innovative idea require skills that allow them to adequately conceptualize an institutional project. I argue that *framing skills* are such needed skills. Thanks to these skills, actors are able to mantle an institutional project that connects to the targeted audience's knowledge. Thus, actors with these skills will design an innovation in

a manner that allows potential users to better anticipate its value. Consequently, I presume that actors with *framing skills* are more successful in launching a commonly accepted institutional change project.

The case study regarding Thomas Edison's introduction of the electric lighting system in New York demonstrates the relevance of *framing skills*. Edison, who can be understood as an institutional entrepreneur, used skeuomorphs to establish his project (Hargadon & Douglas, 2001). Skeuomorphs are design ornaments on a new product that refer to an old product but are of no direct benefit (Basalla, 1988). Thus, Edison designed the electric lighting system by introducing elements of the previous incumbent gas lighting system, although the new product thus became costlier. However, by this approach, people skipped more easily to Edison's innovative electric system as it appeared partly familiar to them. Thus, in addition, due to his *framing skills*, Edison was able to change New York's lighting system.

Translational Skills

Literature has revealed that institutional entrepreneurs can easily communicate with actors of different logic backgrounds (Déjean, Gond & Leca, 2004; Leca & Naccache, 2006; Newenham-Kahindi & Stevens, 2017). As institutional logics influence the manner in how actors speak and argue (Heinze & Weber, 2016; Maguire et al., 2004), potential institutional entrepreneurs adopt their language accordingly (McInerney, 2008). Thus, these entrepreneurs hope to unite a multitude of diverse actors behind a vision for change (Hung & Whittington, 2011).

On this basis, I argue that actors who want to initiate change require *translational skills*. Thanks to these skills, these actors are able to use specific terms that potential allies understand more easily. Alternatively, these actors can render arguments as it is common among the addressed actors. Furthermore, these actors can pass messages from one group to another. Consequently, I presume that actors with such communicative skills will more likely gather allies behind a visionary project.

Czarniawska's (2009) research illustratively discloses how *translational skills* played a role when the institutional entrepreneurs Sidney and Beatrice Webb founded the London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE) in 1885; this was a university that differentiated from other British universities of that time, as it was open to everyone. Webbs' idea was inspired by the École Libre des Sciences Politiques in Paris as well as by Columbia University in New York. The Webbs imported the idea of a social science university to London and were able to find supportive sponsors. As stated by Czarniawska (2009), the Webbs' ability to translate was essential to find these allies; they connected their idea to a current public concern, which said that Britain's international position in business and industry was at risk. Hence, the Webbs translated their proposed innovation into the interests and concerns and therefore the logic of potential supporters. In addition, as a result of the Webbs' *translational skills*, they were able to establish an innovative idea such as the LSE.

Organizational Skills

Existing research has discovered that institutional entrepreneurs take appropriate measures – such as practices and rules – to implement an institutional project (Child, Lu & Tsai, 2007; Garud et al., 2002; Wijen & Ansari, 2007). Such measures ensure that new institutions are respected by concerned actors (Murdoch & Geys, 2014; Olsen, 2017). Thus, new institutions shall be continuously reproduced through daily activities (Bisel, Kramer & Banas, 2017; Sharma, Lawrence & Lowe, 2010) and spread among social fields or organizations (Kukk, Moors & Hekkert, 2016; Rao, 1998; Svejenova, Mazza & Planellas, 2007). Hence, new institutions become steadily institutionalized through the consideration of such measures.

To establish relevant measures, I claim that actors who want to change institutions necessitate *organizational skills*. These skills enable actors to formalize practices/rules in a meaningful manner such that these measures lead to the implementation of the envisaged institution. Furthermore, thanks to these skills, upcoming change agents can wisely place actors as guardians of such new practices/rules to ensure their implementation. Consequently, I

hypothesize that actors with *organizational skills* will more successfully implement new institutional projects.

Greenwood and Suddaby's (2006) study on the big five accounting firms (Arthur Andersen, Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu, Ernst & Young, KPMG, and PricewaterhouseCoopers) is a suitable example of how actors' *organizational skills* enabled institutional change. The Big Five acted as institutional entrepreneurs because they changed their organizational strategy by adopting multidisciplinary practices; they began to deliver consulting services in addition to the traditional accounting activities. Once the Big Five had changed their strategy, they offered in-house training programmes to diffuse the new values throughout the dispersed company. Thus, the companies ensured that their employees became familiar with the new norms and began reproducing these new institutions. Therefore, the Big Five's *organizational skills* were an essential piece to foresee the necessity of developing an in-house training programme and thus to institutionalize new institutions.

Tactical Skills

The literature review has also revealed that institutional entrepreneurs perform tactical manoeuvres to consolidate new institutions (Dieleman & Sachs, 2008; Van Bockhaven, Matthyssens & Vandenbempt, 2015; Zilber, 2007). These steps might be necessary as institutional change processes can produce losers (Khan, Munir & Willmott, 2007), which likely mobilize their remaining power to combat such turnovers (Garud et al., 2002). Institutional entrepreneurs use tactics to circumvent or respond to such power battles (Maguire & Hardy, 2006; Van Dijk et al., 2011).

To successfully struggle along, I foresee that actors establishing new institutions require *tactical skills*. Such skills permit actors to take specific actions to gain advantage against potential opponents. Thus, the skills can help to overcome challengers' initial weaker positions that they might encounter as actors who contest the status quo. For instance, actors with such skills take measures to appear inconspicuous to potential opponents or actively denigrate

opponents to weaken their position. Consequently, I imply that actors with *tactical skills* are able to proficiently address such power games and will more likely implement new institutions.

For instance, Santos and Eisenhardt (2009), demonstrate the relevance of *tactical skills* throughout an institutional change process. The researchers disclose the tactics of five ventures acting as institutional entrepreneurs during the emergence of the US internet market in the mid-2000s. As small players within the business field, they formed alliances with larger partners from proximate markets. These players did so to provide a small segment of the opportunity to potential competitors and thus to deter them by winning their support. Thus, these players “created a demilitarized zone” that allowed the ventures’ further growth. (ibid., p. 655). Once the ventures were established, the institutional entrepreneurs acquired smaller emerging firms with comparable business portfolios. The acquisitions were also a tactical manoeuvre to block entry by established firms, which may have purchased the rivals otherwise. Consequently, the ventures had to equally count on their *tactical skills* to establish a new organization within an emerging market and thus to implement new institutions.

Timing Skills

Finally, literature on institutional entrepreneurship has also discussed change agents’ sense of time (DiVito, 2012; Henfridsson & Yoo, 2014; Hermes & Mainela, 2014). Institutional entrepreneurs refer to their temporal senses as better or worse moments exist to launch or implement new institutions (Canales, 2016; Heinze & Weber, 2016). Hence, institutional entrepreneurs are aware of appropriate moments to advance institutional change processes with as few disruptions as possible (Garud et al., 2002).

As such temporal aspects are relevant, I assume that actors require *timing skills* to advance institutional change processes. Thanks to these skills, actors are able to await the proper moment to move forward by establishing or implementing new institutions. Thus, the skills enable actors to early identify the missing pieces that are needed to advance institutional change

processes. Hence, I predict that actors with *timing skills* will thrive more in executing institutional change.

Buhr's (2012) study on the implementation of an EU emission trading scheme describes the role of *timing skills* during a change process. The policy – aiming at reducing greenhouse gas emissions – was introduced by various players such as by “the European aviation industry, NGOs, consultants and think tanks, and governmental representatives from European nation-states” (ibid., p. 1577). The players acted as institutional entrepreneurs as they collectively lobbied for the trading solution and rejected the other two alternatives (taxes and charges). The players succeeded by intentionally awaiting the UK six-month-long EU Presidency in 2005. The institutional entrepreneurs chose this moment as the British airlines supported the same solution. This support was linked to a parallel national debate on airport expansion, which is why the airlines required a green image that was not overly costly for them. Thus, the institutional entrepreneurs understood that the best moment to lobby for an emission trading scheme was the UK half year-long EU Presidency. Hence, the effective implementation of the EU emission trading scheme can also be traced to the involved institutional entrepreneurs' *timing skills*.

IMPLICATIONS

Upon these findings, future scholars can now develop tools to measure the concept. For instance, scholars can establish direct or indirect measuring methods such as observations techniques, interviews, or questionnaires to detect actors' possession of respective institutional entrepreneurs' skill dimensions. Subsequently, by contrasting different measured results, scholars can investigate the specific conditions that are responsible for the formation of particular skill dimensions. Furthermore, scholars can examine which essential situations trigger the emergence of decisive skill dimensions. Finally, scholars can inquire how the application of specific skill dimensions lead to respective institutional outcomes.

Consequently, as all potential causes and effects of institutional entrepreneurs' skills are located on higher- and/or lower-level structures, scholars can thus apply a multi-level approach in microfoundations of institutions. Therefore, future researchers can not only determine institutional change processes more accurately, institutional theorists can also overcome the image of the "heroic change agent", which is a conceptualization of institutional entrepreneurs that misleadingly portrays change agents as hyper muscular actors appearing from nowhere to transform the world (Lawrence & Suddaby, 2006). When using institutional entrepreneurs' skills at the centre of investigation, scholars can closely explore why and when certain actors are able and willing to change institutions. Thus, scholars can provide answers to the often-discussed paradox of embedded agency: "How can actors change institutions if their actions, intentions, and, rationality are all conditioned by the very institution they wish to change?" (Holm, 1995).

CONCLUSION

To apply a microfoundational approach when studying institutional change processes, I have suggested defining relevant dimensions of institutional entrepreneurs' skills. Therefore, I undertook a systematic literature review on institutional entrepreneurship. On this basis, I discovered seven dimensions of institutional entrepreneurs' skills that actors can apply during an institutional change process. The findings shall enable future microfoundational research.

REFERENCES

- Ahrens, T., & Ferry, L. (2018). Institutional Entrepreneurship, Practice Memory, and Cultural Memory: Choice and Creativity in the Pursuit of Endogenous Change of Local Authority Budgeting. *Management Accounting Research*, 38, 12-21.
- Alexandrescu, F., Martinát, S., Klusáček, P., & Bartke, S. (2014). The Path from Passivity Toward Entrepreneurship: Public Sector Actors in Brownfield Regeneration Processes in Central and Eastern Europe. *Organization & Environment*, 27(2), 181-201.
- Alvesson, M., & Spicer, A. (2018). Neo-Institutional Theory and Organization Studies: A Mid-Life Crisis? *Organization Studies*.
- Argyris, Y. A., & Ransbotham, S. (2016). Knowledge Entrepreneurship: Institutionalising Wiki-Based Knowledge-Management Processes in Competitive and Hierarchical Organisations. *Journal of Information Technology*, 31(2), 226-239.
- Attewell, P. (1990). What is Skill?. *Work and Occupations*, 17(4), 422-448.
- Bartley, T. (2007). Institutional Emergence in an Era of Globalization: The Rise of Transnational Private Regulation of Labor and Environmental Conditions. *American Journal of sociology*, 113(2), 297-351.
- Basalla, G. (1988). *The Evolution of Technology*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Battilana, J., Leca, B., & Boxenbaum, E. (2009). How Actors Change Institutions: Towards a Theory of Institutional Entrepreneurship. *Academy of Management Annals*, 3(1), 65-107.
- Benner, M. J., & Ranganathan, R. (2017). Measuring Up? Persistence and Change in Analysts' Evaluative Schemas Following Technological Change. *Organization Science*, 28(4), 760-780.
- Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The Social Construction of Reality*. London: Penguin Books.

- Bisel, R. S., Kramer, M. W., & Banas, J. A. (2017). Scaling Up to Institutional Entrepreneurship: A life History of an Elite Training Gymnastics Organization. *Human Relations*, 70(4), 410-435.
- Bryson, J. (2017). Disciplinary Perspectives on Skill. In C. Warhurst, K. Mayhew, D. Finegold & J. Buchanan (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Skills and Training* (pp. 17-35). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Buhr, K. (2012). The Inclusion of Aviation in the EU Emissions Trading Scheme: Temporal Conditions for Institutional Entrepreneurship. *Organization Studies*, 33(11), 1565-1587.
- Canales, R. (2016). From Ideals to Institutions: Institutional Entrepreneurship and the Growth of Mexican Small Business Finance. *Organization Science*, 27(6), 1548-1573.
- Cardinale, I. (2018). Beyond Constraining and Enabling: Toward New Microfoundations for Institutional Theory. *Academy of Management Review*, 43(1), 132-155.
- Chandler, D., & Hwang, H. (2015). Learning from Learning Theory: A Model of Organizational Adoption Strategies at the Microfoundations of Institutional Theory. *Journal of Management*, 41(5), 1446-1476.
- Child, J., Lu, Y., & Tsai, T. (2007). Institutional Entrepreneurship in Building an Environmental Protection System for the People's Republic of China. *Organization Studies*, 28(7), 1013-1034.
- Coleman, J. S. (1986). Social Theory, Social Research, and a Theory of Action. *American Journal of Sociology*, 91(6), 1309-1335.
- Creed, W. D., DeJordy, R., & Lok, J. (2010). Being the Change: Resolving Institutional Contradiction through Identity Work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(6), 1336-1364.
- Curran, J. P., & Mariotto, M. J. (1980). A Conceptual Structure for the Assessment of Social Skills. *Progress in Behavior Modification*, 10, 1-37.

- Czarniawska, B. (2009). Emerging Institutions: Pyramids or Anthills?. *Organization Studies*, 30(4), 423-441.
- David, R. J., Sine, W. D., & Haveman, H. A. (2013). Seizing Opportunity in Emerging Fields: How Institutional Entrepreneurs Legitimated the Professional Form of Management Consulting. *Organization Science*, 24(2), 356-377.
- Déjean, F., Gond, J. P., & Leca, B. (2004). Measuring the Unmeasured: An Institutional Entrepreneur Strategy in an Emerging Industry. *Human Relations*, 57(6), 741-764.
- Delbridge, R., & Edwards, T. (2008). Challenging Conventions: Roles and Processes During Non-Isomorphic Institutional Change. *Human Relations*, 61(3), 299-325.
- Dieleman, M., & Sachs, W. M. (2008). Coevolution of Institutions and Corporations in Emerging Economies: How the Salim Group Morphed into an Institution of Suharto's Crony Regime. *Journal of Management Studies*, 45(7), 1274-1300.
- DiMaggio, P. J. (1988). Interest and Agency in Institutional Theory. In L. G. Zucker (Ed.), *Institutional Patterns and Organizations* (pp. 3-22). Cambridge: Ballinger.
- DiVito, L. (2012). Institutional Entrepreneurship in Constructing Alternative Paths: A Comparison of Biotech Hybrids. *Research Policy*, 41(5), 884-896.
- Dorado, S. (2013). Small Groups as Context for Institutional Entrepreneurship: An Exploration of the Emergence of Commercial Microfinance in Bolivia. *Organization Studies*, 34(4), 533-557.
- Durand, R., & McGuire, J. (2005). Legitimizing Agencies in the Face of Selection: The Case of AACSB. *Organization Studies*, 26(2), 165-196.
- Etzion, D., & Ferraro, F. (2010). The Role of Analogy in the Institutionalization of Sustainability Reporting. *Organization Science*, 21(5), 1092-1107.
- Felin, T., Foss, N. J., & Ployhart, R. E. (2015). The Microfoundations Movement in Strategy and Organization Theory. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 9(1), 575-632.

- Fligstein, N. (1997). Social Skill and Institutional Theory. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 40(4), 397-405.
- Fligstein, N. (2001). Social Skill and the Theory of Fields. *Sociological Theory*, 19(2), 105-125.
- Friedland, R., & Alford, R. R. (1991). Bringing Society Back In: Symbols, Practices and Institutional Contradictions. In W. W. Powell and P. J. DiMaggio (Eds.), *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis* (pp. 232-263). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Furnari, S. (2014). Interstitial Spaces: Microinteraction Settings and the Genesis of New Practices Between Institutional Fields. *Academy of Management Review*, 39(4), 439-462.
- Garud, R., Jain, S., & Kumaraswamy, A. (2002). Institutional Entrepreneurship in the Sponsorship of Common Technological Standards: The Case of Sun Microsystems and Java. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(1), 196-214.
- Greenwood, R., & Suddaby, R. (2006). Institutional Entrepreneurship in Mature Fields: The Big Five Accounting Firms. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(1), 27-48.
- Haack, P., Sieweke, J. & Wessel, L. (2019). From Micro-Level Research to Microfoundations of Institutions. In P. Haack, J. Sieweke & L. Wessel (Eds.), *Microfoundations of Institutions (Research in the Sociology of Organizations)*. Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Hardy, C. & Maguire, S. (2017). Institutional Entrepreneurship and Change in Fields. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, T.B. Lawrence & R.E. Meyer (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism (2nd Edition)* (pp. 261-280). London: SAGE reference.
- Hargadon, A. B., & Douglas, Y. (2001). When Innovations Meet Institutions: Edison and the Design of the Electric Light. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46(3), 476-501.
- Harmon, D., Haack, P., & Roulet, T. J. (forthcoming). Microfoundations of Institutions: A Matter of Structure vs. Agency or Level of Analysis? *Academy of Management Review*.

- Heinze, K. L., & Weber, K. (2016). Toward Organizational Pluralism: Institutional Intrapreneurship in Integrative Medicine. *Organization Science*, 27(1), 157-172.
- Henfridsson, O., & Yoo, Y. (2014). The Liminality of Trajectory Shifts in Institutional Entrepreneurship. *Organization Science*, 25(3), 932-950.
- Hermes, J. W., & Mainela, T. (2014). Mobilizing Crisis Management Networks—Entrepreneurial Behavior in Turbulent Contexts. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 43(6), 967-976.
- Heusinkveld, S., & Reijers, H. A. (2009). Reflections on a Reflective Cycle: Building Legitimacy in Design Knowledge Development. *Organization Studies*, 30(8), 865–886.
- Holm, P. (1995). The Dynamics of Institutionalization: Transformation Processes in Norwegian Fisheries. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40(3), 398-422.
- Hung, S. C., & Whittington, R. (2011). Agency in National Innovation Systems: Institutional Entrepreneurship and the Professionalization of Taiwanese IT. *Research Policy*, 40(4), 526-538.
- Jepperson, R., & Meyer, J. W. (2011). Multiple Levels of Analysis and the Limitations of Methodological Individualisms. *Sociological Theory*, 29(1), 54-73.
- Khan, F. R., Munir, K. A., & Willmott, H. (2007). A Dark Side of Institutional Entrepreneurship: Soccer Balls, Child Labour and Postcolonial Impoverishment. *Organization Studies*, 28(7), 1055-1077.
- King, B. G., & Soule, S. A. (2007). Social Movements as Extra-Institutional Entrepreneurs: The Effect of Protests on Stock Price Returns. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 52(3), 413-442.
- Kukk, P., Moors, E. H., & Hekkert, M. P. (2016). Institutional Power Play in Innovation Systems: The Case of Herceptin®. *Research Policy*, 45(8), 1558-1569.

- Lawrence, T. B., & Phillips, N. (2004). From Moby Dick to Free Willy: Macro-Cultural Discourse and Institutional Entrepreneurship in Emerging Institutional Fields. *Organization*, 11(5), 689-711.
- Lawrence, T. B., & Suddaby, R. (2006). Institutions and Institutional Work. In S. R. Clegg, C. Hardy, T. B. Lawrence & W. R. Nord (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Organizational Studies* (pp. 215-254). London: SAGE Publications.
- Leca, B., & Naccache, P. (2006). A Critical Realist Approach to Institutional Entrepreneurship. *Organization*, 13(5), 627-651.
- Lo, J. Y. C. (2015). Selling Science: Resource Mobilization Strategies in the Emerging Field of Nanotechnology. *Research Policy*, 44(8), 1513-1526.
- Lounsbury, M., & Crumley, E. T. (2007). New Practice Creation: An Institutional Perspective on Innovation. *Organization Studies*, 28(7), 993-1012.
- Maguire, S., & Hardy, C. (2006). The Emergence of New Global Institutions: A Discursive Perspective. *Organization Studies*, 27(1), 7-29.
- Maguire, S., Hardy, C., & Lawrence, T. B. (2004). Institutional Entrepreneurship in Emerging Fields: HIV/AIDS Treatment Advocacy in Canada. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47(5), 657-679.
- Mair, J., & Marti, I. (2009). Entrepreneurship in and around Institutional Voids: A case Study from Bangladesh. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 24(5), 419-435.
- McInerney, P. B. (2008). Showdown at Kykuit: Field-Configuring Events as Loci for Conventionalizing Accounts. *Journal of Management Studies*, 45(6), 1089-1116.
- Munir, K. A., & Phillips, N. (2005). The Birth of the 'Kodak Moment': Institutional entrepreneurship and the Adoption of New Technologies. *Organization Studies*, 26(11), 1665-1687.

- Murdoch, Z., & Geys, B. (2014). Institutional Dynamics in International Organizations: Lessons from the Recruitment Procedures of the European External Action Service. *Organization Studies*, 35(12), 1793–1811.
- Mutch, A. (2007). Reflexivity and the Institutional Entrepreneur: A Historical Exploration. *Organization Studies*, 28(7), 1123-1140.
- Newenham-Kahindi, A., & Stevens, C. E. (2017). An Institutional Logics Approach to Liability of Foreignness: The Case of Mining MNEs in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 1-21.
- Olsen, T. D. (2017). Rethinking Collective Action: The Co-Evolution of the State and Institutional Entrepreneurs in Emerging Economies. *Organization Studies*, 38(1), 31-52.
- Perkmann, M., & Spicer, A. (2007). 'Healing the Scars of History': Projects, Skills and Field Strategies in Institutional Entrepreneurship. *Organization Studies*, 28(7), 1101-1122.
- Powell, W. W., & Colyvas, J. A. (2008). Microfoundations of Institutional Theory. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Sahlin & R. Suddaby (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism* (pp. 279-298). London: SAGE reference.
- Powell, W. W., & Rerup, C. (2017). Opening the Black Box: The Microfoundations of Institutions. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, T.B. Lawrence & R.E. Meyer (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism (2nd Edition)* (pp. 311-337). London: SAGE reference.
- Qureshi, I., Kistruck, G. M., & Bhatt, B. (2016). The Enabling and Constraining Effects of Social Ties in the Process of Institutional Entrepreneurship. *Organization Studies*, 37(3), 425-447.
- Rao, H. (1998). Caveat Emptor: The Construction of Nonprofit Consumer Watchdog Organizations. *American Journal of Sociology*, 103(4), 912-961.
- Riggio, R. E. (1986). Assessment of Basic Social Skills. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51(3), 649-660.

- Santos, F. M., & Eisenhardt, K. M. (2009). Constructing Markets and Shaping Boundaries: Entrepreneurial Power in Nascent Fields. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52(4), 643-671.
- Seo, M. G., & Creed, W. D. (2002). Institutional Contradictions, Praxis, and Institutional Change: A Dialectical Perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 27(2), 222-247.
- Sharma, U., Lawrence, S., & Lowe, A. (2010). Institutional Contradiction and Management Control Innovation: A Field Study of Total Quality Management Practices in a Privatized Telecommunication Company. *Management Accounting Research*, 21(4), 251-264.
- Shepherd, D. A., & Sutcliffe, K. M. (2011). Inductive Top-Down Theorizing: A Source of New Theories of Organization. *Academy of Management Review*, 36(2), 361-380.
- Smets, M., Morris, T. I. M., & Greenwood, R. (2012). From Practice to Field: A Multilevel Model of Practice-Driven Institutional Change. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(4), 877-904.
- Svejenova, S., Mazza, C., & Planellas, M. (2007). Cooking up Change in Haute Cuisine: Ferran Adrià as an Institutional Entrepreneur. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 28(5), 539-561.
- Thornton, P. H., & Ocasio, W. (1999). Institutional Logics and the Historical Contingency of Power in Organizations: Executive Succession in the Higher Education Publishing Industry, 1958–1990. *American Journal of Sociology*, 105(3), 801-843.
- Thornton, P. H., Ocasio, W., & Lounsbury, M. (2012). *The Institutional Logics Perspective: A New Approach to Culture, Structure, and Process*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Tracey, P., Phillips, N., & Jarvis, O. (2011). Bridging Institutional Entrepreneurship and the Creation of New Organizational Forms: A Multilevel Model. *Organization Science*, 22(1), 60-80.

- Van Bockhaven, W., Matthyssens, P., & Vandenbempt, K. (2015). Empowering the Underdog: Soft Power in the Development of Collective Institutional Entrepreneurship in Business Markets. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 48, 174-186.
- Van Dijk, S., Berends, H., Jelinek, M., Romme, A. G. L., & Weggeman, M. (2011). Micro-Institutional Affordances and Strategies of Radical Innovation. *Organization Studies*, 32(11), 1485-1513.
- Wallin, A. J., & Fuglsang, L. (2017). Service Innovations Breaking Institutionalized Rules of Health Care. *Journal of Service Management*, 28(5), 972-997.
- Webster, J., & Watson, R. (2002). Analyzing the Past to Prepare for the Future: Writing a Literature Review. *MIS Quarterly*, 26(2), Xiii-Xxiii.
- Wijen, F., & Ansari, S. (2007). Overcoming Inaction through Collective Institutional Entrepreneurship: Insights from Regime Theory. *Organization Studies*, 28(7), 1079–1100.
- Zilber, T. B. (2007). Stories and the Discursive Dynamics of Institutional Entrepreneurship: The Case of Israeli High-Tech after the Bubble. *Organization Studies*, 28(7), 1035-1054.

APPENDIX A

Table 1. Derivation of Institutional Entrepreneurs' (IEs') Analytical Skills

Author(s), publication year	Examined IE(s), empirical setting, time frame	Identified analytical skills of examined IE(s)
Alexandrescu, Martinát, Klusáček & Bartke, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Civil servants · EU-funded project · 2011-2014 	IEs identify relevant causes of the problem to be solved.
Argyris & Ransbotham, 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Victoria (individual) · NBC Universal, US · - 	IE recognizes the need to develop a new tool within an organization.
Bartley, 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · NGOs · Transnational private regulations on social performance · 1987-2000 	IEs understand that traditional arenas are hostile to developing transnational regulations, whereby they identify functioning alternatives.
Bisel, Kramer & Banas, 2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Alexis Reader (individual) · Elite gymnastics in the US · - 	Institutional resistance is increased due to the IE's sensemaking process.
Child, Lu & Tsai, 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Republic of China · Environmental Protection System in China · 1972-2001 	IE understands the need to take actions due to environmental problems and international debates on the same problems.
Czarniawska, 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Beatrice and Sidney Webb (individuals) · London School of Economics and Political Science, UK · 1895-1995 	IEs notice the current zeitgeist that sets the basis to create new institutions.
Delbridge & Edwards, 2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Jon Bannenberg (individual) · Superyacht industry · 1974-2004 	IE uses changing consumer demands and newly available financial resources to create institutions according to his ideas.

INSTITUTIONAL ENTREPRENEURS' SKILLS: A MULTI-DIMENSIONAL CONCEPT

Dieleman & Sachs, 2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Salim Group (organization) · Economy in Indonesia · 1938-2005 	Due to an acute awareness of the institutional context, the IE adopts its business strategy accordingly.
Durand & McGuire, 2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · AACSB (organization) · Accreditation system of international business schools · 1916-2001 	IE recognize internal and external pressures that forces the modification of existing institutions.
Etzion & Ferraro, 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · CERES (organization) · Global Reporting Initiative · ~1995-2010 	IE further develops newly established institutions by recognizing differences between the emergent institution and an analogical source.
Greenwood & Suddaby, 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Firms · Accounting Industry · 1987-1999 	IEs detect raising tensions when conforming to existing conventions, whereby they search for alternatives.
Henfridsson & Yoo, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Designers · CarCorp, Europe · 2002-2011 	IEs develop innovations as they recognize an unsatisfactory performance of the current solution.
Hermes & Mainela, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Representatives of (N)GOs · Humanitarian peace-building community · - 	IEs rapidly adapt their behaviour to changing conditions.
Heusinkveld & Reijers, 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Professor · Piece of Design Knowledge, Netherlands · - 	IE identifies a knowledge gap at the intersection of two different fields on which he builds a new institution.
Lawrence & Phillips, 2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · John Cyprus (individual) · Whale-watching in Canada · ~1979-1997 	IE identifies clients' culturally conditioned changing attitudes as an opportunity for new institutions.
Leca & Naccache, 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · ARESE (organization) · Socially responsible investment industry in France · 1997-2002 	IE recognize the opportunity for new institutions in combining two different institutional logics.
Mair & Marti, 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · BRAC (organization) 	IE depicts institutional voids as opportunities to create new institutions.

INSTITUTIONAL ENTREPRENEURS' SKILLS: A MULTI-DIMENSIONAL CONCEPT

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Development aid in Bangladesh · ~1999-2006 	
McInerney, 2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Rob Stuart and Joan Fanning (individuals) · Nonprofit technology assistance in US · 1995-2000 	IE senses that the opportunity of developing a new institution exists by combining different institutional logics.
Murdoch & Geys, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Civil servants · Recruitment Procedures of the European External Action Service · 2010-2012 	IEs use the opportunity to interpret a vaguely formulated institution according to their advantage.
Mutch, 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Sir Andrew Barclay Walker (individual) · Public house management in Liverpool, UK · 1846-1914 	IE identifies chance to import taken-for-granted practices from elsewhere to develop new institutions.
Newenham-Kahindi & Stevens, 2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Firms · Mining industry in Sub-Saharan Africa · ~2005-2015 	IEs take a relational and holistic approach when interpreting given settings.
Olsen, 2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Associations · Microfinance industry in Brazil and Mexico · 1950-2000 	IEs understand that the inaction of the state provides opportunities to take actions.
Rao, 1998	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Nonprofit consumer watchdog organizations · Consumption sector in US · 1906-1971 	IEs realize that they must adopt institutions to ensure the political support of the state.
Svejenova, Mazza & Planellas, 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Ferran Adrià (individual) · Haute cuisine in Spain · 1983-2006 	IE projects new institutions by combining contradictory ingredients.

INSTITUTIONAL ENTREPRENEURS' SKILLS: A MULTI-DIMENSIONAL CONCEPT

Tracey, Phillips & Jarvis, 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Paul Harrod and Mark Richardson (individuals) · Social entrepreneurship sector in UK · ~1999-2008 	IEs identify innovative opportunities to address a problem that they view from the lenses of two different institutional logics.
Van Dijk, Berends, Jelinek, Romme & Weggeman, 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Research teams · PhemCO and OmegaSys, Europe · 1994-2006 	IEs perceive ambiguity, heterogeneity, as well as multiplicity, whereby they initiate institutional change.
Wallin & Fuglsang, 2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Ventures · Health care system in Europe · - 	Confusing events are the starting point for IEs' sensemaking process.

INSTITUTIONAL ENTREPRENEURS' SKILLS: A MULTI-DIMENSIONAL CONCEPT

Table 2. Derivation of Institutional Entrepreneurs' (IEs') Empathic Skills

Author(s), publication year	Examined IE(s), empirical setting, time frame	Identified empathic skills of examined IE(s)
Alexandrescu, Martinát, Klusáček & Bartke, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Civil servants · EU-funded project · 2011-2014 	IEs possess a wide network as a resource for implementing a new vision.
Argyris & Ransbotham, 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Victoria (individual) · NBC Universal, US · - 	IE shows an understanding with potential contributors' problem by empathizing with them.
Canales, 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Diverse actors · SME financing in Mexico · 2000-2008 	IEs is able to identify each other's dissenting but hidden beliefs.
David, Sine & Haveman, 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Founders of first consulting firms · Management consulting industry · ~1919-1938 	IEs have personal ties with relevant actors within and outside the emerging field.
Dieleman & Sachs, 2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Salim Group (organization) · Economy in Indonesia · 1938-2005 	IE has close connections with representatives of the country's leading regime.
Greenwood & Suddaby, 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Firms · Accounting Industry · 1987-1999 	IEs are located at boundary bridging positions, whereby they are connected with diverse actors.
Heinze & Weber, 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Family Physicians · Health care system in US · 1998-2010 	IEs have high status within and outside the traditional institutional field.
Hung & Whittington, 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Firms · IT industry in Taiwan · 1980-2007 	IEs are highly connected with other relevant actors within and outside the country.
Lawrence & Phillips, 2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · John Cyprus (individual) · Whale-watching in Canada 	IE cooperates with other upcoming organizations to establish a new institutional field.

INSTITUTIONAL ENTREPRENEURS' SKILLS: A MULTI-DIMENSIONAL CONCEPT

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · ~1979-1997 	
Maguire, Hardy & Lawrence, 2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Roberts and Turner (individuals) · HIV / AIDS Treatment Advocacy in Canada · 1981-2000 	IEs are highly respected by actors from diverse institutional fields.
Newenham-Kahindi & Stevens, 2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Firms · Mining industry in Sub-Saharan Africa · ~2005-2015 	IEs collaborate with diverse actors to better understand the established institutional context.
Perkmann & Spicer, 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Diverse actors · EUREGIOs, Europe · 1954-2004 	IEs start cross-border cooperation.
Qureshi, Kistruck & Bhatt, 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Founders · Social enterprise sector in China · ~2012-2016 	IEs have heterophilic, thus much more diverse ties.
Van Bockhaven, Matthyssens & Vandenbempt, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Founders · Dutch electro-technical installation industry · ~2000-2008 	IEs are well connected within the industry.
Van Dijk, Berends, Jelinek, Romme & Weggeman, 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Research teams · PhemCO and OmegaSys, Europe · 1994-2006 	IEs have a boundary spanning position within the respective organizations.
Wijen and Ansari, 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Delegates of nation states · Kyoto Protocol · 1988-1997 	IEs are in solidarity with each other.

INSTITUTIONAL ENTREPRENEURS' SKILLS: A MULTI-DIMENSIONAL CONCEPT

Table 3. Derivation of Institutional Entrepreneurs' (IEs') Framing Skills

Author(s), publication year	Examined IE(s), empirical setting, time frame	Identified framing skills of examined IE(s)
Ahrens & Ferry, 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Newcastle City Council · Public sector in UK · 2010-2014 	IE refers to an organization's cultural memory to implement change.
Benner & Ranganathan, 2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Incumbent firms · Wireline telecommunication industry · 2002-2010 	IEs introduce the need for a new strategy by framing it in accordance with another convincing institutional logic.
Bisel, Kramer & Banas, 2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Alexis Reader (individual) · Elite gymnastics in the US · - 	IE convinces a potential collaborator by mantling the arguments with a universal institutional logic.
David, Sine & Haveman, 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Founders of first consulting firms · Management consulting industry · ~1919-1938 	IEs utilizes accepted expertise to develop a new institutional field.
Durand & McGuire, 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · AACSB (organization) · Accreditation system of international business schools · 1916-2001 	The modification of existing institutions occurs by reinforcing perception of continuity and adherence.
Etzion & Ferraro, 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · CERES (organization) · Global Reporting Initiative · ~1995-2010 	IE introduces a new institution by adapting it to the main institutional logic.
Hargadon & Douglas, 2001	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Thomas Edison (individual) · Electric lighting system in New York, US · 1878-1892 	To establish a new innovation, IE designs it in accordance with established technical features.
Heusinkveld & Reijers, 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Professor · Piece of Design Knowledge, Netherlands 	IE fails as the newly proposed method does not fit with established institutional practices.

INSTITUTIONAL ENTREPRENEURS' SKILLS: A MULTI-DIMENSIONAL CONCEPT

	· -	
Hung & Whittington, 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Firms · IT industry in Taiwan · 1980-2007 	IEs justify a new institution with traditional narratives.
King & Soule, 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Social movements · Economy in US · 1962-1990 	IEs are most influential when they target issues that are relevant to potential collaborators.
Kukk, Moors & Hekkert, 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Roche (organization) · Health care system in UK · 1999-2006 	IE launches a new product by initially developing a scientific discourse.
Lo, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Applicants · Research on nanotechnology in US · 1976-2005 	IEs are successful when they frame proposals in a manner that is familiar but that maintains a certain degree of novelty.
Lounsbury & Crumley, 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Money management professionals · Mutual fund industry in US · 1924-1985 	To establish an institutional field, IEs initially theorize the new practices.
Maguire & Hardy, 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · State and non-state actors · Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants · 1997-2004 	IE refer to established institutions to underpin their arguments.
Mair & Marti, 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · BRAC (organization) · Development aid in Bangladesh · ~1999-2006 	To introduce a new institution within an established institutional context, IE borrows practices from the respective context.
Munir & Phillips, 2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Kodak (organization) · Photography · 1882-1939 	IE embeds new institution in existing practices.
Perkmann & Spicer, 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Diverse actors · EUREGIOs, Europe · 1954-2004 	IEs theorize new institutions by means of analytical reports.

INSTITUTIONAL ENTREPRENEURS' SKILLS: A MULTI-DIMENSIONAL CONCEPT

Rao, 1998	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Nonprofit consumer watchdog organizations · Consumption sector in US · 1906-1971 	IEs infuse prevalent cultural elements into the new organizational form.
Santos & Eisenhardt, 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Ventures · Nascent IT industry in US · 1994-2000 	IEs “adopt templates” to develop a unique identity while being familiar and understandable to their audience.
Tracey, Phillips & Jarvis, 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Paul Harrod and Mark Richardson (individuals) · Social entrepreneurship sector in UK · ~1999-2008 	IEs theorize the organizational template on the basis of multiple institutional logics.
Van Dijk, Berends, Jelinek, Romme & Weggeman, 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Research teams · PhemCO and OmegaSys, Europe · 1994-2006 	IEs adapt their innovations to conform with the established institutional logic.
Wallin & Fuglsang, 2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Ventures · Health care system in Europe · - 	IEs present the advantages of a new product while referring to scientific theories.
Wijen and Ansari, 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Delegates of nation states · Kyoto Protocol · 1988-1997 	IEs develop a shared vision based on objective scientific evidence.
Zilber, 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Professional service providers and venture capitalists · High-tech industry in Israel · 2000-2001 	By means of stories, IE merge new narratives with old narratives to initiate institutional change.

INSTITUTIONAL ENTREPRENEURS' SKILLS: A MULTI-DIMENSIONAL CONCEPT

Table 4. Derivation of Institutional Entrepreneurs' (IEs') Translational Skills

Author(s), publication year	Examined IE(s), empirical setting, time frame	Identified translational skills of examined IE(s)
Czarniawska, 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Beatrice and Sidney Webb (individuals) · London School of Economics and Political Science, UK · 1895-1995 	IEs translate the envisaged institution into the current concerns of potential sponsors.
Déjean, Gond & Leca, 2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · ARESE (organization) · Socially responsible investment industry in France · 1997-2002 	IE presents a new institution that corresponds to the language of the professional standard of the targeted community.
Heinze & Weber, 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Family Physicians · Health care system in US · 1998-2010 	IEs establish platforms such that actors of diverse institutional backgrounds can increase mutual understanding.
Hung & Whittington, 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Firms · IT industry in Taiwan · 1980-2007 	IEs translate among actors of two different systems.
Leca & Naccache, 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · ARESE (organization) · Socially responsible investment industry in France · 1997-2002 	IE presents a new institution that corresponds to the language of the professional standard of the targeted community.
Maguire, Hardy & Lawrence, 2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Roberts and Turner (individuals) · HIV / AIDS Treatment Advocacy in Canada · 1981-2000 	IEs translate the interests of diverse stakeholders.
McInerney, 2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Rob Stuart and Joan Fanning (individuals) · Nonprofit technology assistance in US · 1995-2000 	IEs adjust the narrative to the language of potential contributors.

INSTITUTIONAL ENTREPRENEURS' SKILLS: A MULTI-DIMENSIONAL CONCEPT

Munir & Phillips, 2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none">· Kodak (organization)· Photography· 1882-1939	IE presents a new institution from the perspective of particular actors.
Murdoch & Geys, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none">· Civil servants· Recruitment Procedures of the European External Action Service· 2010-2012	IEs exchange ideas about new institutions in bilateral talks.
Newenham-Kahindi & Stevens, 2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none">· Firms· Mining industry in Sub-Saharan Africa· ~2005-2015	IEs employ local individuals who translate among the firms and the host country.

Table 5. Derivation of Institutional Entrepreneurs' (IEs') Organizational Skills

Author(s), publication year	Examined IE(s), empirical setting, time frame	Identified organizational skills of examined IE(s)
Argyris & Ransbotham, 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Victoria (individual) · NBC Universal, US · - 	IE ensures the routinization of new institutions by engaging key contributors who continuously apply new practices.
Bisel, Kramer & Banas, 2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Alexis Reader (individual) · Elite gymnastics in the US · - 	IEs develops a new organizational philosophy with corresponding practices and rituals.
Canales, 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Diverse actors · SME financing in Mexico · 2000-2008 	IEs establish media-effective meetings to demonstrate the existence of new institutions.
Child, Lu & Tsai, 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Republic of China · Environmental Protection System in China · 1972-2001 	IE defines new legal frameworks as the basis for new institutions and develops a new organizational unit as guardian of these new rules.
Czarniawska, 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Beatrice and Sidney Webb (individuals) · London School of Economics and Political Science, UK · 1895-1995 	The new institution becomes a legal body, while IEs document established practices.
David, Sine & Haveman, 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Founders of first consulting firms · Management consulting industry · ~1919-1938 	IEs develop a social code that clearly defines the content of the new institution.
Garud, Jain & Kumaraswamy, 2002	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Sun (organization) · IT industry in US · 1995-2000 	IE creates control mechanisms to ensure the compliance of the new institution.
Greenwood & Suddaby, 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Firms · Accounting Industry · 1987-1999 	IEs establish in-house training programmes to spread the new organizational identity.

INSTITUTIONAL ENTREPRENEURS' SKILLS: A MULTI-DIMENSIONAL CONCEPT

Heinze & Weber, 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Family Physicians · Health care system in US · 1998-2010 	IEs cultivate a core group that undertakes the change efforts.
Hung & Whittington, 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Firms · IT industry in Taiwan · 1980-2007 	IEs become policy advisers to circulate the new institution.
Kukk, Moors & Hekkert, 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Roche (organization) · Health care system in UK · 1999-2006 	IE develops a supplier network that spreads the new institution.
Lawrence & Phillips, 2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · John Cyprus (individual) · Whale-watching in Canada · ~1979-1997 	IE creates field organizations to self-regulate the emerging field.
Lounsbury & Crumley, 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Money management professionals · Mutual fund industry in US · 1924-1985 	IEs establish a professional association that organizes training programmes to ensure the implementation of new institutions.
Maguire, Hardy & Lawrence, 2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Roberts and Turner (individuals) · HIV / AIDS Treatment Advocacy in Canada · 1981-2000 	IEs institutionalize practices by attaching them to existing routines.
Munir & Phillips, 2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Kodak (organization) · Photography · 1882-1939 	IE develops new products, which encourage the use of new institutions.
Murdoch & Geys, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Civil servants · Recruitment Procedures of the European External Action Service · 2010-2012 	Formal guidelines are adopted to confirm with IEs' modified practices.
Olsen, 2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Associations · Microfinance industry in Brazil and Mexico · 1950-2000 	By means of a new law, newly developed practices become institutionalized.

INSTITUTIONAL ENTREPRENEURS' SKILLS: A MULTI-DIMENSIONAL CONCEPT

Perkmann & Spicer, 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Diverse actors · EUREGIOs, Europe · 1954-2004 	IEs lobby to spread newly developed institutions.
Rao, 1998	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Nonprofit consumer watchdog organizations · Consumption sector in US · 1906-1971 	IEs educate relevant stakeholders such that these stakeholders conform to newly developed institutions.
Sharma, Lawrence & Lowe, 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Managing directors · Telecom organization in Fiji · ~1986-2007 	IEs establish key teams that monitor the compliance of new institutions.
Svejenova, Mazza & Planellas, 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Ferran Adrià (individual) · Haute cuisine in Spain · 1983-2006 	IE spreads his work by publishing books and collaborating with media.
Tracey, Phillips & Jarvis, 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Paul Harrod and Mark Richardson (individuals) · Social entrepreneurship sector in UK · ~1999-2008 	IEs align with highly legitimate actors who enhance the distribution of the new institution.
Van Bockhaven, Matthyssens & Vandenbempt, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Founders · Dutch electro-technical installation industry · ~2000-2008 	IEs collaborate with new actors to obtain their symbolic legitimization.
Wallin & Fuglsang, 2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Ventures · Health care system in Europe · - 	IEs form inter-organizational collaborations with powerful actors who diffuse newly developed institutions.
Wijen and Ansari, 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Delegates of nation states · Kyoto Protocol · 1988-1997 	IEs establish mechanisms that guarantee the implementation of new institution.

INSTITUTIONAL ENTREPRENEURS' SKILLS: A MULTI-DIMENSIONAL CONCEPT

Table 6. Derivation of Institutional Entrepreneurs' (IEs') Tactical Skills

Author(s), publication year	Examined IE(s), empirical setting, time frame	Identified tactical skills of examined IE(s)
Canales, 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Diverse actors · SME financing in Mexico · 2000-2008 	IEs hide institutional experiments to conceal initial mistakes.
Dieleman & Sachs, 2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Salim Group (organization) · Economy in Indonesia · 1938-2005 	IE pursues a double strategy to be prepared for changing conditions.
Garud, Jain & Kumaraswamy, 2002	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Sun (organization) · IT industry in US · 1995-2000 	IE evokes the image of a common enemy to mobilize allies.
Hermes & Mainela, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Representatives of (N)GOs · Humanitarian peace-building community · - 	IEs offer free services to motivate collaboration.
Khan, Munir & Willmott, 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · NGOs · Soccer ball industry in Pakistan · 1995-2003 	IEs develop new institutions that do not help local actors but calm Western consumers.
Kukk, Moors & Hekkert, 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Roche (organization) · Health care system in UK · 1999-2006 	By means of media reports, IEs pressure politicians to facilitate access to new institution.
Maguire & Hardy, 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · State and non-state actors · Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants · 1997-2004 	IEs challenge the credibility of opponents' argumentation.
Santos & Eisenhardt, 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Ventures · Nascent IT industry in US · 1994-2000 	IEs collaborate with powerful actors and/or acquire ventures with similar business models to avoid attacks by potential rivals.
Van Bockhaven, Matthyssens & Vandenbempt, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Founders · Dutch electro-technical installation industry 	IEs operate stealthily to avoid attention from competitors.

INSTITUTIONAL ENTREPRENEURS' SKILLS: A MULTI-DIMENSIONAL CONCEPT

Van Dijk, Berends, Jelinek, Romme & Weggeman, 2011	· ~2000-2008	
	· Research teams · PhemCO and OmegaSys, Europe · 1994-2006	IEs lowers research budget to avoid attention.
Wijen and Ansari, 2007	· Delegates of nation states · Kyoto Protocol · 1988-1997	IEs leverage incentive instruments to establish cooperation.
Zilber, 2007	· Professional service providers and venture capitalists · High-tech industry in Israel · 2000-2001	IEs tell unofficial stories in which certain actors are blamed as a means to modify the existing institutional path.

INSTITUTIONAL ENTREPRENEURS' SKILLS: A MULTI-DIMENSIONAL CONCEPT

Table 7. Derivation of Institutional Entrepreneurs' (IEs') Timing Skills

Author(s), publication year	Examined IE(s), empirical setting, time frame	Identified timing skills of examined IE(s)
Buhr, 2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Diverse actors · EU Emissions Trading Scheme · 1998-2008 	IEs open a window of opportunity due to their time awareness.
Canales, 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Diverse actors · SME financing in Mexico · 2000-2008 	IEs craft organizational experiments to ensure new institutions' functionality before these institutions are publicly presented.
Dieleman & Sachs, 2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Salim Group (organization) · Economy in Indonesia · 1938-2005 	IE remains in the shadow until conditions are less hostile.
DiVito, 2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Firms · Dutch and British biotech industry · 1992-2007 	IEs initially gather financial resources before establishing new institutions.
Garud, Jain & Kumaraswamy, 2002	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Sun (organization) · IT industry in US · 1995-2000 	IE carefully chooses the right time to change the organization's strategy.
Heinze & Weber, 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Family Physicians · Health care system in US · 1998-2010 	IEs embed new institutional logic once new institutions have been carefully tested.
Henfridsson & Yoo, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Designers · CarCorp, Europe · 2002-2011 	IE experiment to eliminate insufficient solutions until a new institution is mature.
Hermes & Mainela, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Representatives of (N)GOs · Humanitarian peace-building community · - 	IEs show reticent behaviour to be perceived as a neutral actor.
Santos & Eisenhardt, 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Ventures · Nascent IT industry in US 	IEs undertake proactively pre-emptive actions to thwart potential rivals.

FIGURE 1

Dimensions of Institutional Entrepreneurs' Skills