Transdisciplinary, Transregional, Trans-sectoral (T3) Systemic Innovation: Reimagining Stakeholder Network Analysis

Ronald C. Williams, Coppin State University, rwilliams@coppin.edu
Ericka N. Covington, Coppin State University
Tammira Lucas, Coppin State University

ABSTRACT

This article presents a theoretical framework for a transdisciplinary, transregional, and trans-sectoral (T^3) stakeholder approach to stakeholder network analysis. By integrating insights from social sciences, business, and technology, the proposed framework emphasizes the importance of collaboration competencies and the interdependencies between various sectors and regions. The analysis draws on multilayer network theory to elucidate the complex economic relationships that exist in local production and the expansion of makerspaces as economic. Furthermore, it highlights the necessity of participatory modeling techniques to facilitate effective stakeholder engagement and knowledge co-production, which are crucial for addressing challenges in regional economic development (Siew & Döll, 2012). The framework also incorporates various forms of impact analysis, including economic performance metrics and social development indicators, to assess the outcomes of stakeholder interactions and collaborations (McFarland, 2022; Delgado et al., 2010). Ultimately, this theoretical paper contributes a more nuanced understanding of how transdisciplinary, transregional, and trans-sectoral (T^3) advancements are facilitated through collaborative, systems-oriented leadership practices grounded in open innovation theory (Chesbrough, 2003), collective advantage, and ecosystem leadership (Kanter, 1994; 2015)

KEYWORDS
collaboration, economic development, network analysis, stakeholder engagement, universities, ecosystem leadership

Introduction

In an increasingly interconnected world, the complexity of stakeholder interactions across sectors and regions demands a comprehensive approach to stakeholder network analysis. Traditional methods often overlook dynamic relationships, especially within diverse economic, social, and technological contexts. This article presents a theoretical framework adopting a transdisciplinary, transregional, and trans-sectoral (T^3) perspective, integrating social sciences, business, and technology to enhance stakeholder network analysis. Grounded in multilayer network theory, it explores intricate economic relationships across geographical contexts, increasing awareness of stakeholder interdependence.

Several existing frameworks inform the emerging approach to stakeholder analysis. A systems approach, as conceptualized by Senge (1990), highlights the need to view stakeholder interactions within larger, evolving systems. Organizations operate within networks that shape decisions, and Senge's "learning organization" concept encourages continuous adaptation and shared understanding, fostering resilience and innovation. The framework also aligns with Chesbrough's (2003) open innovation paradigm, emphasizing external knowledge flows and cross-sector collaboration. In stakeholder networks, open innovation enables co-creation and

leverages diverse capabilities, improving economic and social outcomes. This challenges insular engagement approaches by promoting adaptability and cross-boundary idea exchange.

Kanter's (1994) work on collaborative advantage further underscores the value of cross-sector partnerships, advocating for coalitions, shared purpose, and trust. This framework builds on her insights, emphasizing collaboration competencies for effective engagement. Participatory modeling techniques (Siew & Döll, 2012) also address the value of co-production and inclusive decision-making, strengthening stakeholder involvement and network efficacy.

The new, emerging framework includes impact analysis—economic performance metrics and social development indicators—to assess stakeholder collaboration outcomes. Integrating these analyses offers a holistic view of how networks drive sustainable growth and innovation. Applying systems thinking, open innovation, and collaborative advantage highlights the role of diverse collaborations in fostering resilience.

As global challenges grow more complex, systems thinking leadership is vital for navigating stakeholder dynamics. The T^3 framework provides theoretical insights and practical guidance for policymakers, practitioners, and researchers. It contributes to academic literature through conceptual analysis, model development, and theoretical synthesis, emphasizing examples over direct experimentation (Ryan & Deci, 2000).

Literature Review

The increasing complexity of stakeholder interactions across sectors and regions has spurred a growing body of literature on stakeholder network analysis. Traditional methodologies often fail to address complex relationships, especially within diverse economic, social, and technological contexts. This review synthesizes key contributions informing the proposed transdisciplinary, transregional, and trans-sectoral (T^3) stakeholder framework.

Multilayer network theory is essential for understanding intricate economic relationships across regions. Casarin et al. and Goelz et al. (2020) examined oil linkages, revealing significant regional economic dependencies, while Liu et al. and Freebairn et al. (2018) explored urbanization dynamics in China, emphasizing the link between economic growth and regional development. These studies align with Senge's (1990) systems thinking, which highlights the interdependence of organizations and economies, stressing the need for holistic approaches that consider feedback loops and emergent stakeholder patterns.

Participatory modeling techniques have become vital for fostering stakeholder collaboration. Freebairn et al. and Kaisler & Grill (2021) advocate for these methods to integrate diverse perspectives into decision-making, enhancing engagement. Crawford et al. (Tian, 2023) found that involving policy decision-makers in model development fosters trust and interest in outcomes. Such approaches facilitate knowledge co-production, critical for addressing complex regional economic challenges. Senge (1990) further emphasizes shared vision and team learning as key to organizational adaptability and problem-solving.

The literature also highlights collaboration competencies as crucial in stakeholder engagement. Kaisler and Grill (2021) identified enablers and barriers to transdisciplinary collaboration, noting that researchers' attitudes significantly impact success. Similarly, Crawford et al. (Tian, 2023) stress that stakeholder engagement is essential for co-creating solutions in natural resource management. Kanter's (1994) concept of collaborative advantage supports this, emphasizing trust, aligned incentives, and long-term partnerships across sectors. Bridging institutional and disciplinary divides remains a core competency in fostering inclusive, cross-sectoral engagement.

Integrating various forms of impact analysis is key to assessing stakeholder collaboration outcomes. McFarland, Crawford, et al. (2017) highlight regional economic connectivity's role in bridging the urban-rural divide, while Delgado et al. (2010) and Brún et al. (2015) emphasize cluster-based agglomeration's impact on regional performance. These studies show how stakeholder interactions can drive sustainable growth and innovation. Chesbrough's (2003) open innovation framework reinforces this, stressing the importance of external knowledge flows and cross-boundary collaboration. Applying this to stakeholder networks encourages open, flexible strategies that promote cross-disciplinary knowledge exchange.

The literature underscores the need for a transdisciplinary, transregional, and trans-sectoral (T^3) approach to stakeholder network analysis. By integrating multilayer network theory, participatory modeling, and impact analysis, the proposed framework deepens understanding of stakeholder dynamics and their role in sustainable development. As global challenges evolve, fostering resilience through diverse collaborations will be essential for navigating complexity. This view is reinforced by Senge's systems leadership, Chesbrough's open innovation, and Kanter's collaborative advantage, each advocating adaptive, ecosystem-based leadership for today's economic and social challenges.

Academic Innovation Centers and T^3 Strategy

The multifaceted role of universities in innovation ecosystems extends beyond traditional research to encompass product, process, and social innovation. As incubators for product innovation, universities develop new technologies and methodologies that fuel industry advancements (Lundberg & Öberg, 2021). Process innovation is equally critical, as universities refine educational and administrative practices to enhance efficiency and better respond to industry needs. Sorama (2020) underscores student entrepreneurship as a key driver of process innovation, ensuring that graduates possess the entrepreneurial competencies required for business success.

Social innovation represents another crucial dimension of the university's impact. Through their "third mission," universities engage with community partners to address societal challenges, leveraging research and expertise to create inclusive solutions (Feola et al., 2020). This aligns with Kanter's (1994) argument that institutions must move beyond competitive mindsets to embrace cooperative strategies that drive shared value creation. The "entrepreneurial university" model further encapsulates this evolution, positioning universities as active participants in multi-stakeholder collaborations that extend beyond academia into business and government sectors (Aldawod, 2022). Williams et al. (2021) also emphasize the role of universities in fostering inclusive innovation by transcending relational barriers that often lead to the exclusion of marginalized groups.

Developing robust inter-regional and intra-regional economic networks requires a systems perspective that accounts for the interplay of cultural, financial, and technological dynamics. Senge's (1990) systems approach highlights the importance of understanding these interdependencies to maximize collective impact. Economic networks, much like natural ecosystems, function as interconnected systems where each component influences and is influenced by others. This perspective is echoed in Bashan et al. (2012), who demonstrate how network topology affects system functionality—an insight applicable to economic networks in assessing resilience and adaptability.

Chesbrough's (2003) open innovation framework further supports this systems-based approach by advocating for knowledge sharing across institutional boundaries. Universities, in this context, act as intermediaries that bridge gaps between regional and global innovation networks. Martinez et al. (2021) extend this argument by discussing the dynamics of coupled human-natural networks, emphasizing sustainability in resource management—a crucial consideration in regional economic planning.

Finally, Kanter's (1994) ecosystem leadership perspective underscores the importance of fostering trust, aligning incentives, and creating structures that enable long-term collaboration among diverse stakeholders. Universities, as ecosystem leaders, must not only facilitate knowledge exchange but also cultivate environments where innovation can thrive through strategic partnerships. Huggins and Thompson (2015) reinforce this idea, arguing that the structure of entrepreneurial networks significantly impacts regional growth.

The T^3 framework positions universities as central actors in fostering sustainable regional innovation ecosystems by integrating Senge's systems leadership, Chesbrough's open innovation theory, and Kanter's collaborative advantage. Through systemic thinking, cross-sector collaboration, and ecosystem leadership, universities can orchestrate stakeholder networks that drive economic resilience, technological advancement, and societal impact. This comprehensive approach ensures that universities not only generate knowledge but also actively contribute to the economic and social transformation of their regions.

T³ in Practice

There are projects that demonstrate the T³ framework across teaching, research, and service. The Center for Strategic Entrepreneurship (CSE) has led groundbreaking research in local production and entrepreneurship, earning a reputation for impactful, transdisciplinary applied research. *Turning Makerspaces into Greater Places* (2019) was the first organizational assessment and economic impact analysis of the initial three years of a 34,000-square-foot makerspace in Baltimore, Maryland. The team included faculty from management, computer science, information systems, entertainment management, hospitality, finance, and marketing. The study found that Open Works supports 118 jobs, generates $8M in annual economic impact for Baltimore City, and $9.9M for Maryland, helping justify the first public investment in the U.S. to expand makerspaces as economic drivers.

Another example is the *Excellence in Entrepreneurial Learning (EXCEL)* report, which focuses on strategies to equip Baltimore youth and emerging adults for opportunity. As a follow-up to the 2017 Annie E. Casey Foundation report on workforce development, EXCEL explored 35 entrepreneurship instructional programs through interviews, questionnaires, and observations. It examined program models, success metrics, stakeholder value, trauma-informed approaches, and learner support beyond launch, aiming to refine methods for studying youth entrepreneurship. The study involved researchers from education, psychometrics, English, dance, health information systems, public health, organization development, business administration, social work, and management.

Two emerging projects focus on workforce preparation and transregional economic collaboration. Increased awareness of supply chain vulnerabilities has made local production, especially in food manufacturing, more urgent. Maryland's blend of rural agricultural regions and urban centers, alongside major sports venues, highlights the need for farm-to-table supply chain alignment. Academic institutions play a key role in transregional collaboration through research, teaching, and service. The expansion of makerspaces across rural and urban areas and the revival of industries like apparel in West Virginia and Baltimore further drive this demand.

T³ economic development requires innovative outcome assessments. *Making the Future: A New Assessment Framework for Local Production* (CSE, 2024) proposes a unified framework for evaluating social, economic, and technological impacts across sectors, emphasizing collaboration competencies for cross-disciplinary assessment.

Collaborative competencies (Table 1) enhance teaching, research, and faculty engagement. It fosters teamwork, communication, and shared decision-making, enriching educational experiences and preparing students for multidisciplinary careers. It also drives transdisciplinary research, enabling faculty to address complex societal challenges more effectively. Moreover, collaborative competence improves faculty engagement and institutional climate, leading to higher retention and satisfaction. Integrating these competencies into faculty development programs equips educators with tools for effective collaboration. Institutional support and recognition further strengthen this culture, fostering innovation and growth. As universities navigate modern educational complexities, cultivating collaborative competencies remains the key to long-term success and positive change.

T³ INNOVATION COLLABORATION COMPETENCIES (Table 1)			
Collaboration Competency	**Leadership Alignment**	**Description**	**Theoretical Example**
Communication	Collaborative Advantage	Effective communication is foundational to collaboration, enabling team members to share information, express ideas, and resolve conflicts. It involves both verbal and non-verbal skills, active listening, and the ability to tailor messages to different audiences.	Suter et al. emphasizes communication as a core competency for collaborative practice, particularly in interprofessional healthcare environments (2009). Kanter introduced the idea of collaborative advantage, showing how leaders build cross-sector alliances that

			drive innovation and systemic change. She argues that leaders must act as ecosystem facilitators, connecting diverse disciplines and stakeholders (1994) .
Role Awareness and Recognition	Systems-oriented	This competency involves recognizing and respecting the roles and responsibilities of each team member. Understanding one's own role and the roles of others foster mutual respect and enhances team dynamics.	Suter et al. also highlight role understanding as crucial for effective collaboration in healthcare teams (2009). Peter Senge emphasizes cross-disciplinary problem-solving and breaking down silos within organizations. (1990)
Mutual Trust and Respect	Collaborative Advantage	Trust and respect are vital for creating a safe environment where team members feel valued and are willing to share their perspectives.	Ainsworth and Chesley discuss how organizational design can enhance collaboration by fostering trust among team members (2018). Kanter introduced the idea of collaborative advantage, showing how leaders build cross-sector alliances that drive innovation and systemic change. She argues that leaders must act as ecosystem facilitators, connecting diverse disciplines and stakeholders. (1994)
Conflict Resolution	Collaborative Advantage	The ability to manage and resolve conflicts constructively is essential for maintaining team cohesion. This competency involves negotiation skills, empathy, and the capacity to find common ground.	Suter et al. identify conflict resolution as a key competency for collaborative practice (2009). Kanter introduced the idea of collaborative advantage, showing how leaders build cross-sector alliances that drive innovation and systemic change. She argues that leaders must act as ecosystem facilitators, connecting diverse disciplines and stakeholders. (1994)
Acceptance	Open Innovation Theory	This refers to the openness and commitment of individuals to engage in teamwork. A positive attitude towards collaboration can significantly influence team dynamics and outcomes.	Getha-Taylor et al. explore the situational aspects of collaborative competencies, suggesting that willingness can vary based on context (2016). Henry Chesbrough stresses that leadership must create networks where ideas flow across traditional boundaries (Chesbrough, 2003).
Team Skills	Collaborative Advantage	Team skills encompass the ability to work effectively within a group, including collaboration, coordination, and shared decision-making. These skills are critical for achieving common goals and enhancing team performance.	Getha-Taylor et al. emphasize the importance of team skills in their investigation of collaborative competencies (2016). Kanter introduced the idea of collaborative advantage, showing how leaders build cross-sector alliances that

			drive innovation and systemic change. She argues that leaders must act as ecosystem facilitators, connecting diverse disciplines and stakeholders. (1994)
Reflection	Collaborative Advantage	Reflective practice involves critically assessing one's contributions to the team and learning from experiences. This competency encourages continuous improvement and adaptation in collaborative settings.	Prathumtone highlights the role of reflection in developing interprofessional collaborative competencies among health sciences students (2022). Kanter introduced the idea of collaborative advantage, showing how leaders build cross-sector alliances that drive innovation and systemic change. She argues that leaders must act as ecosystem facilitators, connecting diverse disciplines and stakeholders. (1994)
Adaptability	Ecosystem-oriented	The ability to adjust to changing circumstances and diverse team dynamics is crucial for effective collaboration. Adaptability allows team members to respond to new challenges and leverage the strengths of others.	Campos et al. discuss the importance of adaptability in collaborative logistics practices (2020). Kanter introduced the idea of collaborative advantage, showing how leaders build cross-sector alliances that drive innovation and systemic change. She argues that leaders must act as ecosystem facilitators, connecting diverse disciplines and stakeholders. (1994)
Cultural Competence	Collaborative Advantage	Understanding and respecting cultural differences within a team, which can enhance collaboration and improve outcomes. Cultural competence is increasingly recognized as essential in diverse work environments.	O'Keefe et al. emphasize the need for cultural competence in interprofessional education (2017). Kanter introduced the idea of collaborative advantage, showing how leaders build cross-sector alliances that drive innovation and systemic change. She argues that leaders must act as ecosystem facilitators, connecting diverse disciplines and stakeholders. (1994)
Shared Decision-Making	Open Innovation	The ability to engage in shared decision-making processes, where all team members contribute to the decision-making framework. This fosters ownership and commitment to team goals.	Hall et al. illustrate how shared decision-making is integral to collaboration in long-term care settings (2021). Henry Chesbrough stresses that leadership must create networks where ideas flow across traditional boundaries (2003).

Reimagining Stakeholder Network Analysis

Traditional approaches to stakeholder network analysis have primarily relied on qualitative and quantitative methodologies to identify, evaluate, and categorize stakeholders within a given context. Khedmatgozar et al. (2023) outline three key methods commonly employed in stakeholder analysis: archival material analysis, surveys, and open-ended interviews. Archival material analysis involves examining existing documents such as laws, regulations, and organizational communications to gather insights about stakeholders and their interests. Surveys facilitate the collection of quantitative data from stakeholders, allowing researchers to gauge perceptions, preferences, and levels of influence. Open-ended interviews provide a qualitative dimension, enabling a deeper exploration of stakeholder motivations and relationships. While these methods offer valuable insights, they often fail to capture the dynamic and interconnected nature of stakeholder interactions, particularly in complex, multi-sectoral environments. As a result, there is a growing need for more integrative approaches that incorporate systems theory, open innovation, and collaborative leadership to enhance stakeholder engagement and maximize collective impact (Balance et al., 2020; Rooijen et al., 2020).

Peter Senge's (1990) systems thinking framework provides a valuable lens for understanding stakeholder interactions as part of larger, interdependent networks. Systems thinking emphasizes the importance of recognizing patterns, feedback loops, and interconnections that shape the behavior of stakeholders over time. Traditional stakeholder analysis often assumes linear relationships between actors, but a systems-based approach highlights the nonlinear, emergent dynamics that define stakeholder networks. For example, a university engaged in regional economic development is not merely an isolated actor but rather a central node in an evolving ecosystem of industry, government, and community partners. Understanding how these stakeholders interact, adapt, and co-evolve within the system allows for more strategic engagement and long-term sustainability.

Senge's (1990) concept of *learning organizations* is also critical in stakeholder network analysis, as it underscores the need for continuous adaptation and shared learning among stakeholders. Effective collaboration requires more than just identifying key players; it demands an ongoing process of reflection, dialogue, and systemic adjustment to emerging challenges. By embedding learning mechanisms into stakeholder networks, organizations can foster resilience and innovation, ultimately strengthening their capacity to address complex social and economic issues.

Henry Chesbrough's (2003) open innovation theory further supports the need for a more dynamic and cross-disciplinary approach to stakeholder analysis. Traditional models often assume that knowledge generation and problem-solving occur within closed institutional boundaries, but open innovation suggests that valuable ideas flow across organizations and sectors. In the context of stakeholder networks, this means recognizing that universities, businesses, and public institutions must actively collaborate, sharing insights and resources to drive innovation.

For example, integrating social network analysis (SNA) with open innovation principles can reveal how knowledge and resources flow through stakeholder networks, identifying bottlenecks and opportunities for collaboration. While SNA provides a quantitative approach to mapping relationships (Yu et al., 2017), it often lacks the depth needed to understand the cultural, economic, and technological forces that influence stakeholder interactions. Chesbrough's (2003) framework helps address this limitation by emphasizing the value of cross-sectoral engagement and knowledge exchange. Universities, for instance, can act as knowledge intermediaries, connecting startups with corporate R&D teams, policymakers with community organizations, and technologists with social innovators.

Rosabeth Kanter's (1994) concept of *collaborative advantage* further enhances our understanding of stakeholder network analysis by highlighting the role of leadership in fostering trust, alignment, and shared purpose. In complex, multi-stakeholder environments, relationships are not merely transactional but are built on strategic partnerships that generate mutual benefits. Kanter argues that organizations must go beyond competition to embrace cooperative strategies that strengthen entire ecosystems.

Applying this perspective to stakeholder network analysis, collaboration competencies such as communication, mutual trust, and conflict resolution become critical factors in determining the strength and quality of network connections (Getha-Taylor et al., 2016). Centrality measures in network analysis can

identify key stakeholders who serve as ecosystem leaders, facilitating the diffusion of ideas and best practices. Similarly, clustering coefficients can reveal sub-networks where collaboration is particularly strong, pointing to areas of potential synergy and innovation.

By integrating Kanter's ecosystem leadership principles, stakeholder analysis moves beyond static categorization and toward a more nuanced understanding of how trust and cooperation shape network resilience. For instance, in transregional collaborations, cultural competence becomes a vital asset, helping bridge differences and foster shared decision-making (Dennissen et al., 2018). Effective stakeholder networks are not just structurally connected; they are culturally and strategically aligned, enabling deeper and more sustainable collaborations.

The integration of systems thinking, open innovation, and collaborative leadership offers a more holistic framework for analyzing stakeholder networks. In transregional networks, where economic, technological, and cultural dynamics intersect, a multidisciplinary approach is essential for fostering effective partnerships.

By applying these frameworks, stakeholders can enhance their collective capacity to address complex challenges, from regional economic development to global sustainability efforts. While all reflect some form of ecosystem-oriented alignment. Their relationship to the diverse nature of collaborative advantage creation or open innovation may be different. This intersectional analysis not only enriches our understanding of stakeholder networks but also provides actionable insights for practitioners aiming to cultivate effective collaborations in diverse and dynamic environments (Table 2).

Table 2. T³ Integration and Network Analysis

Stakeholder Network Analysis	Leadership Alignment	Description	Theoretical Example
Nodes (Vertices)	• Ecosystem-oriented • Open Innovation	These represent the entities within the network, such as people, organizations, locations, or concepts. In social networks, nodes are often individuals, while in other contexts, they could be companies, devices, or even places.	Steyvers and Tenenbaum define the degree of a node as the number of links the node has, illustrating how nodes represent entities within a network (2005). Henry Chesbrough stresses that leadership must create networks where ideas flow across traditional boundaries (2003).
Edges (Links or Connections)	• Ecosystem-oriented • Collaborative Advantage	These are the connections between nodes and can represent diverse types of relationships, such as friendships, business transactions, shared membership, or data flow.	Zheng and Skillicorn discussed social network analysis as a method that includes the examination of edges, which represent connections between nodes in various contexts (2017). Kanter introduced the idea of collaborative advantage, showing how leaders build cross-sector alliances that drive innovation and systemic change. She argues that leaders must act as ecosystem facilitators, connecting diverse disciplines and stakeholders (1994).
Degree	• Ecosystem-oriented • Open Innovation	The degree of a node is the number of edges connected to it. In directed networks, we can distinguish between in-degree (incoming edges) and out-degree (outgoing edges). High-degree nodes, or "hubs," can often be influential.	Dai et al. explain degree centrality (DC) as a metric for describing node importance based on the number of direct connections, emphasizing the significance of degree in network analysis (2024). Henry Chesbrough stresses that leadership must create networks where ideas flow across traditional boundaries (2003).

Stakeholder Network Analysis	Leadership Alignment	Description	Theoretical Example
Path and Distance	• Ecosystem-oriented • Collaborative Advantage	A path is a sequence of edges that allows for movement from one node to another. Distance refers to the number of edges in the shortest path between two nodes. Shorter paths generally indicate stronger or faster access to resources or information.	Uddin et al. discuss the analysis of paths and distances within networks, particularly how they change during organizational crises (2011). Kanter introduced the idea of collaborative advantage, showing how leaders build cross-sector alliances that drive innovation and systemic change. She argues that leaders must act as ecosystem facilitators, connecting diverse disciplines and stakeholders (1994).
Centrality Measures	• Ecosystem-oriented • Open Innovation	Centrality is used to identify the most important or influential nodes in a network	Crucitti et al. provide an overview of various centrality measures, including degree centrality, betweenness centrality, and closeness centrality, and their applications in network analysis (2006). Henry Chesbrough stresses that leadership must create networks where ideas flow across traditional boundaries (2003).
Clustering Coefficient	• Ecosystem-oriented • Collaborative Advantage	This measures the extent to which nodes in a network tend to cluster together, creating tightly knit groups. High clustering can indicate strong community structures.	Newman provides a comprehensive analysis of highly clustered networks, demonstrating that increased clustering can lead to a decrease in the size of the giant component of the network (2003). Kanter introduced the idea of collaborative advantage, showing how leaders build cross-sector alliances that drive innovation and systemic change. She argues that leaders must act as ecosystem facilitators, connecting diverse disciplines and stakeholders (1994).
Communities or Clusters	• Ecosystem-oriented • Open Innovation	These are groups of nodes with denser connections among themselves than with the rest of the network. Community detection helps identify clusters or sub-networks, such as social groups or sectors in a business network.	Palla and Vattay explore community detection in networks, identifying clusters of nodes with denser connections among themselves compared to the rest of the network (2005). Henry Chesbrough stresses that leadership must create networks where ideas flow across traditional boundaries (2003).
Network Density	• Ecosystem-oriented • Collaborative Advantage	Density is the ratio of actual edges to all possible edges in a network, indicating how interconnected the network is. Higher density often correlates with greater cohesion among nodes.	Borruso discusses network density as the ratio of actual edges to all possible edges, providing insights into the interconnectedness of urban networks (2003). Kanter introduced the idea of collaborative advantage, showing how leaders build cross-sector alliances that drive innovation and systemic change. She argues that leaders must act as ecosystem facilitators, connecting diverse disciplines and stakeholders (1994).

Stakeholder Network Analysis	Leadership Alignment	Description	Theoretical Example
Network Diameter	• Ecosystem-oriented • Collaborative Advantage	The diameter is the longest shortest path between any two nodes in the network, giving an idea of the network's "size" in terms of connectivity.	Fennell and Gleeson analyze network diameter in the context of multistate dynamics, emphasizing its significance in understanding network connectivity (2019). Kanter introduced the idea of collaborative advantage, showing how leaders build cross-sector alliances that drive innovation and systemic change. She argues that leaders must act as ecosystem facilitators, connecting diverse disciplines and stakeholders (1994).
Homophily and Heterophily	• Ecosystem-oriented • Open Innovation	Homophily is the tendency of similar nodes to connect with each other (e.g., people with similar backgrounds), while heterophily refers to connections between dissimilar nodes. This can shape the network's diversity and access to information.	Newman and Park discuss the concepts of homophily and heterophily in social networks, highlighting how similar or dissimilar nodes connect with each other (2003). Henry Chesbrough stresses that leadership must create networks where ideas flow across traditional boundaries (2003).
Influence and Diffusion	• Ecosystem-oriented • Collaborative Advantage	Network analysis often looks at how influence, information, or resources spread through a network, assessing factors like reach, speed, and barriers to diffusion.	Kumar and Sinha explore models for information diffusion in socially interacting networks, focusing on the dynamics and factors influencing how information spreads across different network structures (2021). Kanter introduced the idea of collaborative advantage, showing how leaders build cross-sector alliances that drive innovation and systemic change. She argues that leaders must act as ecosystem facilitators, connecting diverse disciplines and stakeholders (1994).
Network Motifs	• Ecosystem-oriented • Collaborative Advantage	Motifs are recurring, small sub-structures within the network, like triangles (three nodes all connected) or chains. Identifying motifs can reveal common structural patterns and functional dynamics.	Attar and Aliakbary discuss motifs as recurring structures within networks and their significance in understanding the overall dynamics and functions of complex networks (2017). Kanter introduced the idea of collaborative advantage, showing how leaders build cross-sector alliances that drive innovation and systemic change. She argues that leaders must act as ecosystem facilitators, connecting diverse disciplines and stakeholders (1994).

Conclusion

The proposed theoretical framework for stakeholder network analysis underscores the necessity of adopting a transdisciplinary, transregional, and trans-sectoral (T³) perspective to navigate the complexities of stakeholder interactions in an interconnected world. By integrating insights from social sciences, business, and technology, this framework enhances our understanding of the intricate relationships among stakeholders, particularly in diverse economic, social, and technological contexts. Systems thinking, as outlined by Senge (1990), reinforces this approach by highlighting the interdependence and feedback loops within stakeholder ecosystems. Recognizing that stakeholder interactions are not static but dynamic and evolving, this perspective allows for continuous learning, adaptation, and co-creation of value across networks.

Incorporating collaboration competencies—such as communication, mutual trust, and cultural competence—into network analysis elements facilitates a more nuanced examination of stakeholder dynamics. This

integration aligns with Kanter's (1994) concept of collaborative advantage, emphasizing that organizations thrive not merely through individual strength but through strategic partnerships that leverage shared resources, knowledge, and innovation capacity. This intersection strengthens stakeholder engagement, fostering resilience and adaptability in addressing complex challenges. As McFarland (2022) and Delgado et al. (2010) highlight, understanding the impact of stakeholder interactions on regional economic performance and social development is crucial for promoting sustainable growth.

Universities are increasingly recognized as pivotal players in fostering innovation through their teaching, research, and community engagement roles. By embracing the concept of the "entrepreneurial university," institutions are evolving from traditional educational roles to active participants in regional innovation ecosystems. This transformation is best understood through the lens of Chesbrough's (2003) open innovation theory, which posits that innovation flourishes in environments that encourage cross-disciplinary collaboration and knowledge exchange. As Lundberg and Öberg (2021) highlight, universities generate innovative ideas and cultivate entrepreneurial skills essential for economic growth. Through product, process, and social innovation, universities can effectively orchestrate stakeholder networks, bridging gaps between knowledge creation and practical application. By leveraging their position as knowledge intermediaries, universities can drive sustainable development and strengthen regional economies, reinforcing their leadership role in shaping innovative ecosystems.

The evolution of stakeholder network analysis reflects a growing recognition of the need for more integrative approaches that capture the dynamic and interconnected nature of stakeholder interactions. While valuable, traditional methods often fail to address the complexities inherent in multi-sectoral and transregional contexts. Incorporating social network analysis (SNA) offers a quantitative framework for mapping relationships and assessing the strength of ties among stakeholders, enhancing our understanding of collaboration dynamics. However, by applying systems thinking and open innovation theory, this analysis moves beyond static representations of stakeholder relationships to emphasize continuous learning, adaptive strategies, and cross-sectoral synergies.

Furthermore, integrating cultural, economic, and technological dimensions into stakeholder analysis aligns with Kanter's (1994) ecosystem leadership framework, which underscores the importance of trust-building, shared vision, and collaborative governance. Stakeholders who develop strong collaboration competencies—such as communication, mutual trust, and conflict resolution—can enhance network density and connectivity, ultimately driving more effective problem-solving and sustainable innovation. By fostering a culture of openness and co-creation, organizations and institutions can expand their collective capacity to address complex challenges, transforming stakeholder networks into resilient ecosystems of change.

This intersectional approach enriches our understanding of stakeholder networks while equipping practitioners with actionable insights to cultivate effective collaborations across diverse environments. As stakeholders increasingly operate in a world defined by rapid technological advancement, economic interdependence, and cultural diversity, embracing these integrative methodologies will be essential. By leveraging systems thinking, open innovation, and collaborative advantage, decision-makers can foster more adaptive, innovative, and sustainable stakeholder networks—paving the way for more effective policymaking, organizational strategy, and cross-sectoral cooperation in an increasingly interconnected world.

References:

Ainsworth, D. & Chesley, J. (2018). Built to collaborate? organization design and coalition success. Health Promotion Practice, 21(4), 654-664. https://doi.org/10.1177/1524839918795473

Annie E. Casey Foundation Report (2017). Reshaping Workforce Development in Baltimore: Ensuring Community Voice and Expertise Guide Us. Making the Future: A New Assessment Framework for Local Production. Retrieved from: https://www.aecf.org/resources/reshaping-workforce-development-in-baltimore

Attar, N., & Aliakbary, S. (2017). Classification of complex networks based on similarity of topological network features. Chaos, 27(9), 091102. https://doi.org/10.1063/1.4997921

Bodenmiller, B., Wanka, S., Kraft, C., Urban, J., Campbell, D., Pedrioli, P. & Aebersold, R. (2010). Phosphoproteomic analysis reveals interconnected system-wide responses to perturbations of kinases and phosphatases in yeast. Science Signaling, 3(153). https://doi.org/10.1126/scisignal.2001182

Borruso, G. (2003). Network density and the delimitation of urban areas. Urban Studies, 40(5-6), 905-915. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9671.00139

Brún, M., MacFarlane, A., Brún, T., Okonkwo, E., Bokanga, J., Silva, M., & Weel, C. (2015). Involving migrants in the development of guidelines for communication in cross-cultural general practice consultations: a participatory learning and action research project. BMJ Open, 5(9), e007092. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2014-007092

Budyldina, N. (2018). Entrepreneurial universities and regional contribution. International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal, 14(2), 265-277. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11365-018-0500-0

Campos, E. A. R., Paula, I. C., Caten, C. S. T., Maçada, A. C. G., Marôco, J., & Ziegelmann, P. K. (2020). The effect of collaboration and IT competency on reverse logistics competency - Evidence from Brazilian supply chain executives. *Environmental impact assessment review*, *84*, 106433. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eiar.2020.106433

Casarin, R., Iacopini, M., Molina, G., Ter Horst, E., Espinasa, R., Sucre, C., & Rigobon, R. (2020). Multilayer network analysis of oil linkages. *The Econometrics Journal*, *23*(2), 269-296.

Castro, M., Scheede, C., & Zermeño, M. (2019). The impact of higher education on entrepreneurship and the innovation ecosystem: a case study in Mexico. Sustainability, 11(20), 5597. https://doi.org/10.3390/su11205597

Center for Strategic Entrepreneurship-Coppin State University Report (2024). Excellence in Entrepreneurial Learning: Equipping Baltimore Youth and Emerging Adults for Opportunity. Retrieved from: https://www.greaterspacesandplaces.com/excellence-in-entrepreneurial-learning

Chesbrough, H. W. (2003). *Open innovation: The new imperative for creating and profiting from technology.* Harvard Business Press.

Coetzee, S., Odijk, M., Loenen, B., Storm, J., & Stoter, J. (2018). Stakeholder analysis of the governance framework of a national SDI dataset – whose needs are met in the buildings and address register of the Netherlands? International Journal of Digital Earth, 13(3), 355-373. https://doi.org/10.1080/17538947.2018.1520930

Crawford, B., Katz, R., & McKay, S. (2017). Engaging stakeholders in natural resource decision-making. https://doi.org/10.21079/11681/23956Crucitti, P., Latora, V., & Porta, S. (2006). Centrality measures in spatial networks of urban streets. *Physical Review E, 73*(3), 036125. https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.73.036125

Dai, H., et al. (2024). Identifying influential nodes in social networks using a novel degree centrality metric. Entropy, 26(486), 1-20. https://doi.org/10.3390/e26020486

Delgado, M., Porter, M., & Stern, S. (2010). Clusters, convergence, and economic performance. SSRN Electronic Journal. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1695011

Dennissen, M., Benschop, Y., & Brink, M. (2018). Rethinking diversity management: an intersectional analysis of diversity networks. Organization Studies, 41(2), 219-240. https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840618800103

Fairlie, R., Robb, A., & Robinson, D. (2020). "Black and White: Access to Capital Among Minority-Owned Startups." *The Review of Financial Studies*, 33(1), 1-42.

Fennell, P. G., & Gleeson, J. P. (2019). *Multistate dynamical processes on networks: Analysis through degree-based approximation frameworks*. SIAM Review, 61(1), 92-118. https://doi.org/10.1137/18M1207199

Feola, R., Parente, R., & Cucino, V. (2020). The entrepreneurial university: how to develop the entrepreneurial orientation of academia. Journal of the Knowledge Economy, 12(4), 1787-1808. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13132-020-00675-9

Freebairn, L., Atkinson, J., Kelly, P., McDonnell, G., & Rychetnik, L. (2018). Decision makers' experience of participatory dynamic simulation modelling: methods for public health policy. BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making, 18(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12911-018-0707-6

Getha-Taylor, H., Blackmar, J., & Borry, E. (2016). Are competencies universal or situational? a state-level investigation of collaborative competencies. Review of Public Personnel Administration, 36(3), 306-320. https://doi.org/10.1177/0734371x15624132

Goelz, T., Hartley, T., Scheld, A., & Carboni, I. (2020). The development of attitudes toward scientific models during a participatory modeling process – the impact of participation and social network structure. Frontiers in Marine Science, 7. https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2020.00644

González, S., Kubus, R., & Pérez-Íñigo, J. (2018). Innovation ecosystems in the European union: towards a theoretical framework for their structural advancement assessment. Croatian Yearbook of European Law and Policy, 14(1). https://doi.org/10.3935/cyelp.14.2018.307

Hall, A. M., Flodgren, G. M., Richmond, H. L., Welsh, S., Thompson, J. Y., Furlong, B. M., & Sherriff, A. (2021). Champions for improved adherence to guidelines in long-term care homes: a systematic review. *Implementation science communications*, *2*(1), 85. https://doi.org/10.1186/s43058-021-00185-y

Huggins, R. & Thompson, P. (2015). Entrepreneurship, innovation, and regional growth: a network theory. Small Business Economics, 45(1), 103-128. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-015-9643-3

Joksimovic, S., Gašević, D., & Hatala, M. (2014). Learning analytics for networked learning models. Journal of Learning Analytics, 1(3), 191-194. https://doi.org/10.18608/jla.2014.13.20

Kanter, R. M. (1994). Collaborative advantage: The art of alliances. *Harvard Business Review, 72*(4), 96–108.

Kanter, R. M. (2015). *Move: Putting America's infrastructure back in the lead.* W. W. Norton & Company.

Kaisler, R. & Grill, C. (2021). Enabling transdisciplinary collaboration: stakeholder views on working with "children with mentally ill parents" research groups. Frontiers in Psychiatry, 12. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyt.2021.760716

Khedmatgozar, H., Namdarian, L., & Rasuli, B. (2023). Who or what really counts? The application of baseclass for stakeholder evaluation and classification. Management Decision, 61(7), 1966-1997. https://doi.org/10.1108/md-06-2022-0805

Koryakina, T., Sarrico, C., & Teixeira, P. (2015). Third mission activities: university managers' perceptions on existing barriers. European Journal of Higher Education, 5(3), 316-330. https://doi.org/10.1080/21568235.2015.1044544

Kumar, P., & Sinha, A. (2021). Information diffusion modeling and analysis for socially interacting networks. Social Network Analysis and Mining, 11(11). https://doi.org/10.1007/s13278-020-00719-7

Liu, T., Su, C., & Jiang, X. (2014). Is economic growth improving urbanization? a cross-regional study of China. Urban Studies, 52(10), 1883-1898. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098014540348

Lundberg, H. & Öberg, C. (2021). Teachers, researchers, but not innovators? rethinking university-industry collaboration. Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing, 36(13), 161-173. https://doi.org/10.1108/jbim-03-2020-0126

Martinez, N., Tonin, P., Bauer, B., Rael, R., Singh, R., Yoon, S., & Dunne, J. (2021). Sustaining economic exploitation of complex ecosystems in computational models of coupled human-natural networks. Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, 26(1), 326-334. https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v26i1.8174

Newman, M. E. J. (2003). Properties of highly clustered networks. Physical Review E, 68(2). https://doi.org/10.1103/physreve.68.026121

Newman, M. E. J., & Park, J. (2003). Why social networks are different from other types of networks. Physical Review E, 68(3), 036122. https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.68.036122&#8203

O'Keefe, P. A., Horberg, E. J., & Plante, I. (2017). The multifaceted role of interest in motivation and engagement. In P. A. O'Keefe & J. M. Harackiewicz (Eds.), *The science of interest* (pp. 49–67). Springer International Publishing/Springer Nature. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-55509-6_3

Openworks (2019). Turning Makerspaces into Greater Places. Assessment report on Open Works. Retrieved from: https://www.openworksbmore.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/OW-CoppinState-Report.pdf

Palla, G., & Vattay, G. (2005). Community detection in networks: The identification of clusters with denser connections among nodes. Physical Review E, 71(6), 066103. https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.71.066103

Prathumtone. (2022). The development of an instrument for measuring interprofessional collaborative practice competency of health sciences students. *International Journal of Nursing Education, 14*(2), 217–229. https://doi.org/10.37506/ijone.v14i2.18024

Rooijen, M., Lenzen, S., Dalemans, R., Beurskens, A., & Moser, A. (2020). Stakeholder engagement from problem analysis to implementation strategies for a patient-reported experience measure in disability care: a qualitative study on the process and experiences. Health Expectations, 24(1), 53-65. https://doi.org/10.1111/hex.13147

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). "Self-Determination Theory and the Facilitation of Intrinsic Motivation, Social Development, and Well-Being." *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 68–78.

Schlegel, T., Pfister, C., Harhoff, D., & Backes-Gellner, U. (2021). Innovation effects of universities of applied sciences: an assessment of regional heterogeneity. The Journal of Technology Transfer, 47(1), 63-118. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10961-020-09839-w

Senge, P. M. (1990). The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization. Doubleday.Siew, T. & Döll, P. (2012). Transdisciplinary research for supporting the integration of ecosystem services into land and water management in the tarim river basin, Xinjiang, China. Journal of Arid Land, 4(2), 196-210. https://doi.org/10.3724/sp.j.1227.2012.00196

Sorama, K. (2020). The role of university in the regional innovation ecosystem. https://doi.org/10.21125/inted.2020.0528

Steyvers, M., & Tenenbaum, J. B. (2005). The large-scale structure of semantic networks: Statistical analyses and a model for semantic growth. Cognitive Science, 29(1), 41–78. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15516709cog2901_3

Suter, E., Arndt, J., Arthur, N., Parboosingh, J., Taylor, E., & Deutschlander, S. (2009). Role understanding and effective communication as core competencies for collaborative practice. Journal of interprofessional care, 23(1), 41–51. https://doi.org/10.1080/13561820802338579

Tian, Y. (2023). Participatory modeling with discrete-event simulation: a hybrid approach to inform policy development to reduce emergency department wait times. Systems, 11(7), 362. https://doi.org/10.3390/systems11070362

Tolstykh, T., Gamidullaeva, L., & Shmeleva, N. (2021). Universities as knowledge integrators and cross-industry ecosystems: self-organizational perspective. Sage Open, 11(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244020988704

Uddin, S., Murshed, S. T. H., & Hossain, L. (2011). Power-Law Behaviour in Complex Organizational Communication Network during Crisis. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and Its Applications, 390*(15), 2845–2853. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physa.2011.03.023

Villa-Enciso, E. (2023). Agent-based model to analyze the role of the university in reducing social exclusion. Sustainability, 15(16), 12666. https://doi.org/10.3390/su151612666

Yu, T., Shen, G., Shi, Q., Liu, X., Li, C., & Xu, K. (2017). Managing social risks at the housing demolition stage of urban redevelopment projects: a stakeholder-oriented study using social network analysis. International Journal of Project Management, 35(6), 925-941. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2017.04.004

Williams, R. C., Covington, E., & Tate, C. E. (2022). Innovation-Centric Organizational Community (IOC): What Works for the Emerging Workforce. In J. Rolle & M. Crump (Eds.), *Sustainability and the Future of Work and Entrepreneurship for the Underserved* (pp. 46-66). IGI Global. https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-6684-4322-4.ch003

Zhu, J., Li, Y., Jiang, P., Hu, B., & Yang, L. (2020). Analysis on the dynamic evolution of bioenergy industry in the Yangtze River delta based on multilevel social network theory. Energies, 13(23), 6383. https://doi.org/10.3390/en13236383

Zheng, Q., & Skillicorn, D. (2017). Social networks with rich edge semantics. Chapman & Hall/CRC.