Nina Walker[1] & Petra Moog[2]

European University Alliances and their Third Mission: The case of EELISA

Abstract

The European University Initiative aims to strengthen innovation across Europe through transnational alliances, yet limited understanding exists of how universities can collaboratively develop innovation and entrepreneurship ecosystems. This exploratory case study examines EELISA, analyzing strategic documents and interviews with entrepreneurship coordinators from ten member universities. Findings reveal a multi-level tension between top-down alliance coordination, complex higher education institutions and bottom-up regional entrepreneurship logics. While the alliance serves as a platform for mutual learning, complementarity is still constrained by heterogeneous structures and regionally embedded ecosystem actors.

Keywords

european university alliances, third mission, entrepreneurial ecosystems, knowledge cooperation, transnational collaboration

[1] Corresponding Author; ZHAW; nina.walker@zhaw.ch;
ORCiD 0000-0002-0275-0409
[2] ZHAW; petra.moog@zhaw.ch;
ORCiD 0000-0002-9176-131X

https://doi.org/10.21240/zfhe/21-2/09

European University Alliances und ihre Third Mission: Der Fall EELISA

Zusammenfassung

Die European University Initiative zielt darauf ab, Innovation in Europa durch transnationale Allianzen zu stärken, doch es fehlt an Verständnis dafür, wie Universitäten innerhalb solcher Allianzen gemeinsam Innovations- und Entrepreneurship-Ökosysteme entwickeln können. Diese explorative Fallstudie untersucht EELISA anhand strategischer Dokumente und Interviews mit Entrepreneurship-Koordinator:innen aus zehn Partneruniversitäten. Die Ergebnisse zeigen eine Mehrebenenspannung zwischen der Top-down-Koordination der Allianz, komplexen Hochschulinstitutionen und den Bottom-up-Logiken regionaler Entrepreneurship-Strukturen. Während die Allianz als Plattform für gegenseitiges Lernen dient, wird Komplementarität durch heterogene Strukturen und regional verankerte Ökosystemakteur:innen noch eingeschränkt.

Schlüsselwörter

Europäische Hochschulallianzen, Third Mission, Entrepreneurship-Ökosysteme, Wissenskooperation, Transnationale Zusammenarbeit

1 Introduction

Rising global uncertainties have intensified the pressure on Europe to close the innovation gap (Draghi, 2024). A key barrier identified is that European universities' pipeline from innovation to commercialization remains weak, partly because researchers are insufficiently integrated into innovation clusters – networks of universities, start-ups, companies, and venture capitalists (Draghi, 2024). This diagnosis points to the growing importance of universities' Third Mission, which extends their role beyond education and research to actively engage in economic development within their innovation ecosystems (Etzkowitz & Leydesdorff, 2000).

In parallel, the *European University Initiative* (EUI), launched in 2019, aims to build strategic transnational partnerships in the form of *European University Alliances* (EUAs) (Gunn, 2020). By 2026, the EUI supported 64 alliances involving 560 HEIs across 35 countries (European Commission, 2024). These alliances are highly diverse, not only at the geographical but also organizational level (Galán-Cubillo et al., 2024; Pagliarello, 2022). With innovation and network building embedded in the EUI's objectives (Gunn, 2020), the alliances are positioned to play a critical role in driving innovation across the European education space (Galán-Cubillo et al., 2024; Karvounaraki et al., 2018). However, there is limited understanding in the literature on how universities in their alliance can strategically develop productive innovation and entrepreneurship ecosystems that encompass their own regions or countries, let alone a continent (Hayter et al., 2018; Hess et al., 2025). Research on Third Mission collaborations mainly focuses on university-industry transfer (Rossoni et al., 2024), leaving open how universities can integrate inter-university Third Mission activities to form efficient alliances that not only learn from but also complement each other (Grant & Baden-Fuller, 2004).

This study addresses this gap by exploring the emergence of transnational innovation and entrepreneurship ecosystems within an EUA. Specifically, it examines (1) the integration of alliance activities into universities' Third Mission and regional ecosystems, and (2) how universities exchange and collaborate around the Third Mission.

The paper is structured as follows: following a literature review and methodology section, the findings analyze the positioning of the Third Mission across the ten member universities, the knowledge dynamics within the alliance, and the integration of regional ecosystem partners. The discussion connects these findings to ecosystem theory and alliance literature.

2 Theoretical Background

2.1 The Third Mission of Universities

The "Third Mission" involves various university stakeholders, including students, faculty and staff, through various transfer mechanisms, such as producing employable graduates, disseminating research, transferring patents and licenses to industry, and promoting start-ups and spin-offs (Hayter et al., 2018; Miller et al., 2016). This "capitalization of knowledge" at the heart of the Third Mission is based on context-sensitive and application-focused knowledge production, also referred to as Mode 2 (Etzkowitz & Leydesdorff, 2000; Slaughter, 2020). Initially, this development was critically eyed as a shift away from the traditional, theory-driven and "pure" basic research of autonomous academic institutions (Etzkowitz & Leydesdorff, 2000; Pöcher et al., 2025). However, Shattock (2009) argues that academic entrepreneurship should not only be understood as the commercial exploitation of research, as it complements innovative teaching, regional development programs and internationalization. In fact, responding entrepreneurially to external environments, the university as an organization becomes more adaptive and resilient to change (Shattock, 2009). The Third Mission is thus increasingly integrated into universities' core functions through strategic planning and top-down governance (Pinheiro et al., 2023). Nevertheless, Kitagawa et al. (2016) find that institutionalization varies as universities adapt to external pressures through heterogenous pathways given their historical profiles, institutional logics, and regional policy frameworks. As an example, large research-intensive "elite" institutions often have a global outlook on commercializa-

tion and focus on large-firm partnerships, while younger or less established universities typically focus on regional engagement and collaborations with SMEs (Kitagawa et al., 2016).

2.2 Universities Innovation and Entrepreneurship Ecosystems

This strategic repositioning as an entrepreneurial university reshapes the relationship between universities, governments, and industry into the Triple Helix Model, positioning them as equal partners in knowledge generation and economic development (Etzkowitz & Leydesdorff, 2000). Expanding on this, the Quadruple Helix Model incorporates society as a fourth dimension to emphasize the importance of public engagement to reflect the full innovation process from ideation to societal impact (Carayannis & Rakhmatullin, 2014; Miller et al., 2016). In this role, entrepreneurial universities become important actors within innovation and entrepreneurship ecosystems, fostering Mode 3 knowledge production through a dynamic mix of academic and practical knowledge in innovation and entrepreneurship ecosystems (Carayannis et al., 2016; Pöcher et al., 2025).

Ceci et al. (2026) draw an important distinction between two ecosystem constructs. *Innovation Ecosystems* (IE; Adner, 2017) are described as evolving networks often orchestrated by focal organizations using top-down causation logics to drive innovative performance. *Entrepreneurial Ecosystems* (EE; Stam & van de Ven, 2021), by contrast, are multifaceted, territorially embedded structures focused on new venture creation through bottom-up self-organization and effectuation logics. While IEs and EEs are increasingly well conceptualized as separate constructs, the understanding of their interplay, especially in the university context, remains limited (Ceci et al., 2026). To capture this interplay at the institutional level, Abreu and Grinevich (2024) argue that the university itself can be understood as an entrepreneurial university ecosystem that encompasses teaching, research, knowledge commercialization, as well as civic and community empowerment. Following the configuration of the IE and EE by Ceci et al. (2026), we conceptualize entrepreneurial university ecosystems as driven by entrepreneurial logic and co-evolving dynamically with their

local context, but characterized by top-down complexity, where universities institutionalize entrepreneurship through strategic infrastructures, policies, and educational programs.

2.3 Knowledge Cooperation in University Alliances

While much of the ecosystem research focuses on elements within single ecosystems, there is a growing need to understand the relationship between different ecosystems (Hess et al., 2025), including entrepreneurial university ecosystems. Grant and Baden-Fuller (2004) distinguish between two logics of cooperation: knowledge acquisition, where partners absorb each other's knowledge leading to convergence and eventual dissolution of the alliance rationale, and knowledge accessing, where partners maintain their specialized knowledge bases while integrating complementary capabilities, resulting in more stable, long-term alliances. De Moortel and Crispeels (2018) translate this to international university-university technology transfer, showing that universities engage in cross-border alliances precisely to access complementary skills, while the degree of formalization evolves depending on institutional and cultural contexts. Emerging research on EUAs confirms that these partnerships serve as platforms for peer learning and know-how transfer, particularly regarding the Third Mission (Esparza Masana & Woolford, 2026). Angouri and Palmowski (2025) find that alliances can also help sustain niche or specialized offerings that struggle to attract sufficient students locally, yet persistent challenges remain, including regulatory fragmentation, incentive gaps, and the difficulty of lifting inherently regional Third Mission engagement to a transnational level (Angouri & Palmowski, 2025; Esparza Masana & Woolford, 2026). Beyond the EUAs, EU and national programs such as Germany's EXIST program and the Horizon Europe European Innovation Ecosystems work program have generated relevant experience in Third Mission cooperation (European Commission, 2025; Lehmann et al., 2024). However, earlier cooperation formats typically operated as thematic, time-limited projects rather than integrated multi-partner alliances with a shared strategic agenda —a gap the EUI seeks to address, yet with limited empirical understanding of how

alliances can move from knowledge exchange toward genuine complementarity (Fumasoli & Rossi, 2021).

3 Data and Research Methods

Given the recency of the EUI, we adopt an exploratory, qualitative case study methodology (Yin, 2018). EELISA was selected as a case due to its early and explicit mission to build a transnational Innovation and Entrepreneurship Ecosystem. The profile of the ten member universities is detailed in Table 3. We analyze data at two levels: strategic documents at the alliance level ($N = 5$) and university level ($N = 30$), including strategy papers, mission statements, and EELISA-specific initiatives (see TABLE 1). Documents in national languages were first analyzed using *NotebookLM* to identify relevant content, which was then translated by *DeepL* (DeepL SE, 2026; Google, 2026).

Level	Data sources	N
Alliance	Official / Strategic Documents	5
University	Official / Strategic Documents	30
University	Interviews	10

TABLE 1: DATA SOURCES

Additionally, we conducted ten semi-structured online interviews (average 46 min, range 27–86 min; the shortest interview covered all guideline topics despite time constraints) with innovation and entrepreneurship coordinators from all member universities (Table 2), selected through purposive expert sampling (Ebneyamini & Sadeghi Moghadam, 2018). All but one participant were members of the EELISA Innovation and Entrepreneurship work package, with most engaged since EELISA 1.0. This multi-level approach allows us to examine the interplay between alliance-level strategies and university-level implementation (McAdam et al., 2016).

BME	ENPC	FAU	ITU	PSL	SNS	SSSA	UN-STPB	UPM	ZHAW
Int.1	Int.2	Int.3	Int.4	Int.5	Int.6	Int.7	Int.8	Int.9	Int.10

TABLE 2: INTERVIEW PARTNERS

The documents' comprehensiveness was validated through the interviews. We analyzed the interview transcripts through open inductive coding (Miles & Huberman, 1994) using *MAXQDA 24* (VERBI Software, 2024) to identify patterns in how Third Mission structures and activities are shaped by and shape the alliance. To enhance credibility and traceability, coding was conducted iteratively, with key findings discussed between the authors; an exemplary codebook is provided in Appendix A.

4 The EELISA Network

EELISA was established under the second call of the EUI to create a transnational ecosystem uniting education, research, and innovation across its ten member universities depicted in Table 3. Initially, EELISA 1.0 (2020–2023) focused on equipping future engineers with skills in innovation, impact, and entrepreneurship. EELISA 2.0 (2023–2027) builds on this foundation, expanding to multidisciplinary networks aligned with the UN Sustainable Development Goals. Its vision, "Bridging Engineering, Sciences, and Humanities for Equitable, Sustainable, and Digital Societies," emphasizes interdisciplinary collaboration as well as innovation and entrepreneurship (EELISA, 2023). To leverage the Third Mission, EELISA established a dedicated working package with academic or administrative entrepreneurship coordinators from each partner university that meet bi-weekly, tasked with developing a comprehensive European Innovation and Entrepreneurship Ecosystem. Its tasks include promoting education on entrepreneurship, supporting the creation of ventures, and fostering the collaboration between entrepreneurial ecosystem actors.

	BME	ENPC	FAU	ITU	PSL	SNS	SSSA	UNSTPB	UPM	ZHAW
Foundation	1782	1747	1743	1773	2019	1810	1987	1938	1971	1997
Location	Budapest, HU	Paris, FR	Nuremberg, DE	Istanbul, TR	Paris, FR	Pisa, IT	Pisa, IT	Bucharest, RO	Madrid, ES	Zurich, CH
Academic Profile	Technical university	Technical university	Full-spectrum university	Technical university	Full-spectrum university	Comprehensive HEI	Comprehensive HEI	Technical university	Technical university	Comprehensive HEI
Nr. of Faculties	8	7	5	14	11	3	2	15	17	8
Size: Students[1]	21'800	2'000	38'300	38'700	17'000	600	1'100	28'500	36'000	14'400
Size: Staff[1]	2'000	500	6'600	4'200	2'900	300	700	2'900	5'400	3'500

Table 3: Overview of Universities in EELISA Case ([1]rounded to 100th)

5 Findings

5.1 The Third Mission within EELISA Universities

The analysis of strategic documents and interviews reveals considerable variation in how prominently innovation and entrepreneurship figure in the member universities' strategies (Appendix B). For some universities, cultivating an international, entrepreneurial mindset has become a growing priority, as for example ZHAW's new strategy "transformative, European, entrepreneurial" shows. At others, the Third Mission remains secondary to the core academic identity:

> "What you will be hearing is that BME is number one engineering school of Hungary. And that's what they are trying to push. So, it's less about entrepreneurship, it's less about entrepreneurial activity" (Int.1, p. 11).

Yet at institutions where entrepreneurship has been less emphasized, EELISA plays a key role in elevating its importance among university leadership:

> "I think we are going in the right direction and the fact that EELISA is focusing a lot on entrepreneurship and innovation also will make us more focused on entrepreneurship and innovation in the future" (Int.8, p. 16).

The organizational structures through which entrepreneurship is coordinated vary widely across the alliance (Appendix B). While educational activities are often run separately within each faculty, structures like *Technology Transfer Offices* (TTOs) tend to be strategically centralized. Some universities operate dual systems combining centralized TTOs with regional incubation centers, while others rely on decentralized, faculty-run programs. These differences are compounded by significant size asymmetries within the alliance, ranging from 600 students at SNS to over 38,000 at ITU and FAU (Table 3), which shape both the resources available for entrepreneurship and the incentives to engage in alliance activities. This heterogeneity adds to

the complexity of capturing existing activities and defining opportunities to complement. Decision-making within the universities tends to be decentralized, with faculties enjoying considerable autonomy that can slow the adoption of cross-departmental or international initiatives. Settled professors

> "are not really eager to have new partnerships that we as an administration are forcing onto them" (Int.3, p. 4).

However, early-career researchers emerge as receptive early adopters:

> "Young professors or PhDs that don't already have their network of researchers and collaborations, I think for them it's beneficial" (Int.3, p. 4).

5.2 Knowledge Dynamics within EELISA

EELISA offers a valuable platform for exchanging best practices among entrepreneurship coordinators. Especially smaller universities benefit from the experience of their alliance partners:

> "Cross fertilization through the work package is very interesting because we have been in contact with state-of-the-art and entrepreneurship models […] but we can also say we [SSSA] can also bring something into the alliance like our know-how" (Int.7, p. 10).

This exchange opened new perspectives:

> "Before joining ENPC and EELISA […] I didn't imagine that we could cooperate in in programs for entrepreneurship" (Int.2, p. 19).

Beyond exchange, the alliance aims to build complementary specialization through joint educational offers.

> "To have an Entrepreneurship pathway we need to have some inputs and for me EELISA is a very good opportunity to get some new inputs […] to fill the hole we have in this pathway" (Int.2, p. 15).

From the document analysis, three steps emerge. First, universities opened existing events to the network, such as ENPC's One Night to Innovate or UPM's online Changemaker's course. Second, FAU and ZHAW developed new entrepreneurial seasonal schools for EELISA students. Third, in spring 2026 the alliance launched its first jointly developed Tech2Market course, teaching 18 young research teams to transfer their research into application. The alliance also enables niche topics such as social entrepreneurship to be explored across regional settings. To better leverage local offers, EELISA started to explore how to implement an entrepreneurship supplement or status, modelled on France's National Student Entrepreneur Status (Pépite).

EELISA also serves as a bridge across internal knowledge silos, connecting previously disconnected units and creating interdisciplinary spaces:

> "For innovation – now we are trying to have for the first time a course that is not dedicated to just to science or humanities or social science, but to mix together everything. And this was also an idea related to EELISA project because the multi-disciplinarity is crucial" (Int.6, p. 4).

However, physical distances, conflicting academic schedules, and unequal budgets make coordination challenging, leaving some team members overwhelmed when balancing local and alliance priorities.

5.3 Regional Ecosystems and EELISA

Our analysis reveals that while member universities seek to internationalize their research collaborations, their innovation and entrepreneurship activities maintain a regional focus. Their ecosystems include affiliated or external innovation intermediaries, such as incubators, accelerators, and corporate partners, which serve as foundational elements for localized strategies (Appendix B). At universities with well-developed entrepreneurial ecosystems, these intermediaries operate largely independently:

> "[The faculties] have their own incubators, they're very old institutions. […] They have their own ecosystem of partners. […] I think they don't feel like an attachment to other ecosystems" (Int.5, p. 18).

External innovation partners generally focus on regional programs and view EELISA pragmatically as a resource for immediate, often monetary benefits, rather than as a long-term strategic collaborator:

> "They are running Romanian programs. […] They're trying to raise money from local companies, Romanian companies, to run the program. […] And EELISA, if it's just a label and it's nothing more […] I don't think they see something like an advantage" (Int.8, p. 18).

In regions with a higher concentration of universities, multiple EUAs are present, and without a strong attachment to EELISA's objectives, external partners often perceive the alliances as interchangeable:

> "You have to take into account that there are other partnerships in European alliance similar to EELISA" (Int.6, p. 9).

Yet, new funding schemes that require an international profile can shift this dynamic. One coordinator reports that a regional incubator became interested in EELISA precisely because their EXIST Startup Factory proposal

> "needs to be focused on internationalization, and they are really happy now that we [EELISA] have something already and that's why they want to work with us now a little bit more" (Int.3, p. 4).

Building on this, EELISA's Innovate4Europe initiative actively connects affiliated incubators and supports them in seeking shared funding opportunities, with the goal to deepen the engagement of regional innovation intermediaries.

6 Discussion

This study examined the integration of alliance activities into universities' Third Mission and regional ecosystems, and how universities exchange and collaborate around the Third Mission within an EUA, using EELISA as an illustrative case.

Our findings confirm that Third Mission positioning within universities varies along heterogenous profiles shaped by institutional logics and regional framework (Kitagawa et al., 2016). Applying the ecosystem perspective of Ceci et al. (2026) to look at the integration of EELISA into the Third Mission, we observe a multi-level tension between institutional top-down and entrepreneurial bottom-up logics. EELISA orchestrates collaboration top-down across borders, yet this logic encounters increasing friction at each level below. Within universities, the alliance can elevate the positioning of the Third Mission, but institutionalization is constrained by faculties that resist central coordination (Abreu & Grinevich, 2024). At the regional level, innovation intermediaries remain locally engaged and funded, largely independent of alliance structures. This explains why for now innovation intermediaries have an opportunistic view of the alliances. Funding instruments that promote internationalization, such as the EXIST Startup Factory, can align incentive structures, giving regional actors a reason to engage at the alliance level.

Regarding collaboration between universities, EELISA currently operates primarily as a knowledge acquisition alliance where coordinators exchange best practices and knowledge bases converge (Grant & Baden-Fuller, 2004). The progressive development of joint offers signals a trajectory toward knowledge accessing and complementarity. However, moving beyond learning requires formalization, whether through shared education pathways, supplements, or aligned accreditation, yet the institutional diversity that makes complementarity valuable is what makes formalization difficult (De Moortel & Crispeels, 2018). Size asymmetries play an interesting role: smaller universities benefit from the best practices of large universities. Yet the niche-topic finding that social entrepreneurship is explored jointly by larger tech universities, shows that complementarity can also benefit larger partners for topics outside their core (Angouri & Palmowski, 2025).

This study contributes to the emerging literature on EUAs by offering an ecosystem-based analysis of Third Mission coordination within a transnational alliance, extending current inter-ecosystem research (Hess et al., 2025). Future research should compare governance models across alliances and develop frameworks that integrate both top-down and bottom-up ecosystem dynamics into the analysis of inter-ecosystem cooperation.

7 Limitations

This study relies on qualitative data from a limited number of interviews and documents, which may not fully capture diverse perspectives and practices within EELISA's ten member universities. The focus on early stages of EELISA's implementation limits insight into long-term impacts and scalability. Language barriers and reliance on translations may have introduced nuances in interpretations of institutional documents.

References

Abreu, M., & Grinevich, V. (2024). The entrepreneurial university: Strategies, processes, and competing goals. *The Journal of Technology Transfer*, *49*(6), 1991–2034. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10961-024-10085-7

Adner, R. (2017). Ecosystem as Structure: An Actionable Construct for Strategy. *Journal of Management*, *43*(1), 39–58. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206316678451

Angouri, J., & Palmowski, J. (2025). *European Universities alliances: Pilots without pathways?* (The Guild Insight Paper No.7).

Carayannis, E. G., Campbell, D. F. J., & Rehman, S. S. (2016). Mode 3 knowledge production: Systems and systems theory, clusters and networks. *Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, *5*(1), 17. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13731-016-0045-9

Carayannis, E. G., & Rakhmatullin, R. (2014). The Quadruple/Quintuple Innovation Helixes and Smart Specialisation Strategies for Sustainable and Inclusive Growth in Europe and Beyond. *Journal of the Knowledge Economy*, *5*(2), 212–239. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13132-014-0185-8

Ceci, G., Ancona, A., Iovanella, A., & Veglianti, E. (2026). Entrepreneurial and innovation ecosystems: A scoping review on the complexity of nested configurations. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge*, *14*, 100973. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jik.2026.100973

De Moortel, K., & Crispeels, T. (2018). International university-university technology transfer: Strategic management framework. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, *135*, 145–155. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2018.05.002

DeepL SE (2026). *DeepL Translate* (Version 24.1) [Computer software]. https://www.deepl.com/translator

Draghi, M. (2024). *The future of European competitiveness – A competitiveness strategy for Europe*. European Commission. https://commission.europa.eu/topics/strengthening-european-competitiveness/eu-competitiveness-looking-ahead_en

Ebneyamini, S., & Sadeghi Moghadam, M. R. (2018). Toward Developing a Framework for Conducting Case Study Research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *17*(1), 1609406918817954. https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406918817954

EELISA (2023). *EELISA 2.0 Mission Statement*. https://eelisa.eu/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/00b-Mission-Statement-EELISA-2.pdf

Esparza Masana, R., & Woolford, J. (2026). The Impact of Partnerships Among EU Higher Education Institutions on Territorial Innovation Ecosystems: Translating Transnational Initiatives into Local Contexts. *Tijdschrift Voor Economische En Sociale Geografie*, *117*(2), 271–288. https://doi.org/10.1111/tesg.70059

Etzkowitz, H., & Leydesdorff, L. (2000). The dynamics of innovation: From National Systems and "Mode 2" to a Triple Helix of university–industry–government relations. *Research Policy*, *29*(2), 109–123. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0048-7333(99)00055-4

European Commission (2024, June 28). *New funding for additional European Universities alliances* [Press Release]. European Commission. https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/ip_24_3542

European Commission (2025). *Horizon Europe Work Programme 2026–2027: 10. European Innovation Ecosystems (EIE)* (C(2025) 8493). https://ec.europa.eu/info/funding-tenders/opportunities/docs/2021-2027/horizon/wp-call/2026-2027/wp-10-european-innovation-ecosystems_horizon-2026-2027_en.pdf

Fumasoli, T., & Rossi, F. (2021). The role of higher education institutions in transnational networks for teaching and learning innovation: The case of the Erasmus+ programme. *European Journal of Education*, *56*(2), 200–218. https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12454

Galán-Cubillo, E., Serrano-Cobos, J., & López-Navarrete, A. J. (2024). Understanding European Universities Initiative as the limestone to cement Europe together: A review of existing literature. *Policy Futures in Education*, *0*(0), 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1177/14782103241287579

Google (2026). *NotebookLM* (Version Gemini 3) [Computer software]. https://notebooklm.google/

Grant, R., & Baden-Fuller, C. (2004). A Knowledge Accessing Theory of Strategic Alliances. *Journal of Management Studies*, *41*, 61–84. https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1467-6486.2004.00421.X

Gunn, A. (2020). The European Universities Initiative: A Study of Alliance Formation in Higher Education. In *European Higher Education Area: Challenges for a New Decade* (pp.

13–30). Springer International Publishing. https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-030-56316-5_2

Hayter, C. S., Nelson, A. J., Zayed, S., & O'Connor, A. C. (2018). Conceptualizing academic entrepreneurship ecosystems: A review, analysis and extension of the literature. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, *43*(4), 1039–1082. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10961-018-9657-5

Hess, S., Wurth, B., Stam, E., Giones, F., Fini, R., Cavallo, A., Wahl, A., Bosma, N., Theodoraki, C., Chabaud, D., Brem, A., & Kuckertz, A. (2025). The future of entrepreneurial ecosystems research: Toward a policy-oriented research agenda. *Journal of Business Venturing Insights*, *23*, e00538. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbvi.2025.e00538

Karvounaraki, A., Subramaniam, S., Hristov, H., Ojala, T., Jonkers, K., Huisman, J., & Goenaga, B. X. (2018). *Mapping of European transnational collaborative partnerships in higher education*. JRC Publications Repository. https://doi.org/10.2760/560460

Kitagawa, F., Sánchez Barrioluengo, M., & Uyarra, E. (2016). Third mission as institutional strategies: Between isomorphic forces and heterogeneous pathways. *Science and Public Policy*, *43*(6), 736–750. https://doi.org/10.1093/scipol/scw015

Lehmann, E. E., Otto, J. M., & Wirsching, K. (2024). Entrepreneurial universities and the third mission paradigm shift from economic performance to impact entrepreneurship: Germany's EXIST program and ESG orientation. *The Journal of Technology Transfer*, *49*(6), 2184–2199. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10961-024-10080-y

McAdam, M., Miller, K., & McAdam, R. (2016). Situated regional university incubation: A multi-level stakeholder perspective. *Technovation, Technology Business Incubation*, *50–51*, 69–78. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2015.09.002

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook*. SAGE.

Miller, K., Mcadam, R., & Mcadam, M. (2016). A systematic literature review of university technology transfer from a quadruple helix perspective: Toward a research agenda. *R&D Management*, *48*(1), 7–24. https://doi.org/10.1111/radm.12228

Pagliarello, M. C. (2022). Higher education in the single market between (trans)national integration and supranationalisation: Exploring the european universities initiative. *Journal of European Integration*, *44*(1), 149–164. https://doi.org/10.1080/07036337.2021.2011266

Pinheiro, R., Gänzle, S., Klenk, T., & Trondal, J. (2023). Unpacking strategic alliances in European higher education. *Tertiary Education and Management*, *29*(3), 213–228. https://doi.org/10.1007/S11233-024-09133-6

Pöcher, B., Campbell, D. F. J., & Carayannis, E. G. (2025). Innovation and entrepreneurship in organizational university "Third Space" arrangements: Third Space and third mission in mode 3 universities. *Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, *15*(1), 2. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13731-025-00613-6

Rossoni, A. L., de Vasconcellos, E. P. G., & de Castilho Rossoni, R. L. (2024). Barriers and facilitators of university-industry collaboration for research, development and innovation: A systematic review. *Management Review Quarterly*, *74*(3), 1841–1877. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11301-023-00349-1

Shattock, M. (2009). *Entrepreneurialism In Universities And The Knowledge Economy: Diversification And Organizational Change In European Higher Education*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).

Slaughter, S. (2020). Academic Capitalism, Conceptual Issues. In *The International Encyclopedia of Higher Education Systems and Institutions* (pp. 1–6). Springer, Dordrecht. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-8905-9_100

Stam, E., & van de Ven, A. (2021). Entrepreneurial ecosystem elements. *Small Business Economics*, *56*(2), 809–832. https://doi.org/10.1007/S11187-019-00270-6

VERBI Software (2025). *MAXQDA 24* (Version 24.6.0) [Computer software]. https://www.maxqda.com

Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case Study Research and Applications: Design and Methods* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications, Inc. https://uk.sagepub.com/en-gb/eur/case-study-research-and-applications/book250150

Appendix A

Table A: Exemplary codebook: analytic codes derived from inductive coding of interview transcripts

Theme	Subtheme	Definition	
Positioning of the Third Mission within the university	Strategic emphasis on entrepreneurship	How prominently innovation and entrepreneurship figure in the university's strategy and leadership discourse.	"...innovation and Entrepreneurship is not a huge topic there [in the state-level framework agreement]. It is mentioned, but I don't know to which extent it's our job." (Int.3, p. 6)
	Organizational coordination of entrepreneurship capabilities	The varying structures through which entrepreneurship is coordinated.	"The ecosystem is really complex. There are some units created by Rectorates, so these units are managed centrally by rector and the people who are appointed by the director." (Int.4, p.13)
	Institutional receptivity to EUA integration	How university actors respond to the adoption of EUA initiatives into their Third Mission activities	"EELISA ist so eine Opportunität gewesen, wo man gemerkt hat das passt jetzt wirklich auch in das Schnittfeld hervorragend rein in unsere strategischen Stossrichtungen eben europäisch, entrepreneurial" (EELISA was such an opportunity where one noticed that it really fits outstandingly into the intersection of our strategic directions, namely European and entrepreneurial)." (Int.10, p. 19)

Knowledge dynamics within the EUA	Exchange of best practices	Coordinators share entrepreneurial models and best practices partner universities.	"…the second one is best practices that we can learn from university that already have spinoffs invested in spinoffs, have mechanisms through which they put money, or they have shares in some companies, and we are very interested in how that happened and how we can also adapt that to our legislation here so." (Int.8, p. 14)
	Complementary specialization	Universities combine distinct strengths to create joint offers no single partner could provide alone.	"…to do some different contacts with different departments that maybe we don't have here at the UPM, … so for example here at UPM, we don't have a strong education department … So that's the reason we do the connections with the other departments." (Int.9, p. 29)
	EELISA as bridge across internal silos	EELISA serves as a catalyst for connecting previously disconnected units within a university, creating interdisciplinary spaces and new internal pathways for innovation and entrepreneurship.	"So, for example, for innovation, now we are trying to have a for the first time, a course is not dedicated to just to science or humanities or social science, but to mix together everything. And this was also an idea related to EELISA project because the multidisciplinary is crucial in the new world and the new era." (Int.6, p. 12)

Regional ecosystem and transnational reach	Regional orientation of ecosystem actors, including innovation intermediaries	Ecosystem actors (i.e. innovation intermediaries, incubators, accelerators) operate within regional programs	"…we do all these entrepreneurship estate in rural areas. But as well they don't have connection with EELISA because EELISA is global. Now we need to get it more local." (Int9. p. 31)
	Autonomy of ecosystem actors	Ecosystem actors (i.e. innovation intermediaries, incubators, accelerators) operate independently of the EUA and view them pragmatically rather than as long-term strategic collaborator.	"… remember that's a very old institution. So, they are really have something very well structured regarding innovation and entrepreneurship. They have a foundation, they have a work well, company that they come from there. Should they have their own ecosystem of partners and so on." (Int.5, p. 19)
	Funding-driven orientation to internationalization / localization	Orientation of ecosystem actors' activities depends on source and purpose of their funding resources.	"Well, you know, every decision making is related to money. So, we can do things as long as it doesn't cost money basically, or if we find some Grants or some subsidiaries. If we find money to run our programs or to lead our I DS, it's OK." (Int.2, p. 12)

Appendix B

Table B: Entrepreneurship activities of EELISA Universities
(based on interviews and strategic documents)

	BME	ENPC	FAU	ITU	PSL	SNS	SSSA	UNSTPB	UPM	ZHAW
Entrepreneurship Coordination & Activities	Decentralized education & training; centralized commercialization at BME InnoLab (TTO, spin-off, incubation)	Centralized coordinator managing national Pépite program; collaborating with d.school Paris & regional incubators (Leonardo by Vinci, Station F)	Centralized Founder Support Centre (Gründungsbüro) for training & community; collaborating with affiliated Zollhof incubator	Dual system: centralized TTO & Center for Entrepreneurship (İTÜ GİNOVA); regional incubation center (İTÜ ARI Teknokent)	Multiple faculty-run incubators (e.g. D-Incubator, PC Up); centralized Pôle PSL Innovation & Pépite management; collaborating with regional incubators (e.g. Agoranov)	Centralized education & Research Innovation Area for TT & Open Science; collaborating with PoloTecnologico & JOTTO	Centralized Third Mission Office for TT; decentralized incubation within institutes; collaborating with PoloTecnologico & JOTTO	Centralized UP-Bizz Entrepreneurship Center; education by Entrepreneurship Faculty (FEBEM); collaborating with regional incubators & NGOs	Centralized TTO (CAIT) & Actúa UPM program with pre-incubator; transversal education by management department (IEN UPM); international incubator in Shanghai (Xiji)	Decentralized education & faculty-run programs; affiliated incubator Runway