

Entrepreneurial Behaviour Series

Sustainable Business Models

Insights from the
Tourism, Cultural and
Creative Sectors

Edited by

Maria Della Lucia

Erica Santini

Andrea Caputo

Fabrizio Panozzo

SUSTAINABLE BUSINESS MODELS

ENTREPRENEURIAL BEHAVIOUR

Series Editors:

Dr Andrea Caputo, University of Trento, Italy

Dr Massimiliano M. Pellegrini, University of Rome Tor Vergata, Italy

This series is dedicated to communicating innovative and multi-disciplinary new research that advances theory and practice in *Entrepreneurial Behaviour*. The series is focused on expanding the scope of *Entrepreneurial Behaviour* theory and analysis and enriching practice by encouraging multi-theoretical, multi-cultural, and multi-disciplinary approaches.

Key issues explored in *Entrepreneurial Behaviour* include cognition, decision-making, organizational behaviors, and identifying, creating, and exploiting opportunities concerning new products, services, processes, innovations, or ventures from entrepreneurial perspective.

The primary focus will be on the study of entrepreneurs, small and medium enterprises, and family businesses, with a secondary focus on entrepreneurial and innovative behaviors in other forms of organizations, such as non-profit corporations, and public administration.

Editorial Advisory Board

Aidin Salamzadeh, *University of Tehran, Iran*

Alex Olivier Alves Rodrigues, *University of Trás-os-Montes e Alto-Douro, Portugal*

Barış Armutcu, *Iğdır University, Turkey*

Grisna Anggadwita, *Telkom University, Indonesia*

Khaula Alkaabi, *United Arab Emirates University, UAE*

Meghna Chhabra, *Delhi School of Business, India*

Mohammad Rezaur Razzak, *Sultan Qaboos University, Oman*

Ramo Palalić, *Sultan Qaboos University, Oman*

Rrezon Lajçi, *Technische Universität Ilmenau, Germany*

Shqipe Gërguri-Rashiti, *American University of the Middle East, Kuwait*

Sucheta Agarwal, *GLA University, India*

Vladimir Dzenopoljac, *Zayed University, UAE*

SUSTAINABLE BUSINESS MODELS

Insights from the Tourism, Cultural
and Creative Sectors

EDITED BY

MARIA DELLA LUCIA

University of Trento, Italy

ERICA SANTINI

University of Trento, Italy

ANDREA CAPUTO

University of Trento, Italy

AND

FABRIZIO PANOZZO

Ca' Foscari University of Venice, Italy



United Kingdom – North America – Japan – India
Malaysia – China

Emerald Publishing Limited
Emerald Publishing, Floor 5, Northspring, 21-23 Wellington Street, Leeds LS1 4DL

First edition 2026

Editorial matter and selection © 2026 Maria Della Lucia, Erica Santini, Andrea Caputo,
and Fabrizio Panozzo.

Individual chapters © 2026 The authors.

Published by Emerald Publishing Limited.



This work is published under the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0) licence. Anyone may reproduce, distribute, translate and create derivative works of this work (for both commercial and non-commercial purposes), subject to full attribution to the original publication and authors. The full terms of this licence may be seen at <http://creativecommons.org/licences/by/4.0/legalcode>.

Reprints and permissions service

Contact: www.copyright.com

No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, transmitted in any form or by any means electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without either the prior written permission of the publisher or a licence permitting restricted copying issued in the UK by The Copyright Licensing Agency and in the USA by The Copyright Clearance Center. No responsibility is accepted for the accuracy of information contained in the text, illustrations or advertisements. The opinions expressed in these chapters are not necessarily those of the Author or the publisher.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalog record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN: 978-1-80592-674-0 (Print)

ISBN: 978-1-80592-671-9 (Online)

ISBN: 978-1-80592-673-3 (Epub)



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

CONTENTS

<i>List of Figures and Tables</i>	vii
<i>About the Editors</i>	ix
<i>About the Contributors</i>	xi
<i>About the iNEST Project</i>	xvii
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	xix

Rethinking Sustainable Business Models in Tourism, Cultural, and Creative Sectors <i>Maria Della Lucia, Erica Santini, Andrea Caputo and Fabrizio Panozzo</i>	1
---	---

1 The Relevance of Debunking Sustainable Myths for Theory and Practice <i>Bob Bastian, Andrea Caputo and Maria Della Lucia</i>	17
--	----

Part I

Business Models Incorporating the Principles of Circular Economy and Inclusivity

2 Circular Economy in the Hospitality and Tourism Sector: The Case of Waste Cooking Oil <i>Matteo Baldan, Muhammad Junaid Shahid Hasni and Valentina Beghetto</i>	35
3 Inclusive Tourism Design: Bridging the Information Gap Faced by People with Disabilities <i>Rossana Demurtas, Maria Menendez-Blanco and Erica Santini</i>	51

Part II

Art-based Business Models Incorporating the Authenticity of Places

- 4 Authenticity as Weaving Coherence Across Time and Place: Insights from Craft
Camilla Ferri and Maria Lusiani 69
- 5 Rethinking Cultural Business Models Through Artistic Interventions in Tourism-related Contexts
Margherita De Luca, Chiara Carolina Donelli and Fabrizio Panozzo 85

Part III

Participatory Business Models for Creating Shared Value

- 6 Community-based Enterprises as a Sustainable Business Model for Tourism Destination Regeneration
Stefania Denise Escobar, Chiara Massacesi, Linda Osti, Paola Rovelli and Federica Viganò 107
- 7 Social Innovation and Networking in Tourism: Insights from Case Studies in Northeast Italy
Maurizio Busacca, Silvia Sacchetti and Olga Tzatzadaki 125

Part IV

Regenerative Business Models for Sustainable Place Development

- 8 Rethinking Cultural Heritage in Placemaking: From Preservation to Regenerative Development in Castel Campo
Maria Della Lucia, Giulia Dore, Stefan Lazic and Marina Clerici Rasini 143
- 9 Craft-based Experiences to Revitalize Touristic Urban Centers: The Venetian Case Study
Stefano Micelli and Sofia Mizzan 161

Part V

Conclusion

- 10 Sustaining Impact: Looking Ahead in Tourism, Cultural, and Creative Sectors
Maria Della Lucia, Erica Santini, Andrea Caputo and Fabrizio Panozzo 181

LIST OF FIGURES AND TABLES

FIGURES

Fig. 2.1.	Circular Economy Framework for Waste Cooking Oil (WCO) in the Tourism Sector.	42
Fig. 3.1.	Word Cloud of Barriers, Constraints, and Targeted Needs.	59
Fig. 6.1.	Gestation Process.	115
Fig. 8.1.	View of the Castel Campo Estate.	148
Fig. 8.2.	Castel Campo Hub.	150
Fig. 8.3.	Systemic Place-based Development at Castel Campo.	155

TABLES

Table 3.1.	AChecker Standards Evaluation.	58
Table 3.2.	Wave Standards Evaluation.	58
Table 4.1.	Craft Authenticity Work as Weaving Coherence in Time and Place.	76
Table 6.1.	Business Model Framework Applied to the Case of the CBE.	111

This page intentionally left blank

ABOUT THE EDITORS

Maria Della Lucia is Professor of Tourism and Business Management at the University of Trento, Italy, and Coordinator of the Research Task “Sustainable Business Models,” iNEST Spoke 6. She holds a PhD in Economics and Management. Her research focuses on heterodox approaches to systems development and management, culture-based urban regeneration, creative cities and creative tourism, humanistic tourism, destination management and governance, and digital and social media marketing. She has authored and co-authored articles in leading journals such as *Tourism Management*, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, *Cities*, *International Journal of Tourism Research*, *Tourism Geographies*, and *European Planning Studies*.

Erica Santini is Associate Professor of Innovation at the Department of Economics and Management and at the School of Innovation of the University of Trento. She holds a PhD in Economics from the University of Florence, Italy, and researches technological transformation and sustainable transition in both manufacturing and service industries. Her work has been published in *Regional Studies*, *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, *Small Business Economics*, *Journal of Cultural Economics*, and other international journals.

Andrea Caputo is Associate Professor in Management at the University of Trento, Italy, and Professor of Strategy & Negotiation at the University of Lincoln, UK. He holds a PhD in Management from the University of Rome Tor Vergata, Italy. His research focuses on entrepreneurial decision-making, negotiation, digitalization and sustainability, internationalization, and the strategic management of SMEs. He has published over 100 academic contributions in these areas. His achievements include being recognized on the World’s Top 2% Scientists List of outstanding researchers by Elsevier BV, Stanford University (USA) in 2021, 2022, and 2023.

Fabrizio Panozzo is Associate Professor of Management at the Venice School of Management, Ca’ Foscari University of Venice, Italy, and Scientific Coordinator of iNEST Spoke 6. He holds a PhD in Business Administration and

researches the interplay between business economics, artistic practices, and cultural production. He introduced Critical Management Studies to Italy and has explored how art-based approaches can foster innovation and sustainable economic models. He currently chairs Aiku, Ca' Foscari's research center for culture, creativity, and entrepreneurship.

ABOUT THE CONTRIBUTORS

Matteo Baldan is Research Fellow with a MSc in Chemistry from the University of Padova, Italy. His research activities focus on the revalorization of waste materials and their transformation into new products, with an emphasis on sustainability and environmental impact. He is currently affiliated with Ca' Foscari University of Venice.

Bob Bastian is Assistant Professor of Management at the University of Trento, Italy. He received his PhD from the University of Bergamo, Italy, and has had academic experiences at the Rijksuniversiteit Groningen in the Netherlands and IAE Lyon in France. His current research focuses on entrepreneurial decision-making, uncertainty, and sustainability and has published in journals such as in Harvard Business Review and Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice.

Valentina Beghetto is Associate Professor at the Department of Molecular Sciences and Nanosystems, Ca' Foscari University of Venice, Italy. She holds a PhD in Chemistry and is an expert in polymer chemistry, biomass-derived plastics, and leather chemistry. Her research focuses on the development of eco-sustainable materials and processes for the manufacturing industry, with applications supporting circular economy principles. She has authored over 150 publications and patents. Since 2014, she has been the Founder and Scientific Coordinator of Crossing Srl, leading more than 20 national, regional, and European Union-funded projects on sustainable materials and green technologies.

Maurizio Busacca is Associate Professor of Economic Sociology at Ca' Foscari University of Venice, Italy. His research focuses on welfare systems, social innovation, and the organizational dynamics of economic processes. He has published widely on the intersections between economic practices, institutional frameworks, and collective action.

Margherita De Luca is Research fellow at the Venice School of Management, Ca' Foscari University of Venice. Her work focuses on the intersection of cultural entrepreneurship, artistic practices, and sustainable tourism in heritage cities. She has contributed to iNEST – Spoke 6, focusing on art-based business models and their role in reimagining tourist destinations, particularly in the context of overtourism in Venice. She is currently involved in the Young Researchers project “Sustainable Business Models for Tourism with a Culture-based Approach.”

Rossana Demurtas is a former Research Assistant at the Department of Engineering at the Free University of Bozen-Bolzano, where she contributed to the Interconnected Nord-Est Innovation Ecosystem project, focusing on compliance with accessibility regulations in the tourism sector to promote sustainability. She holds a Master's degree in Law and Economics from the University of Bologna and currently works in the renewable energy field.

Chiara Carolina Donelli is Assistant Professor at the Venice School of Management, Ca' Foscari University of Venice, Italy. She holds a PhD in Innovation and Sustainability Economics and Management from the Universities of Parma and Ferrara, Italy. Her research focuses on sustainability in the arts, particularly its social and environmental dimensions, and the role of art in sustainable tourism. She has been a visiting scholar at the University of South Australia, Adelaide. She is the Principal Investigator of the iNEST Young Researchers project “Sustainable Business Models for Tourism with a Culture-based Approach.”

Giulia Dore is Assistant Professor in Private Comparative Law at the University of Trento, Italy. She holds a PhD in European and Comparative Legal Studies. Her research focuses on the interplay of social norms in the context of intellectual property rights, legal geography, IP and managerial implications on the digitization of cultural heritage, and the broader development of open culture. She has published in journals such as *IIC – International Review of Intellectual Property and Competition Law*, *European Intellectual Property Review*, and *Queen Mary Journal of Intellectual Property*.

Stefania Denise Escobar is Postdoctoral Researcher at the Faculty of Economics and Management and is affiliated with the Competence Center for Mountain Innovation Ecosystems of the Free University of Bozen-Bolzano, Italy. She holds a PhD in Management and Economics from the Free University of Bozen-Bolzano. Her research focuses on sustainable innovation, smart business ecosystems, tourism management, and public sector management.

She has published in international journals such as *Journal of Knowledge Management*, *Cities and Current Issues in Tourism*.

Camilla Ferri is Postdoc at Copenhagen Business School, Department of Business Humanities and Law, Denmark, and part of the Rethinking Entrepreneurship project. She holds a PhD focused on the role of the materiality of the past in organizing for the future. Her research examines business history and entrepreneurship, particularly in the context of tourism and culture. She studies long-standing organizations and creative entrepreneurs, exploring the relationship between change and continuity and the role of temporality in business and society. Her qualitative approach includes visual and textual data as well as historical sources. She is currently involved in projects on uses of the past, organizational categories, and craft entrepreneurship from a historical perspective.

Muhammad Junaid Shahid Hasni is Postdoctoral Researcher with a PhD in Economics and Management from the University of Trento, Italy. His research focuses on consumer behavior, food-related consumption patterns, branding, and digital marketing. He has published in leading journals such as the *Journal of Business Ethics* and *the European Journal of Marketing*. Alongside international academic collaborations, he brings professional experience from the textile and telecom sectors to his research and teaching.

Stefan Lazic is a Research fellow at the Department of Economics and Management of the University of Trento, Italy where he obtained his PhD in Sustainability: Economics, Environment, Management and Society (SUSTEEMS) programme from the same University. His research focuses on regenerative development, regenerative tourism, community-led enterprises, more-than-human ethics, and heterodox approaches to the economy. In addition to his academic work, he has professional experience as a practitioner in these fields.

Maria Lusiani is Associate Professor of Accounting and Business Administration at the University of Bologna, Italy. Her research explores management and accounting practices in public and nonprofit organizations, particularly in cultural and creative sectors, using qualitative methodologies including case studies, ethnography, historical analysis, and discourse analysis. She previously was a postdoctoral fellow at HEC Montréal and held faculty positions at Ca' Foscari University of Venice, where she directed the master's degree and research center in Arts and Cultural Management.

Chiara Massacesi is Postdoctoral Researcher at the Free University of Bozen-Bolzano, Italy. She holds a PhD in Tourism and Food Heritage Tourism from

the University of Otago, New Zealand. Her research focuses on tourism and authenticity in mountain areas, combining rural sociology and cultural studies. She has published articles and book chapters on cheese and gastronomic tourism, emphasizing collaboration among diverse stakeholders. Beyond academia, she has worked as a Consultant for NGOs and currently advises food-producing small businesses and Destination Management Organizations on sustainable gastronomic tourism development to promote local heritage and sustainable practices.

Maria Menendez-Blanco is Assistant Professor at the Faculty of Engineering of the Free University of Bozen/Bolzano, Italy. She holds a PhD in Information and Communication Technologies. Her primary research interest lies in human–computer interaction for societal engagement, specifically exploring how technologies can enable or hinder democratic processes of participation. Her work has been published in top international journals such as *ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction* and *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*.

Stefano Micelli is full Professor of Business Economics and Management at Ca' Foscari University of Venice, Italy, and Director of the Manager's Development Programme. His research focuses on the transformation of the Italian economic system, particularly the evolution of the manufacturing sector and the role of craftsmanship in innovation. He is Executive President of Upskill 4.0, a spin-off of Ca' Foscari University; a Member of the Advisory Board Italy and Advisory Board Nord Est of UniCredit; and a Member of the Scientific Committee of Symbola. He is the author of influential books, including *Futuro Artigiano* (Marsilio, 2011) and *Fare è Innovare. Il nuovo lavoro artigiano* (Il Mulino, 2016).

Sofia Mizzan is Research Fellow at Ca' Foscari University of Venice, Italy, working on models for regenerating the social and economic fabric of Venice. She holds a dual degree in International Management from Ca' Foscari University and SKEMA Business School, France. Her research focuses on the role of SMEs in fostering sustainable business models, cultural enterprises, and territorial revitalization. She has organized workshops, seminars, and training programs to promote entrepreneurship and innovation and collaborates with Upskill 4.0 on digital transformation projects and strategic consulting for SMEs.

Linda Osti is Senior Lecturer in Tourism Management at Bangor University, where she leads the Tourism, Destinations, and Place Engagement research

group. Her research focuses on sustainable tourism, with particular emphasis on its socio-cultural aspects and the behavior of green tourists. Her academic and applied research projects aim to enhance the well-being of local communities as key actors in fostering equitable forms of tourism.

Marina Clerici Rasini is an Artist, Farmer, and Philanthropist. Together with her daughters Sofia, Olivia, and Thea Rasini, she manages the activities of the Castel Campo estate and operates the organic agricultural farm “Castel Campo,” Italy. She also oversees the limited company “Il Campo s.r.l.” and actively contributes to initiatives promoted by the non-profit organization “Associazione Campo Base Onlus.”

Paola Rovelli is Associate Professor at the Faculty of Economics and Management of the Free University of Bozen-Bolzano, Italy. She is a Member of the Entrepreneurship, Innovation and Management Cluster and the Competence Centre for Mountain Innovation Ecosystems. She holds a PhD *summa cum laude* in Management, Economics, and Industrial Engineering from Politecnico di Milano, Italy. Her research focuses on organizational design, individual characteristics, and family business. She has published in leading journals such as *Journal of Management Studies*, *Human Relations*, *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, and *The Leadership Quarterly*.

Silvia Sacchetti is Professor of Political Economy in the Department of Sociology and Social Research of the University of Trento, Italy, where she also coordinates the research unit on Economic Institutions and the Common Good (Cives). Her research explores the interconnections between human motivations, organizational governance, and production systems, including the role of civil society in fostering personal capabilities, identifying publics, and generating shared value for communities. Recent applications include the cultural and welfare sectors.

Olga Tzatzadaki is Research Fellow at Ca' Foscari University of Venice, Italy. She holds a PhD in Urban Planning and Public Policies from the University IUAV of Venice. Her research focuses on sustainable business models and social innovation in tourism, with emphasis on community-based approaches and participatory governance models. Additional research areas include the valorization of non-conventional narratives for socio-spatial analysis.

Federica Viganò is Senior Researcher at the Faculty of Education of the Free University of Bozen-Bolzano, Italy, and is affiliated with the Competence

Center for Mountain Innovation Ecosystems and the Competence Center for Sustainability. Her transdisciplinary research focuses on sustainability and eco-social transitions across sectors, including energy, agriculture, and creative industries, with particular attention to rural areas. Her work has been published in journals such as *Journal of Rural Studies*, *Sociologia Urbana e Rurale*, and *City, Culture and Society*.

ABOUT THE iNEST PROJECT

Under Italy's National Recovery and Resilience Plan (PNRR), funded by the NextGeneration EU program, Innovation Ecosystems are a national initiative designed to foster innovation, drive technology transfer, and support sustainable economic development across Italy. These ecosystems represent a cornerstone of Italy's broader strategy to build a resilient, green, and knowledge-based economy grounded in regional potential and inter-institutional collaboration. Each Innovation Ecosystem is a network of universities, public research institutions, territorial bodies, and companies strategically distributed throughout the country to leverage and enhance regional strengths. These networks focus on specific domains of excellence that reflect the unique economic, industrial, and research vocations of each region. The goal is to align innovation initiatives with regional needs and capabilities. To ensure strategic coherence and value creation while engaging diverse domains of excellence and stakeholders, each ecosystem follows a "hub-and-spoke" organizational model. A leading institution (the Hub) coordinates activities with a network of regional partners (the Spokes), ensuring both central guidance and localized action.

The iNEST Project – Interconnected Nord-Est Innovation Ecosystem is the ecosystem located in the North-East of Italy aimed at accelerating digital and ecological transitions across the northeastern regions of Italy, that is, Friuli-Venezia Giulia, Veneto, and the Autonomous Provinces of Trento and Bolzano. This area makes a significant contributor to the Italian economy, accounting for only 2% of the national population but producing 14% of Italy's GDP and 20% of its exports. It is marked by strong territorial identity and a diverse array of productive specializations reflected in the iNEST Project's nine domains of excellence (Spokes). These thematic networks bring together 24 partners, including 9 universities, 3 public research institutions, and 12 private entities under the coordination of the University of Padua, which serves as the Hub. Far beyond a funding mechanism, iNEST represents a strategic effort to drive regional transformation through innovation that is place-sensitive, socially embedded, and intersectorally collaborative.

Within this ecosystem, the Tourism, Culture, and Creative Industries network (Spoke 6) contributes both structurally and thematically to the overarching objectives of the iNEST project. Led by Ca' Foscari University of Venice, iNEST involves collaborative participation from the Free University of Bozen-Bolzano, the University of Trento, and the University of Verona. Spoke 6 adopts a multidisciplinary approach that integrates management, economics, STEM disciplines, the arts, and the humanities to analyze tourism, culture, and the creative industries through an ecosystem lens. Its mission is to foster and strengthen the interconnections among these sectors, reduce fragmentation, and promote the development of a diversified, culturally rich, and sustainable innovation landscape.

To achieve these goals, Spoke 6 is organized into four coordinated research tracks and designed as an integrated learning and innovation system. Digital Technologies (RT1) integrate domain expertise in tourism, culture, and creative industries with advanced technologies such as Artificial Intelligence, Blockchain, IoT, and Extended Reality. Data Analytics (RT2) analyze big data from heterogeneous sources to inform more sustainable public policies and destination marketing strategies. Sustainable Business Models (RT3) transform business models in the tourism, cultural, and creative sectors toward sustainability. Finally, narratives and communication strategies (RT4) develop new tools to challenge stereotypes and reframe tourism communication through inclusivity and sustainability.

This book concludes at a crucial moment in the NEST trajectory, documenting the main outcomes of the research track on Sustainable Business Models (RT3). It is edited by the leaders of the four key research lines within RT3, all of whom share the overarching goal of promoting the sustainable transformation of business models in the tourism, culture, and creative industries. This transformation covers a range of innovative approaches applied at different levels, including circular and inclusive business models, integrating sustainability and equality into the design of services, products, and experiences; art-based business models, leveraging the creative contributions of artists and cultural entrepreneurs to enhance authenticity and value; participatory business models, which create shared value by reconciling the needs and interests of businesses, communities, and visitors; and regenerative business models, reimagining the use of places and spaces by innovating their original functions and cultural heritage to improve living conditions, accessibility, inclusion, and user experience.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

An edited collection is never a solitary endeavor; it is a collaborative tapestry woven by many hands. First and foremost, we must acknowledge the exceptional dedication of Bob Bastian (Assistant Professor of Management at the University of Trento) as Coordinator of this Book project. Bob was instrumental in liaising between the editorial team, the diverse group of authors, and the publishing house. His ability to streamline communication and his keen eye for detail ensured that this book is not just a collection of chapters, but a cohesive and relevant contribution to the field. We are also grateful for the capable support provided by Giulia Dore (Assistant Professor in Private Comparative Law at the University of Trento) and Muhammad Junaid Shahid Hasni (Postdoctoral Researcher in Management at the University of Trento) in assisting with these coordination efforts.

We extend our sincere thanks to the contributing authors, whose insights and scholarship form the core of this book. We appreciate your responsiveness and willingness to engage in the editorial dialog. We also thank the reviewers who generously gave their time to read early drafts; your feedback was invaluable.

To the team at Emerald Publishing and Book Series Editors Andrea Caputo and Massimiliano M. Pellegrini, thank you for shepherding this project from proposal to print. We also acknowledge our home institutions for their academic and administrative support.

This page intentionally left blank

THE RELEVANCE OF DEBUNKING SUSTAINABLE MYTHS FOR THEORY AND PRACTICE

BOB BASTIAN, ANDREA CAPUTO AND MARIA DELLA LUCIA

University of Trento, Italy

ABSTRACT

Research on sustainable business models has expanded considerably, reflecting the growing need to align organizational strategies with sustainability goals. However, the theoretical fragmentation within this field has led to unchallenged assumptions in which existing paradigms are reinforced rather than questioned. This chapter introduces myth-busting as an approach for researchers and practitioners to debunk taken-for-granted assumptions in sustainable tourism management. By actively dismantling myths, both researchers and practitioners can improve deeper critical thinking and strengthen multidisciplinary collaboration. Embracing a myth-buster mindset enables researchers and practitioners to think better, ask more relevant questions, and make smarter decisions in research, policy, and practice.

Keywords: Sustainability; sustainable business models; problematization; myths; ignorance; problem-based research; multidisciplinary

INTRODUCTION

Studies into the relationship between organizational strategies and sustainability have increased substantially in recent years (e.g., [Bocken & Geradts, 2020](#); [Geissdoerfer et al., 2018](#); [Ringvold et al., 2023](#)). To achieve the Sustainable Development Goals, organizations are on a challenging road to reevaluating how they create, deliver, capture, and exchange value with their stakeholders. One popular avenue for researchers has been the study of sustainable business models since it has explanatory power about how economic, environmental, and societal value are produced and how negative impact can be reduced (e.g., [Bocken et al., 2014](#); [Geissdoerfer et al., 2016](#)). A rich scope of special issues (e.g., [Boons et al., 2013](#); [Dentchev et al., 2018](#); [Pinkse et al., 2023](#); [Schaltegger et al., 2016](#)) and literature reviews have emerged in the last decade to provide insights on sustainability progress ([Evans et al., 2017](#)), indicating that the area is promising and emerging. Nevertheless, transitioning to these new models presents significant challenges, both for practitioners and researchers.

The presence of at least 14 different notions and frameworks of sustainable business models in the literature reflects a general lack of consensus on what a sustainable business model is or should be and what does not ([Geissdoerfer et al., 2018](#)). However, this fragmentation appears to be part of the ongoing (mostly theoretical) discussion that has also embodied the concept of sustainability ([Lüdeke-Freund & Dembek, 2017](#)). Definitional and conceptual issues are, at the same time, a result of the popularity of the field, and in this way, sustainable business models may have become victims of their own success. Yet, sustainability paradigms rely on distinct assumptions, implying that the way they address solutions contains different problems and ways forward. Hence, the relevance of distinguishing sustainable problems ([Foss & Saebi, 2017](#); [Sharma et al., 2022](#)).

A different breed of problems is related to assumptions of the underlying literature ([Matthews et al., 2016](#); [Reuber, 2016](#)). Problems related to the latter go beyond definitional and conceptual issues ([Hasenzagl et al., 2018](#); [Matthews et al., 2016](#); [Reuber, 2016](#)). They are, in a sense, taken for granted ([Alvesson, 2013](#)) and in the domain of dominant knowledge. Identifying what these underlying assumptions are and how they could be challenged is not a method researchers commonly employ. Instead, most contributions build on existing literature and spot gaps to find an issue ([Colquitt & Zapata-Phelan, 2007](#); [Pratt, 2009](#)). When assumptions remain largely unchallenged, they tend to be underproblematized and reinforce existing knowledge ([Alvesson & Sandberg, 2011](#)).

In this way, dominant assumptions of sustainable business models may turn persistent over time and become sustainable myths. These myths arise when the status-quo is maintained (Burmeister & Schade, 2007; Hannan & Freeman, 1984), when assumptions go unchallenged and are reconfirmed (Klayman, 1995), when critical thinking is lacking (Kennedy et al., 2013), and when the wrong type of questions are asked (Foucault, 2013). Understanding what sustainable myths are, where they come from, and how they can be dismantled is relevant to nurturing critical thinking to address the root cause of sustainable problems.

In this chapter, we propose myth-busting as a way forward to question taken-for-granted sustainable assumptions. Myth-busters debunk myths, rather than confirming them, problematize, rather than spotting gaps (Sandberg & Alvesson, 2011), and reframe problems between researchers and practitioners jointly (Dimov, 2020; Hyytinen, 2021; Ringvold et al., 2023) with a multi-disciplinary lens. This is important as organizations cannot solve complex sustainability issues in isolation (Bastian & Caputo, 2024; Fobbe & Hilletoft, 2021). However, taking on the myth-buster role is challenging. It implies acknowledging and embracing one's (own) ignorance (Alvesson et al., 2022; Alvesson & Spicer, 2016). The more myths we bust, the more unknowns we reveal, leading to greater nuance, understanding, and new unknowns. Acknowledging one's ignorance through myth-busting has surprising positive effects for creativity, imagination, and innovation (Firestein, 2012).

Myth-busting, however, is not just a tool for researchers. Practitioners, too, should increasingly become myth-busters. Myth-busting for practitioners implies seeking evidence-based knowledge rather than relying on self-declared experts (Chavda et al., 2022), influencers (Petrocelli et al., 2023), and populist leaders (Bergmann, 2020). By distinguishing facts from misinformation (Vasist & Krishnan, 2023) and informed decisions from conspiracy theories (Douglas et al., 2019; Sunstein, 2014), myth-busting opens space for better thinking, more relevant questions, and smarter decisions, in research, policy, and practice.

The remainder of this chapter is organized in the following way. First, we explain what myth-busting is and exemplify how myth-busting can help to debunk assumptions. Second, we theorize that researchers need to question and reassess their assumptions within sustainable business model practices and that researchers and practitioners need joint alignment to frame sustainable solutions jointly. Third, we argue that both approaches require multidisciplinary approaches to avoid box thinking. In the last section of the chapter, we propose a way forward for theory and practice with concluding thoughts.

SUSTAINABLE BUSINESS MODELS AND SUSTAINABLE MYTHS

Sustainable business models integrate components of both traditional organizational frameworks and corporate sustainability (e.g., [Bocken et al., 2014](#); [Osterwalder & Pigneur, 2010](#); [Teece, 2010](#)). By addressing social, environmental, and business considerations concurrently, these models require collaboration and coordination with a wide array of stakeholders, including communities, customers, investors, shareholders, employees, suppliers, partners, NGOs, and governments ([Antikainen & Valkokari, 2016](#); [Schaltegger et al., 2016](#)).

Given their interest in empirical and theoretical research, the sustainable business model field is expected to continue to evolve ([Ringvold et al., 2023](#); [Rosato et al., 2021](#)). For example, [Geissdoerfer et al. \(2018\)](#) hypothesize that sustainable business models might substitute “traditional” ones to the same extent as sustainable competitive advantage might replace “simple” competitive advantage. Yet, as business models are concerned with strategy, pricing, market positioning, value chain integration, and value creation, it is more likely that sustainability is becoming a core part of business models, rather than entirely replacing it. A realistic transition toward a sustainable economy requires the reevaluation and redesign of business models, a challenging task that often appears to be taken for granted ([Montiel et al., 2020](#)).

Amid the overplus of proposed definitions ([Bocken et al., 2014](#); [Schaltegger et al., 2016](#)), sustainable business models can be defined as a “simplified representation of the elements, the interrelationship between these elements, and the interactions with its stakeholders that an organizational unit uses to create, deliver, capture, and exchange sustainable value” ([Geissdoerfer et al., 2016](#), p. 2). Yet, many other definitions exist (see [Geissdoerfer et al., 2018](#)), and sustainable business models have been described as architectural blueprints, as attributes of organizations, as conceptual representations, and as cognitive schemas in which actors make sense of their logics in order to create value ([Bastian & Caputo, 2024](#); [Massa et al., 2017](#)).

The peril of the variety of descriptions and conceptualizations is that sustainable business models risk becoming an umbrella term, a concept that encompasses various meanings and ideas under the same label (e.g., [Glavič & Lukman, 2007](#)). In addition, sustainable business models have been called out to lack critical reflection on trade-offs ([Prescott & Filatotchev, 2021](#)), on problems, construct clarity ([Suddaby, 2010](#)), and ambiguity of how sustainable business models are operationalized in practice ([Fobbe & Hilletoft, 2021](#)). In the long term, this may lead to the emergence of myths.

When the wrong kind of questions are asked and assumptions are no longer questioned, what sustainable business models imply for theory and

practice becomes increasingly problematic (Alvesson, 2013; Sandberg & Alvesson, 2011). For example, typical sustainable business model myths that are already persistent are that sustainability is good for everyone, that certain types of sustainable interventions are, and will stay, too expensive, that sustainable transitions imply sacrificing comfort and convenience, or that it conflicts with economic growth (Leal Filho, 2000; Mwampamba et al., 2013; Sorman, 2023).

MYTH-BUSTING

Despite being a promising and rapidly expanding field, research on sustainable business models frequently lacks diverse perspectives to compare and contrast the theory with alternative approaches (Alvesson & Sandberg, 2011; Hardy & Grant, 2012; Laguerre, 2023). This is problematic as it may lead researchers to be over reliant on dominant literature streams while ignoring important consequences and trade-offs of the studied phenomenon (Sabaruddin et al., 2023). For example, there is ongoing confusion about how to operationalize sustainable business models, sustainable business model solutions are framed as effective in any context while ineffective solutions are not considered, and assumptions that sustainable business models always bring benefits indicate that they may be misleading (e.g., Fobbe & Hilletoft, 2021; Susur & Karakaya, 2021). When researchers do not critically examine and expose the underlying assumptions of their theories, widely used and overexploited scientific concepts evolve into dominant, ambiguous concepts and constructs with indistinct boundaries (Alvesson & Blom, 2021), with the sustainable business model field might risk becoming a business buzzword (Dzhengiz et al., 2023).

Consequently, a step beyond moderate critical analysis is necessary that questions how new knowledge, and not only current dominant logic, can be detected and questioned. We propose myth-busting as a way forward to question sustainable beliefs that are persistent and largely taken for granted. Myth-busting is crucial to comprehend the nature of sustainable myths, their origins, and the methods to address them. It implies that (1) researchers need to question and reassess their assumptions in order to create impactful theories on sustainability within sustainable business model practices (Alvesson & Sandberg, 2013); (2) researchers and practitioners better align and co-create more concretely how they interpret and refine their knowledge to frame sustainable solutions jointly (Berglund et al., 2018); and (3) a multidisciplinary approach to avoid box thinking (Alvesson & Sandberg, 2014).

PROBLEMATIZING MYTHS

Problematization as a methodology (Alvesson & Sandberg, 2011) deliberately guides researchers to identify and challenge dominant assumptions that are underlying the sustainable business model literature. Problematizing implies that researchers disconfirm some (but not all) of the assumptions held by their audience (Bartunek et al., 2006) to ask more interesting questions and generate reviews that go beyond systemization. Rather than identifying “gaps” within the literature, problematizing helps researchers to detach from familiar perspectives and critique the assumptions of others for the purpose of challenging underlying assumptions. In this way, problematizing seeks to question prevailing assumptions to broaden perspectives and reconsider our understanding past a descriptive level (Alegre et al., 2023; Breslin et al., 2020) that are often overlooked or accepted as given (Patriotta, 2017).

Sustainable business model researchers that chose to problematize may start with the foundational literature and significant works that constitute the core of the field, identify the major assumptions that underlie the sustainable business model field, and develop alternative assumptions based on more broader readings and a constant process of reflexivity (see Alvesson & Sandberg, 2020). When these alternative assumptions are developed, researchers may ask themselves if these have the potential to produce theories that are compelling. For example, one assumption that may be challenged is the nature of sustainable problems, which may emerge from the sustainable business model literature as often well-structured with a single solution for a clearly framed problem. Problematizing these assumptions may lead researchers in the direction of ill-defined problems and uncertainty (Foss & Saebi, 2017, Ho, 2001) or see sustainable problems as subjective mental models (Björkdahl et al., 2022) that requires a reframing process in which problems and solutions are part of a dynamic, instead of a static, sense-making process (Bastian & Caputo, 2024).

PROBLEM-BASED RESEARCH BETWEEN ACADEMICS AND PRACTITIONERS

While most researchers aim to impact their research with practical applications, only a small proportion perceive themselves as successful in doing so (Rynes et al., 2018). This highlights a research-practice gap between researchers who tackle and resolve sustainable issues and those who study these practices as a focus of their research (Sharma & Bansal, 2020). For much published or publishable research, a significant reason why researchers

study a phenomenon can be attributed to the need to publish, for example, to secure tenure or achieve promotion (Pfleeger et al., 2019). However, the value of researching impactful problems lies in its potential to influence future studies and other researchers. This apparent gap between research and practice may reduce when researchers and practitioners collaborate more closely in addressing a meaningful problem to develop sustainable solutions collectively (Berglund et al., 2018; Ellis & Levy, 2008; Volkema, 1983).

Recent academic discussions regarding key stakeholders to be included within a broader spectrum of this process emphasize the critical role of researchers and practitioners jointly (e.g., Bastian & Zucchella, 2023; Sharma & Bansal, 2020). Including practitioners in research settings leads to collaborative efforts that can stimulate the co-creation and alignment of propositions and joint knowledge development (Rynes et al., 2001). A co-creation process between practitioners and academics may also uncover epistemic differences as stakeholders contribute varying perspectives on the defined problem (Shams & Kaufman, 2016). This process may encourage the co-creation of research and knowledge or uncover epistemic distinctions as stakeholders contribute varying perspectives on the defined problem.

These collaborative interactions are essential for addressing the research-practice gap. For example, when practitioners and researchers venture together, they may decompose sustainable problems and generate new heuristics about different problem–solution combinations. Identifying and redefining problems may then facilitate the creation of alternative hypothetical “what-if” scenarios (Dorst, 2011). Thus, while practitioners can aid researchers in contextualizing sustainable business model problems, researchers can contribute by leveraging their expertise to deconstruct and reframe these problems (Bastian & Caputo, 2024; Ho, 2001).

MULTIDISCIPLINARY APPROACHES

Successful myth busting can be achieved through questioning and reassessing assumptions, and through problem-based research in which a careful problem statement is the starting point for academics and practitioners to jointly understand what can be done about it. However, a common denominator between problematization and joint problem-based research is that both approaches require multidisciplinary. Multidisciplinary research involves collaboration among two or more disciplines to undertake a research project, with each discipline preserving its distinct boundaries, epistemologies, methodologies, and core values (Okumus & van Niekerk, 2015).

For problematization, multidisciplinary approaches matter as researchers are stimulated to look beyond meaningless gaps and the usual suspects (Alvesson & Sandberg, 2024). For example, when reviewing sustainable business model literature, problematizing researchers may consider reading and including multidisciplinary sustainability journals (Dzhengiz et al., 2023), as using journal rankings and impact factors can be misleading and lead to excessive emphasis on research of lesser significance simply because it is published in prestigious outlets (Elbanna & Child, 2023).

For problem-based research between academics and practitioners, multidisciplinary matters because it is essential to extend perspectives beyond the organization to generate lasting value for all stakeholders. For instance, “researchers and practitioners can investigate complex social problems by collaborating across the basic stages of the research process, including formulating problems, building theory, designing research, and solving problems” (Bansal et al., 2012, p. 74), to decrease the research-practice gap. Thus, acknowledging the importance of the multidisciplinary character of different stakeholders within the business model is important for collective views on the value-creation processes (Alvarez et al., 2020).

Multi-disciplinarity can also help research on sustainable business models to adopt the so-called “outside view” (Kahneman et al., 2011; Lovallo & Kahneman, 2003). The inside view is an approach that typically happens when same-minded researchers work on sustainable problems together. When researchers use their inside view, they concentrate narrowly on the problem at hand which may lead to overoptimistic judgments. The outside view, on the other hand, ignores information at hand and instead examines a broad set of problems outside the narrow scope of what comes to mind first. Multidisciplinary approaches help researchers to obtain an outside view as different fields and expertise bring different perspectives on sustainable problems and solutions for their sustainable business model design (Geissdoerfer et al., 2016).

Understanding these underlying cognitive processes (Bastian et al., 2025) matter as they may positively impact the quality of idea-generation processes (Frederiks et al., 2019). However, including a broader range of stakeholders may simultaneously create novel challenges. When stakeholders have different expectations, developing a common pathway becomes more complicated (Scheyvens et al., 2016). This may happen when stakeholders do not see a clear direction in the future (Aldrich & Fiol, 1994) or question the plausibility that problems are addressed correctly (Suchman, 1995). Thus, it is evident that collaborations should be aligned, with stakeholders committed and motivated to common goals that represent shared values (Bastian & Zucchella, 2023; Lindenberg & Foss, 2011). This also involves a mutual understanding

of roles and potential perceptual differences between stakeholders and what they know (Huber & Lewis, 2010).

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this chapter highlights the significance of myth-busting as a crucial tool for challenging long-standing assumptions in sustainable management. By critically examining prevailing beliefs, both researchers and industry professionals can move beyond conventional approaches to encourage deeper insights and drive meaningful transformation. Debunking myths not only strengthens evidence-based decision-making but also promotes innovation and multidisciplinary collaboration, leading to more sustainable tourism practices. Future myth-busters will enable organizations to ask more relevant questions, make more informed choices, and make smarter decisions across research, policy, and practice.

REFERENCES

- Alegre, J., Callahan, J., & Iszatt-White, M. (2023). Innovative conceptual contributions – Raising the game for theory-driven reviews. *International Journal of Management Review*, 25, 233–239.
- Aldrich, H. E., & Fiol, C. M. (1994). Fools rush in? The institutional context of industry creation. *Academy of Management Review*, 19(4), 645–670.
- Alvarez, S. A., Young, S. L., & Woolley, J. L. (2020). Creating the world's deadliest catch: The process of enrolling stakeholders in an uncertain endeavor. *Business & Society*, 59(2), 287–321.
- Alvesson, M. (2013). Do we have something to say? From re-search to rei-search and back again. *Organization*, 20(1), 79–90.
- Alvesson, M., & Blom, M. (2021). The hegemonic ambiguity of big concepts in organization studies. *Human Relations*, 75, 58–86.
- Alvesson, M., Einola, K., & Schaefer, S. M. (2022). Dynamics of wilful ignorance in organizations. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 73(4), 839–858.
- Alvesson, M., & Sandberg, J. (2011). Generating research questions through problematization. *Academy of Management Review*, 36(2), 247–271.

- Alvesson, M., & Sandberg, J. (2013). *Constructing research questions: Doing interesting research*. Sage.
- Alvesson, M., & Sandberg, J. (2014). Habitat and habitus: Boxed-in versus box-breaking research. *Organization Studies*, 35(7), 967–987.
- Alvesson, M., & Sandberg, J. (2020). The problematizing review: A counterpoint to Elsbach and Van Knippenberg’s argument for integrative reviews. *Journal of Management Studies*, 57(6), 1290–1304.
- Alvesson, M., & Sandberg, J. (2024). The art of phenomena construction: A framework for coming up with research phenomena beyond ‘the usual suspects’. *Journal of Management Studies*, 61(5), 1737–1765.
- Alvesson, M., & Spicer, A. (2016). *The stupidity paradox: The power and pitfalls of functional stupidity at work*. Profile.
- Antikainen, M., & Valkokari, K. (2016). A framework for sustainable circular business model innovation. *Technology Innovation Management Review*, 6, 5–12.
- Bansal, P., Bertels, S., Ewart, T., MacConnachie, P., & O’Brien, J. (2012). Bridging the research–practice gap. In *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 26, 1, Symposium.
- Bartunek, J. M., Rynes, S. L., & Ireland, R. D. (2006). What makes management research interesting, and why does it matter? *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(1), 9–15.
- Bastian, B., & Caputo, A. (2024). Sustainable business models: Researchers as design thinkers for problem-driven research. *Strategic Change*, 33(3), 129–138.
- Bastian, B., Hjelle, M., & Shepherd, D. (2025). Systemizing entrepreneurial Metacognition: Thinking about the past and future. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 10422587251315664.
- Bastian, B., & Zucchella, A. (2023). Nascent entrepreneurs during start-up competitions: Between beauty contests and co-created problematization. *Journal of Business Venturing Insights*, 20, e00391.
- Berglund, H., Dimov, D., & Wennberg, K. (2018). Beyond bridging rigor and relevance: The three-body problem in entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Venturing Insights*, 9, 87–91.
- Bergmann, E. (2020). Populism and the politics of misinformation. *Safundi*, 21(3), 251–265.

- Björkdahl, J., Fallahi, S., & Holmén, M. (2022). Explaining business model innovation processes: A problem formulation and problem solving perspective. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 105, 223–239.
- Bocken, N. M. P., & Geradts, T. H. J. (2020). Barriers and drivers to sustainable business model innovation: Organization design and dynamic capabilities. *Long Range Planning*, 53(4), 101950.
- Bocken, N. M. P., Short, S. W., Rana, P., & Evans, S. (2014). A literature and practice review to develop sustainable business model archetypes. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 65, 42–56.
- Boons, F., Montalvo, C., Quist, J. N., & Wagner, M. (2013). Sustainable innovation, business models and economic performance: An overview. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 45, 1–8.
- Breslin, D., Gatrell, C., & Bailey, K. (2020). Developing insights through reviews: Reflecting on the 20th anniversary of the International Journal of Management Reviews. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 22, 3–9.
- Burmeister, K., & Schade, C. (2007). Are entrepreneurs' decisions more biased? An experimental investigation of the susceptibility to status quo bias. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 22(3), 340–362.
- Chavda, V. P., Sonak, S. S., Munshi, N. K., & Dhamade, P. N. (2022). Pseudoscience and fraudulent products for COVID-19 management. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 29(42), 62887–62912.
- Colquitt, J. A., & Zapata-Phelan, C. P. (2007). Trends in theory building and theory testing: A five-decade study of the Academy of Management Journal. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(6), 1281–1303.
- Dentchev, N., Rauter, R., Jóhannsdóttir, L., Snihur, Y., Rosano, M., Baumgartner, R., & Nyberg, T. (2018). Embracing the variety of sustainable business models: A prolific field of research and a future research agenda. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 194, 695–703.
- Dimov, D. (2020). Opportunities, language, and time. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 34(3), 333–351.
- Dorst, K. (2011). The core of “design thinking” and its application. *Design Studies*, 32(6), 521–532.
- Douglas, K. M., Uscinski, J. E., Sutton, R. M., Cichocka, A., Nefes, T., Ang, C. S., & Deravi, F. (2019). Understanding conspiracy theories. *Political Psychology*, 40(S1), 3–35.

- Dzhengiz, T., Miller, E. M., Ovaska, J. P., & Patala, S. (2023). Unpacking the circular economy: A problematizing review. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 25(2), 270–296.
- Elbanna, S., & Child, J. (2023). From ‘publish or perish’ to ‘publish for purpose’. *European Management Review*, 20(4), 614–618.
- Ellis, T. J., & Levy, Y. (2008). Framework of problem-based research: A guide for novice researchers on the development of a research-worthy problem. *Informing Science*, 11, 17–33.
- Evans, S., Vladimirova, D., Holgado, M., Van Fossen, K., Yang, M., Silva, E. A., & Barlow, C. Y. (2017). Business model innovation for sustainability: Towards a unified perspective for creation of sustainable business models. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 26(5), 597–608.
- Firestein, S. (2012). *Ignorance: How it drives science*. Oxford University Press.
- Fobbe, L., & Hilletoft, P. (2021). The role of stakeholder interaction in sustainable business models: A systematic literature review. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 327, 129510.
- Foss, N., & Saebi, T. (2017). Business models and business model innovation: Between wicked and paradigmatic problems. *Long Range Planning*, 51(1), 9–21.
- Foucault, M. (2013). Archaeology of knowledge. In A. M. Sheridan Smith (Ed.), Routledge.
- Frederiks, A. J., Englis, B. G., Ehrenhard, M. L., & Groen, A. J. (2019). Entrepreneurial cognition and the quality of new venture ideas: An experimental approach to comparing future-oriented cognitive processes. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 34(2), 327–347.
- Geissdoerfer, M., Bocken, N. M. P., & Hultink, E. J. (2016). Design thinking to enhance the sustainable business modelling process – A workshop based on a value mapping process. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 135, 1218–1232.
- Geissdoerfer, M., Vladimirova, D., & Evans, S. (2018). Sustainable business model innovation: A review. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 198, 401–416.
- Glavič, P., & Lukman, R. (2007). Review of sustainability terms and their definitions. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 15(18), 1875–1885.
- Hannan, M. T., & Freeman, J. (1984). Structural inertia and organizational change. *American Sociological Review*, 49(2), 149–164.

- Hardy, C., & Grant, D. (2012). Readers beware: Provocation, problematization and... problems. *Human Relations*, 65(5), 547–566.
- Hasenzagl, R., Hatak, I., & Frank, H. (2018). Problematizing socioemotional wealth in family firms: A systems-theoretical reframing. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 30(1–2), 199–223.
- Ho, C. H. (2001). Some phenomena of problem decomposition strategy for design thinking: Differences between novices and experts. *Design Studies*, 22(1), 27–45.
- Huber, G. P., & Lewis, K. (2010). Cross-understanding: Implications for group cognition and performance. *Academy of Management Review*, 35(1), 6–26.
- Hyytinen, A. (2021). Shared problem solving and design thinking in entrepreneurship research. *Journal of Business Venturing Insights*, 16, e00254.
- Kahneman, D., Lovallo, D., & Sibony, O. (2011). Before you make that big decision. *Harvard Business Review*, 89(6), 50–60.
- Kennedy, M., Fisher, M. B., & Ennis, R. H. (2013). Critical thinking: Literature review and needed research. In J. A. Bellanca (Ed.), *Educational values and cognitive instruction* (pp. 11–40). Routledge.
- Klayman, J. (1995). Varieties of confirmation bias. *Psychology of Learning and Motivation*, 32, 385–418.
- Laguerre, R. (2023). Challenging assumptions in research and practice using problematization principles. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 16(1), 101–104.
- Leal Filho, W. (2000). Dealing with misconceptions on the concept of sustainability. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, 1(1), 9–19.
- Lindenberg, S., & Foss, N. J. (2011). Managing joint production motivation: The role of goal framing and governance mechanisms. *Academy of Management Review*, 36(3), 500–525.
- Lovallo, D., & Kahneman, D. (2003). Delusions of success. *Harvard Business Review*, 81(7), 56–63.
- Lüdeke-Freund, F., & Dembek, K. (2017). Sustainable business model research and practice: Emerging field or passing fancy? *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 168, 1668–1678.

- Massa, L., Tucci, C. L., & Afuah, A. (2017). A critical assessment of business model research. *Academy of Management Annals*, 11(1), 73–104.
- Matthews, L., Power, D., Touboullic, A., & Marques, L. (2016). Building bridges: Toward alternative theory of sustainable supply chain management. *Journal of Supply Chain Management*, 52(1), 82–94.
- Montiel, I., Gallo, P. J., & Antolin-Lopez, R. (2020). What on Earth should managers learn about corporate sustainability? A threshold concept approach. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 162(4), 857–880.
- Mwampamba, T. H., Ghilardi, A., Sander, K., & Chaix, K. J. (2013). Dispelling common misconceptions to improve attitudes and policy outlook on charcoal in developing countries. *Energy for Sustainable Development*, 17(2), 75–85.
- Okumus, F., & van Niekerk, M. (2015). Multidisciplinarity, tourism. In J. J. Liburd & D. Edwards (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of tourism* (pp. 1–3). Springer.
- Osterwalder, A., & Pigneur, Y. (2010). *Business model generation: A handbook for visionaries, game changers, and challengers*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Patriotta, G. (2017). Crafting papers for publication: Novelty and convention in academic writing. *Journal of Management Studies*, 54(6), 747–759.
- Petrocelli, J. V., Seta, C. E., & Seta, J. J. (2023). Lies and bullshit: The negative effects of misinformation grow stronger over time. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 37(2), 409–418.
- Pfleegor, A. G., Katz, M., & Bowers, M. T. (2019). Publish, perish, or salami slice? Authorship ethics in an emerging field. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 156(1), 189–208.
- Pinkse, J., Lüdeke-Freund, F., Laasch, O., Snihur, Y., & Bohnsack, R. (2023). The organizational dynamics of business models for sustainability: Discursive and cognitive pathways for change. *Organization & Environment*, 36(2), 211–227.
- Pratt, M. G. (2009). From the editors: For the lack of a boilerplate: Tips on writing up (and reviewing) qualitative research. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52(5), 856–862.
- Prescott, J. E., & Filatotchev, I. (2021). The business model phenomenon: Towards theoretical relevance. *Journal of Management Studies*, 58(3), 517–527.

- Reuber, A. R. (2016). An assemblage–theoretic perspective on the internationalization processes of family firms. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 40(6), 1269–1286.
- Ringvold, K., Saebi, T., & Foss, N. (2023). Developing sustainable business models: A microfoundational perspective. *Organization & Environment*, 36(2), 315–348.
- Rosato, P. F., Caputo, A., Valente, D., & Pizzi, S. (2021). 2030 agenda and sustainable business models in tourism: A bibliometric analysis. *Ecological Indicators*, 121, 106978.
- Rynes, S. L., Bartunek, J. M., & Daft, R. L. (2001). Across the great divide: Knowledge creation and transfer between practitioners and academics. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(2), 340–355.
- Rynes, S. L., Colbert, A. E., & O’Boyle, E. H. (2018). When the “best available evidence” doesn’t win: How doubts about science and scientists threaten the future of evidence-based management. *Journal of Management*, 44(8), 2995–3010.
- Sabaruddin, L. O., MacBryde, J., & D’Ippolito, B. (2023). The dark side of business model innovation. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 25(1), 130–151.
- Sandberg, J., & Alvesson, M. (2011). Ways of constructing research questions: Gap-spotting or problematization? *Organization*, 18(1), 23–44.
- Schaltegger, S., Hansen, E. G., & Lüdeke-Freund, F. (2016). Business models for sustainability: Origins, present research, and future avenues. *Organization & Environment*, 29(1), 3–10.
- Scheyvens, R., Banks, G., & Hughes, E. (2016). The private sector and the SDGs: The need to move beyond ‘business as usual’. *Sustainable Development*, 24(6), 371–382.
- Shams, S., & Kaufman, A. (2016). Entrepreneurial co-creation: A research vision to be materialized. *Management Decision*, 54(6), 1250–1268.
- Sharma, G., & Bansal, P. T. (2020). Partnering up: Including managers as research partners in systematic reviews. *Organizational Research Methods*, 24(4), 817–846.
- Sharma, G., Greco, A., Grewatsch, S., & Bansal, P. (2022). Cocreating forward: How researchers and managers can address wicked problems together. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*.

Sorman, A. H. (2023). Deceitful decoupling: Misconceptions of a persistent myth. In F. Demaria, J. Martinez-Alier, & D. Temper (Eds.), *The Barcelona school of ecological economics and political ecology: A companion in honour of Joan Martinez-Alier* (pp. 165–177). Springer.

Suchman, M. C. (1995). Managing legitimacy: Strategic and institutional approaches. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(3), 571–610.

Suddaby, R. (Ed.). (2010). Editor's comments: Construct clarity in theories of management and organization. *Academy of Management Review*, 35(3), 346–357.

Sunstein, C. R. (2014). *Conspiracy theories and other dangerous ideas*. Simon and Schuster.

Susur, F., & Karakaya, E. (2021). A reflexive perspective for sustainability assumptions in transition studies. *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions*, 39, 34–54.

Teece, D. J. (2010). Business models, business strategy and innovation. *Long Range Planning*, 43(2–3), 172–194.

Vasist, P. N., & Krishnan, S. (2023). Fake news and sustainability-focused innovations: A review of the literature and an agenda for future research. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 388, 135933.

Volkema, R. J. (1983). Problem formulation in planning and design. *Management Science*, 29(6), 639–652.