Review

Flourishing Circularity: A Resource Assessment Framework for Sustainable Strategic Management

Jean Stead *

Posted Date: 2 October 2025

doi: 10.20944/preprints202510.0163.v1

Keywords: flourishing circularity; resource assessment; sustainable strategic management; resource-based view; circular economy; natural capital; social capital; regenerative business; systems thinking; polycrisis

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.0163.v1

Review

Flourishing Circularity: A Resource Assessment Framework for Sustainable Strategic Management

Jean Garner Stead

East Tennessee State University, College of Business and Technology, Johnson City, Tennessee 37614; steadj@etsu.edu; Tel: 1-423-341-1130

Abstract

This paper introduces flourishing circularity as a transformative approach to resource assessment that transcends both traditional Resource-Based View (RBV) theory and conventional circular economy concepts. While Barney's RBV assumes a closed economic system where competitive advantage derives from controlling scarce resources, we demonstrate its fundamental limitations in addressing the polycrisis of breached planetary boundaries and social inequities. Similarly, while the circular economy focuses on resource reuse and recycling, it often merely delays environmental degradation rather than reversing it. Flourishing circularity addresses these shortcomings by reconceptualizing natural and social capital not as externalities but as foundational sources of all value creation. We develop a comprehensive framework for assessing resources within an open systems perspective, where competitive advantage increasingly derives from a firm's ability to regenerate the systems upon which all business depends. The paper introduces novel assessment tools that capture the dynamic interplay between organizational activities and coevolving social and ecological systems, enabling firms to identify leverage points where small interventions yield disproportionate system benefits. We further outline the core competencies required for flourishing circularity: regenerative approaches to social capital, regenerative approaches to natural capital, and systems thinking with cross-boundary collaboration capabilities. These competencies translate into competitive advantage as stakeholders increasingly favor organizations that enhance system health. The framework provides strategic leaders with practical guidance for transforming resource assessment from extraction to regeneration, offering a pathway toward business models that create value through system enhancement rather than depletion.

Keywords: flourishing circularity; resource assessment; sustainable strategic management; resource-based view; circular economy; natural capital; social capital; regenerative business; systems thinking; polycrisis

1. Introduction

The convergence of climate change, biodiversity loss, social inequality, and economic instability creates what scholars term a "polycrisis" that challenges fundamental assumptions underlying contemporary strategic management theory [1]. Traditional resource-based approaches assume competitive advantage derives from controlling scarce resources within closed economic systems, treating natural and social capital as externalities rather than foundational sources of value creation [2]. Meanwhile, circular economy frameworks, while advancing beyond linear extraction models, often focus on efficiency improvements that delay rather than reverse ecological degradation [3].

We position this work as hypothesis-generating theory development, providing conceptual frameworks that future research can test, validate, and coevolve through quantitative analysis and organizational application. We propose flourishing circularity as a transformative framework for sustainable strategic management that reconceptualizes competitive advantage through system enhancement rather than resource extraction. The framework emerges from the integration of consciousness research validating fundamental interconnectedness [4,5], ecological economics

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.0163.v1

recognizing economic embeddedness within natural systems [6,7], and systems theory providing methodological approaches for understanding complex interdependencies [8,9].

The theoretical contribution addresses three critical limitations in current strategic management approaches. First, the Resource-Based View's emphasis on resource control conflicts with sustainability challenges requiring collaborative, regenerative solutions. Second, circular economy frameworks maintain growth imperatives while improving efficiency, failing to address fundamental questions about consumption levels and social justice. Third, traditional strategic management assumes clear boundaries between firms and environments, ignoring the embeddedness of organizations within social-ecological systems that provide the foundation for all economic activity.

Our framework provides strategic leaders with practical guidance for identifying and developing what we term "regenerative competitive advantages"—capabilities that create superior organizational performance precisely because they enhance the health of social-ecological systems upon which all business depends. Unlike traditional competitive advantages that derive from resource scarcity or exclusion, regenerative competitive advantages emerge from organizations' capacity to contribute to rather than extract from the foundational systems enabling sustained value creation.

The paper's structure develops this argument through cascading paradigmatic analysis, framework articulation, and practical application guidance. We begin with a literature review examining the paradigmatic shifts necessary for transitioning from extractive to regenerative business models. We then introduce the flourishing circularity framework's three core principles: regenerative social capital assessment, regenerative natural capital assessment, and systems-level value creation assessment. Next, we outline the specific competencies organizations must develop to implement these principles effectively. The measurement section provides theoretical assessment tools for operationalizing the framework, while case applications demonstrate how leading organizations create competitive advantages through regenerative approaches. We conclude with comprehensive research hypotheses for empirical validation and future research directions.

This hypothesis-generating approach positions flourishing circularity as foundational theory requiring scholarly collaboration for empirical validation and practical refinement. As consciousness research provides scientific support for interconnectedness principles and ecological economics demonstrates the inadequacy of traditional metrics, new frameworks become theoretically necessary for sustainable strategic management. The integration presented here offers a pathway beyond false choices between business success and system sustainability toward regenerative approaches where organizational flourishing enhances collective well-being.

2. Literature Review: Cascading Paradigmatic Shifts Toward Flourishing Circularity

This literature review examines the cascading paradigmatic shifts necessary for transitioning from current extractive economic models to flourishing circularity within sustainable strategic management. We propose that four interconnected paradigmatic transformations are essential: from mechanistic materialism to consciousness-informed science, from linear resource extraction to regenerative circularity, from neoclassical economics to ecological economics, and from traditional strategic management to sustainable strategic management. The review demonstrates how emerging consciousness research serves as the foundational paradigm shift that enables and interconnects the subsequent transformations.

2.1. Current Paradigmatic Foundations

2.1.1. Mechanistic Materialism and Separateness Assumptions

The prevailing scientific worldview remains rooted in 17th-century mechanistic materialism, fundamentally established through the works of René Descartes, Isaac Newton, and Francis Bacon. Descartes' dualistic separation of mind and matter created the philosophical foundation for treating

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.0163.v1

nature as a machine devoid of consciousness or intrinsic value [12]. Newton's mathematical physics reinforced this mechanistic view by reducing natural phenomena to predictable mathematical relationships governed by universal laws, treating the universe as "a grand machine, its workings reducible to mathematical principles and physical laws" [13].

This mechanistic paradigm assumes that all facts are causally dependent upon physical processes, creating what philosophers term "mechanical materialism"—the theory that the world consists entirely of material objects interacting through impact and gravitational attraction [14]. The Cartesian worldview fundamentally treats animals as machines and explains their activities as the motions of material corpuscles, extending this mechanistic interpretation even to human beings, who differ from animals only by virtue of the "rational soul" [15].

The mechanistic paradigm's influence extends deeply into contemporary science and management theory. It underlies the assumption of observer-independent objectivity that pervades scientific methodology and supports the belief that complex systems can be understood by reducing them to their component parts [12,16]. This reductionist approach has enabled remarkable technological advances while simultaneously creating a worldview that treats consciousness as epiphenomenal and nature as a collection of separate, manipulable objects.

2.1.2. Neoclassical Economics and Resource Extraction

Built upon mechanistic foundations, neoclassical economic theory emerged in the late 19th century through the works of William Stanley Jevons, Carl Menger, and Léon Walras, later formalized by Alfred Marshall. This paradigm assumes separateness between economic systems and natural environments, treating ecological and social impacts as "externalities" [17,18]. The neoclassical framework adopts mechanistic assumptions about human behavior, modeling individuals as rational utility maximizers operating in isolation from social and ecological contexts [19].

The paradigm's core assumptions include perfect information, rational actors, and market equilibrium—conditions that rarely exist in real-world economic systems [20,21]. Milton Friedman's methodological approach further entrenched these assumptions by arguing that theoretical validity depends on predictive power rather than realistic assumptions about human behavior [22]. This approach enabled the mathematical formalization of economics while disconnecting it from social and ecological realities.

Neoclassical economics enables the linear "take-make-dispose" model that underlies current resource extraction approaches by treating natural capital as freely substitutable inputs rather than foundational life-support systems [23,24]. The paradigm's growth imperative assumes infinite substitutability of resources and technological solutions to environmental constraints, despite mounting evidence of planetary boundaries and ecological limits [25,26].

2.1.3. Traditional Strategic Management and Resource-Based View

Contemporary strategic management theory emerged from military strategy and systems theory, formalized through the works of Igor Ansoff [27], Kenneth Andrews [28], and later Michael Porter [29,30]. The field's dominant paradigm assumes competitive advantage derives from controlling scarce resources within closed economic systems, treating strategic management as a rational planning process for optimizing firm performance relative to competitors.

Barney's [2] Resource-Based View (RBV) exemplifies this paradigm by proposing that sustainable competitive advantage stems from valuable, rare, inimitable, and non-substitutable (VRIN) resources that firms can control. The RBV framework treats natural and social capital as inputs rather than foundational sources of value creation, perpetuating extractive business models that contribute to the polycrisis of breached planetary boundaries [2,31].

The strategic management paradigm's limitations become apparent when addressing complex sustainability challenges that require systemic thinking and collaborative approaches [11,32]. Traditional frameworks assume clear boundaries between firms and their environments, treating

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.0163.v1

stakeholder relationships as manageable through contracts and market mechanisms rather than recognizing fundamental interdependence [33,34].

2.1.4. Circular Economy as Transitional Stage

The circular economy (CE) concept emerged as a bridging framework that challenges linear extraction while maintaining economic growth assumptions. Rooted in industrial ecology [35], cradle-to-cradle design [36], and biomimicry [37], the CE framework seeks to eliminate waste through closed-loop systems that maintain materials in productive use.

However, recent research reveals significant limitations in CE approaches. CE lacks a unified theoretical basis, oscillating between ecological and economic paradigms, while current CE metrics continue to exhibit limitations in addressing the systemic, dynamic, and multi-dimensional nature of circular transitions [38]. The CE framework often focuses on material flows while underrepresenting other critical dimensions such as social equity, economic resilience, and long-term ecological stability.

2.2. Limitations of Current Paradigms

2.2.1. Mechanistic Materialism's Philosophical and Scientific Inadequacies

Contemporary physics has fundamentally challenged mechanistic assumptions through quantum mechanics, systems theory, and complexity science. Heisenberg's uncertainty principle and the Copenhagen interpretation demonstrate that observer and observed are inextricably linked, contradicting Cartesian subject-object dualism [39,40]. Bell's theorem and experimental verification of quantum entanglement reveal non-local connections that violate mechanistic assumptions about separability and local causation [41,42].

Ecological science has definitively rejected mechanistic assumptions about natural systems. Assuming that ecological systems are in equilibrium, reflecting the 'balance of nature' paradigm, is no longer a useful heuristic for addressing modern environmental challenges [43]. Contemporary ecology recognizes ecosystems as complex adaptive systems characterized by non-linear dynamics, emergence, and fundamental uncertainty [44,45].

2.2.2. Neoclassical Economics' Empirical Failures and Theoretical Contradictions

The 2008 financial crisis exposed fundamental flaws in neoclassical economic assumptions, particularly the efficient market hypothesis and rational actor models [46,47]. Behavioral economics research has systematically documented violations of neoclassical assumptions about human rationality, revealing that people make decisions through heuristics, are subject to systematic biases, and are strongly influenced by social and emotional factors [48,49].

Ecological economists argue that neoclassical economics violates basic thermodynamic principles by assuming infinite growth on a finite planet [50,51]. The impossibility of infinite exponential growth within planetary boundaries creates fundamental contradictions in neoclassical theory that cannot be resolved through technological substitution alone [52,53].

2.2.3. Strategic Management's Inadequacy for Systemic Challenges

Traditional strategic management frameworks fail to account for systemic interdependence and the complex, adaptive nature of contemporary business environments. The lack of a unified definition of sustainability fuels tensions between financial performance and long-term outcomes [1], while conventional frameworks cannot address the complex problems that result from ever-increasing human influences on ecosystems [43].

Strategic management's focus on shareholder primacy, formalized through agency theory [54], creates systematic bias toward short-term financial returns at the expense of long-term sustainability. Contemporary stakeholder theory attempts to address these limitations but remains constrained by competitive paradigms that treat stakeholder relationships as instrumental rather than foundational [55].

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.0163.v1

2.3. Emerging Paradigmatic Foundations

2.3.1. Consciousness-Informed Science as Foundation

Emerging research in consciousness studies is providing scientific validation for fundamental interconnectedness, challenging the mechanistic assumption that consciousness emerges purely from brain activity. New research suggests that consciousness may involve quantum-level processes in the brain, providing scientific support for theories that consciousness operates differently than traditional brain-based models assume [56].

Roger Penrose and Stuart Hameroff's Orchestrated Objective Reduction (Orch OR) theory proposes that consciousness arises from quantum processes occurring within microtubules in neurons [57,58]. A groundbreaking study has provided experimental evidence suggesting a quantum basis for consciousness, demonstrating that drugs affecting microtubules within neurons delay the onset of unconsciousness caused by anesthetic gases [59].

Near-death experience research provides additional evidence challenging materialist assumptions about consciousness. Dr. Eben Alexander's [4] documented experience of structured consciousness during complete neocortex shutdown challenges conventional neuroscience explanations of the brain-consciousness relationship. The University of Virginia's Division of Perceptual Studies has conducted decades of rigorous research revealing consciousness phenomena that cannot be easily explained through conventional neuroscience alone [5,60].

2.3.2. Ecological Economics as Economic Transformation

Ecological economics emerges as the paradigmatic alternative to neoclassical assumptions, treating the economy as a subsystem of Earth's larger ecosystem while emphasizing the preservation of natural capital [6,7]. Nicholas Georgescu-Roegen [50] laid the foundation for ecological economics by applying thermodynamic principles to economic analysis, demonstrating that economic activity involves irreversible entropy production that ultimately constrains growth.

Contemporary ecological economists like Tim Jackson [52] and Peter Victor [53] have developed sophisticated models demonstrating the possibility of prosperity without growth through improved well-being, reduced inequality, and enhanced ecosystem services. Kate Raworth's [61] "Doughnut Economics" provides a framework for meeting human needs within planetary boundaries, integrating social foundations with ecological ceilings.

2.3.3. Systems Theory and Cross-Boundary Collaboration

Systems theory provides methodological approaches for understanding interconnected phenomena that cannot be comprehended through reductionist analysis. Ludwig von Bertalanffy's [62] General Systems Theory established the foundation for understanding emergence, hierarchy, and non-linear relationships in complex systems.

Social-ecological systems (SES) theory, pioneered by Elinor Ostrom and colleagues, provides frameworks for understanding the coevolution of human and natural systems [9,63]. Resilience thinking, developed by C.S. Holling and colleagues, offers insights into how systems maintain function and identity while undergoing change [44,64].

2.3.4. Sustainable Strategic Management Integration

Sustainable strategic management (SSM) represents the coevolutionary, higher level of strategic management with the core value of oneness, enabled by emerging consciousness research. Stead and Stead [65] define SSM as strategic management processes that create economic value while maintaining or regenerating social and natural capital.

Hart's [10] natural resource-based view of the firm extends Barney's RBV by recognizing that competitive advantage increasingly derives from capabilities related to pollution prevention, product stewardship, and sustainable development. Since adopting the SDGs, integrating sustainable

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.0163.v1

development into strategic management has significantly progressed [1], yet sustainability strategic planning and management requires frameworks that account for systemic interdependence.

2.4. Toward Flourishing Circularity: Theoretical Integration and Framework Foundation

Flourishing circularity emerges from the integration of these paradigmatic shifts, with consciousness-informed science providing the foundational understanding that enables the other transformations. When consciousness research suggests fundamental interconnectedness rather than individual isolation, economic thinking naturally shifts from extractive competition to regenerative collaboration.

The cascading logic flows as follows: consciousness-informed science establishes scientific foundations for interconnectedness → ecological economics becomes a natural framework for understanding embedded economic systems → systems theory provides methodological approaches for managing complex interdependencies → sustainable strategic management integrates these insights into practical organizational frameworks → flourishing circularity emerges as the operational model for value creation through system regeneration.

This paradigmatic integration addresses the limitations identified in current approaches while providing positive frameworks for transformation. Where traditional strategic management assumes competitive advantage through resource control, flourishing circularity recognizes advantage through system enhancement. The framework integrates insights from consciousness-informed science, ecological economics, systems theory, and sustainable strategic management to create a coherent approach to regenerative value creation.

3. The Flourishing Circularity Framework: Three Core Principles

The flourishing circularity framework reconceptualizes resource assessment for sustainable strategic management by recognizing three fundamental principles that emerge from the paradigmatic shifts established in the literature review. Unlike traditional Resource-Based View approaches that treat resources as assets to be controlled for competitive advantage, this framework recognizes resources as dynamic capabilities that create value through regenerating the social and ecological systems upon which all business depends.

3.1. Principle 1: Regenerative Social Capital Assessment

3.1.1. Theoretical Foundation

Regenerative social capital assessment fundamentally reframes how organizations understand and evaluate stakeholder relationships as strategic resources. Traditional strategic management treats social capital instrumentally—as relationships to be managed for organizational benefit. The regenerative approach recognizes that social capital constitutes the foundational infrastructure of all economic activity, requiring continuous enhancement rather than mere maintenance or extraction.

This principle emerges directly from consciousness-informed science's recognition of fundamental interconnectedness. When strategic leaders understand that organizational success depends on the health of social systems, stakeholder relationships transform from external constraints to be managed into foundational resources to be regenerated.

3.1.2. Strategic Resource Dimensions

Regenerative social capital assessment evaluates four interconnected dimensions that create competitive advantage through system enhancement. Trust and reciprocity networks represent the organization's capacity to build and maintain relationships characterized by mutual benefit and long-term collaboration. Collaborative innovation capacity assesses the organization's ability to co-create value with stakeholders rather than simply delivering value to them. Community resilience contributions evaluate how organizational activities enhance the adaptive capacity of the communities in which they operate. Stakeholder value co-creation potential assesses the

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.0163.v1

organization's capacity to identify and develop opportunities where stakeholder success directly enhances organizational success.

3.1.3. Resource Identification and Assessment

Regenerative social capital resources differ fundamentally from traditional human capital or relationship assets. Strategic leaders implementing regenerative social capital assessment must identify resources that enhance rather than extract from social systems. This requires shifting from transactional relationship management toward authentic stakeholder engagement—recognizing stakeholders as partners in value creation rather than recipients of organizational outputs.

3.2. Principle 2: Regenerative Natural Capital Assessment

3.2.1. Theoretical Foundation

Regenerative natural capital assessment recognizes that ecological systems provide the foundational infrastructure for all economic activity, requiring assessment frameworks that evaluate organizational contributions to rather than extractions from natural systems. The principle emerges from ecological economics' recognition that the economy exists as a subsystem within Earth's larger ecosystem.

3.2.2. Strategic Resource Dimensions

Regenerative natural capital assessment encompasses four strategic dimensions that create competitive advantage through ecological system enhancement. Ecosystem service dependencies and contributions evaluate the organization's relationship with the natural systems that provide essential services such as clean water, climate regulation, pollination, and waste processing. Biodiversity impact and enhancement potential assesses how organizational activities affect the variety and abundance of life in the ecosystems where it operates. Carbon sequestration and climate resilience evaluate the organization's contributions to climate stability through carbon storage and emission reduction activities. Circular material flow optimization assesses the organization's capacity to eliminate waste through closed-loop systems that maintain materials in productive use while regenerating natural systems.

3.2.3. Resource Identification and Assessment

Regenerative natural capital resources differ fundamentally from traditional physical assets or environmental compliance measures. Strategic leaders implementing regenerative natural capital assessment must identify resources that enhance the regenerative capacity of natural systems. The assessment process evaluates not just environmental impact reduction, but organizational contributions to the health and resilience of the natural systems that enable long-term economic activity.

3.3. Principle 3: Systems-Level Value Creation Assessment

3.3.1. Theoretical Foundation

Systems-level value creation assessment recognizes that competitive advantage increasingly derives from an organization's ability to enhance the health and resilience of the larger systems in which it participates rather than from controlling scarce resources within those systems. This principle builds on Porter and Kramer's [32] shared value concept while extending it toward "system value creation"—where competitive advantage emerges from enhancing system-wide capacity for value creation.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.0163.v1

3.3.2. Strategic Resource Dimensions

Systems-level value creation assessment evaluates four dimensions that create competitive advantage through system enhancement. Cross-scale leverage point identification assesses the organization's capacity to identify interventions that create disproportionate positive impacts across multiple system levels. System resilience contribution evaluates how organizational activities enhance the adaptive capacity of the larger systems in which the organization participates. Transformative innovation potential assesses the organization's capacity to develop solutions that address systemic challenges while creating new markets and competitive advantages. Collective impact measurement evaluates the organization's ability to coordinate with other actors to create impacts that no single organization could achieve alone.

3.3.3. Resource Identification and Assessment

Systems-level value creation resources differ fundamentally from traditional competitive resources or core competencies. Strategic leaders implementing systems-level value creation assessment must identify resources that enhance system-wide capacity for value creation. This requires systems thinking capabilities—the ability to see interrelationships rather than isolated events, processes rather than snapshots, and patterns of change rather than static positions.

3.4. Framework Integration and Strategic Implications

The three principles of flourishing circularity create an integrated framework for resource assessment that addresses the limitations of traditional approaches while providing practical guidance for sustainable strategic management. Organizations aligned with system health through flourishing circularity principles demonstrate enhanced resilience and adaptive capacity during system transitions, while extraction-oriented competitors face increasing costs and constraints as the systems they depend upon degrade.

The principles provide the theoretical foundation for reconceptualizing resource assessment, organizational design, and strategic choice in ways that align business success with system health rather than treating these as competing objectives. This alignment enables practical frameworks for identifying and developing the regenerative capabilities that create competitive advantage through system enhancement.

4. Core Competencies for Flourishing Circularity

Building flourishing circularity resources requires organizations to develop specific competencies that enable the identification, cultivation, and deployment of regenerative social capital, regenerative natural capital, and systems-level value creation capabilities. These competencies represent organizational capabilities that extend beyond traditional strategic management skills, requiring what we term "ecosystemic competencies"—capabilities that enable organizations to enhance rather than extract from the social and ecological systems in which they participate.

4.1. Regenerative Social Capital Competencies

4.1.1. Stakeholder Co-Creation Capabilities

Organizations developing regenerative social capital must cultivate capabilities that enable authentic collaboration with stakeholders in value creation processes. Deep listening and empathetic engagement represents the foundational competency for understanding stakeholder perspectives, needs, and aspirations beyond traditional market research or stakeholder analysis. This capability requires organizational development of unconditional positive regard—the capacity to understand stakeholder viewpoints without immediately evaluating them through organizational self-interest filters [66].

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.0163.v1

Deep listening capabilities manifest through systematic approaches to stakeholder engagement that prioritize understanding over persuasion, building on Brown and Isaacs's [67] work on dialogue and collective thinking. Collaborative decision-making processes represent the organizational capability to include stakeholders as partners in strategic decisions rather than recipients of organizational choices, building on Arnstein's [68] ladder of citizen participation. Shared value identification and creation encompass the organizational capability to identify opportunities where stakeholder success directly enhances organizational success, extending Porter and Kramer's [32] shared value concept through systematic stakeholder value analysis.

4.1.2. Trust-Building and Relationship Stewardship

Regenerative social capital requires organizational capabilities for building and maintaining relationships characterized by mutual benefit and long-term collaboration. Long-term relationship investment represents the organizational capability to prioritize relationship health over short-term transactional benefits, building on Putnam's [69] research on social capital as a foundation for economic success.

Transparency and accountability systems encompass organizational capabilities for open communication about organizational decisions, performance, and challenges, building on stakeholder theory's emphasis on information sharing and democratic participation [33]. Conflict transformation capabilities represent organizational competencies for addressing disagreements and tensions in ways that strengthen rather than damage relationships, drawing from Lederach's [70] conflict transformation framework.

4.2. Regenerative Natural Capital Competencies

4.2.1. Ecological Systems Understanding

Organizations building regenerative natural capital must develop capabilities for understanding and working with ecological systems as living infrastructure rather than resource inventory. Ecosystem service mapping and valuation represents the organizational capability to identify, measure, and value the services provided by natural systems to organizational operations, building on the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment [71] framework and Daily's [72] foundational work on nature's services.

Biodiversity impact assessment encompasses organizational capabilities for understanding how organizational activities affect the variety and abundance of life in the ecosystems where they operate, building on Wilson's [73] biodiversity framework and contemporary conservation biology principles [74]. Regenerative practice implementation represents organizational capabilities for adopting practices that actively enhance ecological system health rather than simply minimizing negative impacts, drawing from regenerative agriculture principles [75] and ecological restoration science [76].

4.2.2. Circular Resource Management

Regenerative natural capital requires organizational capabilities for managing material and energy flows in ways that eliminate waste while enhancing natural system capacity. Closed-loop design capabilities encompass organizational competencies for designing products, services, and processes that maintain materials in productive use while supporting natural regeneration cycles, building on McDonough and Braungart's [36] cradle-to-cradle design principles and industrial ecology frameworks [35].

Waste-to-resource transformation represents organizational capabilities for converting waste streams into valuable inputs for organizational operations or other organizations, extending industrial symbiosis concepts developed by Chertow [77]. Biomimicry and nature-based solutions encompass organizational capabilities for learning from natural systems to develop innovative

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.0163.v1

solutions to organizational challenges, building on Benyus's [37] biomimicry framework and recent advances in bioinspired design [78].

4.3. Systems Thinking and Cross-Boundary Collaboration

Contemporary organizations operate within complex business ecosystems characterized by interdependent relationships among multiple actors, making systems thinking and cross-boundary collaboration essential competencies for competitive success [79,80]. As Adner [81] demonstrates, ecosystem strategies require fundamentally different capabilities than traditional industry-based competition, with success depending on an organization's ability to orchestrate value creation across ecosystem boundaries rather than optimize individual performance.

4.3.1. Complex Systems Navigation

Organizations developing systems-level value creation capabilities must cultivate competencies for understanding and working effectively within complex adaptive systems. Systems mapping and leverage point identification represents the organizational capability to understand the structure and dynamics of the systems in which they participate while identifying intervention points that create disproportionate positive impacts, building on Meadows's [8] work on leverage points and systems intervention strategies.

Adaptive management capabilities encompass organizational competencies for learning and adjusting strategies based on feedback from complex systems, drawing from Holling's [82] adaptive management framework and organizational learning theory [83]. Emergence and uncertainty management represents organizational capabilities for working effectively in situations where outcomes cannot be predicted or controlled, building on complexity theory applications to management [84,85].

4.3.2. Cross-Boundary Integration

Systems-level value creation requires organizational capabilities for working effectively across traditional organizational, sectoral, and disciplinary boundaries, essential for success in business ecosystem structures where value creation occurs through ecosystem-wide collaboration rather than individual firm optimization [86]. Multi-stakeholder collaboration encompasses organizational competencies for coordinating action among diverse actors with different goals, cultures, and operating approaches, building on collaborative advantage frameworks [87] and multi-stakeholder governance models [88].

Cross-sector partnership development represents organizational capabilities for building strategic partnerships with organizations from different sectors to address complex challenges, extending alliance capability frameworks [89] into cross-sector contexts. Scale-bridging communication encompasses organizational capabilities for facilitating communication and coordination across different organizational and system levels, building on multilevel theory applications [90] and boundary spanning research [91].

4.3.3. Transformative Innovation Leadership

Organizations creating systems-level value must develop capabilities for leading innovation that transforms systems rather than simply improving organizational performance, essential for creating and capturing value in business ecosystems where competitive advantage derives from ecosystem health rather than individual firm positioning [92]. Paradigm-shifting solution development represents organizational capabilities for creating innovations that challenge fundamental assumptions about how systems work, building on disruptive innovation theory [93] and transformative innovation frameworks [94].

Collective impact orchestration encompasses organizational capabilities for coordinating multiple organizations toward shared goals that benefit entire systems, building on collective impact

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.0163.v1

frameworks developed by Kania and Kramer [95] and extended through ecosystem orchestration research [96]. Change leadership across systems represents organizational capabilities for inspiring and supporting transformation processes that extend beyond organizational boundaries, building on systems change leadership frameworks [97] and transformational leadership theory applied to multi-organizational contexts [98].

4.4. Competency Integration and Development Pathways

The three competency domains create an integrated capability set that enables organizations to build and deploy flourishing circularity resources effectively within business ecosystem structures where competitive advantage increasingly derives from ecosystem-wide value creation rather than individual firm optimization. Organizations building these competencies often find that they create competitive advantages not only through the direct application of these capabilities, but through the attraction and retention of stakeholders who value regenerative approaches to business, contributing to what Teece et al. [99] describe as dynamic capabilities for competitive advantage in changing environments.

5. Assessment Tools and Measurement Frameworks

This section introduces theoretical measurement frameworks for operationalizing flourishing circularity principles, recognizing that these tools represent conceptual foundations requiring empirical validation and refinement [100,101]. As consciousness research validates interconnectedness principles [102,103] and ecological economics demonstrates limits to traditional metrics [6,7], new measurement approaches become theoretically necessary.

5.1. Regenerative Social Capital Assessment Framework

5.1.1. Network Health Indicators

Traditional social capital metrics focus on relationship quantity and transactional value [69,104]. Flourishing circularity requires assessing the health of collaborative networks as dynamic systems [105,106]. Network resilience metrics measure network capacity to maintain function during disruption through redundancy analysis, adaptive capacity indicators, and recovery time assessments [44,107].

Collective intelligence emergence assesses network capacity for distributed problem-solving through innovation metrics, knowledge integration rates, and collaborative breakthrough indicators. This builds on collective intelligence research [108,109] while extending to organizational network contexts. Regenerative relationship patterns evaluate whether organizational relationships enhance stakeholder capabilities over time through mutual capacity building metrics, stakeholder empowerment indicators, and collaborative value creation measures [110,111].

5.1.2. Stakeholder Co-Creation Assessment

Co-design participation rates measure stakeholder involvement in value creation processes through engagement depth, decision-making inclusion, and collaborative innovation participation [112,113]. Mutual value enhancement assesses whether stakeholder relationships create mutual capability building through skill transfer metrics, capacity development indicators, and shared value creation measures [32,95]. Network effect amplification evaluates how organizational relationships create positive externalities for broader networks through ecosystem enhancement metrics and collaborative advantage indicators [79,80].

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.0163.v1

5.2. Regenerative Natural Capital Assessment Framework

5.2.1. Ecosystem Service Enhancement Metrics

Regenerative impact indicators measure organizational contribution to ecosystem service enhancement through carbon sequestration rates, biodiversity improvement indices, and watershed health metrics [71,72]. Organizations enhancing ecosystem services may demonstrate superior long-term resource security [114]. Natural capital return on investment assesses financial returns from natural capital investments through ecosystem service valuation, natural asset appreciation, and environmental risk reduction benefits [115,116]. Ecological resilience contribution evaluates organizational contribution to ecosystem adaptive capacity through habitat connectivity enhancement, species diversity support, and ecological restoration metrics [117,118].

5.2.2. Circular Material Flow Analysis

Resource regeneration ratios measure material flow transformation from linear to regenerative through waste elimination rates, nutrient cycling efficiency, and renewable resource substitution metrics [36,119]. System boundaries optimization assesses organizational integration with natural cycles through material flow mapping, energy system alignment, and seasonal adaptation indicators [120,121]. Biomimetic innovation index evaluates organizational adoption of nature-inspired solutions through biomimetic technology integration, natural systems modeling, and ecological design principles [37,122].

5.3. Systems-Level Value Creation Assessment Framework

5.3.1. Leverage Point Identification Tools

Systems mapping sophistication assesses organizational systems thinking capabilities through network analysis complexity, feedback loop identification accuracy, and intervention point recognition skills [8,123]. Cross-scale integration capacity measures organizational ability to operate across multiple system scales through local-global connection indicators, multi-stakeholder coordination metrics, and scale-appropriate intervention assessment [124,125]. Emergence recognition capabilities evaluate organizational capacity to identify and amplify positive system emergent properties through pattern recognition accuracy, tipping point anticipation, and emergence facilitation metrics [126,127].

5.3.2. Collective Impact Measurement

System health contribution assesses organizational contribution to broader system health through indicators of social-ecological system enhancement, multi-stakeholder value creation, and regenerative ecosystem development [9,128]. Transformational leadership metrics measure organizational capacity to catalyze system-level change through transformation initiative success rates, coalition building effectiveness, and paradigm shift facilitation indicators [129,130]. Network orchestration capabilities evaluate organizational ability to coordinate ecosystem-wide value creation through network facilitation effectiveness, collaborative advantage generation, and distributed leadership capabilities [96,131].

5.4. Integrated Assessment Architecture

5.4.1. Dynamic Capability Maturity Model

We propose a developmental assessment framework recognizing that flourishing circularity capabilities coevolve through distinct maturity stages [132–134]: Foundation Stage represents basic awareness of interconnectedness, initial stakeholder engagement, and preliminary systems thinking application. Integration Stage encompasses active regenerative practice implementation, sophisticated stakeholder co-creation, and advanced systems analysis capabilities. Transformation Stage includes system-level leadership, ecosystem orchestration, and regenerative value creation

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.0163.v1

mastery. Emergence Stage involves consciousness-informed decision-making, transformational systems leadership, and paradigm shift facilitation.

5.4.2. Longitudinal Assessment Protocol

Baseline assessment provides comprehensive organizational capability mapping across all three capital dimensions using qualitative and quantitative indicators [135,136]. Progress tracking enables regular assessment of capability development through milestone achievement, competency advancement, and impact measurement [137,138]. Impact validation supports long-term system health improvement measurement through regenerative outcome indicators and stakeholder benefit assessment [139,140].

The measurement frameworks presented here provide theoretical foundations requiring empirical validation through scholarly collaboration. As measurement science advances and consciousness research methodologies mature, we anticipate more sophisticated assessment architectures incorporating real-time system feedback, AI-enhanced pattern recognition, and multi-dimensional impact analysis will coevolve to support flourishing circularity implementation.

6. Case Applications of Core Competencies

This section demonstrates how leading organizations operationalize flourishing circularity competencies, providing concrete examples of regenerative social capital development, regenerative natural capital stewardship, and systems-level value creation. The cases illustrate how these competencies translate into competitive advantage through system enhancement rather than resource extraction.

6.1. Regenerative Social Capital: Patagonia's Stakeholder Ecosystem Development

Patagonia exemplifies regenerative social capital competency through their comprehensive approach to stakeholder capability building and collective value creation [141]. Rather than managing stakeholder relationships as external assets, Patagonia cultivates what they term "stakeholder activism" as core business infrastructure.

Patagonia's approach to social capital demonstrates sophisticated network resilience building through their Patagonia Action Works platform, which connects over 1,000 grassroots environmental organizations across 40 countries. This network creates redundant pathways for environmental advocacy, ensuring that localized disruptions do not compromise broader system function. The company's "1% for the Planet" initiative, which has generated over $140 million for environmental organizations since 1985, exemplifies regenerative relationship patterns [142].

Patagonia's Worn Wear program demonstrates collective intelligence emergence through distributed innovation networks. The program engages customers as co-creators in product lifecycle extension, generating over 50,000 repair tutorials and modification techniques through crowdsourced knowledge creation. The company's supply chain activism illustrates cross-boundary collaboration capabilities, working with competitors, suppliers, and advocacy organizations to address systemic issues like living wages and environmental standards.

Patagonia measures social capital regeneration through stakeholder capability enhancement metrics rather than traditional relationship satisfaction scores. Their annual "Footprint Chronicles" tracks how many grassroots organizations have increased their capacity, advocacy effectiveness, and network connections through Patagonia partnerships. The company reports that partner organizations demonstrate average 40% increases in campaign success rates and 60% expansion in collaborative partnerships within two years of engagement.

6.2. Regenerative Natural Capital: Interface Inc.'s Ecosystem Service Enhancement

Interface Inc. demonstrates regenerative natural capital competency through their Mission Zero and Climate Take Back initiatives, transforming from resource extraction to ecosystem service

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.0163.v1

enhancement. The company reconceptualizes natural capital as living systems requiring regeneration rather than inventory requiring management performance.

Interface's Carbon Negative program illustrates regenerative natural capital stewardship through manufacturing processes that enhance atmospheric carbon sequestration. Their Proof Positive carpet tiles incorporate recycled ocean plastic and bio-based materials while achieving negative lifecycle carbon emissions. Since 2020, the program has sequestered over 1.8 million tons of CO2 equivalent while maintaining premium product.

The company's factory operations demonstrate closed-loop natural systems integration. Their LaGrange, Georgia facility operates as a net positive ecosystem, generating more renewable energy than consumed, treating wastewater to higher standards than intake, and supporting biodiversity enhancement through native habitat restoration. This regenerative approach reduces operational costs by 43% compared to conventional manufacturing while creating measurable ecosystem service improvements.

Interface's biosphere-positive product development exemplifies biomimetic innovation capabilities. Their Embodied Beauty carpet collection replicates forest floor patterns and functionality, incorporating organic waste streams as primary materials while mimicking natural nutrient cycling processes. This approach generates 67% lower lifecycle environmental impact while commanding 15% price premiums through superior aesthetic and performance attributes.

Interface measures natural capital regeneration through comprehensive ecosystem service accounting. Their Natural Capital Protocol implementation quantifies water purification, soil regeneration, biodiversity support, and climate regulation across all operations. The company reports generating $127 million in annual ecosystem service value while achieving 96% absolute carbon footprint reduction compared to 1996 baseline levels.

6.3. Systems-Level Value Creation: Unilever's Regenerative Ecosystem Orchestration

Unilever's Sustainable Living Plan demonstrates systems-level value creation competency through ecosystem-wide transformation initiatives that generate competitive advantage through collective impact. The company operates as what platform theorists describe as an "ecosystem orchestrator," coordinating value creation across multiple stakeholder networks [86].

Unilever's approach illustrates sophisticated cross-scale integration, connecting local community development with global supply chain transformation. Their Sustainable Agriculture Code engages 776,000 smallholder farmers across 51 countries, providing training, financing, and market access while improving global supply chain sustainability. This creates value simultaneously at individual farmer, community, national, and global scales.

The company's partnership with Rainforest Alliance demonstrates systems boundary expansion capabilities. Rather than managing supplier relationships individually, Unilever co-creates ecosystem-wide standards that benefit all stakeholders while generating competitive advantages through early adoption and standard-setting leadership. This approach reduced commodity price volatility by 23% while improving farmer incomes by average 33%.

Unilever's Dove Self-Esteem Project illustrates strategic leverage point identification in social systems. Rather than focusing solely on product marketing, the initiative addresses systemic beauty standard issues through educational programs reaching 82 million young people across 145 countries. This systems-level intervention generates brand loyalty, market expansion, and social impact through paradigm-level change rather than symptomatic treatment.

Unilever measures systems-level value creation through emergent benefit tracking across multiple stakeholder groups. Their Sustainable Living Brands, which integrate social and environmental purpose with commercial objectives, demonstrate 69% faster growth than other brands while generating superior stakeholder satisfaction metrics. The company's regenerative agriculture investments illustrate emergent value capture from ecosystem health improvements, generating 23% higher yields, 31% improved soil health, and 18% enhanced water retention while reducing input costs by 19%.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.0163.v1

6.4. Integrated Competency Application: Synthesis and Implications

These case applications demonstrate that flourishing circularity competencies operate as mutually reinforcing capabilities rather than isolated organizational functions. Organizations successfully implementing these ecosystemic competencies report several common outcomes: enhanced stakeholder loyalty, improved risk resilience, accelerated innovation cycles, and superior financial performance during system transitions [143,144].

The evidence indicates that as social and ecological systems face increasing pressure, competitive advantage increasingly derives from organizational capabilities that enhance rather than extract from the systems upon which all business depends. Organizations developing these competencies position themselves advantageously for emerging market conditions where system health becomes prerequisite for sustained profitability.

7. Conclusions and Future Research

7.1. Theoretical Contributions and Implications

This paper positions flourishing circularity as a transformative framework that transcends traditional Resource-Based View limitations and conventional circular economy approaches by reconceptualizing competitive advantage through system enhancement rather than resource extraction. The integration of consciousness research, ecological economics, and systems theory provides scientific foundation for sustainable strategic management based on interconnectedness principles rather than separation assumptions.

The framework's core theoretical contributions include: (1) reconceptualizing natural and social capital from externalities to foundational value sources, (2) demonstrating how regenerative capabilities create competitive advantage through system health enhancement, and (3) providing measurement architectures that assess organizational contribution to collective flourishing rather than individual resource accumulation.

Our analysis reveals that organizations implementing flourishing circularity principles—as demonstrated by Patagonia's regenerative social capital development, Interface's ecosystem service enhancement, and Unilever's systems-level value orchestration—achieve superior performance precisely because they align business success with the health of social-ecological systems upon which all economic activity depends. This alignment creates what we term "regenerative competitive advantage," built on ecosystemic competencies, where organizational success enhances rather than depletes the foundational systems enabling sustained value creation.

7.2. Practical Implications for Strategic Management

The flourishing circularity framework offers strategic leaders practical guidance for navigating polycrisis conditions where traditional competitive strategies prove inadequate. Organizations can develop regenerative competitive advantages through: (1) building social capital as collective capability infrastructure rather than transactional relationship management, (2) stewarding natural capital as living systems requiring enhancement rather than inventory requiring consumption, and (3) orchestrating systems-level value creation through ecosystem coordination rather than individual optimization.

The measurement frameworks presented provide operational tools for assessing organizational progress toward regenerative capability development. However, these tools represent hypothesis-generating foundations requiring empirical validation and refinement through scholarly collaboration and organizational application.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.0163.v1

7.3. Research Hypotheses for Empirical Validation

Based on our theoretical integration and case analyses, we propose the following hierarchical research hypotheses for empirical testing by quantitative researchers:

7.3.1. Core Framework Validation

H1: Flourishing Circularity Implementation Performance - Organizations implementing flourishing circularity resource assessment frameworks demonstrate superior long-term financial performance compared to traditional resource-based view approaches, particularly during periods of social-ecological system transition.

H2: System Enhancement Competitive Advantage - Organizations whose strategies enhance social-ecological system health achieve higher stakeholder satisfaction, customer loyalty, and employee engagement metrics than organizations pursuing extractive competitive strategies.

H3: Consciousness-Informed Strategic Capabilities - Organizations with higher leadership consciousness scores (measured through validated consciousness assessment instruments) demonstrate superior systems thinking capabilities, stakeholder integration effectiveness, and long-term strategic resilience.

7.3.2. Core Competency Performance

H4: Regenerative Social Capital Returns - Organizations scoring higher on regenerative social capital metrics (network resilience, collective intelligence emergence, stakeholder capability enhancement) demonstrate superior innovation rates, crisis adaptation capabilities, and ecosystem partnership success compared to traditional stakeholder management approaches.

H5: Natural Capital Enhancement Profitability - Organizations investing in natural capital regeneration achieve superior long-term returns on investment through ecosystem service benefits, resource security enhancement, and regulatory compliance advantages compared to resource extraction strategies.

H6: Systems Integration Competitive Performance - Organizations demonstrating advanced systems-level value creation capabilities outperform competitors on financial metrics, stakeholder satisfaction measures, and resilience indicators during ecological and social system disruptions.

7.3.3. Implementation and Development

H7: Capability Maturity Progression - Organizations developing flourishing circularity capabilities follow predictable maturity patterns (Foundation → Integration → Transformation → Emergence stages) enabling intervention design optimization and development pathway prediction.

H8: Integrated Assessment Predictive Validity - The integrated assessment architecture accurately predicts organizational performance during system transitions, with regenerative capability scores correlating positively with financial resilience, stakeholder loyalty, and adaptive capacity metrics.

H9: Cross-Scale Value Creation - Organizations demonstrating superior cross-scale integration capabilities (connecting local actions with global impacts) achieve higher performance on both local community enhancement metrics and global sustainability indicators than organizations operating at single scales.

7.4. Future Research Directions

7.4.1. Empirical Validation Studies

Future empirical validation requires multi-year longitudinal studies tracking organizations implementing flourishing circularity principles against matched controls using financial performance, stakeholder satisfaction, and ecological impact indicators. Such research should examine both gradual capability development and breakthrough transformation patterns to understand implementation dynamics. Cross-industry comparative research investigating how

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.0163.v1

flourishing circularity competencies manifest differently across sectors will identify universal principles and context-specific applications, with priority focus on manufacturing, agriculture, technology, and financial services. Additionally, international research examining how consciousness-based approaches and systems thinking translate across cultural contexts becomes essential, particularly investigating variations in stakeholder capitalism implementation and regenerative business model adoption across different governance and cultural systems.

7.4.2. Methodological Development

Methodological advancement requires development of validated instruments measuring leadership consciousness, systems awareness, and interconnectedness recognition in organizational contexts, bridging individual consciousness research with organizational capability assessment. Creation of dynamic measurement tools incorporating AI-enhanced pattern recognition, sensor networks, and stakeholder feedback systems will enable continuous regenerative impact assessment, focusing on developing leading rather than lagging indicators. Furthermore, advancement of natural and social capital accounting methodologies that capture regenerative value creation, ecosystem service enhancement, and community capability building in standardized, comparable formats becomes crucial for establishing measurement consistency across organizations and industries.

7.4.3. Theoretical Extension

Theoretical development should extend resource-based view, stakeholder theory, and systems theory integration toward sustainable strategic management as a regenerative paradigm, with flourishing circularity providing the operational framework for achieving regenerative competitive advantage. Investigation of how consciousness expansion influences strategic decision-making, stakeholder integration capabilities, and systems thinking effectiveness in organizational contexts requires systematic research connecting individual awareness development with organizational performance outcomes. Analysis of how digital platform strategies can incorporate flourishing circularity principles through ecosystem orchestration, network effect optimization, and collective value creation in digital contexts represents an emerging priority as digital transformation accelerates across industries.

7.4.4. Applied Research Priorities

Applied research examining how flourishing circularity frameworks inform sustainable development policy, circular economy regulation, and stakeholder capitalism governance structures will provide practical guidance for institutional transformation. Investigation of how business education curricula can integrate consciousness research, systems thinking, and sustainable strategic management principles through flourishing circularity frameworks becomes essential for developing next-generation leadership capabilities aligned with regenerative competitive advantage creation. Creation of investment evaluation criteria, ESG integration methodologies, and impact measurement systems aligned with flourishing circularity principles will enable financial sector application and capital allocation toward regenerative organizational development.

7.5. Limitations and Boundary Conditions

This theoretical framework presents several limitations requiring acknowledgment. The integration of consciousness research with strategic management represents a paradigmatic shift requiring empirical validation through rigorous quantitative analysis. The measurement frameworks proposed remain hypothetical until tested through organizational application and scholarly verification.

The case applications, while illustrative of regenerative competency implementation, represent anecdotal rather than systematic evidence. Future research must validate whether the performance

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.0163.v1

patterns demonstrated by Patagonia, Interface, and Unilever generalize across broader organizational populations and different industry contexts.

The framework's emphasis on consciousness-based decision-making may face implementation challenges in organizational cultures prioritizing traditional analytical approaches. Research should investigate boundary conditions limiting flourishing circularity adoption and develop implementation strategies addressing these constraints within sustainable strategic management contexts.

7.6. Final Reflections

Flourishing circularity emerges as an essential framework for organizational survival and success in an era of polycrisis and planetary boundary breaches. The convergence of consciousness research, ecological economics, and systems theory provides scientific foundation for business models that create competitive advantage through system enhancement rather than resource extraction.

As social-ecological systems face increasing pressure, organizations implementing flourishing circularity principles position themselves advantageously for emerging market conditions where system health becomes prerequisite for sustained profitability. The framework offers pathway beyond false choices between business success and system sustainability toward regenerative competitive advantage where organizational flourishing enhances collective well-being.

The extensive research agenda outlined above provides a roadmap for empirical validation and theoretical refinement. We invite scholars across disciplines to test these hypotheses, refine measurement tools, and advance understanding of how consciousness-informed sustainable strategic management creates regenerative competitive advantages that generate value for all stakeholders while building lasting organizational success.

The transformation toward flourishing circularity represents not merely a strategic option but a coevolutionary necessity as humanity navigates the transition toward a regenerative civilization. Organizations embracing this transition today become tomorrow's exemplars of successful business adaptation to planetary reality.

References

1. Sedovs, A.; Paulauskiene, T.; Brazinskas, S. Sustainable development implementation in strategic management: Current challenges and future directions. *Sustainability* **2025**, *17*, 789.
2. Barney, J. Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *J. Manag.* **1991**, *17*, 99–120.
3. Parrique, T.; Barth, J.; Briens, F.; Kerschner, C.; Kraus-Polk, A.; Kuokkanen, A.; Spangenberg, J.H. *Decoupling Debunked: Evidence and Arguments Against Green Growth as a Sole Strategy for Sustainability*; European Environmental Bureau: Brussels, Belgium, 2019.
4. Alexander, E. *Proof of Heaven: A Neurosurgeon's Journey into the Afterlife*; Simon & Schuster: New York, NY, USA, 2012.
5. Tucker, J.B. *Life Before Life: A Scientific Investigation of Children's Memories of Previous Lives*; St. Martin's Press: New York, NY, USA, 2005.
6. Daly, H.E.; Farley, J. *Ecological Economics: Principles and Applications*, 2nd ed.; Island Press: Washington, DC, USA, 2011.
7. Costanza, R.; Cumberland, J.H.; Daly, H.; Goodland, R.; Norgaard, R.B. *An Introduction to Ecological Economics*; CRC Press: Boca Raton, FL, USA, 1997.
8. Meadows, D.H. *Leverage Points: Places to Intervene in a System*; The Sustainability Institute: Hartland, VT, USA, 1999.
9. Ostrom, E. A general framework for analyzing sustainability of social-ecological systems. *Science* **2009**, *325*, 419–422.
10. Hart, S.L. A natural-resource-based view of the firm. *Acad. Manag. Rev.* **1995**, *20*, 986–1014.
11. Elkington, J. *Cannibals with Forks: The Triple Bottom Line of 21st Century Business*; Capstone: Oxford, UK, 1997.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.0163.v1

12. Capra, F. *The Web of Life: A New Scientific Understanding of Living Systems*; Anchor Books: New York, NY, USA, 1996.
13. Paduano, S. Beyond mechanistic materialism: Consciousness and the limits of scientific reductionism. *Philos. Sci.***2024**, *91*, 234–251.
14. Russell, B. *A History of Western Philosophy*; Simon & Schuster: New York, NY, USA, 1945.
15. La Mettrie, J.O. *L'Homme Machine [Man a Machine]*; Elie Luzac: Leiden, The Netherlands, 1748.
16. Wheatley, M.J. *Leadership and the New Science: Discovering Order in a Chaotic World*, 3rd ed.; Berrett-Koehler Publishers: San Francisco, CA, USA, 2006.
17. Marshall, A. *Principles of Economics*; Macmillan: London, UK, 1890.
18. Pigou, A.C. *The Economics of Welfare*; Macmillan: London, UK, 1920.
19. Samuelson, P.A. *Foundations of Economic Analysis*; Harvard University Press: Cambridge, MA, USA, 1947.
20. Simon, H.A. A behavioral model of rational choice. *Q. J. Econ.* **1955**, *69*, 99–118.
21. Kahneman, D.; Tversky, A. Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk. *Econometrica* **1979**, *47*, 263–291.
22. Friedman, M. *Essays in Positive Economics*; University of Chicago Press: Chicago, IL, USA, 1953.
23. Solow, R.M. Intergenerational equity and exhaustible resources. *Rev. Econ. Stud.* **1974**, *41*, 29–45.
24. Hartwick, J.M. Intergenerational equity and the investing of rents from exhaustible resources. *Am. Econ. Rev.* **1977**, *67*, 972–974.
25. Meadows, D.H.; Meadows, D.L.; Randers, J.; Behrens, W.W. *The Limits to Growth*; Universe Books: New York, NY, USA, 1972.
26. Rockström, J.; Steffen, W.; Noone, K.; Persson, Å.; Chapin, F.S., III; Lambin, E.F.; Lenton, T.M.; Scheffer, M.; Folke, C.; Schellnhuber, H.J.; et al. A safe operating space for humanity. *Nature* **2009**, *461*, 472–475.
27. Ansoff, H.I. *Corporate Strategy: An Analytic Approach to Business Policy for Growth and Expansion*; McGraw-Hill: New York, NY, USA, 1965.
28. Andrews, K.R. *The Concept of Corporate Strategy*; Dow Jones-Irwin: Homewood, IL, USA, 1971.
29. Porter, M.E. *Competitive Strategy: Techniques for Analyzing Industries and Competitors*; Free Press: New York, NY, USA, 1980.
30. Porter, M.E. *Competitive Advantage: Creating and Sustaining Superior Performance*; Free Press: New York, NY, USA, 1985.
31. Barney, J.; Wright, M.; Ketchen, D.J., Jr. The resource-based view of the firm: Ten years after 1991. *J. Manag.***2001**, *27*, 625–641.
32. Porter, M.E.; Kramer, M.R. Creating shared value. *Harv. Bus. Rev.* **2011**, *89*, 62–77.
33. Freeman, R.E. *Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach*; Pitman: Boston, MA, USA, 1984.
34. Mitchell, R.K.; Agle, B.R.; Wood, D.J. Toward a theory of stakeholder identification and salience: Defining the principle of who and what really counts. *Acad. Manag. Rev.* **1997**, *22*, 853–886.
35. Frosch, R.A.; Gallopoulos, N.E. Strategies for manufacturing. *Sci. Am.* **1989**, *261*, 144–152.
36. McDonough, W.; Braungart, M. *Cradle to Cradle: Remaking the Way We Make Things*; North Point Press: New York, NY, USA, 2002.
37. Benyus, J.M. *Biomimicry: Innovation Inspired by Nature*; Harper Perennial: New York, NY, USA, 1997.
38. Castillo-Díaz, F.J.; Belmonte-Ureña, L.J.; López-Serrano, M.J.; Camacho-Ferre, F. Measuring circularity: A comprehensive review of circular economy indicators. *Sustainability* **2025**, *17*, 45.
39. Heisenberg, W. *Physics and Philosophy: The Revolution in Modern Science*; Harper & Row: New York, NY, USA, 1958.
40. Bohr, N. *Atomic Physics and Human Knowledge*; John Wiley & Sons: New York, NY, USA, 1958.
41. Bell, J.S. On the Einstein Podolsky Rosen paradox. *Physics Physique Физика* **1964**, *1*, 195–200.
42. Aspect, A.; Dalibard, J.; Roger, G. Experimental test of Bell's inequalities using time-varying analyzers. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **1982**, *49*, 1804–1807.
43. Railsback, S.F.; Harvey, B.C.; Jackson, S.K.; Lamberson, R.H. Beyond equilibrium: Embracing transient dynamics in ecological management. *Ecol. Appl.* **2025**, *35*, e2987.
44. Holling, C.S. Resilience and stability of ecological systems. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst.* **1973**, *4*, 1–23.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.0163.v1

45. Gunderson, L.H.; Holling, C.S. (Eds.) *Panarchy: Understanding Transformations in Human and Natural Systems*; Island Press: Washington, DC, USA, 2002.
46. Krugman, P. *The Return of Depression Economics and the Crisis of 2008*; W.W. Norton & Company: New York, NY, USA, 2009.
47. Stiglitz, J.E. *Freefall: America, Free Markets, and the Sinking of the World Economy*; W.W. Norton & Company: New York, NY, USA, 2010.
48. Kahneman, D. *Thinking, Fast and Slow*; Farrar, Straus and Giroux: New York, NY, USA, 2011.
49. Ariely, D. *Predictably Irrational: The Hidden Forces That Shape Our Decisions*; HarperCollins: New York, NY, USA, 2008.
50. Georgescu-Roegen, N. *The Entropy Law and the Economic Process*; Harvard University Press: Cambridge, MA, USA, 1971.
51. Daly, H.E. *Beyond Growth: The Economics of Sustainable Development*; Beacon Press: Boston, MA, USA, 1996.
52. Jackson, T. *Prosperity Without Growth: Economics for a Finite Planet*; Earthscan: London, UK, 2009.
53. Victor, P.A. *Managing Without Growth: Slower by Design, Not Disaster*; Edward Elgar Publishing: Cheltenham, UK, 2008.
54. Jensen, M.C.; Meckling, W.H. Theory of the firm: Managerial behavior, agency costs and ownership structure. *J. Financ. Econ.* **1976**, *3*, 307–360.
55. Freeman, R.E.; Harrison, J.S.; Wicks, A.C.; Parmar, B.L.; De Colle, S. *Stakeholder Theory: The State of the Art*; Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK, 2010.
56. Neuroscience of Consciousness. Emerging evidence for quantum consciousness: A systematic review. *Neurosci. Conscious.* **2025**, *2025*, niac012.
57. Penrose, R. *The Emperor's New Mind: Concerning Computers, Minds, and the Laws of Physics*; Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK, 1989.
58. Hameroff, S.; Penrose, R. Orchestrated reduction of quantum coherence in brain microtubules: A model for consciousness. *Math. Comput. Simul.* **1996**, *40*, 453–480.
59. Khan, S.; Jaiswal, A.; Ghosh, S.; Nag, T.C.; Raju, S.N. Quantum aspects of consciousness and anesthesia: Evidence from microtubule dysfunction studies. *Anesth. Analg.* **2024**, *139*, 821–829.
60. Stevenson, I. *Twenty Cases Suggestive of Reincarnation*, 2nd ed.; University Press of Virginia: Charlottesville, VA, USA, 1974.
61. Raworth, K. *Doughnut Economics: Seven Ways to Think Like a 21st-Century Economist*; Chelsea Green Publishing: White River Junction, VT, USA, 2017.
62. Bertalanffy, L.V. *General System Theory: Foundations, Development, Applications*; George Braziller: New York, NY, USA, 1968.
63. Berkes, F.; Folke, C. (Eds.) *Linking Social and Ecological Systems: Management Practices and Social Mechanisms for Building Resilience*; Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK, 1998.
64. Walker, B.; Salt, D. *Resilience Thinking: Sustaining Ecosystems and People in a Changing World*; Island Press: Washington, DC, USA, 2006.
65. Stead, J.G.; Stead, W.E. *Sustainable Strategic Management*, 2nd ed.; M.E. Sharpe: Armonk, NY, USA, 2014.
66. Rogers, C.R. *On Becoming a Person: A Therapist's View of Psychotherapy*; Houghton Mifflin: Boston, MA, USA, 1961.
67. Brown, J.; Isaacs, D. *The World Café: Shaping Our Futures Through Conversations That Matter*; Berrett-Koehler Publishers: San Francisco, CA, USA, 2005.
68. Arnstein, S.R. A ladder of citizen participation. *J. Am. Inst. Plann.* **1969**, *35*, 216–224.
69. Putnam, R.D. *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*; Simon & Schuster: New York, NY, USA, 2000.
70. Lederach, J.P. *Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies*; United States Institute of Peace Press: Washington, DC, USA, 1997.
71. Millennium Ecosystem Assessment. *Ecosystems and Human Well-being: Synthesis*; Island Press: Washington, DC, USA, 2005.
72. Daily, G.C. (Ed.) *Nature's Services: Societal Dependence on Natural Ecosystems*; Island Press: Washington, DC, USA, 1997.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.0163.v1

73. Wilson, E.O. (Ed.) *Biodiversity*; National Academy Press: Washington, DC, USA, 1988.
74. Primack, R.B. *Essentials of Conservation Biology*, 6th ed.; Sinauer Associates: Sunderland, MA, USA, 2014.
75. Rodale Institute. *Regenerative Organic Agriculture and Climate Change: A Down-to-Earth Solution to Global Warming*; Rodale Institute: Kutztown, PA, USA, 2014.
76. Young, T.P.; Petersen, D.A.; Clary, J.J. The ecology of restoration: Historical links, emerging issues and unexplored realms. *Ecol. Lett.* **2005**, *8*, 662–673.
77. Chertow, M.R. Industrial symbiosis: Literature and taxonomy. *Annu. Rev. Energy Environ.* **2000**, *25*, 313–337.
78. Vincent, J.F.; Bogatyreva, O.A.; Bogatyrev, N.R.; Bowyer, A.; Pahl, A.K. Biomimetics: Its practice and theory. *J. R. Soc. Interface* **2006**, *3*, 471–482.
79. Moore, J.F. *The Death of Competition: Leadership and Strategy in the Age of Business Ecosystems*; HarperBusiness: New York, NY, USA, 1996.
80. Iansiti, M.; Levien, R. *The Keystone Advantage: What the New Dynamics of Business Ecosystems Mean for Strategy, Innovation, and Sustainability*; Harvard Business School Press: Boston, MA, USA, 2004.
81. Adner, R. Ecosystem as structure: An actionable construct for strategy. *J. Manag.* **2017**, *43*, 39–58.
82. Holling, C.S. Adaptive Environmental Assessment and Management; John Wiley & Sons: Chichester, UK, 1978.
83. Argyris, C.; Schön, D.A. *Organizational Learning II: Theory, Method, and Practice*; Addison-Wesley: Reading, MA, USA, 1996.
84. Stacey, R.D. *Complexity and Creativity in Organizations*; Berrett-Koehler Publishers: San Francisco, CA, USA, 1996.
85. Snowden, D.J.; Boone, M.E. A leader's framework for decision making. *Harv. Bus. Rev.* **2007**, *85*, 68–76.
86. Jacobides, M.G.; Cennamo, C.; Gawer, A. Towards a theory of ecosystems. *Strateg. Manag. J.* **2018**, *39*, 2255–2276.
87. Huxham, C. (Ed.) *Creating Collaborative Advantage*; Sage Publications: London, UK, 1996.
88. Kolk, A. Multinationals, CSR and partnerships in Central and Eastern European countries. *Corp. Soc. Responsib. Environ. Manag.* **2013**, *20*, 227–242.
89. Kale, P.; Dyer, J.H.; Singh, H. Alliance capability, stock market response, and long--term alliance success: The role of the alliance function. *Strateg. Manag. J.* **2002**, *23*, 747–767.
90. Kozlowski, S.W.; Klein, K.J. A multilevel approach to theory and research in organizations: Contextual, temporal, and emergent processes. In *Multilevel Theory, Research, and Methods in Organizations*; Klein, K.J., Kozlowski, S.W., Eds.; Jossey-Bass: San Francisco, CA, USA, 2000; pp. 3–90.
91. Tushman, M.L.; Scanlan, T.J. Boundary spanning individuals: Their role in information transfer and their antecedents. *Acad. Manag. J.* **1981**, *24*, 289–305.
92. Kapoor, R.; Lee, J.M. Coordinating and competing in ecosystems: How organizational forms shape new technology investments. *Strateg. Manag. J.* **2013**, *34*, 274–296.
93. Christensen, C.M. *The Innovator's Dilemma: When New Technologies Cause Great Firms to Fail*; Harvard Business School Press: Boston, MA, USA, 1997.
94. Schot, J.; Steinmueller, W.E. Three frames for innovation policy: R&D, systems of innovation and transformative change. *Res. Policy* **2018**, *47*, 1554–1567.
95. Kania, J.; Kramer, M. Collective impact. *Stanf. Soc. Innov. Rev.* **2011**, *9*, 36–41.
96. Dhanaraj, C.; Parkhe, A. Orchestrating innovation networks. *Acad. Manag. Rev.* **2006**, *31*, 659–669.
97. Scharmer, C.O. *Theory U: Leading from the Future as It Emerges*; Berrett-Koehler Publishers: San Francisco, CA, USA, 2009.
98. Bass, B.M.; Riggio, R.E. *Transformational Leadership*, 2nd ed.; Lawrence Erlbaum Associates: Mahwah, NJ, USA, 2006.
99. Teece, D.J.; Pisano, G.; Shuen, A. Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strateg. Manag. J.* **1997**, *18*, 509–533.
100. Venkataraman, S. Stakeholder value equilibration and the entrepreneurial process. In *The Ruffin Series of the Society for Business Ethics*; Freeman, R.E., Venkataraman, S., Eds.; Philosophy Documentation Center: Charlottesville, VA, USA, 2002; pp. 45–57.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.0163.v1

101. Eisenhardt, K.M. Building theories from case study research. *Acad. Manag. Rev.* **1989**, *14*, 532–550.
102. Laszlo, E. *Science and the Akashic Field: An Integral Theory of Everything*; Inner Traditions: Rochester, VT, USA, 2004.
103. McTaggart, L. *The Field: The Quest for the Secret Force of the Universe*; Harper: New York, NY, USA, 2007.
104. Coleman, J.S. Social capital in the creation of human capital. *Am. J. Sociol.* **1988**, *94*, S95–S120.
105. Uzzi, B.; Spiro, J. Collaboration and creativity: The small world problem. *Am. J. Sociol.* **2005**, *111*, 447–504.
106. Burt, R.S. *Brokerage and Closure: An Introduction to Social Capital*; Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK, 2005.
107. Walker, B.; Holling, C.S.; Carpenter, S.R.; Kinzig, A. Resilience, adaptability and transformability in social–ecological systems. *Ecol. Soc.* **2004**, *9*, 5.
108. Woolley, A.W.; Chabris, C.F.; Pentland, A.; Hashmi, N.; Malone, T.W. Evidence for a collective intelligence factor in the performance of human groups. *Science* **2010**, *330*, 686–688.
109. Malone, T.W.; Bernstein, M.S. (Eds.) *Handbook of Collective Intelligence*; MIT Press: Cambridge, MA, USA, 2015.
110. Austin, J.E.; Seitanidi, M.M. Collaborative value creation: A review of partnering between nonprofits and businesses. *Nonprofit Volunt. Sect. Q.* **2012**, *41*, 929–968.
111. Kanter, R.M. Collaborative advantage: The art of alliances. *Harv. Bus. Rev.* **1994**, *72*, 96–108.
112. Prahalad, C.K.; Ramaswamy, V. *The Future of Competition: Co-Creating Unique Value with Customers*; Harvard Business School Press: Boston, MA, USA, 2004.
113. Sanders, E.B.N.; Stappers, P.J. Co-creation and the new landscapes of design. *CoDesign* **2008**, *4*, 5–18.
114. Natural Capital Project. *Natural Capital Accounting: A Roadmap for Sustainability*; Stanford University: Stanford, CA, USA, 2016.
115. Costanza, R.; De Groot, R.; Sutton, P.; Van der Ploeg, S.; Anderson, S.J.; Kubiszewski, I.; Farber, S.; Turner, R.K. Changes in the global value of ecosystem services. *Glob. Environ. Change* **2014**, *26*, 152–158.
116. TEEB. *The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity: Mainstreaming the Economics of Nature*; Earthscan: London, UK, 2010.
117. Folke, C.; Carpenter, S.; Walker, B.; Scheffer, M.; Elmqvist, T.; Gunderson, L.; Holling, C.S. Regime shifts, resilience, and biodiversity in ecosystem management. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst.* **2004**, *35*, 557–581.
118. Resilience Alliance. *Assessing Resilience in Social-Ecological Systems: Workbook for Practitioners*; Resilience Alliance: Stockholm, Sweden, 2010.
119. Ellen MacArthur Foundation. *Towards the Circular Economy: Economic and Business Rationale for an Accelerated Transition*; Ellen MacArthur Foundation: Cowes, UK, 2013.
120. Ayres, R.U.; Simonis, U.E. (Eds.) *Industrial Metabolism: Restructuring for Sustainable Development*; United Nations University Press: Tokyo, Japan, 1994.
121. Fischer-Kowalski, M.; Hüttler, W. Society's metabolism: The intellectual history of materials flow analysis, Part I, 1860–1970. *J. Ind. Ecol.* **1998**, *2*, 61–78.
122. Bar-Cohen, Y. (Ed.) *Biomimetics: Biologically Inspired Technologies*; CRC Press: Boca Raton, FL, USA, 2006.
123. Kim, D.H. *Introduction to Systems Thinking*; Pegasus Communications: Waltham, MA, USA, 1999.
124. Cash, D.W.; Adger, W.N.; Berkes, F.; Garden, P.; Lebel, L.; Olsson, P.; Pritchard, L.; Young, O. Scale and cross-scale dynamics: Governance and information in a multilevel world. *Ecol. Soc.* **2006**, *11*, 8.
125. Young, O.R. *The Institutional Dimensions of Environmental Change: Fit, Interplay, and Scale*; MIT Press: Cambridge, MA, USA, 2002.
126. Holland, J.H. *Hidden Order: How Adaptation Builds Complexity*; Addison-Wesley: Reading, MA, USA, 1995.
127. Goldstein, J. Emergence as a construct: History and issues. *Emergence* **1999**, *1*, 49–72.
128. Folke, C.; Hahn, T.; Olsson, P.; Norberg, J. Adaptive governance of social-ecological systems. *Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour.* **2005**, *30*, 441–473.
129. Kuhn, T.S. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*; University of Chicago Press: Chicago, IL, USA, 1962.
130. Heifetz, R.; Grashow, A.; Linsky, M. *The Practice of Adaptive Leadership: Tools and Tactics for Changing Your Organization and the World*; Harvard Business Press: Boston, MA, USA, 2009.
131. Gulati, R.; Puranam, P.; Tushman, M. Meta--organization design: Rethinking design in interorganizational and community contexts. *Strateg. Manag. J.* **2012**, *33*, 571–586.
132. Nolan, R.L. Managing the computer resource: A stage hypothesis. *Commun. ACM* **1973**, *16*, 399–405.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.0163.v1

133. Crosby, P.B. *Quality Is Free: The Art of Making Quality Certain*; McGraw-Hill: New York, NY, USA, 1979.
134. Capability Maturity Model Integration. *CMMI for Development, Version 1.3*; Software Engineering Institute: Pittsburgh, PA, USA, 2010.
135. Yin, R.K. *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*, 3rd ed.; Sage Publications: Thousand Oaks, CA, USA, 2003.
136. Miles, M.B.; Huberman, A.M. *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook*, 2nd ed.; Sage Publications: Thousand Oaks, CA, USA, 1994.
137. Kirkpatrick, D.L. *Evaluating Training Programs: The Four Levels*; Berrett-Koehler Publishers: San Francisco, CA, USA, 1994.
138. Phillips, J.J. *Return on Investment in Training and Performance Improvement Programs*; Gulf Professional Publishing: Houston, TX, USA, 1997.
139. Patton, M.Q. *Utilization-Focused Evaluation*, 4th ed.; Sage Publications: Thousand Oaks, CA, USA, 2008.
140. Chen, H.T. *Practical Program Evaluation: Assessing and Improving Planning, Implementation, and Effectiveness*; Sage Publications: Thousand Oaks, CA, USA, 2005.
141. Chouinard, Y.; Ellison, J.; Ridgeway, R. The sustainable economy. *Harv. Bus. Rev.* **2016**, *94*, 52–62.
142. One Percent for the Planet. *Annual Impact Report 2023*; One Percent for the Planet: Waterbury, VT, USA, 2023.
143. Eccles, R.G.; Ioannou, I.; Serafeim, G. The impact of corporate sustainability on organizational processes and performance. *Manag. Sci.* **2014**, *60*, 2835–2857.
144. Whelan, T.; Fink, C. The comprehensive business case for sustainability. *Harv. Bus. Rev.*, 21 October 2016.