

# JUST2CE

A Just Transition to Circular Economy



The JUST2CE project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 101003491

# CHAPTER 8

## A Diversity of Paths

## Towards Social

## Transformation Through

## the Concept of a Circular

## Economy .

## Chapter 8. A Diversity of Paths Towards Social Transformation Through the Concept of a Circular Economy

Kosheek Sewchurran, Gavin Andersson and Lester M. Davids

### Abstract

This paper contrasts conceptions of the CE in the GN with those in the GS. Appreciating the apparent differences in ontology we can see that such ontological choices imply different levels of transformative impact. Further, these choices manifest different appreciations of leadership and organising. Specifically, we see that the southern approach fosters leadership that is more collaborative and inclusive, to yield ongoing co-development of power, agency, and directionality. This ultimately generates ongoing acts of transformation at individual and collective levels. In addition, the southern practice shows the functioning of being in tune with a complex adaptive system that is an unbounded organisational ecosystem. Circularity thus invariably involves leadership which supports the development and transformation of this ecosystem. In a southern conception leadership and organising are appreciated for their collaborative, dialectic, spontaneous and momentary value to produce transformative values that arise from within the flow of practice.

**Keywords:** circular economy; ecosystems; unbounded organizing; regenerative agriculture; leadership-as-practice

We address blind spots resulting from understanding the circular economy as a thing, or entitative reality, as opposed to processual, ongoing emergence. This latter view enables appreciation of how social transformation and a 'just' transition might happen as durational impacts.

### 8.1 Introduction

the case studies developed in the JUST2CE project show that the interpretation and application of the concept of 'circular economy' differs in the GN and the GS. An adequate definition of the circular economy from a northern perspective is provided by the Ellen McArthur Foundation, which sees it as a "systems solution framework that tackles global challenges like climate change, biodiversity loss, waste, and pollution. It is based on three principles, driven by design to: **eliminate waste and pollution, circulate products and materials** (at their highest value), and **regenerate nature.**" (*Ellen MacArthur Foundation, ellenmacarthurfoundation.org*). The accent is thus on environmental issues, and ways of optimising the work process and associated value chains so that there is a reduction or reuse of waste. European Union policies based in this understanding focus on reducing carbon and other emissions and reducing manufacturing costs through reuse and repurposing of materials.

# JUST2CE

## A Just Transition to Circular Economy

The circumference of the circular economy in the imagination of the GN is most often the enterprise and associated value chains. There are few sociological referents, and environmental factors are considered only with respect to the impact of the individual enterprise. Thus, in manufacturing, circularity is often seen as using the endpoint of one process as the starting point for another, and the design of products with a view to their reuse or biodegrading; the search is for a cradle-to-cradle process (McDonough and Braungart, 2002). While recognized pillars of the circular economy include employment policies, training, social inclusion, and sustainable development more broadly, the application of the concept in the GN often sees the social dimension reduced to enabling consumer choices, helped by the development of certification systems (CEAP, 2021). Social aspects of production or service - such as labour practices, societal inequality, local organizational ecosystems, or gender issues - tend to be ignored by most of the mainstream literature on the topic (Mies et al., 2021).

In cases from other parts of the world, the concept of the circular economy can have a much broader range of interpretations, shaped by the concerns emanating from local contexts and different populations and cultures (Kirchherr, 2017). The GS has expanded the concept of circularity to include social concerns such as improving the well-being of communities in which enterprises are located (Schröder et al., 2019). The southern imagination of circular economy tends to traverse unbounded space, to look at each enterprise in its ecological setting and its organizational ecosystem. Northern conceptions are embraced, but there are now also concerns about the social relations within the enterprise and across the wider unbounded terrain. This is on reflection a matter of common sense in settings which are marked by extremes of inequality, so that there is an imperative for transformative action. The concept of circular economy moreover comes at a moment when the consequences of epistemological devastation of indigenous worldviews becomes manifest in the catastrophic effects of the GN's historical imposition of extractive one-way flows of materials and surplus. In this context circularity assumes a philosophical centrality and recalls indigenous cosmologies of wholeness and systems integrity.

### 8.1.1 Insights from case studies

The series of case studies that inform this essay were conducted under the rubric of the Just Transition to a Circular Economy (JUST2CE) as part of the Horizons 2020 European project, coordinated by the University of Barcelona. The ten case studies are unique and diverse: they span across different countries in the GN (Italy, Spain, Portugal, United Kingdom) and in the GS (Morocco, Ghana, Zimbabwe, Ethiopia, South Africa). Moreover, they examine different industries (plastics, agriculture, fishing, fertilisers, electronics, steelworks etc.), as well as different scales of analysis - from local to global initiatives - and different institutional structures (from bottom-up informal recycling initiatives to large government megaprojects).

Two studies have special salience for this essay. The case of Minga in Portugal concerns a rural landscape that had been impoverished as a result of barriers to market access brought by new regulations and bureaucratic constraints of the EU. In essence, this setting is a microcosm of international divisions: the municipality of Montemor can be seen as an example of the GS within the GN. Here planned moves towards a circular economy saw organisation across districts and involving many enterprises; a departure from most examples of CE in the north (Gonçalves, Sousa and D'Alisa, 2023). Further evidence of this was that interviewees offered their interpretations of what CE meant by focusing on relationship and mutual exchange of proximity products among locals, which is more in line with a GS approach to CE that values communities' well-being and local ecologies (Schröder et al., 2019).

# JUST2CE

## A Just Transition to Circular Economy

Minga researchers caution that this divergence seems to be proof of colonial thinking at work. Indeed, even if unconsciously, university-led knowledge about CE, which emphasises (waste) management and technological improvement, continues. This means that this GN ontology will further contribute to disembodiment of the concept of circularity from concrete people and territories. Moreover, it hinders the humble recognition that is needed to relearn those forms of circularity that marginalised people keep on doing even if in precarious conditions (Gonçalves, Sousa and D'Alisa, 2023).

In Lowerland, a farm in the middle of South Africa, the entrepreneurs set out to replace industrial patterns of agriculture based on chemical inputs with an approach to regenerative agriculture which embraces organic practices. Here there was no *a priori* decision to establish a circular economy, but the necessity to feed the soil required cropping rotation, the prudent use of waste, and the incorporation of animals into the arable spaces. Further, the requirement to learn new ways of working, and the gradual forging of a culture of learning, as farm workers and owners alike explored organic agricultural process, had an unplanned effect. This shared learning activity bridges social divides that have been inscribed over decades.

There were immediate benefits in social relations within the farm workforce; circularity of the production process catalysed social shifts. The need to go beyond conventional routes to market moreover prompted partnerships with other enterprises, and new enterprise formation, in creation of a mutually beneficial value chain. An unforeseen core competence became ecosystem building and management. Within a period of five years, we see the emergence of a circular economy around Lowerland, which both stimulates *social* transformation and is dependent upon it (Sewchurran, Andersson, and Davids, 2023). In many respects an imagination of societal enterprise is kindled, with collaboration of many enterprises across a landscape, with shared commitment to the common good.

### 8.1.2 Diversity of pathways

It is perhaps the wider horizon of the southern imagination that brings such crucial difference in paths of social transformation suggested by the concept of circular economy. In the limited number of cases studied so far, two perspectives help us to understand what is producing the differences in the depth of social transformation being achieved in this pursuit of circular economies.

The first perspective relates to how leadership is understood and practiced. The second perspective relates to an understanding of organising that emerges from within the circular economy process.

The circular economy emanating in the GN seems to focus on the bounded firm and an immediate production process that values leadership as a role responsibility that is placed at the apex, or origin of the flow. In this context, organising is appreciated as bounded by enterprise concerns in its interactions in the market, with clear differences between management, those within the organisation offering their labour, those owing the capital investment, and those identified as recipients of value. This is the quotidian practice of our time and there is reassurance in its very familiarity. While this conception of leadership from a single source may give the impression of steadiness, it may very easily keep people participating in the process without growing their imagination of other potentialities of the circular economy, and without them taking discretionary initiative.

In contrast, the circular economy of the GS with its unbounded horizon seems to appreciate that leadership is both a role responsibility and a collaborative process. The Lowerland and Morocco cases in the Just2CE project show this in the ways the particular organisations define their goals. The Lowerland case shows this in practice too. The case from Zimbabwe shows an acute awareness from participants that the projects potential will be unfulfilled

# JUST2CE

## A Just Transition to Circular Economy

unless a collaborative process is matured to grow reciprocity, solidarity, and ecological care, by seeing leadership as both role as well as collaborative process. There is appreciation that leadership is brought and produced by more than a single individual. Leadership potential is imagined as ongoing changes in potential directionality or momentum by *the whole social grouping*; keeping coherence in the circular economy is then a leadership function that is not solely dictated by a founder or catalyst. One could say that the coherence of the emergence of the circular economy is anchored by the founders' vision but also depends on the motivations and actions of participating members.

In fact, where circular economies concerned with the wider ecology of organization survive and thrive it seems this is because of the efforts of all participating members, and this emergence continues through shared learning. The cases from South Africa, Morocco and Zimbabwe show an understanding of this. The energising influence of the participating members is an important resource to develop and nurture. The Lowerland case study illustrates this more intentionally. The founder highlights the importance of inducting any new participating members, personally, into the story and the whole dream of Lowerland. During this process he invites new members to join in the project of reinventing farming and encourages initiative and project ideas. The interviewees confirmed the impact of this invitation. Several of them, formally workers on the farm, described personal projects that they have been thinking through with the owner which in some cases had already been implemented within the Lowerland ecosystem. One interviewee explained the venture that she was passionate to get going which involved milking the goats used in mob grazing and using the goat milk in cosmetic products for skin care. Another worker shared his interest in keeping a flock of chickens on the farm that grazed the fields after the animals had mob grazed. Yet another interviewee talked about his passion for merino sheep, which he had asked to be brought to the farm to be sheered for their wool, and his excitement about the quality of the wool from sheep that are now grazed on organic fields. In the Portuguese case we observe a similar phenomenon of leadership from Minga's founder, with growing numbers of people involved and learning together, the mobilization of many small enterprises, and a shared commitment to a circular economy that has brought transformation to the rural landscape (Gonçalves, Sousa and D'Alisa, 2023).

Far from a mechanical application of the concept of circular economy we see then in each case ongoing acts of transformation at individual and collective levels to grow the circularity and its potential transformation. This is marked by a particular kind of leadership practice; commonly referred to as collective leadership or leadership as practice (L-A-P) (Raelin, 2016). Leading from within these inter-subjective relationships requires a sharing of values and perspectives, and encouragement for the ongoing forging of a pact for transformation.

These vignettes make it possible to see that the circular economies of the unbounded enterprise, as shown in these examples from the GS, depend on an inclusive collaborative leadership process. Whilst there is a catalysing leadership influence there is also emerging leadership participation that is co-developed continually. The catalysing leadership influence needs to establish coherence - for instance, the owner at Lowerland frequently highlighted the need to balance the long and the short term, concepts that define good business principles within the entrepreneurial space (Sewchurran, Dekker & McDonogh, 2019). Through this mechanism an awareness of living emergence became evident. This resembles the functioning and design of a complex adaptive system that is emerging in newer circularity potential.

The second perspective to explore the differences between circular economy practices relates to how organising is accomplished. In the GS there is an easy appreciation that organising processes and practices need to inculcate an appreciation of being within a system. In both the Lowerland and Minga cases there is evidence of organising

practices being co-developed to grow the connection between participants and their awareness of the wider systems functioning and how this depends on their own involvement. The processes within these cases show that they are designed to engage the participants in dialogical relations with other members of the ecosystem, and this helps to keep the emerging circular economy thriving and coherent. Both cases show organisational ecosystem features and it is useful then to gain insights from the literature on this topic.

## 8.2 Literature Perspectives on Ecosystems

Early organisation studies literature describes ecosystems as a *"community of organizations, institutions, and individuals that impact the enterprise and the enterprise's customers and supplies"* (Teece, 2007, p. 1325). Here, the ecosystem is conceived as an economic community of interacting actors that all affect each other through their activities which show a consideration of all relevant actors beyond their industry boundaries. In this sense, the ecosystem sensibility represents a wider environment that firms must monitor and react to, to build sustainable competitive advantage (Teece, 2007). This initial definition of an ecosystem has evolved.

Adner more recently offers a more encompassing definition of ecosystems as: *"the alignment structure of the multilateral set of partners that need to interact for a focal value proposition"* (Adner 2016, p. 23). This definition combines four constructs that coalesce to reinforce the essence of an ecosystem. *"Alignment structure"* refers to the extent and means through which mutual agreement exists among the members of the ecosystem. *"Multilateral"* implies a multiplicity of partners with an emphasis on non-decomposable relationships. *"Set of partners"* refer to participative actors who have a joint goal of value creation. Finally, *"focal value proposition"* refers to the value proposition which remains the foundation of the ecosystem.

A succinct definition of an ecosystem is suggested by Jacobides, Cennamo, & Gawer (2018) who define it as *"a set of actors with varying degrees of multi-lateral, non-generic complementarities that are not fully hierarchically controlled."* (Jacobides et al. 2018, p. 16). This definition highlights the crucial attributes of an ecosystem. First, *"multi-lateral, non-generic complementarities"* are either unique complementarities (which essentially lead to some degree of co-specialization), or super modular complementarities (often found in complements-in-use). Secondly, ecosystems are not unilaterally, hierarchically controlled. They are distinct in that their members all retain residual control and claims over their assets: no one party can unilaterally set the terms for, e.g., prices and quantities, or standards. Furthermore, ecosystems need to be both *de jure* and *de facto* run with independent decision-making processes i.e. autonomous systems. In addition, the ("multi-lateral") complementarities exist at the level of the sets of roles (Adner, 2016) that link the different parties together—e.g., hub(s), suppliers, or different types of complementors.

These definitions highlight that several conditions are necessary for ecosystems to emerge. **Modularity** and the coexistence of different types of **complementarities** are required to enable the structure of an ecosystem. Furthermore, improved ecosystem formation and structure and the way firms influence them is dependent on examining the nature, **directionality**, and intensity of these complementarities. With these attributes in place, the result is likely a distinct increase in **value creation** (Jacobides et al., 2018). Ecosystems now offer possible forms of organising economic activities, linked by specific complementarities, and these complementarities create the distinction between the structures of ecosystems and the strategically dynamic behaviours that they give rise to. These distinct features of organising collaboration require leadership different to the heroic, power-over models. Whilst little is said about ecosystem leadership it seems logical that a more inclusive ethos of creating power-with

# JUST2CE

A Just Transition to Circular Economy

others is likely to be required (Goshalia, McDonogh, Mhlanga, & Sewchurran, 2021) The ecosystem development that has paralleled Lowerland's transformation of agricultural practice manifests this leadership philosophy. These insights from the theoretical development of ecosystem organising are useful to explain the dynamics at play in the functioning of circular economy ecosystems in the cases of Minga and Lowerland. They show why hierarchical control is avoided. They also show that there is ongoing need to align and structure value creation to balance self and collective interest, to maintain complementariness and modularity. Whilst helpful they don't tell the full story of how the social transformation arises. Could internal practice dynamics provide a part of this story?

## 8.2.1 Internal practice for ecosystems development

Looking more deeply at the examples from Minga and Lowerland, we see an implicit philosophical orientation playing out through the design and practice that implies a valuing of the intersubjective, inter-relating practices. It seems that once there is an appreciation of the enterprise within a broader organizational ecology, and discovery of the circular economy practices that produce social transformation, then this means self-prescribing to the universal principles of reciprocity. Participants in both cases are made increasingly more aware of how 'my' being and 'your' being are collectively creating our humanity as moral beings. In the phrasing of the Vietnamese founder of Engaged Buddhism, Thich Nhat Hahn, there grows an awareness of Interbeing (n.d.). There are examples in the Lowerland case where trainees went back to their tertiary organisations to renegotiate their field assignments to focus on projects that related to work at Lowerland that was not covered in their curricula. Continuing this stance, the founder asked everyone to be their own manager, to get involved in creating new knowledge about farming and to find their passion.

Co-producing circularity – both in terms of directionality and in maintaining momentum - is to lead from within, rather than from above. As Reuel Khoza (2012, p. 65) puts it in recollecting about Nelson Mandela's style, it is to *"plumb the heart for its own motivations"*, and in so doing build *"consonance with [...] desires and disappointments [of self and others], respecting their human worth"* whilst holding oneself and others accountable to, and responsible for, the highest moral possibility. The founders of Lowerland both mention growing up with an acute awareness of their privilege and being uncomfortable with this. This discomfort is channelled into growing themselves in their efforts to be more involved in growing others.

## 8.2.2 Do these differences matter?

Are these differences eclectic, hard to replicate, or unnecessarily complex? When compared to key emerging trends in Organization Studies and Leadership Studies the design principles for initiating circular economy organising in the GS seem to align with the key emerging thrusts of these disciplines.

In leadership studies there is a distinct call to enlarge understanding of leadership to shift focus from the heroic acts of an individual to an appreciation of the collaborative process that needs to be fostered for leadership to emerge as a process of co-developing of power to foster directionality (Grint, Jones, & Holt, 2016; J. A. Raelin, 2020; Sewchurran, 2022; Sewchurran, Davids, McDonogh, & Meyer, 2022).

Similarly in organization studies, numerous schools start to appreciate organisation as an ongoing accomplishment arising from commitments human beings make to themselves and others to drive for particular goals (Shotter, 2006, 2008, 2016). It would seem that these two trends, which are commonly referred to as the



# JUST2CE

A Just Transition to Circular Economy

'process' and 'practice' turn, are being pursued in a practical way in the circular economy projects we have referred to here, albeit out of necessity to achieve a 'just' social transformation.

These cases show the benefits that accrue to the participants as they participate in the organising practices. They show how valuing the socio-material entwinement helps with achieving improvements in purposefulness, inclusiveness, and social solidarity. These benefits that appear to be fundamental to circular economy projects in the GS shed light on the potential value that arises from adopting an understanding of organising that deals more judiciously with the complexity in human systems.

Questions could rightly be asked if this is possible on scale. These questions about scale however need to be balanced with the expressed need for a 'just' transition; as well as an understanding of the early stages of innovation we find ourselves in to produce organizational forms that embody a practice of leadership that allows joint flourishing. The wider need for such organising practices and leadership is highlighted by Leinwand, Mani, & Sheppard (2022) when they make the crucial observation from their fieldwork that organisations world-over seem to lack leadership that is able to use personal transformation processes to drive organisational transformation. They observe that organisations need leadership that is able to drive organisations to commit to their most noble purposes. Is this not what a 'just-transition' is beckoning us to do?

Said differently, if we desire a just transition to a circular economy then the organising process has to be more fully appreciated for the ways it impacts the inter-subjective worlds of the human participants. The creation of organising patterns seem to emerge when there is due care given to the ways the inter-subjective worlds are engaged. This attention to the ongoing accomplishment of organising is very likely the key to producing momentum and directionality in the social systems of the cases discussed.

Circular economy projects in the GN seem by comparison to have less concern with the organising practices and leadership ethos needed to produce the solidarity and resilience in human systems which circular economy organising practices of the south show. In summary whilst it might be achievable to create a circular economy based on a blueprint, such a circular economy might not have the resilience and the social solidarity to adapt to new needs and unforeseen circumstances. A bigger set of questions can also be asked: Who benefits? Who loses? Or who is served ultimately? If these questions are not kept alive in the inter-subjective worlds, deep social transformation will be limited in achievement and aspiration.

## 8.3 Conclusion: CE as a transformative concept

There is a very practical consequence of this insight about how the conception of a circular economy can catalyse transformative action to social process in its application. This is not moreover restricted to the geographical territories of the GS. Calls to circularity are implicit in the reciprocity that is a foundation of African philosophy which is variously labelled *Ma'at/Ubuntu/Botho*, as well as the *buen vivir* of Latin American indigenous traditions, and in fact in indigenous traditions from other parts of the world. This can galvanise northern imaginations just as it does those of people from the GS. There may indeed be a greater receptiveness now to insights from indigenous traditions. The experience of COVID19 pandemic has disrupted previous patterns of international business and brought awareness of the fragility of supply chains while the climate crisis has challenged long held certainties. Perhaps there is more openness now to lessons derived from ancient wisdom.



# JUST2CE

## A Just Transition to Circular Economy

Within southern Africa the concept of circular economy has immediate resonance for social and economic transformation, and specifically informs methodologies for developmental practice. An imperative for circularity emerges from the shared recognition about land dispossession and the destruction of the peasantry, and the daily reality of hunger that has increased with the failures in long-distance supply chains. Self-transformation in those most involved in the process brings proposals about systemic transformation across that landscape. This circularity imperative does not however mean that the final destination is known or fixed, rather that there is confidence in the inner logic of a circular economy in its widest sense and an embrace of the whole ecosystem.

It is not only individual communities that draw on conceptions of a circular economy. The Alliance for Food Sovereignty in Africa mobilises members involved in regenerative agriculture across southern Africa drawing on its precepts (<https://afsafrika.org/>). The Southern African Food Systems Transformation Alliance has brought together key players in the private sector and the broader civil domain who commit to the ambition of at least 80% local sourcing of food and supply chain ingredients by 2033; meaning the circulation in southern Africa of some \$2bn annually that presently leaves the region. Central to this is an increase in numbers and scaling up of productivity of new and emerging farmers, bringing about 72,000 new jobs. (<https://www.idhsustainabletrade.com/southern-africa-food-systems-alliance/>). Local sourcing of food and supply chain ingredients leads to a reduction of unemployment and strengthening of local economies which in turn provide markets for neighbouring producers; there is thus enhanced circularity across organizational ecosystems. Each of these initiatives, and others that are similar, have involved deep reflection and the forging of common purpose; each of them has only been possible through a certain style of work, where leadership is appreciated as process emerging from the flow of practice. There is no blueprint to adopt; the path must be made by walking and engaging the aspirations of those participating. The continual emergence is the path and one of the prominent inter-subjective experiences of the path is an ongoing leveraging of the tensions of ideals of self and other.

Looking at these examples we see that there is a diversity of paths towards social transformation, a journey that needs to be kept alive in both practical aims and aspiration. This space of inquiry is healthiest when it is collaborative. To keep coherent directionality requires the growth of compassion, trust, and constant adjustment of beliefs with a deepening awareness of values cherished. This image of social transformation requires a circular economy construct that is *emergent* rather than a static, completely planned phenomenon, since social transformation is a journey that needs both ideals and pragmatism. In the words of the Lowerland founder there is a continual need to balance the aim for the long term with the needs of the short-term.

Conceptions of circularity are about a living dynamic, emerging ecosystem, undergoing subtle changes in directionality of purpose, meanings, and beliefs. This happens at the levels of self and at the level of concerns for the well-being of others, for all life. A philosophical grounding is as important in this as is an economic literacy, and in southern settings there is a blossoming of confidence in the indigenous knowledges that embrace circularity.

# JUST2CE

A Just Transition to Circular Economy

## Acknowledgments

We express our sincere gratitude to the owners, Bertie and Alette and all the participants at the Lowerland Farm for not only hosting us but being incredibly open to engage in conversation with us. A big thank you to Mrs Glenda Weber for the administrative duties associated with the paper. Lastly, to the European consortium partners for their tireless work in maintaining and stimulating this collaboration. Funding for this project was enabled through the EU Consortium for the Justice to a Circular Economy (JUST2CE) project.

## References

- Adner, R. (2016). Ecosystem as Structure: An Actionable Construct for Strategy. *Journal of Management*, 43(1), 39–58. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206316678451>
- Adner, R., & Kapoor, R. (2010). Value creation in innovation ecosystems: How the structure of technological interdependence affects firm performance in new technology generations. *Strategic Management Journal*, 31: 306-333.
- Asase Harmony (June 2023) Community Listening and Mapping report – grey literature
- Bogers, M., Sims, J., & West, J. (2019). What Is an Ecosystem? Incorporating 25 Years of Ecosystem Research. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 2019(1), 11080. <https://doi.org/10.5465/ambpp.2019.11080abstract>
- Franke, N., & Piller, F. (2004). Value creation by toolkits for user innovation and design: The case of the watch market. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 21(6), 401-415.
- Goncalves, J., Sousa, J. and D'Alisa, G. (2023). Case Study: Minga: an integral cooperative promoting circularities. In *European's Horizon 2020 Programme, Just Transition to a Circular Economy* (pp. 421-470). EU Press.
- Goshalia, C., McDonogh, J., Mhlanga, P., & Sewchurran, K. (2021). The Puppeteer behind the scenes: Toward understanding ecosystem leadership mechanisms to grow IoT in South Africa. *Electronic Journal of Information Systems in Developing Countries*, 87(6), e12183. <https://doi.org/10.1002/isd2.12183>
- Grint, K., Jones, O. S., & Holt, C. (2016). What is leadership: Person, result, position or process, or all or none of these? *The Routledge Companion to Leadership*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315739854>
- Jacobides, M. G., Cennamo, C., & Gawer, A. (2018). Towards a theory of ecosystems. *Strategic Management Journal*, 39(8), 2255–2276. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.2904>
- Khoza, R. (2012). *Attuned leadership: African humanism as compass*. Cape Town: Penguin Random House South Africa.
- Kirchherr, J., Reike, D., & Hekkert, M. (2017). Conceptualizing the circular economy: An analysis of 114 definitions. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, 127, pp. 221-232.
- Leinwand, P., Mani, M. M., & Sheppard, B. (2022). Reinventing Your Leadership Team Your organization ' s future depends on getting this. *Harvard Business Review*, (February), 60–70.
- McDonough W. & Braungart M. (2002) *Cradle to Cradle* (North Point Press: New York)
- Mies, A., & Gold, S. (2021). Mapping the social dimension of the circular economy. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 321, 128960.
- Raelin, J. A. (Ed.). (2016). *Leadership-as-practice: Theory and application*. Routledge.
- Raelin, J. A. (2020). Hierarchy's subordination of democracy and how to outrank it. *Management Learning*, 51(5), 620–633. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350507620928154>.
- Sandstrom, C.G. (2016). The non-disruptive emergence of an ecosystem for 3D Printing - Insights from the hearing aid industry's transition 1989-2008. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 102, 160-168.
- Schröder, P., Anantharaman, M., Anggraeni, K., & Foxon, T. J. (Eds.). (2019). *The circular economy and the GS: sustainable lifestyles and green industrial development*. Routledge.
- Sewchurran, K., Andersson, G., Davids, L.M. (2023). Case Study: Lowerland, South Africa. In *European's Horizon 2020 Programme, Just Transition to a Circular Economy* (pp. 285-324). EU Press.
- Sewchurran, K. (2022). *Sounding the Depths of Leadership*. Cape Town, South Africa: Artistry in Everydayness.
- Sewchurran, K., Davids, L. M., McDonogh, J., & Meyer, C. (2022). Enlarging sustainability learning through integrative thinking with a focus on cultivating virtues. *Journal of International Education in Business*, ahead-135

# JUST2CE

A Just Transition to Circular Economy

of-p(ahead-of-print). <https://doi.org/10.1108/JIEB-04-2021-0048>

Sewchurran, K., Dekker, J., & McDonogh, J. (2019). Experiences of embedding long-term thinking in an environment of short-termism and sub-par business performance: Investing in intangibles for sustainable growth. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 157, 997-1041.

Shotter, J. (2006). Understanding process from within: An argument for 'witness'-thinking. *Organization Studies*, 27(4), 585-604. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840606062105>

Shotter, J. (2008). Dialogism and polyphony in organizing theorizing in organization studies: Action guiding anticipations and the continuous creation of novelty. *Organization Studies*, 29(4), 501-524. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840608088701>

Shotter, J. (2016). Turning leadership inside-out and back-to-front: A dialogical-hermeneutical account. In J. Raelin (Ed.), *Leadership-as-Practice* (pp. 132-155). Routledge.

Teece DJ. 2007. Explicating dynamic capabilities: the nature and microfoundations of (sustainable) enterprise performance. *Strategic Management Journal* 28(13): 1319-1350.

Van Der Borgh, M., Cloudt, M., & Romme, A. G. L. (2008). Value creation by knowledge-based ecosystems: Evidence from a field study. *Academy of Management Review*, 1-38.

West, J., & Mace, M. (2010). Browsing as the killer app: Explaining the rapid success of Apple's iPhone. *Telecommunications Policy*, 34(5-6), 270-286.

## **Websites**

Alliance for Food Sovereignty in Africa. <https://afsafrica.org/>.

Circular Economy Action Plan (CEAP), 2021. [https://environment.ec.europa.eu/strategy/circular-economy-action-plan\\_en#:~:text=The%20new%20action%20plan%20announces,for%20as%20long%20as%20possible](https://environment.ec.europa.eu/strategy/circular-economy-action-plan_en#:~:text=The%20new%20action%20plan%20announces,for%20as%20long%20as%20possible).

Ellen McArthur Foundation, 2021. <https://ellenmacarthurfoundation.org/>.

Southern African Food Systems Transformation Alliance, 2019. <https://www.idhsustainabletrade.com/southern-africa-food-systems-alliance/>.

Ledizioni Ledipublishing  
via A. Boselli 10, 20136 Milan, Italy  
[www.ledipublishing.com](http://www.ledipublishing.com)

PDF ISBN: 9791256001446  
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.10958884

Catalogue and reprints information: [www.ledipublishing.com](http://www.ledipublishing.com)





The JUST2CE project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 101003491

# JUST2CE

A Just Transition to Circular Economy