

Regenerative Organizations: Introduction to the Special Issue

Organization & Environment
2021, Vol. 34(4) 507–516
© The Author(s) 2021



Article reuse guidelines:
sagepub.com/journals-permissions
DOI: 10.1177/10860266211055740
journals.sagepub.com/home/oea



Pablo Muñoz^{1,2,*}  and Oana Branzei^{3,*}

Abstract

This special issue presents six articles and two invited editorials that explore the antecedents, mechanisms, and consequences of regenerative organizing. Together, they draw on a range of disciplines from both organizational and environmental sciences to discover, theorize, and illustrate life-giving intersections between humans and natural ecosystems in Anthropocene. This introduction provides an overview of the reasons for, and especially the possibilities of, regenerative organizing as we stress the limits of planetary boundaries in a post-climate change world.

Keywords

business strategy and the environment, climate change, sustainable development, sustainable development goals (SDGs), environmental entrepreneurship, social or environmental entrepreneurship

Our Relationship With Nature

The way modern human life is organized has proven ecologically damaging (Heikkurinen et al., 2016). With our “progress” as a species, natural ecosystems have undergone radical changes. Biodiversity has been lost and temperatures continue to rise, threatening the existence of entire living systems, and our existence as well. Indeed, we know that biodiversity loss could substantially diminish the benefits that people derive from nature (Isbell et al., 2017). We would be surprised if this comes as a shock to the reader. This is our making. The industrial revolution equipped humankind with superpowers—over and beyond nature we still believe—which have led us to play a new and central role in the geology and ecology of the earth. In this new era, and for the first time, humans are leaving permanent geological markers in the stratospheric record of the planet (Crutzen & Stoermer, 2000). Welcome to the Anthropocene.

Linear thinking, siloed understanding of the world, and human–nature dualism are at the core of anthropocentrism (Heikkurinen et al., 2021; Purser et al., 1995). This has been fueled by misleading convictions regarding human cleverness, technological dominance, and egocentric organizational orientation (Jackson, 2009; Purser et al., 1995).

¹Durham University, Durham, UK

²Universidad del Desarrollo, Santiago, Chile

³Western University, London, Ontario, Canada

*The two co-authors have contributed equally.

Corresponding Author:

Pablo Muñoz, Professor of Entrepreneurship, Business School, Durham University, Durham, DH1 3LB, UK.
Email: pablo.munoz-roman@durham.ac.uk

At the core of the latter, there is the modern relationship humans have developed with nature, which is a rather strange one. We are part of nature but, somehow, we have been progressively detaching ourselves from it, creating cognitive, experiential, and emotional fault lines between the human world and the world of other living and nonliving species. Those still finding ways to live in deep connection to nature are seen as outliers. The real threat is our growing disconnect from nature and increasing inability to reconnect with it. Humans and nature share the same threat: Our changing climate reflects a loss of vital human evolutionary experience. We forget where our food comes from, and indeed, most of what we are consuming today is not food (Pollan, 2009). We enjoy zoos and the occasional YouTube live cams that humanize endangered species while we keep them on the menu. We rarely think of them as other than support, service, or entertainment. We do not take the animals' experiences seriously and our once life-giving relationship with the other species sharing our planet has become unsustainable (Mance, 2021). As Gregory Bateson famously said in his *Ecology of Mind*, "The major problems in the world are the result of the difference between how nature works and the way people think" (Bateson, 2010).

Yet, humans possess an innate tendency to seek connections with nature and other forms of life (Kellert & Wilson, 1993; Nisbet et al., 2009). We crave a reconnect with natural ecosystems, for instrumental, emotional, and evolutionary reasons (Passmore & Howell, 2014). We have indeed coevolved with some species, developing, for example, unique bonds with dogs (Garfield, 2020). What makes this relationship special is that, in most cases, both species benefit from this rich, complicated, and rewarding relationship. Forest bathing is another example, with evidence showing that the (mindful) exposure to nature and green environments has a range of health benefits for human systems (Hansen et al., 2017). Noticing nature (Passmore & Holder, 2017) offers precious occasions for becoming a little less selfish (Zhang et al., 2014) and a lot more cooperative (Zelenski et al., 2015). By rekindling our evolutionary capacity for collective action, human–nature interfaces prepare us to tackle the grand challenges of our times (Howard-Grenville et al., 2019).

When Organizations Meet Nature

A growing number of subdomains within organization and management studies have touched on the many reasons for, and especially the urgency of, reclaiming human–nature connections. Several recent studies flagged the almost insurmountable divides between the timing and the scale of human and natural ecosystems (Bansal et al., 2018). Yet, modern social and environmental problems, such as deforestation, desertification, pollution, inequality, healthy food, and biodiversity loss, can only be effectively addressed if we overcome these fault lines and interlink multiple scales (Isbell et al., 2017).

Most of the current scholarly work is focused on understanding how firms navigate through tensions, risks, and opportunities inherent to or derived from environmental degradation, and whether and how paying attention to environmental issues is beneficial for the business. When it comes to conceptualizing organization–nature relationships, management scholarship tends to position the organization at the center of its frameworks and models. It also positions ecological systems as one of many peripheral circles, enabling and constraining their actions (Elkington, 1999). There is a quest, even an expectation, for win–win solutions. Resources have long been partitioned as natural and human, failing to recognize the unique, life-giving combinations that can only emerge and evolve in connection.

Despite many global calls for action, the next generation feels the existential uncertainty of this chasm widening. The presumed, prevailing dualism between human organizations and nature (Good & Thorpe, 2020; Purser et al., 1995) frames our research agenda from an organization rather than organism centric point of view, asking how the increasing scarcity or fragility of nature as a resource shortchanges firms, industries, and organizational environments (Etzion, 2016). Such a

de-natured view of the world diminishes the biocapacity and natural resources and the human creativity that can flourish on our closer connection with nature. It is time to enliven the sustainable development debate by shifting attention from economic to ecological rationality (Banerjee, 2003).

Acknowledging planetary boundaries (Whiteman et al., 2012) and considering nature as nature open up new research questions that reveal, and help us rediscover, the life-supporting foundations that continue to abound in (our) nature (Winn & Pogutz, 2013).

Inspired by ecological embeddedness and sensemaking (Whiteman & Cooper, 2000, 2011), organization and management studies have very recently begun to embrace the possibility of deeper levels of human–nature entanglement, for example, through industrial symbiosis (Walls & Paquin, 2015), venture synchronicity (Muñoz & Cohen, 2017), biomimicry (Fernhaber & Stark, 2019; Mathews, 2011), place-making (Guthey et al., 2013; Masterson et al., 2017; Shrivastava & Kennelly, 2013), relationality and relational agency (Good & Thorpe, 2020; Heikkurinen et al., 2021), and time–space (de)compression (Bansal & Knox-Hayes, 2013).

Reconnecting with nature requires a departure from dualistic rationality and a return to considering living beings as inherently worthy, regardless of their instrumental utility to humans, while respecting the intrinsic values of richness and ecological diversity. This special issue invites us to rethink how new relationships between modern human organizations and the natural world can be formed and maintained (Newton, 2002) and the many ways in which economic ecosystems can evolve in connection with ecological ones (Drengson, 2005).

With many of our life-giving ecosystems in decline, perhaps it is already too late. The proliferation of movements practicing and promoting ecological restoration and regeneration begs to differ.

The Surge of Regeneration and Regenerative Organizations

Regenerative recipes have grown rapidly in adjacent fields (Young, 2000), such as agriculture, forestry, design, energy, planning, and conservation. Many regeneration experimental projects aimed at, for example, creating more sustainable food systems began to gain traction. These evolved into large organizations that operate under agro-ecological principles and practices, relating to permaculture, biodynamics, holistic management, and planned grazing (Rhodes, 2015; Risser, 1985; Savory, 1991). Regenerative organizations strive to restore the natural ecosystems and the communities these natural ecosystems support (Rhodes, 2012; Tomblin, 2009).

Our special issue invites management and organization scholars to regenerate. As a central attribute of living systems (Stinner et al., 1997), regeneration refers to “the capacity to bring into existence again.” A system is regenerative if it preserves its inherent capacity to exist once more (Rhodes, 2017). Regeneration is not about fixing and protecting, but about working with nature (Hes & Du Plessis, 2014) in a way that allows a system to restore its capacity to continuously self-organize and evolve (Dias, 2019). From an ecological perspective, regenerative development entails expanding the ability of human and nonhuman living beings to coevolve in a way that nurtures diversity, creativity, complexity, and life (Mang & Haggard, 2016). Regeneration is an interconnected process, where the healthy development of one form of life is inseparably connected to the healthy development of all others.

Management practice is warming up to the notion of regeneration, proliferating a variety of terms, for example, regenerative agriculture, regenerative cultures (Wahl, 2016), regenerative design (Cole, 2012), regenerative capitalism (Fullerton, 2015), regenerative leadership (Storm & Hutchins, 2019), and regenerative business (Roland & Landua, 2015; Sanford, 2017). All these subdomains call for a gradual re-embedding of organizations in their socioecological systems and the new forms of value created through regenerative forms of organizing (Hahn & Tampe, 2021; Hernández & Muñoz, 2021). As practices in sustainable management are changing in significant ways, so are the narratives and even the very meaning of “managing” (Perey & Benn,

2015) and “organizing” (Good & Thorpe, 2020). We observe decisive restorative actions, seamless dialogues, provocations, and joint action whereby life is let to reemerge in nature and ecosystems to self-correct. Regeneration offers a fundamental shift in perspective whereby organizing responds to the needs for continued functioning and flourishing of social-ecological systems rather than based on the current goals and existing capabilities of a (disconnected) organization. This special issue calls for, and features, models of generative organizing that “enhance, and thrive through, the health of social-ecological systems in a co-evolutionary process” (Hahn & Tampe, 2021, p. 456).

To encapsulate this new phenomenon, we introduce the notion of regenerative organizing as *the process of sensing and embracing surrounding living ecosystems, aligning organizational knowledge, decision-making, and actions to these systems’ structures and dynamics and acting in conjunction, in a way that allows for ecosystems to regenerate, build resilience and sustain life*. Regenerative organizations are not only ecologically embedded by design but also designed to purposefully restore and regenerate degraded living ecosystems and deliberately build resilience in and improve the well-being of the communities relying on such ecosystems. The papers in this special issue explore occasions and attempts of regenerative organizing, explaining how humans and nature can relearn how to cocreate value in Anthropocene.

By reading these articles as a group, scholars will have a new appreciation of our position as social scientists facing natural ecosystems in rapid decline. At the core of the tensions we face as social scientists and management scholars—as we try to help businesses change the way they do things—is that distance between humans and nonhuman species. This is the heart of anthropocentrism and the many paradoxes we experience. Paradoxes can be accepted, clarified, or solved by creating a new paradigm (Poole & van de Ven, 1989). We argue that a focus on regeneration can bring disciplines together and create affordances for a new environmental-social science.

As the papers in this special issue show, regenerative organizing is different from similar ideas emerging in adjacent fields, such as resilient organizations, prosocial organizing, positive organizing, and compassionate organizing. A resilient organization can maintain a high level of performance even when environmental pressures mount, threats increase, and uncertainties deepen. Positive organizing looks at how organizations can become generative places of excellence—inclusive, diverse, mindful—so that people can flourish (Cameron & Spreitzer, 2011). Prosocial organizations (Haigh et al., 2015; Stephan et al., 2016) refer to those that seek to create social value through market mechanisms. Compassion at work (Dutton et al., 2014) relates to the interpersonal process involving the noticing, feeling, sensemaking, and acting that alleviates the suffering of another person within an organization.

Regenerative organizing is different. Phenomenologically, it materializes at the intersection of the physical and the social. Ecological reasoning can help organizations to recognize new forms of value that fall outside our current economic models of utility. Regeneration enables organizations to develop “co-creative partnership with nature based on strategies of adaptation, resilience and regeneration” (du Plessis, 2012, p. 19) and create an integrated system with reciprocal feedbacks and interdependencies (Folke et al., 2010).

The Papers in This Special Issue

Three Paradoxes of Climate Truth for the Anthropocene Social Scientist

In this opening editorial, Jennings and Hoffman (2021) discuss the triple paradox faced by scholars working at the intersection of climate change and business: (a) eliminating the main driver, (b) objectivity with passion, and (c) double irrelevance. They explain how each of these three paradoxes emerges from the science of the Anthropocene and exacerbates the critical division

between the natural and social sciences. Their editorial blazes a path forward by inviting us to balance this triple paradox.

From Equivocality to Reflexivity in Biodiversity Protection

Quarshie et al. (2021) discover the reflexive processes of Finnish changemakers fighting against biodiversity loss. They explain why reflexivity is central to regenerative organizing. They show how silent conversations help changemakers make sense of the equivocality they face in natural ecosystems on the brink of collapse, so they can then design courses of action that allow them to tackle biodiversity issues.

In Transition Toward the Ecocentric Entrepreneurship Nexus: How Nature Helps Entrepreneurs Make Venture More Regenerative Over Time

By looking at Swedish farmers, Vlasov (2021) shows us how nature becomes a partner in an ecocentric venturing process through intimate, recursive, and informative exchanges, which progressively enables regeneration.

“Nano” Regeneration: How Human Agency Intermediates Between Nature and Technology in Community-Based Energy

Walther et al. (2021) paint a hyper-localized view of regeneration through the examination of community-based energy projects in Germany. They explain how we can begin to repair the lost connection with nature by imbricating the human and the technical with the natural.

Managing the Paradoxes of Place to Foster Regeneration

Drawing on a 6-year inductive study in Fogo Island, Canada, Slawinski et al. (2021) explore regeneration in a community devastated by the collapse of the North Atlantic cod fishery. They identify several place-based tensions and discovered that regeneration depends on how organizations respond to these tensions paradoxically.

Strategizing Nature in Cross-Sector Partnerships: Can Plantation Revitalization Enable Living Wages?

Van Hille et al.¹ (2021) explain how transformative cross-sector partnerships revitalize tea plantations in Africa by reimagining temporal tensions as opportunities for ecosystem co-evolution.

“Nature Cannot Be Fooled”: A Dual-Equilibrium Simulation of Climate Change

In this essay, Sunny (2021) invites us to integrate the natural environment into management theories so that we can address the problem of global climate change. He uses a novel simulation to show how the laws of thermodynamics can work alongside market economics to address today’s pressing issues.

Winds of Change: A Neo-Design Approach to the Regeneration of Regions

In the closing invited editorial, Garud et al. (2021) offer a historical perspective on generation by reenacting the dynamics associated with regions and how the emergence, decline, and

regeneration of regions contribute to social well-being at a variety of scales. They elaborate on three mechanisms of regional regeneration: repurposing, experimentation, and collective learning.

Where Do We Go From Here?

Regenerative organizing opens many avenues for future research. It extends the idea of organizing to take seriously the intersection between human and natural forms of resources, agency, and evolution. As we rekindle our connection with nature and shift from economic to ecological reasoning, future research can explore the affective, cognitive, and experiential aspects of what Nisbet et al. (2009) refer to as nature-relatedness. As regenerative organizing shifts the focus of human organizing to organizing *with and for nature*, conceptions such as systems, time, change, scope, and scale in organizing need to be reconsidered. The rhythm of nature is different from the rhythm of modern human organizations (Muñoz & Cohen, 2017). Atmospheric changes, as understood by climate scientists, evolve over millennia while social or industrial changes unfold over years or decades. The question of how we can deal with or reconcile these temporal spaces in our studies seems inevitable. The artificial demarcations we make that mark the scale of things or scope of action do not exist in nature.

As we advance the agenda of regenerative organizing in research and practice, we invite the reader to recognize places, species, and organizations as intrinsically interconnected parts of living systems, instead of worrying where or when a regenerative organization begins and where it ends. We also invite a broadening of the notion of co-agency at the intersection of human and nature. If agency is the capacity of a human actor to act and produce a particular effect, what happens when the action is co-dependent with nature? When might regenerative organizations take a step back and let nature do its work? How might nature call forth or select for novel forms of agency? What forms of symbiosis emerge when we recognize our interdependence with nature and reclaim our birthright to connect and coevolve with nature as opposed to apart or against it?

As regeneration has begun to create abundant affordances in the new *environmental-social science*, we are committed to a growing community of inquiry toward an overdue *environmental-management science*. Climate is changing, rapidly, and humans and nonhuman species are suffering the consequences. Our planetary boundaries are creaking and cracking under the pressure of outdated value-creating practices that diminish, deplete, and destroy our life-giving human habitat. We hope this special issue offers an auspicious beginning for a life-giving scholarship. We invite the reader to immerse in the wisdom of the two editorials and six papers and reclaim the intersection of human and natural ecosystems as a vital arena for management and organization.

Acknowledgments

The Special Issue and this editorial are the result of a fully collaborative effort. We thank our two guest editors, Sally Russell and Gail Whiteman, for the multiple roles they have played in inspiring, convening, mentoring, and growing the shared research agenda and our growing community of inquiry since our initial call for contributions. We would like to thank *Organization & Environment's* editorial team for their support (Michel Russo, Mauricio Zollo, and Tobias Hahn), all the anonymous reviewers who worked with us, and the 22 authors who answered the call for papers on "Regenerative Organizations: Business and Climate Action Beyond Mitigation and Adaptation" (Branzei et al., 2017). Over the years, we hosted many events that led to a growing community of researchers interested in regenerative organizations. We would like to thank all of those who joined us in these activities; the participants of the AOM symposium "Regenerative Organizations: Living and Well-Being in, With and for Nature" (Branzei et al., 2018)—Magali Delmas, Andrew J. Hoffman, Devereaux Jennings, Gail Whiteman, Stephanie Bertels,

Julia Binder, Diana Jue-Rajasingh, Benyamin Bergmann Lichtenstein, Charon Marais, Timothy M. Smith, Christopher Whynacht, Anna Kim, Andrea Prado, Natalie Slawinski, and Judith Walls; and our colleagues Andres Barrios, Silvia Dorado, Vesna Mandakovic, Ivan Montiel, Lucas Monzani, Andrea Prado, Sally Russell and Vinciane Servantie for helping us mentor a new generation of Latin American PhD students. We would like to thank Sistema B, our partner in Latin America, and IDRC (108270-001) and SSHRC (611-2018-0287) for providing financial support. Finally, a special thanks to Maria Emilia Correa (Sistema B) and Sebastian Tramon (Emiliana Wines), who challenged us to explore the world of regeneration.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) disclosed receipt of the following financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article: Project partially funded by The International Development Research Centre in Canada, “Climate Change Risks and Opportunities for B Corporations in Latin America”. Grant # 108270-001.

ORCID iD

Pablo Muñoz  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8843-5943>

Note

1. This paper was published in a previous issue, Volume 34 Issue 2, pp. 175–197.

References

- Banerjee, S. (2003). Who sustains whose development? Sustainable development and the reinvention of nature. *Organization Studies*, 24(1), 143–180.
- Bansal, P., Kim, A., & Wood, M. (2018). Hidden in plain sight: The importance of scale in organizations’ attention to issues. *Academy of Management Review*, 43(2), 217–241.
- Bansal, P., & Knox-Hayes, J. (2013). The time and space of materiality in organizations and the natural environment. *Organization & Environment*, 26(1), 61–82.
- Bateson, N. (2010). *An ecology of mind: A daughter’s portrait of Gregory Bateson*. AL!VE AG. www.anecologyofmind.com.
- Branzei, O., Muñoz, P., Delmas, M., Hoffman, A. J., Jennings, P. D., Whiteman, G., Russell, S. V., Bertels, S., Binder, J. K., Jue-Rajasingh, D., Lichtenstein, B. B., Marais, C., Smith, T. M., Whynacht, C., Kim, A., Prado, A. M., Slawinski, N., & Walls, J. L. (2018). Regenerative organizations: Living and well-being in, with and for nature. *Academy of Management Annual Meeting Proceedings*, 2018(1), 15451.
- Branzei, O., Muñoz, P., Russell, S., & Whiteman, G. (2017). Regenerative organizations: Business and climate action beyond mitigation and adaptation. *Organization & Environment*, 30(3), 275–277.
- Cameron, K., & Spreitzer, G. (2011). Introduction: What is positive about positive organizational scholarship? In G. Spreitzer & K. Cameron (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of positive organizational scholarship* (pp. 1–15). Oxford University Press.
- Cole, R. J. (2012). Transitioning from green to regenerative design. *Building Research & Information*, 40(1), 39–53.
- Crutzen, P., & Stoermer, E. (2000). The Anthropocene. *Global Change Newsletter*, 41, 17–18.
- Dias, B. D. (2019). Regenerative development—building evolutive capacity for healthy living systems. *Management and Applications of Complex Systems*, 13(8), 315–323.
- Drenson, A. (2005). *Some thought on the deep ecology movement*. Foundations for Deep Ecology. <http://environment-ecology.com/deep-ecology/786-some-thought-on-the-deep-ecology-movement.html>
- du Plessis, C. (2012). Towards a regenerative paradigm for the built environment. *Building Research & Information*, 40, 7–22.

- Dutton, J. E., Workman, K. M., & Hardin, A. E. (2014). Compassion at work. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1, 277–304.
- Elkington, J. (1999). *Cannibals with forks*. Capstone Publishing.
- Etzion, D. (2016). Research on organizations and the natural environment, 1992-present: A review. *Journal of Management*, 33(4), 637–664.
- Fernhaber, S. A., & Stark, A. Y. (2019). Biomimicry: New insights for entrepreneurship scholarship. *Journal of Business Venturing Insights*, 12, Article e00137.
- Folke, C., Carpenter, S. R., Walker, B., Scheffer, M., Chapin, T., & Rockström, J. (2010). Resilience thinking: Integrating resilience, adaptability and transformability. *Ecology and Society*, 15(4), 20.
- Fullerton, J. (2015). *Regenerative capitalism: How universal principles and patterns will shape our new economy*. Capital Institute. <https://cbey.yale.edu/event/regenerative-capitalism-how-universal-principles-and-patterns-will-shape-our-new-economy>
- Garfield, S. (2020). *Dog's best friend: A brief history of an unbreakable bond*. Weidenfeld & Nicolson.
- Garud, R., Gehman, J., & Karnoe, P. (2021). Winds of change: A new-design approach to the regeneration of regions. *Organization & Environment*.
- Good, J., & Thorpe, A. (2020). The nature of organizing: A relational approach to understanding business sustainability. *Organization & Environment*, 33(3), 359–383.
- Guthey, G. T., Whiteman, G., & Elmes, M. (2013). Place and sense of place. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 23(3), 254–265.
- Hahn, T., & Tampe, M. (2021). Strategies for regenerative business. *Strategic Organization*, 19(3), 456–477.
- Haigh, N., Walker, J., Bacq, S., & Kickul, J. (2015). Hybrid organizations: Origins, strategies, impacts, and implications. *California Management Review*, 57, 5–12.
- Hansen, M., Jones, R., & Tocchini, K. (2017). Shinrin-Yoku (forest bathing) and nature therapy: A state-of-the-art review. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 14, 851.
- Heikkurinen, P., Clegg, S., Pinnington, A. H., Nicolopoulou, K., & Alcaraz, J. M. (2021). Managing the Anthropocene: Relational agency and power to respect planetary boundaries. *Organization & Environment*, 34(2), 267–286.
- Heikkurinen, P., Rinkinen, J., Järvensivu, T., Wilén, K., & Ruuska, T. (2016). Organising in the Anthropocene: An ontological outline for ecocentric theorising. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 113(C), 705–714.
- Hernández, M., & Muñoz, P. (2021). Reformists, decouplists and activists: A typology of ecocentric management. *Organization & Environment*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1086026621993204> (in press)
- Hes, D., & Du Plessis, C. (2014). *Designing for hope: Pathways to regenerative sustainability*. Routledge.
- Howard-Grenville, J., Davis, G., Dyllick, T., Miller, C., Thau, S., & Tsui, A. S. (2019). Sustainable development for a better world: Contributions of leadership, management and organizations. *Academy of Management Discoveries*, 5, 355–366.
- Isbell, F., Gonzalez, A., Loreau, M., Cowles, J., Díaz, S., Hector, A., Mace, G. M., Wardle, D. A., O'Connor, M. I., Duffy, J. E., Turnbull, L. A., Thompson, P. L. & Larigauderie, A. (2017). Linking the influence and dependence of people on biodiversity across scales. *Nature*, 546(7656), 65–72.
- Jackson, T. (2009). *Prosperity without growth: Economics for a finite planet*. Earthscan.
- Jennings, P. D., & Hoffman, A. J. (2021). Three paradoxes of climate truth for the Anthropocene social scientist. *Organization & Environment*.
- Kellert, S., & Wilson, E. O. (1993). *The biophilia hypothesis*. Island Press.
- Mance, H. (2021). *How to love animals in a human-shaped world*. Vintage Digital.
- Mang, P., & Haggard, B. (2016). *Regenerative development and design: A framework for evolving sustainability*. John Wiley.
- Masterson, V. A., Stedman, R. C., Enqvist, J., Tengö, M., Giusti, M., Wahl, D., & Svedin, U. (2017). The contribution of sense of place to social-ecological systems research: A review and research agenda. *Ecology and Society*, 22(1), 49–14.
- Mathews, F. (2011). Towards a deeper philosophy of biomimicry. *Organization & Environment*, 24(4), 364–387.
- Muñoz, P., & Cohen, B. (2017). Towards a social-ecological understanding of sustainable venturing. *Journal of Business Venturing Insights*, 7(C), 1–8.

- Newton, T. (2002). Creating the new ecological order? Elias and actor-network theory. *The Academy of Management Review*, 27(4), 523–540.
- Nisbet, E. K., Zelenski, J. M., & Murphy, S. A. (2009). The Nature Relatedness Scale. *Environment and Behavior*, 41(5), 715–740.
- Passmore, H.-A., & Holder, M. D. (2017). Noticing nature: Individual and social benefits of a two-week intervention. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 12(6), 537–546.
- Passmore, H.-A., & Howell, A. J. (2014). Eco-existential positive psychology: Experiences in nature, existential anxieties, and well-being. *The Humanistic Psychologist*, 42, 370–388.
- Perey, R., & Benn, S. (2015). Organising for ecological repair. *Organization & Environment*, 28(4), 458–477.
- Pollan, M. (2009). *In defense of food: An eater's manifesto*. Penguin Books.
- Poole, M. S., & van de Ven, A. H. (1989). Using paradox to build management and organization theories. *The Academy of Management Review*, 14(4), 562–578.
- Purser, R. E., Park, C., & Montuori, A. (1995). Limits to anthropocentrism: Toward an ecocentric organization paradigm? *The Academy of Management Review*, 20(4), 1053–1089.
- Quarshie, A., Salmi, A., & Wu, Z. (2021). From equivocality to reflexivity in biodiversity protection. *Organization & Environment*.
- Rhodes, C. J. (2012). Feeding and healing the world: Through regenerative agriculture and permaculture. *Science Progress*, 95(4), 345–446.
- Rhodes, C. J. (2015). Permaculture: Regenerative—not merely sustainable. *Science Progress*, 98(4), 403–412.
- Rhodes, C. J. (2017). The imperative for regenerative agriculture. *Science Progress*, 100(1), 80–129.
- Risser, P. G. (1985). Toward a holistic management perspective. *Bioscience*, 35(7), 414–418.
- Roland, E., & Landua, G. (2015). *Regenerative enterprise: Optimizing for multi-capital abundance*. Lulu Press.
- Sanford, C. (2017). *The regenerative business: Redesign work, cultivate human potential, achieve extraordinary outcomes*. Hachette UK.
- Savory, A. (1991). Holistic resource management: A conceptual framework for ecologically sound economic modelling. *Ecological Economics*, 3(3), 181–191.
- Shrivastava, P., & Kennelly, J. J. (2013). Sustainability and place-based enterprise. *Organization & Environment*, 26(1), 83–101.
- Slawinski, N., Winsor, B., Mazutis, D., Schouten, J. W., & Smith, W. K. (2021). Managing the paradoxes of place to foster regeneration. *Organization & Environment*.
- Stephan, U., Patterson, M., Kelly, C., & Mair, J. (2016). Organizations driving positive social change. *Journal of Management*, 42, 1250–1281.
- Stinner, D. H., Stinner, B. R., & Martsolf, E. (1997). Biodiversity as an organizing principle in agroecosystem management: Case studies of holistic resource management practitioners in the USA. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment*, 62, 199–213.
- Storm, L., & Hutchins, G. (2019). *Regenerative leadership: The DNA of life-affirming 21st century organizations*. Wordzworth Publishing.
- Sunny, S. A. (2021). “Nature cannot be fooled”—A dual-equilibrium simulation of climate change. *Organization & Environment*.
- Tomblin, D. C. (2009). The ecological restoration movement. *Organization & Environment*, 22(2), 185–207.
- Van Hille, I., De Bakker, F. G. A., Groenewegen, P., & Ferguson, J. E. (2021). Strategizing nature in cross-sector partnerships: Can plantation revitalization enable living wages? *Organization & Environment*, 34(2), 175–197.
- Vlasov, M. (2021). In transition towards the ecocentric entrepreneurship nexus: How nature helps entrepreneurs make venture more regenerative over time. *Organization & Environment*.
- Wahl, C. (2016). *Designing regenerative cultures*. Triarchy Press.
- Walls, J. L., & Paquin, R. L. (2015). Organizational perspectives of industrial symbiosis. *Organization & Environment*, 28(1), 32–53.
- Walther, C., Poldner, K., & Dentoni, D. (2021). “Nano” regeneration: How human agency intermediates between nature and technology in community-based energy. *Organization & Environment*.

- Whiteman, G., & Cooper, W. H. (2000). Ecological embeddedness. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(6), 1265–1282.
- Whiteman, G., & Cooper, W. H. (2011). Ecological Sensemaking. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(5), 889–911.
- Whiteman, G., Walker, B., & Perego, P. (2012). Planetary boundaries: Ecological foundations for corporate sustainability. *Journal of Management Studies*, 50(2), 307–336.
- Winn, M. I., & Pogutz, S. (2013). Business, ecosystems, and biodiversity: New horizons for management research. *Organization & Environment*, 26(2), 203–229.
- Young, T. P. (2000). Restoration ecology and conservation biology. *Biological Conservation*, 92(1), 73–83.
- Zelenski, J. M., Dopko, R. L., & Capaldi, C. A. (2015). Cooperation is in our nature: Nature exposure may promote cooperative and environmentally sustainable behavior. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 42, 24–31.
- Zhang, J. W., Piff, P. K., Iyer, R., Koleva, S., & Keltner, D. (2014). An occasion for unselfing: Beautiful nature leads to prosociality. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 37, 61–72.

Author Biographies

Pablo Muñoz is Professor of Entrepreneurship at Durham University Business School in the United Kingdom.

Oana Branzei is Donald F. Hunter Professor of International Business and Professor of Strategy and Sustainability at the Ivey Business School and Faculty Scholar at Western University in Canada.