

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Cross-Sector Collaboration: Lessons From Industry Self-Regulation, Recycling and Employment for Persons With Disabilities

Lawrence J. Lad¹  | Lauren E. Lad² | Noemi Perez-Macias³  | Paul Ongenaë⁴ | Jose Luis Fernandez⁵

¹Lacy School of Business, Butler University, Indianapolis, Indiana, USA | ²Department of Forest and Rangeland Stewardship, Colorado State University, Ft. Collins, Colorado, USA | ³Department of Management, Comillas, Madrid, Spain | ⁴Erasmus University, Rotterdam, the Netherlands | ⁵Comillas, Madrid, Spain

Correspondence: Lawrence J. Lad (llad@butler.edu)

Received: 28 December 2024 | **Revised:** 19 February 2026 | **Accepted:** 5 March 2026

Keywords: collaborative strategy | disabilities and employment | industry self-regulation | recycling | third-party organizations

ABSTRACT

A range of collaborative approaches to address complexity in the business environment including strategic alliances, public private partnerships, issues management alliances, innovation and enterprise zones, supply chain certification and partnerships, industry self-regulatory systems, and technology incubators are evidence of collaboration across sectors. This paper suggests that these may be part of a bigger adaptation. Such new models may be critical in addressing challenging issues of immigration and workforce development, disruptive technologies, globalization, corruption, and sustainability. The paper builds the case that these collaborative responses are not simply new forms but represent a new logic and values. They incorporate a “both and” logic and a more ecological perspective. They recognize that going it alone may not be sufficient. Partnering with NGOs, third-party organizations, and even government agencies may lead to better solutions. Finally, they challenge leadership to generate new conversations and ask different questions. The paper provides three detailed cases that illustrate collaborative responses to issues and new forms of adaptation including industry self-regulation, recycling, and employment programs for persons with disabilities. It concludes with suggestions for future research.

1 | Context for Collaborating

Business and society research has explored the role of the firm in response to challenges in its environment. The prevailing business order has moved from a single dimensional economic purpose to a more holistic inclusion of sociopolitical and ethical considerations in treatment of employees, its community, and the planet. Our research has evolved from corporate social responsibility (CSR) to stakeholder theory and is at the center of examining the role of business in the sustainability and human rights movements (Freeman 1984; Waddock and McIntosh 2013; Waddock 2020; Schrepf-Stirling et al. 2022; Hart 2024).

At the heart of this movement is evidence of the firm working collaboratively to address challenges. We suggest that this is not simply a response to challenges but a manifestation of a new logic, perhaps a reframing of how firms approach issues and address complexity in its environment.

The goal of this paper is to look deeply at collaboration across sectors. We do this by suggesting a new lens—new logics. Then, we use three examples of cross-sector collaboration to bring out how this works. Finally, we offer implications of these insights and suggest new avenues for research. The paper starts with a literature review; it describes the new logics, offers the

examples, describes the implications, and concludes with ideas for future research.

2 | Literature Review

A variety of examples of business-to-business, business-to-government, and business-to-NGO collaboration are evident in the business press. In examining the range of collaborative approaches to addressing uncertainty in the environment such as strategic alliances, public-private partnerships, issues management alliances, innovation and enterprise zones, supply chain certification and partnerships, industry self-regulatory systems, and technology incubators, we see evidence of collaboration across sectors. This paper suggests these may be part of a bigger adaptation. Such new models may be critical in addressing bigger issues of immigration and workforce development, community economic development, disruptive technologies, globalization, corruption, sustainability, and climate change. The literature on this collaboration is extensive and multidisciplinary.

For complex challenges, Gray and Purdy (2018) create a typology of multisector partnerships and provide a range of examples both domestically and internationally. Castañer and Oliveira (2020) offer a detailed definitional clarification among collaboration, cooperation, and coordination. They make the convincing case that goal agreement is a marker for collaboration and is essential for cross-sector partnerships to work. Voluntarily working together to help others is a driver.

Becker and Smith (2018) present a managerial and leadership case for collaboration on big issues. It entails a mindset shift to stepping into the complexity to get thing done.

Pedersen et al. (2021) explores cross-sector collaboration in sustainability initiatives. They make the case for engaging stakeholders at the table, taking a more holistic view of business in the ecosystem, and emphasize that there are sustainable alternatives to classic business models.

Sometimes better solutions come from looking at problems differently. Fresh perspectives can come from working with different partners.

When developing strategy in what Vaill (1996) refers to as “permanent whitewater,” and Ackoff calls “wicked problems,” Waddock and McIntosh (2013) describe how organization leaders need to go beyond a firm or industry centric approach and consider a broader, network-based, or ecosystem view. Ring and Van de Ven (1992) make a case for cooperative dialog between organizations as we move from contract based relationships to more trust based dialog. This is supported by Jacobides et al. (2018) who suggest this as ecosystems theory and offer a framework for business, innovation, and platform-based systems.

This view is also consistent with Ostrom et al.’s (1999) notion of social environmental systems (SESs), which are created through the interactions of people and the environment and encompass necessarily complex subsystems that must be managed efficiently. Ostrom (2009) described SESs using examples like fisheries and

forests, but the principles that she described for proper governance can be applied to self-regulation, standard setting, the system of recycling, and local resource planning.

3 | Collaboration: It Is in Our Nature

From supply chain partnerships to public-private partnerships in economic development to working with NGOs on an issue, firms are recognizing that going it alone is not always a preferred choice. In a just-in-time world, firms are much more careful to build deeper relationships with supply chain members. Even cities are recognizing that issues of workforce development, crime prevention, and waste management are addressed when community colleges, local businesses, and faith-based leaders are included in planning. Even furniture designers and architects see the need for open office design and collaborative work spaces. By our nature, people seek to work together.

Beyond business, even the scientific community recognizes the role of collaboration. Johnson (2010) points to several technology innovations that debug the myth of a lone scientist at a microscope. He notes that innovation happens at the conference table more often than the lab bench. He also notes that the growth of cities and regional tech hubs evolved as centers for sharing resources and skills. Many of the non-market, network-based solutions draw our attention to Darwin (1859) and Johnson (2010) who suggest that the riverbank or the reef might be the biological equivalent of what we are witnessing in organizations. Collaboration is essential in these ecosystems where interdependence is vital to all living species. Beyond the typical collaborations of trade associations, strategic alliances, and public-private partnerships, we can look to include standards organizations such as ISO and LEAD, workforce development partnerships, and business incubators and enterprise zones as evidence of this recognized interdependence.

Addressing global sustainability challenges—climate change, resource depletion, and ecosystem loss, companies and other stakeholders are collaborating to discover new ways to address difficult challenges. For example, the Latin American Water Funds Partnership, the sustainable Apparel Coalition (Nike, Patagonia, and Walmart), and Action to Accelerate Recycling (partnership between Alcoa, consumer-packaged goods companies, and local governments) are but a few of the examples of new partnerships. Beyond improving business and social outcomes, they exhibit new thinking. To meet the challenges of automotive materials recycling, specifically separating unique plastics from metals, the US DOE has expanded its collaborative research with the automotive industry to create sustainable end-of-life vehicle recycling (Daniels et al. 2004). Even in the water use domain, which pits industry and agribusiness against consumers, we find that debates over water resources and water recycling are more than an engineering challenge. Stakeholder involvement and science-policy dialogs need to occur to create more inclusive decision-making (Calton and Lad 1995; Nidumolu et al. 2014).

4 | A Framework for Understanding Collaboration

The paper builds the case that these collaborative responses are not simply new forms but represent a new logic and values



FIGURE 1 | Diagram of potential sectors involved in collaboration and their prevailing values. Adapted from Lad and Caldwell (2009).

(Austrom and Lad 1989) and perhaps a new level of consciousness (Kegan 1998). They incorporate a “both and logic,” a sense of an expanding, nonzero sum pie, and a more ecological perspective. They recognize that going it alone may not be sufficient. Partnering with NGOs, third-party organizations, and even government agencies may lead to better solutions. Finally, they see leadership in generating new conversations and asking different questions. Knowledge management in this turbulent environment moves from an intra-firm approach to an interorganizational ecosystem way of thinking. We offer here a model of business, government, and NGO relations derived from Williamson (1996).

Figure 1, adapted from Lad and Caldwell (2009), serves as a model for seeing the parties involved in collaboration. Many of these responses are examples of business, government, and NGOs coming together. With links to Williamson (1996) and Ouchi (2012), it illustrates that each domain operates with different rules—business/market, government/law, and NGO/clan or community values. When collaborating to address an issue, each sector needs to consider the prevailing values of the other parties. This is enacted through approaches such as appreciative inquiry (Coopriider and Whitney 2005) and design thinking (Liedtka 2018) where openness to new views is critical and where reframing problems can lead to better solutions. It is mindfulness taken to an institutional level. The second part of the figure shows a range of examples of collaboration. It can

serve as a roadmap for stakeholder involvement, idea generation, and problem-solving (Calton and Lad 1995).

5 | New Values and Logics

The prevailing paradigm of industrialized societies is based on a mechanistic model of the universe with roots traceable to Descartes and Newton. The prevailing logics of American culture are rooted in a Greek–European epistemology based on deductive logic, assumption of one-way causal flow, and hierarchical social order mixed with a unidimensional universe, competition, conquest, and technocentrism (Miller 1985). Hence, it is evident in our organizations—centralized, large scale, bureaucratic, and hierarchical (Maruyama 1976; Capra 1982; Austrom and Lad 1989).

The prevailing paradigm is based on logics, values, and modes of interaction that emphasize either/or distinctions, reductionism, and separation between phenomena. We see ourselves separate from each other, our institutions, and our physical world. Likely, this traces to self-contained individualism, zero-sum game thinking, and win/lose logic (Lodge 1975).

As noted by Austrom and Lad (1989), the logics of separation and self-contained individualism impact how we relate to each other and our organizations. Baken (1966) develops this idea

that we connect either through agency or communion. Agency is manifested in the existence of the organism as isolated and separate. This view may limit our ability to navigate in a turbulent world. This is consistent with Ring and Van de Ven's (1992) move from a contract-based world to one based on trust.

A new more wholistic worldview and ecosystem perspective is evident in the basic sciences. According to Capra (1982):

The new paradigm parallels the view of matter that emerged in modern physics—a view that can be extended to living organisms, mind, consciousness, and social phenomena.

The material world, according to contemporary physics, is not a mechanical system composed of separate objects, but instead appears as a complex web of relationships. Subatomic particles cannot be understood as isolated, separate entities but have to be seen as interconnections in a network of events.

This now follows that instead of individual agency we consider communion as a way to relate (Baken 1966). Communion is manifested in the lack of separation, in the participation of the individual in the larger system, and in cooperative initiatives. It is in our nature as human beings to connect. This view or perspective is ecological and wholistic. It recognizes our interrelatedness and interdependence. In an era of growing interdependence, an ecological worldview provides a more useful lens for approaching challenges. Rather than focusing on differences, the shift is to understanding interrelatedness. “Both/and” thinking opens new ways to address conflict, and old contradictions and dualities are now seen as interdependent paradoxes (religion, economics, energy use, and resource use). The cliché “we’re in this together” now rings truer than ever—think climate change, nuclear weapons proliferation, law of the seas, and terrorism (Ring and Van de Ven 1992; Coopriider and Whitney 2005; Liedtka 2018).

Evidence of this evolution in perspectives can be found in the shift from very symbolic CSR to corporate citizenship, “triple bottom line” initiatives, and issues management alliances. The rise of social enterprise suggests a win/win approach to business as social, environmental, and economic goals replace single dimension economic goals. Companies such as Patagonia and Starbucks collaborate deeply along their respective supply chains to source sustainable ingredients and insure fair treatment of labor.

The call for the use of ethical principles and dialog is an essential mechanism in the emerging, organic view of organizations. Complexity forces the systems to become more self-organizing, adaptive, and responsive. This “autopoiesis” (Capra 1996) allows committed individuals to create a more dynamic system “from within.”

6 | Case Studies

To further develop this idea of collaboration and community, we discuss three examples in more detail. Here, we examine the

challenge facing the system, the involvement of organizations from different sectors, and the outcomes.

The following cases are presented as illustrative instances of the central argument advanced in this paper concerning the structural necessity of interinstitutional collaboration and the corresponding reconfiguration of axiological priorities within contemporary market economies. The analysis begins with industry self-regulation, understood as a paradigmatic form of polycentric and collaborative governance operating at the meso-institutional level. From the perspective of institutional theory, such arrangements exemplify the emergence of normative and cognitive frameworks—often articulated through voluntary standards, codes of conduct, and other instruments of soft law—that complement formal regulation and shape organizational behavior. These governance mechanisms reveal how the pursuit of economic sustainability under conditions of heightened complexity, uncertainty, and systemic interdependence requires firms to integrate ethical considerations into the very structure of competitive interaction.

Beyond compliance-based conceptions of market participation, firms are increasingly compelled to adopt more reflexive and innovative modes of action characterized by coepetition: the strategic combination of competition and cooperation, including deliberate collaboration among direct competitors. Within the framework of stakeholder theory, such practices can be understood as processes of collective value creation aimed at addressing shared risks, negative externalities, and legitimacy deficits that cannot be effectively managed through unilateral action. In this sense, cooperation within the industry—often extending beyond legal obligation—constitutes a mechanism for aligning private economic objectives with broader societal and environmental concerns, thereby reinforcing organizational legitimacy and contributing to the Common Good. These dynamics are briefly illustrated through reference to sectors such as the chemical, financial, communications, and technology industries, where self-regulatory initiatives and collaborative governance structures have become increasingly central to the sustainability of both economic activity and professional practice.

In a second example, the analysis turns to recycling as a paradigmatic case of systemic collaboration within the framework of the circular economy. Drawing on foundational insights from thermodynamics, particularly the first and second laws, recycling can be understood as an institutional and organizational response to the physical constraints governing economic processes. Whereas the first law establishes that matter and energy are conserved through transformation, the second law highlights the irreversible tendency toward entropy in closed systems, implying limits to linear models of production and consumption.

From the perspective of ecological economics, the economy is embedded within the biophysical environment and operates as an open subsystem of the biosphere, dependent on continuous energy and material throughput. In this context, recycling and circular economy strategies aim to slow, narrow, and partially close material loops, thereby reducing entropic degradation and mitigating resource dissipation. Analogously, interinstitutional collaboration, including cooperation among firms, can

be interpreted as a form of industrial symbiosis in which coordinated action enhances systemic efficiency, minimizes waste, and generates shared value over the long term. Such cooperative arrangements reconfigure competitive dynamics without eliminating them, embedding market interaction within a broader logic of sustainability, resilience, and long-term value creation. Empirical evidence of these dynamics can be found across diverse sociopolitical contexts, where circular economy initiatives and recycling ecosystems provide best-practice models that are increasingly influential beyond their original domains, informing governance structures and strategic decision-making in other sectors.

The third illustrative case addresses a domain distinct from the previous examples, highlighting the sociopolitical and ethical dimensions of interinstitutional collaboration. Whereas the first case emphasizes intra-sectoral coordination, and the second situates collaboration within the ecological context to preserve natural equilibria and ensure sustainability, this example focuses on enabling individuals with disabilities—whether physical or cognitive—to access employment. From an inclusive governance perspective, collaboration among public institutions, private enterprises, and civil society actors constitutes a necessary precondition for creating opportunities for social and economic participation.

Whether through paid employment or self-employment arising from entrepreneurial initiatives, collaborative strategies contribute directly to the common good, facilitating economic stability, social inclusion, and personal development. Employment provides not only access to income but also a privileged avenue for full societal participation on equal terms with other citizens while enabling individuals to cultivate their capacities and exercise agency in meaningful ways. These outcomes depend on structured processes and mechanisms that inherently require cooperation across institutional boundaries, demonstrating the indispensable role of collaboration alongside competitive dynamics in socioeconomic life.

Ultimately, improving employment prospects for persons with disabilities (PWB) underscores that sustainable and just socioeconomic systems require the integration of ethical responsibility into institutional practices, aligning corporate and public objectives with human rights and social equity. By fostering inclusive labor markets, collaborative governance not only drives innovation and efficiency but also contributes to a society where every individual can realize their dignity and potential, reflecting the core principles of CSR, ESG, and human-centered public policy.

7 | Industry Self-Regulation

Industry self-regulation is an example of collaborative business government relations on complex regulatory issues. Although government will not abdicate responsibility to regulate on issues of high salience (e.g., pharmaceutical safety), they recognize other areas are opportunities for voluntary codes and standards (i.e., home appliance energy use standards, direct sales, and licensing of professionals). In the United States, the emergence of the Center for Industry Self-Regulation through the Better

Business Bureau examines opportunities for shared dialog on complex regulatory issues, attesting to its value. It has documented efforts in railroad safety, pharmaceutical safety, and financial services.

As noted by Lad and Caldwell (2009) international issues such as product safety in pharmaceuticals, accounting standards in reporting, and, more recently, metrics for measuring progress on sustainability, it is clear that a more critical examination of appropriate mechanisms for global regulation is occurring. Discussions in Brussels consider the cooperative design of processes for setting and enforcing rules and standards. These processes have been cast as collective action (Olson 1965), collective strategy (Astley and Fombrun 1983), cooperation (Schermerhorn 1979), transorganizational systems (Cummings 1984), issues management alliances (Austrom and Lad 1989), catalytic organizations (Waddock 1991), and social environmental systems (Ostrom et al. 1999). Entities both traditional (associations) and new are taking action to secure the “commons,” manage social issues, or address a problem unmanageable with current mechanisms.

Industry self-regulation is a regulatory process in which an industry-level organization (typically a trade association or professional society) sets and enforces rules and standards relating to the conduct of firms and individuals in the industry (Gupta and Lad 1983). The system is characterized by rulemaking/standards setting, monitoring, and enforcement stages. Rarely does industry do it all. More typically, committees within industry associations or professional societies propose standards and request government approval through advisory opinions. If the process is collaborative, it can reduce the chances for antitrust claims based on restraint of trade. Monitoring and enforcement procedures are set up to encourage problem resolution within the system before referring the case to government. Often, government serves as the enforcer of last resort (Lad and Caldwell 2009).

Self-regulation takes on a variety of forms designed to address particular issues—technical standards, credentialing, accreditation, and codes of ethics. The process almost always involves government. As we see in biotechnology safety and stock exchange trading, business and government are collaborative partners in the responsibility for policymaking and enforcement.

Industry self-regulation is an example of both inter-firm and multi-sector collaboration. Typically, the initial choice is inter-firm collaboration to self-police in the early stages of designing a rulemaking system. In many cases, a third-party organization (trade association and professional society) works collaboratively with a government agency to set rules, monitor behavior, and apply sanctions in cases of inappropriate behavior. It is an ongoing problem-solving relationship between the parties.

In *broadcasting and media*, in the United States, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, broadcasters are subject to federal oversight and licensing rules, yet they monitor advertising content through mechanisms like Better Business Bureaus and National Advertising Review Boards. The direct marketing industry also self-regulates.

In the *financial services industry*, the licensing of securities brokers and the stock exchanges is managed outside government. Although the SEC and its counterparts overseas have the responsibility to enforce rules about fraud and insider trading, it relies on insiders to self-police improper behaviors. Parallels can be found in the Investment Dealers Association and the Futures Industry Association.

In the *chemical industry*, the Responsible Care initiative is a voluntary code of conduct for firms in the handling and labeling of products. Research has explored the role of key trade associations in the process (Lenox and Nash 2003) and the challenge of imposing sanctions on industry players. The environmental practice area is a major domain for international self-regulation.

In the *accounting profession*, the AICPA and its international counterparts have explored ways to expand the role of the accounting profession beyond tax and audit services into other areas. The major result of this was the move into consulting and information systems. More recently, the AICPA has considered ways to utilize the profession's expertise at attestation to expand their reach even more. Attestation is essentially the process of certifying or documenting with authority that a procedure or a process was carried out according to a specified set of rules. For example, an audit essentially attests that the process of assembling and disclosing financial statements is done properly. Examples of areas the AICPA has offered its services include the WEB/TRUST certification given to safe web sites and the certification of long-term healthcare facilities. This role represents a monitoring function critical in successful self-regulation. The objectivity of the profession may be an essential element in designing new systems.

In the *artificial intelligence (AI)* sector, leading firms have increasingly adopted voluntary frameworks to guide the deployment of new models. Industry groups such as the Partnership on AI and the Frontier Model Forum (a collaboration between OpenAI, Microsoft, Google, and Anthropic) have advocated for shared principles on transparency, risk assessment, and responsible release practices. These efforts to self-regulate are furthered by emerging federal and local government oversight but are primarily driven by peer standards and social reputational incentives. Partnerships with local municipal governments and social buy-in are being recognized as critical for the future success of AI infrastructure. As companies push to grow and build new data centers, municipal governments and private citizens are raising concerns about energy use, water resource extraction, and related social and environmental externalities. The continued success of AI may be driven by the success of these local partnerships and social investment.

8 | Recycling

As another form of collaboration, recycling plays out the idiom that “one man's trash is another's treasure”. Approximately 75% of what we put into the trash has value in another reuse (Koop 2023). The challenge is to get consumers to participate and generate a sufficient supply of material for the reuse supply chain. Recycling programs represent a collaboration between

consumers, local governments and waste management firms, and various players in the materials supply chain.

Consumption creates waste. Our solid waste landfills are a testimony to a “throwaway” society and to the planned obsolescence of products in a number of industries. The challenge of waste has global dimensions in the recycling of computer parts in Asia, the decommissioning of tankers in India, floating plastic islands in the Pacific, and the flotsam and jetsam found in seacoast communities from coastal Washington to beaches in Normandy and South Africa.

Yet, waste generation, collection, repurposing, and disposal are also a local issue. Many businesses and local governments recognize the value of cost savings or revenue generation by recycling. Consistent with Ostrom et al. (1999) different communities handle recycling with varying degrees of attention. These cover the spectrum from landfills, public and private recycling programs, incinerators, microenterprise, energy recovery initiatives, public–private partnerships, environmental management projects, and unique projects with reprocessed materials. More specifically, it is on the range of recycled materials that can be repurposed and the NGO, social enterprises, and businesses that are created in the recycling domain. It is a bridge between consumption and waste, sustainability and reuse, and collaboration across sectors in a community.

Government has policy tools to encourage recycling such as a tax on plastic bags, a bottle or can fee, or a pay as you go system. Recycling initiatives frequently begin with a local government mandate to separate trash. Sometimes, it is a cost issue to reduce landfill charges. Other times, it is simply the realization that useful materials are being thrown away. Five major materials represent the bulk of recyclable consumer products—paper and cardboard, glass, plastic, aluminum cans, and compost. Each has a separate reuse stream. In some jurisdictions, particularly Europe, up to four separate bins are made available to sort material.

It is helpful to think of recycling as the creation of a system—inputs, throughputs, and outputs. It may start with consumer awareness or an enlightened politician. It entails creating a system or scheme to pay for collecting and sorting material. It requires a reuse plan or supply chain to get the material to the place that needs it. There is a role for each sector. Businesses see the value in lower land use fees and the creation of a reuse supply chain for raw materials. Government saves disposal costs and supports jobs creation. NGOs turn advocacy into sustainability initiatives and community building.

Management of an SES requires a well-designed system of governance and collaboration within each subsystem. Recycling will be best managed on a city or state-run governance system. This is because the size of the resource system of an SES impacts the likelihood that it will be properly managed. A moderately sized resource system, such as a city, allows for a significant flow of recycling inputs to be managed while not having too large of a system so as to have large costs for defining boundaries (Ostrom 2009). Additionally, participants are much more likely to adopt recycling measures that facilitate their efforts than ones that feel as though central authorities are making all

of the decisions (Ostrom et al. 1999). An example of this can be seen in many cities in California, such as San Francisco. San Francisco exists as one of the top cities for waste reduction and has a goal of cutting waste sent to landfills in half by 2030, even though the rest of the United States is far behind (San Francisco Environment Department). This is a result of self-organization and collaboration between the city's Environment Department, local businesses, and the residents. Although the quantity and percentage of waste being recycled in the United States has continued to increase since the 1970s, there has been a diminishing marginal rate of recycling (EPA). Between 1990 and 1995, the percentage of waste recycled grew almost 10%, from 26.0% to 35.7% (EPA). However, since 1995, there has been a diminishing marginal rate of recycling to the point that the percentage of total waste recycled grew less than 1% between 2010 and 2015 (EPA). Meanwhile, San Francisco recycles almost 80% of their municipal solid waste (MSW) (Brigham 2018). Even the top recycling countries in the world—Germany, Austria, and South Korea—are only recycling about 50% of their MSW (Gray 2017).

How are countries like Germany and cities like San Francisco so far ahead of the United States when it comes to recycling? They use market incentives and education efforts (Brigham 2018), and they work collaboratively across sectors. In the global economy, the economic system for recycling will only be successful if there is a demand for recycled products from consumers (Biddle 1993; Biddle and Baehler 2018). This demand from consumers is needed to encourage investment from manufacturers that will make products from recycled materials. One issue with the demand curve for materials made from recycled products is a lack of knowledge in consumers about what products are actually environmentally friendly. Millennials are much more environmentally inclined than previous generations and are strongly tied to social media marketing techniques (Dabija and Bejan 2018). Using data analysis from web activity, advertisements for recycled products could be aimed at people that demonstrate a demand for these products. If an increase in market demand to match the market supply is desired, then the national or state government can play a role in demand-side subsidies in order to promote market demand (Xiao et al. 2022). In a time of global environmental change, it is a duty of corporations and national governments, who create the majority of pollution, to promote lifestyle and consumption changes in Americans. A demand-side subsidy split between consumers and producers would increase the demand and price received for recycled products.

Recycling is a human-constructed process in which there is an attempt to offset consumption externalities and allow for material recirculation instead of waste production. In both SESs and the recycling supply chain, sustainability is the goal, and collaboration is the way to reach that goal. Additionally, in both systems, people are driven to develop a sustainable system of governance of resources when the expected payoffs exceed the perceived costs (Ostrom 2009). In the case of recycling, people often weigh the opportunity costs of their time versus the perceived benefit of recycling. For example, some neighborhoods do not have curbside pickup for recyclables, requiring residents to drive somewhere that will take their materials. The opportunity costs of time, gas, and energy are known to the resident and can often be enough to outweigh the expected payoffs of reducing the use of virgin materials.

Although businesses typically consider the economic viability of their operations as the most significant, environmental and social sustainability must also be considered. The scope of sustainability includes the three spheres of economic, environmental, and social impacts, and an inclusion of environmental and social impacts in business models, especially when viewed as sources of competitive advantage, will allow for an achievement of more business and government enterprises that appeal to the public's demand for sustainability (Bennett 2017). In addition to satisfying the public demand and competitive advantage, there exist at least three other benefits to adopting sustainable business models: cost savings, avoiding legal liability, and being ahead of government regulation (Bennett 2017).

Regardless of the demand from consumers for recycled products, the supply side of the recycling market has room for change. On the supply side, there is competition between clean and virgin products, with virgin products often outselling recycled ones (Biddle and Baehler 2018). Recycled materials are often more contaminated than virgin materials and are viewed as being of lower quality and more expensive to produce as a result (Biddle and Baehler 2018). This makes companies wary of investment in recycled products because of the fear that recycled products will not be able to make as much of a profit. Even in the scrap metal recycling industry, which has seen collaboration between state and local governments and private companies, the costs were too high to be viable in the short term, and the process is both capital and labor intensive (Biddle and Baehler 2018). In order for a recycled products system to be viable, there needs to be a consistent stance on environmentally responsible products from government and NGOs alike. Demonstrated instances of success from this can be seen in the Buy Recycled Business Alliance in the United States, which is a collaboration effort between multiple industries and achieved approximately \$3 billion of profit in the first year (Biddle and Baehler 2018). A further example of successful collaboration exists in the public-private alliance of the German green-dot program, which funds the Duales System Deutschland (DSD), a national recycling company formed by German retailers that works alongside government recycling programs (Biddle and Baehler 2018).

There is economic, environmental, and social profit to be made from increased collaboration in the recycling market. These profits will most easily be achieved through collaborative management of the system at the proper spatial and temporal scales, and through market incentives in the government sector, and strides toward achieving competitive advantage in the private sector. Demand for recycled products can be achieved through proper advertising, and supply of these materials can increase if purchasing companies push for competitive prices of recycled materials (Biddle and Baehler 2018). Profit and proper management in the recycling supply chain are not only achievable but also necessary for sustainability.

9 | Meaningful Work for PWB

Research on the employment inclusion of people with disabilities represents a critical domain for scholarship in business and society. Disability and work are fundamentally a workplace equality issue, as access to meaningful employment is a central

mechanism through which individuals participate fully in economic and social life. From this perspective, disability inclusion extends beyond compliance with legislation and requires coordinated responses across business, government, and civil society actors.

The employment inclusion of people with disabilities has become a central concern in contemporary organizations (Shore 1995; Beatty et al. 2019; Maini and Heera 2019; Van der Zwan and de Beer 2021). The United Nations (2006, 4) defines people with disabilities as individuals with “long-term physical, mental, intellectual, or sensory impairments which, in interaction with various barriers, may hinder their full and effective participation in society on an equal basis with others.” This definition underscores that disability-related employment barriers are not solely individual but emerge from the interaction between individuals and their social, organizational, and institutional environments (Corrigan and Shapiro 2010; Parker et al. 2014; Perez-Macias and Fernandez 2022). Therefore, a holistic evaluation of disabilities can objectively identify the functional barriers that affect the employment status of individuals with disabilities (Chao et al. 2020).

This understanding of disability as an equality issue is reflected in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, where reducing inequalities and promoting decent work are articulated as interconnected goals (United Nations 2015). Rather than treating disability as a stand-alone social concern, the Agenda emphasizes inclusion as a cross-cutting principle that requires coordinated action across sectors.

Barriers to employment inclusion operate at multiple levels. At the individual level, barriers arise from the interaction between a person's impairments and the working environment. These barriers are exacerbated by a lack of workplace accommodations, making it difficult for people with disabilities to maintain employment (Choe and Baldwin 2017). At the organizational level, unclear policies, limited managerial capabilities, and tensions between individualized support and performance goals constrain inclusion efforts (McDowell et al. 2022). At the institutional and cultural levels, stigma, societal attitudes, and national value systems shape both employer behavior and the effectiveness of legislation (Corrigan and Shapiro 2010; Bhaskar et al. 2023; Thomas et al. 2024).

Taken together, the multilevel nature of these barriers suggests that no single actor, whether firms, governments, or civil society organizations, can effectively address disability employment inclusion in isolation. The need for cross-sector collaboration becomes evident when examining national approaches to disability employment inclusion.

The United States has a comprehensive legislative framework that safeguards the rights of individuals with disabilities, notably through the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). This legislation prohibits discrimination and mandates reasonable workplace accommodations. Furthermore, federal and state programs exist to reinforce the employment inclusion of people with disabilities. Blanck (2019) highlights that the ADA provides a clear and comprehensive national mandate for the elimination of discrimination against individuals

with disabilities, promoting their inclusion in education, employment, and other aspects of society. According to Ali et al. (2011), American culture, with its strong emphasis on individual rights and equal opportunities, underpins the effective implementation and enforcement of inclusive policies. This cultural context fosters an environment where people with disabilities are empowered to assert their rights and engage fully in the workforce (Ali et al. 2011). Together, these elements illustrate how a strong legal framework, combined with cultural norms emphasizing individual rights, creates conditions in which cross-sector collaboration can reinforce employment inclusion outcomes.

Spain has implemented various policies aimed at the social and employment integration of people with disabilities, including employment quotas and sheltered employment and training programs. Despite these efforts, significant challenges in execution and effectiveness persist. Cultural barriers, such as overprotection within the family and community, hinder full inclusion (Perez-Conesa et al. 2020). This cultural emphasis on family and community can limit the autonomy of people with disabilities, restricting their employment opportunities and active participation in society. Additionally, Citarella et al. (2020) highlight that the Spanish legal framework for disability, rooted in its Constitutional Charter, transposes major UN and EU supranational legislation. This framework includes laws such as the Law of Social Integration of Disabled Persons (LISMI), the General Law of Equality of Opportunity, Non-Discrimination, and Universal Accessibility (LIONDAU), and the General Law on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (LGD), which collectively aim to ensure the protection, integration, and full participation of people with disabilities in Spanish society. The Spanish case illustrates how formal regulation alone is insufficient without complementary cultural change and coordinated action among families, employers, public agencies, and third-sector organizations.

In the Netherlands, employment policy for people with disabilities has been studied extensively, noted for its comprehensive approach addressing both physical and attitudinal barriers. According to Shoemaker et al. (2019), policies in the Netherlands promote employment inclusion through comprehensive public health and foresight reports that inform decision-making processes and incorporate diverse societal norms and values. This progressive and inclusive approach reflects Dutch culture, which facilitates the acceptance and adaptation of policies that promote the inclusion of people with disabilities. The Dutch approach involves a novel co-creation process, engaging over 100 stakeholders from various sectors, to integrate different societal norms and values in describing possible future developments. This participatory approach ensures that developed policies reflect a wide range of social perspectives and promote greater inclusion. Shoemaker et al. (2014) identified four key societal challenges: keeping people healthy as long as possible and curing illness promptly, supporting vulnerable people and enabling social participation, promoting individual autonomy and freedom of choice, and keeping healthcare affordable. This co-creation approach exemplifies the type of collaborative ecosystem emphasized in this paper, where shared governance and stakeholder participation are central to policy effectiveness.

Beyond Western contexts, research on social inclusion further reinforces the importance of empowerment-based and community-driven approaches to disability employment. Mason and Weber (2021) identified key predictors of social inclusion in Vietnam, emphasizing the importance of empowerment and livelihood factors. Their findings suggest that community-based rehabilitation programs should focus on activities that promote empowerment and improve the livelihoods of people with disabilities to increase their social inclusion. These principles can be applied in other cultural contexts, such as the Netherlands, the United States, and Spain, to enhance the social and employment inclusion of people with disabilities (Mason and Weber 2021). To address the global employment gap between people with and without disabilities, it is essential to move beyond a deficit approach to disability, as highlighted by Lundberg (2024), who explores how frontline workers and activist entrepreneurs in Norway emphasize the assets and contributions of people with disabilities rather than their needs and challenges.

Taken together, these examples illustrate how disability employment inclusion cannot be addressed through firm-level action or regulation alone. Instead, it requires a collaborative ecosystem involving employers, public agencies, NGOs, and community actors. This aligns closely with the paper's broader argument that cross-sector collaboration reflects a new logic of organizing in business–society relations, one that emphasizes communion over agency, asset-based approaches over deficit models, and shared responsibility over isolated action.

10 | Findings and Analysis and Implications

Collaboration is a response to a turbulent environment. It is becoming more cross sector. Each of the detailed examples is a response to a challenge. Industry self-regulation is industries and professions, through third-party organizations, having a sense they can come up with better standards and self-police. Recycling is collaboration around disposables that have value in reuse if a supply chain can be created. It is market making. And the creation of employment opportunities for PWB by reducing barriers happens if the sectors work together. All these examples fit into a new realization that going it alone may not be sufficient for addressing issues that require different skills, resources, and perspectives. It represents new logics and values. Table 1 highlights these common threads.

Cross-sector collaboration works when stakeholders are at the table, and when outcomes/goals are defined. Community is created (Ostrom 1990). The parties are mindful to focus on assets, not needs, new skill development at the community level, and emerging leadership competencies in catalyzing collaboration (Toomer et al. 2018).

From the collaboration examples here it suggests that for complex issues, working alone is not sufficient. Using the new logics of a wholistic, non-zero-sum game, a wider framework creates more options. It sets the stage for Werhane's (1999) idea of moral imagination. Complexity requires broader thinking. Because many issues are not sector specific, individuals need to be at the table and have an opportunity to express their voice (Calton and Lad 1995).

TABLE 1 | Collaboration examples—challenge, logic, outcomes.

Example	Challenge	Collaboration type	New logics	Outcome
Industry self-regulation	Regulate and license professionals; set standards	Multi-sector collaboration; create third-party organization	Work across boundaries; “both and” thinking	Expanded role for associations and professional societies to set standards; ongoing cooperation; shared enforcement
Recycling	Limited incentives to recycle for consumers and citizens; poor infrastructure for integrating recycled material in supply chain	Expanded role for municipal waste systems; citizen involvement; frequently the creation of a new social enterprise	Both and thinking; engagement; local solutions; stakeholder voice	Engagement; variety of different systems; best practices
Disabilities and work	Barriers to employment; limited support systems around employment	Multi-sector entrepreneurial model creation of sheltered workshops and social enterprises	Use assets, not needs model; differences not opposites; wholistic thinking	Programs, social enterprises; unique organization forms

Consider what brings people to the table to work together—a catalytic event, a conversation, an invitation, a recognition that more minds at the table may create a better outcome. Using the new logics, the findings here support theory advances. At the individual level and specifically for leaders, it broadens their perspective—seeing and framing a challenging issue as something that can be tackled if others are engaged. It is wholistic, and it is a search for a win-win solution.

At the firm level, stakeholder theory is supported and operationalized as more people are brought to the table. Stakeholder voice is expressed (Calton and Lad 1995). At the network level, the wholistic view and the embracing of interdependence are supported. Supply chain players have seen this as co-opetition (Flynn et al. 2010). It is ecosystems thinking (Jacobides et al. 2018).

11 | Future Research

Consistent with Pedersen et al. (2021), collaboration can address more wicked problems. As a starting point, we can explore successful supply chains to understand how they have moved from simply transactional to co-design and innovation. Are there elements of these business-to-business relationships that could apply to cross-sector partnerships?

At the interorganizational level, further work in this area could examine the collaborative mechanisms for disaster relief and environmental response to accidents. In many cases, the crisis management plan is practiced in simulations, so the parties are ready when disaster hits. Collaboration is happening in the sustainability domain in the process of agreeing to and using sustainability metrics and standards. Additionally, collaborative action is required for refugee resettlement and investigations of human rights violations.

In US college sports, the Name, Image, and Likeness (NIL) practices represent an opportunity to collaborate to get ahead of the issue before more restrictive legislation is passed. From our look at industry self-regulation, it might suggest that a third-party organization other than the NCAA is needed to manage the process.

As the potential and pitfalls for AI are emerging, some ethical guardrails are needed. We can expect that industry, government, and NGO players need to convene to both reassure consumers and communities and address the known dark sides of this technology. Protests over locating data centers and mass layoffs by the big tech companies using AI as the excuse for downsizing create confusion and resistance. Might a more collaborative approach be warranted?

Finally, in exploring community economic development, cross-sector collaboration is evident in creating affordable and multi-use housing, securing employment for the formerly incarcerated and PWB, and zoning changes. Consider, for example, how cities come together to host a Super Bowl, a Final Four tournament, or an Olympics. We could ask whether there are lessons from this large-scale collaboration that might inform the process on a smaller scale.

12 | Final Thoughts

In conclusion, the cases presented in this paper demonstrate that interinstitutional collaboration is not merely a strategic option but a structural and ethical imperative in contemporary market economies. Across sectors—from industry self-regulation to circular economy initiatives and inclusive employment—cooperation enables organizations to address shared risks, create collective value, and reconcile competitive dynamics with long-term sustainability and legitimacy.

These examples further show that ethical responsibility must be embedded within institutional and organizational practices. Coordinated governance, normative frameworks, and deliberate collaborative arrangements extend the scope of market activity beyond compliance, aligning private objectives with societal and environmental imperatives, and reinforcing the common good.

Clearly, more research is needed to understand collaboration in the broadest sense. The business and society challenge is to capture an array of narratives about the variety of examples offered here. Inquiring into how organizations learn, how communities evolve and regroup is essential. Examining differences across cultures, across sectors, and across industries is a starting point. It will be useful to know whether particular NGOs are better suited as partners, or, how leadership emerges in these settings. Additionally, there is a leadership and management question about the forethought and perseverance required of those who form these partnerships, which are becoming an essential element of economic development and community making.

Ultimately, the evidence confirms that the simultaneous cultivation of collaboration and competition is essential to building socioeconomic systems that are sustainable, inclusive, and just. By fostering cooperative practices across ecological, economic, and social domains, organizations help create a world where innovation, resilience, and human dignity coexist—demonstrating that markets and societies thrive when collaboration becomes both a moral and strategic foundation.

Funding

The authors have nothing to report.

Data Availability Statement

Data sharing not applicable to this article as no datasets were generated or analysed during the current study.

References

- Ali, M., L. Schur, and P. Blanck. 2011. “What Types of Jobs Do People With Disabilities Want?” *Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation* 21: 199–210.
- Astley, W. G., and C. J. Fombrum. 1983. “Collective Strategy: Social Ecology of Organization Environments.” *Academy of Management Review* 84: 576–587.
- Austrom, D., and L. J. Lad. 1989. “Issues Management Alliances: New Responses, New Values, and New Logics.” *Research in Corporate Social Performance and Policy* 11: 233–255.

- Baken, D. 1966. *The Duality of Human Existence*. Beacon Press.
- Beatty, J., D. Baldrige, S. Boehm, M. Kulkarni, and A. Colella. 2019. "On the Treatment of Persons With Disabilities in Organizations: A Review and Research Agenda." *Human Resource Management* 58, no. 2: 119–137.
- Becker, J., and D. B. Smith. 2018. "The Need for Cross-Sector Collaboration." *Stanford Social Innovation Review* 16, no. 1: C2–C3.
- Bennett, R. B. 2017. "A Sustainability Manifesto." *Midwest Law Journal* 27: 1.
- Bhaskar, A., Y. Baruch, and S. Gupta. 2023. "Drivers of Career Success Among the Visually Impaired: Improving Career Inclusivity and Sustainability in a Career Ecosystem." *Human Relations* 76, no. 101: 1507–1544.
- Biddle, D. 1993. "Recycling for Profit: The New Green Business Frontier." *Harvard Business Review* 71, no. 6: 145–155.
- Biddle, J. C., and K. J. Baehler. 2018. "Governance for Adaptive Capacity and Resilience in the US Water Sector." *Ecology and Society*.
- Blanck, P. 2019. "Why America is Better off Because of the Americans With Disabilities Act and the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act." *Touro Law Review* 35: 605.
- Brigham, K. 2018. "How San Francisco Sends Less Trash to the Landfill Than Any Other Major U.S. City." CNBC, CNBC, 14 July 2018. www.cnbc.com/2018/07/13/how-san-francisco-became-a-global-leader-in-waste-management.html.
- Calton, J. M., and L. J. Lad. 1995. "Social Contracting as a Trust-Building Process of Network Governance." *Business Ethics Quarterly* 5, no. 2: 271–295. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3857357>.
- Capra, F. 1982. *The Turning Point*. Simon & Schuster.
- Capra, F. 1996. *The Web of Life: A New Scientific Understanding of Living Systems*. Anchor Books.
- United Nations. 2006. *Convention on the Rights of Persons With Disabilities*.
- Castañer, X., and N. Oliveira. 2020. "Collaboration, Coordination, and Cooperation Among Organizations: Establishing the Distinctive Meanings of These Terms Through a Systematic Literature Review." *Journal of Management* 46, no. 6: 965–1001.
- Chao, P., S. Huang, R. Escorpizo, et al. 2020. "Effects of Hearing Disability on Employment Status Using WHODAS 2.0 in Taiwan." *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 17, no. 24: 9374.
- Choe, C., and M. Baldwin. 2017. "Duration of Disability, Job Mismatch, and Employment Outcomes." *Applies Economics* 49, no. 10: 1001–1015.
- Citarella, A., A. Iglesias, S. Ballester, et al. 2020. "Being Disabled in Spain: Policies, Stakeholders and Services." *Revisa INFAD de Psicología. International Journal of Educational Psychology* 1, no. 1: 507–516.
- Coopridge, D., and D. Whitney. 2005. *Appreciative Inquiry: A Positive Revolution in Change*. Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Corrigan, P., and J. Shapiro. 2010. "Measuring the Impact of Programs the Challenge the Public Stigma of Mental Illness." *Clinical Psychology Review* 30, no. 8: 907–922.
- Cummings, T. 1984. "Transorganizational Development." *Research in Organizational Behavior* 6: 367–422.
- Dabija, D.-C., and B. M. Bejan. 2018. "Green DIY Store Choice Among Socially Responsible Consumer Generations." *International Journal of Corporate Social Responsibility* 3, no. 1: 13. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40991-018-0037-0>.
- Daniels, E. J., J. A. Carpenter, C. Duranceau, M. Fisher, C. Wheeler, and G. Winslow. 2004. "Sustainable End-of-Life Vehicle Recycling: R&D Collaboration Between Industry and the U.S. DOE." *JOM* 56, no. 8: 28–32. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11837-004-0177-4>.
- Darwin, C. 1859. "The Origin of Species."
- Flynn, B. B., B. Huo, and X. Zhao. 2010. "The Impact of Supply Chain Integration on Performance: A Contingency and Configuration Approach." *Journal of Operations Management* 28, no. 1: 58–71.
- Freeman, R. E. 1984. *Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach*. Cambridge University press.
- Gray, A. 2017. "Germany Recycles More Than Any Other Country." World Economic Forum, 18 December 2017, www.weforum.org/agenda/2017/12/germany-recycles-more-than-any-other-country/.
- Gray, B., and J. Purdy. 2018. *Collaborating for Our Future: Multistakeholder Partnerships for Solving Complex Problems*. Oxford University Press.
- Gupta, A., and L. Lad. 1983. "Industry Self-Regulation: An Economic, Organization, and Political Review." *Academy of Management Review* 8, no. 3: 416–425.
- Hart, S. 2024. *Beyond Shareholder Primacy: Remaking Capitalism for a Sustainable Future*. Stanford University Press.
- Jacobides, M. G., C. Cennamo, and A. Gawer. 2018. "Towards a Theory of Ecosystems." *Strategic Management Journal* 39, no. 8: 2255–2276.
- Johnson, S. 2010. *Where Good Ideas Come From: The Natural History of Innovation*. Riverhead Books.
- Kegan, R. 1998. *In Over Our Heads: The Mental Demands of Modern Life*. Harvard University Press.
- Koop, F. 2023. "Why Is Recycling so Important? The Dirty Truth Behind Our Trash." ZME Science. <https://www.zmescience.com/feature-post/technology-articles/sustainability/green-living-1/why-is-recycling-so-important/>.
- Lad, L. J., and C. B. Caldwell. 2009. "Collaborative Standards, Voluntary Codes and Industry Self-Regulation: The Role of Third-Party Organizations." *Journal of Corporate Citizenship* 35: 67–80.
- Lenox, M., and J. Nash. 2003. "Industry Self Regulation and Adverse Selection: A Comparison Across Four Trade Association Programs." *Business Strategy and the Environment* 12: 343–356.
- Liedtka, J. 2018. "Why Design Thinking Works." *Harvard Business Review* 96, no. 5: 72–79.
- Lodge, G. C. 1975. "The New American Ideology."
- Lundberg, C. 2024. "Striving to Abolish a Deficit Approach to Disability: Frames Applies by Frontline Workers and Activist Entrepreneurs in Employment." *Disability and Society* 39, no. 7: 1725–1746.
- Maini, A., and S. Heera. 2019. "Exploring Disability Inclusion in Organizations Through a Managerial Lens." *Vision* 23, no. 2: 144–151.
- Maruyama, M. 1976. *Towards Cultural Symbiosis in Jantsch and Waddington Evolution and Consciousness: Human Systems in Transition*. Addison Wesley.
- Mason, C., and J. Weber. 2021. "What Predictors are Associated With Social Inclusion of People With Disabilities? A Comparison of Community-Based Rehabilitation Participants to the General Population in Vietnam." *Disability and Rehabilitation* 43, no. 6: 815–822.
- McDowell, C., E. Fossey, and C. Harvey. 2022. "Moving Clients Forward: A Grounded Theory of Disability Employment Specialists Views and Practices." *Disability and Rehabilitation* 44, no. 19: 5504–5512.
- Miller, A. 1985. "Technological Thinking: Its Impact on Environmental Management." *Environmental Management* 9: 179–190.
- Nidumolu, R., J. Ellison, J. Whalen, and E. Billman. 2014. "The Collaboration Imperative." *Harvard Business Review* 92, no. 4: 76–84.
- Olson, M. 1965. *The Logic of Collective Action*. Harvard University Press.

- Ostrom, E. 1990. *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. Cambridge University Press.
- Ostrom, E. 2009. "A General Framework for Analyzing Sustainability of Social-Ecological Systems." *Science* 325, no. 5939: 419–422. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1172133>.
- Ostrom, E., J. Burger, C. B. Field, R. B. Norgaard, and D. Policansky. 1999. "Revisiting the Commons: Local Lessons, Global Challenges." *Science* 284, no. 5412: 278–282. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.284.5412.278>.
- Ouchi, W. G. 2012. "Markets, Bureaucracies, and Clans." In *The Roots of Logistics*, 411–427. Springer.
- Parker, S., M. Renko, and K. Caldwell. 2014. "Social Entrepreneurship as an Employment Pathway for People With Disabilities: Exploring Political, Economic, and Socio-Cultural Factors." *Disability and Society* 29, no. 8: 1275–1290.
- Pedersen, E. R. G., F. Lüdeke-Freund, I. Henriques, and M. M. Seitanidi. 2021. "Toward Collaborative Cross-Sector Business Models for Sustainability." *Business & Society* 60, no. 5: 1039–1058.
- Perez-Conesa, F., M. Romeo, and M. Yepes-Baldo. 2020. "Labour Inclusion of People With Disabilities in Spain: The Effect of Policies and Human Resource Management Systems." *International Journal of Human Resource Management* 31, no. 6: 785–804.
- Perez-Macias, N., and J. L. Fernandez. 2022. "Personal and Contextual Factors Influencing the Entrepreneurial Intentions of Persons With Disabilities in Spain." *Disability and Society* 37, no. 7: 1216–1238.
- Ring, P. S., and A. H. Van de Ven. 1992. "Structuring Cooperative Relationships Between Organizations." *Strategic Management Journal* 13, no. 7: 483–498.
- Schermerhorn, J. R. 1979. "Interorganizational Development." *Journal of Management* 5, no. 1: 21–38.
- Schrempf-Stirling, J., H. J. Van Buren III, and F. Wettstein. 2022. "Human Rights: A Promising Perspective for Business & Society." *Business & Society* 61, no. 5: 1282–1321.
- Shoemaker, C., J. Van Loon, P. Achterberg, et al. 2019. "The Public Health Status and Foresight Report 2014: Four Normative Perspectives on a Healthier Netherlands in 2040." *Health Policy* 123, no. 3: 252–259.
- Shore, W. 1995. *Revolution of the Heart*. Riverhead Press.
- Thomas, D., A. Muibi, A. Hsu, et al. 2024. "Cultural Variation in Hiring People With Disabilities: A Theory and Preliminary Test." *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*.
- Toomer, J., C. Caldwell, S. Weitenkorn, and C. Clark. 2018. *The Catalytic Effect*. Emerald Publishing.
- United Nations. 2015. "Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development." <https://sdgs.un.org/2030agenda>.
- Vaill, P. B. 1996. *Learning as a Way of Being: Strategies for Survival in a World of Permanent White Water*. Jossey-Bass.
- R. van der Zwan, and P. de Beer. 2021. "The Disability Employment Gap in European Countries: What is the Role of Labour Market Policy." *Journal of European Social Policy* 31, no. 4: 473–486.
- Waddock, S. 1991. "Social Entrepreneurs and Catalytic Change." *Public Administration Review* 51, no. 5: 1–9.
- Waddock, S. 2020. *Transforming Towards Life-Centered Economies: How Business, Government, and Civil Society Can Build a Better World*. Business Expert Press.
- Waddock, S., and M. McIntosh. 2013. "The UN Global Compact: Retrospect and Prospect." *Business and Society* 52, no. 1: 6–30.
- Werhane, P. H. 1999. *Moral Imagination and Management Decision-Making*. Oxford University Press.
- Williamson, O. E. 1996. *The Mechanisms of Governance*. Oxford University Press.
- Xiao, S., X. Chang, and M. Chen. 2022. "Altruistic Preference and Government Subsidies in a Manufacturing-Recycling System With Eco-Design." *Journal of Cleaner Production* 359: 132095. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2022.132095>.