Designing Agency

Tools for Regenerative Business Practice

Discussion Paper IV: Tools for Transformation

Author
Adina-Iuliana Deacu

RIFS Discussion Paper
Potsdam
March 2026

This paper is part of a six-paper series that examines how regenerative economic systems can emerge by connecting systemic diagnosis (Paper I), conceptual redefinition of business purpose (Paper II), psychological preconditions for transformation (Paper III), practical tools for cultivating agency (Paper IV), and enterprise architectures capable of stabilizing these capacities in practice (Paper V), before examining the policy environments required for wider adoption (Paper VI).

Summary

How can personal and collective capacity-building be translated into systemic redesign through epistemic tools and prototype organizations? Despite growing awareness of the need for systemic change, sustainability transitions remain constrained by a persistent gap between knowledge and action. Paper III identified the psychological infrastructures that limit imagination, cooperation, and long-term decision-making. Yet diagnosing these constraints alone does not generate pathways for transformation. The challenge is therefore translational: how can individuals and communities begin to act differently within environments that continue to reproduce existing logics?

This paper addresses this gap by introducing four epistemic tools developed through practice within Tianmei World Academy (TWA), a decentralized, cross-cultural, and cross-disciplinary educational platform: the Invisible Backpack, the Centre of My Environment, the Action–Reaction Model, and the Puzzle Mindset. These tools function as repeatable scaffolds for reflective sensemaking and relational coordination, enabling individuals to reinterpret constraints, restore perceived agency, and experiment with alternative patterns of action within existing systems.

Rather than proposing a universal methodology, the paper conceptualizes these tools as epistemic infrastructures that support the gradual development of agency, relational resilience, and collaborative capacity under conditions shaped by extractive systems. By making internalized assumptions, reactive patterns, and relational dynamics visible, the tools help interrupt the cycles of scarcity thinking and defensive behaviour identified in Paper III, while simultaneously creating the conditions for new forms of coordination and value creation to emerge.

In this way, the paper reframes capacity-building as a form of systemic intervention and positions epistemic tools as micro-infrastructures for regenerative practice. These practices enable the emergence of prototype organizations capable of aligning internal culture with external purpose, preparing the ground for Paper V, which examines how such capacities can be stabilized within enterprise architectures aligned with the redefined purpose of business proposed in Paper II.

Supported by

The research for this discussion paper has been supported by the Research Institute for Sustainability (RIFS) at GFZ during Adina Iuliana Deacu's Klaus Töpfer Sustainability Fellowship from April 2025 until March 2026.

Contents

1 Introduction

Bridging Inner Capacity and Systemic Redesign

Sustainability transitions literature increasingly recognizes the role of experimentation, learning, and social innovation in enabling systemic change (Geels & Schot, 2007; Westley, 2013). Yet many initiatives struggle to translate conceptual frameworks into sustained organizational practice. Pilot projects frequently remain isolated, depend on charismatic leadership, or fail to scale learning beyond local contexts (Smith & Stirling, 2018). This persistent gap between theory and practice reflects the absence of infrastructures that support embodied learning and processes capable of translating cognitive understanding into durable behavioural and institutional change.

The preceding papers in this series outline the conceptual foundations of this challenge. Paper I diagnosed profit-centric economic logic as an invisible environmental designer producing systemic harm across urban, psychological, educational, and ecological domains. Paper II proposed a paradigmatic redefinition of business as an entity that solves social problems and creates social value in a financially sustainable way, shifting the purpose of economic activity from extraction toward regeneration. Paper III then revealed a critical implementation barrier: even when intellectual commitment to change exists, trauma, scarcity cognition, collective nervous system dysregulation, and unexamined money psychology can prevent individuals and institutions from enacting regenerative paradigms. Together, these dynamics create a translational void between understanding what must change and developing the capacity to enact that change in practice.

This paper addresses that void. It functions as the translational layer between the inner psychological preconditions for change examined in Paper III and the organizational and economic design implications explored in Paper V. It argues that sustainability transitions cannot occur through conceptual reframing alone. Without learning infrastructures that convert awareness into embodied capability, systemic change efforts remain trapped in what was described as the value–action gap in previous papers. However, this gap should not be interpreted as an individual failure of will or knowledge but as a structural condition produced by environments that undermine agency, relational capacity, and long-term thinking.

Design research offers important insights into how such barriers can be addressed. Tools, artifacts, and environments shape how knowledge becomes actionable in practice (Cross, 2006; Escobar, 2018; Schön, 1983). Environmental psychology similarly demonstrates that learning and behaviour are embedded within spatial, social, and symbolic contexts that influence perception, motivation, and interaction (Chawla, 2022; Gifford, 2014). From this perspective, operationalizing regenerative paradigms requires the deliberate design of learning infrastructures that cultivate agency, relational intelligence, and systemic awareness.

Drawing on embodied cognition (Varela et al., 2016), decolonial and Indigenous pedagogies (Simpson, 2017; Tuhiwai Smith, 2022), and participatory design research (Escobar, 2018; Manzini, 2015), this paper introduces four epistemic tools—the Centre of My Environment, Action–Reaction Model, Invisible Backpack, and Puzzle Mindset—as scaffolds for developing these capacities. The concept of scaffolding originates in sociocultural learning theory (Vygotskij & Cole, 1981) and refers to temporary structures that support the development of higher-order cognitive and relational abilities until they become internalized. In regenerative practice, such scaffolds function as architectures of possibility: they create environments in which individuals and groups can experiment with new ways of thinking, relating, and acting before those practices become habitual.

These tools constitute a central component of TWA's Theory of Change, which is grounded in systems thinking: every majority was once a minority, and every minority began with a single individual. Accordingly, TWA focuses on supporting individuals who are ready for change to become leaders by example. By embodying alternative paradigms in their own practices and decisions, these individuals seed new social norms that can spread through networks and communities. Individuals who engage with the tools are therefore encouraged not only to reflect on alternative values but also to enact them in everyday contexts, within their communities, teams, and organizations.

As these micro-practices circulate through networks and repeated participation, they can accumulate into a critical mass of changemakers capable of influencing social norms, institutional arrangements, and prevailing economic assumptions. The tools presented in this paper are designed to support this scaling logic by enabling individuals to experiment with and embody new patterns of value creation, collaboration, and sufficiency. In doing so, they expand the range of practices that become socially and institutionally imaginable.

Specifically, the tools aim to cultivate capacities that extractive systems systematically erode but that regenerative systems require:

- Agency and self-awareness, countering learned helplessness
- Relational intelligence and cooperative capability, countering hyper-competition
- Environmental authorship and participatory design, countering passivity
- Resilience and systems-responsive action, countering reactivity and short-termism

While this paper focuses on the role of such tools in capacity-building, Paper V will examine how these capacities were translated into the institutional architecture of TWA as a practical example of how the redefinition of business proposed in Paper II can be operationalized. In this paper, the emphasis remains on capacity-building as a foundational precondition for transformation, as capacity development represents the often-overlooked “how” of systemic change.

By foregrounding this dimension, this paper responds to growing scholarly calls for a “practice turn” in sustainability transitions research (Shove & Walker, 2010; Strengers, 2014) and for learning infrastructures that recognize plural ways of knowing (Kimmerer, 2020; B. D. S. Santos, 2018). Rather than treating social and ecological crises solely as technical or policy challenges, this approach emphasizes the cultivation of human capacities necessary to enact alternative paradigms.

The remainder of the paper is structured accordingly. Section 2 clarifies the role of tools as epistemic infrastructure within sustainability transitions. Section 3 introduces the four tools, their theoretical foundations. and examines the capacities these tools cultivate. Section 4 establishes the universality of the tools across different traditions, Section 5 analyses their system dynamics for organizational prototyping. Section 6 discusses implications for practitioners and institutions seeking to operationalize regenerative paradigms.

Presented in a deliberate developmental sequence, from cultivating personal agency (Centre of My Environment), to navigating relational dynamics (Action–Reaction Model), to understanding internal narratives (Invisible Backpack), and finally to enabling collaborative co-creation (Puzzle Mindset), the tools together form a pathway from inner transformation to systemic redesign. By bridging inner readiness and outer institutional change, this paper proposes a methodological missing link for moving from critique to enactment in sustainability transitions.

2 Why Tools: Epistemic Infrastructure for Paradigm Enactment

The persistent failure of well-intentioned sustainability and equity initiatives is not only a problem of strategy or willpower, but an epistemic one. While the paradigmatic redefinition of business proposed in Paper II is essential for mapping alternative futures, it risks remaining inert if the psychological terrain documented in Paper III is ignored. Conceptual frameworks can clarify what must change, but they cannot, on their own, shift the stress-amplifying conditions, cognitive overload, and relational distrust that prevent individuals and organizations from enacting new paradigms. Without addressing these barriers, even the most compelling framework will be absorbed into the value-action gap. This section therefore argues that the transition from diagnosis to redesign requires a fundamental shift from a framework-centric to a tool-centric approach to transformation. Tools function as structured practices that operate within the embodied, relational, and context-sensitive dimensions of knowing where change actually resides and, crucially, they can be sequenced to scaffold a developmental arc from personal agency to systemic co-creation.

This argument rests on four interconnected barriers identified in Paper III and confirmed by cross-disciplinary research.

First, chronic stress and trauma shape how individuals perceive risk, authority, and possibility. Trauma should not be understood solely as individual pathology but as a consequence of historical, economic, and ecological conditions that shape neurophysiological regulation (Maté, 2022; Menakem, 2017). Such conditions predispose individuals toward reactive survival strategies rather than cooperative, long-term problem-solving. Legacies of colonialism and racial capitalism are carried somatically, producing collective dispositions of hypervigilance and distrust that cannot be addressed through policy frameworks alone (Chapman & Withers, 2019).

Second, scarcity cognition constrains decision-making capacity. Whether material or perceived, scarcity captures cognitive bandwidth and narrows temporal horizons, encouraging zero-sum thinking and undermining collaborative, regenerative approaches (Mullainathan & Shafir, 2014; Sen, 1999). When individuals operate under persistent conditions of financial, temporal, or psychological scarcity the capacity for long-term planning and cooperative innovation is significantly reduced.

Third, cognitive overload and epistemic inertia limit reflective learning. The acceleration of digital capitalism and performance cultures fragments attention and compresses time for reflection (Wajcman, 2015). These conditions undermine the sustained inquiry required for double-loop learning: the questioning of underlying assumptions and mental models (Argyris & Schön, 1978). This challenge is further compounded by what Boaventura de Sousa Santos (2018) describes as epistemicide: the suppression of non-Western knowledge systems that offer relational and place-based approaches to knowledge and change. Tools can help counter these dynamics by creating repeatable practices that protect space for reflection, relational learning, and plural ways of knowing.

Finally, relational fragmentation undermines collective action. Without psychological safety (Edmondson, 2019) and relational trust (Metz, 2011), organizations default to defensive routines and conflict avoidance. Hierarchical and competitive structures often reproduce the very dynamics of separation and distrust that transformative initiatives aim to overcome.

Organizational learning theory affirms that durable transformation requires iterative cycles of concrete experience, reflection, conceptualization, and experimentation (Kolb, 1984). Yet these cycles are short-circuited in environments that lack the scaffolding to support them. A framework provides a map; a tool provides a practice for learning to navigate. This distinction draws on diverse intellectual traditions that inform the toolkit presented in this paper. Knowledge is not abstractly represented but enacted through sensorimotor engagement with the world (Varela et al., 2016). Tools therefore function as interfaces through which new cognitive, emotional, and relational patterns can be rehearsed and embodied. African philosopher and psychologist Augustine Nwoye (2017) emphasizes within ubuntu

psychology that transformation is a communal and performative process rather than a purely cognitive one. A developmental sequence of tools enables these capacities to be cultivated progressively, moving from individual awareness toward collective practice.

Decolonial and Indigenous pedagogies reinforce this perspective by emphasizing that knowledge is relational, storied, and embedded in lived practice. Scholars such as Linda Tuhiwai Smith (2022) and Leanne Betasamosake Simpson (2017) show how Indigenous epistemologies treat knowledge as inseparable from relationships among people, land, and community. Practices such as Māori whakapapa or Anishinaabe debwewin function as living tools that situate individuals within broader ecological and cultural systems. Similarly, decolonial design theorist Arturo Escobar (2018) advocates for autonomous design: the creation of tools and artifacts through which communities enact place-based alternatives to dominant development paradigms. Sequenced tools honor this tradition by beginning with personal agency and gradually expanding into relational and collective capacities. The following sections will discuss the tools and the developmental sequence they form for organizational prototyping in detail.

3 Four Tools for Four Capacities: Applied Epistemologies for Systemic Transformation

As established in Section 2, conceptual frameworks alone cannot overcome the embodied, cognitive, and relational barriers that hinder systemic change. Change requires practices that enable people to enact new paradigms in everyday contexts. Design philosopher Tony Fry (2009) reminds us that tools are never neutral; they actively participate in shaping the kinds of worlds that become possible. In this sense, the sequence of tools presented here is intentionally oriented toward cultivating regenerative ways of being, supporting the gradual development of capacities that foster regenerative subjects, relationships, and environments through a scaffolded process of learning and practice.

3.1 Centre of My Environment: Cultivating Environmental Authorship to Counter Alienation and Passivity

The Centre of My Environment tool begins with a very simple insight with high transformative power: each individual operates as the Centre of their own lived environment. Every person interprets events, relationships, and spaces from a unique position of perception and experience. At the same time, this insight implies a profound interdependence. While each of us is the interpretive Centre of our own environment, we are simultaneously participants in the environments of others. Our actions, attitudes, and presence shape the social and psychological landscapes that those around us inhabit. Recognizing this dual reality, being both the Centre of one's own experience and a component of the environments of others, creates a foundation for understanding agency as relational rather than purely individual.

Within this framework, the concept of "Centre" does not imply control over external circumstances. Individuals cannot determine every event that affects them, nor can they fully control the actions of others or the structures of the systems in which they live. What remains irreducible, however, is the capacity to interpret events and to choose how to respond to them. Viktor Frankl articulated this principle in his observation that even under extreme conditions, the freedom to choose one's attitude toward circumstances remains intact (Frankl, 2006). The Centre of My Environment therefore reframes agency as interpretive and responsive authorship rather than domination or control.

Building on this foundation, the tool encourages individuals to move from passive reception of circumstances toward active environmental authorship. Engaging with this tool involves examining the immediate environments in which individuals live (e.g. physical spaces, social relationships, routines, and cognitive patterns) and to experiment with small acts of redesign that improve wellbeing, learning, and purposeful action. These interventions may involve reorganizing physical spaces, reshaping patterns of communication, or redefining personal routines that structure daily life. Through such practices, individuals can begin to perceive their surroundings as dynamic contexts that can be shaped through intentional participation, not as fixed structures imposed from outside.

This shift directly addresses the conditions described in Paper III, where alienation from place, loss of perceived control, and chronic environmental stress contribute to nervous system dysregulation, apathy, and learned helplessness. When people experience themselves as passive recipients of the "invisible environmental designer" described in Paper I, their capacity for initiative and engagement diminishes. The Centre of My Environment tool counters this dynamic by demonstrating that individuals and communities can act as co-authors of their environments. Even modest interventions can restore a sense of efficacy and open possibilities for collaborative change.

The theoretical grounding of this tool draws from environmental psychology, participatory design, and place-based education. Environmental psychology has consistently shown that perceived control over one's surroundings is strongly associated with improved mental health, motivation, and prosocial behaviour (Chawla, 2022; Evans, 2003; Gifford, 2014). Participatory design and transition design similarly emphasize that people are not merely users of systems but essential collaborators in shaping them (Irwin, 2015; Manzini, 2015). Critical place-based education extends this insight into the realm of learning by linking knowledge formation to the ecological and cultural contexts in which individuals live (Gruenewald, 2003; Tuck & McKenzie, 2015). Together, these theoretical insights converge on the idea that meaningful transformation emerges when individuals recognize their capacity to influence the environments they inhabit.

3.2 Action–Reaction Model: Cultivating Systems Awareness and Resilience to Counter Reactivity and Short-Termism

Building on the sense of agency cultivated through the Centre of My Environment, the Action–Reaction Model provides a practical roadmap for navigating relational and systemic dynamics. At its core, the model posits that while individuals cannot control the actions of others, they retain significant influence over their own reactions, and that this capacity for conscious response plays a decisive role in shaping the trajectory and quality of relationships and situations. Rather than viewing interactions as isolated events, the model reframes them as unfolding processes shaped by interdependent cycles of action and response.

Importantly, these exchanges are not neutral. Each action and reaction is conditioned by the internal narratives, past experiences, and embodied patterns carried by individuals—what this paper conceptualizes as the Invisible Backpack. Recognizing this transforms the model from a simple behavioural guideline into a dual-purpose epistemic tool. On the one hand, it fosters compassionate inquiry by encouraging individuals to suspend immediate judgment and consider the unseen factors that may be shaping another person's behaviour. On the other hand, it promotes reflexive accountability by inviting individuals to examine how their own actions, presence, or assumptions may have contributed to the responses they receive. In doing so, the model shifts attention away from linear blame attribution toward a more systemic understanding of relational dynamics.

By mapping these interlocking cycles of stimulus and response, the Action–Reaction Model cultivates resilience in the face of uncertainty and conflict. It introduces a deliberate pause between stimulus and response, creating space for more intentional, context-aware action. This capacity is particularly critical in environments characterized by time pressure, cognitive overload, and emotional stress identified in Paper III as drivers of impulsive reactivity, short-term thinking, and reduced relational capacity. Through repeated practice, individuals learn to transform reactive loops into opportunities for relational repair, learning, and co-creation, thereby strengthening both interpersonal dynamics and broader system functioning.

The model is grounded in multiple complementary theoretical traditions that reinforce its systemic orientation. Systems thinking emphasizes the importance of feedback loops, interdependencies, and reciprocal causality, challenging linear notions of cause and effect and highlighting how outcomes emerge from dynamic interactions (Meadows, 2011; Sterman, 2000). Emotional regulation research further distinguishes between automatic reactions and consciously chosen responses, demonstrating that the ability to regulate affective responses is central to adaptive behaviour and decision-making (Gross, 2015). Narrative and relational psychology contribute an additional layer of insight by showing how behaviour is shaped by internalized stories and past experiences, which influence how individuals interpret and respond to present situations (White & Epston, 1990). Finally, social-ecological resilience theory underscores the importance of iterative learning and adaptive response within complex systems, where feedback processes enable systems to reorganize and evolve over time (Folke et al., 2010).

Together, these perspectives reveal that actions and reactions are rarely purely rational or isolated choices; they are embedded within broader cognitive, emotional, and relational patterns that unfold across time. Engaging effectively with these patterns requires not only awareness of external dynamics but also insight into the internal conditioning that shapes perception and behaviour. For this reason, the Action–Reaction Model naturally leads into

the next tool in the developmental sequence, which focuses on making these internal narratives visible and open to transformation.

3.3 The Invisible Backpack: Cultivating Self-Awareness and Agency to Counter Internalized Scarcity and Trauma

The Invisible Backpack refers to the accumulated narratives, experiences, and emotional patterns that shape how individuals perceive themselves, others, and the world. These internalized influences, formed through personal history, cultural conditioning, and socio-economic environments, actively shape both our actions and reactions, as well as our interpretations of the actions of others. By making these influences visible, the tool creates the possibility for more conscious choice: individuals can begin to respond in ways aligned with their values and regenerative intentions, rather than being driven by unconscious patterns rooted in past experience.

At its core, the Invisible Backpack provides a structured yet self-paced process for externalizing these internal contents. This process helps surface how past experiences, cultural norms, emotional responses, and internalized economic narratives, particularly those linked to scarcity, competition, and self-worth as discussed in Paper III, shape everyday behaviour. By bringing these patterns into awareness, the tool reduces both the automaticity and the shame often associated with them. In doing so, it enables individuals to recognize that many fear-based behaviours, such as competitive hoarding, overwork, or perfectionism, are not inherent traits but learned responses to specific environmental conditions. This recognition is critical for disrupting the internalized scarcity logic that often contradicts stated intentions toward collaboration, sufficiency, and care.

The tool directly engages with the psychological barriers identified in Paper III, including unprocessed money narratives, scarcity scripts, and somaticized trauma. These internal dynamics frequently constrain individuals' ability to enact regenerative paradigms, even when there is strong intellectual alignment with them. By creating a reflective space in which economic anxiety, fear of insecurity, and performance-based self-worth can be examined, the Invisible Backpack supports a gradual disentangling of identity from productivity or financial status. In this sense, the tool reframes self-awareness as a form of infrastructural work: it restores the internal conditions necessary for more adaptive, relational, and future-oriented decision-making.

The conceptual foundations of the tool draw from several complementary disciplines. Narrative therapy provides a key methodological anchor through the practice of externalization, which separates individuals from dominant problem-saturated narratives, thereby reducing shame, loosening rigid self-identifications, and reopening space for agency and responsibility (Monk, 1997; White & Epston, 1990). Somatic approaches to trauma further inform the tool by recognizing that behavioural patterns are not only cognitive but also embodied. Attention to bodily sensations and stress responses can therefore support more grounded reflection and enable individuals to act with greater consistency under pressure (Menakem, 2017; Van der Kolk, 2015). In addition, perspectives from Global Majority epistemologies and post-conflict contexts enrich the tool's relational dimension. Testimonial practices, such as those used in reconciliation processes, demonstrate how articulating lived experience can function as a collective and civic act that restores dignity, rebuilds shared meaning, and expands political and social agency (Ross, 2003; B. de S. Santos, 2016).

Through these combined influences, the Invisible Backpack operates as both a reflective and transformative practice. It allows individuals to trace the origins of their patterns without reducing themselves to them, thereby cultivating a form of self-awareness that is simultaneously compassionate and accountable. This deepened awareness does not remain confined to the individual level; it reshapes how people perceive their role in relation to others. As individuals begin to recognize how their own histories influence their sense of capability and contribution, they also become more open to recognizing the unseen histories shaping others.

This shift in perception prepares the ground for the final tool in the sequence. As self-awareness expands, so does the capacity to reinterpret difference as a potential for complementarity and co-creation, instead of a source of competition or inadequacy. The Puzzle Mindset builds directly on this insight, transforming how individuals understand their place within collective systems and how they engage in collaborative processes.

3.4 Puzzle Mindset: Cultivating Relational Intelligence and Co-Creative Capacity

Building on the self-awareness developed through the Invisible Backpack, the Puzzle Mindset reframes how individuals perceive themselves in relation to others. It invites individuals to see their unique “piece” not as fixed, deficient, or inherently superior, but as an essential contribution to a larger collective whole. Each person is understood to hold a distinct and irreplaceable piece of a shared puzzle, shaped by their particular combination of skills, lived experiences, strengths, and passions, as well as their limitations, vulnerabilities, and imperfections. Rather than treating these imperfections as deficits to be corrected or concealed, the Puzzle Mindset recognizes them as integral to the possibility of connection and collective creation.

Within this perspective, difference is not a problem to be managed but a generative condition for collaboration. The varied shapes, edges, and contrasts between individual “pieces” are precisely what make relational fit possible. No single piece is complete in isolation; meaning and function emerge only through interaction. The emphasis therefore shifts away from striving to become the “best” or most optimized individual toward engaging in the ongoing process of discovering how one’s contribution can align with and complement others. This process requires mutual adjustment, openness to different perspectives, and a willingness to engage in iterative collaboration. Through this relational work, a collection of individual fragments can gradually form a coherent, adaptive, and resilient whole.

The Puzzle Mindset thus cultivates key relational capacities necessary for systemic transformation. It guides individuals in perspective-taking, enabling them to understand the position, constraints, and contributions of others. It fosters mutual recognition by emphasizing the value of each person’s role within the collective configuration. It also supports non-zero-sum collaboration, in which the success of the shared endeavor enhances rather than diminishes the value of each participant’s contribution. In this way, the mindset transforms interdependence from a perceived limitation into a critical resource for collective problem-solving, enabling forms of translocal co-creation that extend across geographical, cultural, and ideological boundaries.

This orientation directly addresses the dynamics identified in Paper III, where fear-based decision-making, social fragmentation, and competitive individualism are shown to both result from and reinforce extractive systems. By shifting the interpretive frame through which individuals understand difference and value, the Puzzle Mindset counters the scarcity-driven logics that position others as competitors or threats. Instead, it establishes a relational foundation in which diversity becomes a source of strength and innovation, supporting more cooperative and adaptive forms of organization.

The theoretical grounding of the Puzzle Mindset further reinforces its relational and systemic orientation. Social interdependence theory demonstrates that cooperative goal structures characterized by positive interdependence lead to higher levels of effort, more constructive relationships, and improved psychological wellbeing compared to competitive or individualistic structures (Johnson & Johnson, 2009). Relational constructionist perspectives similarly emphasize that knowledge, identity, and meaning are co-created through interaction and dialogue rather than existing as fixed individual attributes (Gergen, 2011).

Taken together, the Puzzle Mindset completes the developmental trajectory established by the preceding tools. Where the Centre of My Environment restores agency, the Action–Reaction Model cultivates relational awareness and responsiveness, and the Invisible Backpack deepens self-understanding, the Puzzle Mindset enables individuals to engage in collaborative co-creation. It marks the point at which individual transformation becomes explicitly collective, translating internal shifts into shared practices of coordination, cooperation, and meaning-making.

In this way, the four tools form a coherent and cumulative epistemic system for capacity development within a regenerative paradigm. The sequence is not arbitrary but developmental: participatory design requires a foundation of agency; adaptive stewardship depends on relational resilience; value-centric economic models require awareness of internalized narratives; and cooperative governance relies on relational intelligence. Each layer builds on the previous one, creating a pathway from individual transformation to collective and institutional redesign.

4 Cross-Cultural Foundations of Epistemic Tools: Relational Agency Across Traditions

The four epistemic tools presented in this paper are not culturally isolated constructs. They resonate with a wide range of philosophical, pedagogical, and socio-ecological traditions across the globe, thus illustrating their universality. While developed through contemporary practice, their underlying logics—environmental authorship, relational responsiveness, reflexive self-awareness, and collaborative co-creation—echo long-standing ways of knowing that position humans as embedded, interdependent participants within social and ecological systems. Situating these tools within a cross-cultural context not only strengthens their conceptual robustness but also highlights their relevance as plural, globally grounded pathways for systemic transformation.

At the level of environmental authorship, the recognition that individuals can actively shape their immediate environments finds deep roots in Indigenous and relational worldviews. Indigenous land stewardship and kin-centric ecology conceptualize humans as part of a reciprocal network of life, where agency emerges through fulfilling responsibilities toward human and more-than-human relations (Kimmerer, 2020; Whyte, 2017). Similarly, Latin American traditions of autogestión and popular urbanism demonstrate how communities collectively design and build their environments, transforming participants from passive recipients into active agents of spatial and social change (Zibechi, 2012). In parallel, the Andean concept of Buen Vivir (Gudynas, 2011) and Southern African Ubuntu philosophy (Mbiti, 1990) emphasize that individual and collective wellbeing are co-constituted, with agency arising through relational harmony rather than individual control. Daoist philosophy further complements this perspective through the principle of wu wei, which frames effective action as emerging from attunement to context and alignment with dynamic environmental conditions rather than coercive intervention (Ames, 2010; Slingerland, 2014). Together, these traditions reinforce the tool's core premise: agency is exercised through situated, relational participation in shaping one's environment.

The Action–Reaction Model, which cultivates conscious responsiveness rather than impulsive reactivity, similarly reflects a broad cross-cultural understanding of action as embedded within relational and temporal chains of consequence. Buddhist teachings on dependent origination (pratītyasamutpāda) emphasize that actions arise within interconnected causal processes and that awareness of these patterns enables the interruption of habitual, reactive cycles (Thích-Nhất-Hạnh, 2015). Ubuntu ethics frame human action as inherently relational, where each response contributes either to the restoration or disruption of communal harmony (Mbiti, 1990; Metz, 2011). In Latin American contexts, practices such as tequio—forms of collective labor and mutual aid—embed action within reciprocal obligations to community and environment, privileging restoration over competition (Estermann, 2021; Zibechi, 2012). Indigenous philosophies further extend this relational temporality through principles such as seventh-generation decision-making, which situate action within long-term webs of responsibility and consequence (Cordova, 2007; Deloria & Wildcat, 2001). Daoist wu wei again reinforces the importance of responsive, context-sensitive action, where effectiveness arises from careful observation and minimal, well-timed intervention (Ames, 2010). Across these traditions, action is understood not as isolated choice but as relational navigation, requiring awareness, restraint, and responsibility.

The Invisible Backpack, which focuses on making internalized narratives and conditioning visible, also finds strong resonance in diverse cultural practices of reflection and relational self-understanding. Ubuntu philosophy conceptualizes the self as fundamentally relational—"a person is a person through other persons"—emphasizing that identity and transformation emerge through social and communal processes (Metz, 2011; Nwoye, 2017). Indigenous storytelling traditions similarly treat narrative as a mode of knowledge transmission, healing, and relational restoration, reconnecting individuals to community, place, and history (Archibald, 2008; Simpson, 2017). In Japanese Naikan therapy, structured reflection on what one has received, given, and contributed to others cultivates humility, accountability, and gratitude within relational systems (Krech, 2002). Daoist inner

cultivation practices, including neidan (internal alchemy) and xinzhai (fasting of the heart-mind), emphasize introspection, the release of rigid identities, and alignment with broader patterns of existence (Komjathy, 2013; Roth, 1999). These practices echo the Invisible Backpack's aim of observing and transforming internal narratives to restore natural flow and agency. These practices collectively underscore that self-awareness is not just introspective but relational, involving the recognition of how personal histories, social structures, and cultural narratives shape perception and action.

Finally, the Puzzle Mindset, which frames diversity as complementary rather than competitive, reflects a long-standing cross-cultural understanding of wholeness as emerging through relational interdependence. African communitarian philosophies such as Ubuntu and Ujamaa conceptualize personhood as realized through collective contribution, where individual uniqueness gains meaning within the social whole (Gyekye, 1996; Nussbaum, 2003). Latin American concepts such as convivencia and tequio similarly emphasize cooperative coexistence and reciprocal contribution, valuing each individual's role within a shared system (Esteva, 2010; Freire, 1974). Indigenous governance systems, including those of the Haudenosaunee Confederacy, rely on consensus-based decision-making processes that recognize the partiality of individual perspectives and the necessity of integrating diverse viewpoints, including consideration of future generations (Corntassel, 2012). Daoist philosophy further articulates this principle through the concept of yin–yang, where dynamic balance arises from the interaction of complementary differences rather than their homogenization (Ames, 2010; Ziporyn, 2012). Across these traditions, systemic integrity depends not on uniformity or dominance, but on the relational fit and mutual enhancement of diverse elements.

Taken together, these cross-cultural perspectives reveal a shared epistemic foundation: human agency, knowledge, and transformation are inherently relational, embodied, and context-dependent. The four tools presented in this paper do not introduce entirely new ways of thinking; rather, they translate and operationalize enduring, globally distributed principles into structured practices that can be applied within contemporary learning and organizational contexts. By doing so, they offer a bridge between ancient relational wisdom and the practical demands of systemic transformation, positioning epistemic tools as vehicles for reactivating capacities that have been marginalized by dominant extractive paradigms.

5 How the Tools Interact: System Dynamics of Organizational Prototyping

The four tools presented in this paper are designed to function as an integrated system that enables the prototyping of organizations aligned with the redefined purpose of business proposed in Paper II: entities that solve social issues and create social value in a financially sustainable way. While Section 3 has outlined the specific capacities each tool cultivates, and Section 4 has documented their universality across traditions, their significance at this stage lies in how they interact to shape organizational dynamics, decision-making processes, and institutional design. Rather than operating as individual practices, the tools form a recursive system through which organizations can continuously align internal culture with external purpose.

In practice, organizational prototyping unfolds as an iterative process in which shifts in perception, behaviour, and relational dynamics translate into new forms of coordination, governance, and value creation. The Centre of My Environment provides the entry point by enabling individuals within organizations to move from passive role compliance toward active participation in shaping processes and outcomes. When this orientation is embedded collectively, organizations begin to function less as fixed hierarchies and more as participatory systems in which stakeholders perceive themselves as co-authors of both problems and solutions. This shift is foundational for designing organizations that are responsive to the specific social contexts they aim to address, rather than imposing pre-defined, top-down models.

As individuals and teams engage more actively in shaping their environments, the Action–Reaction Model becomes critical for stabilizing organizational processes under conditions of complexity and uncertainty. Organizations addressing social and ecological challenges operate in dynamic contexts where feedback is constant and outcomes are rarely predictable. The ability to pause, interpret, and respond rather than react allows organizations to function as adaptive systems capable of learning from their own operations. Decision-making processes become iterative rather than reactive, enabling continuous adjustment without collapsing into blame or rigidity. In this way, the organization begins to embody forms of adaptive stewardship, where responsiveness to feedback replaces control as the primary mode of coordination.

The Invisible Backpack introduces a deeper layer of organizational prototyping by making visible the internalized narratives and assumptions that shape economic and strategic decisions. Even when organizations articulate a purpose aligned with social value, unexamined beliefs about money, success, and risk can reproduce extractive patterns at the level of practice. By creating space to surface and work with these narratives, organizations can begin to redesign their economic logic from within. Profit is no longer treated as the primary objective but as a condition that supports the organization's capacity to address the problem it exists to solve. This shift enables the development of value-centric models in which financial flows are aligned with long-term social and ecological outcomes rather than short-term optimization.

The Puzzle Mindset extends these dynamics into the domain of governance and collaboration. As organizations move away from competitive and individualistic logics, they require new ways of coordinating diverse perspectives, capabilities, and interests. The Puzzle Mindset enables this by reframing diversity as a source of systemic intelligence rather than fragmentation. Organizational structures can therefore evolve toward more distributed and polycentric forms, where decision-making authority is shared and contextual, and where collaboration is organized around complementarity rather than hierarchy alone. This supports the emergence of trust-based coordination mechanisms that are better suited to addressing complex, multi-dimensional problems.

The interaction of these tools creates a feedback loop between individual practice and organizational form. Changes in how individuals perceive, relate, and act are continuously translated into changes in how the organization operates, and vice versa. This recursive relationship allows organizations to function as living prototypes, where structures, processes, and cultures are not fixed but continuously redesigned in response to both internal

learning and external conditions. In this sense, organizational prototyping becomes an ongoing process rather than a one-time design intervention.

Importantly, the system is inherently self-correcting. Breakdowns in collaboration, for example, often signal the persistence of unexamined narratives or misalignments in how roles and contributions are understood, indicating a need to revisit the practices associated with the Invisible Backpack or the Puzzle Mindset. Similarly, patterns of reactive decision-making may reveal a weakening of the reflective processes cultivated through the Action–Reaction Model, or a loss of agency within the organization that requires re-engagement with the Centre of My Environment. These feedback signals enable continuous recalibration, ensuring that the organization remains aligned with its stated purpose.

Through this integrated dynamic, the tools enable organizations to move beyond declarative commitments to social value and toward embodied practice. They provide a mechanism through which the redefinition of business proposed in Paper II can be translated into operational reality, shaping not only what organizations aim to achieve but how they function in pursuit of those aims. The result is a form of organizational prototyping in which purpose, culture, and structure co-evolve, creating institutions that are capable of sustaining regenerative outcomes over time. Paper V builds on this foundation by examining how these dynamics are operationalized within TWA as a concrete institutional prototype, illustrating how the integration of these tools translates into governance structures, learning environments, and economic practices in real-world settings.

6 Implications for Practitioners: Leadership by Example and Building Critical Mass

For entrepreneurs, intrapreneurs, and organizational developers seeking to build according to the redefined purpose of business proposed in Paper II, the implications of this work extend beyond conceptual alignment toward concrete shifts in practice. The tools presented in this paper suggest that the transition toward regenerative organizations cannot be achieved solely through structural redesign or strategic planning; it requires deliberate attention to the human and relational conditions that shape how organizations actually function. As such, practitioners are called to engage in a form of leadership by example, where transformation begins with how individuals and teams perceive, relate, and act, and gradually scales through organizational and networked contexts.

A critical starting point lies in the internal dynamics of founding teams and core organizational units. Before business models, governance structures, or growth strategies are finalized, there is value in creating space to surface the internal narratives and relational patterns that will inevitably shape decision-making. Practices associated with the Invisible Backpack and the Action–Reaction Model can support this process by making visible the assumptions, money narratives, and reactive tendencies that often operate implicitly. By addressing these dynamics early, teams can reduce the risk of reproducing extractive patterns, such as competition, defensiveness, or short-term optimization, even when their stated mission is aligned with social value. This initial phase establishes a more stable relational foundation upon which strategic and operational decisions can be built.

As organizations develop, the integration of relational capacity into governance becomes increasingly important. The Puzzle Mindset offers a practical orientation for designing decision-making processes that move beyond competitive and hierarchical fragmentation toward more inclusive and trust-based forms of coordination. Rather than treating diversity as a challenge to be managed, it can be approached as a source of systemic intelligence, where different perspectives contribute to more robust and adaptive solutions. Embedding this mindset into governance structures supports the emergence of collaborative cultures in which stakeholders are not only represented but actively engaged in shaping organizational direction. This is particularly relevant for organizations addressing complex social and ecological challenges, where no single perspective is sufficient to grasp the full scope of the problem.

In parallel, practitioners are encouraged to design organizations in ways that actively cultivate agency among employees, users, and communities. The Centre of My Environment provides a lens through which organizational design can move away from models that position individuals as passive recipients of services or directives, toward approaches that recognize them as co-authors of both problems and solutions. This shift has significant implications for product development, service design, and community engagement, as it prioritizes participation, contextual sensitivity, and shared ownership. Organizations that operate in this way are more likely to generate solutions that are both locally relevant and sustainably maintained, as they are grounded in the lived realities and capacities of those involved.

Finally, the implementation of this approach requires a reconsideration of how success is measured and evaluated. Traditional performance indicators, often Centreed on financial outputs or short-term efficiency, may not adequately capture the conditions necessary for regenerative impact. Practitioners can therefore benefit from tracking capacity-building processes as leading indicators of long-term outcomes. Metrics such as psychological safety, the quality of conflict resolution, expressions of collective agency, and the depth of participatory engagement provide insight into whether the organization is cultivating the relational and cognitive conditions required for sustained transformation. These process-oriented indicators do not replace outcome measures but complement them by making visible the underlying dynamics that enable or constrain impact over time.

Taken together, these implications point toward a model of practice in which organizational transformation is approached as an ongoing process of alignment between purpose, culture, and structure. Leadership, in this context, is less about directing change from above and more about embodying and enabling the conditions through which change can emerge collectively. As these practices are adopted and refined across different contexts, they have the potential to generate a critical mass of organizations that operate according to alternative logics, gradually reshaping broader economic and institutional landscapes.

7 Conclusion

From Capacity-Building to Regenerative Institutional Change

This paper has argued that the transition toward a regenerative economy depends not only on redefining the purpose of business as discussed in Paper II, but on strengthening the human and relational capacities examined in Paper III, namely agency, regulation under pressure, trust, and the ability to imagine and cooperate across difference. The four epistemic tools introduced here—the Centre of My Environment, the Action–Reaction Model, the Invisible Backpack, and the Puzzle Mindset—provide a structured pathway for cultivating these capacities in everyday contexts.

Together, these tools form a coherent developmental progression of practice. The Centre of My Environment establishes a foundation of agency by enabling individuals to recognize their role as interpretive and responsive actors within their environments. The Action–Reaction Model builds on this by developing relational awareness and resilience, supporting more conscious engagement with interpersonal dynamics. The Invisible Backpack deepens this process by making visible the internalized narratives and patterns that shape perception and behaviour, fostering both self-understanding and compassionate accountability. Finally, the Puzzle Mindset translates these internal and relational shifts into collaborative capacity, enabling individuals to engage in co-creation across difference and to recognize diversity as a source of collective strength.

This sequence creates a developmental arc from individual awareness to collective action, offering a practical pathway for moving beyond the value–action gap identified across the discussion paper series. Without such grounded and sequential tools, frameworks for regenerative business risk remaining intellectually compelling yet operationally inaccessible. By contrast, tools translate paradigmatic shifts into practice by creating structured opportunities to rehearse new ways of thinking, relating, and acting.

Importantly, these tools do not simply add new skills; they contribute to rebuilding the psychosocial infrastructure often eroded by extractive systems. They support transitions from passivity to agency, from scarcity-driven responses to sufficiency-oriented sensemaking, from fragmentation to collaboration, and from reactivity to adaptive resilience. In doing so, they create the conditions under which individuals and organizations can begin to enact the redefined purpose of business: addressing social issues while generating social value in a financially sustainable way.

Within this perspective, capacity-building and relational repair emerge as foundational design tasks of regenerative enterprise. The tools presented here are not therapeutic interventions, nor do they reduce structural challenges to individual psychology. Rather, they function as enabling infrastructures that allow practitioners to translate conceptual commitments into observable patterns of practice. Consistent with TWA's theory of change—that every majority was once a minority, and every minority began with one—these patterns can scale through leadership by example, gradually forming a critical mass of actors capable of shifting institutional norms.

At the same time, tools alone are insufficient to stabilize systemic transformation. Durable change requires organizational structures that can embed these capacities within everyday economic activity. The following paper therefore extends this work by examining how such capacities can be institutionalized within enterprise design. Through the case of TWA, Paper V explores how organizations can operationalize the redefined purpose of business introduced in Paper II, translating capacity-building into sustained institutional practice.

Literature

Ames, R. (with Hall, D.). (2010). Dao de Jing: A Philosophical Translation. Random House Publishing Group.

Archibald, J. (2008). Indigenous storywork: Educating the heart, mind, body, and spirit. Univ. of British Columbia Press.

Argyris, C., & Schön, D. A. (1978). Organizational learning. Addison-Wesley Pub. Co.

Chapman, C., & Withers, A. J. (2019). A violent history of benevolence: Interlocking oppression in the moral economies of social working. University of Toronto Press.

Chawla, L. (2022). Childhood Nature Connection and Constructive Hope: Helping Young People Connect with Nature and Cope with Environmental Loss. In R. Jucker & J. Von Au (Eds.), High-Quality Outdoor Learning (pp. 95–122). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-04108-2_5

Cordova, V. F. (2007). How it is: The Native American philosophy of V.F. Cordova (K. D. Moore, Ed.). University of Arizona Press.

Corntassel, J. (2012). Re-envisioning resurgence: Indigenous pathways to decolonization and sustainable self-determination. Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society, 1(1), 86–101.

Cross, N. (2006). Designerly ways of knowing. Springer.

Deloria, V., & Wildcat, D. R. (2001). Power and place: Indian education in America. Fulcrum.

Edmondson, A. C. (2019). The fearless organization: Creating psychological safety in the workplace for learning, innovation, and growth. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Escobar, A. (2018). Designs for the pluriverse: Radical interdependence, autonomy, and the making of worlds. Duke University press.

Estermann, J. (2021). Filosofía Andina: Sabiduría indígena para un mundo nuevo. ADMIT HUB REF SERVICE PR.

Esteva, G. (2010). From the Bottom-up: New institutional arrangements in Latin America. Development, 53(1), 64–69. https://doi.org/10.1057/dev.2009.80

Evans, G. W. (2003). The Built Environment and Mental Health. Journal of Urban Health: Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine, 80(4), 536–555. https://doi.org/10.1093/jurban/jtg063

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), art20. https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-03610-150420

Frankl, V. E. (2006). Man's search for meaning. Beacon Press.

Freire, P. (1974). Pedagogy of the oppressed (Tenth printing). The Seabury Press.

Fry, T. (2009). Design futuring: Sustainability, ethics, and new practice (English ed). Berg.

Geels, F. W., & Schot, J. (2007). Typology of sociotechnical transition pathways. Research Policy, 36(3), 399–417. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2007.01.003

Gergen, K. J. (2011). Relational Being: Beyond Self and Community. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:osobl/9780199846269.001.0001

Gifford, R. (2014). Environmental Psychology Matters. Annual Review of Psychology, 65(1), 541–579. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010213-115048

Gross, J. J. (2015). Emotion Regulation: Current Status and Future Prospects. Psychological Inquiry, 26(1), 1–26. https://doi.org/10.1080/1047840X.2014.940781

Gruenewald, D. A. (2003). The Best of Both Worlds: A Critical Pedagogy of Place. Educational Researcher, 32(4), 3–12. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X032004003

Gudynas, E. (2011). Buen Vivir: Today's tomorrow. Development, 54(4), 441–447. https://doi.org/10.1057/dev.2011.86

Gyekye, K. (1996). African cultural values: An introduction. Sankofa Pub. Co.

Irwin, T. (2015). Transition Design: A Proposal for a New Area of Design Practice, Study, and Research. Design and Culture, 7(2), 229–246. https://doi.org/10.1080/17547075.2015.1051829

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (2009). An Educational Psychology Success Story: Social Interdependence Theory and Cooperative Learning. Educational Researcher, 38(5), 365–379. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X09339057

Kimmerer, R. W. (2020). Braiding sweetgrass: Indigenous wisdom, scientific knowledge and the teachings of plants. Penguin Books.

Kolb, D. A. (1984). Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development. Prentice-Hall.

Komjathy, L. (2013). The Daoist tradition: An introduction (First edition). Zed Books. https://doi.org/10.5040/9781350284876

Krech, G. (2002). Naikan: Gratitude, grace, and the Japanese art of self-reflection. Stone Bridge Press.

Manzini, E. (2015). Design, When Everybody Designs: An Introduction to Design for Social Innovation. The MIT Press. https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/9873.001.0001

Maté, G. (with Maté, D.). (2022). The myth of normal: Trauma, illness, & healing in a toxic culture. Avery, an imprint of Penguin Random House.

Mbiti, J. S. (1990). African religions & philosophy (2nd rev. and enl. ed). Heinemann Education Botswana (Publishers) Pty) Ltd.

Meadows, D. H. (2011). Thinking in systems: A primer (D. Wright, Ed.; Nachdr.). Chelsea Green Pub.

Menakem, R. (2017). My grandmother's hands: Racialized trauma and the pathway to mending our hearts and bodies. Central Recovery Press.

Metz, T. (2011). Ubuntu as a Moral Theory and Human Rights in South Africa. African Human Rights Law Journal, 11(2), 532–559.

Monk, G. (Ed.). (1997). Narrative therapy in practice: The archaeology of hope (1st ed). Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Mullainathan, S., & Shafir, E. (2014). Scarcity: The new science of having less and how it defines our lives (First Picador edition). Picador/Henry Holt and Co.

Nussbaum, B. (2003). <I>Ubuntu:</I> Reflections of a South African on Our Common Humanity. Reflections: The SoL Journal, 4(4), 21–26. https://doi.org/10.1162/152417303322004175

Nwoye, A. (2017). An Africentric theory of human personhood. Psychology in Society, 54, 54–66. https://doi.org/10.17159/2309-8708/2017/n54a4

Ross, F. C. (2003). Bearing witness: Women and the truth and reconciliation commission in South Africa. Pluto Press.

Roth, H. D. (1999). Original Tao: Inward training (nei-yeh) and the foundations of Taoist mysticism. Columbia University Press.

Santos, B. D. S. (2018). The End of the Cognitive Empire: The Coming of Age of Epistemologies of the South. Duke University Press. https://doi.org/10.1215/9781478002000

Santos, B. de S. (2016). Epistemologies of the South: Justice against epistemicide. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315634876

Schön, D. A. (1983). The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action. Basic Books.

Sen, A. (1999). Development as freedom. Oxford University Press.

Shove, E., & Walker, G. (2010). Governing transitions in the sustainability of everyday life. Research Policy, 39(4), 471–476. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2010.01.019

Simpson, L. B. (2017). As We Have Always Done: Indigenous Freedom through Radical Resistance. University of Minnesota Press. https://doi.org/10.5749/j.ctt1pwt77c

Slingerland, E. G. (2014). Trying not to try: Ancient China, modern science, and the power of spontaneity (First paperback edition). Broadway Books.

Smith, A., & Stirling, A. (2018). Innovation, sustainability and democracy: An analysis of grassroots contributions. Journal of Self-Governance and Management Economics, 6(1), 64. https://doi.org/10.22381/JSME6120183

Sterman, J. (2000). Business dynamics: Systems thinking and modeling for a complex world. Irwin/McGraw-Hill.

Strengers, Y. (2014). Social Practices, Intervention and Sustainability: Beyond behaviour change (1st ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315816494

Thích-Nhất-Hạnh. (2015). The heart of the Buddha's teaching: Transforming suffering into peace, joy & liberation: the four noble truths, the noble eightfold path, and other basic Buddhist teachings. Harmony Books.

Tuck, E., & McKenzie, M. (2015). Place in research: Theory, methodology, and methods. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315764849

Tuhiwai Smith, L. (2022). Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples (Third edition). Bloomsbury Academic.

Van der Kolk, B. A. (2015). The body keeps the score: Brain, mind and body in the healing of trauma. Penguin Books.

Varela, F. J., Thompson, E., & Rosch, E. (2016). The embodied mind: Cognitive science and human experience (revised edition). MIT Press.

Vygotskij, L. S., & Cole, M. (1981). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes (Nachdr.). Harvard Univ. Press.

Wajcman, J. (2015). Pressed for time: The acceleration of life in digital capitalism (paperback edition 2016). The University of Chicago Press.

Westley, F. (2013). Social Innovation and Resilience: How One Enhances the Other. Stanford Social Innovation Review, 11, A6A8. https://doi.org/10.48558/X1BZ-AK47

White, M., & Epston, D. (1990). Narrative means to therapeutic ends (1st ed). Norton.

Whyte, K. (2017). Indigenous Climate Change Studies: Indigenizing Futures, Decolonizing the Anthropocene. English Language Notes, 55(1–2), 153–162. https://doi.org/10.1215/00138282-55.1-2.153

Zibechi, R. (2012). Territories in resistance: A cartography of Latin American social movements (R. Ryan, Trans.). AK Press.

Ziporyn, B. (2012). Ironies of oneness and difference: Coherence in early Chinese thought; prolegomena to the study of Li. State University of New York Press.

Author

Adina-Iuliana Deacu

Adina-Iuliana Deacu is a sustainability researcher and social entrepreneur working at the intersection of environmental psychology, systems change, and regenerative economics. She is the 2025 Klaus Töpfer Sustainability Fellow at the Research Institute for Sustainability (RIFS) in Potsdam, Germany, where her research explored how redefining business as a social problem-solving institution can contribute to addressing the polycrisis. Adina is also the founder of Tianmei World Academy, a translocal learning platform experimenting with environments and tools that cultivate agency, relational intelligence, and regenerative leadership. Her work integrates systems thinking, design research, and cross-cultural knowledge traditions to explore how inner transformation and institutional redesign can support sustainability transitions.

The Research Institute for Sustainability (RIFS) conducts research with the goal of understanding, advancing, and guiding processes of societal change towards sustainable development in Germany and abroad. The Institute is embedded within the GFZ Helmholtz Centre for Geosciences and is thus part of the Helmholtz Association. Its research approach is transdisciplinary, transformative, and co-creative: RIFS cooperates with partners in science, political and administrative institutions, the business community, and civil society to understand the problems of sustainable development, identify appropriate solutions, and support their implementation in cooperation with relevant actors and affected communities. Its central research topics include the energy transition, climate change and socio-technical transformations, as well as sustainable governance and participation. A strong network of national and international partners and a Fellow Programme support the work of the Institute.

RIFS Discussion Paper

March 2026

Contact:
Adina-Iuliana Deacu: tianmeisworld@outlook.com

Address:
Berliner Straße 130
14467 Potsdam
T: +49 (0) 331–28822–340
F: +49 (0) 331–28822–310
media@rifs-potsdam.de
www.rifs-potsdam.de

ViSdP:
Prof. Dr. Doris Fuchs,
Scientific Director, Speaker

Editor:
Damian Harrison

DOI: 10.48481/rifs.2026.010

GFZ Helmholtz Centre for Geosciences

HELMHOLTZ
RESEARCH FOR GRAND CHALLENGES