

Bridging the Gap: Adaptive Governance and ESG Integration

Anri Lock Ferguson

Head of School: Law, STADIO Higher Education

Keywords: Adaptive Governance; ESG Integration; Corporate Governance; Stakeholder Engagement; Sustainable Leadership

Abstract: Contemporary organisations operate within an environment of unprecedented technological, environmental, and social volatility (Kraaijenbrink, 2019). Traditional governance models, characterised by rigidity and hierarchical structures, are proving increasingly inadequate for navigating this complexity of unprecedented volatility (Kotter, 2012). Simultaneously, Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) factors have transitioned from what was once a niche concern, to a central driver of long-term corporate value and resilience (Giese et al., 2019). This study addresses the persistent gap between the static nature of conventional governance and the dynamic demands of meaningful ESG integration. It aims to develop a conceptual framework that synergises adaptive governance principles with ESG strategy to foster more agile, resilient, and responsible organisational systems. The research is founded on a systematic review of peer-reviewed literature, analysing scholarly articles, institutional reports, and established frameworks pertaining to adaptive governance and ESG reporting. A thematic analysis was conducted to identify points of convergence and synergistic potential between the two domains (Adaptive governance principles and ESG strategy). The study identifies five critical intersections for integration, namely: 1) Continuous Learning and Iterative Policy Cycles; 2) Dynamic Stakeholder Engagement; 3) Integrated Risk Management; 4) Flexible Institutional Arrangements; and 5) Dynamic Materiality Assessments. Furthermore, it proposes a three-pillar pathway for practical implementation, comprising a Diagnostic Assessment Tool, a Capability-building Roadmap, and a Staged Implementation Methodology. This paper contributes a novel, integrated framework that moves beyond compliance-based ESG towards a dynamic, strategic approach. It offers both a theoretical model and practical tools for leaders to build governance systems capable of navigating complexity and driving sustainable, long-term value creation.

I. Introduction

1.1. Background

The 21st century is defined by an environment of profound and persistent disruption. Organisations and institutions are navigating the confluence of three concurrent revolutions: 1) Rapid technological acceleration, most notably in artificial intelligence, which is fundamentally reshaping industries (World Economic Forum, 2018); 2) Accelerating environmental changes, including the escalating climate crisis, which present existential risks and demand systemic responses (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [IPCC], 2021); and 3) Deep social transformations that are redefining societal values, stakeholder expectations, and the very purpose of “the Corporation” (Edelman, 2022). In an era of volatility, uncertainty, complexity, and ambiguity, the foundational

models of governance that have guided institutions for the past century are being tested and found wanting. The core challenge for modern leadership is no longer simply managing predictable change but navigating systemic, non-linear disruptions (Head & Alford, 2015).

Simultaneously, the paradigm for measuring and understanding organisational success has undergone a radical shift. The rise of Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) criteria represents a move away from a singular focus on shareholder profit, towards a more holistic assessment of long-term sustainability and value creation (Kell, 2018). Investors, regulators, consumers, and employees now demand transparency, accountability, and demonstrable positive impact on a wide range of non-financial metrics (Edelman, 2022). ESG has evolved from a peripheral consideration for ethical investors into a mainstream framework for evaluating corporate resilience, risk management, and profitability (Eccles et al., 2014). However, the integration of ESG principles is often hampered by the very governance structures that are meant to oversee it. Reporting can become a superficial, compliance-driven exercise rather than a catalyst for meaningful strategic change, largely because the underlying governance systems lack the dynamism required to manage these complex factors effectively (Porter & Kramer, 2011).

This research proposes that a solution lies at the intersection of two powerful but often disconnected concepts: Adaptive Governance and ESG Integration. Adaptive Governance, is a concept rooted in social-ecological systems theory, offers a set of principles — flexibility, continuous learning, inclusivity, and polycentricity — designed specifically for managing complex and uncertain systems (Folke et al., 2005). By strategically integrating these principles with the objectives of ESG, organisations can create a governance framework that is not only robust and responsible but also agile and resilient enough to thrive in the face of 21st century challenges (World Economic Forum, 2018).

1.2. Problem Statement

Traditional governance models—characterised by: 1) Rigid hierarchies, 2) Siloed decision-making, and 3) Long, linear planning cycles — were designed for a stable and predictable world (Hamel & Zanini, 2020). In the context of environmental management, these frameworks often stifle the very flexibility and innovation required to address modern, interconnected problems. When an entire industry can be transformed by artificial intelligence in a matter of months, a five-year regulatory cycle is no longer merely slow; it is dangerously obsolete (World Economic Forum, 2018). Climate change does not respect the boundaries between environmental, economic, and energy departments, yet institutions continue to address it in regulatory silos, leading to inefficient and sometimes counterproductive outcomes (Giddens, 2009). Furthermore, these outdated systems are increasingly misaligned with the expectations of modern stakeholders, who demand transparency and accountability on social and environmental impacts, leading to a loss of trust and credibility when institutions fail to deliver (Edelman, 2022; Freeman, 1984).

The research problem is, therefore, that traditional, static governance models are ill-equipped to manage the dynamic, interconnected challenges of the 21st century, particularly in integrating complex ESG factors effectively for long-term sustainability and value creation.

1.3. Research Objectives

To address the identified problem, this study pursues the following research objectives:

1. To critically review the theoretical foundations of traditional governance, adaptive governance, and ESG frameworks, highlighting their core principles and limitations.
2. To identify and analyse the points of failure in traditional governance models when confronted with the complexity and dynamism of contemporary ESG challenges.
3. To propose a novel conceptual framework that systematically integrates adaptive governance principles with ESG strategy and reporting.
4. To outline a practical, actionable pathway for organisations to implement this integrated framework, moving from theoretical concepts to applied practice.

1.4. Layout of the Paper

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. Section 2 provides a detailed literature review, exploring the scholarly discourse on traditional and adaptive governance, and the evolution of ESG reporting. Section 3 outlines the research methodology, detailing the systematic review process employed to synthesise the literature and develop the proposed framework. Section 4 presents the core findings of the study, detailing the five critical intersections of the integrated framework and the three-pillar implementation pathway. Section 5 discusses the practical implications of these findings for business leaders and policymakers. Finally, Section 6 provides a conclusion, acknowledges the study's limitations, and suggests avenues for future research.

II. Literature Review

2.1. The Inadequacy of Traditional Governance Models

Traditional governance models, largely inherited from the bureaucratic structures of the 20th century, are built upon the principles of hierarchy, specialisation, and top-down command-and-control. These models, theoretically grounded in the work of thinkers like Max Weber, were designed to maximise efficiency and predictability in stable environments (Weber, 2019). However, contemporary research consistently demonstrates their shortcomings when faced with complexity, uncertainty, and rapid change (Head & Alford, 2015). The literature identifies the three critical failings, as outlined in the problem statement.

First, they are excessively rigid. Characterised by fixed rules, long planning horizons, and resistance to change, these systems struggle to respond to exponential disruptions like technological advances or sudden global events such as the COVID-19 pandemic. These legal and regulatory frameworks often inhibit the very flexibility required to solve complex environmental problems, locking organisations into outdated modes of operation.

Second, these models are deeply fragmented. They operate through vertical silos, where distinct departments manage complex, interconnected issues in isolation. A challenge like climate change, which is simultaneously an environmental, economic, social, and political issue, cannot be effectively managed by separate ministries of environment, economy, and energy acting independently (Giddens, 2009). This siloed approach not only breeds inefficiency but it can also generate undesirable outcomes, where a solution in one domain creates an unforeseen problem in another.

Third, traditional governance is fundamentally misaligned with modern stakeholder expectations. In an era of radical transparency, stakeholders—including investors, employees, customers, and the public—demand accountability for societal and environmental impacts, not just financial returns (Edelman, 2022). When governance systems fail to provide this, they erode public trust and social license to operate, creating significant long-term risks to profitability and sustainable growth (Freeman, 1984).

2.2. The Emergence and Principles of Adaptive Governance

In response to the shortcomings of traditional models, the concept of adaptive governance has emerged as a more suitable alternative for navigating complexity. Originating from social-ecological systems theory, adaptive governance is designed to manage systems characterised by uncertainty and change (Folke et al., 2005). It is a framework that emphasises learning, flexibility, and collaboration. The work of Elinor Ostrom is foundational, particularly her research on polycentric systems, which demonstrated that complex problems are often best managed by multiple, overlapping centres of decision-making rather than a single, uniform authority (Ostrom, 2010).

The literature defines adaptive governance by four core principles:

Firstly, flexibility, with the capacity of a system to respond to changing conditions in real-time by adjusting rules, strategies, and operational processes. This is crucial in environments shaped by rapid technological change, such as the advancement of Artificial Intelligence (World Economic Forum, 2018). Continuous Learning is a principle that contends that the institutionalisation of feedback loops and evidence-based adjustments to refine policy and

strategy over time. This involves actively monitoring outcomes, questioning assumptions, and adapting based on new information, a process often described as "double-loop learning" (Argyris & Schön, 1978).

Thirdly, inclusivity, which is the active and meaningful engagement of diverse stakeholders in decision-making processes. This principle recognises that local communities, scientific experts, private sector actors, and Indigenous groups possess valuable knowledge and that their participation enhances the legitimacy and effectiveness of governance outcomes (AccountAbility, 2015). Lastly, polycentricity, which is the distribution of decision-making authority across multiple, nested centres rather than concentrating it at the top. This structure allows for both localised, context-specific solutions and coordination on broader, system-wide goals, avoiding the brittleness of centralised control (Ostrom, 2010).

The governance of the Great Lakes watershed in North America serves as a good case study for adaptive governance. Initial top-down, fragmented management by a few government agencies proved slow and suboptimal. The subsequent shift to an adaptive, polycentric model—involving federal, state, and provincial governments, Indigenous communities, academic institutions, and non-profits—allowed for more effective, collaborative problem-solving (Krantzberg & Song, 2020). This distributed network fostered learning and context-specific solutions, leading to significantly better environmental and social outcomes, validating Ostrom's theories.

2.3. The Evolution of Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) Frameworks

The rise of ESG marks a paradigm shift in corporate accountability. What began as a niche consideration for socially responsible investing (SRI) has become a mainstream framework for assessing a company's long-term viability and risk profile (Kell, 2018). ESG factors are no longer seen as mere ethical add-ons but as fundamental drivers of corporate value, resilience, and sustainable growth (Giese et al., 2019).

This "ESG revolution" is driven by growing evidence that strong ESG performance correlates with improved financial performance, reduced risk, and enhanced brand reputation (Eccles, Ioannou, & Serafeim, 2014). Regulatory bodies are also increasingly mandating ESG disclosures, such as the European Union's Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD).

However, the rapid proliferation of ESG has also exposed significant challenges. A primary criticism is the lack of standardisation across rating agencies and reporting frameworks, which can lead to inconsistent data and investor confusion (Berg, Kölbel, & Rigobon, 2022). This ambiguity can, in turn, enable "greenwashing," where companies engage in superficial reporting focused on compliance and public relations rather than embedding sustainability into their core strategy and operations. This is the critical gap this research addresses: ESG integration is often constrained by governance systems that are not designed to handle its dynamic and multifaceted nature (COSO, 2018).

2.4. The Conceptual Gap: Integrating Adaptive Governance and ESG

The literature review indicates that adaptive governance and ESG have largely evolved in parallel academic and professional spheres. Adaptive governance has been historically applied to social-ecological systems like fisheries or watersheds, while ESG reporting has been developed within the domain of finance and corporate management. This paper argues that the principles of adaptive governance offer a powerful solution to the implementation challenges facing ESG. By applying the concepts of flexibility, continuous learning, inclusivity, and polycentricity to corporate ESG strategy, organisations can move beyond static reporting and create a truly dynamic, resilient, and impactful governance framework. The following sections will develop a framework to bridge this conceptual gap.

III. Research Methodology

3.1. Research Approach and Design

This study employs a conceptual research approach founded in a systematic literature review. The objective is not to test pre-existing hypotheses through empirical data but rather to engage in theory-building. The research design

is intended to synthesise knowledge from the distinct but related fields of public administration, corporate governance, environmental science, and strategic management to construct a novel, integrated framework for adaptive ESG governance. This approach is appropriate for addressing complex problems where existing theories are insufficient and a new conceptual lens is required to guide future empirical research and practice.

3.2. Data Collection and Search Strategy

A systematic search of scholarly literature was conducted to form the evidence base for this study.

(a) Databases: The primary electronic databases searched were Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar, chosen for their extensive coverage of peer-reviewed literature across law and social sciences.

(b) Search Terms: A structured search query was developed using Boolean operators to combine key concepts. The search strings included variations of: ("adaptive governance" OR "polycentric governance" OR "dynamic governance") AND ("ESG" OR "Environmental Social Governance" OR "sustainability reporting" OR "corporate social responsibility" OR "non-financial reporting").

(c) Timeframe: The search was limited to publications from 2000 to 2025 to ensure relevance and capture the concurrent rise of both adaptive governance and ESG as prominent concepts.

3.3. Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

A two-stage screening process was applied to the search results. First, titles and abstracts were reviewed, followed by a full-text review of the shortlisted articles. The following criteria were used:

3.3.1 Inclusion Criteria

- (a) Peer-reviewed journal articles, books, and high-impact institutional reports (e.g., from regulatory bodies like the European Banking Authority).
- (b) Articles explicitly discussing principles of governance in relation to environmental, social, or sustainability challenges.
- (c) Publications written in the English language.

3.3.2 Exclusion Criteria

- (a) Non-peer-reviewed content such as blogs and conference presentations without full papers.
- (b) Articles where the key terms were mentioned only peripherally without substantive discussion.
- (c) Studies focused purely on technical aspects of environmental science or financial modelling without a connection to governance structures.

3.4. Data Analysis

The final body of selected literature was analysed using a thematic analysis approach. This involved the following process:

- (a) Familiarisation: A thorough reading of all selected articles to gain an in-depth understanding of the key concepts, arguments, and evidence presented.
- (b) Theme Development: The selected articles were collated, refined, and organised into broader, more substantive themes. This process focused on identifying patterns and relationships within the data.
- (c) Synthesis and Framework Development: The refined themes were synthesised to construct the core arguments of this paper. The analysis focused specifically on identifying points of synergy and interaction between adaptive governance principles and ESG objectives. This synthesis directly led to the development of the "Five Critical Intersections" and the "Three-Pillar Implementation Pathway" presented in the findings section. The framework emerged directly from this structured analysis of the literature, representing a novel conceptualisation grounded in existing scholarly work.

IV. Results and Findings

The systematic review and thematic analysis of the literature resulted in the development of a comprehensive framework for integrating adaptive governance and ESG. This framework is composed of two main elements: first, the identification of five critical intersections where adaptive governance principles can be synergistically applied to ESG strategy and reporting; and second, a practical three-pillar pathway for implementation.

4.1. An Integrated Framework: The Five Critical Intersections

The analysis revealed five key areas where a synergistic fusion of adaptive governance and ESG creates a system that is more resilient, responsive, and effective. These intersections represent the core of the proposed framework, moving ESG from a static reporting function to a dynamic, strategic capability.

4.1.1. Intersection 1: Continuous Learning and Iterative Policy Cycles

Traditional ESG reporting is often a static, annual event—a snapshot in time that quickly becomes outdated. An adaptive approach transforms this into a continuous learning loop, where real-time ESG data informs ongoing adjustments to policy and strategy. This involves establishing robust feedback mechanisms where performance data is not just reported but actively analysed to identify what is working and what is not, allowing for rapid iteration. This aligns with the principle of "reflexivity", which promotes continuous reassessment of underlying assumptions and goals in governance systems. For example, instead of merely reporting annual carbon emissions, an adaptive system would use monthly or even weekly emissions data to adjust operational processes, supply chain logistics, or energy procurement in near real-time, embedding learning directly into the operational fabric of the organisation.

4.1.2. Intersection 2: Dynamic Stakeholder Engagement

Conventional governance often treats stakeholder engagement as a one-way communication or a periodic consultation exercise (Greenwood, 2007). The integrated framework repositions it as a dynamic, two-way dialogue that is central to strategy formation and evaluation. This involves actively and continuously engaging a diverse range of stakeholders—from investors and employees to local communities and NGOs—in the co-creation of the ESG agenda. This approach ensures that the organisation's ESG priorities are not just an internal corporate exercise but are legitimately aligned with broader societal expectations, thereby creating shared value (Porter & Kramer, 2011). This aligns with the implementation pathways recommended by standards like the AA1000 Stakeholder Engagement Standard (AccountAbility, 2015), which emphasise continuous stakeholder engagement to ensure strategic alignment, and with the foundational principles of Stakeholder Theory (Freeman, 1984), which argues that long-term value is created by managing and balancing the interests of all stakeholders, not just shareholders.

4.1.3. Intersection 3: Integrated Risk Management

In many organisations, ESG risks are managed in a silo, separate from the primary enterprise risk management (ERM) framework. An adaptive approach demands that ESG considerations be fully integrated into a comprehensive, dynamic risk management system. This means the governance structure must proactively scan the horizon for emerging environmental and social risks—such as water scarcity in the supply chain, shifts in public policy on human rights, or technological disruptions affecting the workforce—and use this intelligence to inform strategic decision-making in real-time. This proactive, integrated stance is increasingly being mandated by regulators. For instance, the European Banking Authority has published guidelines requiring financial institutions to embed ESG risks into their standard risk management frameworks, treating them with the same rigour as credit, market, and operational risks (European Banking Authority, 2025).

4.1.4. Intersection 4: Flexible Institutional Arrangements

The rigidity of traditional corporate structures is a major barrier to adaptive management (Kotter, 2012). An integrated framework requires the creation of flexible, polycentric institutional arrangements that can adapt to emerging risks and opportunities. This involves moving beyond rigid departmental silos to establish structures like cross-functional ESG committees, stakeholder advisory boards, and temporary, mission-focused task forces. These polycentric arrangements distribute decision-making authority, empowering those closest to an issue with the autonomy to act quickly while maintaining strategic alignment with the whole. This organisational design embodies the principles of strengthening corporate governance for agility and responsiveness. For example, a cross-functional committee on circular economy could bring together experts from product design, supply chain, marketing, and finance to rapidly develop and pilot new business models.

4.1.5. Intersection 5: Dynamic Materiality Assessments

In traditional ESG reporting, a materiality assessment—the process of identifying which ESG issues are most critical to the business and its stakeholders—is often a static, one-time exercise conducted every few years. In an adaptive model, materiality assessment becomes a dynamic, ongoing process that continuously refocuses governance attention on the most critical and emerging ESG issues. This approach utilises real-time data analytics, media sentiment analysis, and continuous stakeholder feedback to regularly reassess what is material (World Economic Forum, 2020; Business for Social Responsibility [BSR], 2020). For example, a sudden social media campaign about labour practices in a supplier's factory could instantly elevate that issue to high materiality, triggering a governance response. This contrasts sharply with a static model where such an issue might not be formally recognised until the next scheduled assessment, years later. This ensures the governance system remains focused, agile, and aligned with a constantly shifting risk landscape.

4.2. From Theory to Practice: A Three-Pillar Implementation Pathway

Moving this integrated framework from theory to practice requires a structured and deliberate approach. The research identified a practical implementation pathway built on three core tools or pillars.

4.2.1. Pillar 1: The Diagnostic Assessment Tool

The first step for any organisation is to understand its current state. A diagnostic assessment tool provides a comprehensive benchmarking framework to evaluate existing governance and ESG capabilities. This tool would go beyond a simple compliance checklist to conduct a deep analysis of institutional capacity across multiple dimensions, such as structural flexibility regarding how quickly can the organisation reallocate resources or form new teams to address emerging issues. Learning Culture is included and determines if there Are established processes for feedback, reflection, and policy adjustment based on performance data. Stakeholder integration is considered insofar how deeply stakeholder perspectives are integrated into core decision-making processes. Data and analytics capacity also features insofar the organisation's systems to collect, analyse, and act on real-time ESG data.

The tool provides a clear baseline, identifying specific gaps and opportunities for improvement.

4.2.2. Pillar 2: The Capability-Building Roadmap

Based on the results of the diagnostic assessment, the second pillar is a customised, capability-building roadmap. This is a clear, actionable plan for developing the necessary skills, structures, and technologies to support an adaptive ESG framework. Key components of the roadmap start with talent development in which training programs are built to internal expertise in systems thinking, stakeholder facilitation, and ESG risk analysis. Technological Investment aspects are considered insofar establishing new data systems for real-time monitoring and reporting of ESG metrics are concerned. The European Banking Authority (2025), for instance, notes that sound data processes are a prerequisite for properly identifying and measuring ESG risks. Lastly, cultural fostering

is encouraged regarding initiatives to promote a culture of transparency, collaboration, and continuous learning throughout the organisation.

4.2.3. Pillar 3: The Staged Implementation Methodology

The final pillar is a staged, context-sensitive implementation methodology. Recognising that every organisation has unique constraints and capabilities, this approach avoids a one-size-fits-all solution. Instead, it advocates for a phased rollout that begins with focused pilot initiatives to build momentum and demonstrate value. For example, an organisation might start with a single project, such as creating a dynamic materiality process for one business unit or launching a pilot program for supply chain transparency in a high-risk area. The learnings from these pilots are then used to refine the approach before scaling it across the entire organisation. This iterative, adaptive methodology for implementation mirrors the principles of the framework itself, ensuring a better fit and higher chance of success.

V. Practical Implications

The findings of this study offer significant practical implications for organisational leaders and policymakers, as well as for teaching and learning in higher education. For management and boards of directors, the framework provides a compelling alternative to the compliance-driven, "tick-box" approach to ESG that currently prevails. The practical implication is a call to fundamentally rethink governance structures. This means moving beyond simply creating an ESG committee and instead embedding adaptive capabilities throughout the organisation. Leaders should prioritise investment in dynamic data systems, foster cross-functional collaboration, and empower teams to experiment and learn. The implementation pathway offers a tangible method for starting this journey, allowing companies to build resilience and competitive advantage by more effectively navigating complex ESG risks and opportunities.

For policymakers and regulators, this research suggests that designing effective sustainability-focused regulation requires a shift in philosophy. Instead of prescribing rigid, static reporting requirements, policy should aim to foster adaptive capacities within industries. This could involve creating "safe-to-fail" experimental spaces for companies to pilot innovative governance models, promoting standards for real-time data sharing, or designing policy frameworks that are themselves subject to periodic review and adaptation based on outcomes. The goal should be to regulate for resilience, not just for compliance.

VI. Conclusions, Limitations and Future Research

6.1. Conclusions

This study began by identifying a disconnect between the static nature of traditional governance and the dynamic challenges of the modern world, particularly concerning the meaningful integration of ESG factors. The accelerating pace of technological, environmental, and social change demands governance systems that are not only stable and responsible but also agile, innovative, and resilient (World Economic Forum, 2018).

The primary contribution of this paper is the development of a conceptual framework that synergises the principles of adaptive governance with the strategic imperatives of ESG. By conducting a systematic review of the literature, this research identified five critical intersections where this integration can occur: continuous learning, dynamic stakeholder engagement, integrated risk management, flexible institutional arrangements, and dynamic materiality assessments. This integrated model reframes ESG from a periodic reporting exercise into a continuous, strategic learning process embedded within an organisation's core. Furthermore, the paper provides a pathway for implementation through a three-pillar model of a diagnostic tool, a capability-building roadmap, and a staged methodology, demonstrating that this approach is not just theoretically sound but practically achievable. Ultimately, this research offers a path forward for leaders to build governance systems capable of navigating our complex future successfully, fostering innovation and sustainability holistically.

6.2. Limitations

This study has several limitations that should be acknowledged. First, as a conceptual paper based on a literature review, the proposed framework has not been empirically tested. Its real-world efficacy and the challenges of its implementation are theoretical. Second, the systematic review process, while rigorous, is subject to potential publication bias, as studies with negative findings are less likely to be published. Finally, the framework is presented at a high level of abstraction and would require significant customisation to be applied within specific organisational contexts, each with its own unique political, economic, and cultural constraints.

6.3. Future Research

The limitations of this study point toward several promising avenues for future research. This may include empirical validation. Future research should focus on in-depth case studies of organisations that have implemented elements of adaptive ESG governance. Such studies would be invaluable for identifying the specific enablers, barriers, and performance outcomes associated with the framework. Building on this, a large-scale quantitative analysis may then investigate the statistical relationship between specific adaptive governance practice, such as board diversity or the frequency of materiality reassessments, and key ESG performance indicators, providing broader evidence of effectiveness.

Further research may also concentrate on developing practical tools and sector-specific applications. A key priority is the creation and validation of the proposed diagnostic assessment tool. A robust, quantifiable instrument would empower organisations to benchmark their current adaptive capacity and track their progress over time. Alongside tool development, sector-specific analysis is crucial. Research may be needed to explore how the framework can be tailored for diverse industries, such as finance, energy, and technology, as well as for different organisational types, including multinational corporations, SMEs, and public institutions, each of which faces unique ESG challenges and governance constraints.

Acknowledgments

The author would like to acknowledge the contributions of the reviewers and the scientific committee of the ShiftXChange 2025 Conference for their insightful feedback on the abstract that preceded this paper.

References

- [1] AccountAbility. (2015). *AA1000 Stakeholder Engagement Standard 2015*. AccountAbility.
- [2] Argyris, C., & Schön, D. A. (1978). *Organizational learning: A theory of action perspective*. Addison-Wesley.
- [3] Berg, F., Kölbel, J. F., & Rigobon, R. (2022). Aggregate confusion: The divergence of ESG ratings. *Review of Finance*, 26(6), 1315–1344.
- [4] Business for Social Responsibility (BSR). (2020, July 23). *Dynamic materiality: How companies can future-proof ESG*. BSR.
- [5] COSO (Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission). (2018). *Applying enterprise risk management to environmental, social and governance-related risks*. COSO & WBCSD Report.
- [6] Eccles, R. G., Ioannou, I., & Serafeim, G. (2014). The impact of corporate sustainability on organizational processes and performance. *Management Science*, 60(11), 2835–2857.
- [7] Edelman. (2022). *Edelman Trust Barometer 2022*. Edelman.
- [8] European Banking Authority (EBA). (2025). *Final report: Guidelines on the management of ESG risks*. Paris: EBA.
- [9] Folke, C., Hahn, T., Olsson, P., & Norberg, J. (2005). Adaptive governance of social-ecological systems. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, 30, 441–473.
- [10] Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Boston: Pitman.
- [11] Giddens, A. (2009). *The politics of climate change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- [12] Giese, G., Lee, L. E., Melas, D., Nagy, Z., & Nishikawa, L. (2019). Foundations of ESG investing: How ESG affects equity valuation, risk, and performance. *Journal of Portfolio Management*, 45(5), 69–83.
- [13] Greenwood, M. (2007). Stakeholder engagement: Beyond the myth of corporate responsibility. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 74(4), 315–327.

- [14] Hamel, G., & Zanini, M. (2020). *Humanocracy: Creating organizations as amazing as the people inside them*. Boston: Harvard Business Review Press.
- [15] Head, B. W., & Alford, J. (2015). Wicked problems: Implications for public policy and management. *Administration & Society*, 47(6), 711–739.
- [16] Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). (2021). *Climate change 2021: The physical science basis*. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the IPCC. Geneva: IPCC.
- [17] Kell, G. (2018, July 11). The remarkable rise of ESG. *Forbes*. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/georgkell/2018/07/11/the-remarkable-rise-of-esg>
- [18] Kotter, J. P. (2012). Accelerate! *Harvard Business Review*, 90(11), 44–58.
- [19] Kraaijenbrink, J. (2019, January 4). Is the world really more VUCA than ever? *Forbes*. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/jeroenkraaijenbrink/2019/01/04/is-the-world-really-more-vuca-than-ever>
- [20] Krantzberg, G., & Song, Z. (2020). How does adaptive governance help restore and protect shared waters? *Open Access Library Journal*, 7(11), 1–19.
- [21] Ostrom, E. (2010). Beyond markets and states: Polycentric governance of complex economic systems. *American Economic Review*, 100(3), 641–672.
- [22] Porter, M. E., & Kramer, M. R. (2011). Creating shared value. *Harvard Business Review*, 89(1–2), 62–77.
- [23] Weber, M. (2019). *Economy and society*. Mohr Siebeck. Ed, Keith Tribe.
- [24] World Economic Forum. (2018). *Agile governance: Reimagining policy-making in the Fourth Industrial Revolution*. Geneva: World Economic Forum.
- [25] World Economic Forum. (2020). *Measuring stakeholder capitalism: Towards common metrics and consistent reporting of sustainable value creation*. Geneva: World Economic Forum.