



Achieving Circularity is a Distant Dream: Entrepreneurial Barriers to Circular Business Models in SMEs of Emerging Economies

Journal:	<i>Management Decision</i>
Manuscript ID	MD-02-2023-0269.R1
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	Circular entrepreneur, Circular entrepreneurship, Circularity, Circular economy

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Achieving Circularity is a Distant Dream: Entrepreneurial Barriers to Circular Business Models in SMEs of Emerging Economies

Abstract

Purpose: Circularity has acted as an essential phenomenon for Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) in emerging economies, pressuring entrepreneurs to its adoption in their businesses. During the adoption and implementation of circularity, entrepreneurs or circular entrepreneurs (to be precise) are facing various challenges to its effective functioning. However, the scholarly literature has offered limited research into this phenomenon. Thus, the purpose of this research is to identify the various barriers and sub-barriers for circular entrepreneurs to adopt circularity in SMEs of emerging economies.

Design/methodology/approach: A combined qualitative and quantitative approach was employed to achieve the objectives of the study. In the first stage, through an extensive literature review, a list of barriers was identified and in the second stage, a deductive approach was employed to finalize the barriers. Finally, Best-Worst Method (BWM), a multi-criteria decision-making (MCDM) method, was used to analyze the significant importance of the barriers.

Findings: The findings of the study suggested the ‘financial barrier’ as the first-ranked barrier in the adoption of Circular Business Models (CBMs), followed by the ‘regulatory and operational barriers’ as the top second and third barriers. In terms of sub-barriers, ‘lack of access to funding and capital’ has been identified as the top sub-barrier in the adoption of CBM, followed by ‘excessive regulations and red tape’ and ‘challenges due to ambiguity of the concept’.

Practical implications: To transition from a circular to a linear business approach considerably quicker and smoother, entrepreneurs may utilize the findings of this study as a blueprint for the steps to overcome the barriers in a linear to a circular transition.

Originality: This research differentiates from other studies due it solicited input directly from the people who are most familiar with the challenges of making the transition from linear to CBM, i.e. the entrepreneurs themselves.

Keywords: Circular entrepreneur; circular entrepreneurship; circularity; circular economy

1. Introduction

Many industries and countries have set ambitious goals towards a circular economy (CE) for the next 20-25 years. Recently, the G20 countries have declared CE as one of the three priority areas in the first environment and climate sustainability working group (ECSWG) meeting (PIB, 2023). Owing to its focus on minimizing resource use, waste, and emissions, the CE is attracting industry, academicians, and policymakers (Geissdoerfer *et al.*, 2020). European Union members and many other countries such as Kenya, the Republic of Rwanda, Singapore, China, and the USA have adopted the framework for CE (World Economic Forum, 2023). As per the European Commission, it is estimated that the transformation of linear business models to circular can add 600 billion euros in economic gains (European Commission, 2019). Similarly, estimates suggest that India can also create value worth US\$ 624 billion in the year 2050 (Ellen MacArthur Foundation, 2016). However, serious and large-scale efforts for the implementation of circular practices are still lacking, and CE is suffering like Mother Earth. As per the Circularity Gap Report 2022, the percentage of materials entering the global economy that will be recycled is expected to decrease from 9.1% in 2018 to 8.6% in 2022 (Circle Economy, 2022).

Some practitioners from the industry argue that adopting circular practices is now more than just a desirable option for organizations - it is a crucial factor in gaining a competitive advantage (Mensink *et al.*, 2019). Therefore, new business models called as “Circular Business Model (CBM)” are being developed that broaden the definition of value creation to encompass both environmental and social value (Cullen and de Angelis, 2021; Zucchella and Urban, 2019). As per Geissdoerfer *et al.* (2020), a circular business model is defined as “*business models that are cycling, extending, intensifying, and/or dematerializing material and energy loops to reduce the resource inputs into and the waste and emission leakage out of an organizational system. This comprises recycling measures (cycling), use phase extensions (extending), a more intense use phase (intensifying), and the substitution of products by service and software solutions (dematerialising)*” (pg 7).

In a similar vein, transforming businesses from a linear model to a circular model through entrepreneurship has been conceptualized as “circular entrepreneurship”. It is defined first by Zucchella and Urban (2019) “*to be an element of a complex socio-economic system that needs rethinking in terms of relationships, patterns (accumulated memories of events and structures) and context (technical, political, legal, cultural)*” (pg. 8). They further argue that circular entrepreneurship aims to establish organizations focused on sustainability, which includes not

1
2
3 65 just legally registered businesses but also non-governmental organizations (NGOs), territorial
4 66 institutions, communities with a sustainability agenda, and political associations (Zucchella
5 67 and Urban, 2019).
6
7
8

9 68 But according to the recent World Economic Forum (2023) report, 58% of the
10 69 entrepreneurial actions towards CBMs are caught in the planning or pilot stages. Within this
11 70 context, CE practices among small and medium enterprises (SMEs) in developing countries
12 71 are also in their early stages, both in terms of academic research and practical implementation
13 72 (Mishra *et al.*, 2022). It is rare to put CE practices into action among SMEs as they lack a proper
14 73 strategy for such practices (Luthra *et al.*, 2022). Moreover, a significant proportion of SMEs
15 74 lack familiarity with the concept of CE and its associated practices (Sharma *et al.*, 2021).
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 75 Therefore, it is crucial to search for the issues faced by entrepreneurs to employ CBMs,
23 76 particularly in the SME context. Previously, studies mainly focused on barriers and drivers of
24 77 CE practices in SMEs. For example, Agyemang *et al.* (2019) in their study delved into barriers
25 78 and enablers of putting CE practices in the automobile industry in Pakistan. Using a multiple-
26 79 case study approach, Tura *et al.* (2019) proposed a framework of drivers and barriers for the
27 80 adoption of CE in businesses in SMEs from Finland. García-Quevedo *et al.* (2020) identified
28 81 barriers to environmental innovations – a dimension of CE practices – among SMEs from a
29 82 cross-sectional dataset of European countries. Sharma *et al.* (2021) identified opportunities,
30 83 barriers, and prerequisites for the transition from a linear economy to CE among six SME cases
31 84 in India. Other studies have explored the enablers and barriers of CBM, for example, Rizos *et*
32 85 *al.* (2016) identified barriers and enablers for implementing CBM among European SMEs.
33 86 Vermunt *et al.*, (2019), using case study methodology, explored the barriers to CBM adoption
34 87 among 43 SMEs in the Netherlands. Further, only a few studies have addressed the
35 88 entrepreneurial critical factors of CBMs (Cullen and de Angelis, 2021; Zucchella and Urban,
36 89 2019).
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 90 The recent reviews related to CBMs (Geissdoerfer *et al.*, 2020; Suchek *et al.*, 2022)
49 91 highlighted that research in this area is in its nascent stage. The existing literature suggests, in
50 92 the SME context, the focus of scholars has shifted from CE practices to CBM and recently to
51 93 entrepreneurial factors of CBM (Cullen and de Angelis, 2021). But, as mentioned above, the
52 94 majority of previous studies investigating barriers to the adoption of CBM have been performed
53 95 in developed economies creating a knowledge gap from emerging economies. Moreover,
54 96 despite the identification of barriers to CBM, there is no clarity in the literature about which
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 97 barriers are more important and need immediate attention from practitioners. Hence, in the
4 98 CBM context, an empirical examination of entrepreneurial barriers to CBM adoption among
5 99 SMEs from emerging economies is needed. Thus, this study acts as a beacon in investigating
8 100 the entrepreneurial barriers to adopting CBMs among SMEs in emerging economies. More
9 101 precisely, the study aims to address the subsequent research question:

12 102 RQ1: What are the entrepreneurial barriers that hinder the adoption of CBM in SMEs of
13 103 emerging economies?

16 104 RQ2: Which are the most and least significant entrepreneurial barriers among all the barriers?

18 105 RQ3: What are the key measures that SMEs can take to overcome these barriers and adopt
20 106 CBMs?

22 107 Therefore, to address these questions, the study aims to explore the key barriers to CBM
23 108 adoption. We conducted a thorough examination of existing literature and found that there is a
24 109 lack of information on entrepreneurial barriers to the adoption of CBM among SMEs. To
25 110 address this gap in the existing literature, subsequent objectives were established.:

- 30 111
- 31 112 • To empirically investigate the entrepreneurial barriers to the adoption of CBM in SMEs
32 113 for achieving circularity
 - 33 114 • To assign and prioritize the most and least significant entrepreneurial barriers to
34 115 adopting CBM in SMEs.
 - 35 116 • To provide strategic and managerial implications to overcome the most important
36 117 entrepreneurial barriers to adopting CBM in SMEs.

37 117 To attain the aforementioned objectives, the current study, in its initial phase, conducted
38 118 a thorough literature review to investigate the entrepreneurial barriers to adopting CBM in
39 119 SMEs, validated with the experts using deduction technique and on experts' recommendations
40 120 classified barriers according to integrated Human-Organization-Technology and Technology-
41 121 Orgnaization-Environment (HOT-TOE) framework. Further, in the second phase, the same
42 122 experts were approached again to rate the final 6 main barriers and their subsequent 23 sub-
43 123 barriers. These ratings were analyzed using Best-Worst Method (BWM), a multi-criteria
44 124 decision-making (MCDM) method. The findings reveal that among the main barriers (sub-
45 125 barriers), financial barriers (lack of access to funding and capital for CE) are the top barrier,
46 126 followed by regulatory barriers (excessive regulations and red tape), operation barriers (waste
47 127 processing challenges), market barriers (challenges due to ambiguity of the concept CE),
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 128 stakeholder's barriers (lack of access to CE networks) and human resource barriers (lack of
4 129 understanding about 4-R of CE) respectively. Finally, a framework is suggested to overcome
5 130 the most significant barriers. The current study aims to provide entrepreneurs and academicians
6 131 with insights into the entrepreneurial barriers of CBM that firms need to overcome to “go
7 132 circular from the linear model”.

12
13 133 The remaining article is organized as follows: Section 2 presents the literature review to
14 134 provide a holistic view of entrepreneurial barriers of CBM among SMEs in emerging
15 135 economies. Section 3 describes the research methods. Next, Section 4 presents the finalization
16 136 process of the barriers and analysis of the results. Further, Section 5 discusses the contribution
17 137 of the study on the basis of findings and provides practical implications. In the end, Section 6
18 138 presents the conclusion of the study, including limitations and provides future research
19 139 directions.

25 140 **2. Literature Review**

27 141 This section provides an overview of the existing literature on CBM and its significance
28 142 for SMEs and elaborates on exploring the entrepreneurial barriers to the adoption of CBM
29 143 among SMEs in emerging economies. Research gaps from the literature review are outlined in
30 144 the last sub-section and justify the need for the current study.

35 145 **2.1 Significance of CBM adoption for SMEs**

37 146 The underlying principle of the CE paradigm is focused on reducing waste generation
38 147 through the implementation of the 4Rs approach, encompassing reduction, repair, reuse, and
39 148 recycling while also ensuring controlled waste and minimizing environmental impact
40 149 (Agyemang *et al.*, 2019; Ellen MacArthur Foundation, 2016). The prevailing approach to
41 150 operationalizing CE for SMEs is to bring about a significant transformation in the business
42 151 model and transition from a linear to a circular model (Takacs *et al.*, 2022). Thus, the
43 152 implementation of CBMs in SMEs holds the potential to reduce waste and energy costs (Rizos
44 153 *et al.*, 2016; Tura *et al.*, 2019) to confer financial benefits. CBMs facilitate firms to generate
45 154 and add new value chains, thereby attaining a competitive advantage (Sharma *et al.*, 2021).
46 155 Hence, to adopt CBM, businesses need to develop profound knowledge and capabilities, undo
47 156 prevailing organizational routines, and procure additional resources encompassing skilled
48 157 personnel, capital for fresh investments and advanced technology (Dzhengiz *et al.*, 2023).

1
2
3 158 By adopting of CBM, SMEs can contribute to society as they have the capacity to
4
5 159 generate numerous job prospects for people in their local communities (Kumar *et al.*, 2019).
6
7 160 Similarly, CBM assists firms in getting valuable insights from their customers and in delivering
8
9 161 more customized and personalized recyclable products that cater to their needs at lower prices
10
11 162 (Ellen MacArthur Foundation, 2016). The commitment of SMEs to sustainability and social
12
13 163 responsibility also improves brand reputation (Luthra *et al.*, 2022). Nonetheless, the adoption
14
15 164 of CBM helps in reducing social pressure and makes SMEs adhere to government laws (Kumar
16
17 165 *et al.*, 2019; Sharma *et al.*, 2021). Despite these opportunities, less than 9% of the global
18
19 166 economy is found to be circular (Circle Economy, 2022). Therefore, it becomes crucial to
20
21 167 investigate the barriers to CBM adoption.

21 168 **2.2 Barriers to CBM adoption among SMEs in emerging economies**

22
23 169 Accordingly, for an exploration of the barriers to CBM adoption, literature was searched
24
25 170 on databases including “Scopus” and “Web of Science” (WoS). Following keywords were
26
27 171 searched in these databases: “*Circular Business Models*” OR “*Circular Economy*” AND
28
29 172 “*SMEs*” AND “*Entrepreneur*” AND “*Barriers*” OR “*Constraints*” OR
30
31 173 “*Challenges*” OR “*Impediments*”. The keyword search was restricted to titles, keywords,
32
33 174 and abstracts. The scope of the search was constrained to “articles” and the time period from
34
35 175 “2015–2022”. The objective of this article's inclusion was to concentrate on the provision of
36
37 176 high-quality content in the study. An extensive literature examination initially uncovered 26
38
39 177 barriers (Explained in Table 1).

40 178 The researchers are increasingly focusing on CBM comprising cycling, extending,
41
42 179 intensifying, and dematerializing resources to benefit the environment, people, and economic
43
44 180 dimensions of a firm (Geissdoerfer *et al.*, 2020). In this vein, based on the strategies and
45
46 181 innovations adopted, (Henry *et al.*, 2020) proposed five types of circular start-ups including:
47
48 182 “design-based, waste-based, platform-based, service-based and nature-based”. Similarly,
49
50 183 (Reim *et al.*, 2021) investigated the CBM selection and their implementation among the
51
52 184 manufacturing firms and based on their maturity level suggested 4 types of CBMs including
53
54 185 “regeneration, customer operation optimization, responsibility sharing service agreements, and
55
56 186 product looping business models”. However, evidence from a survey of 10,618 SMEs in the
57
58 187 UK indicates that as a CBM approach, 59% of firms consider only reducing waste as CBM by
59
60 188 either waste material recycles or reusing or selling it to other firms (García-Quevedo *et al.*,

189 2020). This indicates that SMEs even from the developed economy are not clear about how to
190 implement CBM.

191 Various studies in literature, although small in number, have focused on opportunities,
192 enablers, and barriers of CE and CBMs in SMEs (Suchek *et al.*, 2022). For example, firms
193 entering foreign markets with a CBM strategy are struggling with support on legal, practical,
194 and technical advice in addition to financial support (Rizos *et al.*, 2016). The heterogeneity of
195 economic growth, national policies, finance mechanisms, institutional interventions and
196 incentives among EU countries significantly impacts the engagement of SMEs in the CE
197 (Zamfir *et al.*, 2017). A study of Romanian SMEs reports a high level of bureaucracy in
198 monitoring, a lack of information on CBM benefits, and insufficient support from suppliers
199 and consumers as major barriers (Ghenta and Matei, 2018). Similarly, Spanish SMEs reported
200 the unavailability of innovative technology, consumer preferences, financial, and legal
201 constraints to pose challenges in harnessing the potential benefits of CE (Pla-Julián and
202 Guevara, 2018). The adoption of CBM introduces a novel form of risk referred to as "circular-
203 risk" leaving conventional financing instruments inadequate for accommodating the unique
204 requirements of CBM implementation among SMEs (Ghisetti and Montresor, 2020). Also,
205 different types of CBMs exhibit heterogeneity in terms of associated risks, thus, resulting in
206 different responses from various financial sources (Ghisetti and Montresor, 2020).

207 A survey of manufacturing firms by Kumar *et al.* (2019) from the UK and Ireland
208 reported economic, environmental, and socio-political barriers to the adoption of CE practices.
209 Vermunt *et al.* (2019) focused on firms with "product-as-a-service, product life extension,
210 resource recovery, and circular supplies" and classified their CBM adoption barriers as internal,
211 external, and institutional. Similarly, SMEs from Norway and the USA reported an
212 insufficiency of technical skills and information pertaining to circular product design and
213 production, higher start-up costs, lack of cooperation among SMEs, and time-consuming waste
214 processing (Jaeger and Upadhyay, 2020). Likewise, García-Quevedo *et al.* (2020) studied the
215 role of two sets of barriers including a lack of capabilities and resources; and the presence of
216 regulations. Further, Takacs *et al.* (2022) have classified barriers to CE implementation among
217 SMEs as company internal, technology, market, legislative, societal and consumer barriers.

218 From the previous literature, it is established that manufacturing firms, particularly
219 SMEs, face complex challenges in adopting CMBs which require distinct and robust
220 entrepreneurial skills (García-Quevedo *et al.*, 2020; Kumar *et al.*, 2019; Mishra *et al.*, 2022;

1
2
3 221 Takacs et al., 2022). At times, SMEs lack knowledge about the green and sustainable practices
4
5 222 that they should adopt (Mishra *et al.*, 2022). Extant research suggests that various human,
6
7 223 technological, organizational, and environmental barriers are vexing firms from adopting CBM
8
9 224 (Agyemang *et al.*, 2019; de Angelis, 2021; Kumar *et al.*, 2019; Le *et al.*, 2022). The final
10
11 225 representation of barriers to CBM adoption among SMEs is exhibited in Table 1.

12 226 **2.3 Research Gaps**

13
14
15 227 In light of the substantial social, environmental, and economic pressures, the focus on
16
17 228 CBMs has become highly pertinent as it reflects the significant transformations observed in the
18
19 229 role of firms (Ünal *et al.*, 2019). The literature review suggests CBM concept is gaining
20
21 230 attention from scholars (Cullen and de Angelis, 2021; Geissdoerfer *et al.*, 2020; Suchek *et al.*,
22
23 231 2022). CBM adoption among SMEs requires the formulation of strategies that can be executed
24
25 232 by considering existing internal and external challenges (Dzhengiz *et al.*, 2023; Suchek *et al.*,
26
27 233 2022). Therefore, understanding different CBM challenges is important for SMEs and scholars.
28
29 234 Most previous studies have identified barriers to CBM from developed economies (Kumar *et*
30
31 235 *al.*, 2019; Moktadir *et al.*, 2020; Takacs *et al.*, 2022) thus, it is important to explore barriers to
32
33 236 CBM adoption among SMEs in developing economies. Next, for the understanding of both
34
35 237 scholars and practitioners, these studies fail to explain the degree of importance of each barrier.
36
37 238 Therefore, further investigation is required to identify which entrepreneurial barriers of CBM
38
39 239 are more significant than others so that industry and policymakers can target to overcome those
40
41 240 barriers first.

241 **Table 1:** Initial list of entrepreneurial barriers to circular business model adoption

Barriers	Description	Supporting References
Lack of access to funding and capital for CBM	The paucity of investments such as impact investing, crowdfunding, and public-private partnerships in CBM poses a formidable challenge to the growth and sustenance of CBM, impeding progress towards the CE.	(European Commission, 2019; Luthra <i>et al.</i> , 2022; Pla-Julián and Guevara, 2018; Rizos <i>et al.</i> , 2016; Suchek <i>et al.</i> , 2022; Toxopeus <i>et al.</i> , 2021)
Technology expenses for CBM	Technology expenses include the development and implementation of resource-efficient technologies, adoption of closed-loop production systems, and establishment of viable CE practices.	(Ghisetti and Montresor, 2020; Luthra <i>et al.</i> , 2022; Tura <i>et al.</i> , 2019)
Logistical costs and footprint challenge	The adoption of CBMs poses significant logistical challenges and environmental footprints, including the establishment of optimization of material flows and management of waste streams.	(Jaeger and Upadhyay, 2020; Mensink <i>et al.</i> , 2019; Takacs <i>et al.</i> , 2022)
Reverse logistics costs	Implementing reverse logistics in CBMs entails significant costs and challenges, including the collection, sorting, and processing costs of used products and materials.	(Geissdoerfer <i>et al.</i> , 2020; Mensink <i>et al.</i> , 2019; Vermunt <i>et al.</i> , 2019)
Lack of funds for research	The insufficiency of financial resources allocated towards exploring CBM represents a notable constraint to advancing knowledge in this field.	(Rizos <i>et al.</i> , 2016; Vermunt <i>et al.</i> , 2019)
Excessive regulations and red tape	CBMs are subject to complex regulations and administrative procedures which create excessive red tape and hinder the development and implementation of these models.	(Ghenta and Matei, 2018; Jensen <i>et al.</i> , 2022; Takacs <i>et al.</i> , 2022; Tura <i>et al.</i> , 2019)
Lack of awareness about the taxation system of CE	Taxation policies can influence the economic feasibility and competitiveness of CBMs, but complexity and multiplicity in the tax system create confusion among SMEs.	(Hull <i>et al.</i> , 2021; Luthra <i>et al.</i> , 2022; Mensink <i>et al.</i> , 2019)
Lack of awareness about government regulations regarding CE	SMEs' lack of awareness about government regulations related to waste management, product design, and end-of-life management designed to support CBM poses a significant challenge for SMEs aiming to adopt circular practices.	(European Commission, 2019; Hull <i>et al.</i> , 2021; Luthra <i>et al.</i> , 2022; Zucchella and Urban, 2019)
The challenge of balancing business with environmental impact	It is a huge challenge for SMEs to achieve balance in CBM which necessitates aligning economic, social, and environmental considerations within a systemic and circular framework.	(Henry <i>et al.</i> , 2022; Hull <i>et al.</i> , 2021; World Economic Forum, 2023)
Non-acceptance of CE by people	People have limited awareness and lack trust in circular products and have pre-notions that circular products are more expensive than traditional options.	(Jensen <i>et al.</i> , 2022; Tunn <i>et al.</i> , 2021; Tura <i>et al.</i> , 2019)
Challenges due to ambiguity of the concept of CE	Circular products present several challenges, including varying interpretations and definitions, difficulties in measuring the circularity of products, and the potential for greenwashing.	(European Commission, 2019; Geissdoerfer <i>et al.</i> , 2020; World Economic Forum, 2023)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46	<p>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46</p>	<p>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46</p>
Volatile market condition	The volatile market conditions persist for circular products due to several reasons, including limited consumer demand, lack of market incentives, and challenges in scaling CBMs.	(Jensen <i>et al.</i> , 2022; Kumar <i>et al.</i> , 2019; Luthra <i>et al.</i> , 2022)
Lack of a market for CE products	SMEs lack the market for CE products, which hinders the spread of sustainable business practices and obstructs the adoption of CBM.	(Ellen MacArthur Foundation, 2016; Rizos <i>et al.</i> , 2016)
Lack of skilled employees	SMEs lack skilled employees as CBMs requires a range of specialised skill, including those related to product design, and sustainable resource management.	(Jensen <i>et al.</i> , 2022; Sharma <i>et al.</i> , 2021; Zucchella and Urban, 2019)
Lack of awareness about the waste management	Employees at SMEs are unaware of the waste management practices required for CBMs.	(Luthra <i>et al.</i> , 2022; Mishra <i>et al.</i> , 2022)
Lack of understanding about 4-R of CE	SMEs often face challenges in implementing the 4-R of CBMs - reduce, reuse, repair, and recycle - due to limited resources and expertise.	(Khan <i>et al.</i> , 2022; Tura <i>et al.</i> , 2019; World Economic Forum, 2023)
Employee hiring & training challenges.	Hiring and training employees in SMEs for CBMs presents several challenges, including a lack of available talent, limited training programs, and the need for specialized skills.	(Kumar <i>et al.</i> , 2019; Sharma <i>et al.</i> , 2021)
Employee retention & compensation challenges	SMEs face difficulties in hiring and keeping qualified employees with the necessary skills for CBMs in light of the limited pool of experienced candidates.	(García-Quevedo <i>et al.</i> , 2020; Sharma <i>et al.</i> , 2021)
Lack of access to CE networks	SMEs transitioning towards CBMs lack access to circular entrepreneurs' networks and their knowledge to learn from.	(Kumar <i>et al.</i> , 2019; Mensink <i>et al.</i> , 2019)
Lack of cooperation between stakeholders	SMEs lack a culture of collaboration, transparency, and trust between stakeholders for the implementation of CBMs.	(Jaeger and Upadhyay, 2020; Le <i>et al.</i> , 2022; Tura <i>et al.</i> , 2019)
Lack of Confidence in CE	SMEs lack confidence in CBMs due to several factors, including a limited understanding of circularity, a lack of market incentives, and excessive government regulations.	(Kumar <i>et al.</i> , 2019; World Economic Forum, 2023)
Fear of failure of CE	The fear of failure of CBMs among SMEs stems from perceived risks, uncertainties, and lack of expertise related to circularity.	(Agyemang <i>et al.</i> , 2019; Henry <i>et al.</i> , 2022)
Manufacturing and recycling challenge	The manufacturing and recycling challenges in CBMs are related to the need for new material streams, waste reduction, and efficient recycling processes.	(Jaeger and Upadhyay, 2020; Rizos <i>et al.</i> , 2016; Tura <i>et al.</i> , 2019)
Lack of stock due to logistics difficulties	SMEs rely on regular and timely material flows for smooth production for CBMs but often face logistic difficulties.	(Jensen <i>et al.</i> , 2022; Kumar <i>et al.</i> , 2019)
Equipment and waste availability challenges	SMEs need efficient and cost-effective waste processing equipment and technologies for the improvement of their circular material streams.	(Agyemang <i>et al.</i> , 2019; European Commission, 2019)
Waste processing challenges	SMEs lack adequate infrastructure, have limited waste streams, and lack technological solutions for employing CBMs.	(Luthra <i>et al.</i> , 2022; Sharma <i>et al.</i> , 2021)

243 3. Research Methods

244 A four-phased study was carried out to accomplish the objectives of this study, as
245 depicted in Figure 1. During the first phase, a comprehensive review of relevant literature was
246 conducted to identify the entrepreneurial barriers being faced by SMEs in CBM adoption.
247 Subsequently, a brainstorming session was organized to obtain the viewpoints of experts from
248 academics, industry and policy-making. Three barriers were deducted, and a final list of 23
249 barriers was prepared, which were further classified under financial, human, market,
250 operational, regulatory, and stakeholder barriers following the integrated HOT-TOE
251 framework. After confirmation of barriers, the same experts were contacted again to rate the
252 barriers according to best-worst importance, and the ranking was prepared. Finally, after
253 consultation with the experts, a framework was proposed to overcome the top-ranked barriers
254 of CBM.

255 <Insert Figure 1 here>

257 3.1 Best Worst Method (BWM)

258 BWM is a revolutionary multi-criteria decision-making (MCDM) approach in which
259 the best criterion is compared to all other criteria, and all other criteria are compared to the
260 worst criterion (Rezaei, 2015). There are numerous other MCDM techniques available such as
261 Analytical Hierarchical Processing (AHP)/Fuzzy AHP, Analytical network Processing (ANP),
262 Multi-Attribute Utility Theory (MAUT), Simple Multiple Attribute Rating Technique
263 (SMART), etc., to rank the criteria. However, compared to other MCDM techniques, such as
264 AHP/Fuzzy AHP, BWM holds an edge over these techniques because it requires fewer pair-
265 wise comparisons (Rezaei, 2015). Discussions in extant literature suggest that AHP is the most
266 commonly used MCDM technique for computing weights of factors/criteria, etc. But the
267 existence of integer values in the ranking reduces computational effort in BWM, in contrast to
268 fractional values in AHP (Tarei *et al.*, 2021). Further, BWM has a lower chance of inconsistency
269 (Rezaei, 2016). The literature may imply that AHP is widely used and adopted in many
270 investigations. However, this does not guarantee its outcomes. For example, Rezaei (2015) has
271 found BWM's results exhibit greater consistency when compared to AHP. In terms of
272 performance, BWM outperforms AHP in four crucial areas: conformity, consistency, minimum
273 violation, and total deviation (Mi *et al.*, 2019). Thus, BWM is a popular, powerful, and easy-to-
274 use MCDM technique for analyzing complex decision-making problems.




Figure 1: Research design for conducting the study

Not only this, BWM has found widespread application in the scholarship of various research fields, including agriculture, education, environmental science, medicine, management, technology, etc. (Mi *et al.*, 2019). In the business and management context, (Moktadir *et al.*, 2023) have employed BWM to assess ‘strategic drivers’ to overcome the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic. Similarly in the CE context, (Moktadir *et al.*, 2020) assessed barriers to CE practices in the leather industry using BWM. Whereas, in the entrepreneurship literature, recently, Mondal *et al.* (2023) and Muneeb *et al.* (2020) have used BWM to rank enablers of “green entrepreneurship” and “sustainable entrepreneurship” respectively. Provided successful and widespread application of BMW in the extant literature, it becomes convincing to apply BWM in the current study to effectively find the ranking of entrepreneurial barriers of CBM in SMEs. The following steps of the BWM are used for computation:

Step 1: Determine a suitable set of criteria pertinent to the phenomenon under investigation.

Step 2: Select the best (B) and worst (W) criteria for both main and sub-criteria.

Step 3: Employing a scale ranging from 1 to 9, ask each expert to furnish a pairwise assessment between best criterion B over all the other criteria. This will produce a vector:

$$A_B = (a_{B1}, a_{B2}, \dots, a_{Bn})$$

Where a_{Bj} indicates the preference of the best criterion B over criteria j. Here $a_{BB} = 1$.

Step 4: Similar to the above, each of the managers was asked to elicit pairwise ratings of all the other criteria with the worst criterion (W). This will also produce a vector:

$$A_W = (a_{1W}, a_{2W}, \dots, a_{nW})^T$$

Where a_{jW} indicates the preference of the criteria j over the worst criterion W. Here $a_{WW} = 1$.

Step 5: Further, to get the optimized weights ($w_1^*, w_2^*, w_3^*, \dots, w_n^*$) for all the criteria, derive the weights of criteria with the aim of minimizing the highest absolute variations for all j $\{|w_B - a_{Bj} w_j|, |w_j - a_{jW} w_W|\}$. The below minimax model will be determined:

$$\min \max\{|w_B - a_{Bj} w_j|, |w_j - a_{jW} w_W|\}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{s.t.} \\ & \sum_{j=1}^n w_j = 1 \\ & w_j \geq 0, \text{ for all } j \end{aligned} \quad \dots(1)$$

Model (1) is transformed into a linear model and is shown as $\min \xi^L$,

Subject to:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \min \xi^L \\
 & \text{s.t.} \\
 & |w_B - a_{Bj} w_j| \leq \xi^L, \text{ for all } j \\
 & |w_j - a_{jw} w_w| \leq \xi^L, \text{ for all } j \\
 & \sum_{w_j \geq 0, \text{ for all } j} w_j = 1 \quad \dots(2)
 \end{aligned}$$

“Optimal weights” can be acquired by solving Model (2) ($w_1^*, w_2^*, w_3^*, \dots, w_n^*$) and “optimal value” ξ . Consistency (ξ^{L*}) of criteria comparisons close to “0” is desired (Rezaei, 2015, 2016).

4. Analysis

After selecting the barriers from the literature, experts within the pertinent area of the current study were contacted by email and phone. The Sonipat region of India, a prominent player in the SME industry, is home to many skilled professionals. Entrepreneurs of SMEs in Sonipat, are making efforts to adopt some of the circularity features, such as recycling and reusing substances in order to shift from linear to CBMs. Despite this, entrepreneurs have not been able to make a full shift to circularity, prompting us to single out the majority of experts among them. Using snowball sampling, we reached out to over twenty experts, and about 70% (fourteen) consented to take part in the research. The remaining six declined to participate in the study due to unavailability in the city, a busy schedule, and the requirement of their participation in multiple phases of the study. For reliability and consistency of MCDM results, previous studies by Murry and Hammons (1995) recommended data collection from 10-13 experts while Okoli and Pawlowski (2004) recommended 10-18 experts. Moreover, previous studies by Mondal et al. (2023) and Muneeb et al. (2020) using BWM collected data from thirteen and eight experts respectively. This study considered 14 experts which increased the accuracy of the barriers’ identification and analysis.

These experts were from industry (for example, start-up owners, heads of circular operations), academia (professors working in circular entrepreneurship), and policymakers (for example, consultants, and senior officers from the Ministry of MSMEs in India). The experts had an average of 12.5 years of experience in their field and had minimum post-graduation and maximum PhD as their educational qualification. Next, in-person face-to-face meetings were arranged with the experts by taking prior appointments over the mobile call. At first, the experts

354 were asked to rate the most appropriate barriers for this investigation from the list of 26 barriers
355 as explained in the next section.

356 **4.1 Finalization of the barriers**

357 For the deduction phase, we followed the research methodology steps suggested by Orji and
358 Liu (2020). A questionnaire was prepared for the experts that featured binary "YES" and "NO"
359 responses to determine the barriers. The questionnaire included these responses to assess the
360 significance of the barriers to circular entrepreneurship in Indian manufacturing SMEs.

361 Depending on their importance, the experts replied with "YES" to retain the barriers and "NO"
362 to remove them. Once the experts' responses were collected, the deduction process was carried
363 out to conclude the various main barriers and their sub-enablers. The deduction of circular
364 entrepreneurship in SMEs was determined by calculating the threshold value as follows:

365 $[(\text{Sum of Experts with Yes Response}) / (\text{Total Number of responses received for all KSFs}$
366 $\text{including yes and no})] * 100 = [(12 + 10 + 12 + 10 + 2 + 12 + 10 + 10 + 10 + 3 + 10 + 12 + 11$
367 $+ 10 + 11 + 12 + 10 + 2 + 13 + 10 + 10 + 10 + 12 + 10 + 11 + 12) / (26 * 14)] * 100 = (257/364)$
368 $* 100 = 70.60\%$. The outcome of the threshold value calculation demonstrated that options
369 with a threshold value below 70.60% were to be eliminated from the study. The entrepreneurial
370 barrier "lack of funds for research" received 2 Yes (14.29%) and 12 No (85.71%) while, named
371 "lack of a market for CE products" received 3 Yes (21.43%) and 11 No (78.57%).
372 Furthermore, the entrepreneurial barrier "employee retention & compensation challenges" also
373 received 2 Yes (14.29%) and 12 No (85.71%). Since these three barriers had a lower value for
374 "Yes" percentage than the threshold value of 70.60%, they were removed from the final list.
375 Table 2 presents the responses to the final remaining 23 barriers after the deduction process.

376 Additionally, the experts suggested that these entrepreneurial barriers must be classified
377 further. Therefore, to classify the barriers, the current study employed an integrated theoretical
378 framework of TOE and HOT fit. The "Technology-Organization-Environment (TOE)"
379 framework (Tornatzky *et al.*, 1990) is a highly regarded and long-standing theory in the study
380 of innovation and technology adoption, particularly as it relates to organizations. TOE has been
381 extensively used to understand technology adoption within CE research contexts. On the other
382 side, "Human-Organization-Technology (HOT)" fit model (Yusof *et al.*, 2008) is a dynamic
383 organizational framework that has been utilized in various academic areas to examine the
384 adoption of innovations. The HOT fit model is based on the philosophy that human and
385 organizational factors are equally important to technical aspects for the successful
386 implementation of any innovation diffusion (Ahmadi *et al.*, 2018). Previous research has

1
2
3 387 utilized the combination of the TOE framework and HOT fit model called Human-
4
5 388 Organization-Technology-Environment (HOTE) for enablers of green entrepreneurship
6
7 389 (Mondal *et al.*, 2023) and circular economy (Le *et al.*, 2022) and recommended the use of an
8
9 390 integrated model for the robustness of results. Therefore, after the deduction process, this study
10
11 391 classified the remaining 23 entrepreneurial barriers of CBM in SMEs based on the integrated
12
13 392 approach of the TOE framework and HOT fit model. These were called main barriers named
14
15 393 financial, regulatory, market, human resource, stakeholder, and operational barriers as shown
16
17 394 in Table 2. Previously, identified and deduced barriers were named sub-barriers. Once the main
18
19 395 and sub-barriers were chosen and eliminated, the next phase was to examine the weights of the
20
21 396 barriers as given in the following section.

22 397
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

398 **Table 2:** Final list of entrepreneurial barriers identified from the literature and their validation scores by experts

Main barriers	Sub-barriers	Code	Pertinent to small and medium enterprises (SMEs)				Sum
			“Yes” response	“Yes” response (%)	“No” response	“No” response (%)	
Financial barriers (FB)	Lack of access to funding and capital for CBM	F1	12	85.71	2	14.29	14
	Technology expenses for CBM	F2	10	71.43	4	28.57	14
	Logistical costs and footprint challenge	F3	12	85.71	2	14.29	14
	Reverse logistics costs	F4	10	71.43	4	28.57	14
Regulatory barriers (RB)	Excessive regulations and red tape	R1	12	85.71	2	14.29	14
	Lack of awareness about the taxation system of CE	R2	10	71.43	4	28.57	14
	Lack of awareness about government regulations regarding CE	R3	10	71.43	4	28.57	14
	Challenge of balancing business with environmental impact	R4	10	71.43	4	28.57	14
Market barriers (MB)	Non-acceptance of CE by people	M1	10	71.43	4	28.57	14
	Challenges due to ambiguity of the concept of CE	M2	12	85.71	2	14.29	14
	Volatile market condition	M3	11	78.57	3	21.43	14
Human Resource Barriers (HRB)	Lack of skilled employees	H1	10	71.43	4	28.57	14
	Lack of awareness about waste management	H2	11	78.57	3	21.43	14
	Lack of understanding about 4-R of CE	H3	12	85.71	2	14.29	14
	Employee hiring & training challenges	H4	10	71.43	4	28.57	14
Stakeholder's barriers (SB)	Lack of access to CE networks	S1	13	92.86	1	7.14	14
	Lack of cooperation between stakeholders for CE	S2	10	71.43	4	28.57	14
	Lack of Confidence in CE	S3	10	71.43	4	28.57	14
	Fear of failure of CE	S4	10	71.43	4	28.57	14
Operational barriers (OB)	Manufacturing and recycling challenge	O1	12	85.71	2	14.29	14
	Lack of stock due to logistics difficulties	O2	10	71.43	4	28.57	14
	Equipment and waste availability challenges	O3	11	78.57	3	21.43	14
	Waste processing challenges	O4	12	85.71	2	14.29	14

400 **4.2 BWM analysis**

401 A questionnaire was prepared as per the method proposed by BWM and the same experts who
 402 participated in the deduction process were approached again. The experts were asked to select
 403 the most and least important barriers to CE among SMEs in India. Next, a pair-wise comparison
 404 was done of both main and sub barriers on a 1 to 9 scale, where 1 signifies “equal importance,”
 405 and 9 signifies “extreme/intense less importance,” respectively. This study has been based on
 406 the comprehension and judgements of experts; hence, results may be biased. Tables 3 and 4
 407 show the pair-wise comparison of the main barriers.

408 **Table 3:** Best to others rating of main entrepreneurial barriers of CBM among SMEs

Expert	Best to Others	FB	RB	MB	HRB	SB	OB
E1	FB	1	2	2	7	5	4
E2	OB	4	2	5	9	7	1
E3	FB	1	2	1	7	8	3
E4	RB	2	1	3	6	5	4
E5	FB	1	2	7	4	4	3
E6	FB	1	4	2	5	7	2
E7	OB	1	3	2	9	5	1
E8	RB	1	1	9	5	8	3
E9	FB	1	2	4	7	6	3
E10	FB	1	4	3	9	6	2
E11	FB	1	3	2	5	6	4
E12	FB	1	5	2	3	9	6
E13	OB	2	5	3	9	6	1
E 14	FB	1	2	3	7	5	3

409

410 **Table 4:** Others to worst rating of main entrepreneurial barriers of CBM among SMEs

Expert	E1	E2	E3	E4	E5	E6	E7	E8	E9	E10	E11	E12	E13	E14
Others to the Worst	HRB	HRB	SB	HRB	MB	SB	HRB	MB	HRB	HRB	SB	SB	HRB	HRB
FB	7	5	8	5	7	7	9	8	7	9	6	9	8	7
RB	6	8	7	6	6	3	5	9	6	3	3	3	4	6
MB	6	4	7	3	1	6	8	1	3	5	4	8	6	4
HRB	1	1	2	1	3	3	1	3	1	1	2	5	1	1
SB	2	3	1	2	3	1	3	2	2	3	1	1	3	3
OB	4	9	4	3	4	6	9	5	3	8	3	4	9	4

411

412 Once the ratings for the entire set of main and sub-barriers were obtained, the next phase
 413 of BWM is employed to determine the weights of the entire set of barriers using a linear
 414 equation (2). Afterwards, a simple average was applied to determine the overall local weights

1
2
3 415 from the data collected from 12 experts. Later, global weights were calculated by multiplication
4 416 of the local weights of the main barrier by the local weights of the sub-barrier and obtained
5 417 ranks on the basis of global weights. The weights and corresponding ranks of all 23 sub-barriers
6 418 are shown in Table 5. The consistency ratio (Ksi*) of individual experts was calculated for the
7 419 main entrepreneurial barriers' as reported 0.06, 0.07, 0.05, 0.05, 0.06, 0.05, 0.05, 0.05, 0.06,
8 420 0.06, 0.05, 0.07, 0.07, 0.06 respectively for each expert. The values of all were less than 0.10
9 421 for each expert and were found to be in the desired range (Mondal *et al.*, 2023; Muneeb *et al.*,
10 422 2020). Further, the consistency (Ksi*) of individual experts for all sub-barriers under each main
11 423 barrier was as follows: Financial barriers (0.05, 0.08, 0.09, 0.05, 0.07, 0.05, 0.09, 0.05, 0.09,
12 424 0.07, 0.05, 0.05, 0.08, 0.09), Regulatory barriers (0.07, 0.06, 0.07, 0.04, 0.05, 0.08, 0.07, 0.06,
13 425 0.08, 0.07, 0.05, 0.02, 0.08, 0.08), Market barriers (0.06, 0.09, 0.08, 0.04, 0.04, 0.07, 0.08, 0.04,
14 426 0.00, 0.09, 0.04, 0.03, 0.06, 0.08), Human resource barriers (0.05, 0.06, 0.05, 0.05, 0.08, 0.08,
15 427 0.09, 0.05, 0.07, 0.09, 0.05, 0.05, 0.08, 0.07), Stakeholder barriers (0.04, 0.02, 0.07, 0.05, 0.08,
16 428 0.06, 0.09, 0.05, 0.08, 0.09, 0.05, 0.08, 0.06, 0.04), Operational barriers (0.05, 0.07, 0.07, 0.05,
17 429 0.08, 0.06, 0.09, 0.05, 0.08, 0.07, 0.05, 0.07, 0.08, 0.05). Further, average consistency for each
18 430 main barrier was calculated where Financial barriers (0.07), Regulatory barriers (0.06), Market
19 431 barriers (0.06), Human resource barriers (0.07), Stakeholder barriers (0.06), and Operational
20 432 barriers (0.07). All the consistency ratio values were below desired 0.10 for both the individual
21 433 expert and the barrier and were thus highly consistent (Mondal *et al.*, 2023; Muneeb *et al.*,
22 434 2020). Moreover, the robustness of BWM results is checked by employing sensitivity analysis.

4.3 Sensitivity Analysis

23 435
24 436 A sensitivity analysis was performed to assess the robustness of the barriers ranking by
25 437 varying the weight of the main barrier with the highest weight and checking the impact on the
26 438 sub-barriers. Previously, scholars have examined the stability in ranks by changing the weight
27 439 of the highest-ranked criteria from 0.1 to 0.9 and analysing subsequent changes in the ranking
28 440 of the sub-criteria (Moktadir *et al.*, 2023). In the current study, the weight of the most important
29 441 barrier "financial barriers" was varied in the range of 0.1 to 0.9 and changes in the ranking of
30 442 sub-barriers were investigated. The variation of weight among main barriers and sub-barriers
31 443 according to changes in "financial barriers" from 0.1 to 0.9 is shown in Tables 6 and 7.

444 **Table 5:** Weights and ranking of main and sub-entrepreneurial barriers of CBM among SMEs by the experts.

Main barrier	Weight	Sub-barrier	Local Weights	Global Weights	Rank
Financial barrier (FB)	0.326	Lack of access to funding and capital for CBM (F1)	0.535	0.174	1
		Technology expenses for CBM (F2)	0.120	0.039	10
		Logistical costs and footprint challenge (F3)	0.181	0.059	7
		Reverse logistics costs (F4)	0.164	0.053	9
Regulatory barriers (RB)	0.194	Excessive regulations and red tape (R1)	0.448	0.087	2
		Lack of awareness about taxation system of CBM (R2)	0.082	0.016	20
		Lack of awareness about government regulations regarding CBM (R3)	0.124	0.024	14
Market barriers (MB)	0.159	Challenge of balancing business with environmental impact (R4)	0.346	0.067	5
		Non-acceptance of CE by people (M1)	0.126	0.020	16
		Challenges due to ambiguity of the concept CE (M2)	0.530	0.084	3
Human Resource Barriers (HRB)	0.064	Volatile market condition (M3)	0.344	0.055	8
		Lack of skilled employees (H1)	0.254	0.016	18
		Lack of awareness about waste management (H2)	0.251	0.016	19
		Lack of understanding about 4-R of CE (H3)	0.417	0.027	12
Stakeholder's barriers (SB)	0.068	Employee hiring & training challenges (H4)	0.078	0.005	23
		Lack of access to CE networks (S1)	0.428	0.029	11
		Lack of cooperation between stakeholders for CE (S2)	0.378	0.026	13
		Lack of Confidence in CE (S3)	0.103	0.007	21
Operational Barriers (OB)	0.189	Fear of failure of CE (S4)	0.092	0.006	22
		Manufacturing and recycling challenge (O1)	0.349	0.066	6
		Lack of stock due to logistics difficulties (O2)	0.087	0.016	17
		Equipment and waste availability challenges (O3)	0.123	0.023	15
		Waste processing challenges (O4)	0.441	0.084	4

446 **Table 6:** Variation in the weight of other main barriers when weights of financial barriers are
 447 increased for sensitivity analysis.

Main Barriers	0.1	0.2	0.3	BWM Results	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.9
Financial barrier	0.100	0.200	0.300	0.326	0.400	0.500	0.600	0.700	0.800	0.900
Regulatory barriers	0.259	0.230	0.201	0.194	0.173	0.144	0.115	0.086	0.058	0.029
Market barriers	0.212	0.189	0.165	0.159	0.142	0.118	0.094	0.071	0.047	0.024
Human Resource Barriers	0.085	0.076	0.066	0.064	0.057	0.047	0.038	0.028	0.019	0.009
Stakeholder's barriers	0.091	0.081	0.071	0.068	0.061	0.050	0.040	0.028	0.020	0.010
Operational Barriers	0.252	0.224	0.196	0.189	0.168	0.140	0.112	0.084	0.056	0.028

448

449 **Table 7:** Variations of sub-barriers during sensitivity analysis when 'financial barriers' weights
 450 range between 0.1 to 0.9.

Sub barriers	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.326	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.9
F1	0.053	0.107	0.160	0.174	0.214	0.267	0.321	0.374	0.428	0.481
F2	0.012	0.024	0.036	0.039	0.048	0.060	0.072	0.084	0.096	0.108
F3	0.018	0.036	0.054	0.059	0.072	0.090	0.109	0.127	0.145	0.163
F4	0.016	0.033	0.049	0.053	0.066	0.082	0.098	0.115	0.131	0.148
R1	0.116	0.103	0.090	0.087	0.077	0.064	0.052	0.039	0.026	0.013
R2	0.021	0.019	0.017	0.016	0.014	0.012	0.009	0.007	0.005	0.002
R3	0.032	0.029	0.025	0.024	0.021	0.018	0.014	0.011	0.007	0.004
R4	0.090	0.080	0.070	0.067	0.060	0.050	0.040	0.030	0.020	0.010
M1	0.027	0.024	0.021	0.020	0.022	0.015	0.012	0.009	0.006	0.003
M2	0.113	0.100	0.088	0.084	0.092	0.063	0.050	0.038	0.025	0.013
M3	0.073	0.065	0.057	0.055	0.059	0.041	0.032	0.024	0.016	0.008
H1	0.022	0.019	0.017	0.016	0.014	0.012	0.010	0.007	0.005	0.002
H2	0.021	0.019	0.017	0.016	0.014	0.012	0.010	0.007	0.005	0.002
H3	0.036	0.032	0.028	0.027	0.024	0.020	0.016	0.012	0.008	0.004
H4	0.007	0.006	0.005	0.005	0.004	0.004	0.003	0.002	0.001	0.001
S1	0.039	0.035	0.030	0.029	0.026	0.022	0.017	0.012	0.009	0.004
S2	0.034	0.030	0.027	0.026	0.023	0.019	0.015	0.011	0.008	0.004
S3	0.009	0.008	0.007	0.007	0.006	0.005	0.004	0.003	0.002	0.001
S4	0.008	0.007	0.006	0.006	0.006	0.005	0.004	0.003	0.002	0.001
O1	0.088	0.078	0.069	0.066	0.059	0.049	0.039	0.029	0.020	0.010
O2	0.022	0.019	0.017	0.016	0.015	0.012	0.010	0.007	0.005	0.002
O3	0.031	0.028	0.024	0.023	0.021	0.017	0.014	0.010	0.007	0.003
O4	0.111	0.099	0.087	0.084	0.074	0.062	0.049	0.037	0.025	0.012

451

452 At 0.1 weight of financial barriers, the sub-barrier R1 ranks the highest and H4 ranks
 453 the lowest. However, R1 is not able to retain the highest position on changing the values of the
 454 financial barrier to 0.2 and F1 takes the highest position. Similarly, F1 remains at rank 1 on
 455 further varying the weights from 0.3 to 0.9 as shown in Table 8.

456 **Table 8:** Ranking of barriers during sensitivity analysis

Sub barriers	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.326	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.9
F1	7	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
F2	20	15	10	10	10	7	4	4	4	4
F3	18	8	8	7	5	2	2	2	2	2
F4	19	10	9	9	6	3	3	3	3	3
R1	1	2	2	2	3	4	5	5	5	5
R2	17	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
R3	11	13	14	14	15	14	14	14	14	14
R4	4	5	5	5	7	8	8	8	8	8
M1	13	16	16	16	14	16	16	16	16	16
M2	2	3	3	3	2	5	6	6	6	6
M3	6	7	7	8	8	10	10	10	10	10
H1	15	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18
H2	16	19	19	19	19	19	19	19	19	19
H3	9	11	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12
H4	23	23	23	23	23	23	23	23	23	23
S1	8	9	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11
S2	10	12	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13
S3	21	21	21	21	21	21	21	21	21	21
S4	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	22
O1	5	6	6	6	9	9	9	9	9	9
O2	14	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17
O3	12	14	15	15	16	15	15	15	15	15
O4	3	4	4	4	4	6	7	7	7	7

457
 458 The global weights of sub-barriers to CBM adoption among SMEs are shown in Figure
 459 2. It can be observed from the figure that the variation is insignificant. Therefore, the proposed
 460 ranking of barriers is robust enough in addressing any human bias and uncertainty in data under
 461 fuzzy conditions.




Figure 3: Sensitivity analysis of weights of entrepreneurial barriers of CBM

5. Findings and Discussion

The current study employed a combination of literature review, integrated HOT-TOE framework for classification and expert opinion to investigate entrepreneurial barriers to CBM adoption among SMEs. Chronologically, barriers were identified and classified; deduced and validated with experts; and finally ranked by taking responses from the same experts using the best-worst method.

5.1 Findings of the BWM study

Based on the findings, among the main barriers, financial barriers (FB), with 0.326 assigned weight, were found to be ranked first and the biggest challenge for the adoption of CBM by SMEs. Finance is the oil for running any business. The findings are in line with previous studies (Luthra *et al.*, 2022; Toxopeus *et al.*, 2021) which stressed the participation of private and public sectors in financing CBM. Next, regulatory barriers (RB), with 0.194 assigned weight, were ranked second. Government regulations create a conducive environment for the adoption of new business models. However, the results of this study are contrary to common belief. Previously, Hull *et al.* (2021) and Jensen *et al.* (2022) have also highlighted that government regulations create obstacles to a circular economy and need to be altered. Furthermore, operational barriers (OB), with 0.189 assigned weight, were ranked third which could be reasoned for a combination of factors related to manufacturing, technology, and recycling challenges. The findings are in line with prior studies of Agyemang *et al.* (2019), Sharma *et al.*, (2021), and Tura *et al.* (2019) which emphasized that firms need to advance their

operational processes to adopt CBM. The combined weight of these three barriers is 0.712 indicating that 71.20% of the CBM adoption among SMEs can be overcome by addressing these barriers. A more detailed and elaborated understanding of the results of sub-enablers is discussed.

Among all 23 sub-barriers, “*lack of access to funding and capital (F1)*” for CBM, with an assigned global weight of 0.174, ranked first indicating that SMEs do not have enough funds for transitioning from linear to circular business models. The findings are in line with the previous studies (Ghisetti and Montresor, 2020; Toxopeus *et al.*, 2021), which have highlighted the importance of finance for CBM adoption in developed countries. Sub-barrier “*excessive regulations and red tape (R1)*”, with an assigned global 0.087, is ranked second, indicating stringent rules and regulations hampering the SMEs transitioning from linear to CBMs. The findings are in line with existing literature (Kumar *et al.*, 2019; Takacs *et al.*, 2022; Zamfir *et al.*, 2017), which has emphasized the inadequate laws and legal systems creating barriers to CBM adoption. Sub-barrier “*challenges due to ambiguity of the concept CE (M2)*”, with assigned global weight 0.084 was ranked third indicating that SMEs like others do not have clarity on what CE is. The findings are in line with the extant literature (García-Quevedo *et al.*, 2020; Henry *et al.*, 2020; Jensen *et al.*, 2022; World Economic Forum, 2023) wherein both practitioners and scholars have an ambiguous understanding of the CBM and CE.

Ranked in the fourth position, “*waste processing challenges (O4)*”, with an assigned global weight of 0.084, require large efforts from SMEs. The findings are similar to previous research of (Hull *et al.*, 2021; Jaeger and Upadhyay, 2020; Mensink *et al.*, 2019; Sharma *et al.*, 2021) who have stated that SMEs face major impediments when it comes to waste management for CBM adoption. Next, the “*challenge of balancing business with environmental impact (R4)*”, with an assigned global weight of 0.067 was ranked fifth. The findings are matching the previous literature (Henry *et al.*, 2022; Hull *et al.*, 2021; Ünal *et al.*, 2019), which has indicated the importance of circular business to reduce the impacts on the environment. If combined, these top 5 ranked entrepreneurial barriers are responsible for almost 50% of roadblocks in CBMs adoption among SMEs. Hence, half of the issues can be resolved only by focusing on these top 5 barriers only. The remaining sub barriers were ranked as follows O1 > F3 > M3 > O4 > R4 > F2 > S1 > H3 > O4 > R4 > M1 > O2 > H1 > H2 > R2 > S3 > S4 > H4.

5.2 Theoretical contribution, implications, and research propositions

The current study presents both theoretical and practical implications, suggesting that certain themes explored in the research could be applied to facilitate the adoption of CBMs among SMEs in emerging economies. First, the study provides a holistic view of the entrepreneurial barriers faced by SMEs in CBM adoption. While extant literature has predominately considered only identifying the barriers to CE practices and CBM adoption among SMEs (Mishra *et al.*, 2022; Sharma *et al.*, 2021; Takacs *et al.*, 2022). This study first identified the barriers from the literature and verified, with the help of experts, the importance of all barriers for Indian SMEs. Second, this study has contributed to the literature by providing a perspective on challenges faced in the adoption of CBM by SMEs from an emerging economy. Previously, the literature has majorly concentrated on identifying challenges SMEs from developed economies only (Kumar *et al.*, 2019; Moktadir *et al.*, 2020; Takacs *et al.*, 2022). These barriers may also be important to other emerging economies where SMEs operate in a similar business environment. Third, the study classified the barriers under the HOT-TOE framework, assigned weights and ranked the barriers according to their best-worst importance. As per the authors' knowledge, no previous study has attempted to assign weights and rank entrepreneurial barriers to CBM adoption among SMEs from developing economies. Fourth, this study provides propositions for the implication and further exploration. The implications based on the theory are provided next.

Proposition 1: Both policymakers and SMEs from emerging economies should work in tandem for easy access to capital

Borrowing from public funds by SMEs exhibits a greater impact in facilitating the adoption of CBM than self-funding but a lesser impact than debt funding (Ghisetti and Montresor, 2020). Thus, it is imperative for the government and the finance industry to devise novel financial instruments or mechanisms that enable SMEs to effectuate a resilient transition towards CE (Ghisetti and Montresor, 2020; Toxopeus *et al.*, 2021). Nonetheless, SMEs should be proactive and step forward to benefit from these financial instruments. Luthra *et al.* (2022) suggested that SMEs from emerging economies should prepare a monthly or yearly report highlighting firms' efforts for the adoption of CE, this can give confidence to involved stakeholders to invest in CE efforts. Further, to obtain finance for CBM, SMEs from emerging economies can use a mix of these three strategies that are signalling future cash flow

1
2
3 547 expectations, relationship building with banks and suppliers, and designing standardized,
4
5 548 durable circular assets that can be used as bank's collateral (Toxopeus *et al.*, 2021).
6

7 549 **Proposition 2: Bring changes in government rules and regulations to transform a linear**
8
9 550 **economy into a circular economy**

10
11 551 Zamfir *et al.* (2017) argue that the location of SMEs in the EU shapes the decision to
12
13 552 adopt CBM due to various factors including economic growth, national policies, finance
14
15 553 mechanisms, institutional interventions and incentives available in the member country. Hence,
16
17 554 learning from developed economies, the government and policymakers from developing
18
19 555 economies should relax laws related to CE at both state and national levels. Further, incentives
20
21 556 for the adoption of CBM can motivate SMEs to CE readiness (Singh *et al.*, 2018). For the same,
22
23 557 while procuring products government agencies such as on Government e-Marketplace (GeM)
24
25 558 - an online public procurement platform in India - can prefer circular products for their use.
26
27 559 Similarly, other e-commerce websites can create separate sections for circular products.

28 560 Moreover, the governments in emerging economies should create a standardized
29
30 561 mechanism for CE performance evaluation including data collection, analysis, and punishment
31
32 562 for CBM adoption among SMEs (Kumar *et al.*, 2019). For this purpose, already existing
33
34 563 agencies such as the Quality Council of India (QCI) and the Central Pollution Control Board
35
36 564 (CPCB) in India can provide certification of circularity to SMEs. However, these assessments
37
38 565 should be easy to understand by SMEs as the complexity of regulations engenders ambiguity
39
40 566 and perplexity among SMEs and results in a state of uncertainty for CE implementation
41
42 567 (Takacs *et al.*, 2022). Here, SME associations can bridge the gap and should put clear demands
43
44 568 in front of policymakers to boost CE.

45 569 **Proposition 3: Standardized definition of CBM can reduce challenges arising due to the**
46
47 570 **ambiguity of the CE concept**

48 571 World Economic Forum (2023) states that regardless of its full potential, firms perceive
49
50 572 themselves as adhering to CE principles only if they include recycled material in a finely tuned
51
52 573 and entirely optimized supply chain. Likewise, recycling or reusing waste or merely selling it
53
54 574 to other companies is confused with CBM by SMEs (García-Quevedo *et al.*, 2020). Moreover,
55
56 575 the ambiguity encompassing the CE concept leads to confusion among customers and creates
57
58 576 uncertainty regarding the environmental and social benefits of circular products, thus inhibiting
59
60 577 demand in the market (Jensen *et al.*, 2022).

1
2
3 578 Not only this, but scholars are also confused about defining the CBM, Henry *et al.*
4 579 (2020) collated 128 different definitions of types of CE start-ups. Hence, by adopting a proper
5 580 definition, governments can set the scope of CE and CBMs for SMEs and encourage them to
6 581 adopt CE and CBMs. Furthermore, the governments of emerging economies should take a
7 582 bottom-up approach and advertise the benefits of circular products to spread awareness among
8 583 customers and boost demand which will attract new entrepreneurial ventures for circular
9 584 products.

15
16 585 **Proposition 4: Industry should prepare strategies and solutions for the waste processing**
17 586 **challenge**

19
20 587 The waste is generated at various stages of the production process; however, the end-
21 588 of-product life waste management is very complex. The complexity arises from various factors
22 589 including an increased number of materials, the use of small but significant materials, and the
23 590 presence of multiple components with diverse characteristics (Jaeger and Upadhyay, 2020).
24 591 SMEs from emerging economies lack the expertise to segregate and recover different materials
25 592 from waste (Sharma *et al.*, 2021). As per an estimate by Mensink *et al.* (2019) to sustain a
26 593 plastic waste processing facility operating at a scale of 1 million tonnes per annum, it would be
27 594 necessary to have a catchment area of approximately 33,000 square kilometres within a
28 595 standard metropolitan agglomeration. Operating at such a scale is a herculean task for SMEs.
29 596 Sharma *et al.* (2021) emphasized that waste processing is expensive and based on investments.
30 597 However, SMEs can have a competitive advantage over large firms by setting up smaller and
31 598 mobile waste processing units.

32
33
34 599 Firms from emerging economies need to have a long-term vision (Luthra *et al.*, 2022)
35 600 and consider the end life of product management at the product planning and development
36 601 phase. For the same, firms should clearly mark the ratio of materials in the produced product
37 602 and provide the information for its proper disposal beforehand (Jaeger and Upadhyay, 2020).
38 603 Government agencies like Metrology Department can stay forefront and provide industry-wise
39 604 measurement standards for different waste materials to promote fairness, transparency, and
40 605 trust in waste trade activities. Nonetheless, academics can help SMEs and play an important
41 606 role in developing and transferring knowledge on waste management (Hull *et al.*, 2021).

42
43
44 607 **Proposition 5: Challenges of balancing business with environmental impact**

45
46
47 608 SMEs generally have fewer resources and capabilities compared to larger firms, and
48 609 they often encounter difficulties in adopting and implementing environmentally friendly

1
2
3 610 practices for the extraction of material from waste (Henry *et al.*, 2022). But, value creation by
4
5 611 extracting certain waste materials - having positive impacts on the environment and society -
6
7 612 may be costly for a firm to even operate at, on the other hand, there are certain materials (for
8
9 613 example bio-waste) which costs low but are hazardous to environment and society (Ünal *et al.*,
10
11 614 2019). This results in a decision paradox for SMEs particularly as they have a resource crunch.
12
13 615 Therefore, SMEs need to be motivated to proactively focus on integrating circular strategies
14
15 616 for balancing business with environmental impact (Hull *et al.*, 2021). For the same SMEs can
16
17 617 integrate their processes of circularity with the standard practices suggested by ISO 14001 to
18
19 618 address environmental issues such as climate change, net zero, and sustainability.

20
21 619 The analysis of barriers and proposed solutions to the adoption of CBM in this study will be
22
23 620 helpful for practitioners to design feasible CBMs for SMEs.

24 621 **6. Conclusion, limitations, and future research direction**

25
26 622 Circularity has been an emergent topic even for SMEs in developing nations. The emergence
27
28 623 of circularity has pressured various entrepreneurs to adopt the CBM to sustain themselves in
29
30 624 the market. Therefore, many entrepreneurs have started their SMEs' transition from linear to
31
32 625 CBM without even the proper awareness and knowledge of circularity. These haste-oriented
33
34 626 actions of adoption of CBM lead entrepreneurs to fail or partially fulfilled the circularity
35
36 627 projects. The entrepreneurs or circular entrepreneurs have ignored the different factors that
37
38 628 came as a barrier during the adoption of circularity.

39
40 629 The present research has identified the barriers to adopting CBM from the literature and
41
42 630 used a deductive approach to filter and finalise the barriers which are more relevant to SMEs
43
44 631 and circularity settings. Finally, BWM is implemented based on the experts, which are majorly
45
46 632 associated with these barriers, and prioritised the barriers in adopting CBM. The study was
47
48 633 conducted on Indian SMEs entrepreneurs, specially oriented to the Sonipat region, which
49
50 634 greatly contributes to SMEs. The findings indicate “financial barrier” as the top barrier and
51
52 635 “lack of access to funding and capital” as a top sub-barrier for entrepreneurs in adopting CBM
53
54 636 in SMEs. Therefore, the study offers a comprehensive look at various barriers and delivers the
55
56 637 most influential barriers and sub-barriers, which will help entrepreneurs of SMEs to plan the
57
58 638 actions needed to be taken for handling these barriers for effective adoption and
59
60 639 implementation of CBM in the emerging nation’s setting.

60 640 Like any other study, this study also has some limitations. Given that the study's
61
62 641 responses are inherently subjective and reliant upon expert’s beliefs, experiences, judgments,

and values there exists a potential for the final outcome to be influenced by biases. However, it is probable to mitigate potential biases by implementing conducting an exploratory factor analysis to combine interrelated barriers set into a composite set of barriers. Also, this study has not emphasized the interrelationships between the barriers, therefore, future studies can apply methodology such as interpretive structural modelling (ISM) to establish interrelationships.

Further statistical investigations (for example structural equation modelling) might be added to this research to help with generalisation and validation. Although this is a groundbreaking study, more research into the challenges that will inevitably arise after putting this research into practice in the industry is needed to ensure its usefulness in overcoming the barriers to circularity adoption in SMEs in the Indian context. Hence, this study might look at the same activity again in the future to investigate some other developing theme in entrepreneurial action towards net zero capabilities.

References

- Agyemang, M., Kusi-Sarpong, S., Khan, S.A., Mani, V., Rehman, S.T. and Kusi-Sarpong, H. (2019), "Drivers and barriers to circular economy implementation", *Management Decision*, Vol. 57 No. 4, pp. 971–994, doi: 10.1108/MD-11-2018-1178.
- Ahmadi, H., Nilashi, M., Shahmoradi, L., Ibrahim, O., Sadoughi, F., Alizadeh, M. and Alizadeh, A. (2018), "The moderating effect of hospital size on inter and intra-organizational factors of Hospital Information System adoption", *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, Vol. 134, pp. 124–149, doi: 10.1016/j.techfore.2018.05.021.
- de Angelis, R. (2021), "Circular economy: laying the foundations for conceptual and theoretical development in management studies", *Management Decision*, Vol. 59 No. 6, pp. 1209–1227, doi: 10.1108/MD-05-2019-0587.
- Circle Economy. (2022), *The Circularity Gap Report 2022*, Amsterdam.
- Cullen, U.A. and de Angelis, R. (2021), "Circular entrepreneurship: A business model perspective", *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, Vol. 168, p. 105300, doi: 10.1016/j.resconrec.2020.105300.
- Dzhengiz, T., Miller, E.M., Ovaska, J. and Patala, S. (2023), "Unpacking the circular economy: A problematizing review", *International Journal of Management Reviews*, Vol. 25 No. 2, pp. 270–296, doi: 10.1111/ijmr.12329.
- Ellen MacArthur Foundation. (2016), "Circular economy in India: Rethinking growth for long-term prosperity", <https://Ellenmacarthurfoundation.Org/Circular-Economy-in-India>, 5 December.
- European Commission. (2019), *Accelerating the Transition to the Circular Economy: Improving Access to Finance for Circular Economy Projects*, doi: 10.2777/983129.

- 1
2
3 677 García-Quevedo, J., Jové-Llopis, E. and Martínez-Ros, E. (2020), “Barriers to the circular economy in
4 678 European small and medium-sized firms”, *Business Strategy and the Environment*, Vol. 29 No. 6,
5 679 pp. 2450–2464, doi: 10.1002/bse.2513.
- 7 680 Geissdoerfer, M., Pieroni, M.P.P., Pigosso, D.C.A. and Soufani, K. (2020), “Circular business models:
8 681 a review”, *Journal of Cleaner Production*, Vol. 277, p. 123741, doi:
9 682 10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.123741.
- 11 683 Ghenta, M. and Matei, A. (2018), “SMEs and the circular economy: from policy to difficulties
12 684 encountered during implementation”, *Amfiteatru Economic*, Vol. 20 No. 48, pp. 294–309, doi:
13 685 10.24818/EA/2018/48/294.
- 15 686 Ghisetti, C. and Montresor, S. (2020), “On the adoption of circular economy practices by small and
16 687 medium-size enterprises (SMEs): does ‘financing-as-usual’ still matter?”, *Journal of Evolutionary*
17 688 *Economics*, Vol. 30 No. 2, pp. 559–586, doi: 10.1007/s00191-019-00651-w.
- 19 689 Henry, M., Bauwens, T., Hekkert, M. and Kirchherr, J. (2020), “A typology of circular start-ups: An
20 690 analysis of 128 circular business models”, *Journal of Cleaner Production*, Vol. 245, p. 118528,
21 691 doi: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.118528.
- 23 692 Henry, M., Hoogenstrijd, T. and Kirchherr, J. (2022), “Motivations and identities of ‘grassroots’
24 693 circular entrepreneurs: an initial exploration”, *Business Strategy and the Environment*, pp. 1–20,
25 694 doi: 10.1002/bse.3097.
- 27 695 Hull, C.E., Millette, S. and Williams, E. (2021), “Challenges and opportunities in building circular-
28 696 economy incubators: Stakeholder perspectives in Trinidad and Tobago”, *Journal of Cleaner*
29 697 *Production*, Vol. 296, p. 126412, doi: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2021.126412.
- 31 698 Jaeger, B. and Upadhyay, A. (2020), “Understanding barriers to circular economy: cases from the
32 699 manufacturing industry”, *Journal of Enterprise Information Management*, Vol. 33 No. 4, pp. 729–
33 700 745, doi: 10.1108/JEIM-02-2019-0047.
- 35 701 Jensen, S.F., Kristensen, J.H., Uhrenholt, J.N., Rincón, M.C., Adamsen, S. and Waehrens, B.V. (2022),
36 702 “Unlocking barriers to circular economy: an ISM-based approach to contextualizing
37 703 dependencies”, *Sustainability*, Vol. 14 No. 15, p. 9523, doi: 10.3390/su14159523.
- 39 704 Khan, E.A., Chowdhury, Md.M.H., Hossain, M.A., Mahmud, A.K.M.S., Baabdullah, A.M. and
40 705 Dwivedi, Y.K. (2022), “Performance of small firms in a circular economy: configuring challenges
41 706 and entrepreneurial orientation”, *Management Decision*, Vol. ahead-of-print, doi: 10.1108/MD-
42 707 05-2022-0731.
- 44 708 Kumar, V., Sezersan, I., Garza-Reyes, J.A., Gonzalez, E.D.R.S. and AL-Shboul, M.A. (2019), “Circular
45 709 economy in the manufacturing sector: benefits, opportunities and barriers”, *Management*
46 710 *Decision*, Vol. 57 No. 4, pp. 1067–1086, doi: 10.1108/MD-09-2018-1070.
- 48 711 Le, T.T., Behl, A. and Pereira, V. (2022), “Establishing linkages between circular economy practices
49 712 and sustainable performance: the moderating role of circular economy entrepreneurship”,
50 713 *Management Decision*, doi: 10.1108/MD-02-2022-0150.
- 52 714 Luthra, S., Kumar, A., Sharma, M., Arturo Garza-Reyes, J. and Kumar, V. (2022), “An analysis of
53 715 operational behavioural factors and circular economy practices in SMEs: An emerging economy
54 716 perspective”, *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 141, pp. 321–336, doi:
55 717 10.1016/j.jbusres.2021.12.014.
- 57 718 Mensink, M., Bartels, R., Elser, B. and Ulbrich, M. (2019), *Winning in a Circular Economy: Practical*
58 719 *Steps for the European Chemical Industry*.

- 1
2
3 720 Mi, X., Tang, M., Liao, H., Shen, W. and Lev, B. (2019), “The state-of-the-art survey on integrations
4 721 and applications of the best worst method in decision making: Why, what, what for and what’s
5 722 next?”, *Omega*, Vol. 87, pp. 205–225, doi: 10.1016/j.omega.2019.01.009.
- 7 723 Mishra, R., Singh, R.K. and Govindan, K. (2022), “Barriers to the adoption of circular economy
8 724 practices in Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises: Instrument development, measurement and
9 725 validation”, *Journal of Cleaner Production*, Vol. 351, p. 131389, doi:
11 726 10.1016/j.jclepro.2022.131389.
- 12 727 Moktadir, Md.A., Ahmadi, H.B., Sultana, R., Zohra, F.-T.-, Liou, J.J.H. and Rezaei, J. (2020), “Circular
13 728 economy practices in the leather industry: A practical step towards sustainable development”,
14 729 *Journal of Cleaner Production*, Vol. 251, p. 119737, doi: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.119737.
- 16 730 Moktadir, Md.A., Paul, S.K., Kumar, A., Luthra, S., Ali, S.M. and Sultana, R. (2023), “Strategic drivers
17 731 to overcome the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic: implications for ensuring resilience in
18 732 supply chains”, *Operations Management Research*, Vol. 16 No. 1, pp. 466–488, doi:
20 733 10.1007/s12063-022-00301-8.
- 22 734 Mondal, S., Singh, S. and Gupta, H. (2023), “Assessing enablers of green entrepreneurship in circular
23 735 economy: An integrated approach”, *Journal of Cleaner Production*, Vol. 388, p. 135999, doi:
24 736 10.1016/j.jclepro.2023.135999.
- 26 737 Muneeb, F.M., Yazdi, A.K., Wanke, P., Yiyin, C. and Chughtai, M. (2020), “Critical success factors
27 738 for sustainable entrepreneurship in Pakistani Telecommunications industry: a hybrid grey systems
28 739 theory/ best-worst method approach”, *Management Decision*, Vol. 58 No. 11, pp. 2565–2591, doi:
29 740 10.1108/MD-08-2019-1133.
- 31 741 Murry, J.W. and Hammons, J.O. (1995), “Delphi: A versatile methodology for conducting qualitative
32 742 research”, *The Review of Higher Education*, Vol. 18 No. 4, pp. 423–436, doi:
33 743 10.1353/rhe.1995.0008.
- 35 744 Okoli, C. and Pawlowski, S.D. (2004), “The Delphi method as a research tool: an example, design
36 745 considerations and applications”, *Information & Management*, Vol. 42 No. 1, pp. 15–29, doi:
37 746 10.1016/j.im.2003.11.002.
- 39 747 PIB. (2023), “First Environment and Climate Sustainability Working Group (ECSWG) meeting
40 748 concludes in Bengaluru with all G20 countries showing commitment to constructively work
41 749 towards the objective of the three priority areas”, *Press Investigation Bureau*, 11 February,
42 750 available at: <https://www.pib.gov.in/PressReleasePage.aspx?PRID=1898304> (accessed 13
43 751 February 2023).
- 45 752 Pla-Julián, I. and Guevara, S. (2018), “Is circular economy the key to transitioning towards sustainable
46 753 development? Challenges from the perspective of care ethics”, *Futures*, Vol. 105, pp. 67–77, doi:
47 754 10.1016/j.futures.2018.09.001.
- 49 755 Reim, W., Sjödin, D. and Parida, V. (2021), “Circular business model implementation: a capability
50 756 development case study from the manufacturing industry”, *Business Strategy and the
51 757 Environment*, Vol. 30 No. 6, pp. 2745–2757, doi: 10.1002/bse.2891.
- 53 758 Rezaei, J. (2015), “Best-worst multi-criteria decision-making method”, *Omega (United Kingdom)*,
54 759 Elsevier, Vol. 53, pp. 49–57, doi: 10.1016/j.omega.2014.11.009.
- 56 760 Rezaei, J. (2016), “Best-worst multi-criteria decision-making method: Some properties and a linear
57 761 model”, *Omega*, Vol. 64, pp. 126–130, doi: 10.1016/j.omega.2015.12.001.
- 59
60

- 1
2
3 762 Rizos, V., Behrens, A., Kafyeke, T., Hirschnitz-Garbers, M. and Ioannou, A. (2016), “The circular
4 763 economy: barriers and opportunities for SMEs”, *CEPS Working Documents*.
- 6 764 Sharma, N.K., Govindan, K., Lai, K.K., Chen, W.K. and Kumar, V. (2021), “The transition from linear
7 765 economy to circular economy for sustainability among SMEs: A study on prospects, impediments,
8 766 and prerequisites”, *Business Strategy and the Environment*, Vol. 30 No. 4, pp. 1803–1822, doi:
9 767 10.1002/bse.2717.
- 11 768 Singh, M.P., Chakraborty, A. and Roy, M. (2018), “Developing an extended theory of planned behavior
12 769 model to explore circular economy readiness in manufacturing MSMEs, India”, *Resources,
13 770 Conservation and Recycling*, Vol. 135, pp. 313–322, doi: 10.1016/j.resconrec.2017.07.015.
- 15 771 Suchek, N., Ferreira, J.J. and Fernandes, P.O. (2022), “A review of entrepreneurship and circular
16 772 economy research: state of the art and future directions”, *Business Strategy and the Environment*,
17 773 Vol. 31 No. 5, pp. 2256–2283, doi: 10.1002/bse.3020.
- 19 774 Takacs, F., Brunner, D. and Frankenberger, K. (2022), “Barriers to a circular economy in small- and
20 775 medium-sized enterprises and their integration in a sustainable strategic management framework”,
21 776 *Journal of Cleaner Production*, Vol. 362, p. 132227, doi: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2022.132227.
- 23 777 Tarei, P.K., Chand, P. and Gupta, H. (2021), “Barriers to the adoption of electric vehicles: Evidence
24 778 from India”, *Journal of Cleaner Production*, Vol. 291, p. 125847, doi:
25 779 10.1016/j.jclepro.2021.125847.
- 27 780 Tornatzky, L., Fleischer, M. and Chakrabarti, A.K. (1990), *The Process of Technology Innovation*,
28 781 Lexington Books.
- 30 782 Toxopeus, H., Achterberg, E. and Polzin, F. (2021), “How can firms access bank finance for circular
31 783 business model innovation?”, *Business Strategy and the Environment*, Vol. 30 No. 6, pp. 2773–
32 784 2795, doi: 10.1002/bse.2893.
- 34 785 Tunn, V.S.C., Van den Hende, E.A., Bocken, N.M.P. and Schoormans, J.P.L. (2021), “Consumer
35 786 adoption of access-based product-service systems: the influence of duration of use and type of
36 787 product”, *Business Strategy and the Environment*, Vol. 30 No. 6, pp. 2796–2813, doi:
37 788 10.1002/bse.2894.
- 39 789 Tura, N., Hanski, J., Ahola, T., Stähle, M., Piiparinen, S. and Valkokari, P. (2019), “Unlocking circular
40 790 business: A framework of barriers and drivers”, *Journal of Cleaner Production*, Vol. 212, pp. 90–
41 791 98, doi: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.11.202.
- 43 792 Ünal, E., Urbinati, A., Chiaroni, D. and Manzini, R. (2019), “Value creation in circular business models:
44 793 the case of a US small medium enterprise in the building sector”, *Resources, Conservation and
45 794 Recycling*, Vol. 146, pp. 291–307, doi: 10.1016/j.resconrec.2018.12.034.
- 47 795 Vermunt, D.A., Negro, S.O., Verweij, P.A., Kuppens, D.V. and Hekkert, M.P. (2019), “Exploring
48 796 barriers to implementing different circular business models”, *Journal of Cleaner Production*, Vol.
49 797 222, pp. 891–902, doi: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.03.052.
- 51 798 World Economic Forum. (2023), *Circular Transformation of Industries: Unlocking New Value in a
52 799 Resource Constrained World*, Geneva.
- 54 800 Yusof, M.Mohd., Papazafeiropoulou, A., Paul, R.J. and Stergioulas, L.K. (2008), “Investigating
55 801 evaluation frameworks for health information systems”, *International Journal of Medical
56 802 Informatics*, Vol. 77 No. 6, pp. 377–385, doi: 10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2007.08.004.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

803 Zamfir, A.-M., Mocanu, C. and Grigorescu, A. (2017), "Circular economy and decision models among
804 European SMEs", *Sustainability*, Vol. 9 No. 9, p. 1507, doi: 10.3390/su9091507.

805 Zucchella, A. and Urban, S. (2019), *Circular Entrepreneurship: Creating Responsible Enterprise*,
806 Springer International Publishing, Cham, doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-18999-0.

807

Management Decision