ENVIRONMENTAL ORIENTATION AND CORPORATE STRATEGY: ON THE WAY TO CORPORATE SUSTAINABILITY?

Shima Barakat and George Cairns
University of Strathclyde Graduate School of Business

Introduction

In an effort to ensure that they are effectively responding to 'changing market place needs' (Jaworski and Kohli, 1993) companies have accepted that the boundaries of business and of doing business are being redefined by environmentalism and that adjustments must be made accordingly. From the academic literature it appears that the environment is now recognised as an important influence on corporate strategy (Menon and Menon, 1997) and that companies are now incorporating the environment in their strategies to remain competitive (Kirkpatrick 1990; Mason 1993). The question then arises: are organisations in the 21st century really conforming to the theoretical models that have been recently developed (e.g. Rugman and Verbeke, 1998; Porter and Van Der Linde, 1995; Aragon-Correa, 1998; Judge Jr. and Douglas, 1998)?

This paper will look at corporate environmentalism as an initial measure of sustainability and thus the different forms of environmental behaviour are explored. Among some of the common perceptions on the effects of environmental issues on strategy and management are:

1. The idea that integrating environmental issues in the strategic planning results in better financial and environmental performance (Judge Jr. and Douglas, 1998) and that 'company image, corporate mission and social responsibility are the major factors that influence environmental strategy' (Lau and Ragothaman, 1997).
2. 'The degree to which each firm's environmental strategy focuses on market or non-market areas reflects its existing core competencies' (Maxwell et al., 1997).
3. That the most strategically proactive firms will be inclined to employ both 'traditional corrective' and 'modern preventive' approaches to the natural environment (Aragon-Correa, 1998).

A paper presented at the Business Strategy and Environment conference (Barakat and Cairns, 2000) suggests that this is not always the case. Barakat and Cairns explore the above statements using both academic and corporate literature and conclude that top companies generally espouse a degree of environmental orientation, but that this sits in isolation of, and is not often supported or reinforced by the espoused business strategies. This initial desk study has been followed up by a study in which companies were approached in order to explore the findings of the desk study. In this research, in-depth interviews were conducted with environmental managers of six large organizations from different industries located in the West of Scotland.

This paper presents the findings of this exploratory study, in order to bring forward more contemporary issues that face modern industry as they handle the environmental challenge. This paper will deal with only this one part of the sustainability challenge. The writers have uncovered a variety of reactions and behaviours among companies in different sectors, which conform to current literature in some ways, but not in others. From the interview data, three main emergent categories of context of impacts on environmental orientation have been identified: people, markets and the legislative environment, and management and operations. Within each of these broad contexts, a number of more detailed impacts were identified. Each theme, and the key issues it embodies, is explored in more detail within its context in this paper. Initial conclusions are drawn on the possible reasons for divergence in organisational environmental and business strategies and their possible impact on corporate sustainability.

Literature

The World Economic Forum held in January 2001 clearly illustrated the world in which companies must now survive. The multitude of protestors represented the present and evolving thoughts and values that can no longer be ignored. Among these were the "environmental and social justice advocates who genuinely lay claim to concerned constituencies" (Wootliff and Deri, 2001; p.157). Companies are realising that they can "no longer rely on their products and services [only] as a means of effective differentiation and added value" (Wright and Fill, 2001; p.99. [] added by authors). Thus first movers in the sustainability effort will reap dividend to their profitability, social and environmental bottom lines, to the so-called 'triple bottom line'. This may be why there is some evidence that more companies are embarking on more and more efforts to uptake issues of sustainability (Wootliff and Deri, 2001). These efforts are currently manifesting themselves in different forms.

Until the beginning of the 1990's, standard theory prevailing at the time assigned a passive role to business in the environmental story (and the sustainability story was just beginning) but then another perspective was presented in which an instrumental role is played by businesses and thus also creating competitive advantage (Scott Barrett, 1992). To realize competitive advantage through adopting and promoting corporate 'environmentalism', Reinhart (1999) proposes that we need a more complex approach to deal with environmental issues within organisations than the all-or-nothing one that companies use so far. He takes the debate further to state that "managers should make environmental investments for the same reasons they make other investments" (p.2) which is because they either expect them to result in a positive financial return or to reduce their perceived risk. But companies are not only making environmental investments on which they expect return, they are also investing in creating a suitable image for themselves to endorse their products, as illustrated by the 55% of the top 100 UK companies that have been involved in "radical development of their identities in the last decade" (Wright and Fill, 2001; p.99)

Therefore, a strategic approach must be adopted for a new frontier to be crossed and for the company to truly benefit. It is beyond this threshold that the environment can be treated as an opportunity and no longer as a threat (Hutchinson, 1992). Reinhart (1999) proposed five different strategies to take advantage of the environmental opportunities while recognizing that environmental issues "do not automatically create opportunities to make money" (p.2). One of these describes how companies can actively pursue developing new environmental technologies and encouraging government to adopt stricter regulation to protect their market position. Seven years earlier, Gil Friend (1992) hinted at a similar approach but presented a different, more idealistic, drive for companies to "actually move ahead of government…in a pragmatic effort to bring a new level or environmental quality." (p.1)

There is a different picture to be seen, where "companies tailor their environmental program to comply with government mandates rather than to adopt a proactive approach." (Lau and Ragothaman, 1997; p.1). This can be witnessed today as companies continue to react to legislative pressure in accordance with other stakeholders' pressure and not in isolation of them (McKay, 2001). They also realise that the tradeoffs that exists within companies over economic issues and environmental ones, for "production processes, customer needs and technology, is dynamic and complex." (p.2) Conttrill (1997) takes this concept further and describes an 'environmentally-friendly strategy' that he identifies as investment recovery, whereby non-working assets are identified, reused, or remarked. In that way, not only is there a positive environmental impact but also a significant impact on the bottom line as any returns from this process go directly to the bottom line.

Ultimately, the corporate world seems to be still most sensitive to factors and stakeholders that affect the financial bottom line and issues of sustainability still follow an economic rationale (Banerjee, 2001).

This paper will illustrate, using six cases, how these issues and debates manifest themselves in industry today, in the new millennium. The complex and dynamic trade-offs will be highlighted as well as the different strategies employed by the companies. The paper will show that the cases sometimes conform exactly to the literature, and sometimes not as precisely as the academic literature would espouse.

Methodology

To highlight some of the current thought in industry on environmental issues, an exploratory study was undertaken from October to December 2000. The findings of this study are to be used as the basis for the formulation of the research questions to be further investigated in the more extensive exploratory part of a Ph.D.

For this study, the Glasgow area sites of six large organisations from different industries were used. The companies shown for the study were distributed as follows within the industries covered: 3 in electronic manufacturing and/or assembly, 2 in the chemical industry, and one in heavy machinery manufacturing and maintenance. These industries were seen as appropriate for this study because they have significant environmental impact without being any of the 'hot' environmental industries targeted by the media. These industries have serious environmental impacts without being controversial in the public perception as well as being in a position to be able to choose how they use their resources.

To get some contrasting views, people from slightly different areas were asked for an interview. The choice was all geared around people with direct interest in the environment but with conceptually different roles ranging from technical, to direct environmental responsibility, to advisors. The exact composition of the group interviewed was: one technical manager, one responsible care advisor, two HSE managers, one senior environmental engineer and one management site representative (for the environment). Their different perspective on the ideas discussed were collected and are presented in a collated version in this paper.

The interviews were conducted in 2-3 hour meetings using exploratory, open-ended questions and letting the interviewee lead the discussion into the areas they thought important. This was deliberate to uncover the 'key' areas of concern for industry, from an industrial angle. The meetings were then followed up by a site visit and the discussion continued as examples were pointed out to the researcher.

From this study 3 main areas have been identified as being the contexts within which the discussions and ideas revolved. These were namely people, markets and the regulatory environment, and management and operations. These broad contexts hold within them several different themes that the companies felt were affecting them in different ways and they were reacting to all the different factors and considerations. Each theme, and the issues it embodies, is explored in detail within its context below. Each statement in quote marks but not referenced indicates that this is a direct quote of one of the managers.

1. People

1.1 Attitude

There is a general recognition that the environment has gained attention and focus in the last few years and there has been a feeling that "a company that ignores the environment does so at its own peril". This is particularly so for one company that has expressed a feeling that the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) seeks to prosecute the larger companies as it gains them good publicity and as a result feels particularly threatened.

This movement towards more environmental considerations and activities seem to be driven firstly by legislation and secondly by economic factors. The companies are now trying to find "potentially 'win' opportunities" though it seems that initiative comes about more as a result of different factors coming together rather than consistent reasons. The companies are now dealing with their two major problems: the pressure of complying with legislation and filling the gaps in their familiarity with environmental issues. The companies are driven to develop new business opportunities as a result of these.

The companies have displayed consistency in the fact that they do have 'reasonable' commitment from their Board of Directors and their top management. Also lower down the organizational hierarchy where "people are generally willing to accept environmental reasoning and act accordingly."

The problems with modifying behaviour and activities tend to arise from the manufacturing managers. This results in support being given to environmental initiative as long as they do not really affect production. The attitude that has developed from this is that the environmental departments are expected to 'deal with it' and 'not bother' the core business. They are seen to exist to 'fix' things while working within an already defined process and having no substantial influence over production. Put simply by the Responsible Care Advisor: "environment is great as long as the business doesn't have to look at it."

The bottom line attitude is "either in business or not" and environment must fit ***around*** that, [apparently not ***within***.]

1.2 Awareness

Lack of awareness and knowledge of environmental issues was cited by three of the managers as a major problem that they had to over come. It was even considered as one of the two major pressures a company had to deal: the internal resistance that results from this lack of awareness and familiarity and the other being the external legislative pressure.

Communications was seen as a step in solving this knowledge problem but it still remains that communication on environmental issues are "lacking, too much or inappropriate" and thus not effectively affecting awareness in a positive manner. On the other hand, when communication has been successful and knowledge transferred, the managers found that others in the company more willing to accept environmental behaviour. This was illustrated by an example in one of the companies where resistance to an Environmental Management System (EMS) was significantly lowered when it was explained clearly and in detail. Before that, those involved had not been aware of what an EMS mean, nor what would be required of them, which resulted in them being negative and unwilling to cooperate.

With improved communication and raised awareness companies are witnessing changing roles. There is a trend towards "highlighting the HSE role and properly defining roles" within HSE and across the organization with regards to HSE issues.

1.3 Time and Logistics

There were several other areas of concerns for the companies when considering environmental issues in relation to their people. The first area pertained to the ***time*** requirements that face the people in the organization. Time is needed to adequately think about issues and actions while still more time is needed to carry out these actions. Managers were finding that they need the time to think while there was "too many demand on time" resulting from their regular routine.

The second area pertained to the ***staff disciple***, which was needed to make them more inherently environmental. Here again the issue of knowledge (outlined above) was raised and the need for education was recognized as a means of 'breaking out' of complacency. The possibility of involving the EPA in a form of partnership in an effort to fulfil these educational needs was mentioned. This would also aid in institutionalising the responsibility of every person towards the environment. It was the opinion of managers that it is necessary to ensure that people feel ownership over the environment and environmental initiatives as well as it becoming formally part of everybody's job.

The final area of concern revolved around ***logistics***. The companies were concerned that they had to deal with issues of production, space, segregations etc. It was generally felt that if "people don't like what they have been asked to do they won't do it" and that it was necessary to "make it easy so that people won't mind the added work/job".

2. Markets and the Legislative Environment

2.1 Legislation

Legislation was mentioned as the major pressure on industry at the moment to act in a more environmentally concerned manner. The pressure is strong to respond to targets and guidelines set by the EPA and yet some companies feel that the pressure is not strong enough to make the environment a priority. This is illustrated well by one of the companies. In this example, they were completely ready to embark on an environmental project when they thought it would help them comply with the new legislation. Then, as soon as they discovered that the law was not going to impact them as much as they had initially thought, the whole project was put on halt despite its substantial positive environmental contribution.

On the other hand, it was not only current legislation that was considered but also potential laws and regulations. It was therefore agreed that the companies are ‘reactive’ to environmental legislation with only one of the companies feeling that they had influenced an international environmental agreement and that they would continue to be involved in driving legislation.

For those who regarded the legislative pressure enough to be a serious consideration, the new work environment was seen either as a challenge or as an opportunity. The companies agree that “what is required by law must be met” - regardless of cost. The underlying motivation is to avoid prosecution on both a company and personal (site manager) level. The fear of this prosecution drives the companies into responding by looking for new ways of doing things, encouraging creativity in some cases. Legislation is also driving companies in a less proactive direction where they are considering whether is it worthwhile for them to invest the time and resources themselves or simply pass on the burden to another organization. To illustrate, one of the companies was considering taking on a subcontractor for their processes to avoid the “time, cost, hassle, and risk” that they themselves would bear if they engaged in re-inventing their processes to be more environmental.

Generally, the companies are very willing to comply with environmental legislation but reported that they were not always certain which laws were applicable to them and those they could identify were difficult to understand and difficult to apply.

2.2 Economics

The companies realise that even though people are becoming more flexible and accepting of environmental behaviour, resources are still limited. Therefore, it is “unrealistic to expect huge capital investments just for the environment.” On the other hand, there are cost drivers for certain initiatives that would lead to their undertaking.

The mangers agreed that the limit on resources was a challenge to them. Funding for environmental work was a particular challenge for one of the companies and it even looked for external partners for sharing the resource burden as it seeks to “bring in more people, services and facilities.” This restriction on time, money, people and physical resource has made the companies “deal with environmental issues little by little”, in some case so as not to “kill the company completely”. That is why actions are taken when they can be financially or legally justified.

There seems to be a current waste focus, which seems to have resulted not only from legislative pressure but also from economic incentives. The companies have agreed that it is becoming more and more expensive to dispose of their waste due to transport and landfill costs. Removal contractors are becoming “very picky with what they want to remove” causing the prices to inflate even more. In addition, there is “value in the waste products so why throw it away?” This has resulted in recycling and waste reduction schemes from the companies, fuelled further by the belief of one company that recycling is part of “Scottish Ethics.”

2.3 Markets

Within the companies a “recognition that there is a global change” towards environmental concern has come about as well as an acceptance that “things change very fast.” The market forces that have resulted from this are seen as “very effective” drivers of responses from the organisation.

At the industry level, one company saw the strengths of the home market drivers as “important for improvement” and the case of a Nordic company was given as an example. With customers and competitors pressuring the business, companies have moved towards improving themselves internally even though the environment is still “a discriminator rather than driver of customer choice.” The companies have taken on the implementation of an ISO 14001 system and certification because their competitors have as well as the now occasional requirement from customers. But apart from EMS’s and ISO certification, the companies seem to be more concerned with their products rather than processes as the “product is a selling point, the process is not” and so the “product might be more environmental but not necessarily the process.”

At the more basic level, the questions that affect the companies are “what is the waste?” and “Who wants it?” With the price for recycled material going down and waste companies now demanding ‘clean’ waste the companies are forced to rethink their handling of waste. Limited by resources as well, the company must think in an innovative manner to find solutions to their dilemmas.

2.4 Public Relations

Even though companies are still “not excluded from bidding based on environmental issues” they seem to be quite concerned about their environmental image and place some emphasis on ‘looking good’ and being ‘seen as good’. This favourable perception of their environmental behaviour is sought not only with the public and their customers but also with the EPA. One manager commented that their company worked hard to be seen as “championing the environment for marketing aspects and competitive advantage and that environment is an underlying principle”.

The environment and EMS’s are seen as good promotion particularly in response to popular media. The media is seen as influential in guiding public opinion and ultimately this exerts pressure on the companies to display certain behaviour. The need to be promoted in a certain way also drives companies to initiate change. One company who was ranked poorly on the FTSE 100 environmental survey gave an example of this. The poor projection of their performance prompted them to take on the implementation of an EMS and get their ISO 14001 certification. As a result this gained them a respected place in the next evaluation.

In this effort to look good the companies are now starting to require their suppliers to be environmental and show evidence of that through an EMS and an ISO 14001 certificate in particular. This not only displays ‘good environmental behaviour’ on their part but also answers questions from environmentally conscious customers.

3. Management and Operations

3.1 Strategy

When it came to strategy, many areas were discussed starting by one company’s strategy to not only comply with local and international agreements but to exceed them. Another manager did not share this confidence and apparent environmental champion. For him, “environment is strategy at top level. Whether is it lower down is a different matter.” One idea that the companies seem to share is that they are committed to continuous improvement and are trying to actively anticipate and plan for the future environmental pressures they may face and be ready with appropriate strategies.

The strategies that most companies have adopted so far seem to be more “minimisation rather than elimination strategies” as they still have ‘sufficient’ customers, which makes the environment not a significant risk and therefore still not a priority. With the environment not seen as part of ‘core business’ it is still taking a second place position. This is illustrated by two companies, one of which was aiming for an “integrated environment and business strategy but a plateau was hit and the effort aborted”. The other company was of the opinion that “if the company was in trouble the environment would not have been looked at” and that it was only due to the company’s strong business position that they had the possibility to explore environmental improvements.

Another company took a completely opposite stand. In this case as the company faced serious business threat, they found that exploring environmental possibilities offered them an opportunity to see their business from a completely different perspective and permit them to survive. They admit that they are in a unique position to re-evaluate their strategy and performance as they are shutting down operations and decommissioning most of their site. But this still presents a new view on adopting the environment at a time when the company is facing business challenges and finding that their survival is in this recourse.

Whatever the strategy adopted, the companies seemed to be distinctly moving towards strategic partners. With different focuses, companies approached other companies and the EPA for support, information, collaboration or even business partnership. Some even had several strategic partners that they relied on in their quest for continuous improvement and fulfilment of their corporate responsibility.

3.2 Management Pressure

When looking at management pressure it becomes apparent that some of the previously mentioned issues arise again to be confirmed or questioned. As expected from the previous section, since environment is "strategy at the top" then it follows that it also "needs to be promoted top-down". The companies seem to follow the strong signals given from top management and they need to signal 'the way forward' for the companies to move. In one case the extraordinary reduction of waste they achieved was driven by their CEO's dictate which was influenced by their very active environmental director.

Policy, standards and procedures were typically developed at corporate head quarters by a corporate environmental group and passed down in the organisation. This corporate group sets targets and uses audits to verify that their targets are being met. They also receive reports from the site directors who now have environmental elements in their performance evaluations. One company reported that they had a bonus tied to 'no prosecutions' in addition to the manager's "incentive scheme containing the environment".

One company felt that even though they had a "dedicated team managing the opportunities development," the whole process was still "fragmented at the moment and needs to be brought together as a proper project" which is exactly what one of the other companies has done. Others have turned to ISO 14001 to provide them with the structure and the discipline to manage their environmental activities. Several of the managers felt that even though a significant amount of discipline came from the corporate group, an added formality from ISO 14001 ensured that they maintained their EMS and provided external pressure to take the advice of the corporate group.

3.3 Trade-offs

It was clear that all the companies were looking at bottom-line, financial results and to "keep the share holders happy." Operating within this paradigm and with limited resources has resulted in the companies needing to put "resources to the best use" and thus the rise of 'trade-offs'. Where these trade-offs involve the consideration of the different courses of action and their demand on resources and then choosing between them while giving precedence to the "projects that offer financial benefits".

One manager describes the situation when it comes to environmental projects as follows: "Environmental initiatives need to be at least 'cost neutral' and they usually involve an inconvenience that needs to be justified." Given that some companies' environmental standards are not always explicitly detailed, this puts pressure on the individual sites to justify their actions and choose the 'cost-effective' alternatives when they are presented with the different environmental alternatives. This course of action will always be taken unless their corporate standards or the law has different stipulations. One manager summarised this well by saying: "environmental initiatives will be taken on board if they are a) required by the law, b) required by the corporate standards or c) they are cost effective."

It seems to be true that there is still a very strong financial focus when it comes to environmental initiatives that are not dictated down, but some companies have built-in some flexibility into the justification of environmental projects. One of the companies interviewed had a policy of requiring a 1-year payback period on any of their capital investments but this did not apply to those who were intended for environmental purposes. Such investments were allowed to payback over three years signalling a corporate support and willingness to bear some financial burden in favour of the environment.

In efforts to justify and control their spending, companies have now started tracking their environmental spend and producing annual statements of these. This has been necessary at the site level to control costs and ensure that "unit costs remain competitive or else production will be moved to another site." This again leads to sites applying methods that are "reasonably applicable and maintaining a balance between what is right and what can be afforded." This trade-off can be most starkly illustrated in one company's desire to stop discharging toxic chemicals to the river but being unable to justify it financially.

3.4 Operations

It seems that “there is a gap between identified problems and solutions and fitting into manufacturing: problems of logistics and space.” This means that the environmental departments have to motivate “production personnel focused on production targets” and who “consider that [the environment] is separate from them and maintained by the environmental department.”

Two different managers report that they are “met with resistance when actively trying to engage production” and that their plans can be “‘blocked’ if they are not agreed with production.” One company is particularly facing resistance to its recycling programme managed by its facilities management team because the production group does not accept any interference with their process.

To solve, or more to ‘by-pass’, this problem environmental people have adopted the method of raising the issues to higher level management and letting them translate it down again to the production division. One company involves its powerful corporate environmental group to drive production and another raises the issues to the directors for them to settle the matter. On the other hand, one company feels that the solution is to involve members of production with the site environmental team and one company does exactly that to make production feel more accountable.

3.5 Implementation

There is a consensus among the companies that “if it was that easy, everyone would do it” but “when people are under pressure decisions are taken on what ‘***must*** be done’ and what ‘can be done later’”. Under these conditions, companies are trying to understand the processes needed, the legislation, and what they must do to “bring it all together” and remain “efficient and customer driven”.

In their efforts to understand and make progress towards adopting more environmental practices, the companies are “working on new designs”, “allocating environmental responsibility to the different teams”, developing contingency planning, reacting rapidly to environmental incidences, among other activities. Several of the companies either have, or are exploring the possibilities of having, supplier policies in relation to the environment so as “not to be seen as exporting environmental problems.”

More specifically, all but one of the study group of companies have issued both environmental and safety policies and standards, sometimes separately and sometimes in conjunction with each other. These are then closely followed by guidelines on implementation in some organisations to translate the standards to the sites. Procedure prototypes have also been provided as further aid in developing site-specific procedures. This has been helpful for the sites but some concern has been put forward regarding the fact that the corporate standards are very North American legislation influenced.

At the most fundamental level industry seems to be moving toward forming alliances to share the environmental burden. One company was searching of a partnership to enhance the knowledge within the company, another had secured a packaging partner, and yet another one was seeking partners to undertake new environmental projects that could potentially benefit and be used by the entire region where their site was based. That same company chose to part with some of its land to alleviate the environmental burden it carried.

In seeking new ways of operating their business one company chose to change directions and redirect its people into exploring all the different environmental options available to them. They set up pilot projects to evaluate the possibilities of creating a gas-powered plant, a composting plant, and a renewable (wind) energy farm on their site. This not only used the waste they produced from their core business but also provided a new business opportunity to carry the site into the new millennium and ensure that they continue to survive.

Conclusion

As can be seen from the results of the exploratory research, the companies share many ideas, concerns and behaviours and yet there are times when they are distinctly different. The key conclusions that seem to have come out of this study are:

1. The companies accept the fact that the subject of 'environment' is putting increasing pressure on them, but they are not always clear on what is expected of them. They recognize that they need more knowledge and training on some environmental aspects.
2. Environmental initiatives, especially if they are to be innovative, need time, effort and resources to realize them that the companies, and the people who work there, don't always have.
3. Environmental projects are undertaken to comply with legislation or corporate standards, to save costs, or are 'seen as good.' The pressure from customers is still in its infancy, and not significant enough to concern companies, though they are planning ahead for it.
4. Environmental Strategy is 'Strategy at the Top', which is then somehow transferred down through the organization.
5. Environmental activities are meant to 'solve the problem', whatever 'the problem' may be, but should not interfere with the core business.
6. There was no evidence of triple bottom line considerations among these companies. The financial bottom line was clearly dominant. Though a move towards environmental reporting was undertaken, it is unclear if/when and to what extent environmental accountability will become part of 'doing business'.
7. Whereas most companies see the environment as a challenge, one company has seen it as an opportunity and has embraced it as its tool for survival.

Interestingly, the issue of ethics was not discussed directly during any of the interviews but the issue was raised by several of the interviewees. An interesting point they raised was that it was top management that took the ethical stand as one manager reported that "top management take a 'good' point of view". This idea was reiterated and taken further by another manager who felt that "ethical considerations were taken at corporate level and not site."

Another opinion voiced was that it was not really ethical consideration that were the drivers but that they were linked closely with the previous sections and concern for the environment was all part of "being good" and "good business" and being seen as such.

These conclusions lead to some interesting questions that need further research:

- How is the environmental strategy formulated?
- In what form does it translate down and across the organisation?
- How does environment-related vs. non-environment staff perceive the environment?
- What do people feel about the environment personally? Are there environmental values within corporate employees?
- Why are there barriers to integrating the environment into the core business?
- What will cause a company to rethink its business in environmental terms?

References

Aragon-Correa, J. ***'Strategic Proactivity and Firm Approach to the Natural Environment.'*** Academy of Management Journal, Oct 1998 v41.

Banerjee, S. B. ***'Management Implications of Corporate Environmentalism: Interpretations from Industry and Strategic Implications for Organizations.'*** Journal of Management Studies, June 2001 v38.

Barakat, S. and Cairns, G. '***Environmental Orientation and Corporate Strategy: Divergence and Convergence in Academic and Corporate Literature'***, presented at Business Strategy and Environment Conference, September 2000.

Barrett, S. ***'Strategy and the Environment.'*** The Columbia Journal of World Business. Fall and Winter, 1992

Conttrill, K. ***'Turning Trash into Profit'*** Journal of Business Strategy. July-August 1997 v.18

Friend, G. 'Environment vs Economy: Myth Hurts Country and Companies' The New Bottom Line (electronic edition at www.igc.apc.org/eco-ops/nbl/nbl.1.1.html) May 14, 1992.

Hutchinson, C***. 'Corporate Strategy and the Environment'*** Long Range Planning, 1992 v25.

Jaworski, B. and A. Kohli. ***'Market Orientation: Antecedents and Consequences'*** Journal of Marketing, July 1993 v57.

Judge Jr., W. and T. Douglas. '***Performance Implications of incorporating natural environmental issues into the strategic planning process: an empirical assessment.'*** Journal of Management Studies. March 1998 v35.

Lau, R.S.M. and S. Ragothaman. ***'Strategic Issues of Environmental Management.'*** South Dakota Business Review, Dec 1997 v56.

Maxwell, J et al. ***'Green Schemes: Corporate Environmental Strategies and the Implementation.'*** California Management Review, Spring 1997 v39.

McKay, R. B. ***'Organizational Responses to an Environmental Bill of Rights.'*** Organisation Studies, 2001 v22.

Menon, A. and A. Menon. ***'Enviropreneural Marketing Strategy: the Emergence of Corporate Environmentalism as Marketing Strategy.'*** Journal of Marketing, Jan 1997 v61.

Porter M. and C. Van Der Linde. ***'Green and Competitive'***. Harvard Business Review, May 1995 v73.

Reinhardt, F. ***'Bring the Environment Down to Earth'*** Harvard Business Review. Jul/Aug 1999.

Rugman, A. and A. Verbeke. ***'Corporate Strategy and International Environmental Policy.'*** Journal of International Business Studies, Winter 1998 v29.

Wootliff, J. and C. Deri. ***'NGO's: The New Super Brands'***. Corporate Reputation Review, 2001 v4.

Wright, H. and C. Fill. ***' Corporate Images, Attributes and the UK Pharmaceutical Industry.'*** Corporate Reputation Review, 2001 v4.