

# Ecocentrism vs. Environmental Management

Julian Barg

February 21, 2021

What is sustainable? What is sustainability? There are some formulaic definitions that are widely accepted, including the dogmatic definition that "[s]ustainable development is development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs" (WCED, 1987, p. IV). But if you ask two sustainability scholars to define sustainability in their own terms, chances are you are still going to get very different answers. Potentially including the ubiquitous phrase "I know it when I see it" (White, 2013). All that is not to criticize sustainability scholarship. It is the nature of the beast of dealing with complex systems—such as our planet—that things are difficult to nail down.

Definitions attain importance in research because they shape the research that takes place after the introduction section. Things may be assumed away, and a definition can determine the direction of a research project. The definition of sustainable development by the World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED)—despite being the most widely used definition of sustainability by far—is still contested. On the one hand, the WCED definition is widely used as a working definition. On the other hand, the WCED definition is criticized for putting too much focus on economic *development* for resolving current and future distributive and environmental problems (e.g., Constanza et al., 2014, 6f.).

This blurb introduces the discourse on the WCED definition and what assumptions it introduces to research. It covers on the one hand research in business journals that apply the definition. These articles have in common that they turn to businesses and their policy decisions for potential solutions to common environmental or social problems. On the other hand, there is a critical discourse on sustainable development that explicitly discusses the inherent assumptions and typically rejects the notions that companies are suitable agents that can be relied on for change (e.g., Banerjee, 2003).

The discourse is driven by competing assumptions on the ability for corporations to act as agentic actors for change.

- Add "third way" implications similar to Giddens (1979).
- Actually in some sense, this directly parallels Giddens's comments on structure vs. agency—e.g., Heikkurinen et al. (2019).

Avoid label "critical" for its connotations?

- the "third way" is actually the extant literature I have extracted before—<http://wiki.jbarg.net/Constructivism%20%26%20Ecology.md#environmental-science-stream>

## Terminology and Definition

A range of terms have emerged to describe the different takes on sustainability. For the critical stream, there is ecocentrism (Purser et al., 1995), deep ecology (Newton, 2002), the New Ecological Paradigm (Catton and Dunlap, 1980 via Hoffman and Jennings, 2015), critical epistemologies (Ergene et al., 2020) or even ecofascism (Newton, 2002). For the "non-critical"<sup>1</sup> stream there are environmental management (Purser et al., 1995), corporate sustainability (Hahn et al., 2014), eco-modernism (Springett, 2003), and managerial epistemologies (Ergene et al., 2020). For the purpose of this work, I will adopt the terms ecocentrism and environmental management respectively (Purser et al., 1995).

## Environmental Management

Hart (1995) is possibly the first work in the business space to pick up the ideas of the WCED (Montiel & Delgado-Ceballos, 2014). He introduces these ideas to a wider audience by building on the resource-based view. Hart identifies the natural environment as a potential "bottleneck" that could strangle corporations' long-term business. But alas, through reduction of their environmental emissions, and by low-impact development of the global South,<sup>2</sup> the negative relationship between business and environment can be "severed" (Hart, 1995, p. 996), while regulations will only play a temporary role or follow from corporate action (Hart, 1995, footnote p. 991, p. 995).

The next landmark article in this discourse is Bansal (2005), which was preceeded by Bansal (2002) by the same author. Bansal (2002) lays out the vision of environmental management most explicitly, maybe because it targets managers alongside an academic audience.

---

<sup>1</sup>For the lack of a better word. It should be acknowledged that these authors themselves are also critical of an orthodox works such as Friedman (1962).

<sup>2</sup>This development of the global South is the *development* part in sustainable development.

## References

- Banerjee, S. B. (2003). Who Sustains Whose Development? Sustainable Development and the Reinvention of Nature. *Organization Studies*, 24(1), 143–180. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840603024001341>
- Bansal, P. (2002). The corporate challenges of sustainable development. *Academy of Management Executive*, 16(2), 122–131. <https://doi.org/10.5465/ame.2002.7173572>
- Bansal, P. (2005). Evolving Sustainably: A Longitudinal Study of Corporate Sustainable Development. *Strategic Management Journal*, 26(3)pmid 16095689, 197–218. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.441>
- Catton, W. R., & Dunlap, R. E. (1980). A New Ecological Paradigm for Post-Exuberant Sociology. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 24(1), 15–47. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000276428002400103>
- Constanza, R., Cumberland, J., Daly, H., Goodland, R., & Norgaard, R. (2014). *An Introduction to Ecological Economics* (2nd Editio). Boca Raton, CRC Press.
- Ergene, S., Banerjee, S. B., & Hoffman, A. J. (2020). (Un)Sustainability and Organization Studies: Towards a Radical Engagement. *Organization Studies*, 017084062093789. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840620937892>
- Friedman, M. (1962). *Capitalism and Freedom*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- Giddens, A. (1979). *Central Problems in Social Theory. Action, Structure, and Contradiction in Social Analysis*. Berkeley, University of California Press.
- Hahn, T., Preuss, L., Pinkse, J., & Figge, F. (2014). Cognitive Frames in Corporate Sustainability: Managerial Sensemaking with Paradoxical and Business Case Frames. *Academy of Management Review*, 39(4)pmid 98418389, 463–487. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2012.0341>
- Hart, S. L. (1995). A Natural-Resource-Based View of the Firm. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(4), 986–1014. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1995.9512280033>
- Heikkurinen, P., Clegg, S., Pinnington, A. H., Nicolopoulou, K., & Alcaraz, J. M. (2019). Managing the Anthropocene: Relational Agency and Power to Respect Planetary Boundaries. *Organization & Environment*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1086026619881145>
- Hoffman, A. J., & Jennings, P. D. (2015). Institutional Theory and the Natural Environment: Research in (and on) the Anthropocene. *Organization & Environment*, 28(1), 8–31. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1086026615575331>
- Montiel, I., & Delgado-Ceballos, J. (2014). Defining and Measuring Corporate Sustainability: Are We There Yet? *Organization & Environment*, 27(2)pmid 96555657, 113–139. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1086026614526413>
- Newton, T. J. (2002). Creating the New Ecological Order? Elias and Actor-Network Theory. *Academy of Management Review*, 27(4), 523–540. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2002.7566046>

- Purser, R. E., Park, C., & Montuori, A. (1995). Limits to Anthropocentrism: Toward an Ecocentric Organization Paradigm? *Academy of Management Review*, 20(4), 1053–1089. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1995.9512280035>
- Springett, D. (2003). Business conceptions of sustainable development: A perspective from critical theory. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 12(2), 71–86. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.353>
- WCED. (1987). *Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development: Our Common Future (The Brundtland Report)*. World Commission on Environment and Development. Oxford. <http://www.un-documents.net/wced-ocf.htm>
- White, M. A. (2013). Sustainability: I know it when I see it. *Ecological Economics*, 86, 213–217. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2012.12.020>