**Strategy Textbooks and the Environment Construct:
Are the texts enabling strategists to realize sustainable outcomes?**

Nick Barter

Professor

Griffith Business School

Griffith University

170 Kessels Road

Nathan, QLD 4111

Australia

T: +61 7373 53250

F: +61 7 373 55111

E: n.barter@griffith.edu.au

Biography

Nick is currently Academic Director for Griffith Online, prior to this he was Griffith's MBA director and deputy director of the Asia-Pacific Centre for Sustainable Enterprise. He has also been an International Associate of the Centre for Social and Environmental Accounting Research, PRME chapter coordinator for Australia and New Zealand and a director of the UNGlobal Compact in Australia. His research explores sustainability and strategy with a focus on developing theory that avoids the perpetuation of dualistic understandings between humans and their surroundings.

**Strategy Textbooks and the Environment Construct:
Are the texts enabling strategists to realize sustainable outcomes?**

Abstract

A central claim within the sustainable development literature is that realizing sustainable outcomes requires a move away from a conceptualization of the environment as a separate, bounded, independently given entity. In this paper, the conceptualization of the environment within bestselling strategy textbooks in the UK and Australia in 2011 is reviewed. The paper focuses on strategy textbooks as it is argued that corporate strategists are key actors in the realization of sustainable outcomes, and that the constructs those individuals may learn from texts are potentially key to the realization of sustainable outcomes. The findings show that the constructs in the textbooks offer a sclerotic, dehumanized view of the environment that is partitioned into external and internal categories by an organizational boundary – a limitation, it is argued, that will not foster sustainable outcomes.

Introduction

All narratives are subject to editing and negotiation that define the “included and excluded, relevant and irrelevant, empowered and disempowered” (Cronon, 1992, p. 1349), and as such cater to a particular perspective. However, textbooks are not necessarily perceived as pandering to a particular perspective, arguably because the metaphor of ‘textbook operation’ implies operating in a set of agreed upon and regulated procedures (Crawford, 2003) that occur in a bubble of ahistorical, decontextualized truth (Cummings & Bridgman, 2011). Consequently, a textbook is commonly perceived to be a “delivery system of facts” (Apple & Christian-Smith, 1991, p. 1) that has “bona fide status with a potential for universal application” (Issitt, 2004, p. 685). This view of textbooks is necessarily challenged, with arguments centering on their being negotiated ideological devices that capture claims to truth, and that through their application in education they help to legitimize and normalize a particular social order (e.g., see Cameron et al., 2003; Crawford, 2003; Gilbert, 2003; Issitt, 2004; Mir, 2003; Pingel, 1999; Bouvier, 1984).

Notwithstanding that textbooks may not be read by students (Apple & Christian-Smith, 1991; Cameron et al., 2003), ripostes to the criticisms of textbooks as normalizing devices are that any text can have multiple readings (Crawford, 2003), and that a text may not necessarily reflect what is taught in a classroom (Cameron et al., 2003; Hackley, 2003; Apple & Christian-Smith, 1991; Enz, 1986). For example, a textbook reader may not end up being paradigmatically colonized by the text, while an instructor may use a textbook purely as a foil from which to develop deconstructive and critical arguments regarding the ‘facts’ within. Nevertheless, the central challenge that textbooks are ideological devices remains (e.g., see Cummings & Bridgman, 2011; Mir, 2003; Enz, 1986; Bouvier, 1984; Ross & Murdick, 1977).

This paper reviews how ‘environment’ and ‘sustainable development’ are defined and conceptualized in bestselling strategy textbooks in 2011, the year in which the original study was conducted. While the inability to gather data on bestselling strategy textbooks in the US means that the scope of the study is limited to the UK and Australia, the final list of 23 textbooks in these two countries does include 14 US editions and one Asia-Pacific edition of a US text. Thus, as 15 of the textbooks reviewed are US texts, it is reasonable to hypothesize that the results from this study also apply to that country.

The study’s focus on how the environment and sustainable development are conceptualized in these textbooks is based on the premise that sustainability is considered to

be a key issue for organizations as a source of advantage, innovation, and the catalyst for new and profitable management techniques (e.g., see Kiron et al., 2013; Kiron et al., 2012; Hopkins, 2009). Further, there have been consistent calls for the development of sustainable management theories (e.g., see Starik & Kanashiro, 2013; Gladwin et al., 1995). The driver for this current study is to understand, principally, how the environment is defined and conceptualized within the bestselling strategy textbooks in Australia and the UK. This focus is taken because of arguments within the sustainable development literature, which in précis advocate a move away from a fractured epistemology that posits the environment as an entity separate from humans and, in turn, organizations (e.g., see Egri & Pinfield, 1999; Gladwin et al., 1995; Shrivastava, 1995). In so doing, the literature argues for a move away from Cartesian dualism towards embracing systemic, non-bounded understandings of humanity's relationship with all that surrounds us. Thus it contends that humanity's conception of the environment should not be that it is a separate, bracketed- out 'thing'. The relevance of this to strategy textbooks is that the United Nations, notwithstanding the views of others, argues that key protagonists in the realization of sustainable outcomes are organizations and, in turn, "corporate strategists" (UNSGHLPS, 2012, p. 22). Consequently, if corporate strategists are key actors in the realization of sustainable outcomes, it is appropriate to question how the environment is conceptualized within the textbooks from which those strategists may learn.

The paper proceeds in the following manner. First a discussion on sustainable development, identification of organizations and corporate strategists as key actors, and the challenge to separable, bounded understandings of the environment is brought forward. The study's design, methodology and mode of data collection are then discussed. Following this, the findings are presented. While these findings focus on the list of bestselling textbooks in 2011 when the original study was conducted, this section is also supplemented by a brief review of the latest editions of the texts from the 2011 list. This supplement enhances the relevancy of this article as given the review period involved significant time has elapsed between the original study and publication. After presenting the findings, the results are discussed and implications brought forward. To close and as an endnote the article comments on the environment and sustainable development.

Sustainable Development Key Actors and Conceptions of the Environment

The roots of the contemporary call for sustainable development can arguably be found in the environmental movement of the 1960s and the publication of key texts (Tulloch & Neilson, 2014; Tulloch, 2013; Carruthers, 2001), such as *Silent Spring* (Carson, 1962), *The*

Population Bomb (Ehrlich, 1971), and *The Limits to Growth* (Meadows et al., 1972). Tulloch (2013) argues that these texts, when coupled to Hardin's (1974) lifeboat ethic and the concept of carrying capacity, informed the radical environmental discourse of the time, a discourse that entered mainstream consciousness via the publication of *Our Common Future* (WCED, 1987) (on this, see Tulloch & Neilson, 2014; Tulloch, 2013; Yates, 2012; Carruthers, 2001; Shrivastava & Hart, 1994; Steer & Wade-Gery, 1993).

Our Common Future (1987) defines sustainable development as, "development which meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs" (WCED, 1987, p. 8). This definition, however, has attracted critique such as its being a compromise aimed at dissolving historical conflicts between ecological and economic concerns (e.g., see Tulloch & Neilson, 2014; Tulloch, 2013; Banerjee, 2003; Carruthers, 2001). Nevertheless, it is generally accepted that sustainable development is now the dominant global discourse on ecological concerns (Tulloch, 2013; Carruthers, 2001), and a concept that is increasingly important for organizations and business leaders to embrace (e.g., see Kiron et al., 2013; Kiron et al., 2012; Hopkins, 2009; Blewitt, 2008; Brych et al., 2007; Gladwin et al., 1995). Taking this logic further, if organizations are central actors then organizational leaders and in turn corporate strategists are key, especially as these individuals are critical in marshalling the resources for and setting the direction of organizations. The importance of corporate strategists is recognised in the United Nations' 2012 update to *Our Common Future* (1987), that is, *Resilient People, Resilient Planet* (2012). This report identifies "corporate strategists" (UNSGHLPS, 2012, p. 22) as key actors who "have more opportunity than ever to pick and choose from the best practices and resources ... combine them in new and previously unforeseen ways ... [and thus help] ... to drive sustainable development" (UNSGHLPS, 2012, p. 22). This recognition of organizations and corporate strategists as key actors in the realization of sustainable development arguably highlights how sustainable development has "morphed to accommodate neoliberal assumptions" (Tulloch, 2013, p. 109) and moved away from its radical roots. However, if organizations and corporate strategists are key to realizing sustainable outcomes, then key to enabling such outcomes is the cognition of those individuals. And this is especially relevant if it is accepted that individuals act upon the basis of their cognitive representations of the world around them, and that cognition is informed through education and thus textbooks (e.g., see March & Simon, 1958; Simon, 1947; Lakoff, 2010).

A central argument regarding our ability to realize sustainable development is our understanding of the environment, that is, whether we consider it to be something that is

separate and ‘out there’, has equivalence with the economy, or is inseparable from ourselves — in short, whether we embrace dualistic or monistic understandings. In terms of conceptualizing the environment, it is argued that realizing sustainable outcomes requires a move away from dualistic understandings. Most simply and directly, *Our Common Future* (1987) argues that “the environment does not exist as a sphere separate from human actions, ambitions, and needs, and attempts to defend it in isolation from human concerns have given the very word environment a connotation of naivety” (WCED, 1987, p. xi). This statement implicates a move away from a dualistic understanding wherein the environment is considered as something that is a thing that is bounded, separate and external to humanity. Rather, it implies a monistic understanding where individuals understand that they *are* their surroundings (Tulloch, 2014, citing Suzuki, 2008).

To explicate, *Our Common Future* (1987) (also referred to as the Brundtland Report) argues that humans have historically understood the planet as “a large world in which human activities and their effects were neatly compartmentalized within nations, within sectors (energy, agriculture, trade) and within broad areas of concern (environmental, economic, social)” (WCED 1987, p. 4). This understanding conceptualizes the world as consisting of separate domains, for example, environment, society and economy. However, a challenge to this type of conceptualizing is that it reinforces a false dichotomy that there are two separate categories: humans and everything else (nature) (for further explanation, see Castree, 2002; Newton, 2002; Latour, 1999a, 1999b). A counter to this is the “real world of interlocked economic and ecological systems ... [that] ... will not change” (WCED, 1987, p. 9); thus, if the ‘real’ world will not change, the challenge is whether humanity’s understandings and our “policies and institutions” (WCED, 1987, p. 9) can.

As such the call for sustainable development is also a call for a change in humanity’s understandings, in that to realize sustainable development humans need to embrace an understanding that the environment is not separate and out there; rather it surrounds and is entwined with them (Ingold, 2011). Consequently, sustainable development is not about saving ‘the environment’, because to do so would imply that the environment is a separate thing to be saved. Rather, sustainable development is arguably, as per the implications of the Brundtland definition, about us humans (present and future) facilitating development through a change in our understanding of ourselves relative to everything else, a change that moves us from dualistic to a monistic (i.e., singular, not split), non-compartmentalized (non-bounded) understanding. In this regard, it could be argued we need to recognize the obviousness of the “mutual embedding of humans and the rest of nature” (Starik & Kanashiro, 2013, p. 8). In

sum, the logic of the argument is that the misalignment between humanity's ontology (reality) and epistemology (knowledge practices) requires rectification. Or alternatively as Gladwin et al. (1995) claim, we are suffering a "profound epistemological crisis" (p. 874) that splits humans from nature. Thus to realize sustainable outcomes we need to move to a knowledge base that implies a connectionist as opposed to an atomistic ontology (Boisot & McKelvey, 2010). This move implies a change to theories and frameworks that do not assume and/or perpetuate the notion that there is a "phenomenal world [that can be] directly and unproblematically observed and described by a disinterested actor who remains external to what is being observed" (Boisot & McKelvey, 2010, p. 415).

If it is accepted that organizations and corporate strategists are key actors in realizing sustainable development, this becomes a challenge for organizational theory. If theories of organization site the organization as central and perpetuate notions of a separate environment to be analyzed and exploited (e.g., see Egri & Pinfield, 1999; Shrivastava, 1995), the ability of the strategist to realize sustainable outcomes will be hampered. And even though such separatist theories may enable particular forms of analysis, they flounder with regards to perpetuating a fractured epistemology and, in turn, dualistic understandings that fail to recognize systemic interconnections. As such, it can and has been argued that organizational theories need reorientation so that the organization is no longer considered as separate, and that this will help realize sustainable outcomes (e.g., see McAuley et al., 2007; Sarasvathy, 2001, 2004; Egri & Pinfield, 1999; Katz & Gartner, 1988).

In overview, the logic of this argument is that organizations and in turn corporate strategists are key actors in the enabling of sustainable development. Hence, sustainable development requires a change in our understandings so that we do not see ourselves as separate to the environment. Further, theories guide action, and if theories imply and perpetuate a world of separations and discrete entities such as humans and the environment, our ability to realize sustainable outcomes is hindered. Consequently, if corporate strategists learn the fundamentals of strategy in a university strategy course, many of which have an associated textbook, a key consideration is how organization relative to the environment is articulated within those textbooks. A further consideration is whether a dualistic or monistic understanding of humanity's relationship with the environment is perpetuated. Perpetuating dualistic understanding implies that the future corporate strategist may have a conceptualization that reinforces separation between the organization and the environment. And as such, that individual will be hindered in his/her ability to enable organizations to realize sustainable outcomes. Similarly, how and if sustainable development is defined in the

text will also potentially impact the individual's ability to enable sustainable outcomes. These two considerations drive the research questions at the core of this study, the first being the primary question:

(1) How is the environment defined and as such conceptualized in strategy textbooks in Australia and the UK?

(2) Is sustainable development defined in strategy textbooks in Australia and the UK and if so how?

Research Design, Methodology and Data Collection

The primary aim of this research is to understand how the environment is defined and conceptualized in strategy textbooks. Given the context of this study, the secondary aim is to understand if and how sustainable development is defined. A simple search on the bookselling website Amazon confirms a plethora of available strategy textbooks. However, the time and resource constraints of this study dictated that a more manageable list be reviewed. Data was gathered in November 2011, with the focus on identifying bestsellers to ensure a manageable list of textbooks. As an Internet search for listings of bestselling textbooks yielded no results, these lists were requested from some well-known publishers of academic textbooks (e.g., Wiley, Pearson, McGraw Hill and Cengage). Each publisher was asked for advice on the bestseller rankings for strategy/strategic management textbooks in the territories of the UK, Australia and the US in 2011. In response, some of the publishers, although not all, provided a list of bestselling titles or in one case a list of titles with the number of university courses that had adopted a title as its course textbook. Those publishers that did respond requested that their data remain anonymous; thus their specific data is not published within the context of this article.

In addition to the publishing houses and as a way of attempting to triangulate the data, an international book sales data monitoring company was contacted for sales data on strategy textbooks within the aforementioned territories. Further, the University Co-Operative Bookshop chain of Australia was contacted for strategic management textbook sales in the year to October 2011 (the most recent 12 month period they could provide at the time of the request). This chain is the largest seller of textbooks in Australia with a shop on almost every Australian campus. Consequently, its sales data can be considered indicative of the strategy textbooks being recommended within Australian universities.

In sum, four lists were obtained: (1) from a publisher, the top ten strategy textbooks in Australia based on course adoptions; (2) from another publisher, the top ten bestselling texts

(by sales volume) in Australia; (3) from an international book sales monitoring company, the top twenty bestsellers for the UK and, separately, Australia; and (4) from the University Co-Operative bookshop, sales data from its Australian stores for the year to October 2011. All of the sources requested that the actual sales of any particular title not be shared and, with the exception of the University Co-Op, all requested anonymity. Finally, although attempts were made to obtain data from the US both via the publishers and also a book sales monitoring agency, no responses were received. Given this lack of response from the US, the book selling website Amazon was asked whether they could provide bestselling data for the year to October 2011. The response received was that this would not be possible. The four lists provided by the UK and Australian sources, however, provided a list of 46 strategic management textbooks.

On reviewing the Australian sales volume data from the University Co-Operative bookshop (27 titles), approximately 95% of strategy textbook sales in Australia were found to represent just 10 titles. Further, the bookshop's sales volume data indicated that many titles ranked after 10 in the sales ranking sold only one copy in the twelve-month period. Using this information as an example for the other lists and regions, the 46 titles were reduced to a more manageable, shorter list for review. To create a shorter list of the bestselling textbooks in Australia and the UK, the following decision rules were applied: A textbook would be included in the final shortlist if (1) it was ranked in the top ten of either an Australian or UK ranking according to a sales data monitoring organization; (2) it was in the top 20 of an Australian and UK ranking according to a sales data monitoring organization; (3) it was in the top ten of sales according to the University Co-Operative Bookshop of Australia; and (4) it was in the top ten of either of the two other lists that were provided by publishers on bestselling textbooks or number of course adoptions. This shortlist resulted in 23 textbooks as highlighted in Table 1 below.

INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

Once this final list of textbooks was collated, a copy of each textbook was obtained and data collected. The two key research questions at the core of this study informed the focus of data gathering. Data was gathered on the definitions of the environment and how it is discussed, and similarly for sustainable development/sustainability (as shown in Table 2

below). To obtain the data, the index and glossary of each text was checked for mention of the above terms and, if apparent, the term and its use on the page(s) recorded. If a specific term was not mentioned in the index or glossary, the books' chapters were reviewed for mention of the terms or associated terms; for example, with regard to natural environment or sustainability, terms such as ecological or environmental integrity were also considered (see Table 2 for examples). In addition to identifying if and how a term was defined, consideration was given to how it was conceptualized. For example, with regard to the environment, as Table 2 indicates, notes were taken on whether the environment was considered to have levels (micro, meso, macro) and/or was split into external and internal environments relative to the organization. If this splitting was evident, the texts were also reviewed for discussion of organizational boundaries and thus how the boundary between the external and internal environment was identified.

After collecting the data, the definitions and concepts offered by the 23 textbooks were analyzed. The analysis in this study was conducted within a frame of reference regarding the sustainable development literature. As such, the focus was not only on descriptions but also on interpretations through the refraction of that literature. In this regard the study involved critical discourse analysis, wherein there is a focus on the ideology and language use of texts to enable the identification of underlying themes and meanings (e.g., see Rogers, 2004; Robson, 2002; Van Dijk, 2001). It should be noted that the results section below concentrates on the 2011 list and the edition of the texts at that time. However, given the time between the study and article publication, the results are supplemented with a brief review of the latest editions of the texts from the 2011 list that were available in November 2015. Thus, as can be seen in Table 2, each of the 23 titles includes a review of the edition from the 2011 list and additional notes from the latest edition as at November 2015, where available.

INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

Results

The conceptualization of the environment within the textbooks reveals a number of consistent messages. First, definitional exactitude is lacking in terms of what the environment is, and/or there are multiple categories of environment discussed. Second, the environment is

consistently discussed as being a repository of opportunities and threats that an organization needs to analyze, exploit or avoid. Third, an organization has an external and internal environment. Taking each point in turn, to illustrate the lack of definitional exactitude and multiplicity of categories, Carpenter and Sanders (2009), for instance, highlight that the “external environment consists of a wide array of economic and socio-political factors” (p. 106). Similarly, Hanson et al (2011) outline that a “firm’s external environment is divided into three main areas: the general, industry and competitor environment” (p. 36), wherein the general environment is “composed of dimensions in broader society that influence an industry and indirectly, the firms within it” (p. 37). Likewise, Capon (2008) describes the external environment as “literally the big wide world in which organizations operate” (p. 31) while Hubbard and Beamish (2011) argue that “the environment represents all those aspects outside the organization that affect the business strategy of an organization” (p. 21). Similarly, Thompson and Martin (2010) define the environment as “everything and everyone outside the organization or organizational boundary — including competitors, customers, financiers, suppliers and government” (p. 787) while Wheelan and Hunger (2010) state that “the external environment consists of variables (opportunities and threats) that are outside the organization” (p.16). Hence the environment is presented as having a wide array of factors, general dimensions in society, variables, and categories. Reinforcing this lack of definitional exactitude, the environment is portrayed as not only a general thing but more specifically as “much more than the ecological green issues that the word commonly evokes” (Capon, 2008, p. 31), and/or an element that has “long been a factor in firm strategy, primarily from the standpoint of access to raw materials” (Carpenter & Sanders, 2009, p. 111).

With regard to the environment being a repository of opportunities and threats, the texts are consistent. For example, Capon’s (2008) argues that the “external environment is where the opportunities and threats arise from to confront the organization” (p. 6), while Johnson et al. (2011) claim that “the environment is what gives organizations their means of survival. It creates opportunities and presents threats” (p. 49). Further, by analyzing the external environment, “a firm identifies the critical threats and opportunities in its competitive environment” (Barney & Hesterly, 2010, p. 8), especially as these threats and opportunities “could significantly benefit or harm an organization in the future” (David, 2011, p. 43). Crucially, “identifying opportunities and threats is an important objective of studying the general environment” (Hitt et al., 2011, p. 39), if not the sole objective. In these terms, Grant (2010) highlights that “the emphasis of the book has been the identification of profit opportunities in the external environment of the firm” (p. 122). Given that the texts are

consistent in their view that “successful managers must recognize opportunities and threats” (Dess et al., 2010, p. 40), a focus on the environment being a repository of opportunities and threats is self-reinforcing, especially because opportunities and threats affect how a firm “pursues its mission” (Hill & Jones, 2010, p. 17) and “provide a foundation for strategic direction” (Harrison & John, 2010, p. 4).

The third key construct offered by the majority of the textbooks (18 out of 23) is the concept that an organization has an internal and external environment. This construct is shown through the quotes above that alight upon the term ‘external environment’. In addition, the notion of external and internal environments is reinforced through the position that “environmental scanning (both external and internal)” (Wheelan & Hunger, 2010, p. 5) to uncover opportunities and threats is key to strategic management. Further, the external environment constitutes “the forces that act outside of an organization” (Viljoen & Dann, 2003, p. 451), and managers need to consider an organization’s position “in the external environment” (Capon, 2008, p. 28).

This splitting of the environment into external and internal is, as De Wit and Meyer (2010a) highlight, the “first dichotomy” (p. 11) that managers’ face. Examples of this ‘splitting’ in the reviewed books include that the “external environment influences firms as they seek strategic competitiveness” (Hitt et al., 2011, p. 36), but that it is largely “beyond the direct control of a single organization” (David, 2011, p. 43). This is in contrast to the “internal environment [which] is subject to far more control” (Witcher & Chau, 2010, p. 122) and is the source of “organizational strengths and weaknesses” (Barney & Hesterly, 2010, p. 8). Thus, while the goal of external analysis is to “understand opportunities and threats” (Hill & Jones, 2010, p. 39), internal analysis “focuses on resources and capabilities as internal sources of uniqueness that allow firms to beat the competition” (Carpenter & Sanders, 2009, p. 23).

With regard to sustainable development, the texts show a consistency in either their lack of acknowledgement or narrow focus. As Table 2 shows, in the original list of 23 reviewed texts, only one textbook actually offers the Brundtland definition, 15 texts do not define the term at all, and the remaining seven texts develop their own terms. Where texts have developed their own construct, invariably that construct is narrow and concerned with the so-called ‘natural environment’ and an organization’s ability to “protect, mend and preserve” (David, 2011, p. 343) this environment. While the texts tend to recognize that “a number of companies are developing environmentally friendly policies” (Hitt, et al., 2011, p.

49) as a result of increasing concern about the natural environment, in Grant's (2010) view such concern has "pressured" (p. 458) businesses to adopt such strategies.

More description regarding areas of concern is offered by Thompson et al. (2012) who argue that sustainability is "concerned with the relationship of a company to its environment and its use of natural resources, including land, water, air, plants, animals, minerals, fossil fuels and biodiversity" (p. 316). Nevertheless, what is clear in all those texts that discuss sustainability is that the focal subject is the firm, more specifically, "stakeholders" (Hubbard & Beamish, 2011, p. 12), although Hanson et al. (2011) does indicate that the natural environment is one of these stakeholders.

The above analysis focuses on the 2011 versions of the texts, but as indicated, the revision timeframes meant that a review of the latest editions of the texts was also carried out. The results of this review are highlighted in Table 2, which, in summary, shows that little has changed. None of the texts has changed its construct that splits the environment into internal and external master sets. With regard to sustainable development, however, a change is noticeable in two of the texts, with Hitt, Ireland, and Hoskisson (2015) now including the Brundtland definition of sustainable development, and Witcher and Chau (2014) discussing corporate sustainability as taking into account the "implications of an organization's activities for the welfare of future generations" (p. 45).

Discussion

This study aimed to explore two key research questions: (1) How is the environment defined and as such conceptualized in strategy textbooks? and (2) Is sustainable development defined in strategy textbooks and if so how? To answer these questions a review was conducted of definitions and conceptualizations of the environment and sustainable development in 23 bestselling strategy textbooks in Australia and the UK in 2011. A list compiled from numerous sources accounted for course adoption rates and sales volumes. The review reveals a degree of isomorphism, particularly in how these textbooks offer a sclerotic, dehumanized and commoditized view of the environment. They were also consistent in that they either did not provide a definition of sustainability, or provided a definition that was designed to suit narrow economic purposes. Unfortunately this situation remains unchanged in the latest editions of the texts as of November 2015.

Strategy textbooks have been likened to recipe books (e.g., see Whittington, 1993; Spender, 1989), recipe books that belie a promise that through adherence to it the delights of a successful strategy will be realized (Whittington, 1993; Spender, 1989). In this regard, the

review indicates that these textbooks all offer the same recipe, that is, a construct of the environment that lacks definitional exactitude, consists of multiple categories, and critically hinges around there being internal and external master sets where the external environment is separate and independently given because it is beyond direct control. Further, the external environment is constructed as a repository of opportunities and threats that need to be exploited or avoided to enable the economic prosperity of the organization.

While separating the environment into external and internal components partitioned by an organizational boundary facilitates analysis, this construct also objectifies, as the environment then becomes something to which we turn and respond (Hatch, 2011). In this context, the texts do not consider the environment as being “where we all live” (WCED, 1987, p. xi) and entwined with humans (Ingold, 2011). Similarly, they do not even contemplate that we may be living in a new geological age, the Anthropocene, where humanity shapes its surroundings.

Likewise, the internal environment is not posited in the texts as somewhere that individuals spend significant amounts of their life; rather it is advanced as a source of organizational strengths and weaknesses that needs to be matched to external opportunities and threats. Overall, the rationale in the texts is that the conceptions of environment, society and humans are subsumed by and in thrall to the economics of the organization (McAfee, 2012). Similarly, the environment is not considered to be something that has intrinsic value, or with which we are *simpatico* (Bonnett, 2002). Rather, the environment is defined against the backdrop of the organization and something that should be attentive to its requirements (Bonnett, 2000, 2002, 2007). The implication of this rationale, then, is that the space in which we all live essentially evaporates as a meaningful concern beyond its economic utility to the reified organization. Consequently, what should be obvious becomes lost: that humans are constituted by the natural environment, the firm’s external environment is a place where we live, and our societies and neighborhoods may have value beyond serving economics. In such a construct we are without context, and that our biology might be shaped and influenced by our surroundings, or our wellbeing by our society and neighborhood, are only meaningful relative to the economic performance of the organization.

It might be expected that the texts present a construct of the environment as a dehumanized place that is a separable collection of different categories, opportunities, threats, strengths and weaknesses, all subject to a master dichotomy of internal and external that hinges around the organization. As Grant (2010) highlights, the emphasis of these books is not necessarily the realization of sustainable outcomes but rather the “identification of profit

opportunities in the external environment of the firm” (p. 122). Thus the rationale in these texts is the metaphysics of mastery and totalizing economics rather than human wellbeing, a key aspect of the sustainable development debate (Bonnett, 2013).

Also the splitting of the environment into four bounded domains (external opportunities and threats, and internal strengths and weaknesses) constrains the ability of the strategist to move beyond dichotomous understandings (Clegg et al., 2004). In turn, this reinforces the notion of an organizational boundary, albeit none of the texts offer a clear identification of such a boundary. This dichotomy, however, has been consistently challenged as being false and of perpetuating a Cartesian dualism (e.g., see Shrivastava, 1995; King, 1995; Gladwin, 1995) that does not enable sustainable outcomes. This construct of the environment as “something outside and completely unrelated to the observer, except in a very narrow utilitarian sense” (Purser et al., 1995, p. 1064) is an example of how our knowledge systems have outstripped our reality, the reality of systemic interconnections in a borderless world (Shrivastava, 1995; King, 1995; Gladwin, 1995) that is an “intrinsically dynamic, interconnected web of relations in which there are no absolutely discrete entities and no absolute dividing lines” (Eckersley, 2003, p. 49). It could be argued that this bounded, separable conceptualization is necessary given our continual desire for order out of chaos. For example, as Santos & Eisenhardt (2005) argue, “given bounded rationality and environmental complexity, sense making tends to crystallize into cognitive frames that reduce ambiguity and facilitate decision making” (p. 500), and as such it indicates how humans “tend toward static, isolated, one factor at a time analysis rather than dynamic whole systems appraisal” (Gladwin et al., 1997, p. 241). Consequently, a narrow, compartmentalized understanding of the environment such as that offered by textbooks is perhaps a necessary requirement in order to facilitate our own sense making, particularly as “purposeful classifications of objects, people and events are ... [it can be argued] ... an indispensable requirement for thinking about competition or strategy” (Bourgeois, 1980, p. 333). Furthermore, a move away from this type of construct will likely be difficult, perhaps because since Coase’s (1937) article on the nature of firm, organizational boundaries have become the central concern of organizational theory and analysis (e.g., see Hernes, 2004; Dolfsma & Dannreuther, 2003). Thus the idea of a boundary has served organizational analysis for decades, particularly as it is argued that boundaries and their reproduction enable organizations to persist (e.g., see Hernes, 2004). However, as indicated, boundaries reinforce objectification and a dualism that limits the enabling of sustainable development, and to deconstruct such a dualism is an ongoing challenge for sustainability management academics.

Outside the above, it is possible that the textbooks' conceptualization of the environment as being something separate could also be a challenge of the English language, in that it does not enable a move past dualistic implications. To explain, language allows us to detach ourselves and create symbolic distance (e.g., see Deleuze & Guattari, 2007; Newton, 2007), something that is ably demonstrated by the subject-verb structure of the English language that reinforces separation and reification. For example, Ingold (2011) outlines how an individual might typically say, "the wind blows" (p. 17). The structure of the phrase reinforces notions of there being a wind (subject) that is separate from the action of blowing, as if the blowing is a separate act upon the body that is the wind. Thus English language structure and its semiotic underpinnings imply compartmentalization and separation. In this way the language perpetuates a kind of fracture between subject and action (here, wind and blowing). To counter the fracturing, Ingold (2011) argues (perhaps self-evidently) that the "wind is its blowing" (p. 17). Here, the wind is the result of the blowing and thus there is no separation between subject and action. Indeed, the wind would not exist without the blowing. The wind is therefore the process, the action. Similarly, an organization and its environment are co-constitutive of each other, not independently given entities. However, the language used in this current study's analysis, for example, 'environment', 'society', 'economy', deals in fractures that imply a separatist ontology. As such, while it could be argued that because of language structure the texts are benign, such a dismissal would mislead and fail to acknowledge the descriptions provided in the texts of the environment as being a source of economic opportunities for and threats to the organization. Further, if it is accepted that language is "both descriptive and constitutive of reality" (Tsoukas, 1991, p. 568) and a guide to how we think and act (Cornelissen, 2002, 2004, 2005; Lakoff & Johnson, 1980; Lakoff & Turner, 1987; Tsoukas, 1991, 1993), then language and sentence structures guide our cognitive representations and in turn our actions through enactment theory (e.g., see Hatch, 2011; Smircich & Stubbart, 1985). Thus the constructs used in the texts are not neutral in their implications. Given this, if a sustainable strategy text is to be realized, a key component will need to be its use of language and sentence structures that imply surrounds that are not dehumanized but, rather, human-related (Bonnett, 2000).

Overall, the homogeneity in the prescriptions of the texts arguably reinforces a hegemony that is stabilized around the intellectual leadership of neoliberalism (Spence, 2009). It has been argued that neoliberalism has colonized business schools (e.g., see Khurana, 2007; Cummings, 2005) and, as such, textbooks are tools that help to ensure a neoliberal arrangement of society, corporations and political groups (Tulloch & Neilson,

2014; Tulloch, 2013; Spence, 2009). Thus the colonization of the texts is necessary from the perspective of corporations. As Levy and Egan (2003) argue, corporations cannot dominate by virtue of their economic power alone; rather, their control rests on the consent of a wider group of actors and the “alignment of forces capable of reproducing the field” (p. 810). And this is something textbooks can enable. Tulloch (2013) argues the consensus in the West is that the environment is something ‘out there’ to be used for the service of the firm and the economy. Indeed the reviewed texts reinforce this hegemony by prescribing what is knowable and thinkable, an aspect made clear in how they treat sustainability as just another category to be dealt with, only important in so much as it enables or hinders economic gains. Further, the texts in the main either do not define sustainable development or do so on their own terms, reframing it as being a concern relative to the pursuit of economic gains, not as something to be considered for all humans across present and future generations. In such terms, sustainability is defined as just another category to deal with as opposed to something fundamental and core.

Grant’s (2010) textbook highlights that public pressure forces a firm to consider sustainability, with the corollary being that if the public are not concerned then neither should the firm be. This type of position not only reinforces a neoliberal capture of the texts, but also panders to the simplistic. Enshrining the pursuit of profitable income as the central concern of organizations ensures simplicity in knowledge transfer to students, as organizational purpose becomes a bigger numbers game (more money), a maths construct of revenue and costs. What it is not is the messy, qualitative mix of values and judgments that are congruent with the challenges inherent to pursuing sustainable outcomes. In this light, and while the neoliberal capture is evident, it is unclear whether such simplistic constructs are actually about easing the passage of the educator by helping to ensure complexity does not enter the classroom.

Ultimately, neoliberal capture of the texts and the treatment of sustainability as a saddlebag issue help to ensure that only superficial change persists. Thus as Spence (2009) argues, “we are left to experience the frustration of Gramsci’s paradox: the old order appears to be dying yet the new order cannot quite be born” (p. 224).

Nearly 30 years ago, Smircich and Stubbart (1985) observed that, “according to most strategic management literature, an organization ... exists within an independently given environment” (p. 724). This current research indicates that little seems to have changed since that time. Further, that the reviewed textbooks fail in the main to even acknowledge sustainability or sustainable development in their indices indicates that there is still much

work to be done. Thus even though sustainability is a key issue for organizations (e.g., see Kiron et al., 2013; Kiron et al., 2012; Hopkins, 2009) and researchers have consistently called for the development of sustainable management theories over the past 20 years (e.g., see Starik & Kanashiro, 2013; Gladwin et al., 1995), the breakthrough of this issue and these theories into strategy textbooks does not seem to have been made. As indicated above, this is arguably because of the neoliberal capture of business schools (e.g., see Khurana, 2007; Cummings, 2005) and, in turn, university career progression systems that promote publishing in top-tier journals and thus a form of conservatism that does not encourage the risk-taking that is associated with researching sustainability. In turn, this difficulty flows through to textbooks. In this context, it can be argued that there is nothing particularly novel or new about highlighting the limitations of the environmental construct or sustainability definitions offered in the bestselling strategic management textbooks. Since the publication of Smircich and Stubbart's (1985) article, sustainable development has become popularized and the challenge of conventional organizational theories and their perpetuating a dualism that does not enable sustainable outcomes has been extensively discussed. Yet despite all this, textbooks do not seem to have moved forward in their constructs to enable corporate strategists, the key actors, to realize sustainable outcomes. What is clear is that we are still in the foothills of a sustainability management theory and the reflection of the near obvious regarding our mutual embedding in and inseparability from all that surrounds us (Starik & Kanahsiro, 2013).

A challenge here is how to progress. Notwithstanding that there are texts that cover sustainability more thoroughly in the broad area of business and society (e.g., see Stead & Stead; 1996), the implications of this current study are for non-academics to ask these questions: Why is it that, given a radically changed context for the planet in the last 30 years or more, strategy texts do not reflect this change? Why do they still offer theories that rely on dualistic conceptions? Who or what is being served by such a state of affairs? Given the answers to such questions are almost obvious, academics need to ensure the ideological underpinnings evident in the texts are at the very least deconstructed and made apparent, and not treated as if they are facts beyond discussion. In so doing academics can challenge the production line of consenting actors by asking students simple questions such as: Where is the environment? What is the purpose of an organization? Where is the external and internal environment? How would any one individual know the boundary? Why do CEOs see the challenge of sustainability but this does not appear to be reflected in textbooks? How does considering the environment as a repository of opportunities and threats to the survival of the

organization relate to the place where you and I, who have the natural environment inside of us, live? Can sustainability only be a profit concern or is it a more encompassing concept?

Outside of this form of questioning, sustainability management theorists need to keep developing new theories and where possible new strategy textbooks, not least because textbooks are considered to have a bona fide status as delivery systems of facts (Issitt, 2004; Apple & Christian-Smith, 1991). Further, strategy textbooks that do not perpetuate dualistic understandings are going to help ensure enhanced tension regarding accepted norms and what is knowable and thinkable. At this stage, such courses of action are viable and necessary if Kuhn's (1996) arguments regarding the scientific structure of revolutions are accepted. As change will eventually occur once the existing paradigm can no longer absorb the mounting body of contrary evidence, the onus is on academics to ensure that until that time convention is continually challenged.

Endnote

Two main arguments inform this paper: first, how the environment is constructed in textbooks as a separate place devoid of humans, a place from which humans stand apart, with no utility beyond its being exploited for economic opportunities and to avoid economic threats; and, second, how sustainable development is an undeveloped concern within the texts and/or is defined within an economic frame. A point of interest that arises from both of these arguments is how the author of this articles defines the environment and sustainable development.

With regard to the environment, the simplest and most direct description is potentially that offered by the Brundtland report: "the environment does not exist as a sphere separate from human actions, ambitions, and needs, and attempts to defend it in isolation from human concerns have given the very word environment a connotation of naivety." Thus, building on this, any reinforcement of the term environment is inappropriate; rather, given that we are in the age of the Anthropocene, texts should focus on concerns such as how an organization impacts the air that humans breathe and the water that humans drink. Such a focus will shift the current emphasis on the 'environment' as a place isolated from human concerns to one that accentuates our articulation with our surroundings.

With regard to sustainable development, all definitions are problematic: however again the simplest and easiest description is that offered by the Brundtland report: "development which meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of

future generations to meet their own needs” (WCED, 1987, p. 8). The rationale for this choice of definition is that it clearly highlights humans as its central concern, and in discussing needs, although needs are malleable and temporal, it advances a wide area for debate that is beyond the economic alone, one that includes needs such as our wellbeing.

References

- Apple, M., & Christian-Smith, L. (1991). The politics of the textbook. In M. Apple & L. Christian-Smith (Eds.), *The Politics of the Textbook*, 1-22, London: Routledge.
- Banerjee, S. B. (2003). Who sustains whose development? Sustainable development and the Reinvention of Nature. *Organization Studies*, 24, 143-180.
- Barney, J. B., & Hesterly, W. S. (2010). *Strategic management and competitive advantage: Concepts and cases* (3rd ed). New Jersey, USA: Prentice Hall.
- Blewitt, J. (2008). *Understanding sustainable development*. London: Earthscan.
- Boisot, M. & McKelvey, B. (2010). Integrating modernist and postmodernist perspectives on organizations: A complexity science bridge. *Academy of Management Review*, 35(3), 415-433.
- Bonnett, M. (2000). Environmental concern and the metaphysics of education. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 34(4), 591-602.
- Bonnett, M. (2002). Education for sustainability as a frame of mind. *Environmental Education Research*, 8(1), 9-20.
- Bonnett, M. (2007). Environmental education and the issue of nature. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 39(6), 707-721.
- Bonnett, M. (2013) Sustainable development, environmental education, and the significance of being in place. *The Curriculum Journal*, 24 (2), 250-271.
- Bourgeois, L. J. (1980) Strategy and environment: A conceptual integration. *Academy of Management Review*, 5(1), 25-39.
- Bouvier, P. B, (1984) The Emperor's new clothes: Management texts, management education and misinformation. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, August, 116-120.
- Byrch, C., Kearins, K., Milne, M., & Morgan, R. (2007). Sustainable “what”? A cognitive approach to understanding sustainable development. *Qualitative Research in Accounting and Management*, 4(1), 26-52.
- Cameron, K., Ireland, .R. D., Lussier, R. N., New, J. R., & Robbins, S. P. (2003a). Management textbooks as propaganda. *Journal of Management Education*, 27(6), 711-729.
- Capon, C. (2008). *Understanding strategic management*. Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Carpenter, M. A., & Sanders, W. G. (2009). *Strategic management: A dynamic perspective concepts and cases* (2nd ed.). New Jersey, USA: Pearson, Prentice Hall.
- Carson, R. (1962). *Silent Spring*. USA: Houghton Mifflin.

- Carruthers, D (2001). From opposition to orthodoxy: The remaking of sustainable development. *Journal of Third World Studies*, 18(2), 93-112.
- Castree, N. (2002). False antitheses? Marxism, nature and actor-networks. *Antipode*, 34(1), 111-116.
- Clegg, S., Carter, C., & Kornberger, M. (2004). Get up, I feel like being a strategy machine. *European Management Review*, 1, 21-28.
- Coase, R. (1937). The nature of the firm. *Economica*, 4(4), 386-405.
- Cornelissen, J. P. (2002). On the 'Organizational identity' Metaphor. *British Journal of Management*, 13, 259-268.
- Cornelissen, J. P. (2004). What are we playing at? Theatre, organization, and the use of metaphor. *Organization Studies*, 25(5), 705-726.
- Cornelissen, J. P. (2005). Beyond compare: Metaphor in organization theory. *Academy of Management Review*, 30(4), 751-764.
- Crawford, K. (2003). The role and purpose of textbooks. *International Journal of Historical Learning, Teaching and Research*, 3(2), 5-11.
- Cronon, W. (1992). A place for stories: Nature, history and narrative. *The Journal of American History*, 78(4), 1347-1376.
- Cummings, S. 2005. *Recreating Strategy*. London: Sage.
- Cummings, S., & Bridgman, T. (2011). The relevant past: Why the history of management should be critical for our future. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 10(1), 77-93.
- David, F. R. (2011). *Strategic management: Concepts* (13th ed.). New Jersey, USA: Pearson Education.
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (2007). *A thousand plateaus*. London: Continuum.
- Dess, G. G., Lumpkin, G. T., Eisner, A. B., & McNamara, G. (2010). *Strategic management texts and cases* (5th ed.). New York, USA: McGraw Hill Irwin.
- De Wit, B., & Meyer, R. (2010a). *Strategy process, content, context: An international perspective* (4th ed.). Mason, USA: South Western Cengage Learning.
- Dolfsma, W., & Dannreuther, C. (2003). Subjects and boundaries: Contesting social capital-based policies. *Journal of Economic Issues*, 37, 405-413.
- Eckersley, R. (2003). *Environmentalism and political theory: Towards an ecocentric approach* (reprint of 1992 edition). London: Routledge.

- Egri, C. P., & Pinfield, L. T. (1999). Organizations and the biosphere: Ecologies and environments. In S.R. Clegg, C. Hardy & W.R. Nord (Eds.), *Managing Organizations*, 209-233. London: Sage.
- Ehrlich, P. (1981). *The Population Bomb*. London: Pan.
- Enz, C. A. (1986). Strategy Textbooks: A case of consistently inconsistent evaluations. *Academy of Management Review*, 11(1), 226-237.
- Gilbert, D. R. (2003). Propaganda, trusteeship, and artifact. *Journal of Management Education*, 27(6), 730-739.
- Gladwin, T. N., Kennelly, J.J., & Krause, T. S. (1995). Shifting paradigms for sustainable development: Implications for management theory and research. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(4), 874-907.
- Gladwin, T. N., Newburry, W. E., & Reiskin, E. D. (1997). Why is the northern elite mind biased against community, the environment and a sustainable future? In M.H. Bazerman, et al. (Eds.), *Environment, Ethics and Behavior: The Psychology of Environmental Valuation and Degradation*. San Francisco: The New Lexington Press.
- Grant, R. M. (2010). *Contemporary strategy analysis*, (7th ed.). West Sussex: Wiley & Sons.
- Hackley, C. (2003). We are all customers now: Rhetorical strategy and ideological control in marketing and management texts. *Journal of Management Studies*, 40(5), 325-1352.
- Hanson, D., Hitt, M. A., Ireland, R. D., & Hoskisson, R. E. (2011). *Strategic management: Competitiveness and globalisation* (Asia-Pacific 4th ed.). Melbourne, Australia: Cengage Learning.
- Hardin, G. (1974). Lifeboat Ethics: the case against helping the poor. *Psychology Today*.
http://www.garretthardinsociety.org/articles/art_lifeboat_ethics_case_against_helping_poor.html (Accessed 14th November, 2014)
- Harrison, J. S., & St. John, C. H. (2010). *Foundations in strategic management* (5th ed.). Mason, USA: South Western Cengage Learning.
- Hatch, M. J. (2011). *Organizations: A very short introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hernes, T. (2004). Studying composite boundaries: A framework of analysis. *Human Relations*, 57, 9-29.
- Hill, C. W. L., & Jones, G. R. (2012). *Essentials of strategic management* (3rd ed.). Mason, USA: Southwestern Cengage Learning.

- Hitt, M. A., Ireland, R. D., & Hoskisson, R. E. (2011). *Strategic management: Competitiveness and globalization: Concepts and cases* (9th ed.). Mason, USA: South Western Cengage Learning.
- Hopkins, M., S. (2009). 8 Reasons Sustainability will Change Management (That You Never Thought of). *Sloan Management Review*, 51(1), 27-30.
- Hopwood, B., Mellor, M., & O'Brien, G. (2005). Sustainable development: Mapping different approaches. *Sustainable Development*, 13(1), 38-52.
- Hubbard, G., & Beamish, P. (2011). *Strategic management: Thinking, analysis, action* (4th ed.). Frenchs Forest, NSW: Pearson Australia.
- Ingold, T. (2011). *Being alive: Essays on movement, knowledge and description*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Issitt, J. (2004). Reflections on the study of textbooks. *History of Education*, 33(6), 683-696.
- Johnson, G., Whittington, R., & Scholes, K. (2011). *Exploring Strategy* (9th ed.). Harlow, Essex: Pearson Education.
- Kates, R. W., Parris, T. M., & Leisowicz, A. A. (2005). What is sustainable development. *Environment*, 47(3): 8-21.
- Katz, J., & Gardner, W.B. (1988). Properties of emerging organizations. *The Academy of Management Review*, 13(3), 429-441.
- Khurana, R. (2007). *From Higher Aims to Hired Hands*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press
- King, A. (1995). Avoiding ecological surprise: Lessons from long standing communities. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(4), 961-985.
- Kiron, D., Kruschwitz, N., Haanaes, K., von Streng Velken, I. (2012). Sustainability Nears a Tipping Point, *Sloan Management Review* 53(2), 69-74.
- Kiron, D., Kruschwitz, N., Reeves, M., Goh, E. (2013). The Benefits of Sustainability-Driven Innovation, *Sloan Management Review*, 54(2), 69-73.
- Kuhn, T., S., (1996) *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press
- Lakoff, G., (2010). Why it Matters How We Frame the Environment. *Environmental Communication*, 4(1), 70-81.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G., & Turner, M. (1987). *More than cool reason: A field guide to poetic metaphor*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Latour, B. (1999a). On recalling ANT. In J. Law & J. Hassard (eds.), *Actor Network Theory and After*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Latour, B. (1999b). *Pandora's hope essays on the reality of science studies*. London: Harvard University Press.
- Lele, S. (1991). Sustainable development: A critical review. *World Development* 19(6): 607-621.
- Levy, D. L., & Egan, D. (2003). A Neo-Gramscian approach to corporate political strategy: Conflict and accommodation in the climate change negotiations. *Journal of Management Studies*, 40(4), 803-829.
- March, J. G., & Simon, H. A. (1958). *Organizations*. New York: Wiley.
- McAfee, K. (2012). Nature in the market-world: Ecosystem services and inequality. *Development*, 55(1), 25-33.
- McAuley, J., Duberle, J., & Johnson, P. (2007). *Organization theory: Challenges and perspectives*. London: FT Prentice Hall.
- Meadows, D.H., Meadows, D.L., Randers, J., Behrens III, W. & Visser, W. (1972) *The Limits to Growth: a report to the Club of Rome's project on the predicament of mankind*. New York: Universe.
- Mebratu, D. (1998). Sustainability and sustainable development: Historical and conceptual Review. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review*, 18(6), 493-520.
- Mir, A. (2003). The hegemonic discourse of management texts. *Journal of Management Education*, 27(6), 734-738.
- Newton, T. (2002). Creating new ecological order? Elias and actor-network theory. *Academy of Management Review*, 27(4), 523-540.
- Newton, T. (2007). *Nature and sociology*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Pingel, F. (1999). *UNESCO guidebook on textbook research and textbook revision*. Hannover: Verlag Hahnsche Buchhandlung.
- Purser, R. E., Park, C., & Montuori, A. (1995). Limits to anthropocentrism: Toward an ecocentric organization paradigm? *Academy of Management Review*, 20(4), 1053-1089.
- Redclift, M. (2005). Sustainable development (1987-2005): An oxymoron comes of age. *Sustainable Development*, 13, 212-227.
- Robson, C. (2002). *Real world research* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Rogers, R. (2004). *An Introduction to Critical Discourse Analysis in Education*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

- Ross, J. E., & Murdick, R. G. (1977). What are the principles of management? *Academy of Management Review*, 2(1), 436-146.
- Santos, F. M., & Eisenhardt, K. M. (1985). Organizational boundaries and theories of organization. *Organization Science*, 16(5), 491-508.
- Sarasvathy, S. D. (2001). Causation and effectuation: Toward a theoretical shift from economic inevitability to entrepreneurial contingency. *Academy of Management Review*, 26(2), 243-263.
- Sarasvathy, S. D. (2004). Making it happen: Beyond theories of the firm to theories of firm design. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Winter, 519-531.
- Shrivastava, P., & Hart, G. (1994). Greening organizations – 2000. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 17(3-4), 607-635.
- Shrivastava, P. (1995). The role of corporations in achieving ecological sustainability. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(4), 936-960.
- Simon, H. A. (1947). *Administrative behavior: A study of decision-making processes in administrative organizations*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Spence, C. (2009). Social accounting's emancipatory potential: A Gramscian critique. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, 20(2), 205-227
- Spender, J. C. (1989). *Industry recipes: The nature and sources of managerial judgment*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Steer, A., & Wade-Gery, W. (1993). Sustainable development: Theory and practice for a sustainable future. *Sustainable Development*, 1(3), 23-35.
- Smircich, L., & Stubbart, C. (1985). Strategic management in an enacted world. *Academy of Management Review*, 10(4), 724-736.
- Stead, W. E., Stead, J. G. (1996) *Management for a Small Planet*, London: Sage (2nd edition)
- Starik, M., Kanashiro, P. (2013). Toward a Theory of Sustainability Management: Uncovering and Integrating the Nearly Obvious. *Organization & Environment*, 26(1), 7-30.
- Thompson, J., & Martin, F. (2010). *Strategic management, awareness and change* (6th ed.). Hampshire, UK: South Western Cengage Learning.
- Thompson, A. A., Peteraf, M.A., Gamble, J. E., & Strickland, A. J. (2012). *Creating & executing strategy: The quest for competitive advantage: Concepts & Cases* (18th ed.). New York: McGraw Hill/Irwin.
- Tsoukas, H. (1991). The Missing link: A transformational view of metaphors in organizational science. *Academy of Management Review*, 16(3), 566-585.

- Tsoukas, H. (1993). Analogical reasoning and knowledge generation in organization theory. *Organization Studies*, 14, 323-346.
- Tulloch, L. (2013). On Science, Ecology and Environmentalism. *Policy Futures in Education*, 11(1), 100-114.
- Citation: Suzuki, D. (2008). *The Sacred Balance: rediscovering our place in nature*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
- Tulloch, L., Neilson, D (2014). The Neoliberalisation of Sustainability. *Citizenship, Social and Economics Education*, 13(1), 26-38.
- United Nations Secretary – General’s High Level Panel on Global Sustainability (2012). *Resilient people, resilient planet: A future worth choosing*. New York: United Nations.
- Van Dijk, T., A., (2001) Critical Discourse Analysis. In Schiffrin, D., Tannen, D., Hamilton, H., E., (eds). *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Oxford, UK: Blackwells.
- Viljoen, J., & Dann, S. (2003). *Strategic management* (4th ed.). Frenchs Forest, NSW: Prentice Hall, Pearson Education Australia.
- Wheelan, T. L., & Hunger, D. J. (2010). *Strategic management and business policy: Achieving sustainability* (12th ed.). New Jersey, USA: Prentice Hall.
- Whittington, R. (1993). *What is strategy – and does it matter?*. London: Routledge.
- Witcher, B. J., & Chau, S. (2010). *Strategic management: Principles and practice* (1st ed.). Mason USA: South Western Cengage Learning.
- World Commission on Environment and Development (1987). *Our common future*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Yates, J. J. (2012). Abundance on trial: The cultural significance of sustainability. *The Hedgehog Review*, Summer, 8-25.

Table 1: Strategy Textbook Titles as of 2011

	Strategy Textbook
1.	Angwin, D., Cummings, S., & Smith, C. (2008). <i>The strategy pathfinder: Core concepts and micro-cases</i> . Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
2.	Barney, J. B., & Hesterly, W. S. (2010). <i>Strategic Management and competitive advantage: Concepts and Cases</i> (3 rd ed.). New Jersey, USA: Prentice Hall.
3.	Besanko, D., Dranove, D., Shanley, M., Schaefer, S. (2010). <i>Economics of strategy</i> (5 th ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
4.	Capon, C. (2008). <i>Understanding Strategic Management</i> . Harlow: Pearson Education.
5.	Carpenter, M. A., Sanders, W. G. (2009). <i>Strategic management: A dynamic perspective concepts and cases</i> (2 nd ed.). New Jersey, USA: Pearson, Prentice Hall.
6.	David, F. R. (2011). <i>Strategic management: Concepts</i> (13 th ed.). New Jersey, USA: Pearson Education.
7.	De Wit, B., & Meyer, R. (2010a). <i>Strategy process, content, context: An international perspective</i> (4 th ed.). Mason USA: South Western Cengage Learning.
8.	De Wit, B., & Meyer, R. (2010b). <i>Strategy synthesis: Resolving strategy paradoxes to create competitive advantage</i> (3 rd ed.). Andover, UK: Cengage Learning.
9.	Dess, G. G., Lumpkin, G. T., Eisner, A. B., & McNamara, G. (2010). <i>Strategic management texts and cases</i> (5 th ed.). New York, USA: Mc-Graw-Hill Irwin.
10.	Grant, R. M. (2010). <i>Contemporary strategy analysis</i> (7 th ed.). West Sussex: Wiley & Sons.
11.	Hanson, D., Hitt, M. A., Ireland, R. D., & Hoskisson, R. E. (2011). <i>Strategic management: Competitiveness and globalisation (Asia-Pacific</i> 4 th ed.). Melbourne: Cengage Learning Australia.
12.	Harrison, J. S., & St. John, C. H. (2010). <i>Foundations in strategic management</i> (5 th ed.). Mason USA: South Western Cengage Learning.
13.	Hill, C. W. L., & Jones, G. R. (2010). <i>Strategic management: An integrated approach</i> (9 th ed.). Mason, USA: South Western Cengage Learning.
14.	Hill, C. W. L., & Jones, G. R. (2012). <i>Essentials of strategic management</i> (3 rd ed.). Mason USA: Southwestern Cengage Learning.
15.	Hitt, M. A., Ireland, D. R., & Hoskisson, R. E. (2011). <i>Strategic management: Competitiveness and globalization: Concepts and cases</i> (9 th ed.). Mason USA: South Western Cengage Learning.
16.	Hubbard, G., & Beamish, P. (2011). <i>Strategic management: Thinking, analysis, action</i> (4 th ed.). Frenchs Forest NSW: Pearson Australia.
17.	Johnson, G., Whittington, R., & Scholes, K. (2011). <i>Exploring strategy</i> , (9 th ed.). Harlow, Essex: Pearson Education.
18.	Saloner, G., Shepard, A., & Podolny, J. (2001). <i>Strategic management</i> . New York USA: J Wiley & Sons.
19.	Thompson, A. A., Peteraf, M. A., Gamble, J. E., & Strickland, A. J. (2012). <i>Creating & executing strategy: The quest for competitive advantage, concepts & cases</i> (18 th ed.). New York: Mc-Graw Hill/Irwin.
20.	Thompson, J., & Martin, F. (2010). <i>Strategic management, awareness and change</i> (6 th ed.). Hampshire, UK: South Western Cengage Learning.
21.	Viljoen, J., & Dann, S. (2003). <i>Strategic management</i> (4 th ed.). Frenchs Forest, NSW: Prentice Hall, Pearson Education Australia.
22.	Wheelan, T. L., & Hunger, D. J. (2010). <i>Strategic management and business policy: Achieving sustainability</i> (12 th ed.). New Jersey, USA: Prentice Hall.
23.	Witcher, B. J., & Chau, S. (2010). <i>Strategic management: Principles and practice</i> (1 st ed.). Mason USA: South Western Cengage Learning.

Table 2: Strategy Textbook Titles and Constructs/Definitions for 2011 Titles and Latest Editions of Titles as at November 2015

	Reference	The Environment (Defined/Discussed) External/Internal	Sustainability/Sustainable Development
1.	Angwin, D., Cummings, S., & Smith, C. (2008). <i>The strategy pathfinder: Core concepts and micro-cases</i> . Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.	<p>Three levels of the environment are offered, macro, meso and micro</p> <p>The macro-environment consists of: political, legal, ethical, ecology, technological, economic, media and social (ESTEMPLE).</p> <p>Ecological – “reflects concern for the sustainability of the physical environment. Issues include: greenhouse effect, CO2 emissions, genetic engineering. Factors for consideration include environmental policies, waste disposal, and energy consumption” (pp.7)</p> <p>Organizational boundaries/boundaries terms do not appear to be explicitly discussed.</p>	<p>Chapter 10 explores Sustain Ability - The Brundtland Report definition of sustainable development is offered on pp. 264. The concept results from “the convergence of principles of economic integrity, economic prosperity and social equity” (pp.264)</p> <p>“Corporate environmental integrity emphasises a firm’s responsibility to manage its processes and products so as to minimise their impact on the physical environment” (pp.265)</p> <p>“Corporate social equity...is manifest as corporate social responsibility” (pp.266)</p> <p>“Corporate economic prosperity. Is the fundamental rationale underpinning the existence of firms and the capitalist system” (pp.268)</p>
	Angwin, D., Cummings, S., & Smith, C. (2011). <i>The strategy pathfinder: Core concepts and micro-cases</i> (2 nd ed). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.	<p>Three levels of external environment are discussed – macro, meso and micro.</p> <p>Ecological concerns related to sustainability are listed on p. 305. These include; biodegradable, carbon footprint, carbon neutral, ecological footprint, energy efficiency, organic, waste neutral, recyclable, renewable materials or energy technology, remanufacturable, repurposable, reusable.</p> <p>As previous edition, organizational boundaries do not appear to be explicitly discussed.</p>	<p>As previous version, Chapter 10 explores Sustain Ability. It is argued that “sustainable development or “sustain ability” [is] a convergence of several as yet not fully defined paradigms which is reshaping the role of the firm and capitalism. Sustainable development according to some of its most zealous advocates goes beyond dealing with how organizations should look to protect and sustain their competitive advantage across the long term and how they should act as good citizens concerned with sustaining or preserving our shared environments for the future. It goes to the heart of what an organization strategically is.” (pp.304)</p> <p>Brundtland definition is outlined on page 305.</p> <p>“Sustainable development had traditionally been discussed as an intraglobal issue at the level of the nation state.....However, in modern industrialized nation states the firm is becoming (willingly or not) a focus for sustainable development rather than an involved but necessarily committed bystander” (pp.306)</p> <p>Ecological footprint is also discussed in chapter 10.</p>
2.	Barney, J. B., Hesterly, W. S. (2010). <i>Strategic management and competitive advantage: Concepts</i>	<p>“By conducting an external analysis, a firm identifies the critical threats and opportunities in its competitive environment” (pp.8)</p>	<p>Sustainable development and or sustainability do not appear in the index.</p> <p>Ethic and strategy features are in the chapters, example titles include: stockholders and stakeholders, social welfare, externalities, race to the bottom,</p>

	Reference	The Environment (Defined/Discussed) External/Internal	Sustainability/Sustainable Development
	<i>and cases</i> (3 rd ed.). New Jersey, USA: Prentice Hall.	<p>“internal analysis helps a firm identify its organizational strengths and weaknesses” (pp.8)</p> <p>“General environment consists of broad trends in the context within which a firm operates that can have an impact on the firm’s strategic choices” (pp.30)...“the general environment consists of six interrelated elements: technological change, demographic trends, cultural trends, the economic climate, legal and political conditions, and specific international events” (pp.30)</p> <p>Internal analysis is outlined in chapter three and is focused on a resources based view of the firm.</p> <p>Organizational boundaries/boundaries terms do not appear to be explicitly discussed.</p>	outsourcing, cheating and prosperity.
	Barney, J. B., Hesterly, W. S. (2012). <i>Strategic management and competitive advantage: Concepts and cases</i> (4 th ed.). New Jersey, USA: Prentice Hall.	<p>External and internal analysis defined as per previous edition.</p> <p>General environment defined as per previous edition.</p>	<p>Sustainable development and or sustainability do not appear in the index.</p> <p>As per the previous edition, ethics and strategy appears in some chapters.</p>
3.	Besanko, D. Dranove, D., Shanley, M., & Schaefer, S. (2010). <i>Economics of strategy</i> (5 th ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.	<p>External and internal environment do not appear to be defined.</p> <p>“The firm’s boundaries define what the firm does” (pp.6)</p> <p>“The firm’s horizontal boundaries refer to how much of the product market the firm serves....The firm’s vertical boundaries refer to the set of activities that the firm performs itself and those that it purchases from market speciality firms. The firm’s corporate boundaries refer to the set of distinct businesses the firm competes in” (pp.6).</p>	Sustainable development and or sustainability do not appear in the index.
	Besanko, D. Dranove, D., Shanley, M., & Schaefer, S. (2013). <i>Economics of strategy</i> (6 th ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.	<p>“Boundaries of the firm. What should the firm do, how large should it be, and what businesses should it be in?” (pp.6)</p> <p>“The firm’s boundaries define what the firm does” (pp.6)</p> <p>The definition of horizontal and vertical boundaries is as per the previous edition of the book.</p> <p>“External context concerns not only the business environment in which the firm operates, which we have discussed in detail throughout this book, but also the legal, regulatory, political and cultural environment in which the firm acts” (pp.472)</p> <p>“Internal context concerns the political and cultural environment within a firm that affects how managers and employees behave” (pp. 472)</p>	Sustainable development and or sustainability do not appear in the index.
4.	Capon, C. (2008). <i>Understanding strategic management</i> . Harlow: Pearson Education.	<p>“The external environment is where the opportunities and threats arise from to confront the organization” (pp.6)</p> <p>“The aim of environmental analysis is to help a company understand its current position in the external environment” (pp.28)</p> <p>“The external environment is literally the big wide world in which organizations operate” (pp.31)</p>	Sustainable development and or sustainability do not appear in the index.

	Reference	The Environment (Defined/Discussed) External/Internal	Sustainability/Sustainable Development
		<p>“The term ‘environment’ in this case refers to much more than the ecological, ‘green’ issues that the word commonly evokes, although being environmentally friendly and reducing the carbon footprint can be part of an organization’s strategy” (pp.31)</p> <p>Internal analysis is focused on the resources and capabilities of an organization.</p> <p>Organizational boundaries/boundaries terms do not appear to be explicitly discussed.</p>	
	The 2008 version of the text is the latest edition.		
5.	Carpenter, M. A., & Sanders, W. G. (2009). <i>Strategic management: A dynamic perspective concepts and cases</i> (2 nd ed.). New Jersey, USA: Pearson, Prentice Hall.	<p>“The external perspective focuses on the structure of industries and the ways in which firms can position themselves within them for competitive advantage” (pp.23)</p> <p>“The external environment consists of a wide array of economic and socio-political factors” (pp.106)</p> <p>“The external environment is the specific market arenas that the firm has chosen in its strategy...it is the external environment that provides the business opportunities...the external environment is also a source of threats” (pp.109)</p> <p>The external environment is split into the macro, industry and strategic group. PESTEL is the analysis tool for the macro-environment.</p> <p>“PESTEL is an acronym for the political, economic, sociocultural, technological, environmental and legal context(s) in which a firm operates” (pp.109)</p> <p>“The environment has long been a factor in firm strategy, primarily from the standpoint of access to raw materials. Increasingly, however, this factor is best viewed as a direct and indirect operating cost for the firm, as well as from the lens of the footprint left by a firm on its respective environments in terms of waste, pollution and so on.” (pp.111)</p> <p>“The internal perspective focuses on resources and capabilities as internal sources of uniqueness that allow firms to beat the competition” (pp.23)</p> <p>Organizational boundaries/boundaries terms do not appear to be explicitly discussed.</p>	Sustainable development and or sustainability do not appear in the index.
	The 2009 version of the text is the latest edition.		
6.	David, F. R. (2011). <i>Strategic management: Concepts</i> (13 th ed.). New Jersey, USA: Pearson Education.	<p>“External opportunities and external threats refer to economic, social, cultural, demographic, environmental, political, legal, governmental, technological and competitive trends and events that could significantly benefit or harm an organization in the future” (pp.43)</p> <p>“Opportunities and threats are largely beyond the control of a single organization – thus the word external” (pp.43)</p> <p>“The purpose of an external audit is to develop a finite list of opportunities that could benefit a firm and threats that should be avoided” (pp.93)</p> <p>“External forces can be divided into five broad categories: (1) economic forces; (2) social, cultural, demographic and natural environment forces; (3) political, governmental, and legal forces; (4)</p>	<p>Business ethics, social responsibility, environmental sustainability is introduced in chapter 10.</p> <p>“Social responsibility refers to actions an organization takes beyond what is legally required to protect or enhance the well-being of living things” (pp.343)</p> <p>“Sustainability refers to the extent that an organization’s operations and actions protect, mend, and preserve rather than harm or destroy the natural environment” (pp.343).</p> <p>“Businesses must not exploit and decimate the natural environment” (p.349)</p> <p>Citing ISO, “the word environment is defined as ‘surroundings in which an</p>

	Reference	The Environment (Defined/Discussed) External/Internal	Sustainability/Sustainable Development
		<p>technological forces; and (5) competitive forces” (pp.93)</p> <p>“Internal strengths and internal weaknesses are an organization’s controllable activities that are performed especially well or poorly” (pp.44)</p> <p>Internal environment is discussed via a resource based view and a value chain analysis of a firm.</p> <p>Organizational boundaries/boundaries terms do not appear to be explicitly discussed.</p>	<p>organization operated including air, water, land, natural resources, flora, fauna, humans and their interrelation” (pp.349)</p> <p>“The ecological challenge facing all organizations requires managers to formulate strategies that preserve and conserve natural resources and control pollution” (pp.351)</p>
	David, F. R., David F. R., (2015). <i>Strategic management: Concepts</i> (15 th ed.). Harlow, UK: Pearson Education.	<p>Environment does not appear to be defined.</p> <p>External opportunities and threats are defined as previous edition, thus the organization is a situation of facing external opportunities and threats.</p>	<p>Ethics/Social Responsibility/Sustainability are introduced in chapter 3.</p> <p>“Social responsibility refers to actions an organization takes beyond what is legally required to protect or enhance the well-being of living things” (p.110) – same definition as previous version</p> <p>“Sustainability refers to the extent that an organization’s operations and actions protect, mend, and preserve rather than harm or destroy the natural environment” (p.110) – same definition as previous version</p> <p>As previous citing ISO “the word environment is defined as “surrounding in which an organization operates, including air, water, land, natural resources, flora, fauna, humans and their interrelation” (p.119)</p> <p>“It is no longer just cool to be environmentally proactive, it is expected” (p.124)</p>
7.	De Wit, B., & Meyer, R. (2010a). <i>Strategy process, content, context: An international perspective</i> (4 th ed.). Mason USA: South Western Cengage Learning.	<p>Terms are not defined as such. However, it is highlighted that “the first dichotomy employed is that between the organization and its industry environment” (pp.10/11)</p> <p>External assessment involves “investigating the structure and dynamics of the environment surrounding the organization” (pp.110)</p> <p>Internal assessment is “the activity of investigating the capabilities and functioning of the organization” (pp.110)</p> <p>Organizational boundaries/boundaries terms do not appear to be explicitly discussed.</p>	Sustainable development and or sustainability do not appear in the index.
	The 2010 version of the text is the latest edition.		
8.	De Wit, B., & Meyer, R. (2010b). <i>Strategy synthesis: Resolving strategy paradoxes to create competitive advantage</i> (3 rd ed.). Andover, UK: Cengage Learning.	<p>Terms are not defined as such. However, it is highlighted that “the first dichotomy employed is that between the organization and its industry environment” (pp.11)</p> <p>Organizational boundaries/boundaries terms do not appear to be explicitly discussed.</p>	Sustainable development and or sustainability do not appear in the index.
	De Wit, B., & Meyer, R. (2014). <i>Strategy synthesis: Resolving strategy paradoxes to create competitive advantage</i> (4 th ed.).	<p>As per the previous version, the highlighting of a dichotomy between the organization and its environment.</p> <p>External and internal analysis are discussed as above.</p>	Sustainable development does not appear in the index.

	Reference	The Environment (Defined/Discussed) External/Internal	Sustainability/Sustainable Development
	Andover, UK: Cengage Learning.		
9.	Dess, G. G., Lumpkin, G. T., Eisner, A. B., & McNamara, G. (2010). <i>Strategic management texts and cases</i> (5 th ed.). New York, USA: Mc-Graw-Hill Irwin.	<p>“Successful managers must recognise opportunities and threats in their firm’s external environment” (pp.40)</p> <p>The firm’s external environment is constituted by a general environment and a competitive environment.</p> <p>The general environment consists of demographic, sociocultural, political/legal, technological, economic and global.</p> <p>The “sociocultural segment of the general environment [is] the values, beliefs, and lifestyles of a society” (pp.49). Within this segment a constituent is ‘greater concern for the environment’ (pp.48)</p> <p>Internal environment is not defined explicitly. However chapter three discusses a firm’s internal environment and highlights analysis of this environment would involve the use of SWOT, the value chain and a focus on resources and capabilities.</p> <p>Organizational boundaries/boundaries terms not offered in the index, other than within a context of managerial control by setting boundaries for individuals.</p>	<p>“Environmental sustainability is now a value embraced by the most competitive and successful multinational companies” (pp.23)</p> <p>Social responsibility is “the expectation that businesses or individuals will strive to improve the overall welfare of society” (pp.21)</p> <p>The triple bottom line involves “assessing financial, social and environmental performance” (pp.22)</p>
	Dess, G. G., Lumpkin, G. T., Eisner, A. B., & McNamara, G. (2014). <i>Strategic management texts and cases</i> (7 th ed.). New York, USA: Mc-Graw-Hill Irwin.	<p>As previous version, “successful managers must recognise opportunities and threats in their firm’s external environment” (pp.36)</p> <p>The general environment is split into the same sectors, as previous edition the sociocultural segment consists of “general concern for environment” (pp.43)</p> <p>Boundaries are discussed within the context of acceptable behaviour (see page 284). But do not appear to be discussed in terms of organizational boundaries relative to the master dichotomy of internal and external environment.</p> <p>Internal business perspective – “measures of firm performance that indicate how well firms’ internal processes, decisions and actions are contributing to customer satisfaction” (p.95)</p>	<p>Environmental sustainability is highlighted in the first chapter as a strategy spotlight segment. “Companies across the world embrace the concept of sustainability as a powerful source of innovation and improving operational effectiveness” (pp.21)</p> <p>Sustainable development does not appear in the index.</p> <p>Environmentally friendly manufacturing is mentioned on page 75. A company is highlighted in how it has reduced expenses associated with the cost of dangerous chemical disposal.</p> <p>Triple bottom line is discussed in the first chapter, as is social responsibility and the concept of shared value.</p>
10.	Grant, R. M. (2010). <i>Contemporary strategy analysis</i> (7 th ed.). West Sussex: Wiley & Sons.	<p>Environment not defined as such other than the industry environment being a focus. The industry environment outlined as containing suppliers, competitors and customers.</p> <p>Natural environment is offered as a component of the macro-environment (pp. 65) The natural environment is not defined.</p> <p>With regard to the external environment “the emphasis of the book has been on the identification of profit opportunities in the external environment of the firm” (pp. 122)</p> <p>Internal environment of the firm is “more specifically, with the resources and capabilities of the firm” (pp.122)</p> <p>Organizational boundaries/boundaries terms do not appear to be explicitly discussed.</p>	<p>“As public concern over the degradation of the natural environment grows, so businesses are increasingly pressured to adopt strategies and actions that are conducive to environmental sustainability” (pp.458)</p>
	Grant, R. M. (2013). <i>Contemporary strategy analysis</i>	<p>Environment not defined, reader is referred to industry environment as with previous version. “The business environment of the consists of all the external influences that impact its decisions and its</p>	<p>The statement above cannot be readily found, and sustainable development and or sustainability do not appear in the index.</p>

	Reference	The Environment (Defined/Discussed) External/Internal	Sustainability/Sustainable Development
	(8 th ed.). West Sussex: Wiley & Sons.	performance” (pp. 60) Internal environment of the firm is “more specifically, with the resources and capabilities of the firm” (pp.112) – <i>Same definition as previous</i> Organizational boundaries do not appear to be discussed; industry boundaries are discussed from the perspective of substitution.	
11	Hanson, D., Hitt, M. A., Ireland, R. D., & Hoskisson, R. E. (2011). <i>Strategic management: Competitiveness and globalisation</i> . (Asia-Pacific 4 th ed.). Melbourne: Cengage Learning Australia.	“An integrated understanding of the external and internal environments is essential for firms to understand the present and predict the future” (pp.36) “A firm’s external environment is divided into three main areas: the general, industry and competitor environment.” (pp.36) “The general environment is composed of dimensions in broader society that influence an industry and indirectly, the firms within it.” (pp.37) The general environment splits into demographic, economic, political/legal, socio-cultural, technological and global. Concerns about the natural environment are a subset of socio-cultural. Natural environment also indicated as a stakeholder (pp.20) with a requirement for it to be recognised because of its intrinsic value albeit this is “a notion that is worryingly at odds with the basic logic of business” (pp.23) Internal Environment is not defined Organizational boundaries/boundaries terms do not appear to be explicitly discussed.	Sustainable development and or sustainability do not appear in the index.
	Hanson, D., Hitt, M. A., Ireland, R. D., & Hoskisson, R. E. (2014). <i>Strategic management: Competitiveness and globalisation</i> . (Asia-Pacific 5 th ed.). Melbourne: Cengage Learning Australia.	“the external environment influences firms as they seek strategic competitiveness and above-average returns”(pp.36) “The general environment is composed of dimensions in broader society that influence an industry and indirectly, the firms within it.” (pp.38) - <i>Same definition as previously used</i> The general environment splits into demographic, economic, political/legal, sociocultural, technological, global and physical environment. Concerns about an organization’s environmental footprint are captured within the physical environment segment.	Sustainable development and or sustainability do not appear in the index.
12	Harrison, J. S., & St. John, C. H. (2010). <i>Foundations in strategic management</i> (5th ed.). Mason, USA: South Western Cengage Learning.	“External environmental analysis...involves evaluation of the broad and task environments to determine trends, threats, and opportunities and to provide a foundation for strategic direction” (pp.4/5). “The broad environment consists of domestic and global environmental forces such as socio cultural, technological, political and economic trends...The task environment consists of external stakeholders” (pp.5) Internal analysis is focused on resources and capabilities. Organizational boundaries/boundaries terms do not appear to be explicitly discussed.	Sustainable development is defined as “business growth that does not deplete the natural environment or damage society in any way” (pp.81) Corporate social responsibility is referred to in the index and discussed at three points through the text. A term enterprise strategy is offered to “join ethical and strategic thinking about an organization” (pp.76)
	Harrison, J. S., & St. John, C. H.	External environment defined as previous version of text. Similarly with other definitions.	Sustainable development “supports a pattern of economic decision making

	Reference	The Environment (Defined/Discussed) External/Internal	Sustainability/Sustainable Development
	(2014). <i>Foundations in strategic management</i> (6th ed.). Mason, USA: South Western Cengage Learning.		that uses resources to meet current human needs while also ensuring that adequate resources will be available for generations to come” (pp.25) “Sustainable development can be defined as business growth that does not permanently deplete the natural environment or damage society in anyway” (pp. 86) Corporate social responsibility contains four major components: (1) economic responsibilities such as the obligation to productive and profitable and meet the consumer needs of society; (2) a legal responsibility to achieve economic goals within the confines of established laws; (3) moral obligations to abide by unwritten codes, norms and values implicitly derived from society and (4) discretionary responsibilities that are volitional or philanthropic in nature” (pp.85)
13	Hill, C. W. L., & Jones, G. R. (2010). <i>Strategic management: An integrated approach</i> (9 th ed.). Mason USA: South Western Cengage Learning.	“The essential purpose of the external analysis is to identify strategic opportunities and threats in the organization’s operating environment that will affect how it pursues its mission” (pp.17) The external environment consists of the “industry environment in which the company operates; the country or national environment; and the wider socioeconomic or macro environment” (pp.17) Goal of external analysis “to understand the opportunities and threats confronting the firm and to use this understanding to identify strategies that will enable the company to outperform its rivals” (pp. 39) Natural environment or resource concerns are not mentioned. Internal analysis is “concerned with identifying the strengths and weaknesses of a company” (pp.74) Organizational boundaries/boundaries terms do not appear to be explicitly discussed.	Sustainable development and or sustainability do not appear in the index. “Environmental degradation occurs when a firm takes actions that directly or indirectly result in pollution or other forms of environmental harm. Environmental degradation can violate the rights of local communities and the general public for such things as clean air and water, land that is free from pollution by toxic chemicals, and properly managed forests (because forests absorb rainfall, improper deforestation results in land erosion and floods).” (pp.368)
	Hill, C. W. L., Jones, G. R., Schilling M. A. (2015). <i>Strategic management: An integrated approach</i> (11 th ed.). Mason USA: South Western Cengage Learning.	The external and internal analysis perspective is as per the previous version.	Sustainable development and sustainability do not appear in the index. “Environmental degradation occurs when a company’s actions directly or indirectly result in pollution or other forms of environmental harm. Environmental degradation can violate the rights of local communities and the general public for things such as clean air and water, land that is free from pollution by toxic chemicals, and properly managed.” (pp.382)
14	Hill, C. W. L., & Jones, G. R. (2012). <i>Essentials of strategic management</i> (3 rd ed.). Mason, USA: Southwestern Cengage Learning.	“The essential purpose of the external analysis is to identify strategic opportunities and threats in the organization’s operating environment that will affect how it pursues its mission” (pp.9) The external environment can be split into industry, national and macro-environment. “Analysing the macro-environment consists of examining macroeconomic, social, government, legal, international and technological factors that may affect the company and its industry” (pp.9) “Internal analysis....serves to pinpoint the strengths and weaknesses of the organization” (pp.9)	Sustainable development and or sustainability do not appear in the index. “Environmental degradation occurs when the firm takes actions that directly or indirectly result in pollution or other forms of environmental harm. Environmental degradation can violate the rights of local communities and the general public for clean air and water, land that is free from pollution by toxic chemicals, excessive deforestation that results in land erosion and floods (forests absorb rainfall and limit flooding), and so on.” (pp.44)

	Reference	The Environment (Defined/Discussed) External/Internal	Sustainability/Sustainable Development
		<p>“Opportunities arise when a company can take advantage of conditions in its environment to formulate and implement strategies that enable it to become more profitable. Threats arise when conditions in the external environment endanger the integrity and profitability of the company’s business” (pp.56)</p> <p>Organizational boundaries/boundaries terms do not appear to be explicitly discussed.</p>	
	The 2011 version of the text is the latest edition.		
15	Hitt, M. A., Ireland, D. R., & Hoskisson, R. E. (2011). <i>Strategic management: Competitiveness and globalization: Concepts and cases</i> (9 th ed.). Mason, USA: South Western Cengage Learning.	<p>“Regardless of the industry in which they compete, the external environment influences firms as they seek strategic competitiveness and the earning of above average returns” (pp.36)</p> <p>The general environment consists of seven segments – economic, political/legal, sociocultural, technological, global and physical.</p> <p>Physical environment concerns “energy consumption, practices used to develop energy sources, renewable energy efforts, minimising a firm’s environmental footprint, availability of water as a resource, producing environmentally friendly products” (pp.38)</p> <p>“Identifying opportunities and threats is an important objective of studying the general environment” (pp.39)</p> <p>Internal environment is not explicitly defined. However, “analysis of the firm’s internal organization requires that evaluators examine the firm’s portfolio of resources and the bundles of heterogeneous resources and capabilities managers have created” (pp.73)</p> <p>Organizational boundaries/boundaries terms do not appear to be explicitly discussed.</p>	<p>Sustainable development and or sustainability do not appear in the index.</p> <p>Within the discussion of the physical environment there is the following commentary - “because of increasing concern about sustaining the quality of the physical environment, a number of companies are developing environmentally friendly policies” (pp.49)</p>
	Hitt, M. A., Ireland, D. R., & Hoskisson, R. E. (2015). <i>Strategic management: Competitiveness and globalization: Concepts and cases</i> (11 th ed.). Mason, USA: South Western Cengage Learning.	Definitions as per previous version.	<p>Sustainable development appears in the index, the definition offered is the Brundtland definition “development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs” (pp.50)</p> <p>This discussion is embedded in a discussion of the physical environment wherein “firms recognize that ecological, social and economic systems interactively influence what happens in this particular segment and that they are part of an interconnected society” (pp.50)</p>
16	Hubbard, G. & Beamish, P. (2011). <i>Strategic management: Thinking, analysis, action</i> (4 th ed.). Frenchs Forest, NSW: Pearson Australia.	<p>“The environment represents all those aspects outside the organization that affect the business strategy of an organization” (pp.21)</p> <p>The environment can be split into two the macro-environment (those environmental forces that are outside the industry in which the business competes, but of relevance and the industry environment (pp.21) This macro-environment is divided into sections (economic, political, technological, legal, social/cultural, demographic and green environment).</p> <p>Green environment trends are how “industries are facing the unsustainability of existing commercial practices in terms of their effects on the natural environment” (pp.70)</p>	<p>Sustainability defined as “development that meets the needs of stakeholders without compromising the ability to meet their needs in the future” (pp.12)</p> <p>Sustainability and sustainable development is introduced in the first chapter.</p> <p>Outlines in chapter two that sustainability is likely to impact on strategy by making economic growth less important a maxim.</p> <p>All chapters have a sustainability section.</p>

	Reference	The Environment (Defined/Discussed) External/Internal	Sustainability/Sustainable Development
		Internal environment not defined. Organizational boundaries/boundaries terms do not appear to be explicitly discussed.	
	Hubbard, G. Rice, J & Beamish, P. (2015). <i>Strategic management: Thinking, analysis, action</i> (5 th ed.). Melbourne, Victoria: Pearson Australia.	“The environment represents all those aspects outside the organization that affect the business strategy of an organization” (pp.22) – <i>Same definition as previous version</i> “For analytical convenience, we break the environment in this analysis into two elements: the macro-environment (those environmental forces that are outside the industry in which the business competes, but of indirect relevance to the business) and the industry environment.” (pp.22) Green environment trends “industries are facing the unsustainability of existing commercial practices in terms of their effects on the natural environment” (pp.73.) - <i>Same definition as previous version</i> Internal environment does not appear to be defined. Organizational boundaries do not appear to be explicitly discussed.	Sustainability discussed in first chapter of the book. Sustainability defined as “development that meets the needs of stakeholders without compromising their ability to meet their needs in the future” (pp.51) - <i>Same definition as previous version</i> Argues that sustainability issues are leading to a focus on corporate social responsibility or corporate responsibility and that environmental sustainability will be a “normal for organizations in the near term” (pp.12) All chapters have a sustainability section.
17	Johnson, G., Whittington, R., & Scholes, K. (2011). <i>Exploring strategy</i> (9 th ed.). Harlow, Essex: Pearson Education.	Environment – “organizations operate in a complex political, economic, social and technological world...The fundamental question here relates to the opportunities and threats available to the organization in this complex and changing environment” (pp.16) “The environment is what gives organizations their means of survival. It creates opportunities and it presents threats.” (pp.49) The business environment is presented in layers from macro-environment, industry or sector to competitors. “The macro-environment is the highest-level layer....here, the PESTEL framework can be used to identify future issues... <i>environmental</i> (<i>‘green’</i>) [italics in original text]” (pp.49) The internal environment is not defined, rather within chapter three there is a focus on strategic capabilities, resources and competencies. “The more the boundaries between the organization and its environment are reduced, the more innovation is likely to occur” (pp.35)	Sustainable development and or sustainability do not appear in the index. Chapter 4 introduces social responsibility and ethics and introduces the concept of Corporate Social Responsibility. “Corporate social responsibility is the commitment by organizations to behave ethically and contribute to economic development while improving the quality of life of the workforce and their families as well as the local community and society at large” (pp.134)
	Johnson, G., Whittington, R., Scholes, K., Angwin, D., Regnér, P. (2014). <i>Exploring strategy</i> (10 th ed.). Harlow, Essex: Pearson Education.	Highlights how the macro environment is understood through the PESTEL framework. Then the next layer is the industry or sector environment. One aspect of the acronym PESTEL is ecological – “stands specifically for ‘green’ environmental issues, such as pollution, waste and climate change. Environmental regulations can impose additional costs, for example with pollution controls, but they can also be a source of opportunity, for example the new businesses that emerged around mobile phone recycling” (pp.36) Regarding boundaries – “strategy therefore is also crucially concerned with an organization’s external boundaries: in other words, questions about what to include within the organization and how to manage important relationships with what is kept outside” (pp.7)	Sustainable development does not appear in the index. However sustainability is discussed in chapter 4, which is focused on social responsibility and ethics. Within the context of stakeholder interaction – “such organizations adopt the principle of sustainability in strategy, one that ensures a better quality of life by attending to all three dimensions of environmental protection, social responsibility and economic welfare” (pp.129) Corporate social responsibility defined as the previous edition.
18	Saloner, G., Shepard, A., & Podolny, J. (2001). <i>Strategic</i>	“The firm’s external environment includes both industry characteristics – such as actual and potential competitors, buyers, and suppliers – as well as non-market factors, such as the regulatory, political and	Sustainable development and or sustainability do not appear in the index.

	Reference	The Environment (Defined/Discussed) External/Internal	Sustainability/Sustainable Development
	<p><i>management</i>. New York, USA: J Wiley & Sons.</p> <p>A 2008 version of the text is available but was not available within the timescales of revisions to this article.</p>	<p>social environment in which the firm operates” (pp.3)</p> <p>“The firm’s internal context consists of the assets it owns and the way it is organized” (pp.2)</p> <p>Organizational boundaries/boundaries terms do not appear to be explicitly discussed.</p>	
19	<p>Thompson, A. A., Peteraf, M. A., Gamble, J. E., & Strickland, A. J. (2012). <i>Creating & executing strategy: The quest for competitive advantage, concepts & cases</i> (18th ed.). New York: Mc-Graw Hill/Irwin.</p>	<p>“Every company operates in a larger environment that goes well beyond just the industry in which it operates: this “macro environment includes seven principal components: population demographics; societal values and lifestyles; political, legal and regulatory factors; the natural environment and ecological factors; technological factors; general economic conditions; and global forces” (pp.50)</p> <p>Key questions to ask about a company’s competitive environment are whether there are “attractive opportunities for growth?” (pp.53)</p> <p>Internal environment not clearly defined – however the internal situation of a company is focused on “its collection of resources and capabilities and the activities it performs along its value chain” (pp.91)</p> <p>Organizational boundaries/boundaries terms do not appear to be explicitly discussed.</p>	<p>Sustainability is “concerned with the relationship of a company to its environment and its use of natural resources, including land, water, air, plants, animals, minerals, fossil fuels, and biodiversity.” (pp.316)</p> <p>‘It is widely recognised that the world’s natural resources are finite...Since corporations are the biggest users of natural resources, managing and maintaining these resources is critical for the long-term economic interests of corporations” (pp.316)</p> <p>“Sustainable business practices are those capable of meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability to meet the needs of the future” (pp. 317)</p> <p>“Environmental sustainability strategies entail deliberate and concerted actions to operate businesses in a manner that protects natural resources and ecological support systems, guards against outcomes that will ultimately endanger the planet, and is therefore sustainable for centuries” (pp.317)</p>
	<p>Thompson, A. A., Peteraf, M. A., Gamble, J. E., & Strickland, A. J. (2014). <i>Creating & executing strategy: The quest for competitive advantage, concepts & cases</i> (19th ed.). New York: Mc-Graw Hill/Irwin.</p>	<p>“Every company operates in a broad “macro-environment” that comprises six principal components: political factors, economic conditions in the firm’s general environment (local, country, regional, worldwide), sociocultural forces, technological factors, environmental factors (concerning the natural environment), and legal regulatory conditions.” (pp.46)</p> <p>Environmental forces – “This includes ecological and environmental forces such as weather, climate, climate change, and associated factors like water shortages. These factors can directly impact industries such as insurance, farming, energy production and tourism. They may have an indirect but substantial effect on other industries such as transportation and utilities.” (pp.48)</p> <p>Internal environment is not clearly defined.</p>	<p>“The term sustainability is used in a variety of ways. In many firms, it is synonymous with corporate social responsibility...more often, however, the term takes on a more focused meaning, concerned with the relationship of a company to its environment and its use of natural resources, including land, water, air, plants, animals, minerals, fossil fuels and biodiversity.” (pp.275)</p> <p>Sustainable business practices defined as above.</p> <p>Environmental sustainability strategies defined as previously.</p> <p>Outlines the moral case and separately the business case for corporate social responsibility and environmentally sustainable business practices.</p>
20	<p>Thompson, J., & Martin, F. (2010). <i>Strategic management, awareness and change</i> (6th ed.). Hampshire, UK: South Western Cengage Learning.</p>	<p>“Wider environmental forces bear on all the players in the industry, and these are shown in the outer circle as political, economic, social and technological forces” (pp.69)</p> <p>“It is quite typical for us to think of the organization as a group of activities (and/or functions) and then to place everything and everyone else, including suppliers and customers, in a so-called business environment.” (pp.69)</p>	<p>Sustainable development and or sustainability do not appear in the index.</p> <p>“Social responsibility – strategies and actions that can be seen to be in the wide and best interests of society in general and the environment. Sometimes associated with the notion of mutual self-interest” (pp.790)</p>

	Reference	The Environment (Defined/Discussed) External/Internal	Sustainability/Sustainable Development
		<p>“environment – everything and everyone outside the organization or organizational boundary – including competitors, customers, financiers, suppliers and government” (pp.787)</p> <p>Internal environment appears un-defined.</p> <p>Organizational boundaries/boundaries terms do not appear to be explicitly discussed.</p>	<p>“Issues of social responsibility and business ethics are important for all organizations. They will be seen by some organizations as a threat or constraint and encourage a strategy of compliance. Other organizations will perceive them as an opportunity to create a difference and in turn a positive image. They are becoming increasingly visible, issues which organizations should take seriously and not ignore.” (pp.304)</p>
	Thompson, J., & Martin, F. (2014). <i>Strategic management, awareness and change</i> (7 th ed.). Hampshire, UK: South Western Cengage Learning.	<p>Environment is defined as per the previous version.</p> <p>As per previous version “often an organization is conceived as a group of activities (and/or functions) with everything and everyone else, including suppliers and customers, in a so-call external business environment” (p.112)</p> <p>Internal environment appears undefined.</p>	<p>Sustainability and or sustainable development do not appear in the index.</p> <p>Social responsibility – defined as per previous version.</p>
21	Viljoen, J., & Dann, S. (2003). <i>Strategic management</i> (4 th ed.). Frenchs Forest, NSW: Prentice Hall, Pearson Education Australia.	<p>“External environment: the forces that act outside of an organization but which directly or indirectly impact on the activities of the organization” (pp.451)</p> <p>The physical environment is a subset of the external environment and constitutes – “the geographic and raw material characteristics of the areas in which business takes place” (pp.454)</p> <p>The external environment is “beyond the direct control of managers” (pp.93), whereas the internal environment can be controlled by managers.</p> <p>The internal environment is the “structure, systems, skills, resources” (pp.82) or a firm.</p> <p>Organizational boundaries/boundaries terms do not appear to be explicitly discussed.</p>	<p>Sustainable development and or sustainability do not appear in the index.</p>
	The 2003 version of the text is the latest edition.		
22	Wheelan, T. L., & Hunger, D. J. (2010). <i>Strategic management and business policy: Achieving sustainability</i> (12 th ed.). New Jersey, USA: Prentice Hall.	<p>“strategic management is a set of managerial decisions and actions that determines the long run performance of a corporation. It includes environmental scanning (both external and internal).” (pp.5)</p> <p>”the external environment consists of variables (opportunities and threats) that are outside the organization and not typically within the short-run control of top management... They may be general forces and trends within the natural or societal environments” (pp.16)</p> <p>“The internal environment of a corporation consists of variables (strengths and weaknesses) that are within the organization itself and are not usually within the short-run control of top-management” (pp.16)</p> <p>“The natural environment includes physical resources, wildlife, and climate that are inherent part of existence on Earth” (pp.99)</p> <p>“The societal environment is mankind’s social system that includes general forces that do not directly touch on the short-run activities of the organization that can, and often do, influence its long run decisions” (pp.99)</p> <p>“The task environment includes those elements or groups that directly affect a corporation and, in turn,</p>	<p>“Sustainability may include more than just ecological concerns and the natural environment...the concept of sustainability can be broadened to include economic and social as well as environmental concerns” (pp.75)</p> <p>“In order for a business corporation to be sustainable, that is, to be successful over a long period of time, it must satisfy all of its economic, legal, ethical and discretionary responsibilities” (pp.75)</p>

	Reference	The Environment (Defined/Discussed) External/Internal	Sustainability/Sustainable Development
		are affected by it.” (pp.99) Organizational boundaries/boundaries terms do not appear to be explicitly discussed.	
	The 2010 version of the text is the latest edition.		
23	Witcher, B. J., & Chau, S. (2010). <i>Strategic management: Principles and practice</i> (1 st ed.). Mason, USA: South Western Cengage Learning.	<p>“An organization’s external environment consists of conditions that influence the external changes in its industry, especially those that influence the intensity of competition” (pp.90)</p> <p>The external environment can be considered through scanning, scenarios, monitoring, forecasting.</p> <p>“The PESTEL framework is a mnemonic used in strategic management to group macro-environmental factors to help strategists to look for sources of general opportunity and risk” (pp.91)</p> <p>The natural environment is captured within the PESTEL framework, as follows: “This concerns trends in environmental factors, such as the awareness of the damaging effects of industrialisation on the limited space, beauty and health of the countryside. There are global concerns about resources, and most important of all, how climate change brought about global warming.” (pp.92)</p> <p>“The internal environment is subject to far more control” (pp. 122) relative to the external environment.</p> <p>Internal environment not defined – resources, competencies and capabilities view is brought forward.</p> <p>Organizational boundaries/boundaries terms do not appear to be explicitly discussed.</p>	Sustainable development and or sustainability do not appear in the index.
	Witcher, B. J., & Chau, S. (2014). <i>Strategic management: Principles and practice</i> (2 nd ed.). Andover, UK: Cengage EMEA.	<p>“An organization’s external environment consists of the conditions outside the organization, including people and organizations, which influence the external changes in the organization’s industry, especially those that influence the intensity of competition” (pp.90)</p> <p>The environment is considered within the PESTEL framework, “environment factors include the quality of life, sustainability and recycling of resources, but also logistical possibilities, infrastructure and facilitators.” (pp.94)</p> <p>“An organization’s internal environment consists of the conditions inside an organization, including its strategic resources, abilities and management capabilities” (p.122)</p>	<p>Sustainable development and or sustainability do not appear in the index.</p> <p>“Corporate sustainability; this puts an emphasis on the longer-term and the need to take into account the implications of an organization’s activities for the welfare of future generations.” (pp.45)</p> <p>“The most challenging aspect is how to incorporate sustainability as manageable objectives in strategic plans” (pp.45)</p>