



Course Approval Form

For approval of new courses and deletions or modifications to an existing course.

More information is located on page 2.

Action Requested:

Create new course Delete existing course

Modify existing course (check all that apply)

Title Credits Repeat Status Grade Type

Prereq/coreq Schedule Type Restrictions

Course Level:

Undergraduate

Graduate

College/School: Department:

Submitted by: Ext: Email:

Subject Code: Number: Effective Term: Fall Spring Summer

(Do not list multiple codes or numbers. Each course proposal must have a separate form.)

Year:

Title: Current

Banner (30 characters max including spaces)

New

Credits: 3 Fixed Variable

Repeat Status: Not Repeatable (NR) Repeatable within degree (RD) Repeatable within term (RT) Total repeatable credits allowed:

Grade Mode: Regular (A, B, C, etc.) Satisfactory/No Credit Special (A, B C, etc. +IP)

Schedule Type Code(s): Lecture (LEC) Lab (LAB) Recitation (RCT) Internship (INT)

Independent Study (IND) Seminar (SEM) Studio (STU)

Prerequisite(s):

Corequisite(s):

Special Instructions: (restrictions for major, college, or degree; cross-listed courses; hard-coding; etc.)

Catalog Copy for NEW Courses Only (Consult University Catalog for models)

Description (No more than 60 words, use verb phrases and present tense)	Notes (List additional information for the course)
This course is designed to critically evaluate the scholarly research related to sustainable enterprise. The class provides an overview of the major theories, research designs, and methodologies associated with this emerging research domain. Students apply these theories to develop social science research proposals for empirical investigation.	
Indicate number of contact hours: <input type="text" value="3"/> Hours of Lecture or Seminar per week: <input type="text" value="3"/> Hours of Lab or Studio: <input type="text"/>	
When Offered: (check all that apply) <input type="checkbox"/> Fall <input type="checkbox"/> Summer <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Spring	

Approval Signatures

Department Approval _____ Date _____ College/School Approval _____ Date _____

If this course includes subject matter currently dealt with by any other units, the originating department must circulate this proposal for review by those units and obtain the necessary signatures prior to submission. Failure to do so will delay action on this proposal.

Unit Name	Unit Approval Name	Unit Approver's Signature	Date

For Graduate Courses Only

Graduate Council Member _____ Provost Office _____ Graduate Council Approval Date _____

Course Proposal Submitted to the COS Curriculum Committee

1. COURSE NUMBER AND TITLE:

EVPP 738 Theories of Sustainable Enterprise

Course Prerequisites:

EVPP 638 Corporate Environmental Management and Policy, equivalent class, or permission of instructor

Catalog Description:

This course is designed to critically evaluate the scholarly research related to sustainable enterprise. The class provides an overview of the major theories, research designs, and methodologies associated with this emerging research domain. Students apply these theories to develop social science research proposals for empirical investigation.

2. COURSE JUSTIFICATION:

Course Objectives:

The objective of this advanced topics class is to:

- Critically evaluate the scholarly research related to sustainable enterprise
- Provide an overview of the major theories, research designs, and methodologies associated with this emerging research domain
- Develop students' critical thinking skills related to developing a testable research proposal

Course Necessity:

Graduate students at Mason are increasingly interested in the interaction between business and society. As such, they are seeking to develop Ph.D. or masters' theses that explore these issues. This class offers a theoretical foundation for graduate students to study these issues. As yet, there are no course of this sort is taught at Mason.

Course Relationship to Existing Programs:

This course will be part of the Masters and Ph.D. programs in Environmental Science and Public Policy.

Course Relationship to Existing Courses:

This course has been taught as a Special Topics class since 2005. It will be the first formalized advanced topics class in sustainable enterprise offered at Mason. The School of Management does not offer related courses.

3. APPROVAL HISTORY:

none

4. SCHEDULING AND PROPOSED INSTRUCTORS:

This course is anticipated to be offered every other year and taught by Prof. Nicole Darnall

Semester of Initial Offering: Spring 2010

Proposed Instructors: Nicole Darnall

5. TENTATIVE SYLLABUS: See attached.

Instructor: Dr. Nicole Darnall
Course Time: Monday 4:30-7:10
Location: Robinson Hall A243
Office: 3020 David King Hall

Office Hours: by appt.
Email: ndarnall@gmu.edu
Office Phone: 993.3819
349.1233

EVPP 738

Theories in Sustainable Enterprise

Spring 2010

PURPOSE:

The objective of this advanced topics class is to critically evaluate literatures in sustainable enterprise. The class provides an overview of the major theories, research designs, and methodologies associated with this emerging research domain. It is literature-based and requires students to read, reflect, critique, and become expert in readings around a particular theory base for each class. The theories used to develop scientific knowledge and the logic of the research process will be emphasized rather than specific environmental problems.

READINGS:

The readings consist of two types of journal articles. The first represents seminal research in the area of sustainable enterprise. These articles date to the early 1990s, although some were produced much earlier. The second type of article represents more recent works that draw on the seminal papers.

Readings are available online and from the instructor.

To locate them, rely on the following key:

- * = available through GMU's database—Proquest (ABI/Inform)
- + = available through GMU's database—JSTOR
- = available from instructor—bring your memory stick and I will get you the files
- ◇ = available through course reserves (EVPP 741-003)

To reduce your printing costs investigate purchasing printer ink on eBay. Ink refills runs as little as \$6 per cartridge. Purchasing ink (rather than the new cartridge) will allow you to reuse your old printer cartridges and reduce waste.

FORMAT

Each week we will address a different theory or research stream in the field. Sessions will be guided by a discussion leader, a synthesizer, and non-leaders.

Discussion Leader

Each class will have a student designated to serve as “discussion leader.” The leader's role will be to summarize the key points associated with each of the readings—in oral and written form—and to serve as the moderator for the session's discussion. In developing your summary, consider each paper's:

1. Assumptions
2. Theoretical soundness
3. Research design
4. Data sources and sample
5. Analysis
6. Contributions to the field
7. Relevance to practitioners
8. Future directions for research in this area

Discussion leaders should develop one page essays (for each article) that address each of these points. That is, if five readings are assigned, discussion leaders should submit five 1-page reviews. In some instances, all eight points may not be relevant. For instance, a theory development paper may not use data to test its research

propositions, and so “data sources” and “analysis” are not relevant. In instances such as these, you can ignore the listed item.

Discussion leaders should bring copies of their written assignments for each student in the class.

Non-leaders

Students who are neither discussion leaders nor synthesizers in a given week are expected to come to class prepared to question and critique each reading regarding the following:

1. Assumptions
2. Theoretical soundness
3. Research design
4. Data sources and sample
5. Analysis
6. Contributions to the field
7. Relevance to practitioners
8. Future directions for research in this area

Like discussion leaders, you are expected to submit one page essays that address the above for each of the assigned readings. To broaden the discussion and facilitate exposure to other literatures, non-leaders also will be asked to select at least one additional reading (more are optional) from a supplemental list for each class and come prepared to introduce ideas from these readings into the discussion.

MERIT OF 1-PAGE ESSAYS

The essays are designed to provide you with a reference source that summarizes the key contributions of each article. Since discussion leaders and synthesizers will share their essays with the rest of the class, each student will walk away with multiple summaries of the readings. There are five reasons for the essays:

1. They will be critical time-savers as you begin writing your research proposals. Rather than re-reading sections of the original paper, you can rely on your summary.
2. They will be an important reference tool should you pursue research in sustainable enterprise at a later time.
3. They will be a valuable tool in studying for your comprehensive exams.
4. They will be critical sources of information as you develop your dissertation proposal.
5. They will make our time together more lively because everyone will be prepared to contribute

Paper summaries will be graded on a 1, 2, 3-point scale. Based on your evaluation, you may also earn a “-” or “+” to your grade. Papers that demonstrate a superior ability to understand the key aspects of the papers will receive a score of 3...or even a 3+, whereas a 1 point score will be awarded to evaluations that have weak analytical form and poor construction.

RESEARCH PROPOSAL

In an effort to apply the course readings to a promising area of research, students will develop a formal research proposal. The primary focus of your proposal is to offer contributions to scholarly research. The reason for this emphasis is that a Ph.D. is a research degree, and holding this degree demonstrates an ability to contribute to scholarly research. While it is acceptable for your research proposal to have practical implications (and in fact I encourage this!), practical relevance should not be the central focus of the paper. Proposals that are grounded in theory and offer persuasive (and cogent) arguments can form the basis of a dissertation proposal or a publishable paper.

Initial Proposal

Initial proposals will consist of two-page statements of your proposed research topic. Your 2-pager should include your central research question, identify key literatures and research gaps, and include references. References should not be included in the two-page limit. You will present your proposal during class and receive feedback from your peers and from the instructor. Your 2-pager will not receive a grade. It will,

however, be the first (and only formal) opportunity to receive feedback on your proposed research path. Initial proposals will be presented March 27.

Final Proposal

While you have only one *formal* opportunity to receive feedback on your proposal prior to your final submission, my expectation is that you will be speaking with me throughout the semester about your research progress. This type of interaction will be critical to producing a high quality proposal.

Proposals should be constructed with the following elements:

1. Interesting research question
2. Review and critique of the relevant literatures related to your research area
3. Identification of research gap as yet unexplored
4. Development of testable research hypotheses

Proposals should be double-spaced and no more than 20 pages (excluding references and tables). No less than 1-inch margins and 12-point font are acceptable.

You should anticipate that it will be difficult to stay within the 20-page limit. If you find it easy, your analysis likely does not meet the requirements for a publishable paper. If you find it difficult to stay within the page limit, remember that critical points often can be made more clearly if you chose your words more carefully. Good writing is about filtering your relevant points to make them sharper and cogent. The key is editing, editing, editing. You should plan on a week to edit your work. I cannot emphasize this point strongly enough! Students will present and defend their research proposals May 9. Presentations should utilize PowerPoint slides and should be no more than 20 minutes in length.

WRITING STANDARDS

All assignments must be:

1. Reflective of independent thought
2. Well written
3. Logically persuasive

All writing must meet academic and professional standards for form, substance and attribution of other scholars' ideas. If you use a scholar's ideas you must reference them. Using another scholar's *ideas* without citation is plagiarism. It is essential that you give credit to those who worked hard to get their work published. The general rule is that relying on others' published work and appropriately recognizing their contributions adds support for (rather than taking away from) your arguments.

As is the case with most scholarly research, internet citations should be minimized.

CLASS PARTICIPATION

Participation grades will be based on students' questions and insightful commentary as they relate to the assigned readings. Writing strong summaries of the readings (see FORMAT) is necessary—although not sufficient—to earn a strong participation grade. In the event that you must miss a class, you are still expected to submit your class summary. It is your responsibility to obtain class notes, outlines, and other handouts from your peers. Please do not contact me about these matters.

Three missed classes will result in a participation grade of 0%. Should you decide to leave at the break you will receive 0 participation points, regardless of how active you were during the first half of class.

OTHER IMPORTANT EXPECTATIONS:

1. Please do not exceed the specified page limits. You can single-space weekly writing assignments, but your research proposal should be double spaced. All writings should use 12 pt fonts with 1" margins.
2. Assignments are due at the beginning of class.

3. *Late assignments* automatically will be penalized by 5 percent, as well as an additional 5 percent each day thereafter.

GRADING

1. Class Participation: 30%
2. Class summaries and leadership: 30%
3. Research proposal: 40%

A+ = 96 up

A = 92-95

A- = 90-91

B+ = 88-89

B = 82-87

B- = 80-81

C+ = 78-79

C = 73-77

C- = 71-72, etc.

JANUARY 25—WHAT IS SUSTAINABLE ENTERPRISE RESEARCH?

- * Starik M. & Markis A. 2000. Introduction to the special research forum on the management of organizations in the natural environment: A field emerging from multiple paths, with many challenges ahead. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(4): 539-546.
- * Griffin J.J. & J.F. Mahon. 1997. The corporate social performance and corporate financial performance debate: Twenty-five years of incomparable research. *Business and Society*, 36(1): 5-31.
- + Gladwin T., Kennelly J. & Krause T.-S. 1995. Shifting paradigms for sustainable development: Implications for management theory and research. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(4): 874-907.
- * McWilliams A. & D. Siegel. 2001. Corporate social responsibility: A theory of the firm perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 26(1): 117-127.

Supplemental Readings

- * Berry M.A. & Rondinelli D.A. 1998. Proactive corporate environment management: A new industrial revolution. *Academy of Management Executive*, 12(2): 38-41.
- * [Hall J](#), [Vredenburg H](#). 2003. The challenges of innovating for sustainable development. *Sloan Management Review*, 45(1): 61-68.
- * Shrivastava P. 1995. Ecocentric management for a risk society. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(1): 118-137.
- * Shrivastava P. 1995. The role of corporations in achieving ecological sustainability. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(4): 936-960.
- * Starik M. 1995. Should trees have managerial standing? Toward stakeholder status for non-human nature. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 14(3): 207-217.
- * Starik M. & Rands G.P. 1995. Weaving an integrated web: Multilevel and multisystem perspectives of ecologically sustainable organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(4): 908-935.

FEBRUARY 1—INSTITUTIONAL THEORY

- + DiMaggio P. & Powell W. 1983. The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48(2): 147-160.
- + Meyer J.W. & Rowan B. 1977. Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83(2): 340-363.
- Bansal P. & Clelland I. 2004. Talking trash: Legitimacy, impression management and unsystematic risk in the context of the natural environment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47(1): 93-103.

Supplemental Readings

- * Bansal P. & Roth K. 2000. Why companies go green: A model of ecological responsiveness. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(4): 717-736.
- Cashore B. & Vertinsky I. 2000. Policy networks and firm behaviours: Governance systems and firm responses to external demands for sustainable forest management. *Policy Sciences*, 33(1): 1-30.
- * Davidson W.N. & Worrell D.L. 2001. Regulatory pressure and environmental management infrastructure and practices. *Business and Society*, 40(3): 315-342.
- * Greening D.W. & Gray B. 1994. Testing a model of organizational response to social and political issues. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(3): 467-498.
- Henriques I. & Sadorsky P. 1996. The determinants of an environmentally responsive firm: An empirical approach. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, 30(3): 381-395.
- * Hoffman A. 1999. Institutional evolution and change: Environmentalism and the U.S. chemical industry. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42(4): 351-371.
- + Jaffe A.B. & Palmer K. 1997. Environmental regulation and innovation: A panel data study, *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 79(4), 610-619.
- + Jennings P.D. & Zandbergen W.W. 1995. Ecologically sustainable organizations: An institutional approach. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(4): 1015-1052.

- * Khanna M. & Anton W.R.Q. 2002. Corporate environmental management: Regulatory and market-based incentives. *Land Economics*, 78(4): 539-558.
- Martinez R.J. & Dacin M.T. 1999. Efficiency motives and normative forces: Combining transaction costs and institutional logic. *Journal of Management*, 25(1): 75-97.
- + Oliver C. 1991. Strategic responses to institutional pressures. *Academy of Management Review*, 16(1): 145-179.
- * Rugman A.M. & Verbeke A. 1998. Corporate strategies and environmental regulations: An organizing framework. *Strategic Management Journal*, 19(4): 363-375.
- * Scott W.R. 1987. The adolescence of institutional theory. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 32(4): 93-511.

FEBRUARY 8—STAKEHOLDER THEORY

- Fineman S. & Clarke K. 1996. Green stakeholders: Industry interpretations and response. *Journal of Management Studies*, 33(6): 715-730.
- * Donaldson T. & Preston L. 1995. The stakeholder theory of the corporation: Concepts, evidence, and implications. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(1): 65-91.
- Sharma S. & Henriques I. 2005. Stakeholder influences on sustainability practices in the Canadian forest products industry. *Strategic Management Journal*, 26(2): 159-180.
- * Mitchell R.K., Agle B.R. & Wood D.J. 1997. Toward a theory of stakeholder identification and salience: Defining the principle of who and what really counts. *Academy of Management Review*, 22(4): 853-886.

Supplemental Readings

- * Buysse K. & Verbeke A. 2003. Proactive environmental strategies: A stakeholder management perspective. *Strategic Management Journal*, 24(5): 453-470.
- * [Clarkson M.B.E.](#) 1995. A stakeholder framework for analyzing and evaluating corporate social performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 20(1): 92-117.
- * Delmas M. 2001. Stakeholders and competitive advantage: The case of ISO 14001. *Productions and Operations Management*, 10(3): 343-359.
- * [Hall J.](#) & [Vredenburg H.](#) 2005. Managing stakeholder ambiguity. *Sloan Management Review*, 47(1): 11-13.
- * Henriques I. & Sadorsky P. 1999. The relationship between environmental commitment and managerial perceptions of stakeholder importance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42(1): 87-99.
- ◇ Hillman A. & Keim G. 2001. Shareholder value, stakeholder management, and social issues: What's the bottom line? *Strategic Management Journal*, 22(2): 125-139.
- * Jones T.M. & Wicks A. 1999. Convergent stakeholder theory. *Academy of Management Review*, 24(2): 206-221

FEBRUARY 15—COGNITION THEORY

- * Andersson L.M. & Bateman T.S. 2000. Individual environmental initiative: Championing natural environmental issues in U.S. business organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(4): 548-570.
- * Cordano M. & Frieze I.H. 2000. Pollution reduction preferences of U.S. environmental managers: Applying Ajzen's theory of planned behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(4): 627-641.
- * Sharma S. 2000. Managerial interpretations and organizational context as predictors of corporate choice of environmental strategy. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(4): 681-716.

Supplemental Readings

- * Andersson L., Shivarajan S. & Blau G. 2005. Enacting ecological sustainability in the MNC: A Test of an adapted value-belief-norm framework. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 59(3), 295-305.
- * Daily B.F. & Huang S.C. 2001. Achieving sustainability through attention to human resource factors in environmental management. *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*, 21(12): 1539-1552.

- * Egri C.R. & Herman S. 2000. Leadership in the North American environmental sector: Values, leadership styles, and contexts of environmental leaders and their organizations. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 43(4): 561-604.
- * Ramus C.A. 2001. Organizational support for employees: Encouraging creative ideas for sustainability. *California Management Review*, 43(3): 85-107.
- * Sharma S. & Nguan O. 1999. The biotechnology industry and strategies of biodiversity conservation: The influence of managerial interpretations and risk propensity. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 8(1): 46-61.

FEBRUARY 22—RESOURCE-BASED VIEW

- * Barney J. 1991. Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17(1): 99-120.
- Darnall N. & Edwards Jr. D. 2006. Predicting the cost of environmental management system adoption: The role of capabilities, resources and ownership structure. *Strategic Management Journal*, 27(2), 301-320.
- * Hart S. 1995. A natural-resource-based view of the firm. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(4): 986-1014.
- * Sharma S. & Vredenburg H. 1998. Proactive corporate environmental strategy and the development of competitively valuable organizational capabilities. *Strategic Management Journal*, 19(8): 729-753.

Supplemental Readings

- Aragon-Correa J.A. & Sharma S. 2003. A contingent resource-based view of proactive corporate environmental strategy. *Academy of Management Review*, 28(1): 71-88.
- * Bowen F.E. 2000. Environmental visibility: A trigger of green organizational response? *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 9(2): 92-107.
- * Christmann P. 1998. Effects of "best practices" of environmental management on cost advantage: The role of complementary assets. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(4): 663-680.
- * Grant R.M. 1991. The resource-based theory of competitive advantage. *California Management Review*, 33(3): 114-135.
- * Kitazawa S. & Sarkis J. 2000. The relationship between ISO 14001 and continuous source reduction programs. *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*, 20(4): 225-248.
- * Oliver C. 1997. Sustainable competitive advantage: combining institutional and resource-based views. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18(9): 679-713.
- * Wernerfelt B. 1984. A resource-based view of the firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, 5(2): 171-180.

MARCH 1-- EVOLUTIONARY ECONOMICS AND CREATIVE DESTRUCTION

- * Jacobson R. 1992. The 'Austrian' School of strategy. *Academy of Management Review*, 17(4): 708-807.
- ◇ Hall J.K. & Martin M.J.C. 2005. Disruptive technologies, stakeholders and the innovation value-added chain: a framework for evaluating radical technology development. *R & D Management*, 35(3): 273-285.
- + Schumpeter J.A. 1947. The creative response in economic history. *The Journal of Economic History*, 7(2): 149-159.

Supplemental Readings

- * Hart S.L. & Milstein M.B. 1999. Global sustainability and the creative destruction of industries. *Sloan Business Review*, 41(1): 23-34.
- ◇ Schumpeter J.A. 1962. *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*. New York: Torchbooks. Part III. (Focus your attention on the on creative discussion sections)
- ◇ Winter S.G. 1984. Schumpeterian competition in alternative technological regimes. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 5(3-4): 287-320.

MARCH 8—SPRING BREAK! BEGIN WORK ON INITIAL PROPOSAL

MARCH 15—EARLY VIEWS OF ENVIRONMENTAL STRATEGY AND PERFORMANCE—DOMESTIC PERSPECTIVES—INITIAL PROPOSAL DUE

- Konar S., Cohen M.A. 1997. Information as regulation: the effect of community right to know laws on toxic emissions. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, 32(1): 109-124.
- ◇ Hart S.L. & Ahuja G. 1996. Does it pay to be green? An empirical examination of the relationship between emission reduction and firm performance. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 5(1): 30-37.
- * Klassen R.D. & McLaughlin C.P. 1996. [The impact of environmental management on firm performance](#). *Management Science*, 42(8): 1199-1214.
- * Russo M.V. & Fouts P. 1997. A resource-based perspective on corporate environmental performance and profitability. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 40(3): 534-559.

Supplemental Readings

- ◇ Hamilton J.T. 1995. Pollution as news: Media and stock market reactions to the Toxics Release Inventory data. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, 28(1): 98-113.
- * Henderson R. & Mitchell W. 1997. The interactions of organizational and competitive influences on strategy and performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18(7): 5-14.
- Judge Jr. W.Q. & Douglas T.J. 1998. [Performance implications of incorporating natural environmental issues into the planning process: An empirical assessment](#). *Journal of Management Studies*, 35(2): 241-261.
- Ruf B.M., Muralidhar K. & Paul K. 1998. The development of a systematic, aggregate measure of corporate social performance. *Journal of Management*, 24(1): 119-133.
- Walley N. & Whitehead B. 1994. It's not easy being green. *Harvard Business Review*, 72(3): 2-7.

MARCH 22—RECENT DEVELOPMENTS—ENVIRONMENTAL STRATEGY AND PERFORMANCE—DOMESTIC PERSPECTIVES

- * Klassen R.D. & Whybark D.C. 1999. The impact of environmental technologies on manufacturing performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42(6): 599-615.
- * King A. & Lenox M. 2002. Exploring the locus of profitable pollution reduction. *Management Science*, 48(2): 289-299.
- Russo M.V. & Harrison N.S. 2005. Organizational design and environmental performance: Clues from the electronics industry. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(4): 582-.

Supplemental Readings

- Bansal P. 2005. Evolving sustainably: A longitudinal study of corporate sustainable development. *Strategic Management Journal*, 26(3): 197-218.
- * Figge F., Hahn T., Schaltegger S. & Wagner M. 2002. The Sustainability Balanced Scorecard - linking Sustainability Management to Business Strategy. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 11(5): 269-284.
- * Gerde V.W. & Logsdon J.M. 2001. Measuring Environmental Performance: Use of the Toxics Release Inventory (TRI) and Other US Environmental Databases. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 10(5): 269-285.
- * Lothe S. & Myrtevit I. 2003. Compensation systems for green strategy implementation: Parametric and non-parametric approaches. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 12(3): 191-203.
- * Stanwick P.A. & Stanwick S.D. 2001. [CEO compensation: does it pay to be green?](#) *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 10(3): 176-182.
- * Slveig L. Myrtevit I. & Trapani T. 1999. [Compensation systems for improving environmental performance](#). *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 8(6): 313-321.
- Margolis J. & Walsh J. 2003. Misery loves companies: Rethinking social initiatives by business. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 48(2): 268-305.

MARCH 29— ENVIRONMENTAL STRATEGY AND PERFORMANCE—INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVES

- ◇ Blackman A. 2000. Informal sector pollution control: What policy options do we have? *World*

Development, 28(12): 2067-2082.

- Christmann P. 2004. [Multinational companies and the natural environment: Determinants of global environmental policy standardization](#). *Academy of Management Journal*, 47(5): 747-760.
- + Christmann P. & Taylor G. 2001. Globalization and the environment: Determinants of firm self-regulation in China. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 32(3): 439-458.

Supplemental Readings

- ◇ Hettige H, Huq M, Pargal S. & Wheeler D. 1996. Determinants of pollution abatement in developing countries: Evidence from South and Southeast Asia. *World Development*, 24(12): 1891-1904.
- * Nehrt C. 1998. Maintainability of first mover advantages when environmental regulations differ between countries. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(1): 77-97.
- * King A. & Shaver J.M. 2001. Are aliens green? Assessing foreign establishments Environmental Conduct in the U.S. *Strategic Management Journal*, 22(11): 244-256.
- ◇ Neumayer E. 2001. Pollution Havens: An analysis of policy options for dealing with an elusive phenomenon. *Journal of Environment & Development*, 10(2): 147-177.
- ◇ Porter G. 1999. Trade competition and pollution standards: "Race to the bottom" or stuck at the bottom? *Journal of Environment & Development*, 8(2): 133-151.
- Potowski M. & Prakash A. 2004. [Regulatory convergence in nongovernmental regimes? Cross-national adoption of ISO 14001 certifications](#). *The Journal of Politics*, 66(3): 885-
- * Ramus C.A. & Steger U. 2000. The roles of supervisory support behaviors and environmental policy in employee 'ecoinitiatives' at leading-edge European companies. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(4): 605-626.
- Rivera J. & De Leon P. 2005. [Chief executive officers and voluntary environmental performance: Costa Rica's certification for sustainable tourism](#). *Policy Sciences*, 38(2-3): 107-127.
- Busse M. 2004. [Trade, environmental regulations and the World Trade Organization: New empirical evidence](#). *Journal of World Trade*, 38(2): 285-306.

APRIL 5—VOLUNTARY ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS—ORGANIZING FRAMEWORKS

- + Akerlof, G. 1970. The market for lemons: Quality uncertainty and the market mechanism. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 84(3): 488-500.
- + Khanna M. 2001. Non-mandatory approaches to environmental protection. *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 15(3): 291-324.
- Potoski M. & Prakash A. 2005. [Green clubs and voluntary governance: ISO 14001 and firms' regulatory compliance](#). *American Journal of Political Science*, 49(2): 235-248.
- Segerson K. & Miceli T.J. 1998. Voluntary environmental agreements: Good or bad news for environmental protection? *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, 36(2): 109-130.

Supplemental Readings

- ◇ Arora S. & Cason T.N. 1995. An experiment in voluntary environmental regulation: Participation in EPA's 33/50 program. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, 28(3): 271-286.
- Bansal P. & Hunter T. 2003. [Strategic explanations for the early adoption of ISO 14001](#). *Journal of Business Ethics*, 46(3): 289-299.
- * Carmin J., Darnall N. & Mil-Homens J. 2003. Stakeholder involvement in the design of U.S. voluntary environmental programs: Does sponsorship matter? *Policy Studies Journal*, 31(4): 527-543.
- [Christmann P.](#) & [Taylor G.](#) 2002. Globalization and the environment: Strategies for international voluntary environmental initiatives. *Academy of Management Executive*, 16(3): 121-135.
- Darnall N. & J. Carmin. 2005. [Greener and cleaner? The signaling accuracy of U.S. voluntary environmental programs](#). *Policy Sciences*, 38(2-3): 71-90.
- * Delmas M.A. & Terlaak A.K. 2001. A framework for analyzing environmental voluntary agreements. *California Management Review*, 43(3): 44-62.
- * Prakash A. 2001. Why do firms adopt beyond-compliance environmental policies? *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 10(5): 286-299.

- ◇ Rondinelli D.A. & Vastag G. 2000. Panacea, common sense, or just a label? The value of ISO 14001 environmental management systems. *European Management Journal*, 18(5): 499-510.
- * Videras J. & Alberini A. 2000. The appeal of voluntary environmental programs: Which firms participate and why? *Contemporary Economic Policy*, 18(4): 449-462.

APRIL 12—VOLUNTARY ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS—IMPROVING ENVIRONMENTAL PERFORMANCE?

- ◇ Delmas M. & Keller A. 2005. [Free riding in voluntary environmental programs: The case of the U.S. EPA WasteWise program](#). *Policy Sciences*, 38(2-3): 91-106.
- Potoski M. & Prakash A. 2005. Covenants with weak swords: ISO 14001 and facilities' environmental performance. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 24(4): 745–769.
- * King A. & Lenox M. 2000. Industry self-regulation without sanctions: The chemical industry's Responsible Care Program. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(4): 698-716.
- * Dowell G., Hart S.L. & Yeung B. 2000. Do corporate global environmental standards create or destroy market value? *Management Science*, 46(8): 1059-1074.

Supplemental Readings

- ◇ Anton W.R.Q., Deltas G. & Khanna M. 2004. Incentives for environmental self regulation and implications for environmental performance. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, 48(1): 632-654.
- * Arora S. & Cason T.N. 1996. Why do firms volunteer to exceed environmental regulations? Understanding participation in EPA's 33/50 Program. *Land Economics*, 72(4): 413-432.
- ◇ Khanna M. & Damon L.A. 1999. EPA's voluntary 33/50 program: impact on toxic releases and economic performance of firms. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, 37(1): 1-25.
- King A., Lenox M. & Terlaak. 2005. The strategic use of decentralized institutions: exploring certification with the ISO 14001 management standard. *Academy of Management Journal*.
- Melnyk S.A., Sroufe R.P., Calantone R.L. & Montabon F.L. 2002. [Assessing the effectiveness of US voluntary environmental programmes: An empirical study](#). *International Journal of Production Research*, 40(8): 1853-1878.
- ◇ Welch E.W., Mazur A. & Bretschneider S. 2000. Voluntary behavior by electric utilities: Levels of adoption and contribution of the climate challenge program to the reduction of carbon dioxide. *Journal of Public Policy Analysis and Management*, 19(3): 407-426.

APRIL 19—BASE OF THE PYRAMID & ROLE OF NGOS

- * Pearce J.A. & Doh J.P. 2005. [The high impact of collaborative social initiatives](#). *Sloan Management Review*, 46(3): 30-39.
- Hart, S.L. & Sharma S. 2004. Engaging fringe stakeholder for competitive imagination. *The Academy of Management Executive*, 18(1): 7-18.
- ◇ [Lertzman D.](#) & [Vredenburg H.](#) 2005. Indigenous peoples, resource extraction and sustainable development: An ethical approach. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 56(3): 239-254.
- * London T. & Hart SL. 2004. Reinventing strategies for emerging markets: Beyond the transnational model. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 35(5): 350-370.

Supplemental Readings

- [Arnould E.J.](#) & [Mohr J.J.](#) 2005. Dynamic transformations for base-of-the-pyramid market clusters. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 33(3): 254-274.
- * Hart S.L. & Christensen C.M. 2002. [The great leap: Driving innovation from the base of the pyramid](#). *Sloan Management Review*, 44(1): 51-56.
- * [Meyer K.E.](#) 2004. Perspectives on multinational enterprises in emerging economies. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 35(4): 259-276.

- * Teegeen H., Doh J.P. & Vachani S. 2004. [The importance of nongovernmental organizations \(NGOs\) in global governance and value creation: An international business research agenda.](#) *Journal of International Business Studies*, 35(6): 463-483.
- Wright M., Filatotchev I. Hoskisson R.E. & Peng M.W. 2005. Strategy research in emerging economies: Challenging the conventional wisdom. *Journal of Management Studies*, 42(1), 1-33.

APRIL 26—FINAL PRESENTATIONS

MAY 3—FINAL PRESENTATIONS