

CRR Conference 2012  
Bordeaux Management School, Bordeaux, France  
September 12–14

Conference paper submission 15.8.

Author:  
Anna Heikkinen  
PhD student  
School of Management, University of Tampere, Finland  
Email: anna.l.heikkinen@uta.fi

## **Framing Climate Change in Business Organisations: Empirical Findings from Finland**

### **Abstract:**

Management scholars have profiled climate change as a drastic large-scale system change that may force us to face the limits of 'business as usual'. Indeed, climate change has become one of the most topical issues for companies, governments and the civil society in the 21st century. Climate change drives companies to consider the ecological sustainability of their operations, products and services. The empirical context of this study is the Finnish food industry and its efforts to contribute to creation of a sustainable, low carbon future. This issue is approached from constructionist perspective and accordingly climate change and climate change engagement are viewed as abstract and contextual concepts that are produced and maintained in social interaction through language practices. The focus of this study is on corporate constructs of climate change and the aim is *to recognise and identify the discourses used in business organisations when talking about climate change*. This approach allows for examining what and how different views are emphasised or silenced. Research data consists of observations, semi-structured interviews, and company documents. The results of this study will shed light on how climate change is understood and argued for in the business world and on the different values and views related to climate change management at play in everyday organisational life.

- *Work in progress, please do not cite* -

## Introduction

This study is about how Finnish business professionals understand climate change as a business issue. In management and organisation literature, climate change has been profiled as a rapid and drastic large-scale system change that may force us to face the limits of ‘business as usual’ (Hahn, Kolk & Winn 2010). According to climate scientists, global warming is related to human action resulting in increased greenhouse gas (GHG) and other emissions and may have such severe consequences as growing energy insecurity and higher energy prices, extreme weather events causing economic and physical damage, shortage of fresh water and food, and declining economies as they try to deal with a different climate. The business sector directly and indirectly accounts for a vast majority of GHG emissions and thus has a critical role in addressing this issue.

The empirical context of this study is the Finnish food industry and its efforts to contribute to the creation of a sustainable, low carbon future. Finnish companies are increasingly engaging with climate change due to, for instance, government regulation and recommendations, and growing consumer demands. Business organisations in the food industry can directly cut down their emissions by, for example, selecting low carbon food products, reorganising logistics and reducing energy use in their premises. In addition, the food sector plays a significant role in the quest for a low carbon future; food is the third biggest source of GHG emissions from private consumption in Finland (Seppälä et al. 2011). Thus, by providing low carbon options for customers these companies can modify their customers’ consumption patterns and thereby have a significant indirect impact in reducing GHG emissions.

This study applies the ‘language perspective’ to examine corporate climate change engagement. The ‘linguistic turn’ and focus on language have been increasingly adopted in management and organisation literature, and also by environmental management scholars. The language perspective to environmental management has been acknowledged to be an important, yet understudied field (Dobers, Strannegård & Wolff 2001, Joutsenvirta 2009). Addressing that gap, the aim is to recognise and identify the discourses used in business organisations when talking about climate change, with a special focus on emphasised or silenced views or issues. This study adopts the view that climate change and climate change engagement are abstract and contextual concepts that are produced and maintained in social interaction through language practises. These constructs are influenced by a number of different actors, such as climate policy makers, business consultants,

other companies, NGO's, etc., and they evolve with time and vary across countries, industries and other contexts.

The contents of this paper are as follows: After this introduction, I present briefly the key concepts of this study focusing on previous literature on climate change management and engagement and environmental values. In the methodological part I will discuss the constructionist perspective and discourse analysis, and describe the empirical data and analysis process. After that I will move on to the preliminary findings of this study. In the discussion part of this paper, I will focus on the potential contributions of this research.

## Key Concepts of the Study

### **Climate change as a business issue**

Even though climate change is much debated by scientists, scholars and practitioners, in management literature there seems to be some kind of agreement that the effects of climate change on business are likely to be substantial. Previous studies have identified climate change to be an “international environmental issue, which has actual or potential impact on many companies” (Kolk & Pinkse 2004). It has been claimed to be a rapid and drastic large scale system change that may force us to face the limits of “business as usual” (Hahn, Kolk & Winn 2010). Along the same lines, in the context of the much researched oil industry, Livesey (2002) has presented that climate change is “an issue greater in magnitude and potentially more threatening to oil companies than anything that had gone before” and that it “presents a potentially more critical challenge to the [oil] industry’s core business of gas and petroleum and, concomitantly, to consumer lifestyles, which depend on them”. Recently, even more drastically, Okereke, Wittneben and Bowen (2012) have stated that it “poses a difficult challenge for humanity”.

Corporate responses to and engagement with climate change have been analysed using corporate environmentalism and (environmental) sustainability frames, and these streams of research offer valid starting points for further studies. That being said, these frames might not be able to cover the full complexity of the issue. Sprengel and Busch (2011) present that climate change is fundamentally different compared to most environmental issues in three ways: it happens on a truly global scale with almost irreversible, yet uncertain, consequences; the cause-and-effect relationships related to climate change are long-term in nature; and climate change impacts cannot

be directly attributed to individual causers. Slawinski & Bansal (forthcoming) suggest that the reactive/proactive continuum of corporate environmentalism prevailing in literature might not be sufficient to provide a thorough explanation of corporate responses to climate change. The authors present that climate change activities can be both reactive and proactive, and criticise the hierarchical categorisation implying that one category is superior to another. They find that companies' perceptions of time play a key role in shaping their climate change responses, and thus set forth a perspective that that is not often explicitly discussed in corporate environmental literature – time. Yet climate change is clearly an issue connected to time and corporate responses vary greatly in their time horizons (Weinhofer & Hoffmann 2010). The effects of climate change are uncertain and might not come true for decades. On the contrary, the corporate world tends to focus on the short term, which impinges upon planning for decades ahead and dealing with the uncertainties related to the issue.

Previous studies on corporate engagement with climate change have largely focused on companies' political (e.g. influencing policy debates, opposing upcoming regulations) and market strategies (e.g. product and process improvements, emissions trading) (Kolk & Pinkse 2004; 2007). Main activities used to engage with the issue are categorised in literature as mitigation and adaptation. Mitigation refers to activities aiming to cut down GHG and other emissions in order to prevent further global warming (Pinkse & Kolk 2012) and covers such responses as compensation for carbon emissions through offsets, substituting carbon-based technologies with non-carbon-based ones, reducing energy consumption, and external collaboration (Hoffman 2005, Okereke & Russel 2010, Slawinski & Bansal forthcoming). Adaptation covers activities by which a company learns to deal with actual or expected impacts of climate change (Klein, Schipper & Desai 2005), for example by operating in a low carbon society with weather extremes and higher energy prices. The required adaptation strategies differ between and industries, as for example agriculture will face more severe impacts than a clothing store.

Studies about Finnish corporate perceptions of climate change are still scarce. Perceptions have been researched in Finland mostly by pro-market think tanks (e.g. EVA Finnish business and policy forum) and other public organisations (e.g. Finnish Business & Society). A research report published by EVA (Johansson et al. 2007), discusses the perceptions of top executives of Finnish multinational corporations. The conclusions state that Finnish corporations take curbing climate change seriously and that some see it as a business opportunity and some as a threat. The dominant view among corporations is that businesses can provide solutions, but in the end it is the customers

who make the decisions about their own ecological footprint. Further, it is stated that Finnish corporations are significantly further ahead in dealing with climate change than is perhaps generally believed, because such issues as energy efficiency have been paid attention to for a long time already. However, on a less positive note, the report finally remarks that adaptation strategies are still underdeveloped.

### **Language perspective and defining the research gap**

The ‘linguistic turn’ and its focus on language in social sciences have been increasingly adopted in management and organisation literature, and also by environmental management scholars. The language perspective to environmental management has been acknowledged to be an important, yet understudied field (Dobers et al. 2001, Joutsenvirta 2009). The language perspective has been increasingly used to study climate change, and for example Livesey (2002) has employed rhetorical and discourse analysis to examine corporate texts on climate change.

Joutsenvirta (2009) has studied the environmental debate between a forest industry company and Greenpeace utilising the language perspective in the Finnish context. She concludes that the language perspective opens up ways to understand how certain ways of talking about corporate responsibilities not only determine and restrict how issues are thought about and acted upon. Further, she proposes that these discourses may have unintended and undesired consequences that may hinder the efforts to act environmentally responsibly.

Another recent discussion that has inspired this study has been raised by environmental management and sustainability researchers criticising the win-win paradigm and the business case view that are presented to dominate the sustainability literature. The view that economic, environmental and social sustainability aspects could be achieved simultaneously (e.g. Bansal 2005) has been questioned by researchers calling for a more inclusive notion of corporate sustainability (e.g. Hahn, Figge, Pinkse & Preuss 2010, Margolish & Walsh 2003). Hahn, Figge, Pinkse & Preuss (2010) have stated that the win-win view is simplistic and argue that trade-offs and conflicts in corporate sustainability are the rule rather than the exception. They present that “in trade-off situations it is impossible to achieve two or more desirable objectives simultaneously; rather decision-makers need to weight a loss in at least one dimension against a gain in other dimensions” (2010, 219). The authors argue that “the win-win paradigm limits the scope of potential corporate responses and approaches to sustainable development” and that the win-win paradigm leads the

research to be trapped in tunnel vision where contributions outside the win-win logic are systematically overlooked.

Based on this brief introduction to research on climate change engagement it seems that the field is still underdeveloped. Firstly, previous research is largely based on concepts and advances presented in the environmental management or sustainability literature. Yet these frames might not cater the full complexity and multifaceted nature of climate change and they might even ignore some aspects that could prove central for understanding the issue. Secondly, the literature on corporate engagement with climate change seems to be mainly normative, focusing on MNCs' market and political strategies (e.g. Kolk & Pinkse 2004; 2007, Pinkse & Kolk 2012). There is a need for in-depth, qualitative empirical research focusing on not only the different ways of which corporations engage with climate change but also on the understandings of climate change as a business issue and on how these understandings may be linked to climate change engagement.

## Methodology

### **Social constructionism and discourse analysis**

The main idea of social constructionism is that social reality is created within social human interaction (Berger & Luckmann 1966). This approach assumes a relativist ontology (there are multiple realities) and a subjectivist epistemology (knower and subject create understandings) (Denzin & Lincoln 1994, 13–14). The constructionist approach focuses attention on language use and on how language practises produce definitions and attach meanings to various phenomena. In environmental studies this approach highlights the view that environmental issues, such as climate change, are not objective, rather they are produced and maintained, and therefore receive different meanings, in social interaction. Accordingly, in this study climate change and business engagement with it are viewed as contextual concepts that are produced in business professionals' language practises. These constructs are influenced by a number of different actors, such as climate policy makers, business consultants, other companies, NGO's, etc., and they evolve with time and vary across countries, industries and other contexts.

To analyse these constructs, their production and functions, this study uses discourse analysis as an analysis method. The uses and definitions of discourse and discourse analysis vary greatly, but typically they are used to refer to the study of structure and form of language and/or language as

social interaction (van Dijk 1997), in other words human communication. An important feature of discourse analysis is that the data is open to many different interpretations and the researcher is not aiming to reach an ‘objective truth’, but to find a well grounded interpretation about the studied phenomena (Joutsenvirta 2006). Alasuutari (1995) calls this process of qualitative analysis ‘solving the riddle’, meaning that the researcher forms a research question to capture the essence of the phenomenon at hand and then uses the data to look for ‘clues’ that are then used to answer this research question.

### **Empirical context**

The empirical focus of this study is on Finnish business professionals working in the food sector in companies that actively engage with climate change. These companies and business professionals have participated in a low-carbon economy project called ‘Peloton’ in 2009–2011. Peloton was a joint project of the Finnish think tank Demos Helsinki and the Finnish Innovation Fund Sitra, and it was launched in 2009. The project’s main objective was to empower professionals and peer groups to fight against climate change. The aim was to encourage companies and consumers into all-around, everyday energy consciousness and to help companies to create products, services and social innovations that systematically lower the energy need of the Finnish lifestyle. The project organised workshops for companies from different industries. The workshops were organised as two-day intensive courses, which consisted of lectures and group work. The objective of these workshops was that the participants would develop together innovative and radical ideas on how to lower the energy usage of their operations, customers and peers. Peloton has been one of the pioneer projects focusing on climate change and targeting companies in Finland, thus these companies are among the first to engage with the issue. There are other advances brought forward by other companies as well, but focusing on this project provides an unique setting of a group of companies working in the same industry.

This study focuses on a single industry in order to limit the variance of climate change engagement activities. Different industries face different regulations thus making it more urgent for other companies to engage with the issue than others. The companies included in this study are food retail companies and lunch & catering service providers. They actively engage with climate change by improving their energy efficiency and developing and implementing services to reduce the GHG emissions of their customers. Activities range from reducing energy consumption, increasing the use of local and organic products, reorganising logistics and planning low-carbon menus to formulating formal environmental policies.

## Data generation

The empirical data for this study has been generated by observing the Peloton workshops, by interviewing the participants, and by collecting company documents and other publicly available data from various internet sources. I have participated in three Peloton workshops in 2010 and 2011, one of which was for food retail industry (February 2011). In these workshops I have used participant observation to generate data, after the workshops I have transcribed my field notes and recordings and generated a description of the workshop. Even though in this study I only focus on the food sector, participating in the other workshops helped me greatly in the early phase of this research project to understand the phenomena of corporate climate change engagement and to start to notice some interesting issues related to that.

After the workshops, companies that had actively started to engage with climate change and to create new services or products were contacted in order to interview them. I contacted companies that had attended a workshop for lunch restaurants or for food retail industry (which I attended myself). The interviews were conducted approximately within one to two years after the workshops, which allowed time for the companies to develop and implement their ideas. Altogether 10 interviews were conducted with business professionals who deal with the issue working in four companies (1-4 interviews / company). I used a semi-structured interview guide, which was updated from one interview to another when necessary. The themes focused on interviewee's reflections on the workshop, on their low-carbon projects and on their experiences of the project and the process of creating new products and services. The interviews lasted between 38 and 68 minutes and were fully transcribed. The transcripts vary between 9–16 pages in length (single spaced, Times New Roman, 12). Table 1 presents the interview data used in this study.

Table 1 Interviews

| Pseudonym | Role of the interviewee  | Type of company             | Date of the interview | Length |
|-----------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|--------|
| Jenni     | Nutritionist             | Lunch & catering services A | 17.11.2010            | 68 min |
| Pekka     | Restaurant group manager | Lunch & catering services A | 25.11.2010            | 60 min |
| Suvi      | Buyer/product specialist | Lunch & catering services A | 2.12.2010             | 68 min |
| Marianne  | Quality manager          | Lunch & catering services A | 23.11.2011            | 61 min |
| Venla     | Managing director        | Food retail B               | 23.11.2011            | 45 min |
| Lotta     | Corporate responsibility | Food retail C               | 30.11.2011            | 62 min |

|         |                     |                             |            |        |
|---------|---------------------|-----------------------------|------------|--------|
|         | specialist          |                             |            |        |
| Lauri   | Quality manager     | Food retail C               | 30.11.2011 | 64 min |
| Liisa   | Development manager | Lunch & catering services D | 1.12.2011  | 38 min |
| Johanna | Area manager        | Lunch & catering services D | 1.12.2011  | 64 min |
| Kaisa   | Managing director   | Lunch & catering services D | 1.12.2011  | 58 min |

In addition, I have collected other data such as public company document, newspaper articles, and notes from informal discussions with project organisers to provide more context and to ensure that I understand the contextual meaning of the phenomenon under study.

### **Analysis process**

I started the analysis process with the interview data in order to familiarise myself with what is going on in the companies to develop a more specific focus for this study. So, when I started the analysis data, I did not have one, clear research question in mind. Rather, my plan was to start working with the data and to look for interesting or puzzling issues and for things that would leave me wondering. I was mostly interested in climate change discourses and constructs, but was not sure what more specific research questions my data could provide answers.

First, I printed out the interview transcripts and started reading them one by one. I read through the interviews once or twice in order to familiarise myself with each interview. While reading, I wrote down remarks on the tone of the interview, dominant themes and any issues that seemed particularly interesting. Based on these first impressions, I wrote down interview summaries paying special attention to the issues that I had thought to be dominant or contradictory in the interview. After that I formed initial categories of the different themes and read through the text again while highlighting any words, sentences or sections related to each theme by using coloured markers. This process was rather time consuming, but already after four or five interviews I started to notice how some themes were constantly recurring and how some themes had slight variations from one interview to another. The main themes and issues presented in the data are discussed in the next section.

### **Preliminary Findings**

In this section I will present the preliminary findings based on the first round of data analysis and on only the interview data. Thus, this discussion is not comprehensive; rather I highlight some of

the interesting features and issues that I've come across when analysing the data. The aim is to describe the main features of the climate change engagement discourse(s) and to develop ideas for the empirical part of my dissertation. I have included quotes from data to illustrate the findings.

The main features of the climate change engagement discourse produced in the interviews are focus on mitigation activities, intrinsic value of climate change engagement, and uncomplicated nature of climate change engagement. Table 2 summarises these features, highlights ways that are used to produce them, and presents silenced issues.

Table 2 Main features of climate change engagement discourse

| Climate change engagement discourse: Main features |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|
|  | Focus on mitigation activities  | Intrinsic value of climate change engagement  | Uncomplicated nature of climate change engagement   |
| Produced by focusing on                            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reducing energy consumption, energy efficiency</li> <li>- Local and organic products</li> <li>- Logistics</li> <li>- Organic waste generation</li> <li>- Informing and educating customers</li> <li>- The present</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Topical issue demanding awareness</li> <li>- Moral issue, doing the right thing</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Climate-friendly activities do not conflict other aims</li> <li>- Development and implementation of activities is easy</li> <li>- Saving energy is not a new thing</li> <li>- Win-win view</li> <li>- Referring to strategy</li> </ul> |
| Silenced issues                                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Adaptation; potential impacts of changing weather to operations and foodstuff prices</li> <li>- The future</li> </ul>  | - ?   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ambiguities or uncertainties related to engaging with climate change</li> <li>- Actual impacts of the activities</li> </ul>  |

### Focus on mitigation activities

The most prominent feature of the climate change engagement discourse is the focus on mitigation activities, i.e. focus on aims to cut down greenhouse gas and other emissions to prevent further climate change. In terms of their internal operations the interviewees described how they focus on reducing their energy consumption of their business operations for example by operating in a energy-efficient way and saving water in kitchens and favouring low energy machinery:

*[...] in terms of our kitchen equipment purchases, energy efficiency, it is nowadays definitely the main criterion for our purchases [...], Marianne*

In addition to reducing energy consumption, the importance of favouring local and organic food products, improving logistic operations, and reducing organic waste generation is highlighted:

*[...] and then we measured the generation of organic waste, in terms of per customer, and we informed our customers about the results. Because in fact it is the worst kind of wasting when food goes into organic waste bins, as the production of food requires enormously energy and raw material, and then it goes into organic waste, which will have adverse effects on the environment when it is composted or when, in the worst case, it is taken to a landfill, where it will generate a lot of emissions. Pekka*

The shared view of the interviewees seems to be that food production and consumption patterns have a significant impact on climate change, as they produce a lot of emissions. The significance of their activities was produced by highlighting their role as food producers and also as educators of consumers:

*I find that our engagement is of importance, yes. If we can even slightly change people's attitudes or if people would wake up a bit [...], Liisa*

*And then increasing awareness, if we could show the carbon footprint of every food, product, to show it to the customers, how their purchases all add up, that would be a good thing. Venla*

This focus on mitigation silenced adaptation discussions, i.e. learning to deal with actual or expected impacts of climate change. Only a few times such issues as the impacts of global warming on food prices or the wider impacts of climate change were brought up. And even then in a quite vague manner and soon the discussion was back on more tangible examples of how they were engaging with the issue at the moment. The focus of the discourse was on the present and future was not discussed.

### **Intrinsic value of climate change engagement**

Highlighting the uncomplicatedness of these activities produces justification for climate change engagement by stating that it is actually economical to engage with these issues. The other 'reason' for climate change engagement can be found in the talk where the interviewees emphasise the intrinsic value of climate change engagement. This is achieved by, for example describing climate change engagement as a topical issue that demands awareness:

*First of all it is one of those issues that every listed company should be starting to get aware of, about the kinds of environmental impacts that our operations have. [...] I wouldn't call them environmental pressures, because for example our stakeholders have not demanded that*

*actively, the main reason is not that it was demanded of us. But rather... we feel that it is an issue that we just have to be aware of at the moment. Lotta*

Or as a moral issue, doing the right thing, also for the customers and the whole society:

*[...] we do these things for ourselves, in a way one's personal, for one's personal satisfaction.*

*[...] It makes us feel so good, when we know that... be it conscience or something that is happy when we have actually thought about these things. Kaisa*

*It is not only about reducing the overall global consumption but also about increasing well-being when a customer chooses a vegetarian option once a week, and leaves out greasy fries, I find that to be important. Liisa*

*Now we don't have any idea about how much we consume because all that goes to the overall bill. But we engage with these activities because it is advantageous from the society's point of view when we conserve energy and water. Johanna*

*There are these things that are ideologically important, even though they might not save the whole world.[...] I think that it is important to look for morally right and valid solution, no matter what they are in the end. Lauri*

I found this emphasis of the intrinsic value to be interesting because it seems to conflict the other two that seem to be based on business and market values. The view is that these kinds of activities are engaged with because they are part of the strategy and that actually it is easy and economical to do these things. Focus on the intrinsic value, however, brings forward moral reasons for this behaviour.

### **Uncomplicated nature of climate change engagement**

The third feature, the seemingly uncomplicated nature of climate change engagement, refers to the way the interviewees described in detail the different activities they have engaged with and how it actually is quite easy for them to implement these activities. Firstly, this is achieved by stating that climate-friendly aims fit closely together with their other goals, and that there are no conflicts with these aims:

*This idea of climate-friendly food, this is quite easy for us [...] when we examined this climate-friendly thing more closely we realised that the other arguments, such as organic and local and so forth, are covered by it as well. Liisa*

*And of course the fact that these things do not conflict each other. Kaisa*

Secondly, the development and implementation of climate-friendly activities is depicted as easy and straightforward:

*And our environmental adverse effects in principle, it has been easy for us to identify them, they are mainly related to our purchases, so where we buy our foodstuff, responsibility issues related to that, and also their delivery to our restaurants, so the emissions from deliveries.*

Marianne

This is also produced by stating that actually they have paid attention to energy efficiency for a long time already, thus it is not a new issue:

*These activities to save energy and these investments that we do regardless, and have been doing for a long time, so now we have to translate them into the language of carbon emissions.*

Lotta

Thirdly, being climate-friendly is depicted as a win-win deal, where ecological behaviour saves money. However, money is not primary motive for engaging in these activities:

*[...] the fun part of all that is that after all it saved us money.* Kaisa

*The way I see it is that they [doing business and being climate-friendly] fit together very well, because when you save energy you save Euros as well.* Pekka

Lastly, any possible ambiguities or uncertainties related to the activities or their significance and actual impacts are silenced by stating that this part of their strategy:

*Of course this is stated in our strategy. It all starts from the strategy, and everyone who wants to work here has to pledge to this strategy. We have ecological, economical, well-being, these are clearly a part of our operations.* Liisa

*[...] in our strategy we have well-being and ecology, we used to have health, now well-being is a more holistic view, which is quite wonderful, and then we also have customer orientation, and these all endorse each other. None of these slaps any of the others across its face.* Johanna

By referring to strategy the interviewees state that they have, as a company, formal guidelines to engage with this issue. Thus, there are no ambiguities about what to do and what kind of activities are of importance.

## Discussion

In a recent call for papers for Organization, Wright et al. (2011) suggested that corporate response to climate change is fundamentally affected by the way organisational actors imagine the future climate changed worlds. If the future is not imagined to be very different from now and climate change is seen as a manageable process, as seems to be the case in my empirical data (or at least a different kind of future is not talked about), existing patterns of economic behaviour and consumption are likely to be reinforced and maintained (Wright et al. 2011). The authors call for research examining the different ways in which climate change is constructed and how these ways inform current beliefs, actions and behaviours. I think that my data could be used to contribute to this discussion.

The main contribution of this study will be to environmental and climate change management literature in two ways. Firstly, climate change is often researched as an environmental management or a sustainability issue, which might not provide sufficient frames to cover the full complexity of the issue. This study will provide a more thorough understanding of climate change as a business issue in its own right, not only as another environmental issue. Secondly, this study will discuss how climate change is constructed in the business world and what consequences for organisational behaviour these constructs might have. The language perspective will shed light on how business professionals account for and make sense of new, emerging environmental challenges. In addition, the results will reveal the different values and views related to climate change engagement at play in everyday organisational life.

Alternatively, or in addition, this study could contribute to research on trade-offs in sustainability by addressing the issue from language perspective, which allows examining the different values at play in business world and how they at the same time able and disable certain types of behaviour. And how possible conflicts are reconciled through language practises. Another academic contribution could be made by discussing how prevailing discourses could be changed.

For managers, this study will provide guidance on how to facilitate climate change engagement in organisations and on what values to draw on in order to facilitate these kinds of activities and how to take the 'next step' in becoming more sustainable.

## References

- Alasuutari, P. 1995. *Researching culture. Qualitative method and cultural studies*. London: Sage publications.
- Bansal, P. 2005. Evolving Sustainability: A Longitudinal Study of Corporate Sustainable Development. *Strategic Management Journal*, 26, 197–218.
- Berger, P. L. & Luckmann, T. 1966. *Social construction of reality. A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. New York: Garden City.
- Denzin, N. K. & Lincoln, Y. S. 1994. Introduction: Entering the Field of Qualitative Research. In Denzin & Lincoln (Eds.) *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.
- Dobers, P., Strannegård, L. & Wolff, R. 2001. Knowledge interests in corporate environmental management. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 10 (6), 335–343.
- Hahn, T., Figge, F., Pinkse, J. & Preuss, L. 2010. Trade-Offs in Corporate Sustainability: You Can't Have Your Cake and Eat It. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 19, 217–229.
- Hahn, T., Kolk, A. & Winn, M. 2010. A New Future for Business? Rethinking Management Theory and Business Strategy. *Business & Society*, 49 (3), 385–401.
- Hoffman, A. J. 2005. Climate change strategy: The business logic behind voluntary greenhouse gas reductions. *California Management Review*, 47 (3), 21–46.
- Johansson, O., Lilius, M., Pesonen, J., Rantanen, J. & Tamminen, S. 2007. *Ilmastonmuutos ja yritykset. Kansainvälisten suomalaisyritysten näkemyksiä. [Climate change and corporations]*. Helsinki: Taloustieto Oy. (In Finnish)
- Joutsenvirta, M. 2006. *Ympäristökeskustelun yhteiset arvot: diskurssianalyysi Enso ja Greenpeacen ympäristökirjoituksista [The shared values of the environmental debate: discourse analysis of Enso's and Greenpeace's environmental writings]*. Helsinki School of Economics, Helsinki: Acta Universitatis Oeconomicae Helsingiensis A 273. (In Finnish.)
- Joutsenvirta, M. 2009. A Language Perspective to Environmental Management and Corporate Responsibility. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 18, 240–253.
- Klein, R. J. T., Schipper, E. L. F. & Desai, S. 2005. Integrating mitigation and adaptation into climate and development policy: three research questions. *Environmental Science & Policy*, 8, 579–588.
- Kolk, A. & Pinkse, J. 2004. Market Strategies for Climate Change. *European Management Journal*, 22 (3), 304–314.
- Kolk, A. & Pinkse, J. 2007. Multinationals' Political Activities on Climate Change. *Business & Society*, 46 (2), 201–228.
- Livesey, S. M. 2002. Global Warming Wars: Rhetorical and Discourse Analytic Approaches to Exxonmobil's Corporate Public Discourse. *Journal of Business Communication*, 39 (1), 117–148.
- Margolish, J. D. & Walsh, J. P. 2003. Misery Loves Companies: Rethinking Social Initiatives by Business. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 48 (2), 268–305.
- Okereke, C. & Russel, D. 2010. Regulatory pressure and competitive dynamics: Carbon management strategies of UK-based energy intensive companies. *California Management Review*, 52 (4), 100–124.
- Okereke, C., Wittneben, B. & Bowen, F. 2012. Climate Change: Challenging Business, Transforming Politics. *Business & Society*, 51 (1), 7–30.
- Pinkse, J. & Kolk, A. 2012. Addressing the Climate Change--Sustainable Development Nexus: The Role of Multistakeholder Partnerships. *Business & Society*, 51 (1), 176–210.
- Seppälä, J., Mäenpää, I., Koskela, S., Mattila, T., Nissinen, A., Katajajuuri, J.-M., Härmä, T., Korhonen, M.-R., Saarinen, M. & Virtanen, Y. 2011. An assessment of greenhouse gas

- emissions and material flows caused by the Finnish economy using the ENVIMAT model, *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 19(16), 1833–1841.
- Slawinski, N. & Bansal, T. Forthcoming. What's time got to do with it?: Understanding temporal perspective in organizational responses to climate change. *Organization Studies*.
- Sprengel, D. C. & Busch, T. 2011. Stakeholder Engagement and Environmental Strategy – the Case of Climate Change. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 20, 351–364.
- van Dijk, T. A. 1997. The Study of Discourse. In van Dijk (Ed.) *Discourse as structure and process: Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction*, Vol. 2. London: SAGE Publications Ltd. pp. 1–34.
- Weinhofer, G. & Hoffmann, V. H. 2010. Mitigating Climate Change – How Do Corporate Strategies Differ? *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 19, 77–89.
- Wright, C., Nyberg, D., De Cock, C. & Whiteman, G. 2011. Future imaginings: Organizing in response to climate change. Accessed online  
[http://www.uk.sagepub.com/repository/binaries/pdf/org\\_climate-change.pdf](http://www.uk.sagepub.com/repository/binaries/pdf/org_climate-change.pdf)