

A Study on Business Sustainability and Strategic Approach Towards IT

Prof. Gaurav Mishra and Mohite Prerana Lalasaheb

Jai Bharat College of Commerce (Night), Mumbai, Maharashtra, India

Abstract: *Achieving business sustainability goes beyond corporate social responsibility (CSR). To achieve long-term benefits, it is necessary to plan strategically rather than incrementally. We must make changes given the current social, environmental, technological, and political challenges facing business. This paper examines the significance of a strategic approach to business sustainability and the various strategies that businesses can use to achieve strategic sustainability.*

Keywords: Sustainability, Business Sustainability, Sustainable Development, Sustainability, Strategic Sustainability, Green Giants, Triple Bottom Line, and Corporate Social Responsibility are all strategic approaches

I. INTRODUCTION

Milton Friedman, winner of the Nobel Prize in Economics in the 1970s, said that "the sole purpose of business is to increase its returns to stakeholders." He argued that businesses that implement CSR will face more legal requirements than businesses that do not, making them less competitive. He came to the conclusion that making money is the only purpose of business.

In the 1970s, CSR and sustainability issues were not seen as significant. Friedman's theory was one of the most important business models at the time because climate change was not seen as a threat to future generations.

Costanza and others According to an estimate made by (2014), the value of ecosystem services such as pollination, soil formation, and a great number of other services that nature provides for free would significantly exceed the global GDP if we had to pay for them. This pivotal work has served as the foundation for the sustainability perspectives of many experts. The natural resources of water, soil, and air are finite and must be protected and sometimes replenished through projects like watershed projects.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

According to the Brundtland Commission's 1987 report, "meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs" is the definition of sustainability. By simultaneously delivering economic, social, and environmental benefits, or the triple bottom line, a sustainable business truly contributes to sustainability (Dyllick & Hockerts, 2002; 1998, Elkington). Organizations have been redefining their roles, action domains, and interdependence in conjunction with the state and civil society, as well as developing new strategies, policies, and arrangements (Marrewijk, 2003).

Sustainability and Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) are increasingly used interchangeably because of their similarities and convergence (Emerson, 2003; Mazon, 2004). Multiple levels of analysis are involved with both concepts (individual, group, company, community, etc.) and numerous stakeholders (such as employees, shareholders, customers, suppliers, partners, and members of the community, among others). Sustainability and corporate social responsibility (CSR) address issues that occasionally overlap in social, environmental, and economic dimensions. In addition to short-term performance indicators like return on investment (ROI), the economic sector includes elements that contribute to long-term financial success, such as a company's reputation and relationships. According to Raynard & Forstater (2002), managing sustainability and CSR requires striking a balance between short-term and long-term considerations, taking into account the interests of a wider range of stakeholders. The strategy of strategic planning is better suited to this situation when it comes to creating a sustainable business environment.

Sustainable Development

The idea of sustainable development is becoming more and more accepted, but many executives in the business world have never heard of it before, so it remains a theoretical and abstract concept. "the means adopting business strategies and activities that meet the needs of the enterprise and its stakeholders today while protecting, sustaining, and enhancing the human and natural resources that will be needed in the future" is the definition of sustainable development.

This definition reflects the World Commission on Environment and Development's original concept of sustainable development, which recognizes that economic development must cater to the requirements of business organizations and their stakeholders. Shareholders, lenders, customers, employees, suppliers, and communities that are impacted by the organization's activities are all considered stakeholders in this context. The dependence of a business on human and natural resources, in addition to physical and financial capital, is also the focus of the definition. It states that economic activity cannot irreparably damage or deplete these human and natural resources. This definition was intended to assist directors of businesses in implementing the concept of sustainable development within their own organizations. However, it is important to emphasize that sustainable development cannot be achieved by a single business or the entire business community on its own. Sustainable development necessitates a concerted effort on the part of everyone involved in the global economy in order to not only meet the requirements of the present but also to safeguard the capacity of future generations to do so.

Making sustainability a part of everyday business operations According to Bielak, Bonini, & Oppenheim (2007), organizations are increasingly under pressure to incorporate society's expectations into their business strategies in order to respond to customers, employees, and other stakeholders and investigate opportunities for gaining a competitive advantage. (Oppenheim, Mendonça, and Bonini, 2006) The goal of the research is to find a set of factors that could make it easier to effectively incorporate sustainability into organizational practices.

The Strategic Approaches

"The majority of strategies are based on particular notions of the future. Sadly, the future is extremely unpredictable. More than half of organizations that have failed at some point, according to research, could be attributed to a flawed strategy rather than a poor economic situation. Planning a strategy takes a lot of time and money. Strategies can sometimes be developed by organizations without allocating resources. Throughout the long term many methodologies have been proposed to determine system disappointments. To increase the likelihood of success for future generations, sustainability necessitates formal strategic planning. An official strategy gives an organization the chance to cut down on risk and increase the likelihood that it will be safe in the future. A strategy starts with planning, which comes from the military. 2,500 years ago, Sun Tzu wrote "The Art of War," which is considered to be the first strategy guidelines. The author of this legendary book, a Commander of the Chinese army, lays out the guidelines for conducting military operations. A number of other authors, including M. Porter, D.P. Norton, S. Kaplan, and H. Mintzberg, have also contributed to our comprehension of strategic organizational planning.

The term "critical" refers to the understanding of various schools of thought regarding strategy. There is no universal idea, and strategy may mean different things in different contexts. Because different metaphors can demonstrate how divergent perspectives exist on the same concept, it is essential to investigate various schools of strategy. However, business does not approach strategy differently.

The following schools of strategy exist: They define, form, and explain the strategy in the same way:

1. School of design: conception process striking a balance between the opportunities and threats presented by the outside world and the organization's internal strengths and weaknesses.
2. School planning: formal method Control tables and specific steps make up the formal procedure. It is backed up by a variety of methods, particularly when it comes to different plans, budgets, objectives, and operational plans.
3. School positioning: analytical method It incorporates ideas like strategic groups and value chains, among others, and the analyst becomes the plan maker. There are always some analytical specifics in it.
4. School of entrepreneurship: process of the future vision. The key person is the top manager. The key development of the concept was that it changed the focus of the strategy from a precise design, plan, or position to an uncertain vision and a broader perspective.

5. Cognitive training: an intellectual procedure that focuses primarily on the investigation of the strategy concept. Additionally, this school has its own patterns, interpretations, or constructive perspective on a strategy. Instead of just dealing with reality charts, it is used to build plans.

6. Going to school: an unpredictably occurring process- This school emphasizes learning as you go rather than developing strategies in advance. They are distributed throughout the organization. There is a connection between formulation and execution,

7. Strong school: process of negotiation. The micro power group and the major power group are the two subgroups of power school. The micro power concept views the process of developing a strategy as an internal policy-making process that involves negotiations, exerting pressure, and conflict among the power players. The macro power concept emphasizes that an organization is a person with power over others and among its alliance partners, joint venture partners, and other forms of networking. It exists so that "collective" strategies can be agreed upon for the organization's benefit.

8. Culture college: a social activity. Integration and collective interests are at the heart of the strategic concept.

9. Environment school: It is emphasized that strategy formulation is a social process rooted in an organization's culture. a process that reacts. The idea includes "probability theory," which looks at how an organization might react to its environment. The "population ecology" is viewed as severely restricting strategic options. The institutional pressure that organizations face is referred to as "institutional theory." This strategy idea is a cross between the power and cognition schools.

10. School configuration: a transformational process Organizations are regarded as configurations rather than distinct entities. groups of traits and behaviors that are common. If the term "status" can be used to describe an organization, then the transformations can be described as a dynamic process of transformation in which the organization shifts from one status to another as a result of the change.

There are other classifications for strategy schools as well. The strategic management approaches have also been divided into three strategic schools, according to Elfring and Volberda (2001).

1. Limitation school addresses the problem of where to draw an organization's boundaries and how to manage processes across division lines. School of dynamic capabilities:

2. Strategic management is a process of collective learning aimed at developing unique organizational capabilities that are difficult to duplicate.

3. The school of configuration views strategy as the ascending and descending process of an organizational configuration, as well as strategic techniques, archetypes, and development stages.

These main trends in the field of strategic management, not various theories or the development of new theories, are the basis for this classification of approaches to strategic management.

The various schools of thought deliberate on the priorities that organizations assign to their various parts during the process of creating a strategy; however, the majority include Peter Drucker's categories for the development of strategic objectives.

III. OBSERVATION

Sustainability strategies must be tailored to each company in its own unique way because no two businesses are the same. Each company has its own organizational structure, supply chain, employee base, and geographic footprint. This makes it abundantly clear that no single strategic strategy can be sufficient. You can look at references from other businesses in the same industry or region; however, what works for one company might not work for another. Because it involves analytics, a positioning school approach may be beneficial in this situation. The planning school approach, on the other hand, may assist in identifying and prioritizing material issues to focus resources.

The entrepreneurial, cognitive, and cultural approaches may be better suited to developing innovative ideas to solve sustainability issues. Developing a sustainability strategy that will create long-term value for the company and communicating that to shareholders is a major obstacle for businesses worldwide. Companies with successful sustainability strategies connect their sustainability efforts with issues and activities that are material to the business. The problem that many businesses face is coming up with a strategy that both improves the environmental and social impacts of their operations and boosts their bottom lines. The most important factor in gaining support from

shareholders is demonstrating that the strategy has the potential to generate value from a business perspective. As a result, strategy replaces cost as the link between sustainability and profit.

The cultural approach will assist in consulting and engaging middle management. The underrepresentation of middle management in the development of sustainability strategies can be reduced by cultivating sustainability as an organizational culture through a cultural strategy. Employee self-worth and engagement will rise as a result, and resistance to change will be reduced. To get middle management on board, a cultural approach to strategic planning will result in improved communication, patience, and persistence.

The Positioning and Power Schools approach will assist in the creation of key performance indicators (KPIs) that are linked to significant, measurable objectives and will clearly assign responsibilities. It is essential to manage and monitor progress toward sustainability; otherwise, efforts will fail. The positioning strategy will assist in the planning of resources and their allocation, which is necessary for the performance check. The establishment of a separate department within the company to carry out this task merits consideration.

Companies may benefit from adopting a learning approach to enhance company-wide sustainability initiatives. The change procedure could assist with integrating new mission and vision for organization assisting them with recognizing what their status is and where are the headed

IV. CONCLUSION

Over 40 years have passed since Milton Friedman gave is renowned perception and this present reality is seeing another age of billion dollar "Green Goliaths" arising into the market. Green Giants are companies whose products, services, or business lines are centered on sustainability or social good and generate at least a billion U.S. dollars in annual revenue. Green Giants include Chipotle, which is worth 4.1 billion US dollars, Unilever, which is worth 52.27 billion US dollars, Whole Foods Market, which is worth 14.19 billion US dollars, Natura, which is worth 2.65 billion US dollars, and Tesla, which is worth 3.2 billion US dollars. Their success demonstrates that sustainability is the driving force of their business that generates value socially, environmentally, and economically. What sets these businesses apart from other businesses is that sustainability is more than just a department within their organization that looks for ways to save energy and eliminate paper.

The system incorporates their sustainability. The company as a whole is built on sustainability, and every one of them has a sustainable strategy that works and makes money. Many businesses claim to have a sustainable strategy, but it is only a short-term or incremental approach that prioritizes compliance with regulatory and legal authorities. Some businesses do have a sustainability strategy that is connected to their overall business strategy, which includes how they deal with customers and their supply chain. In the event of organizations like the Green Monsters, their supportability system is their business procedure.

The fact that these businesses have been successful shows that there is a growing demand for businesses to incorporate sustainability into their business models. Corporate sustainability is no longer a marginal or money-losing set of activities. It is time for businesses to realize that having a sustainability strategy is necessary for them to be competitive. As a result, there is no one-size-fits-all solution to complex sustainability issues. Manageability requires a decent blend of various methodologies which supplement each other in accomplishing a business supportability.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Milton Friedman's book The Social Responsibility of Business is to Increase Its Profits
- [2]. <http://www.colorado.edu/studentgroups/libertarians/issues/friedman-soc-resp-business.html>
- [3]. E. Freya Williams's third book is titled Green Giant: How Smart Companies Turn Sustainability into Billion-Dollar Businesses.
- [4]. Corporate Sustainability at a Crossroads: Making Progress Towards Our Common Future in Uncertain Times
- [5]. http://sloanreview.mit.edu/projects/corporate-sustainability-at-a-crossroads/?utm_medium=email&utm_source=enews&utm_campaign=susrpt17
- [6]. S. M. Bonini, L. T. Mendonca, and J. M. Oppenheim are the authors. when social issues turn into strategic issues. 2, 20 of the McKinsey Quarterly

- [7]. T. Dyllick, K. Hockerts, and others beyond the business case for sustainability in business. Environment and business strategy, 11(2), 130-141.
- [8]. The Ecoservices document was obtained from http://www.robertcostanza.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/2017_J_Costanza-etal.-20yrs.-EcoServices.pdf. T. Elfring, H. W. Volberda, and Schools of strategic management thought: Integration, fragmentation, or synthesis
- [9]. J. Elkington (1998). Taking into account the triple bottom line. 2(3), pp. 18-22 in Measuring Business Excellence.