

1 Corporate Sustainability Factors that Promote a Positive Work 2 Environment

3 Orlando Rivero, D.B.A.¹

4 ¹ Herzing University

5 *Received: 11 December 2015 Accepted: 4 January 2016 Published: 15 January 2016*

6

7 **Abstract**

8 American firms continue to improve services/product lines in order to stay competitive within
9 their respective industry. Unfortunately, expectations can be out of the norm, resulting in
10 misguided organizational change. Studies have suggested that misguided organizational
11 change initiatives trigger managers to mistreat employees. Consequently, most studies suggest
12 that the lack of leadership is attributable to promoting a false sense of urgency resulting in a
13 hostile work environment. Moreover, past studies have suggested that a highly emotional,
14 intelligent leader is able to deal with corporate sustainability factors that may have an effect
15 on organizational change initiatives. At the end, recommendations will be offered for improved
16 organizational change initiatives.

17

18 **Index terms**— corporation, social responsibility, sustainability, corporate sustainability, ecology, sociology,
19 CEO, internal environment, external environment, pub

20 **1 Corporate Sustainability Factors that Promote a Positive 21 Work Environment**

22 In an effort to have a better understanding of misguided organizational change issues, a recent study suggested
23 that employees are expected to perform beyond the norm without additional resources. According to Rivero
24 (2013) "??employees are pushed to perform at peak levels with unrealistic expectations, which has resulted in
25 a counterproductive work environment" (p. 169). Although organizational change is critical to organizational
26 sustainability, most have been unsuccessful. According to Kotter (2008), "?it is estimated that 70 percent of
27 needed change either fails to be launched or completed" (p. 12).

28 Tragically, misguided organizational change has triggered managers to mistreat employees. Hutchinson,
29 Vickers, Jackson, and Wilkes (2005) point out that "?rather than accepting that processes and pressures of
30 organizational change might be an 'accidental trigger' for bullying by managers who may be in over their heads"
31 (p. 57). This being said, workplace bullying should not be tolerated in any organizational setting regardless of
32 the circumstances.

33 As a result of staff reduction, scarce resources, and added pressure to complete deadlines, managers develop
34 a "Siege Mentality" behavior to deal with added stress due to overbearing expectations. As Horstein (1996)
35 further suggests, "Siege Mentality" exists when managers are forced to micromanage employees in an effort to
36 stay abreast of day-to-day functions. Unfortunately, employees are then severely mistreated, which will eventually
37 lead to counter productivity.

38 **2 III.**

39 **3 Workplace Bullying**

40 Several years ago, workplace bullying was not commonly known among researchers and practitioners. However,
41 Adam & Crawford (1992) conducted a landmark study on the effects of workplace bullying and how it can have a

42 direct impact on the overall workplace environment. This study has provided a foundation for other researchers
43 to establish measures to explore this phenomenon in the workplace.

44 According to Namie & Namie (2000), workplace bullying occurs when an individual with authority within
45 an organizational setting deliberately mistreats employees. Through the collaboration of several researchers, a
46 survey was conducted to determine the severity of workplace bullying in the United States. The survey consisted
47 of 3,461 respondents and the following results were revealed. Those who were currently being Introduction
48 merican firms aspire to improve their quality of services/product lines to stay competitive within their industry
49 standards. It is highly encouraged that swift organizational change initiatives are initiated to stay ahead of
50 organizational competitors. However, certain organizations are promoting misguided organizational change
51 initiatives. Consequently, studies have suggested that misguided organizational change initiatives trigger bullying
52 by managers. In some cases, when allegations of workforce bullying are reported, management does not take
53 corrective action. As a result, the work environment becomes deplorable, which will have an effect on work
54 productivity in the long run. Most importantly, modern organizations should consider hiring a progressive leader
55 who is suitable to deal with organizational change dilemmas, as it relates to corporate suitability issues. The
56 hiring of a progressive leader will not prevent certain organizational behavioral issues, but will certainly make a
57 difference.

58 **4 II. Misguided Organizational Change**

59 Progressive organizations throughout America continue to strive to improve services rendered to clients/customers
60 due to fierce competition. Unfortunately, organizations are aiming beyond expectations to meet deadlines and
61 are pressured to do more for less.

62 **5 A**

63 Abstract-American firms continue to improve services/product lines in order to stay competitive within their
64 respective industry. Unfortunately, expectations can be out of the norm, resulting in misguided organizational
65 change. Studies have suggested that misguided organizational change initiatives trigger managers to mistreat
66 employees. Consequently, most studies suggest that the lack of leadership is attributable to promoting a false sense
67 of urgency resulting in a hostile work environment. Moreover, past studies have suggested that a highly emotional
68 intelligent leader is able to deal with corporate sustainability factors that may have an effect on organizational
69 change initiatives. At the end, recommendations will be offered for improved organizational change initiatives.

70 **6 Keywords:**

71 corporation, social responsibility, sustainability, corporate sustainability, ecology, sociology, CEO, internal
72 environment, external environment, public relations, emotional intelligence. bullied amounted to 12.6% of the
73 respondents while 24% had been bullied in some sort of way and another 12% had witnessed workplace bullying,
74 but did nothing to address the issue. The remaining of the totality did not experience or been targeted as victims.
75 Unfortunately, 72% of the perpetrators held a position of authority. Also, the distribution of respondents who
76 were either bullied or had been bullied during a certain period of time totaled 36.6%, rounded to 37% (Workplace
77 Bullying Institute, 2007, p. 4; Namie & Namie, 2009, p. 205). Most experts suggest that mid-management should
78 take an active role to reshape the organizational culture to prevent workplace bullying (Liefoghe, & Mac Davey,
79 2001). Doing so would allow the organization to minimize cost associated with the potential of work productivity
80 loss, employee turnover, workers compensation, and court litigation (Hoel & Einarsen, 2010).

81 **7 IV. The Lack of Leadership Initiatives**

82 In certain instances, organizational leaders are faced with the challenge of meeting work expectations in an effort
83 to increase work productivity with minimal resources. Unfortunately, this has led to misguided organizational
84 change issues (Rivero & Theodore, 2014). Other studies suggest that the lack of communication between
85 employer/employee is to blame for organizational change resistance (Ford, Ford, and D'Amelio 2008). On the
86 other hand, it is understood that organizational leaders who promote trust in the workplace, (particularly when
87 organizational change initiatives are taking place), are far more successful as opposed to other organizations that
88 do not promote this philosophy. Rivero further states, During organizational transition, employees are uncertain
89 of the future, which can have an effect on the transitional stages of an organization. This is a critical stage
90 that will determine how quickly the organization can transcend its business processes. This being said, it is
91 important that an organization promotes organizational change readiness. This leads to successful change agents
92 that promote a positive work environment (2014a, p.

93 **8 2).**

94 A seasoned leader should be emotionally stable in order to deal with uncertainties as the organization is
95 transitioning. Moreover, other researchers have suggested that leaders with a high level of emotional intelligence
96 (EI) are ideal for leading an organization. According to Goleman (2011), a leader with high emotional intelligence
97 is one who is self-aware of his/her surroundings, portrays empathy among employees/staff members, and has

98 good social skills. As Stein & Book (1999) point out, due to the complexity of organizational change, a highly
99 emotionally intelligent leader is better equipped to make difficult decisions that may have an effect on others in
100 the workplace.

101 According to Rivero (2014b), "Modern organizational leaders are placed in difficult situations to act upon
102 due circumstances that are beyond their control. At times, expectations are unreachable/ unrealistic and
103 employers/employees are expected to perform despite the unlikeness of reaching those expectations" (p. 12).
104 V.

105 **9 Corporate Sustainability**

106 Corporate Sustainability has continued to be an important part of organizational behavior discipline throughout
107 America. As a result of organizational change initiatives, it is important that corporate sustainability be embraced
108 to keep the organization right on track with its strategic objectives.

109 According to Heintz & Parry (2014), a corporation is considered to be a legal entity that is separate by its
110 owners and administrative staff members (p. 7). As Theodore (2014) According to Dunphy, Griffiths, and Benn
111 (2007), corporate sustainability is concerned with the ecological system, human survival and survival of other
112 species, the development of a humane society, and the creation of a work environment that provides dignity and
113 selffulfillment for those parties involved.

114 This being said, from an external environment perspective, an organization should be concerned with ecological
115 and sociological areas that are beyond its control.

116 For example, an organization should be concerned with government legislations, economy, or physical
117 environment that may have a direct impact on the overall organizational strategic plan. "Moreover, it is vital
118 that organizations keep abreast of new government relations sudden changes to the environment. By doing so,
119 the organization is better prepared to make sudden changes to the overall strategic plan" ??Rivero, 2014b, p.
120 13).

121 Similarly, from an internal environment perspective, an organization should promote equitable treatment of
122 its employees at every level of the organizational hierarchy ??Rivero & Theodore, 2014, p. 2). By doing so, it
123 will support the corporate sustainability model throughout the organizational setting, which will eventually lead
124 to a positive work environment.

125 Most importantly, it is critical that leaders have an understanding of corporate sustainability factors that
126 may have an effect on the overall organizational setting. Although it is understood that organizations are
127 faced with challenges with minimal operational resources, a leader should maintain his/her composure prior to
128 communicating with staff members. This will have a

129 **10 Global Journal of Management and Business Research**

130 Volume XVI Issue I Version I Year () A positive impact on the overall work environment, which will eventually
131 lead to the increase of work productivity. Also, leaders should monitor the organizational climate for subtle
132 changes that may have the potential to derail the organizational setting.

133 **11 VI.**

134 **12 Recommendations**

135 Progressive organizations should continue to make improvements to embrace the corporate sustainability model.
136 This being said, the following recommendations are suggested.

137 **13 Summary**

138 It is understood that American firms need to embrace organizational change initiatives in order to stay
139 competitive. Misguided organizational change occurs when goals and objectives are not aligned and well
140 presented to subordinates, which leads to miscommunication. In some cases, employees are overworked, and
141 mistreated by management. In certain instances, managers are not emotionally fit to deal with the day-to-day
142 work responsibilities due to the lack of leadership abilities. This causes infighting among employers/employees
143 preventing the organization from ever meeting its goals and objectives.

144 Although there are certain organizations that have embraced the corporate sustainability model, there are
145 others that have not. Corporate sustainability should be incorporated by all organizations, regardless. At the
146 end, the organization is better fit to meet its goals and objectives. ^{1 2 3}

¹© 2016 Global Journals Inc. (US)

²© 2016 Global Journals Inc. (US) 1Corporate Sustainability Factors that Promote a Positive Work Environment

³© 2016 Global Journals Inc. (US) 1

147 [European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology] , *European Journal of Work and Organizational
148 Psychology* 19 (1) p. .

149 [Global Journal of Management and Business Research] , *Global Journal of Management and Business Research
150* 14 (4) p. .

151 [Mississauga] , Ont Mississauga . Jossey-Bass.

152 [American Journal of Business Education (AJBE)] , *American Journal of Business Education (AJBE)* 2 (5) .

153 [Rivero ()] *A review of emotional intelligence initiatives from a corporate sustainability*, O Rivero . 2014b.

154 [Kotter ()] *A Sense of urgency*, J P Kotter . 2008. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

155 [Liefooghe and Davey ()] 'Accounts of workplace bullying: The role of the organization'. A P Liefooghe , K Davey
156 . *European Journal of work and organizational psychology* 2001. 10 (4) p. .

157 [Hornstein ()] *Brutal bosses and their prey: How to identify and overcome abuse in the workplace*, H A Hornstein
158 . 1996. New York: Riverhead Books.

159 [Heintz and Parry ()] *College accounting*, J Heintz , R Parry . 2014. Mason, OH: Cengage Learning. (st ed.)

160 [Matthew ()] 'Leader creativity as a predictor of leading change in organizations'. C T Matthew . *Journal of
161 Applied Social Psychology* 2009. 39 (1) p. .

162 [Goleman ()] *Leadership: The power of emotional intelligence*, D Goleman . 2011. Northampton, MA: More than
163 Sound.

164 [Rivero ()] 'Misguided organizational change initiatives and how it promotes a destructive work environment'. O
165 Rivero . *International Journal of Management & Information Systems (IJMIS)* 2013. 17 (3) p. .

166 [Hutchinson et al. ()] 'Organizational change as a legitimized vehicle for bullies'. M Hutchinson , M H Vickers ,
167 D Jackson , L Wilkes . *Health Care Management Review* 2005. 30 (4) p. . (I'm gonna do what I wanna do)

168 [Adams et al. ()] *Organizational change for corporate sustainability: A guide for leaders and change agents of
169 the future*, A Adams , N ; D C Crawford , A Griffiths , S Benn . 1992. 2007. London; New York: Routledge.
170 (Bullying at work: How to confront and overcome it. nd ed.)

171 [Ford et al. ()] 'Resistance to change: The rest of the story'. J D Ford , L W Ford , A & D'amelio . *Academy of
172 Management Review* 2008. 33 (2) p. .

173 [Hoel and Einarsen ()] *Shortcomings of an anti-bullying relations: The case of Sweden*, H Hoel , S Einarsen .
174 2010.

175 [Winstead et al. ()] *Teaching The 'Soft Skills': A Professional Development Curriculum To Enhance The
176 Employability Skills Of Business Graduates*, A S Winstead , B L Adams , M R Sillah . 2011.

177 [Namie and Namie ()] *The bully at work: What you can do to stop the hurt and reclaim your dignity on the job*,
178 G Namie , R Namie . 2000. Naperville, IL: Sourcebooks.

179 [Stein and Book ()] *The EQ edge: Emotional intelligence and your success*, S Stein , H Book . 1999.

180 [Rivero and Theodore ()] *The importance of public relations in corporate sustainability*, O Rivero , J Theodore
181 . 2014.

182 [Rivero ()] 'The lack of leadership leading to misguided organizational change'. O Rivero . *Global Journal of
183 Management and Business Research* 2014a. 13 (12) p. .

184 [Theodore ()] 'The necessity of strategic leadership in corporate sustainability'. J Theodore . *Journal of
185 Sustainability Management (JSM)* 2014. 2 (1) p. .

186 [Namie and Namie ()] 'U.S. workplace bullying: Some basic considerations and consultation interventions'. G
187 Namie , R Namie . *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research* 2009. 61 (3) p. .

188 [Workplace Bullying Institute Zogby International (2007)] *Workplace Bullying Institute & Zogby International*,
189 <http://workplacebullying.org/multi/pdf/WBIssurvey2007.pdf> 2007. September 2007. March 24.
190 2015. U.S. (Workplace Bullying Survey)