

Organizational Culture And Its Linkages To Organizational Sustainability: A Study On Employee's Perception, In Corporate Organizations

Jyothi Kumar*

India, a land of rich culture and heritage, has to an extent made it possible for its firms to have a culture passed to the employees and have them engaged in the organizational sustainability practices. The culture of an organization is intertwined with the philosophy, purposes, functions and structures and wherein organizational members develop mutually-accepted ideas and beliefs regarding what is real, what is important and how to respond. This study proposes that a cultural perspective could be used to explore sustainability of organizations (organizations meaning private, public and multinational corporations). However, there is no wholly accepted model of culture and the purpose of this paper is not to analyze the theoretical debate with regard to culture, but to explain the use of the theoretical framework adopted for this Study-Schein's (1985) "levels of culture" model. Schein's framework will allow an analysis of those deeper underlying assumptions about sustainability in the organization as well as analysis at other levels of culture. Assumptions are likely to be manifested through observable sustainability policies and practices. Schein's model thus provides a framework for analysis that constructs a holistic view of sustainability in the organization. Schein (2004) defines culture in terms of "shared basic assumptions" derived from "shared learning experiences". This then evolves as the correct way to perceive and behave in situations and becomes "the way we do things around here" (Deal and Kennedy, 1982). Furthermore, according to Schein (2004), organizational culture will manifest itself as visible organizational structures and style, norms, values, rituals and climate. Values and beliefs of the organization, whether derived from initial founders or evolved from organizational leadership become the embodiment of the underlying organizational philosophy which will predict behavior that can be observed.

Keywords: Organization, Corporate, Sustainability, Culture, Perception

JEL Classifications: L2, L20, M14, Q5, Q50.

1. Introduction

Sustainability as an aspect is more relevant as the opportunities for corporations in India are quite different from those of developed countries. In developed countries with strong governments, and some form of social security, the focus is on limiting the negative environmental impact of industrial activities rather than problems of the underprivileged. Corporations in developing countries like India need to address problems, which are development oriented in a more holistic manner Hoekstra, (2003). It is in this context that the need for Public-Private partnership with well-defined controls and processes for the best use of resources for social change gains importance. "Social reforms driven by the community will bring people together, turn the attention of the masses to task that benefit society and reinforce peace and harmony" Konana, (2006). The old concept of business has undergone a radical

*Mrs. Jyothi Kumar, Department of Management Studies, Christ University, India, Email: jyothi.s@christuniversity.in

Kumar

change. Now the concept is that the business is not an end in itself but a valuable means to achieve an end viz. Human welfare and public good. Today business is regarded as a social institution forming an integral part of the social system. It touches every aspect of our life. There is only one definition of Business purpose - "To create a customer". (Peter F. Drucker) In modern times profit making is considered as a secondary objective and here we give too much regard to our prospective customer. In modern times, customer is regarded as a king of the market. Business cannot survive without customers. Developing economies like India faces complex socio economic challenges during the times of Globalization. Within the context of Globalization, the role of the corporation is changing. The traditional assumption that the business of a business is to make profits (Friedman, 1970) changes to the belief that drivers of business success are not the traditional drivers of quality or price or convenience alone. Sustainability is an issue of higher importance because of the result of structural changes in the organizations which are on a spree of downsizing, merging and outsourcing as due to the increasing complexity and sheer contingencies in the environment. Assessing and managing organizational culture can help create both stability and adaptability for organizations.

Sustain comes from the Latin *sustenare*, meaning to keep or hold up. Modern use of the word can be traced to German forestry science of the 1700s, in which it was the precursor to today's 'sustainable yield', a level of resource extraction that can be maintained over time. The Oxford English Dictionary dates the first usage of 'sustainable' – meaning 'capable of being maintained at a certain level' – to 1965, when the McGraw Hill Dictionary of Modern Economics defined 'sustainable growth' as "a rise in per capita income or per capita real gross national product that is capable of continuing for a long time. The origin of the term "sustainable development" is generally taken to be the Brundtland report of 1987, which defines it as: "development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs". A simpler statement is Dr Peter Smith's "leaving the planet to the next generation in no worse state than that in which the present generation found it". Sustainability as an aspect is more relevant as the opportunities for corporations in India are quite different from those of developed countries. In developed countries with strong governments, and some form of social security, the focus is on limiting the negative environmental impact of industrial activities rather than problems of the underprivileged. Corporations in developing countries like India need to address problems, which are development oriented in a more holistic manner (Hoekstra, 2003). It is in this context that the need for Public-Private partnership with well-defined controls and processes for the best use of resources for social change gains importance. "Social reforms driven by the community will bring people together, turn the attention of the masses to task that benefit society and reinforce peace and harmony" (Konana, 2006, p. 10).

Corporations , here meaning profit making organizations, also serve the community through the concept of fair product distribution. There is growing evidence that global companies can serve the poor more efficiently and provide better products and services at a lower cost and at a profit. This will involve corporations to decide products/services for the enormous population at the bottom of the pyramid. The basic assumption is that this population segment has some disposable income and firms can still make profits at large volume (Prahalad and Hammond, 2002). There's no alternative to sustainable development. (Ram Nidumolu, C.K. Prahalad, and M.R.

Kumar

Rangaswami) The articulated thoughts of the authors reflect that Even though so, many companies are convinced that the more environment-friendly they become, the more the effort will erode their competitiveness. They believe it will add to costs and will not deliver immediate financial benefits.. Suppliers can't provide green inputs or transparency; sustainable manufacturing will demand new equipment and processes; and customers will not pay more for eco-friendly products during a recession. That's why most executives treat the need to become sustainable as a corporate social responsibility, divorced from business objectives.

Not surprisingly, the fight to save the planet has turned into a pitched battle between governments and companies, between companies and consumer activists, and sometimes between consumer activists and governments. It resembles a three-legged race, in which you move forward with the two untied legs but the tied third leg holds you back. One solution, mooted by policy experts and environmental activists, is more and increasingly tougher regulation. They argue that voluntary action is unlikely to be enough. Another group suggests educating and organizing consumers so that they will force businesses to become sustainable. Although both legislation and education are necessary, they may not be able to solve the problem quickly or completely. Executives behave as though they have to choose between the largely social benefits of developing sustainable products or processes and the financial costs of doing so. But that's simply not true. Research shows that sustainability is a mother lode of organizational and technological innovations that yield both bottom-line and top-line returns. Becoming environment-friendly lowers costs because companies end up reducing the inputs they use. In addition, the process generates additional revenues from better products or enables companies to create new businesses.

2. Theoretical correlation - Culture and Sustainability

Schein (2004) defines culture in terms of "shared basic assumptions" derived from "shared learning experiences". This then evolves as the correct way to perceive and behave in situations and becomes "the way we do things around here" (Deal and Kennedy, 1982, p4). Furthermore, according to Schein (2004), organizational culture will manifest itself as visible organizational structures and style, norms, values, rituals and climate. Values and beliefs of the organization, whether derived from initial founders or evolved from organizational leadership become the embodiment of the underlying organizational philosophy which will predict behaviour that can be observed. The strong binding element of an organizations culture is put forward by Schein as the "basic underlying assumptions" which are explained as those which are so taken for granted that there becomes little variance where they tend to be non-confrontable and non-debatable. In order to analyse culture, Schein proposes levels of culture – the term level referring to the "degree to which the cultural phenomenon is visible to the observer". It is to understand that there exists unison with the fact that Organizational culture and its dissemination to the employee force will derive some benefits to the organization in terms of having a strong focus to create a sustainable business organization. Employee engagements in sustainability focused activities shall reap benefits of a long run, thriving organizations.

3. Review of Literature

Although Indian firms have traditionally practiced corporate philanthropy, the issue of corporate responsibility and safety standards and code of ethics became an overnight issue after the tragic incident in Bhopal in 1987. A chemical plant operated by Union Carbide Limited leaked toxic gas enveloping the entire city and left thousands of people dead in what has been dubbed as “one of the most monumental industrial catastrophes in history” Robertson and Fadil (1998). However, initial expert interviews have revealed that apart from a few isolated occurrences, Indian corporations still do not face immense pressure consistently from national nonprofits or third parties for sustainable responsibilities. The pressure exerted mostly comes from international bodies Sawhney (2004). Nevertheless, it can be safely stated that the recent wave of undertaking sustainable business practices by corporate leaders has reached India by and large, and active corporate sustainability measures has been taking the place of traditional passive philanthropy British Council et al. (2002). The majority of the bigger firms in India today claim to have sustainability related policies and practices. Empirical evidence also shows conflicting evidence on the role of MNCs in this context. Ruud (2002) opines that the multinational corporations in India are the drivers of the sustainability agenda. They act in a more environmentally sustainable manner than local companies do, and follow stricter standards in accordance with their headquarters. As a result, sustainable business practices often threaten the competitive advantage for the MNCs that are more responsible. However, Mohan (2001) finds no discernable differences between the sustainability policies of MNCs and local companies in India. This finding is corroborated by Sawhney (2004). The survey by Kumar et al. (2001) reveals the existence of the general perception that “MNCs are not giving their due to the Indian society” Kumar et al. 2002, Thorpe and Prakash-Mani (2004) essentially conveys the same message in a more neutral tone, saying that MNCs in India view sustainability only as a risk management issue, with little integration in the core management practices. Another study shows that MNCs in India only practice sustainability partially, and hardly engage in policies and practices in tune with their parent companies in Europe (Rose 2004). Kumar et al. (2002) opined that very few MNCs actively pursue sustainability measures, and reported that the public perception of MNCs concerning trustworthiness in general is very low. In fact, MNCs rated responsible in India were graded upon their ‘good quality products and services’, ‘trusted brand’, ‘good company’, and ‘personal knowledge about the company’ and not based on their social and environmental performances Kumar et al. (2002). To sum up, although there has been some specific initiatives taken by certain corporations, the proliferation still seems restrained and chaotic. Therefore, the roles of (both local and multinational) corporations in India with relation to sustainability practices remain ambiguous, vague, controversial and unsolved. The existence of conflicting evidences e.g. Ruud (2002), Kumar et al. (2001) among studies from Indian companies clearly shows that their role in the context of sustainability are yet to be determined.

The perception by individuals that business has a purely economic function is a concept that has been challenged. Historically, the role of business was to provide goods and services and it was left to theologians to discuss fair wages, and the morality of capitalism Lantos, (2001). However, the notion that business has a responsibility beyond just making profits for the shareholder Friedman, (1970) and has wider responsibilities to stakeholders generally Freeman, (1984) began to take a

Kumar

firm hold in the latter half of the twentieth century. The rise in corporate power over the last couple of decades has received attention from the general public and academics Crane and Matten, (2007) giving rise to public discourse about the responsibility of corporations, that now affect and shape the lives of people across the globe. De George (2006) states that social responsibility is a term that became popular in the 1960s. It is still a term used indiscriminately by many to cover areas such as legal, moral and social responsibility. De George acknowledges thus, that Sustainability is used in a manner which is ambiguous. Carroll's (1991) model proposes that there are four elements that are either required, expected or desired by society that must be met in order for true Sustainability to be experienced. They are: economic, legal, ethical and philanthropic. Friedman (1970), however, disagreed with the growing calls for Sustainability, and maintained that the only social responsibility a business has is to make profits and doing good for society was the role of elected governments. To date, the widely differing interpretations of Sustainability plus the evolving nature of the concept Knouse et al., (2007) have made CSR open to differing interpretations both theoretically and practically. Moon, Crane and Matten (2005) argue that Sustainability is a contested concept where application is in a relatively open manner. According to Knouse et al. (2007), ethical codes are influenced by the prevailing ideology of the time regarding the social responsibility of business (p 94). The moves towards globalisation, however, in the last decades in the twentieth century have pushed corporations towards international codes of ethics. Knouse et al. (2007) suggest that 'prescriptive standards for the twenty-first century thus reflect many aspects of legal compliance, business practices, and international concerns'. Finally, in the twenty-first century Knouse et al. (2007) state that the increasing number of companies becoming global enterprises led to global emphases on codes of ethics which are compliant with local laws, corporate responsibility, environmental protection and universal values. Matten and Moon (2004) found that Sustainability has gained unprecedented momentum in the recent years. Additionally, the study included an added dimension which acknowledges the possibility of different cognitive processes by groups of respondents. There are well known cognitive and psychology differences between men and women. For example, Tannen (1990 and 1994) reports that in conversation men report and women rapport. These outcomes are consistent with the stereotypical perceptions of gender roles. Additionally, Wark and Krebs (1996) review gender and dilemma differences in real-life moral judgments. Notably, females made higher moral stage and more care-based moral judgments than males on personal real-life dilemmas. Gilligan (1982) notes that men approach morality from the point of view of basic rights and the respect the rights of others, whereas women view morality as imposing limitations on behaviour, such that that people have interpersonal responsibilities with a care imperative. Gilligan concludes that female morality has a "responsibility orientation" and male morality has a "justice orientation".

Managers' perceptions of organizations can be different from those of non-managers'; Smith and Taylor (2000), identified Top manager's behavior and Concern for processes as two factors within their Learning organization ideal questionnaire. Bamber and Castka (2004) demonstrated that these two factors are more likely to be Orientation to managers' roles and behaviours or Orientation to employees' roles and behaviors. Hence, it seems plausible that managers and non-managers with have different cognitive sets across a range of issues, including Sustainability.

4. Methodology

This study proposes that a cultural perspective could be used to explore sustainability of Organizations. However, there is no wholly accepted model of culture and the purpose of this paper is not to analyse the theoretical debate with regard to culture, but to explain the use of the theoretical framework adopted for this study – Schein’s (1985) “levels of culture” model. Schein’s framework will allow an analysis of those deeper underlying assumptions about sustainability in the organization as well as analysis at other levels of culture. Assumptions are likely to be manifested through observable sustainability policies and practices. Schein’s model thus provides a framework for analysis that constructs a holistic view of sustainability in the organization. A widely accepted definition of culture is that given by Schein (1985) “a pattern of basic assumptions, invented, discovered or developed by a given group as it learns to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration- that has worked well enough to be considered valuable and therefore , to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think and feel in relation to those problems.” Schein models the “levels of culture” with “artifacts”, “beliefs and values”, and “underlying assumptions”, as three layers (Schein, 2004). The model is adopted as this study’s analytical framework in order to analyse sustainability as organizational assumptions; as manifested through these three levels of this cultural manifestation of sustainability, highlighting key issues. By using Schein’s model as a theoretical framework, an understanding is possible of visible and invisible elements contributing the culture of sustainability within the organization, in addition to those observable and measurable elements of organizational cultural sustainability constructs.

Objectives of the Study:

- To Study the concept of Sustainability and its components
- To understand Organizational Culture
- To draw a linkage between Organizational Culture and Sustainability
- To understand employees perception of Sustainability

Scope of the Study:

The study intends to draw a parallel and find any correlation between the presence of a strong organizational culture, which make the transformation into sustainable business.

Hypothesis

1. H1: Younger respondents have more favourable perceptions of sustainability than older respondents
2. H2: Women respondents have more favourable perceptions of each sustainability than men respondents.
3. H3: Respondents who are managers have more favourable perceptions of sustainability than respondents who are non-managers.
4. H4: Scale scores totalled for each of the Sustainability elements will all correlate with each other.

Tools Used

This study proposes that a cultural perspective could be used to explore sustainability of Organizations. The organization of the paper is in terms of understanding what the concept intends, in relation to sustainability and the cultural

Kumar

impact on sustainability. Extensive literature review was undertaken to understand the concepts of culture, perception and sustainability. Research work post year 2000 were looked at to understand major findings and efforts authors have taken to define the concepts technically. Then there were tools designed to capture the perception of the employees on sustainability issues. Mark Coleman, in his work “A Stimulus for the better world”, writes, For those companies that have embraced business sustainability and proactively pursued sustainable business strategies, the following benefits are most frequently cited lower operating costs; a license to operate; enhanced corporate reputation; more efficient and responsible use of commodities and natural resources; more competitively priced products and higher margins.

The tool used is a perception questionnaire based on the Schein’s model of culture, which allows employee engagement to initiate sustainability policies and practices of the organization. There are two sets of questionnaires, one being a schedule describing the 3 variants of Culture according to Schein – the Artifacts, the Espoused values and the Underlying Assumptions of the Organization and the second Questionnaire comprise of 19 questions divided into certain criteria apart from a few demographic variables. Time period of the study was between the June 2010 and march 2011. The analysis should be a fact finding exercise to reveal the nature of impact of culture on the organization and its effectiveness. Questionnaires and semi structured interviews have already been devised using the concept of CSR which encompasses social and environmental approaches, Friedmanite views, external roles and company obligations, the tension of implementation of Sustainability with profit demands and a general exploration of the relationship between Culture and Sustainability within the organization. Data is collected both from the Primary and Secondary source and analysed using Microsoft Excel and SPSS. The measures of Central Tendencies, Standard deviations, ANOVA, and Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis, Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization is adopted.

Limitation of the Study

Small and disproportionate sample of men and women were selected, due to the difficulty in getting the data as not many organization were cooperative in allowing collection of data. There was also Disproportionate sample of managers and non managers, and a one off questionnaire. It needs to be noted that perception can change over time. However, this was outside the scope of this study. This indicates that future research needs a structured approach with a balanced sample

5. Analysis and Interpretation

Table 1: ANOVA – Senior Managers / Managers

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Discussion of Sustainability	Between Groups	.002	1	.002	.002	.963
	Within Groups	35.218	48	.734		
	Total	35.220	49			
Donating money	Between Groups	1.136	1	1.136	5.597	.022
	Within Groups	9.744	48	.203		
	Total	10.880	49			
Returns	Between Groups	2.135	1	2.135	5.033	.030
	Within Groups	20.365	48	.424		
	Total	22.500	49			
Difficult to achieve	Between Groups	.412	1	.412	1.661	.204
	Within Groups	11.908	48	.248		
	Total	12.320	49			
Involves community	Between Groups	.099	1	.099	.147	.703
	Within Groups	32.401	48	.675		
	Total	32.500	49			
Environment	Between Groups	.047	1	.047	.185	.669
	Within Groups	12.273	48	.256		
	Total	12.320	49			
Sustainability difficult unethical	Between Groups	.769	1	.769	7.027	.011
	Within Groups	5.251	48	.109		
	Total	6.020	49			
No one bothers about Sustainability	Between Groups	.779	1	.779	3.195	.080
	Within Groups	11.701	48	.244		
	Total	12.480	49			
Sustainability is an illusion	Between Groups	.152	1	.152	.113	.738
	Within Groups	64.568	48	1.345		
	Total	64.720	49			
Develop staff	Between Groups	.012	1	.012	.039	.844
	Within Groups	14.568	48	.304		
	Total	14.580	49			
Time to community	Between Groups	2.004	1	2.004	3.204	.080
	Within Groups	30.016	48	.625		
	Total	32.020	49			

Kumar

Consider environment	Between Groups	.007	1	.007	.013	.908
	Within Groups	26.493	48	.552		
	Total	26.500	49			
Social impact	Between Groups	.185	1	.185	.720	.400
	Within Groups	12.315	48	.257		
	Total	12.500	49			
Lack of awareness of Sustainability	Between Groups	.038	1	.038	.054	.817
	Within Groups	33.642	48	.701		
	Total	33.680	49			
Environmental impact discussed	Between Groups	5.766	1	5.766	2.591	.114
	Within Groups	106.814	48	2.225		
	Total	112.580	49			
Company literature	Between Groups	1.860	1	1.860	7.166	.010
	Within Groups	12.460	48	.260		
	Total	14.320	49			
Goal is profit	Between Groups	.013	1	.013	.053	.820
	Within Groups	11.987	48	.250		
	Total	12.000	49			
Societal wellbeing	Between Groups	1.124	1	1.124	2.524	.119
	Within Groups	21.376	48	.445		
	Total	22.500	49			
Legal regulations	Between Groups	.195	1	.195	.250	.620
	Within Groups	37.425	48	.780		
	Total	37.620	49			
Environmental policies	Between Groups	.156	1	.156	.891	.350
	Within Groups	8.424	48	.175		
	Total	8.580	49			

Kumar

Table 2: ANOVA - Age

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Discussion of Sustainability	Between Groups	4.752	3	1.584	2.391	.081
	Within Groups	30.468	46	.662		
	Total	35.220	49			
Donating money	Between Groups	.999	3	.333	1.550	.214
	Within Groups	9.881	46	.215		
	Total	10.880	49			
Returns	Between Groups	.044	3	.015	.030	.993
	Within Groups	22.456	46	.488		
	Total	22.500	49			
Difficult to achieve	Between Groups	.856	3	.285	1.145	.341
	Within Groups	11.464	46	.249		
	Total	12.320	49			
Involves community	Between Groups	11.948	3	3.983	8.915	.000
	Within Groups	20.552	46	.447		
	Total	32.500	49			
Environment	Between Groups	2.030	3	.677	3.026	.039
	Within Groups	10.290	46	.224		
	Total	12.320	49			
Sustainability difficult unethical	Between Groups	.361	3	.120	.979	.411
	Within Groups	5.659	46	.123		
	Total	6.020	49			
No one bothers about Sustainability	Between Groups	.369	3	.123	.467	.707
	Within Groups	12.111	46	.263		
	Total	12.480	49			
Sustainability is an illusion	Between Groups	3.597	3	1.199	.902	.447
	Within Groups	61.123	46	1.329		
	Total	64.720	49			
Develop staff	Between Groups	1.528	3	.509	1.796	.161
	Within Groups	13.052	46	.284		
	Total	14.580	49			
Time to community	Between Groups	.639	3	.213	.312	.816
	Within Groups	31.381	46	.682		
	Total	32.020	49			
Consider	Between	1.448	3	.483	.887	.455

Kumar

environment	Groups					
	Within Groups	25.052	46	.545		
	Total	26.500	49			
Social impact	Between Groups	2.032	3	.677	2.976	.041
	Within Groups	10.468	46	.228		
	Total	12.500	49			
Lack of awareness of Sustainability	Between Groups	4.501	3	1.500	2.365	.083
	Within Groups	29.179	46	.634		
	Total	33.680	49			
Environmental impact discussed	Between Groups	9.969	3	3.323	1.490	.230
	Within Groups	102.611	46	2.231		
	Total	112.580	49			
Company literature	Between Groups	1.447	3	.482	1.724	.175
	Within Groups	12.873	46	.280		
	Total	14.320	49			
Goal is profit	Between Groups	1.119	3	.373	1.577	.208
	Within Groups	10.881	46	.237		
	Total	12.000	49			
Societal wellbeing	Between Groups	1.008	3	.336	.719	.546
	Within Groups	21.492	46	.467		
	Total	22.500	49			
Legal regulations	Between Groups	11.239	3	3.746	6.532	.001
	Within Groups	26.381	46	.573		
	Total	37.620	49			
Environmental policies	Between Groups	.473	3	.158	.894	.451
	Within Groups	8.107	46	.176		
	Total	8.580	49			

Kumar

Table 3: ANOVA – Gender

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Discussion of Sustainability	Between Groups	.008	1	.008	.011	.918
	Within Groups	35.212	48	.734		
	Total	35.220	49			
Donating money	Between Groups	.027	1	.027	.119	.732
	Within Groups	10.853	48	.226		
	Total	10.880	49			
Returns	Between Groups	1.773	1	1.773	4.105	.048
	Within Groups	20.727	48	.432		
	Total	22.500	49			
Difficult to achieve	Between Groups	.157	1	.157	.619	.435
	Within Groups	12.163	48	.253		
	Total	12.320	49			
Involves community	Between Groups	.001	1	.001	.002	.967
	Within Groups	32.499	48	.677		
	Total	32.500	49			
Environment	Between Groups	.157	1	.157	.619	.435
	Within Groups	12.163	48	.253		
	Total	12.320	49			
Sustainability difficult unethical	Between Groups	.276	1	.276	2.310	.135
	Within Groups	5.744	48	.120		
	Total	6.020	49			
No one bothers about Sustainability	Between Groups	.862	1	.862	3.563	.065
	Within Groups	11.618	48	.242		
	Total	12.480	49			
Sustainability is an illusion	Between Groups	4.538	1	4.538	3.620	.063
	Within Groups	60.182	48	1.254		
	Total	64.720	49			
Develop staff	Between Groups	.039	1	.039	.129	.721
	Within Groups	14.541	48	.303		
	Total	14.580	49			
Time to community	Between Groups	3.475	1	3.475	5.843	.019
	Within Groups	28.545	48	.595		
	Total	32.020	49			

Kumar

Consider environment	Between Groups	.057	1	.057	.104	.749
	Within Groups	26.443	48	.551		
	Total	26.500	49			
Social impact	Between Groups	.029	1	.029	.112	.739
	Within Groups	12.471	48	.260		
	Total	12.500	49			
Lack of awareness of Sustainability	Between Groups	1.135	1	1.135	1.673	.202
	Within Groups	32.545	48	.678		
	Total	33.680	49			
Environmental impact discussed	Between Groups	2.445	1	2.445	1.066	.307
	Within Groups	110.135	48	2.294		
	Total	112.580	49			
Company literature	Between Groups	.082	1	.082	.277	.601
	Within Groups	14.238	48	.297		
	Total	14.320	49			
Goal is profit	Between Groups	.019	1	.019	.075	.786
	Within Groups	11.981	48	.250		
	Total	12.000	49			
Societal wellbeing	Between Groups	.057	1	.057	.122	.728
	Within Groups	22.443	48	.468		
	Total	22.500	49			
Legal regulations	Between Groups	1.998	1	1.998	2.692	.107
	Within Groups	35.622	48	.742		
	Total	37.620	49			
Environmental policies	Between Groups	.235	1	.235	1.352	.251
	Within Groups	8.345	48	.174		
	Total	8.580	49			

6. Interpretation

1. H1: Younger respondents have more favourable perceptions of sustainability than older respondents
 2. H2: Women respondents have more favourable perceptions of sustainability than men respondents.
 3. H3: Respondents who are managers have more favourable perceptions of sustainability than respondents who are non-managers.
 4. H4: Scale scores totalled for each of the Sustainability elements will all correlate with each other
-
1. There is not much significant difference between the way the senior managers and the junior managers think about the concept of Sustainability. We may see above with respect to certain factors Donating money, or thinking of

Kumar

featuring sustainability issues in the company literature or may societal well being, there is a difference in thinking, else it is much significant. Therefore we say that H1 is not accepted.

2. The study also does not show any results where there exists a better or favourable perception of women than men with respect to sustainability
3. Generally is assumed that Senior managers would have a favourable perception than managers, but the study showed there is not any significance with respect to such assumptions.
4. To understand the variables and their perceptions of the employees based on the strongest and the most influential among all of them the study has been done on a Rotated component Matrix with 6 Principle components.

Kumar

Table 4: Rotated Component Matrix(a)

	Component					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
4 Discussion of Sustainability	.609		.475			
5 Donating money	.411	-.399	-.302			
6 Returns		-.559	.433			
7 Difficult to achieve	.772					
8 Involves community						-.753
9 Environment	.501				.486	
10 Sustainability difficult unethical					-.767	
11 No one bothers about Sustainability					-.659	
12 Sustainability is an illusion	.651			.324		
13 Develop staff						.459
14 Time to community		.713				
15 Consider environment	.321	.725				
16 Social impact				.767		
17 Lack of awareness of Sustainability						
18 Environmental impact discussed				.831		
19 Company literature	-.371			.445	.484	
20 Goal is profit			.693			
21 Societal wellbeing			-.760			
22 Legal regulations						-.699
23 Environmental policies					.340	.454

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization. Rotation converged in 12 iterations.

Kumar

Principal component Analysis based on 6 components. (Interpretation)

I	PC 1	components	particulars
		4	4 Discussion of Sustainability
		7	7 Difficult to achieve
		9	9 Environment concerns
		12	12 Sustainability is an illusion
II	PC 2	6	6 Returns
		14	14 Time to community
		15	15 Consider environment
III	PC 3	20	21 Societal wellbeing
		21	22 Legal regulations
IV	PC 4	16	16 Social impact
		18	18 Environmental impact discussed
V	PC 5	10	10 Sustainability difficult unethical
		11	11 No one bothers about Sustainability
VI	PC 6	8	8 Involves community
		22	22 Legal regulations
		23	23 Environmental policies

The Extraction Method, Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization. Rotation converged in 12 iterations.

The grouping according to the most important criteria's thought by the employees is grouped together based on having correlation between them either positive or negative.

1. Employees of the organizations think that the most concerned aspect of understanding what Sustainability is through a thorough deliberation or discussion of sustainability, though they think it is difficult to achieve. However it is essential to consider environmental concerns and employees think that sustainability is an illusion. Hence these are considered to be the most aggressive of all the variables of the study.
2. Second in order is what employees think on sustainability, considering returns and providing time to community and considering environment. It is thus understood that employees also affirm to the fact that, returns of the organization is an essential component to achieving sustainability.
3. Societal Wellbeing and Legal Regulations are considered to be on the 3rd most important priority. Primary motive of any company is to make profit, however it is also a universal truth to consider societal wellbeing and also to adhere to legal regulations.

Kumar

4. Any organization is considered sustainable only when the environmental aspects are manifested and social impact and environmental aspects are discussed. This is found to be in the 4th most important priorities of the organization
5. It is evident from the analysis that employees rarely assume that sustainability is difficult and unethical, and generally no one bothers about sustainability.
6. The analysis signifies that sustainability is least thought of, to be aspects to involve community, should there be a consideration on legal regulations and having environmental policies.

7. Summary of Findings

A major goal of this paper was study the employees' perception of Sustainability. The findings present plausible reasons why the results might have turned out the way they did.

1. There was no significant difference between the Younger respondents and the older respondents with regard to perception the element of Sustainability,
2. One way analysis of variance showed no overall significant effect with respect to gender and perception of Sustainability.
3. One way analysis of variance showed no overall significant effect with respect to managerial status for three of the five Sustainability elements, Environmental issues External roles and company obligation and Community and Social Impact. However, the analysis showed a significant effect with respect to managerial status for two of the Sustainability elements- the extent of addressing Sustainability in the organization and ethical reality of implementation of Sustainability.
4. Understanding that Sustainability means developing sound environmental policies by the company receives highest ranking. It coincides with the generic feeling that companies should primarily take care of the environment (Effluent management, Waste disposal, etc.)
5. Sustainability can be viewed as the company's responsibility toward society- Consumers, shareholders and towards its own employees. Societal concerns ranked high in the study. Concerns related to share holders and employees are ranked lower compared to societal and environmental concern.
6. Perceptions about Sustainability as being involved with community services is ranked higher. Community as being involved in company affairs has ranked lower. Company's responsibility to developing its staff does not find a very favorable response as being past of Sustainability
7. Ethical reality of implementing Sustainability - the study found most responses ranked lower. It reflects a better stand that respondents have taken with problems of ethical dilemmas. It could be seen as respondents not viewing Sustainability as being opposed to adhering to ethical standards.

Through the findings of the study it is noted that many of the things which is presumed to be ranked in the positive did not be so, and this can be attributed to the nature of the study , which involves perception based analysis. Perception as a matter of study involves individuals behavior and is determined by the situation, time

Kumar

and more so, on certain recency effects. The perception by individuals that business has a purely economic function is a concept that has been challenged.

8. Implications of the Study

1. Based on ANOVA it was found that the older employees have unfavourable perception of the element of Sustainability - Ethical reality in implementing Sustainability Therefore companies should concentrate on orienting the older employer along with new employees. In order to create more Societal conscious employees, the companies can ensure that, at the time of placement of new young employees, orientation need to given to create awareness of every employees responsibility towards the community. Infusing new blood and new ideas can shape the organization as well as the society.
2. Based on one way analysis it is understood that in general women and men respondents have no difference in consciousness and awareness to respond to the society and its well being. So more and more community development programmes can be thought of to enhance the blend in delivering thorough social development initiatives.
3. It is understood that organizations comprise of more of non - managers than that of managers. Hence educating the non-mangers on the plans initiated on the extent of addressing Sustainability in the organization and ethical reality of implementation of Sustainability is essential as implementations of such policies are generally at the non-managerial level.
4. In today's world of awareness to societal issues, it is quite impressive to note through the analysis that every employee has had a internalization of societal concerns and positive attitude to community development and the elements of the Sustainability. This shows the importance to be given by the companies on most of the elements of the Sustainability
5. Since Sustainability means developing sound environmental policies by the company, receives highest ranking the companies should primarily take care of the environment. As the result of the study shows that employees have thoroughly understood environmental issues and the ways and means of control environmental hazards, care needs to be taken to ensure complete waste management.
6. It is interesting to note that the pyramid has started to get inverted, where usually profit making and customer satisfaction always preceded societal welfare. It necessitates putting the social welfare at the pinnacle of the pyramid by the companies.
7. Since Perceptions about Sustainability as being involved with community services is ranked higher, it is advisable that the companies should start projects in community services either on its own or it can even be outsourced through some renowned NGOs.
8. It is better understood that fewer respondents favored Ethical reality in implementing Sustainability. Often organizations face an ethical dilemma in operations as to what is legal Vs what is ethical. The question to be answered is, are all legality part of ethical perspective, or the vice versa. It has to be judged and understood by the employees of the organization.

To sum up the implications it can be said that it is the combined responsibility of each and every one of the organization, be it the management or the non management,

Kumar

women or men, young or old, to internalize the concept of Sustainability and understand its relevance in today's business environment. It is essential to mark differently from the others and also to enhance the service orientation which is quite essential for success and survival.

9. Conclusions

The link between culture and Sustainability has been established in International Business operations and a theoretical framework. Sustainability in an Indian context has yet to be explored, although a suitable methodology, with appropriate data collection procedures, for each level of culture in India has been presented. Although, the study is on a small scale it is likely to provide interesting insights despite limitations of scope.. Importantly, this study provides a platform from which to conduct further comparisons. Sustainability do seem to be quite well developed among the best-practice companies responding to the questionnaire. Perhaps not surprisingly, however, there is rather more activity. As corporations pursue growth through globalization, they have encountered new challenges that impose limits to their growth and potential profits. Government regulations, tariffs, environmental restrictions and varying standards of what constitutes labour exploitation are problems that can cost organizations millions of dollars. Some view ethical issues as simply a costly hindrance. Some companies use Sustainability methodologies as a strategic tactic to gain public support for their presence in global markets, helping them sustain a competitive advantage by using their social contributions to provide a subconscious level of advertising.

The motivation for the study is sheer interest in the area of Culture studies in organizations. In today's business environment, it is clearly understood that culture and values play a vital role in the making of an organization. This will directly or indirectly impact the sustainability of any organization. The study focused on the Employees perception of Sustainability and deliberated also on the Organizational Culture in order to make sense of the aspects specified by Schein in his Model of Organizational Culture. It was observed that the Employees in the company were aware of the Sustainability activities and would volunteer to take active part in the community development activities of the organization. It could be assumed that Sustainability would mean, Donating money to Charity, Maximizing returns to shareholders, Donating time to community or Developing Staff. No economic system is sustainable unless it accommodates the ecosystems on which it depends.. We need to acquire the ability to distinguish between need and greed, in spite of what the society assure us we need. An organization's general business environment shapes and influences its strategy; it does not mechanistically determine it. The characteristics of the general business environment and the threats and opportunities it presents to an organization have a subjective component, since they are influenced by managerial interpretations. Organizations need to identify and analyze specific organizational and human resources, in addition to focusing on pollution control/prevention technologies and specific organizational capabilities that will generate dynamic proactive environmental strategies.

Through this study it is evident that employee engagements in creating a sustaining business and its environment is paying. It is considered the need of the hour to be in constant monitoring and governance of the sustainability issues. It is easier said and done through the willful and voluntary cooperation of members of the organization in

Kumar

creating and sustaining business of today. Educate the requirement to the people across the pyramid, involve people in community development projects, engage them in policy implementation, regard human resource as an asset and give them due concerns. This will ease the process of working together to attain the common goal of preserving the Today for a Safer Tomorrow.

10. Suggestions for future Research

1. Future study can look into cross company analysis of the Sustainability practices.
2. A comparative study on the Sustainability practices in different types of industries can be undertaken.
3. Cross Cultural implication between Sustainability in India with any other Asian countries can be studied.
4. Cross Cultural influence of Sustainability between the Asian and the European countries can be undertaken.
5. A study on the impact of Sustainability practices on the organizational climate of the companies can be undertaken.

References

- Barbier, E 1989, *The Economic Value of Ecosystems:1 - Tropical Wetlands*, Gatekeeper. Series No LEEC 89-02.
- Chakraborty, KS 1997, 'Business ethics in India', *Journal of Business Ethics* 16, pp.1529-1538
- Collins, JC and JI Porras 2000, *Built to Last: Successful Habits of Visionary Companies*. (revised edition) New York:
- Deal and Kennedy, 1982, p4: *The rites and rituals of Corporate Life*
- D Shyam, A Rosencranz 2001, Oxford University Press, New Delhi
- Freeman, RE 1984, *Strategic Management. A stakeholder approach*, Boston: Pitman
- Frankental, P 2001, 'Corporate a PR invention?', *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, 6 [1], pp. 18-23
- Friedman, M 1970, 'The social responsibility of business is to increase profits', *New York Times Magazine*, 13th September 33, pp. 122-126
- Foster, R and Kaplan, S 2000, *Creative Destruction, Survival of business - 1962 to 1998*
- Harper Collins. Collins, Jim 2001, *Good to Great: Why some companies make the leap, and others don't*. New York: Harper Business.
- Hazari, RK and Oza, AN 1970, 'Public Sector in India' in Robinson, E. A. G. and Kidron, M. (1970) (eds) *Economic Development in South Asia*, London.
- Hoekstra, B 2003, 'IT industry in Bangalore: Observations of a practitioner'. *IIMB Management Review*, December 2003, pp. 78-81
- Moon, J 2002, 'Corporate Social Responsibility: An Overview', in *International Directory of Corporate Philanthropy*, Europa, London, pp. 385-408
- Konana, P 2006, 'Towards Corporate Social Responsibility' The
- Mallin, CA 2004, *Corporate Governance* 1st Edition. Oxford University Press 2004.
- Nidumolu, R, Prahalad, CK & Rangaswami, MR 2009, 'Why sustainability is now the key driver of innovation', *Harvard Business Review*, 57- 64.

Kumar

- Prahalad, CK and Hammond, A 2002, 'Serving the poor profitably', *Harvard Business Review*, September 2002, pp. 48-56.
- Robertson, C and Fadil, P 1998, *Developing Corporate Codes of Ethics in Multinational*
- Rudd, A 2002, 'Environmental Management of Transnational Companies in India: Are TNCs Creating Islands of Environmental Excellence in a Sea of Dirt?', *Business Strategy and the Environment*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 103-118.
- Schein, EH 2004, *Organizational Culture and Leadership* 3rd Edition. San Francisco Jossey Bass
- Sawhney, Kumar J, Rose, Rudd et.al 2004, *understanding Humans*.
- Taylor et al 1996, 'Toward an Integrative Model of Strategic International Human Resources Management', *Academy of Management Review*.
- Thorpe & Prakash-Mani 2003, *World Business Council on Sustainable Development*. in, R. K. (2003) *Case Study Research Design and Methods* 3rd Edition. Sage Publications.
- Zook, C & Allen, J 2001, *Profit from the Core* Harvard Business School Press)