



EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT AND ITS IMPACT ON BUSINESS SUSTAINABILITY IN FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Pooja Tiwari

Sharda University, India

Vikas Garg

Amity University, India

Email: vgarg@gn.amity.edu

Abstract

This study explored the relationship between organizational identification and sensemaking and understanding how employee engagement influences the business sustainability of any organization. To conduct this study, a qualitative method was adopted, and the authors used qualitative data. Data were collected by interviewing the middle-level managers of eight financial institutions located in the Delhi National Capital Region (NCR) of India. The results of the qualitative study indicated a positive linkage of organizational identification with the organization and the contribution of organizational identification to the goals and actions for business sustainability. Conversely, individual actions for sustainability contribute to the increase in organizational identification. The results of the interviews indicated that people have different objectives, obstacles, and ways of maintaining organizational sustainability. The results analyzed the processing of cognitive and emotional dynamics present in the sample, and provide implications for practitioners and future studies.

Keywords: Organizational identification, Sensemaking, Organizational sustainability, Employee engagement

1 INTRODUCTION

Much research has been conducted to understand strategies of different organizations for managing sustainability. Business sustainability has become a much-discussed phenomenon in volatility, uncertainty, complexity, and ambiguity (VUCA) research (Andrey & Bourne, 2011). Moreover, the majority of organizations are transforming their actions toward business sustainability. Although the phrase “sustainable development” is derived from “sustain” and “ability,” in recent decades it has denoted “the capacity to maintain.” The potential to endure and adapt can also be considered as sustainability, raising the issue of whether current conditions must be preserved. Several businesses and NGOs have realized that long-term success necessitates carefully considering one’s environmental factors, impact on communities, global society, and

economic growth (Elkington, 1997; Savitz & Weber, 2006). The ability of a company to achieve its business objectives and boost long-term shareholder value by combining economic, environmental, and social prospects into its business plans is one definition of sustainability, according to Symposium on Sustainability (2001). Different authors have proposed different definitions of sustainable development, and still there is lack of consensus regarding the importance of sustainable development or how organizations must understand and identify the most effective way to sustain in all areas.

Several businesses have successfully integrated sustainability into their strategic objectives to reach a high level of management for sustainability (Laszlo & Zhexembayeva, 2011). However, it is imperative to become more familiar with the underlying processes that motivate workers to pursue sustainable

objectives. Andrey and Bourne (2011) concluded that there is a link between motivation and performance appraisal, which ultimately influences the organization's overall performance. In addition, they concluded that certain people's behaviors influence an organization's business sustainability.

The main focus of the present study is to examine the motivation behind employee engagement and its impact on organizational sustainability. This requires the authors to understand the following research questions:

1. How do employees interpret environmental stimuli in their environment?
2. What connection does this organizational sensemaking have on the fundamentals of the employee? Can it increase their sense of belonging to the organization?
3. When the organizational identification is high, does an individual want to become more involved in sustainability efforts? If so, does increased involvement strengthen that organizational identity in a positive feedback loop?

According to researchers, it is crucial to understand an employee's mindset regarding managing sustainability in the organization (Fairfield, 2018; Rimanoczy, 2013; Schein, 2015a, 2015b). This will help to understand how an individual is involved in decision-making and add extra factors to already complex problems. They may cover various topics, such as the effect of developing new products on the inner and outer environment (Wirtenberg, 2014). Many justifications for why businesses incorporate sustainability issues into their strategy have been put forth by academics, consultants, and industry professionals.

In a pioneering study, Bansal and Roth (2008) examined 53 companies and identified the key factors for motivating and managing ecological stewardship. They identified different factors, such as competitive advantage, linked with maximizing profits or increasing sales or marketing skills. However, what motivates the people to become so committed that they work tirelessly, passionately, and creatively to bring about sustainable activities presents a more specific difficulty. How do employees understand their environment, explore the influence of social or ecological factors on the organization, and

understand the level of motivation for sustainability, taking into consideration organizational sensemaking? In addition, what kind of an impact does such sensemaking have on employees and the motivation level to manage sustainability? What are the factors that contribute to sensemaking?

According to certain studies, an employer's perceived social responsibility actions improve the likelihood that potential employees will join the company and want to stay (Jones et al., 2014). Does a stronger organizational identity result in greater effort to achieve those sustainability outcomes? In addition, are workers more likely to identify with their company if they implement active tactics for increased sustainability (Glavas & Piderit, 2009)? According to certain evidence, workers frequently care more about sustainability issues than they believe their employers do (Slepian & Jones, 2013). There is a disconnect between what is understood about the dynamics of human behavior and the enterprise-level pursuit of sustainable management. This study bridges the gap.

Limited research has been conducted in this domain, and scholars have suggested that business conduct and leadership are always crucial factors; for example, studies have investigated the effects of leadership strategies for pursuing sustainability management, and discovered that organizations that made this promise had higher executive responsibility, stakeholder engagement, long-term focus, and disclosure of non-financial information. Importantly, these businesses outperformed their competitors in terms of capital valuation. According to organizational academics, implementing strategic goals will be accelerated if staff involvement and commitment are increased below the executive level (e.g., Fairfield, Harmon, & Benson, 2011; Gratton, 2007). Some authors contend that self-organized behavior and self-driven activity are essential for any long-lasting transformation (Knowles, 2006).

To enhance the psychological potential of the employees, the present study explored the basic strategies of engaging people in sensemaking concerning sustainable management. This study also examined how organizational identification might be a pioneer to the sustainability mindset, a byproduct of it, or both, given the strength of social impact and identity. This research examined these issues by reviewing the liter-

ature on organizational identity and individual and communal sensemaking. The outcomes of exploratory research are reported. Interviews with manager involved in managing sustainability has yielded positive results. This research article presents profiles of eight firms from the financial industry and their varying degrees of commitment to sustainability.

2 LITERATURE REVIEW

In research between 1993 and 1995, Weick proposed that sensemaking is rooted in building one's identity, which will promote self-enhancement, self-efficacy, and self-consistency in the individual. According to Weick's interpretation of Follett's (1924) early work, "People receive stimuli as a result of their activity," and sensemaking gains meaning only when it is performed in an organizational environment (Weick, 1995, p. 32). It makes us consider how others could view and assess us, and the possible positive or negative emotions that might result (Dutton & Dukerich, 1991). This happens when the situations in the organization can be expressed in words and can be discussed. This discussion works as a stimulus to act and helps generate fresh stimuli to repeat the process.

Making sense of a situation is more about the cyclical relationship between action and interpretation than evaluating a situation to make a decision (Weick et al., 2005). Because sensemaking derives from the individual perspective of socialization, it is implied that individuals will be influenced by the people with whom they socialize, whether in their personal lives or their work environments (Sonenshein, 2010). In a professional environment, the process of socialization starts with hiring and onboarding. People are "thrown into the heart of things," receiving cues from superiors, coworkers, and the larger culture. As a result, sensemaking never ends (Weick et al., 2005, p. 44). Making sense begins with asking "What occurred here?" and looking backward.

It inherently draws from prior experience, which has aided in developing a person's mental model. The inevitable question of "What do I do now?" arises in an employee's mind. A person does something, and that something then is construed to lead to more doing. Even when a person's sensemaking is incorrect, it proceeds because it is believable.

This study investigated how a person's feeling of sustainability motivates them to take personal action. The self-evaluation of employees has a significant impact on whether they support sustainability-related problems. Sonenshein, DeCelles, and Dutton (2014) examined how participants rated their sustainability in their qualitative study.

Although a person's self-assertion and values might influence their willingness to support sustainability, their self-doubts can inhibit that willingness. Instead of being an unwavering advocate or a reluctant observer, each person exhibits a mix of self-assertion and self-doubt. Bansal (2003) contended that when individual interests align with organizational values, this can be the best course of action. Conversely, if there is no support from the company, an individual's desire for a cause with societal benefits will be diminished. The idea that sensemaking does not occur on a merely cognitive level is fundamental (Haidt, 2013; Kahneman, 2013).

Sonenshein (2007) asserted that individuals create issues before reaching an intuitive conclusion. The person then starts to justify and explain their decision. Similarly, Haidt (2013) claimed that we hardly ever objectively discuss opposing viewpoints with people in order to modify our own. Instead, we act more like lawyers by rationalizing evidence to support our claims and win a disagreement due to our self-protective emotions. As a result, appealing to employees' instincts and emotions rather than their intellect is necessary to persuade them to embrace sustainability initiatives; according to Porac, Thomas, and Baden-Fuller (1989), elements inside and outside organizational boundaries impact sensemaking in organizations.

To comprehend what is occurring in the organization's competitive environment, a person explores "the consensual identity and underlying beliefs formed by top management" (Porac et al., 1989, p. 401). Employees can observe how these viewpoints relate to the company's marketing strategy. Constant actions and reactions enable people to modify or improve their core ideas about themselves and the world, leading to group-level sensemaking (Sonenshein, 2016; Stigliani & Ravasi, 2012). For example, Marcal Paper Products, which was established in the 1950s, uses recycled paper to produce different types of products. The employees involved in this process

might have little understanding of corporate social responsibility (CSR) because it is an old tradition that has not been advertised widely (Glavas & Godwin, 2013). The management reframed its business strategy by referring to itself as an eco-friendly sustainability corporation in the latter half of the 20th century. As a result, it launched an aggressive marketing effort that highlighted the plantation that was procured by utilizing only recycled paper. Employees then could modify their identities as members of an organization prioritizing sustainability (Weick, 1995). "Identification with all Humanity" is another factor that plays a role in sensemaking (McFarland et al., 2012). Through this, the concern of the organization for the environment and their inclination toward philanthropical needs are validated (McFarland & Matthews, 2005). This trait also is considered to be one of the crucial factors in understanding the organizational inclination toward sustainability.

Organizational dynamics also were interpreted by Sonenshein (2016). The mission of the company is another strong influence on sensemaking. Some well-known sustainable businesses point to a long history in which concern for the environment and the general welfare appears to be ingrained in their "Nature." Social learning theory can be used to better understand how individual beliefs and values interact with organizational reality (Bandura, 1977). The organization's internal and external factors impact the sensemaking of the individual. When the belief of a particular group in the organization changes, it occasionally influences the organization's mission as well. Biomimicry training helps increase employees' internal motivation and engagement, which helps with sustainable innovation. Due to COVID-19 restrictions, the present study conducted interviews with middle-level managers online in order to investigate the phenomena.

2.1 Organizational Identification and Sustainability Management

A person's sense of self and belonging to a group are crucial to sensemaking (Whetton & Albert, 1985). Social identity theory is the foundation of organizational identification. Tajfel & Turner (1986) provided evidence that people's responses to others depend on whether they belong to a clique or an out-group.

Employees prefer the group to the out-group because it provides important information about their identity (Tajfel & Turner, 1986; Turner et al., 1987). As a result, belonging to a group that performs well compared with other groups boosts self-esteem, inspiring pride and encouraging group-friendly conduct (Tyler, 1989). Organizational identity is "how an individual links the organizational identity with his/her identity based on the information of groups" (Dutton et al., 1994, p. 242). An individual begins to feel that "the organization's successes are my successes" (Ashforth & Mael, 1989, p. 23) and that "the organization's failures are my failures" (Pratt, 1998, p. 194) by defining themselves in terms of their organizational identities. Identifying with an organization is tremendously inspiring (Van Knippenberg, 2000).

In addition, organizational identification is specific to the organization, unlike organizational commitment, which is focused on goals and values that can be attained by various organizations (Vadera & Pratt, 2013). According to Ashforth and Mael (1989), Deaux et al. (1999), Dutton et al. (1994), and Pratt (1998), organizational identification also has been demonstrated to support a person's demand for belongingness, ambiguity, and self-respect. According to additional research, it can boost motivation and job satisfaction (Alpander, 1990). In addition, it can influence individuals to perform in the company's best interests (Cheney, 1983). According to Farooq, Payaud, Merunka, and Valette-Florence (2014), organizational identification, which is roughly comparable to sustainability management, is correlated with corporate social responsibility, and fully mediates the relationship between CSR and organizational dedication. Two routes may lead to organizational identity, according to Pratt (1998). Affinity is one route, in which individuals look for groups that resemble their own. An example is choosing a place to work. Emulation is the second route, in which one's self-concept is altered such that "participation in a group becomes part of one's self-concept" (Pratt, 1998, p. 174; see also Gioia, Schultz, & Corley, 2000). The final route aligns with the present study, which examined whether individual engagement with sustainability may change a person's self-perception and encourage them to take on a more active role.

A specific organizational vision, a societal purpose, or a worldview may be linked to organizational identity (Collins & Porras, 1991; Lofland & Stark, 1965; Pratt, 1998; Schein, 2015a, 2015b). Empathy for the organization may be developed on the consumers' part if the company's reputation is upright (Dutton et al., 2010). Turban & Greening (1997) and Pratt (1998) considered these to be examples of "competition" initiators identifying with the organization. Dutton et al. (1994) recognized organizational pride as a distinct component in earlier research. Organizational pride is a more focused psychological phenomenon linked to an individual's self-concept, whereas a firm's identity generally is a multifaceted component (Riketta, 2005). The enjoyment and respect that people derive from their organizational membership is called "organizational pride" (Jones, 2010, p. 859).

Despite lacking any sense of pride, a worker may identify with a company (Dutton et al., 1994). According to a large global poll, people at work felt gradually more anxious about various environmental issues than they believed their employer to be (Slepian & Jones, 2013). According to Jones et al. (2014), firms prioritizing sustainability have been demonstrated to attract, keep, and inspire employees to experience a strong sense of pride and affiliation. A company's sustainability can be viewed as a type of CSR, at least in part. Jones (2010) examined volunteerism's role in CSR in terms of company identification and pride. The findings provide information about the character of the connection between organizational pride and identification. When employees feel that others hold their organization in high regard, they are more likely to identify with it (Mael & Ashforth, 1992; Smidts et al., 2001; among others).

All these relevant and available studies present motivation for authors to examine organizational identification and employee motivation toward sustainability management.

2.2 Employee Engagement and Sustainability

According to Kahn (1990, 1992), "being there" enables an employee to optimize effort and satisfying results. Kahn's groundbreaking research suggests that employee engagement involves applying physical, mental, and emotional resources to ac-

complish the work function. Kahn's study supported the following three factors as predictors of employee involvement:

1. Similarity among the group members should be valued and realized.
2. Supportive social systems.
3. A fundamental self-evaluation, self-perceptions of confidence and self-consciousness.

These three factors had a full mediating effect on task performance and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) through job engagement. This has shown that if the engagement level of the employees is higher, they will be able to generate more desirable results. The work of Detert and Pollock (2008) are in line with these findings. According to their research, executives are more likely to support change in the company if there is:

1. an alignment between personal objectives and organizational objectives.
2. supposed personal interest alignment with motivations and lack of deterrents.
3. employee autonomy and the potential of an individual to handle and accept the change.

According to a study of sustainability and human resources executives, they were most actively involved when their objectives and the organization's goals were assumed to be aligned (Harmon et al., 2010). They also were more likely to make changes when they felt that they had the resources and authority to do so (Harmon et al., 2010). In addition, these managers reported feeling more capable and motivated to take on the challenges when they understood that sustainability was a key component of the company's mission. These results are consistent with Csikszentmihalyi's argument (2003) that people intensely immersed in their jobs enter a state of flow in which they are more engaged, creative, and productive. Several factors that contribute to the sense-making that results in employee engagement have been identified through research.

Sustainability, which encourages an organization to involve employees whose performance is at its peak, engaging creative people and quality interpersonal interactions, is a component of perceived corporate citizenship (Glavas & Piderit, 2009; Milliken & See, 2014). Among medical professionals

(Bartel, 2001), social service providers (Dukerich et al., 2002), and nurses, OCB has been reported to increase with stronger identification (Fairfield, 2004).

Additionally, sharing the negative association with the turnover intention, evidence of additional positive outcomes of identifying with the organization has included increased employee level of satisfaction and job involvement (van Dick, Wagner, Stellmacher, & Christ, 2004; Riketta, 2005; Mael & Ashforth, 1995).

In conclusion, sensemaking helps employees understand their external environment, societal concerns, and perspective toward the organization. Conversely, it may be claimed that employees' perceptions of their company implementing sustainability methods and morally righteous activities lead to organizational pride, which limits organizational identification (see also Glavas & Godwin, 2013). Therefore, this study focused on understanding employee engagement toward sustainability.

3 METHODS

Primary research was conducted to understand the phenomena in detail. Qualitative data were collected using the interview method. To conduct this study, the researcher collected data in semi structured interviews with 20 middle-level managers working in 8 different financial institutions. The au-

thor created interview questions to explore the phenomena in detail. Interviews with different respondents were conducted using a hybrid mode. Based on the availability of middle-level managers, interviews were conducted online and offline. Because the data were qualitative, the sample size for conducting the study was 20. There are a total of eight categories of financial institutions, and to conduct the research, the authors used one organization from each category.

4 RESULTS

To maintain the confidentiality of the companies from which data were collected, the names are not revealed. Table 1 presents the responses of various respondents and the rating of the organization on the various reasons for business sustainability.

4.1 Making Sense and Organizational Identification

The results of the interviews indicated several common factors between employers and employees regarding how they define the concept of sustainability. Several factors contribute to the sensemaking of an employee toward an organization, as Weick (1995) concluded. Some of these factors are based on the individual's attitudes, values, and mindset. In addition, the results revealed that this can raise the

Table 1: Response of Various Respondents

Company	Competitive advantage	Legal reasons	Ethical reasons	Comments
Company 1	High	High	Medium	Main focus on sustainability and strategic issues. Focus on product customization.
Company 2	High	Low	High	Company has focus on high customer interaction through employee involvement.
Company 3	Low	Low	Low	Not much focus on sustainability practices, not much action taken due to less impact on overall output.
Company 4	High	Medium	High	High emphasis on product development and focus on energy savings.
Company 5	Medium	Low	Low	Works on the report of employee sustainability and very less awareness on employee awareness
Company 6	Medium	High	Low	Average involvement of employees. Not much strategic orientation for substantivity.
Company 7	Medium	Medium	Low	Employee involvement is not the main concern. Very low involvement of people.
Company 8	High	High	Medium	Major focus on sustainability and trying to incorporate sustainability in products. Also involved in various societal programs.

awareness level of the employee toward environmental activities. Managers revealed that employees devoted to the organizational objective are more committed to actions that promote business sustainability. Organizational identifications also change along with individual sensemaking, depending on the stimuli. A person's organizational identification will be impacted by these stimuli, which is another aspect of sensemaking (Pratt, 1998).

Table 1 presents the different crucial elements that is identified during interview which improves or reduces the affinity for each organization towards sustainability. Companies are involved in business sustainability for competitive advantage and legal and ethical reasons. Three major reasons have been identified and the rating of the organization towards these factors has been done on the basis of the responses of the interviews. Based on the responses it can be inferred that the orientation of the organization towards sustainability is due to various reasons (as mentioned in comment section). The importance of some elements, such as pride in a well-known corporate brand, widespread employee loyalty, and a track record of transparent recruitment practices, may strengthen one's connection with the organization. Organizational pride and identity are can be ignited by specific activities, such as saying things such as "We are proud of the sustainability of our company." However, some elements decrease organizational identity.

4.2 Main Sources for Sustainability

Major focus on sustainability and trying to incorporate sustainability in products and different business actions. Also, involved in various societal programs. Table 2 has shown the various sources of the organizations towards sensemaking and sustainability. Three major sources have been identified and through responses various reasons under these factors have shown the actions of the organization towards sustainability and sensemaking. These factors are categorized into three sources: Individual factors, organizational factors and environmental factors. All the various financial institutions have presented the thrust focus area in all the three respective factors.

5 DISCUSSION

Based on the responses conducted during the interviews, several conclusions can be drawn about organizational identification and sensemaking for each company. Employees are sensitive to certain factors, as revealed by the results of the interviews, such as unambiguous sustainability discussions and actions; not settling previous administrative issues; and pressure from key stakeholders such as clients, suppliers, and nongovernmental organizations. Managers stated that an organization's vision needs to be clear when management attempts to focus on managing sustainability in the organization. Everyone who has worked within an organization should relate to sustainability issues (Sonenshein, 2016). The results revealed that highly engaged employees embrace sustainability issues properly and are more involved in them (Laszlo & Zhexembayeva, 2011; Winston, 2014).

For all of the organizations included in the analysis, Table 1 indicates a roughly positive link between the identification of the organization and the degree of sustainability. It has shown the inclination of the organization towards sustainability in three different dimensions. The results suggest a more intricate connection than a straightforward, direct link. Many would argue that senior administration setting convincing sustainability goals and strongly holding the purpose to move in that track is a fundamental requirement (Fairfield et al., 2011; Harmon et al., 2010).

The study outlines how managerial leadership may or may not demand significant sustainability actions. When stimuli for the sustainability is provided to the employees, due to their organizational sensemaking it can motivate the employee towards sustainability. The mix of sensemaking elements also includes internal aspects such as the organization's history and professional culture and external factors such as market trends and institutional influences.

Employee engagement probably will be moderated by these factors, because the identification with the organization will alter how an individual identifies with the organization, which is influenced by the company's pride. Identification can considerably increase the probability of successfully implementing a thorough sustainability plan (e.g., Fairfield et al., 2011).

Table 2: Sensemaking and sustainability and various sources

Company	Individual factor	Organizational factor	Environmental factor
Company 1	Focus on hiring employees having sustainability orientation.	Focus on code of conduct. Focus on corporate goal linking with sustainability issue	Focus on sustainability due to market dynamics
Company 2	Younger employees are more oriented toward sustainability issues.	Middle-level management is pressurized to achieve results. Follow COD for internal employees.	Need to approach sustainability issue due to motivation from customer.
Company 3	Some employees have focus on local community sustainability issues.	Sustainability programs are designed mainly by the consultant. Focus on go green.	Majority of the investors are more inclined toward profitability then sustainability.
Company 4	Company has been pushed by the customers toward sustainability issues. Lower-level and younger employees are more inclined toward sustainability goals.	Much focus is given to pragmatic products and services. Not much focus is placed on employee engagement. Focusing also is placed on new product development strategies.	Many competitors also are focusing on sustainability issues.
Company 5	Not all the employees are oriented toward sustainability; some are indifferent.	Have set certain goals for sustainable strategies. Not much focus on employee engagement.	Focus of the company is to maintain transparency.
Company 6	Majority of the people are indifferent toward sustainability. Some respondents have shown personal passion for sustainability. Active in local sustainability issues.	Major focus on the value of shareholders, so the threshold is on sustainability.	Sustainability issue is important due to competitive purpose.
Company 7	Young employees are more focused on sustainability. Older employees are less engaged.	Not much clarity about sustainability. HR is not active enough, and employee are less engaged.	Not many customers are persuading the organization to pursue sustainability.
Company 8	Awareness about corporate sustainability, and has a long history related to it.	Involved in many sustainability projects. Also handling oversees projects.	Promoting CSR activities. Employees are engaged in R & D activity and improving the life of the public.

If brand image and reputation of the organization is good or favorable, all efforts to involve people at work in a sustainability strategy may be improved. The strategy provides feedback loops in which meeting sustainability objectives can boost organizational pride and identity, which, in turn, impact a person’s capacity for sustainable thinking.

Comments from some organizations support the initial research on the impact of one’s actions on personal attitudes and beliefs by providing evidence of this beneficial loop (Bem, 1967). Similar findings were made in studies suggesting that job seekers favor businesses prioritizing sustainability (Chapman et al., 2005; Jones et al., 2014). Weick 1995, concluded that making sense since the beginning is not a static but a dynamic concept, which best illustrates the cyclical, dynamic paradigm advanced in the present study.

6 LIMITATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study has shown the link between employee engagement and business sustainability by considering other organizational identification and sensemaking factors. The results provide valuable input, but the study still has certain limitations. Only two authors did the interviewing, so the study results may be biased. This study was conducted only in the Delhi National Capital Region (NCR) of India, so the study results cannot be generalized. However, the leadership and cultural resemblance to the Delhi NCR suggests some confidence in extrapolating these findings to Northern India. To extend this inquiry further and clarify its findings, the conclusions drawn from these exploratory findings should be strengthened by interviewing more people at the same and many other companies.

According to our findings, at the small level, an interpretation that strengthens organizational identification will play a significant role in motivating and involving workers in realizing this possibility. Future studies can be conducted using a larger sample size

taking the similar variables in consideration. This study can be strengthened by collecting and analyzing qualitative and quantitative data. Therefore, a mixed-methods approach can be used to conduct future studies.

EXTENDED SUMMARY/IZVLEČEK

V sedanjem okolju nestanovitnosti, negotovosti, kompleksnosti in dvoumnosti (angl., volatility, uncertainty, complexity, and ambiguity; VUCA) je poslovna trajnost postala modna beseda za vse organizacije po vsem svetu. V organizacijah je bilo izvedenih veliko raziskav, da bi razumeli različne strategije, ki jih je mogoče uporabiti za trajnost. Sposobnost vzdržljivosti in prilagajanja lahko imenujemo tudi trajnost, pri čemer se postavlja vprašanje, ali moramo in potrebujemo ohraniti trenutne razmere. Ta študija je raziskovala razmerje med organizacijsko identifikacijo in ustvarjanjem smisla ter razumevanjem, kako zavzetost zaposlenih vpliva na poslovno trajnost katerekoli organizacije. Raziskovalci so zbrali podatke s pomočjo polstrukturiranih intervjujev (izvedenih hibridno) z 20 menedžerji na srednji ravni, ki delajo v 8 različnih finančnih institucijah. Ugotovitve kvalitativne študije so pokazale, da obstaja pozitivna povezava med organizacijsko identifikacijo in njenim prispevkom k ciljem in dejanjem za trajnost poslovanja. Nasprotno pa so posamezni ukrepi za trajnost prispevali k povečanju organizacijske identifikacije. Rezultati intervjujev so pokazali, da imajo ljudje različne cilje, ovire in načine za ohranjanje trajnosti organizacije.

REFERENCES

- Albert S., & Whetten D. A. (1985). Organizational identity. In Cummings L. L., Staw M. M. (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 7, pp. 263-295). Greenwich, CT: JAI.
- Andrey, P. & Bourne, M. (2011). Explaining the effects of performance measurement on performance: An organizational routines perspective. *Int. J. Operation Product. Manage.*, 31, 101-122.
- Alpander, G. G. (1990). Relationship between commitment and hospital goals and job satisfaction: A case study of a nursing department. *Health Care Management Review*, 15(4), 51-62.
- Anderson, R. L. (2009). *Business lessons from a radical industrialist*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.
- Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of Management Review*, 14, 20-39.
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Oxford, England: Prentice-Hall.
- Bansal, P. (2003). From issues to actions: The importance of individual concerns and organizational values in responding to natural environmental issues. *Organizational Science*, 14, 510-527.
- Bansal, P., & Roth, K. (2000). Why companies go green. A model of ecological responsiveness. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43, 717-736.
- Bartel, C. A. (2001). Social comparisons in boundary spanning work: Effects of community outreach on members' organizational identity and identification. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46, 379-414.
- Basu, K., & Palazzo, G. (2008). Corporate responsibility: A process model of sensemaking. *Academy of Management Review*, 33, 122-136.
- Bem, D. (1967). Self-perception: An alternative interpretation of cognitive dissonance phenomena. *Psychological Bulletin*, 74, 183-198.
- Benefiel, M. (2005). *Soul at work: Spiritual leadership in organizations*. New York, NY: Seabury Books.
- Chapman, D. S., Uggerslev, K. L., Carroll, S. A., Piasentin, K. A., & Jones, D. A. (2005). Applicant attractions to organizations and job choice: A meta-analytic review of the correlates of recruiting outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 928-944.
- Cheney, G. (1983). On the various and changing meanings of organizational membership: A field study of organizational verification. *Communications Monograph*, 50(4), 342-362.

- Collins, J., & Porras, J. E. (1991). *Built to last: Successful habits of visionary companies*. New York, NY: Harper Business.
- Csikszentmihaly, M. (2003). *Good business: Leadership, flow and the making of meaning*. New York, NY: Penguin Group.
- Deaux, K., Reid, A., Mizrahi, K., & Cotting, D. (1999). Connecting the person to the social: The functions of social identification. In T. R. Tyler, R. M. Kramer, & O. P. John (Eds.), *The psychology of the social self* (pp. 99–113).
- Detert, J. R., & Pollock, T. G. (2008). Values, interests, and the capacity to act: Understanding professionals' responses to market-based improvement initiatives in highly institutionalized organizations. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 44*, 186–214.
- Dukerich, J. M., Golden, B. R., & Shortell, S. M. (2002). Beauty is in the eye of the beholder: The impact of organizational identification, identity, and image on the cooperative behaviors of physicians. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 47*, 507–533.
- Dutton, J., Dukerich, J., & Harquail, C. (1994). Organizational images and member identification. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 39*(2), 239–263.
- Dutton, J., Roberts, L. M., & Bednar, J. (2010). Pathways for positive identity construction at work: Four types of positive identity and the building of social resources. *Academy of Management Review, 35*, 265–293.
- Dutton, J., & Dukerich, J. (1991). Keeping an eye on the mirror: Image and identity in organizational adaptation. *Academy of Management, 34*, 517–554.
- Eccles, R. G., Ioannou, I., & Serafeim, G. (2014). Impact of sustainability on organizational processes and performance. *Management Science, 60*(11), 2835–2857.
- Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989). Building theories from case study research. *Academy of Management Review, 14*, 532–550.
- Eisenhardt, K. M., & Graebner, M. E. (2007). Theory building from cases: Opportunities and challenges. *Academy of Management Journal, 50*, 25–32.
- Elkington, J. (1997). *Cannibals with forks: The triple bottom line of 21st century business*. Oxford, England: Capstone Publishers.
- Fairfield, K. D. (2004, January-February 17–29). Whose side are you on? Interdependence and its consequences in management of healthcare delivery. *Journal of Healthcare Management, 49*, 17–29.
- Fairfield, K. D. (2018). Educating for a sustainability mindset. *Journal of International Global Sustainability, 6*(1), 21–40.
- Fairfield, K. D., Harmon, J., & Benson, S. (2011). Influences on the implementation of sustainability: An integrative model. *Organizational Management Journal, 8*, 4–20.
- Farooq, O., Payaud, M., Merunka, D., & Valette-Florence, P. (2014). The impact of corporate social responsibility on organizational commitment: Exploring multiple mediation mechanisms. *Journal of Business Ethics, 125*(4), 563–580.
- Follett, M. P. (1924). *Creative experience*. New York, NY: Longmans, Greene.
- Fombrun, C., & Shanley, M. (1990). *Academy of Management Journal, 33*(2), 233–258.
- Gioia, D. A., Schultz, M., & Corley, K. G. (2000). Organizational identity, image, and adaptive instability. *Academy of Management Review, 25*, 63–81.
- Glavas, A. (2012). Employee engagement and sustainability: A model for implementing meaningfulness at and in work. *Journal of Corporate Citizenship, 46*, 13–29.
- Glavas, A., & Godwin, L. (2013). Is the perception of “goodness” good enough? Exploring the relationship between perceived corporate social responsibility and employee organization identification. *Journal of Business Ethics, 14*(1), 15–27.
- Glavas, A., & Piderit, S. K. (2009). How does doing good matter? Effect of corporate citizenship on employees. *Journal of Corporate Citizenship, 36*, 51–70.
- Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. New York: Anchor.
- Golden-Biddle, K., & Locke, K. D. (2007). *Composing qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gratton, L. (2007). *Hot spots: Why some teams, workplaces, and organizations buzz with energy – And others don't*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- Haidt, J. (2013). *The righteous mind: Why good people are divided by politics and religion*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.
- Harmon, J., Fairfield, K. D., & Wirtenberg, J. (2010). Missing an opportunity: HR leadership and sustainability. *People and Strategy, 33*(1), 16–21.
- Hoffman, A. J. (2016). *Finding purpose: Environmental stewardship as a personal calling*. Abington, U.K.: Greenleaf Publishing, Ltd.
- Jones, D. A. (2010). Does serving the community also serve the community? Using organizational identification and social exchange theories to understand employee responses to a volunteerism program. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 83*, 857–878.
- Jones, D. A., Willness, C. R., & Madey, S. (2014). Why are job seekers attracted by corporate social performance? Experimental and field tests of three signal-based mechanisms. *Academy of Management Journal, 57*, 383–404.
- Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal, 33*, 692–724.
- Kahn, W. A. (1992). To be fully there: Psychological presence at work. *Human Relations, 45*, 321–349.

- Kahneman, D. (2013). *Thinking fast and slow*. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus, & Giroux.
- Knowles, R. N. (2006). Engaging the natural tendency for self-organization. *World Business Academy Transformation*, 20(15), 1–10.
- Laszlo, C., & Zhexembayeva, N. (2011). *Embedded sustainability: The next big competitive advantage*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford Business.
- Lofland, J., & Stark, R. (1965). Becoming a world saver. A theory of conversion to a deviant perspective. *American Sociological Review*, 30, 862–874.
- Mael, F. A., & Ashforth, B. E. (1992). Alumni and their alma mater: A partial test of the reformulated model of organizational identification. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13, 103–123.
- Mael, F. A., & Ashforth, B. E. (1995). Loyal from day one: Biodata, organizational identification, and turnover among newcomers. *Personnel Psychology*, 48, 309–333.
- McFarland, S., Webb, M., & Brown, D. (2012). All humanity is my group: A measure and study of identification with all humanity. *Journal of Personal and Social Psychology*, 103(5), 830–853.
- McFarland, S. G., & Matthews, M. (2005). Who cares about human rights? *Political Psychology*, 26, 365–385.
- McInerney, S. J., & Niewiarowski, P. H. (2022). Biomimicry Training to Promote Employee Engagement in Sustainability. *Biomimetics*, 7(2), 71.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Milliken, F. J., & See, K. L. (2014). *Exploring the linking mechanisms between corporate sustainability practices and employee outcomes* (Unpublished Working Paper). Stern School of Business, New York University.
- Pancer, S. M., Baetz, M. C., & Rog, E. J. (2002). *Corporate volunteer programs: Benefits for employees, corporations, and the community*. Toronto, CA: Canadian Center for Philanthropy.
- Porac, J. F., Thomas, H., & Baden-Fuller, C. (1989). Competitive groups as cognitive communities: The case of Scottish knitwear manufacturers. *Journal of Management Studies*, 26(4), 397–416.
- Pratt, M. G. (1998). To be or not to be: Central questions in organizational identification. In D. A. Whetten & P. C. Godfrey (Eds.), *Identity in organizations: Building theory through conversations* (pp. 171–208). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Riketta, M. (2005). Organizational identification: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 66, 358–384.
- Rimanoczy, I. (2013). *Big bang being: Developing the sustainability mindset*. Sheffield, UK: Greenleaf.
- Savitz, A., & Weber, K. (2006). *The triple bottom line*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job demands, job resource, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25, 293–314.
- Schein, S. (2015a). *A new psychology for sustainable leadership: The hidden power of ecological worldviews*. Sheffield, UK: Greenleaf.
- Schein, S. (2015b). Ecological worldviews: A missing perspective to advance global sustainability leadership. *Journal of Management for Global Sustainability*, 3(1), 1–24.
- Slepian, J. L., & Jones, G. (2013). Gender and corporate sustainability: On values, vision, and voice. *Organization Management Journal*, 10(4), 215–226.
- Smidts, A., Pruyn, A. T. H., & Van Riel, C. B. M. (2001). The impact of employee communication and perceived external prestige on organizational identification. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(5), 1051–1062.
- Smith, P. A. C., & Sharicz, C. (2011). The shift needed for sustainability. *Learning Organization*, 18(1), 73–86.
- Smith, E. E. (2017). *The power of meaning: Finding fulfillment in a world obsessed with happiness*. New York, CA: Broadway Books.
- Sonenshein, S. (2007). The role of construction, intuition, and justification in responding to ethical issues at work: The sensemaking-intuition model. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(4), 1022–1040.
- Sonenshein, S. (2010). We're changing – or are we? untangling the role of progressive, regressive, and stability narratives during strategic change implementation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(3), 477–512.
- Sonenshein, S. (2016). How corporations overcome issue illegitimacy and issue equivocality to address social welfare: The role of the social change agent. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41(2), 349–366.
- Sonenshein, S., DeCelles, K. A., & Dutton, J. E. (2014). It's not easy being green: the role of self-evaluations in explaining support of environmental issues. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57(1), 7–37.
- Stigliani, I., & Ravasi, D. (2012). Organizing thoughts and connecting brains: Material practices and the transition from individual to group-level prospective sensemaking. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55, 1232–1259.
- Symposium on Sustainability: Profiles in Leadership. (2001). *Innovative ICT Solutions for the Societal Challenges*, New York, NY.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In S. Worchel & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *Social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 2–24). Chicago, IL: Nelson-Hall.
- Tajfel, H., Billig, M., & Bundy, R. (1971). Social categorization and intergroup behavior. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 1, 149–178.

- Turban, D. B., & Greening, D. W. (1997). Corporate social performance and organizational attractiveness to prospective employees. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40, 658–672.
- Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A., Oakes, P. J., Reicher, S. D., & Weatherell, M. S. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory*. Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell.
- Turner, J. C., Oakes, P. J., Haslam, S., & McGarty, C. (1994). Self and collective: Cognition and social context. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 20, 454–463.
- Tyler, T. R. (1989). The psychology of procedural justice: A test of the group-value model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57(5), 830–838.
- van Dick, R., Wagner, U., Stellmacher, J., & Christ, O. (2004). The utility of a broader conceptualization or organizational identification: Which aspects really matter? *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 7, 171–191.
- Van Knippenberg, D. (2000). Work motivation and performance: A social identity perspective. *Applied Psychology International Review*, 49(3), 357–371.
- Vadera, A. K. (2013). Love, hate, ambivalence, or indifference? A conceptual examination of workplace crimes and organizational identification. *Organization Science*, 24(1), 172–188.
- Walt, V. (2017, February 17). *Unilever's Paul Polman's plan to save the world*. Fortune.
- Weick, K. E. (1993). The collapse of sensemaking in organizations: The Mann Gulch disaster. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 38, 628–652.
- Weick, K. E. (1995). *Sensemaking in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Weick, K. E., Sutcliffe, K. M., & Obstfeld, D. (2005). Organizing and process of sensemaking. *Organization Science*, 16, 409–421.
- Winston, A. S. (2014). *The big pivot: Radically practical strategies for a hotter, scarcer, and more open world*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Review.
- Wirtenberg, J. (2014). *Building a culture for sustainability: People, planet and profits in a new green economy*. New York, NY: Praeger.
- Wrzesniewski, A. (2003). Finding positive meaning at work. In K. S. Cameron, J. E. Dutton, & R. E. Quinn (Eds.), *Positive organizational scholarship: Foundations of a new discipline* (pp. 296–308). San Francisco, CA: BerrettKoehl.