An Investigation into the Strategies Employed for Corporate Sustainability and the Impact of Organizational Culture in the Field of E-Commerce

Shweta Pathak[1], Khatik Faisal[2], Kori Jyoti Devi[3]

Asst. Professor[1] and SYBCOM[2,3]

Uttar Bhartiya Sangh's Mahendra Pratap Sharda Prasad Singh College of Commerce & Science, Mumbai, Maharashtra

Abstract: *The concept of "corporate sustainability" has recently become more prominent in the field of organizational theory and practice. Despite the ongoing uncertainty surrounding the definition of corporate sustainability and the most effective means of achieving it, many scholars propose that fostering a culture within organizations that prioritizes sustainability is the key to implementing corporate sustainability principles. In this research, we thoroughly analyze the proposed correlation between an organization's cultural orientation and its commitment to corporate sustainability principles. Specifically, we aim to determine whether organizations can demonstrate a cohesive organizational culture focused on sustainability, if they can enhance their sustainability through cultural transformation, and the precise elements that define a sustainability-oriented organizational culture. The document highlights and delineates potential courses of action and challenges for effective administration and further investigation.*

Keywords: corporate, business, approach, culture, organization

I. INTRODUCTION

There has been a lot of writing about sustainable development principles and the need for businesses to implement sustainable practices (e.g., Sharma, 2003). Several academics, on the other hand, maintain that these changes are insufficient because they are only superficial and not conducive to the formation of sustainable organizations and industries (Hart & Milstein, 1999; Crane, 2000). Many organizations have introduced or changed policies, products, or processes in recent years to address pollution, minimize resource use, and improve community and stakeholder relations. 2001, Senge and Carstedt). They argue that organizations will need to undergo significant cultural transformation in order to effectively respond to environmental and social challenges (Post & Altman, 1994; Welford, 1995; Stead & Stead, 1992). The central idea is that in order to move toward corporate sustainability, organizations will need to create a culture that is focused on sustainability (Crane, 1995). The idea of an organizational culture has become popular in the sustainability literature because it makes it easy for the fields of human resources and organizational behavior to explain an organization's sustainability performance. However, there is little theoretical foundation for what constitutes an organizational culture focused on sustainability. In addition, there are only generic instructions on how businesses can achieve and implement a culture shift centered on sustainability.

II. CORPORATE SUSTAINABILITY DEFINITION

The larger concept of sustainability was shaped over time by a number of political, public, and academic influences. Public pressure increased for new approaches to the environment and development, and to integrate environmental protection with a development that would ultimately lead to an alleviation of poverty. This is where the idea of corporate sustainability comes from. Through the publication of the report "Our Common Future" by the World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED, 1987), a United Nations agency formerly known as the Brundtland Commission, the concept of sustainability gained global recognition.

The WCE coined the term "sustainable development," which is defined as "development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs." However, there is disagreement not only regarding the idea of "corporate sustainability," but there is also a lack of clarity on how to best

implement "corporate sustainability" in organizational practice (Daily & Huang, 2001). Companies' overall adoption of sustainability practices and related classification schemes have been the primary focus of previous research (e.g., Azzone&Bertele, 1994; Dunphy and co. ,2003; Chase and Auster, 1990). It was believed that external factors, such as environmental regulations and standards established by governments or pressures from customer groups and the community, were the primary drivers behind this adoption process. However, the organization itself was largely treated as a "black box" (Howard-Grenville, 2006).

The idea of organizational culture: first emerged in the 1970s and 1980s (e.g., Hofstede, 1981; 1993, Ouchi & Price; Pettigrew,1979; Schwartz & Davis, 1981), and it quickly became one of management research and practice's most influential and controversial concepts (Crane, 1995; J Organizational culture research reveals a number of common themes and similarities despite the variety of interpretations and cultural dimensions (Parker & Bradley, 2000). First, studies frequently use concepts that are used to identify and define organizational culture; As a result, a number of academics have attempted to construct conceptual frameworks for the study of organizational culture by categorizing important dimensions (Hofstede, 1981; 2002, House, Javidan, Hanges, and Dorfman; 2004 Schein; Quinn, 1988). Second, values, ideologies, and beliefs have been viewed as a trustworthy representation of an organization's culture and are thought to be particularly important for understanding it (Howard, 1998; Ott,1989)

As a result, cultural orientations have typically been the focus of the evaluation and measurement of organizational culture: competing values in an organization The internal-external dimension reveals whether an organization is focused on its internal dynamics or its external environment's demands. Organizational preferences for structuring coordination and control, or flexibility, are reflected in the flexibility-control dimension. To enforce compliance with behavioral norms, organizations that emphasize the control end of the dimension typically rely on formal coordination and control mechanisms like rules, policies, direct supervision, financial planning, and budgets.

On the other hand, organizations that emphasize flexibility tend to rely more on social coordination and control to achieve desired outcomes and behavior through internalization of beliefs, training, participation, commitment, socialization, and peer assurance. Cultures that are dominated by internal process values (lower left quadrant) promote stability and control through formal means such as information management, precise communication, and data-based decision-making (Jones et al., 2005, Zammuto et al. 2000). This type of culture has also been referred to as a "hierarchical culture" because it emphasizes technical details and enforces rules (Denison & Spreitzer, 1991; 1987, Kerr and Slocum; P A bureaucratic organization, for instance, would place less emphasis on adaptability and change and would be dominated by an internal process culture that valued formal procedures and regulation.

According to Quinn (1988), dysfunctional organizations are more likely to exhibit a strong overemphasis on a single culture type. For instance, a strong orientation toward internal process values (lower left quadrant) may result in a rigid bureaucracy that is highly resistant to any change efforts.

Cultural perspectives: competing demands within an organization on two distinct and competing dimensions are illustrated by the four-cell CVF (Quinn & Kimberly, 1984). The interior outer aspect reflects whetherthe association is centered around its inward elements, or on thedemands of its outside climate. Organizational preferences for structuring coordination and control, or flexibility, are reflected in the flexibility-control dimension. To enforce compliance with behavioral norms, organizations that emphasize the control end of the dimension typically rely on formal coordination and control mechanisms like rules, policies, direct supervision, financial planning, and budgets.

Theoretical proposition

(1)The theories and ideologies that underpin the internal process quadrant are characterized by their focus on economic performance and a general omission of the wider organizationalenvironment. On the other hand, organizations that place an emphasis on the flexibility end tend to rely more on social coordination and control through internalization of beliefs, training, participation, commitment, socialization, and peer assurance, in order to achieve desired outcomes and behavior. The internal process quadrant is in line with the scientific management ideology of Barley and Kunda (1992), which aims to maximize economic gains through rationalized production processes (Taylor, 1911). Under relatively stable environmental conditions, the hierarchical structure, its enforcement, and compliance with rules allow for maximum production of goods and services (Cameron & Quinn, 2006). Scott's classification of closed-rational systems models (2003) corresponds to the internal process quadrant (Zammuto, 2005; Zammuto and other, 2000), in which

organizations are presented as instruments for achieving predetermined goals with formalized structures to enhance economic performance and organizational efficiency. The attention on formalization recommends that there are mental and inspirational impediments of individuals which oblige worker decisions and activity inside the organization

Associations show a unified "feasible" culture?This segment examines whether associations can show onlyone unified hierarchical culture or whether there exist sub-bunch contrasts among various elements or worker gatherings. Despite the fact that commonalities between members of an organization are frequently mentioned in definitions of organizational culture (such as ,Louis, 1985; According to Schein (2004), not all researchers share the viewpoint that members of an organization are part of the same, unified organizational culture (for instance, Gregory, 1983; 1998 Hofstede; Riley,1983; 1992 Sackmann; 1996 Schein Organizational researchers have used a variety of methodological approaches to study the various cultural dimensions of Schein's typology in addition to conceptual distinctions (Ashkanasy et al., 2000). In her description of the field, Martin (2002) identifies three theoretical perspectives on organizational cultures: integration, differentiation, and fragmentation perspectives.

The integration perspective focuses on the existence of unified cultures within organizations and assumes that employees at all levels of an organization agree on a set of shared assumptions, values, and beliefs (Martin, 2002). The differentiation perspective is of primary interest to this paper and is outlined below. According to Zammuto (2005), such consensus is regarded as desirable because it fosters unity of purpose and action as well as consistency in members' perceptions, interpretations, and actions. The hypothesis that cultural strength, defined as the extent to which cultural values and beliefs are widely shared and strongly held throughout the organization, has received a lot of public and academic attention (O'Reilly, 1989; 1996, O'Reilly and Chatman; improves financial performance (Denison, 1984; Saffold,1988) Sørensen,2002). Based on the assumption that improved coordination and control, as well as increased motivation and goal alignment among organizational members, result in performance benefits from a strong corporate culture (e.g., Deal & Kennedy, 1982; 1993, Ouchi & Price;

The differentiation perspective is similar to the integration perspective in that organizational culture is defined on the basis of what is shared yet at the level of groups within an organization (Martin, 2002; Srensen, 2002). 2005 Zammuto). In any case, there are contrasts in the degree to which separation scientists recognize that subcultures can coincide with some type of association wide consensus (Martin, 2002). While some argue that subcultures exist within the context of a larger, overarching "common" organizational culture (Trice & Beyer, 1984), others argue that many organizations are most accurately described as multi-cultural and deny the existence of a dominant organizational culture (Gregory, 1983).

The existence of subcultures has been confirmed by a number of studies (Howard-Grenville, 2006). They can develop around hierarchical levels within an organization (Jermier, Slocum, Fry, & Gaines, 1991; Organizational roles like department (Hofstede, 1998), function, and occupation (Schein, 1996; Riley, 1983) or around distinctions Barley and van Maanen, 1984). Managerial relevance It appears that leaders must abandon a purely economic paradigm and achieve a more balanced set of socially and environmentally responsible values in order to move toward corporate sustainability. Subcultures can also emerge around personal contacts and networks, as well as individual demographic differences like ethnicity and gender (Martin, 2002). A few observers, such as Hart and Milstein (2003), have contended that associations need to consider their openness to social and natural occasions, not only in the present, yet in addition later on, for of generating sustainable worth.

III. CONCLUSION

The CVF has provided a framework for discussing how ideological underpinnings of organizational culture influence how corporate sustainability is implemented and the kinds of outcomes that can be achieved, in accordance with the conclusion of the integration perspective. In their pursuit of corporate sustainability, employees of various cultures place different emphasis on various aspects, such as internal staff development, resource efficiency, environmental protection, or stakeholder engagement. Second, we wanted to see if it was possible for businesses to have a single organizational culture that prioritizes sustainability. The differentiation perspective challenges the integration perspective of organizational culture, which generally holds that organizations have a single dominant culture with employees across the board agreeing on a set of shared assumptions, values, and beliefs.

The differentiation perspective states that different subcultures can exist throughout an organization, and members of each subculture may have distinct perspectives on corporate sustainability from those of other subcultures. Third, we inquired as to whether associations can turn out to be more sustainable through culture change. The rigidity of the organization as a whole as well as the existence of subcultures within it have been identified as significant obstacles and limitations to sustainability-related cultural change. How-ever, the reception of corporate maintainability standards can occurat a few distinct aspects. Changes on the surface, such as the publication of corporate sustainability reports, the incorporation of sustainability measures into employee performance evaluations, or employee training, according to our research, can provide a favorable setting for altering employees' core assumptions or even their values and beliefs.

REFERENCES

[1]. N. M. Ashkanasy, L. E. Broadfoot, and S. Falkus Organizational culture is measured by a questionnaire. C. M. Wilderoom, M. F. Peterson, and N. M. Ashkanasy (Eds.),

[2]. Handbook on the climate and culture of organizations (pp. 131–145). CA,

[3]. Thousand Oaks: Sage. G. Azzone, U. Bertele, and others utilizing green strategies to gain an advantage over rivals. 27(6),

[4]. Long-Term Planning: 69–81; Barley, S. R., and G. Kunda Devotion and design: Increases in managerial discourse of control ideologies that are rational and normative. 37(3) of Administrative Science Quarterly: 363–399.

[5]. Beer, M., R. A. Eisenstat, and B. Spector why change programs within an organization do not result in change. 68(6) of the Harvard Business Review A.

[6]. Crane, pp. 158–166 Amoralization as corporate sustainability. 21:4 of Organization Studies: 673–696. Daily, B. F., & S. Huang achieving sustainability through environmental management's focus on human resources. 21(12) of the International Journal of Operations and Production Management 1539–1552

[7]. Freeman, Richard E. Management by strategy: a strategy for stakeholders. Boston: Pitman. T. N. Gladwin, J. J. Kennelly, and T. S. Krause Beyond sustainability: toward a business that is good for society. Three: Sustainable Development 35–43