Organizational Environment and Attitudes of Economics and Administrative Sciences Students toward Natural Environment

Korhan ARUN[1] & Suat BEGEÇ[2]

Abstract: *Global consciousness based on an understanding of the unity and connection of all things. Nature represents environmentalists' living space in the global world. They have been joined by all social spectrum for future of the nature by their moral values. Ravaging of natures is turning into a wider platform for expressing opposition against states policies and from that point environmental concerns shall become important and may be expensive. Managers must more intensively take in count to comply with corporate environment and gain in competition. To accomplish that companies have laws, regulations, norms, social conventions and other written or unwritten rules. From these factors that are seen as effective on preventing the polluting of natural environment accordance with organizational environment perspective have been examined in this article.*
Keywords: *Attitudes, Business management, Environmental ethics, Organizational environment*

Örgütsel Çevre ve İktisadi İdari Bilimler Öğrencilerinin Doğal Çevreye Olan Tutumları
Özet: *Küresel bilinç, bütün varlıkların bağlantılı ve birbiri ile ilişkili olduğunu anlamaya bağlıdır. Doğa, çevrecilerin dünyadaki yaşam alanını temsil etmektedir. Toplumların büyük kesimi etik değerler sayesinde çevreye karşı duyarlılık göstermektedir. Doğanın tahrip edilmesi geniş çerçeveli bir politika kaşıtlığı yaratabilmektedir. Çevresel kaygılar çok önemli ve sonuçları belirlenemeyen bir hale gelebilmektedir. Yönetimler bundan dolayı örgüt çevreleriyle uyum sağlayarak rekabette ön plana çıkmalıdırlar. Bunu başarmak için işletmelerde kanunlar, normlar, sosyal antlaşmalar ve diğer yazılı olan ve/veya olmayan talimatlar bulunmaktadır. Bu makalede çevrenin kirlenmesini önlemeye en etkili yardımcı olacak değişkenler örgütsel çevre çerçevesinde incelenmiştir.*
Anahtar Kelimeler: *Çevresel Etik, Davranış, İşletme Yönetimi, Örgütsel çevre*

---

1. Introduction

There is only one world but being consumed by companies for almost hundred years that the conservation of natural resources, proper disposal of waste, and reduction of carbon emissions have become worldwide concerns. Environmental protection and economic strategy are now inextricably

---
[1] Namık Kemal University, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Tekirdag. Email: korhanarun@gmail.com
[2] Çağ University Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Mersin. Email: suat_begec@yahoo.com

intertwined which emphasizes that the business economy and the natural environment are interlinked because the environment provides critical support to economic systems not financial capital, but natural capital (Jakobsen and Persson, 2009, p 14). Also increasing recognition that the non-human (or more-than-human) world is entitled to recognition of dignity and worth for its` own intrinsic sake, and not simply for its instrumental value to humans (McKinnon, 2010, p 50) still environment has been polluted and ecosystem has been destroyed incrementally either directly or indirectly.

People are angry and frustrated at the states' decision to gain interest at the expense of natural environment. Ravaging of natures is turning into a wider platform for expressing opposition against states policies. Due to the fact that nature represents environmentalists' living space in the global world. So they have been joined by all social spectrums for future of the nature by their moral values.

Global consciousness based on an understanding of the unity and connection of all things that will expand environmental awareness. Organizations' management and governments with the environmental awareness have to obey laws, should compete non-financial and take in account of effects of media and Non-governmental Organizations (NGO). To do that companies have laws, regulations, norms, social conventions and other written or unwritten rules. From organizational environment view, the factors which are seen as effective on preventing the environment.

Today non-financial/market issues becoming more important than the financial measures in the modern world of competition. While the environment becoming the legal discourse and governance and environmental responsibility is being demanded by the stakeholders, increasing power of activist groups and the media in pluralist western societies (Onkila, 2009; Orlitzky et al., 2003, p 403). An organization's reality is constructed by people, and it has to adjust to the demands people have outside and inside the organization (Jakobsen and Persson, 2009) that customers are influenced by a organization's green image which does help sell their products (Mercado and Walker, 2012, p 279).

Environmental responsibilities are positively associated with competitive advantages and financial performance (Gomez-Mejia and Balkin, 2012, p 89; Chang, 2011, p 364), inescapably the costs of companies investments like certification as ISO 14001 getting higher -$50,000 for small organizations to more than $200,000 for larger organizations- (Delmas and Montes-Sancho, 2011, p 108). So if punished by laws or lose the investment because of individual carelessness, environmental concerns will become important and can be expensive. Managers must more intensively take in

count to comply with corporate environment and gain in competition. To do those companies should raise consciousness, creating attitudes, justifications and motivations (Tyburski, 2008).

There is no common ground for defining when moral responsibility is being met and what is basis for the acceptable environmental actions (Onkila, 2009, p 285) but the whole ecosystem is endangered if we will not develop an ethical framework or even deal with all issues that are at stake in the debate. Seen from an ethical perspective, the endangering of the environment is gaining economic goals on the cost of the living and non-living environment (Borrong, 2005, p 60) but if range of motivations underlying environmental actions can be understood measures can be taken.

2. Organizational Environment

An organization cannot exist in isolation organizational environment is a major factor that needed to be considered in every organization. Environment surrounds an individual positively or negatively (Owolabi, 2012, p29)

Previous studies have noted the role of regulatory, economic, social, industrial and competitive structures and their enforcement mechanisms in the adoption of various types of environmental management practices (Roxas and Coetzer, 2012, p 463). Organizational environment is made by the amount of the influence of factors (Luchesi, 2012, p 564) important because these factors including norms, beliefs and values affect one's overall predisposition to act with pro-environmental intent which in turn influences all behaviours an individual considers to be environmentally important (Roxas and Coetzer, 2012, p 463). Also organizational environment has great effect on this process (Rogers et al., 2009, p 773).

While organizations having being influenced by regulatory, cognitive and normative multidimensions, according as manegerial attitudes toward environment have been changing. Regulatory dimension is codified and coercive notions, normative dimension is beliefs, norms etc and last cognitive dimension refers to socially defined axioms that provide templates for action (Roxas and Coetzer, 2012, pp 462-463). These dimensions effect the natural environment or ecological world of the organization and individuals choose from a "suite" of mental models associated with different organizations through the levels of organizational environment (Daniels et al., 2002, p 35).

3. Environmental Ethics

After 1972 United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, governments have recognized that they face environmental challenges which require cooperative responses (Wapner, 2000, p 355). Responsible environmental behavior of organizations rests largely with managerial attitudes but roots of these attitudes -moral philosophy- focus on such terms as untruthful and unjust, it is not clear how such evaluations might obtain in our relationship with the ecological entity (Stockfeld, 2008. P 47)

Discussions of environmental protection may focus on how to reduce human vulnerability and accomplish sustainable living conditions by treating humans and nature as interrelated (McKinnon, 2010, p 36). Generally there are two ideas about environmental ethics; first is coming from respect to the environment idea that see nature as inhabitants of earth living community on the other hand, the anthropocentric version of the environmental protection ethic which correspond to basic human needs (Shah et al., 2011, p 1384) says duties and actions lose their moral character when their direct and only addressee is the environment (Tyburski, 2008). Ecological or environmental ethics should directly discuss the function of ethics to practical reality and contrarily to the ethics (Borrong, 2005, p 60).

Ethical reflection presents and justifies the desirable hierarchy of values and enriches inordinately all attempts to answer the fundamental questions: how should people behave towards their natural environment and why should they act in this way? (Tyburski, 2008) With this aim it wishes to develop an axiological model of preferences in the relations between humans and nature, in order that moral values should represent an important criterion regulating these relations. They should also temper potential conflicts between human activities and nature and enable such choices to be made that would favor the preservation of ecological balance in situations where humans intervene in the world of nature, adapting it for their needs (Tyburski, 2008, p 101). As people become more aware of the intimate union with their fellow human beings and physical environment each one inhabit, harmonization of the economic, social and environmental realms has at its center a more profound ethics of the human being.

Previous research shows national governments and corporations as being important actors, facilitating or hampering the adoption of organizational practices; whereas in reality the legal environment is likely to be more complex (Delmas and Montes-Sancho, 2011, p 104). Common view of ethics is the study of right and wrong conduct within a defined environment i.e. Environment defines the ethic and ethical roles.

"Environmental ethics" presents and defends a systematic and comprehensive account of the moral relations between human beings and their natural environment. It is the discipline that studies the moral relationship between human beings and nature and also the value and moral status of the environment (Fard and Noruzi, 2011, p 496) that helps members of the organisation to understand how it interacts with and potentially harms environment, or how it could help or heal its natural environment and resources. But still environmental ethics is seen as reconceptualization of ethics between human and nature; this limits moral engagement (Wapner, 2000, p 355).

Despite similarity in size and business operations and being embedded in the same organizational environment some organizations are more proactive than others are, in their environmental management practices, (Roxas and Coetzer, 2012, p 463). business has an ethical responsibility to the environment which goes beyond obeying environmental law. Managers can find themselves in a similar situation in regard to environmental imperatives because there is little or no direction in the various codes of ethics to help them address the ethical conflicts that arise when human need or desire is in direct and/or indirect divergence with non-human needs. Such a conflict might arise, for example, in relation to housing development that is needed for an increasing population where the proposed location involves the destruction of bushland that provides valuable wildlife habitat.

Environmental ethics education should promote environmental ethics, not because good ethics is good business, but because it is–morally required to adopt the moral point of view in all our dealings with nature (Hoffman, 1991, p 176). One of research (Lau et al., 2012) shows that:

  a. Students do believe that ethics is important to them,
  b. Education has influence on their ethical behaviors,
  c. Students perceive that faculty (faculty culture),
  d. Instructors (leaders) so managers play a part in shaping ethical behaviors,
  e. Students think that they are living in an ethical environment

(Lau et al., 2012). So environmental ethics is crucial to our making of environmental policy and to organizations' perception of moral duties to the environment, including business.

4. Methodology and Measurement

Survey questionnaire was conducted and distributed to all the first year students (freshman) enrolled at faculty of Economics and Administration Sciences of a private university in Turkey. The goal of the Faculty is that its graduates will be the managers of the organizations who will be responsible for the environment or will play an important role about decisions of organizations' on environment issues.

Aim of the survey is to understand the underlying the most important factor which effects the decions of students (future managers) when dealing with environmental issues. Questionnaire is composed of one question which requires arragement of choices from most important (1) to least important (5). Choices were chosen related to the instutional environment perspective. One question with 5 multi answer was asked. Choices are in order:

- **a.** My moral values (ethics)=1 (most important)
- **b.** Rewards=2 (very important)
- **c.** Leaders in my organization=3 (important)
- **d.** Laws=4 (less important)
- **e.** Organizational culture=5 (least important)

Table 1. Sample Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
ETHC[a]	164	95.9%	7	4.1%	171	100.0%

Note: a: Dichotomy group tabulated at value 1.

It is seen the Sample Summary Table-1. Population is around 200 students. Data was collected from 171 anonymous respondents. Also it is important to mention that different totals can be seen from total sample number Frequencies. This is because some participants checked choices not orderly from 1 to 5 using once instead they used same digitals more than one. This can be accepted in order to the aim of the questionnaire is to see the importance degree of the given institutional environment factors that they think effects their attitude towards natural environment.

Table 2. Frequencies of "1" (most important)				
		Responses		Percent of Cases
		N	Percent	
FACTORS PREVENTIN G FROM POLLUTING[a]	MY MORAL VALUES	68	37.6%	41.5%
	REWARDS	5	2.8%	3.0%
	LEADERS IN ORGANIZATION	34	18.8%	20.7%
	LAWS	50	27.6%	30.5%
	ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE	24	13.3%	14.6%
Total		181	100.0%	110.4%
a. Dichotomy group tabulated at value 1.				

As it is seen the frequencies of the most important factor from Table-2. The most important factor (checked as 1=most important) with 37.6 percent ratio is "**my moral values (ethics)**". 68 students are seeing the ehtical issues as the most important factor to decide on environmental issues. As mentioned total number is greater than the sample total because some participants used "**most important=1**" choice more than one for the factors in the questionnaire. So frequencies of "**1**" is higher than the sampel total number.

Table 3. Frequencies of "2" (very important)				
		Responses		Percent of Cases
		N	Percent	
FACTORS PREVENTIN G FROM POLLUTING[a]	MY MORAL VALUES	32	16.5%	18.9%
	REWARDS	33	17.0%	19.5%
	LEADERS IN ORGANIZATION	42	21.6%	24.9%
	LAWS	52	26.8%	30.8%
	ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE	35	18.0%	20.7%
Total		194	100.0%	114.8%
a. Dichotomy group tabulated at value 2.				

"**Laws**" are checked as "**very important=2**" factor 26,8% as highest factor seen Table-3. So it can be concluded that laws are very important dissuasive factor. "**Leaders in organization**" frequency is 21,6% as the second and "**organizational culture**" is 18% as the third very important factors. So if the environmental laws are very important for the students, supposed that laws related to natural environment are being taught at this university. Again total sum is different from the sample number because

some participants gave "**very important=2**" choice more than one factor when answering the question.

Table 4. Frequencies of "3" (important)		Responses		Percent of Cases
		N	Percent	
FACTORS PREVENTING FROM POLLUTING G[a]	MY MORAL VALUES	32	17.5%	19.3%
	REWARDS	32	17.5%	19.3%
	LEADERS IN ORGANIZATION	40	21.9%	24.1%
	LAWS	30	16.4%	18.1%
	ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE	49	26.8%	29.5%
Total		183	100.0%	110.2%
a. Dichotomy group tabulated at value 3.				

Moral values got 17,5% of "**important=3**" choice from the students. But "**organizational culture**" and "**leaders in organization**" choices were also seen the "**important**" factor by 26,8% and 21,9% from Table-4. From that result It can be concluded that organizational culture seems to have more efficacy on students. As mentioned before importance of leadership has an descending importance compared to organizational culture that is to say organizational environment has important than leaders. As also discussed before total number of the frequencies of "**3**" is different because of some participants gave it to more than one factor in the questionnaire.

Table 5. Frequencies of "4" (less important)		Responses		Percent of Cases
		N	Percent	
FACTORS PREVENTING FROM POLLUTING G[a]	MY MORAL VALUES	24	15.7%	15.9%
	REWARDS	38	24.8%	26.5%
	LEADERS IN ORGANIZATION	40	26.1%	25.2%
	LAWS	21	13.7%	13.9%
	ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE	30	19.6%	19.9%
Total		153	100.0%	101.3%
a. Dichotomy group tabulated at value 4.				

In Table 5 above "**leaders in organization**" (26,1%) are seen less important factor. "**rewards**" can be seen (24.8%) as "**less important**" factor;. Than **organizational culture, moral values** and **laws** are seen "**less important**" factor in order. This results give the self awereness for the students is more important than leaders for protecting the environment. Here total number is smaller than the sample number because some participants did not give "**4**" because as it is mentioned before they graded other numbers instead of juxtaposing.

Table 6. Frequencies of "5" (least important)				
		Responses		Percent of
		N	Percent	Cases
FACTORS PREVENTING FROM POLLUTING[a]	MY MORAL VALUES	15	10.4%	10.6%
	REWARDS	61	42.4%	43.3%
	LEADERS IN ORGANIZATION	17	11.8%	12.1%
	LAWS	18	12.5%	12.8%
	ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE	33	22.9%	23.4%
Total		144	100.0%	102.1%
a. Dichotomy group tabulated at value 5.				

And as it can be seen from Table 6 "**rewards**" are the least important factor on preventing of polluting natural environment when it comes to personal choices (42,4%) "**least important=5**" was given by 61 participants. The second least important factor is "**organizational culture**" but it can be seen that frequencies of factors dispersed almost averagely same execept "**rewards**" factor. So it is consistent with todays generation cultures` motivating theories that they are self-directed and individualist (Jones, 2012, p 21) that leaders and rewards (Table 5 and Table 6) have less effect on them.

5. Conclusion

Despite the laws, written or unwritten rules and implementations for caring natural environment some organizations have more success than the others. That is where culture and environmental ethics go into action because despite the commonalty of laws and other rules culture is unique and ethics affects the attitudes and behaviors of members of the organization. But general ethics is not implementing human to nature interactions so they should be taught. As it can be seen from the results the most important factor for preventing the nature is "my moral values (ethics)" but least is

"rewards". This result is the evidence that materialistic approach to natural environment by the organizations will not work at least on preventing of the environment.

If the importance of the factors that prevents the students of polluting the environment is arranged from highest importance to lowest, that will be: moral issues (ethics), laws, organizational culture, leaders and rewards. As it sees from the results it can be inferred that organizations must provide individuals moral support or laws education by using organizational culture but not to build strategic actions depending on materialistic approach such as rewards. At the same time all members of the organization may be seen as self-leader or self-aware individuals that organizations should find ways to reach individually instead of classic hierarchical approach.

For the university students to highlight the natural environment awareness, environmental ethics and natural environmental laws could be put in to syllabus. Also it is important to have the universities a environmental culture and environment caring professors because that can align university and organizational environment strategies. Also graduate students from universities can adopt more easily and make progress on organizations` natural environmental systems.

Succinctly organizations have to grip the ethics of their citizens and taught the laws. Instructing the laws is easier than the influencing the moral values. But the effective way of natural environmental strategy to have environmental ethics is the organizational implement the right culture also the management engages about natural environment.

References
Borrong, R.P. (2005), "Environmental Ethics and Ecological Theology: Ethics as Integral Part of Ecosphere from an Indonesian Perspective", Ph.D. Thesis, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam

Chang, C.-H. (2011), "The Influence of Corporate Environmental Ethics on Competitive Advantage: The Mediation Role of Green Innovation", Journal of Business Ethics, 104, 361–370.

Daniels, K., Johnson, G., de Chernatony, L. (2002), Task and Institutional Influences on Managers' Mental Models of Competition, Organization Studies, 2311, 31-62

Delmas, M., Montes-Sancho, M.J. (2011), "An Institutional Perspective on the Diffusion of International Management System Standards: The Case of the Environmental Management Standard ISO 14001", Business Ethics Quarterly 21(1), 108.

Fard, H. D., Noruzi, M.R., (2011), "A Snap Shot on Business Ethic and Ethic in Business", Interdisciplinary Journal Of Contemporary Research In Business, 2(9), 496.

Gomez-Mejia, L.R., Balkin David, B. (2012), "Management People / Performance / Change", Prentice Hall.

Hoffman W. M. (1991), "Business and Environmental Ethics", Business Ethics Quarterly, 1(2), 169-184.

Jakobsen, G.D., Persson, A. (2009), "A Study Of Three Companies' Environmental Performance Environmental Performance -Content And Context", Thesis, Baltic Business School, University of Kalmar. Sweden, june.

Jones, P.H. (2012), "The Continuum of Learner Disengagement: Ethnographic Insights Into Experiential Learning in Marketing Education", Journal of Marketing Education, 34(1), 19–29.

Lau ,L.K., Caracciolo B., Roddenberry S., Scroggins A., (2012), "College students' perception of ethics", Journal of Academic and Business Ethics, 5, 1-13.

Luchesi, J.R. de S., Crespi K.M., Camargo, M.E. (2012), "Organizational Environment Research: Methodology Proposed to a Higher Education Institution from Serra Gaucha", Information Management and Business Review, 4(11), 563-569.

McKinnon, J.G. (2010), "Towards a new consciousness of 'environment' for the social work profession: Perceptions of a sample of environmentally-conscious social workers in Australia", Thesis, Charles Sturt University

Onkila, T.J. (2009), "Corporate Argumentation for Acceptability: Reflections of Environmental Values and Stakeholder Relations in Corporate Environmental Statements", Journal of Business Ethics 87, 285–298

Orlitzky, M., Frank, L. Schmidt, Sara L. Rynes, (2003), Corporate Social and Financial Performance: A Meta-analysis, Organization Studies 24(3), 403–441.

Owolabi, A.B. (2012), "Effect of Organizational Justice and Organizational Environment on Turn-Over Intention of Health Workers in Ekiti State", Nigeria, Research in World Economy, 3(1), 28-34.

Rogers, P., Berg, G., Boettcher, J., Howard, C., Justice, L., Schenk K. (2009), "Encyclopedia of Distance Learning", Second Edition, InformatIon ScIence reference, Hershey, New York.

Roxas, B., Coetzer, A. (2012), "Institutional Environment, Managerial Attitudes and Environmental Sustainability Orientation of Small Firms", Journal of Business Ethics, 111, 461–476.

Shah S. M., Farooq M., Munir S., Mahmood Z., Saeed G. (2011), "Workforce Ethics In Organization Procedure And Practices", Interdisciplinary, Journal of Contemporary Research in Business, Institute of Interdisciplinary Business Research, 3(3), 1383.

Stockfeld, K.J. (2008), "The Self and the Ecological: Towards an Integration of Selfhood and Environmental Responsibility", Thesis, The University of Sydney, October.

Tyburski, W. (2008), "Origin and Development of Ecological Philosophy and Environmental Ethics and Their Impact on the Idea of Sustainable Development", Sustainable Development, 16, 100–108.

Uecker-Mercado H., Matthew W. (2012), "The Value of Environmental Social Responsibility to Facility Managers: Revealing the Perceptions and Motives for Adopting ESR", Springer Science+Business Media, Journal of Business Ethics, 110, 269–284.

Wapner, P. (2000), "People, Nature and Ethics", Current History, 99, 640, p 355.