



## CORPORATE HOPE AND OPERATIONAL SUSTAINABILITY

**Victor Barinua (Ph.D)**

*Department of Management, Faculty of Management Sciences  
Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria*

**Joe-Okidi, Precious O.**

*Department of Management, Faculty of Management Sciences  
Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria*

### ABSTRACT

*The study focused on corporate hope and operational sustainability. The aim of the study was to investigate the relationship between corporate hope and operational sustainability. Qualitative research design was adopted, specifically, the literature review method. Data was collected from secondary sources. The major findings of the study revealed that environmental sustainability, economic sustainability, and social sustainability positively and significantly influence corporate hope. In view of these findings, the study concludes that corporate hope is a veritable means of achieving operational sustainability in terms of belief and expectation. Thus, committing resources to achieve sustainability will enable organizations to achieve high performance in their operations. Businesses must focus on more than just products, sales, and profit to succeed in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Therefore, the study recommends that organizations should commit resources to operational sustainability to enhance corporate hope.*

**Keywords:** Corporate Hope, Operational sustainability, Ecological or Environmental Sustainability, Social Sustainability. Economic Sustainability

## Introduction

In today's global business organizations, the desire to improve performance and productivity has become a very crucial issue as every firm struggles to outwit the other. Many organizations have been seen to play and continue to contribute significantly to the growth and industrialization of economies globally (Onugu, 2005). However, in some developing economies, some organizations have performed below expectations as a result of many confrontations that may vary from environmental factors, instability of government and their policies as a result of frequent alterations, declining financial support, pandemics, etc. From reflection on the numerous challenges facing many organizations, particularly in developing countries, one can easily be drawn into concluding that they have led to poor morals, discontent, and poor performance. Thus, the quest to achieve a high level of productivity through operational sustainability is becoming high.

Herman (1974, 1991), Barrett (1994), Rees (2008, 2010) and Hgydn Washington (2015) have argued that the mainstream approaches to sustainability need to be critically examined. Businesses must focus on more than just products, sales, and profit to succeed in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Organizations strive to gain a competitive advantage in the business space by ensuring that they out-perform other players in the same industry. There is a pronounced need to provide corporate leaders with concrete steps on how to travel down a sustainable path. Corporate sustainability. The partnership between industry and the community has many benefits for business in terms of better employees and a positive public image that attracts more customers seeking to support companies that support a high quality of life for this and future generations. Corporate sustainability has become a buzzword in companies big and small. Walmart stores, McDonald's corporation, and many of the true corporate firms have named sustainability as a key priority moving forward (Blewitt, 2014). Now, other companies are under pressure to show how they plan to commit and deliver their goods and services in a sustainable manner. This, of course, brings the question of what exactly this means.

Corporate sustainability in investment can fall under the term ESG (Environmental, Social, and Government) or the acronym SRI, which stands for Socially Responsible Investment (William, 2010). Sustainability is most often defined as meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet theirs (Blewitt, 2004). It has three main pillars: economic, environmental or ecological, and social. Investors who seek not only economic profit but also social good are increasingly concerned about corporate sustainability. It adds a competitive edge to the company's bottom line. It means that organizations are meeting their own needs without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. As Barlett (1994) has noted, the idea of sustainable means for an unspecified period of time. This brings us to the issue of corporate hope in an organization.

Hope is a critical part of achieving a strategy when it is based on what is possible, perhaps not highly probable, but possible (Davis, 2018). While people think of hope as an emotion, researchers describe it as a cognitive theory that is used in goal setting (William, 2010). Snuder (2014) described hope with this phrase: "you can get there from here." Hope is an abstract. It can neither be felt nor seen. A high level of hope has been linked to fewer cases of absenteeism, more productivity, and greater health and happiness. Organizations start most operations with hope, especially the hope of succeeding and performing well. Often times, they get motivated by intermediate results, feedback, and milestones they hit in their journey. In a job or project, as organizations hit milestones or get feedback on their progress, it refuels

them to sail stronger on the same path or course that is correct to better direction. Davis (2018) posits that great organizations are built around a stable to positive hope quotient. The hope quotient is also a function of clear communication and a clear strategy that allows for committing a mistake but not repeating it. Hope and productivity are connected. Increased levels of productivity translate into good business results (Lopez, 2005). Hope is the belief that things should be better and that they can be made better. This can help organizations prosper. Leaders need to be skillful at building hope in their followers. Followers want their leaders to meet their psychological needs, which include stability, trust, compassion, and hope. The term "hope" is future-oriented. It is defined as the belief that the future will be better than the present. This is an incredibly valuable feeling to instill in the workplace. It is when this is put in place in the organization that we talk about corporate hope. Corporate hope, when instilled in the organization, can have a positive impact on employee morale and the general performance of the organization. While employers cannot actually make individual staffers feel hopeful, they can instill hope as part of their company's policy.

Organizational policy is a course or method of action selected, usually by an organization, institution, university, society, etc., from among alternatives to guide and determine present and future decisions and positions on matters of public interest or social concern (Kshirsagar, 2019). An organization can have a policy to implement physical security and prevent unauthorized access inside the office premise. This policy is applicable to everyone in the organization and the general public and must be followed strictly, without deviation. Policy may state that the public is only permitted to assess up to the reception area and that beyond the reception area, only employees are permitted (Kshirsagar, 2019). Favourable organizational policies enhance productivity and quality service in the organization. Therefore, employers should initiate friendly policies that seem to incorporate hope and organizational sustainability to enhance organizational performance and productivity. The greatest purpose of instilling corporate hope in the workplace is to give team members a community of support around their hopes (Davis, 2014). According to Lopez (2018), corporate hope helps organizations launch new businesses that thrive and dream up new products that sell. It pushes people to be ambitious and successful, and it accounts for 14% of the productivity in the workplace. To take advantage of corporate hope in the organization, world leaders must make goals meaningful, strategize hope and plan for its what-ifs, and help employees understand they can use operational sustainability to achieve corporate hope and make the workplace better and yield good performance and productivity. The aim of the study was to determine the relationship between corporate hope and operational sustainability.

## **REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE**

### **Conceptual Review**

#### **Concept of Corporate Hope**

In social science, hope has been defined in a number of ways, including fundamental trust (Erikson, 1950), conditional response (Mower, 1960), goal expectation (Stotland, 1987), and spiritual connection (Stotland, 1987; Prayser, 1987). As a result, hope seems to be strongly linked to positive affectivity at work. Workers' mindfulness, for example, has been shown to boost hope, while mindfulness has also been shown to predict employee job engagement and health via corporate hope (Malinowski & Lin, 2015). According to Strauss, et al. (2014), employee hope was positively connected to supervisors' ratings of workers' task adaptivity,

and hope had a strong direct influence on insurance agents' commissions through task adaptivity. While most people consider hope to be an emotion, scholars define it as a cognitive notion related to goal planning (Snyder, 2014). Snyder (2014) often used the term "you'll get there from here" to describe hope: Corporate hope is the organization's collective hope fused into one body. A steady-to-positive optimism quotient is the foundation of great organizations. The conviction that things may be better and that they can be made better will help a company flourish is known as corporate optimism (Lopez, 2005). Organizations must begin and grow with the aim of succeeding and doing so effectively. There is a link between hope and production (Stotland, 1969). Snyder (2002) claims that higher productivity leads to improved business results as a consequence of optimism.

In a longitudinal study of 308 white-collar US employees (CSR), they found that sentiments of optimism and appreciation boost concern for corporate social responsibility. Employees with higher levels of hope and thankfulness, in particular, were shown to have a larger feeling of responsibility for employee and social concerns; interestingly, employee hope and gratitude had no effect on their sense of responsibility for economic or safety/quality issues. These results add to Giacalone's study, which is based on the assumption and expectation that the organization would work effectively and efficiently, resulting in high production in terms of economics, social issues, politics, and other factors.

To give a meaningful perspective on corporate hope, it is necessary to analyze the assessment of excellent corporate hope concepts that have progressively revolutionized the corporate landscape—that is, the need for changes in managers' attitudes about how to operate their organizations efficiently (Lopez, 2005). The term "corporate hope" refers to what company executives consider to be positive. It is the assumption and expectation that an efficient and effective organization would result in increased production and performance.

### **The Concept of Operational Sustainability**

Corporations are increasingly incorporating sustainability into their business strategies and aiming for sustainable development objectives as a result of their efforts (Bletwitt, 2014). Operational sustainability is a means of determining if a business can continue current practices without jeopardizing future resources (Davis, 2018). According to Bletwitt (2014), operational sustainability may be defined as activities that fulfill current demands without jeopardizing the potential to meet future needs. Sustainability may refer to a wide range of topics, including ecological, social, and environmental resources.

Most often, operational sustainability is described as addressing current needs without jeopardizing future generations' capacity to meet their own (Daly & Cobb, 1994). It's a means of determining if a company can keep its current methods without jeopardizing future resources (Barlett, 1994). Operational sustainability is a long-term growth strategy that is in tune with people and the business (Burlett). As a result, the organization's survival is dependent on corporate optimism. Business sustainability is a method through which organizations manage their financial, social, and environmental risks, duties, and possibilities. Profits, people, and the environment are terms used to describe these three consequences. They are businesses that can withstand shocks because of their close ties to a healthy economic, social, and environmental system. They provide economic benefits while also helping to maintain a healthy environment and community (Davis, 2018). According to William (2010), there are a few approaches to making business operations more sustainable. Creating a sustainability action plan, inspecting the HVAC system, upgrading lights, boosting

fleet energy efficiency, minimizing water waste, adopting sustainable landscaping, and diverting waste and sources are just a few of them. Economic, environmental, and social sustainability are the three primary pillars of operational sustainability. The function of operations in ensuring long-term viability is critical. Better environmental performance may be a result of firms' improving quality or cutting costs (Barlett, 1994). Manufacturing processes and supply chains that are more efficient not only save money, but they also use less energy, utilize fewer resources, and generate less waste.

### **Ecological or Environmental Sustainability**

From an ecological perspective (Freeman, 1984), a company's ability to use natural resources at its current pace without depleting the resources on which it relies is referred to as "operational sustainability." This may be from the standpoint of a single corporation or the entire industry. Environmental impact reduction leads to greater global efficiency when it comes to the distribution of goods and services. Environmental sustainability investigates how a firm utilizes natural resources, recycles, and according to Alhaddi (2015), the environmental line of the triple bottom line refers to participating in actions that do not jeopardize the environmental resources for future generations. Mohd Zawawi and Abd Wahab (2019) clarify that "the environmental dimensions are usually understood as the natural resource utilised, the residue left by their operational processes, and any other environmental consequences or activities, such as leaks and spills, nitrogen release, suspended sediment discharge, water reclamation, environmental efficiencies and benefits, ecological training expenses, environmental availability of information, etc." Organizational environmental effects are a hot topic for discussion in the sustainability community. It decreases waste throughout the production and distribution process (Hill & Kein, 2001).

### **Social Sustainability**

From an ecological perspective, a company's ability to use natural resources at its current pace without depleting the resources on which it relies is defined as operational sustainability (Freeman, 1984). This may be from the standpoint of a single corporation or the entire industry. When it comes to the distribution of goods and services, global efficiency is achieved through reducing environmental effects. Environmental sustainability investigates how a firm utilizes natural resources, recycles, and According to Alhaddi (2015), the environmental line of the triple bottom line refers to participating in actions that do not jeopardize the environmental resources for future generations. Mohd Zawawi and Abd Wahab (2019) explain that "the environmental measurements are generally taken as the amount of natural resources used, the residue left by their operations, as well as any other environmental costs or activities, such as spillages, nitrogen discharge, suspended solids discharge, wastewater reuse, environmental savings and incentives, ecological training costs, environmental information availability, etc." Environmental effects from businesses' actions are a hot topic of conversation in sustainability circles nowadays, as they decrease waste throughout the production and distribution process (Hill & Kein, 2001).

### **Economic Sustainability**

From an ecological perspective (Freeman, 1984), a company's ability to use natural resources at its current pace without depleting the resources on which it relies is referred to as "operational sustainability." This may be from the standpoint of a single corporation or the entire industry. Environmental impact reduction leads to greater global efficiency when it

comes to the distribution of goods and services. According to Alhaddi (2015: 6), the economic line of the triple bottom line connects the organization's development to the economy's growth and how well it contributes to its support. However, Rasouli and Kumarasuriyar (2016) identified two perspectives on economic sustainability, noting that while some scholars believe the central concept is based on the relationship between economic growth and the use of natural resources, others believe the central concept is based on the long-term performance of capital.

Considering both perspectives, one could argue that economic sustainability is determined by economic performance measures, which, according to Mohd Zawawi and Abd Wahab (2019), are typically taken for profit and loss factors such as profit growth, sales growth, returns on equity or assets, after-tax income, transportation and marketing costs, and so on. Atkinson et al. (2007), as summarized in Rasouli and Kumarasuriyar (2016), argue that if sustainability is defined as leaving future generations with at least as many opportunities as we have today, the only way to accomplish this is by passing on to future generations a level of capital at least as high as ours today. This occurs when organizations provide economic value to the surrounding system in a manner that benefits it and strengthens its capacity to sustain future generations (Alhaddi, 2015).

### **Empirical Review**

This study's credibility is derived from the empirical work of other researchers who have attempted to pave the way for future research on corporate hope and operational sustainability. However, none of this research examined this subject in the manner in which this study does. Additionally, no existing research was evaluated in relation to the scope of this subject. As a result, it is clear that the discrepancies in dimension have produced a knowledge gap that this work seeks to close.

Dua Le, Daq, and Truong (2020) explored the determinants of a Vietnamese microfinance institution's operational self-sustainability (OSS) (MFIs). The study included both qualitative and quantitative methods. It is critical for MFIs to prioritize operational and financial sustainability as much as customer outreach. However, in order to attain long-term sustainability, MFIs would ultimately need capital from commercial sources (such as public deposits). The present research sought to determine if the existing manner of operation used by MFIs in Vietnam is sustainable. The conclusion is that microfinance organizations in Vietnam are more efficient than their counterparts (Dang & Vu, 2021). As they focus on improved resource usage and elimination of waste, and the majority of funders are now interested in sponsoring sustainability initiatives.

Atlee and Kirchain (2006) conducted research on operational sustainability measures, specifically evaluating the usefulness of metrics in the context of an electronic recycling system. The writers noted that during the last 15 years, firms and governments have become more aware of the importance of sustainability. However, no clarity exists on how to progress toward the objective of sustainability or quantify advances. Not only are there few operational measures available at the moment for evaluating progress toward sustainability in practice, but there is also insufficient knowledge of how to evaluate the usefulness of such measurements. The research takes a pragmatic approach to generating and analyzing system-specific sustainability performance metrics. Electronics recycling is discussed, as well as a case study for designing and evaluating such a metric's performance. Despite rising worries about how end-of-life electronics are handled, data availability is constant, and there is still a

lack of awareness of the electronics recycling system as a whole. To address the requirement for realistic qualitative methodologies for system performance assessment, many indicators were created and used at three electronics recycling plants in the United States. These metrics were evaluated using the defined criteria for successful measurements, which require that they be relevant, resilient, and practicable. The results indicate that the present mass percent to land fill metric is insufficient for assessing system performance. Additional insight into resource efficiency may be gained by using relevance-weighted mass indicators with variable data requirements.

Mareike and Hans (2008) conducted a market analysis of the German outdoor clothing business, concentrating on environmentally and human health-friendly manufacturing. A literature review was conducted on the cradle-to-cradle (C2C) design idea, as it provides a solution to pollution, waste, and environmental degradation caused by existing industrial design and waste management practices. Secondary research was used to acquire data for the following market and competitive study of the German outdoor apparel sector in order to identify various important market indicators for assessing market potential. The study concluded with the development of a positioning strategy for outdoor clothes based on the C2C design idea. The results indicate stagnating growth rates in the German outdoor apparel sector in recent years and intense competition among rivals. However, a sizable market opportunity was identified, as well as advantageous trends for sustainable outdoor firms. This data indicates that a market exists for an outdoor gear brand that adheres to the C2C design principle. By pursuing a strategy of transparency and unwavering dedication to sustainable manufacturing, the firm may be able to acquire market share from rivals since future forecasts suggest the industry will develop at a rapid pace. The findings of this investigation might be very beneficial to companies looking to enter the German outdoor gear sector.

### **Baseline Theory**

Operational sustainability is a business strategy that focuses on the ethnic, social, environmental, cultural, and economic components of conducting business. Corporate social responsibility, stakeholder theory, operational sustainability, and green economics are described as the four primary theories of corporate sustainability. Originally, operational sustainability was described as the process through which natural systems create and supply the environment in a balanced manner (Daly & Cobb, 1994). This research explored the stakeholder theory of corporate social responsibility.

According to Freeman's (1984) stakeholder theory, managers must satisfy a range of constituencies (e.g., employees, customers, suppliers, and local community groups) who might influence business results. According to this concept, managers cannot concentrate primarily on the interests of stakeholders or business owners. According to stakeholder theory, it may be profitable for the corporation to participate in specific CSR activities that are deemed significant by non-financial stakeholders. According to Hillman and Kein (2001), the rationale for CSR is based on two propositions: first, there is a moral imperative for businesses to do the right thing regardless of how such decisions affect firm performance (the social issues argument); and second, firms can gain a competitive edge by tailoring CSR activities to primary stakeholders (the stakeholders argument). Their research on 500 firms indicated that investing in stakeholder management may be complementary to creating value for stakeholders and may even provide a foundation for competitive advantage by enabling the development of critical resources and capabilities that differentiate a firm from its competitors. Participating in social concerns that are not directly related to the firm's

immediate stakeholders, on the other hand, may have a detrimental effect on the firm's potential to generate shareholder value. Porter and Kramer provided a compelling case for CSR (2006). Morgan and Ghoshal (1996) argued that what is good for society does not have to be good for business, and that what is good for business does not have to come at the expense of society. Effective company strategies, such as operational sustainability, are founded on value generation rather than value appropriation.

### **Corporate Hope and Operational Sustainability**

Operational sustainability goes beyond platitudes to enact improvements that mitigate enterprises' effects on the environment (Davis, 2018). Some businesses prioritize environmental sustainability, while others prioritize health, poverty, education, and fair access to resources. It is a long-term growth strategy that is in harmony with people and business. According to Mareike and Hans, operational sustainability practices emphasize the fact that resources are finite and should be used prudently and with an eye toward long-term priorities and the consequences of resource use. Increasingly, businesses are making public commitments to sustainability through actions such as waste reduction, investment in renewable energy, and support for organizations working toward a more sustainable future.

Operational sustainability promotes businesses to make long-term choices based on environmental, social, and human implications rather than on quarterly earnings reports. It persuades people to evaluate more than just the immediate profit or loss at stake. Increasingly, businesses are committing to sustainable targets such as achieving zero waste by a specific year or reducing total emissions by a given amount (Davis, 2018). These businesses may achieve sustainability through reducing emissions, reducing energy consumption, obtaining items from fair-trade organizations, and ensuring physical trash is disposed of with the least possible carbon impact (Morgan & Ghoshal, 1996).

Operational sustainability in investment might be referred to as ESQ (environment, social, and government) or as SRI (socially responsible investment) (Davis 2018). Sustainability is built on three pillars, which are colloquially known as "people, planet, and profit." Corporate sustainability is becoming a significant issue for investors, seeking not just economic gain but also social benefit. It provides a competitive advantage to the organization's bottom line, leading to increased corporate hope. As previously noted, the environmental pillar, Environmental pillars often get the greatest emphasis. The company focuses on carbon footprints, packaging waste, trash utilization, and the company's total environmental impact. Businesses have discovered that operational sustainability has a positive financial impact by reducing the amount of materials used in packaging, which typically results in lower overall spending on those materials. For example, Walmark focused on packaging through a zero-waste initiative, pushing for less packing throughout their supply chain and for more packing to be sourced from recycled or reused material (Porter & Kramer, 2006). Other businesses, such as mining or food items, tackle the environmental pillar via benchmarking and reduction.

### **The Social Pillar**

A sustainable business requires the backing and cooperation of its workers, stakeholders, and the community in which it works. While there are several strategies for obtaining and maintaining this support, they ultimately boil down to treating workers fairly and being a good neighbor and community member, both locally and worldwide (Barlett, 1994). On the

employee side, firms prioritize retention and engagement tactics, which include more responsive benefits such as enhanced maternity and paternity leave, flexible scheduling, and chances for learning and development. Businesses have devised several methods of giving back to the community, including money-raising, sponsorship, scholarships, and investment (William, 2010). On a worldwide social scale, a business must consider how its supply chain is stocked, whether employees are paid properly, and whether the work environment is safe.

### **The Economic Pillar**

Because waste is the economic pillar of sustainability, businesses believe they are on a solid foundation. A business must be lucrative in order to be sustained. Indeed, profit at any cost is not the economic pillar's *raison d'être*. Compliance, effective governance, and risk management are all activities that fall within the economic pillar. This pillar is sometimes referred to as the "governance pillar" in reference to sound corporate governance. This implies that the board of directors and management act in the best interests of the company's shareholders, as well as the community, value chain, and end-user consumers. In terms of governance, investors may want to know that a business employs accurate and transparent accounting practices and that stakeholders are given the chance to vote on significant issues. Additionally, they may seek assurances that businesses avoid conflicts of interest in their board member selection, do not utilize political donations to achieve overly favorable treatment, and, of course, do not participate in unlawful acts.

Economic pillars and revenues enable corporations to embrace sustainability solutions. Economic considerations act as a check on extreme actions that firms are occasionally compelled to take, such as abruptly abandoning fossil fuels or chemical fertilizer in lieu of gradual transitions. The primary concern for investors and executives is whether sustainability represents a competitive advantage for a business. In practice, all of the sustainability techniques have been appropriated from other business environments, such as community involvement and talent acquisition (Davis, 2018). Sustainability gives businesses a greater purpose and some new deliverables to aim for, aiding them in renewing their commitment to fundamental objectives such as efficiency, sustainable growth, and shareholder value.

More crucially, a publicly communicated sustainability plan may result in difficult-to-quantify advantages like increased public goodwill and a stronger reputation. It enables a business to get credit for work already completed. Sustainability is a tenet of the 21st century. Organizations that want to succeed do so by maintaining hope. Corporate hope enables many businesses to implement appropriate strategies and policies with the hope of improving performance in the future. Without focus and the confidence and expectation that the business will flourish, an organization will not see operational sustainability as a significant problem. To flourish in the twenty-first century, businesses must concentrate on more than just goods, sales, and profit. Corporate hope will result in operational sustainability for any business aiming for peak performance. For some businesses, sustainability provides a chance to consolidate disparate efforts under a single umbrella idea and earn public recognition (William, 2010). For some businesses, sustainability entails confronting difficult questions about the how and why of business activities that have the potential to have a significant, if not gradual, influence on other operations. According to Porter and Kramer (2006), sustainability spans a business's whole supply chain, demanding responsibility from the primary level to suppliers and retailers, if providing something sustainable becomes a competitive advantage for international suppliers.

Thus, corporations might reorganize parts of the worldwide supply chains that have formed exclusively on the basis of manufacturing costs. Of course, such a scenario is contingent upon the degree to which corporations adopt sustainability. This brings up the topic of corporate hope inside a company once again. Corporate hope and operational sustainability are inextricably linked. Operational sustainability enables organizations to reinvent themselves via intelligent operations that result in operational excellence. It enables firms to transit holistically from segregated departments to a highly resilient organization focused on long-term operational excellence. It assists firms in risk management, compliance, operational discipline, maximizing output, minimizing equipment downtime, and increasing productivity.

## **Conclusion**

Operational sustainability is a delicate mix of environmental stewardship, equality, and economic viability. Sustainability is the blending of environmental stewardship, social equality, and economic vitality in order to foster the development of prosperous, healthy, diversified, and resilient communities for this generation and future generations. Corporate hope creates space for organizations focused on operational sustainability. A sustainability-oriented company must convey their commitment to social concerns, the rationale for their sustainability measures, and the consistency of the programs advocated and their corporate mission statement consistently (Porter & Kremer, 2006). Sustainable companies are increasingly developing as a new business paradigm that is seen as necessary for an organization's growth and competitiveness (Baumgartner, 2009). The sustainability approach establishes the company's identity and emphasizes the business commitment to the "3Ps" (Planet, People, and Profit) (Savitz & Weber, 2006). According to this triple bottom line concept, an organization is considered sustainable if it is capable of striking the appropriate balance between economic performance, environmental preservation, and social growth (Quadds & Siddique, 2011).

## **Findings**

This part of the study summarized empirical data from this study on corporate hope and operational sustainability to see if they corroborated or contradicted findings from earlier studies. The study's conclusions are consistent with those of other experts who have conducted comparable investigations in the past. For instance, the study's results corroborate those of Atlee and Kirchain (2007), who investigated operational sustainability metrics, evaluating metric performance in the context of electronic regulatory systems. The study noted that over the last 15 years, corporations and the government have developed a growing appreciation for the importance of sustainability, implying that organizations have hope that businesses will continue to thrive in an environment that does not jeopardize the efforts of future generations. The research also discovered a strong correlation between corporate hope and operational sustainability. Similarly, the results corroborate Dua and Truong's (2020) and Mareike and Itans' (2008) studies on the determinants of self-sustainability and market potential, respectively, by concentrating on environmentally and human health-friendly manufacturing. Their findings suggest a strong link between corporate hope and operational sustainability.

## **Recommendations**

The following suggestions are offered in light of the debate and conclusion above: the study recommended that:

- i. Management should ensure that they have a technique for determining if a business can continue to operate under current conditions without jeopardizing future potential resources.
- ii. Management should guarantee that operations address current demands without jeopardizing future needs.
- iii. Second, management should develop policies that both acknowledge and promote corporate optimism.
- iv. Management should train employees should progress and make the most of the opportunity to aspire to a better future.

## References

- Anderson L.M., Giacalone R., & Jurkiewicz. (2007). *Journals of business ethics* 45(12), 4500-4512. Springer.
- Atless J., & Korchain, R. (2006). Environmental science & technology. *Journal of business ethics*. 40(14), 4506-4513.
- Barlett, A. (1994). *Population and environmental*. Prentice Hall.
- Baumgartner, R.J. (2009). Organizational culture and leadership: Precondition for the development of a sustainable corporate. *Sustain development*, 17,102-113.
- Blewit, J. (2014). *Understanding sustainable development*, Routledge.
- Crane, A., Matten, D. (2007). *Business ethics*. Oxford university press
- Daly, H.E., & Cobb, J.B., (1994). *For the common good; redirecting the economy toward community, the environment and a sustainable future*, Boston, Beacon Press.
- Dang T., VuQ. (2021). *Data science for financial economics*, Springer.
- Davis, J. (2018). Corporate social performance revisited. *Academy of management review* 16(4), 61-719
- Elkington, J. (1994). Towards the sustainable corporation: Win-win-win business strategies for sustainable development. *Calif.manag.Rev.*36, 90-100.
- Erikson, E.H. (1950). *Childhood and society*: Norton.
- Fieseler, C., Fleck M., & Meckel, M. (2010). Corporate social responsibility in the blogosphere. *J Bus Ethics*, 91, 599-614.
- Fombrun, C., V. (2004). *Fame and fortune. How successful companies build winning reputations; financial times*: upper saddle river, NJ, USA.
- Freeman R.E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder perspective*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice Hall.
- Giacalone, A., & Paul E., Jurkiewicz C. (2005). *Journals of business ethics*,58, 295-305.
- Haq M., Hoque M., & Pathan S. (2008). *International review of business research* gete.net.
- Hillman A & Keim, G. (2001). Shareholder value, stakeholder management and social issues: What's the bottom line? *Management Journal*, 22(2), 125-139.
- Kshirsagar S. (2019). Impact of organizational policies on the morale of line managers in Mumbai. <https://gud.eu/doi/10.4108/eal>
- Le T., DaQN. M, Truong T. (2020). *The Journal of Asian Koreascience.or.kr*.
- Lopez, S. (2018). *Making hope happen*, Dalles Caiden Press.
- Mareike S., Hans T, (2008). *The Journal of Asian, Koreascience.org*.
- Morgan, R. & Ghoshal, S. (1996). *Value creation by firms, academy of management best paper proceedings*, 41-45.
- Mowrer, O.H. (1960). *Learning theory and behaviour*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/10802-000>.
- Onugu, B.A.N. (2005). *Small and medium enterprises (SMEs) in Nigeria: Problems and prospects*. A dissertation submitted to the St. Clement University United Kingdom in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the award of Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in management. Retrieved from <http://stelments.edu/grad/fradonug.pdf.on> 04/01/2019.
- Porter, M.E. & Kramer, M.R. (2006). Strategy and society: The link between competitive advantage and corporate social responsibility, *harvard business review*, 1-6.
- Pruyser, P.W. (1987). *Maintaining hope in adversity*. *Bultetrin of the meninger clinic*, 51, 463-474.
- Quaddus, M.A., & Siddique M.A.B. (2011). *Handbook of corporate sustainability: Frameworks, strategy and tools*; Edward Elgar publishing: London UK, 2011 (Google Scholar).

- Savitz, A.: Weber, K. (2006). *The triple bottomline how today's best-run companies are achieving economic, social and environmental success.*
- Scotland, E. (1969). *The psychological of hope.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Strans, K., Niven, K., McClelland, C., & Cheing, B. (2014). Hope and optimism in the face of change: Contributions to task adaptivity. *Journal of Business Psychology* 30,733-745.
- Snyder C.R. (2002). *Hope theory: Rainbows in the mind psychological inquiry*, 13,249-275
- Snyder C.R. (2014). Hope and optimism. *Encyclopedia of human behaviour*, 2, 535-542.
- Snyder C.R., (1995). Conceptualizing, measuring and nurturing hope. *Journal of Counseling and Development* 73, 355-360. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6676.1995.tb01764.x>.
- William A. (2010). Corporate social responsibility: Strategic implications. *Journal of Management Studies* 43(1), 1-12.