



OXFORD LIBRARY OF PSYCHOLOGY

Editor-in-Chief PETER E. NATHAN

The Oxford Handbook of Positive Organizational Scholarship

Edited by

Kim S. Cameron

Gretchen M. Spreitzer

Positive Deviance for a Sustainable World

Linking Sustainability and Positive Organizational Scholarship

Andrew J. Hoffman and Nardia Haigh

Abstract

This chapter examines the linkages between the positive organizational scholarship (POS) and sustainability research domains; examining ways in which each domain can enrich the other, their mutual research agendas, and practical contributions. Positive organizational scholarship can help sustainability make a shift from addressing “deficit gaps” to instead addressing “abundance gaps.” Sustainability can help expand the scope of the POS research domain from explaining how people and organizations can flourish, to also considering ways in which human and organizational flourishing is embedded within the state of the natural environment. To do this, the chapter first outlines the issues and domain of sustainability scholarship, then discusses the linkages in more detail, and explores the scholarly implications for each domain. It concludes by suggesting potentially fruitful research questions posed by these sustainability–POS linkages, and discusses the implications of these linkages for business education.

Keywords: Sustainability, sustainable development, natural environment, positive organizational scholarship, cultural creatives, LOHAS, hybrid organizations

This chapter explores the fit between the research domains of sustainability and positive organizational scholarship (POS), both of which are grounded in the core concept of flourishing. Positive organizational scholarship is concerned with “conditions that foster flourishing at the individual, work group, and organizational levels” (Dutton & Glynn, 2008). Sustainability holds “the possibility that human and other life will flourish on the planet forever” (Ehrenfeld, 2008, p. 6). As a vision, POS research seeks to explore organizational and institutional contexts that help to realize the fullest human potential. Sustainability research explores economic development that will “meet the needs of present generations without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs” (World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987). With these as foundational starting points, we explore two fundamental ways in which these

domains are interconnected; each emerging from the other.

On the one hand, scholars and practitioners in the sustainability literature have long sought to explain and prescribe how individuals and organizations can live and organize *less unsustainably*. More recent scholars have begun to push the literature into focusing instead on living *more sustainably* (Ehrenfeld, 2008; McDonough & Braungart, 2002). This distinction represents a shift from addressing “deficit gaps” to instead addressing “abundance gaps” (Cameron, 2007). However, this shift has not been adequately explained within the sustainability literature. Positive organizational scholarship can help sustainability scholars explain and make this transition by offering a conceptual basis by which to understand it. Further, contributions from POS can make sustainability issues more actionable and sustainability more achievable by

suggesting tangible skills and actions that individuals can use to transform their lives and organizations. For sustainability scholars, this means focusing beyond the managed destruction or regeneration of the natural world, to instead understanding and working with nature's bias toward abundance without waste.

On the other hand, POS scholars focus on the study of especially positive (or "positively deviant") contexts, systems, practices, and outcomes that foster and enable individuals and collectives to flourish (Cameron, 2007; Dutton & Glynn, 2008; Dutton & Sonenshein, 2008). By introducing sustainability issues more directly into POS scholarship, researchers can expand the scope of the research domain, from explaining how people and organizations can flourish to also considering ways in which human and organizational flourishing is embedded within the flourishing of the natural environment.

By highlighting these linkages, we hope that sustainability and POS scholars will see how their domains can enrich each other, their mutual research agendas, and practical contributions. We invite readers to examine these linkages, and to identify other ways in which the two domains are complementary. To more fully explore these possibilities, this chapter first outlines the issues and the domain of sustainability scholarship. We then discuss the linkages in more detail, examining the scholarly implications for each domain. We conclude by suggesting potentially fruitful research questions posed by these sustainability-POS linkages, and we discuss the implications of the linkages for business education.

Issues of Sustainability

The past century has witnessed unprecedented economic growth and human prosperity. World population increased by a factor of four, the world economy increased by a factor of 14 (Thomas, 2002), global per capita income tripled (World Business Council on Sustainable Development, 1997), and average life expectancy increased by almost two-thirds (World Resources Institute, 1994). In the United States alone, life expectancy rose from 47.3 to 77.3 years between 1900 and 2002 (National Center for Health Statistics, 2004).

But, although these and other advances are notable, widening income disparities mean that not all people share in the material and economic progress of the past century. According to the United Nations (UN), the richest 20% of the world's population consume 86% of all goods and services while the

poorest 20% consume just 1.3%. In fact, the richest three people in the world have assets that exceed the combined gross domestic product of the 48 least developed countries. Of the 4.4 billion people in the developing world, almost 60% lack access to safe sewers, 33% do not have access to clean water, 25% lack adequate housing, and 30% have no modern health services (Crossette, 1998).

At the same time, the past century has witnessed unprecedented human impacts on the natural environment. The Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (Reid et al., 2005) commissioned by the UN (involving more than 1,360 experts worldwide) concluded that, of the 24 global ecosystem services analyzed, 60% were degraded or used unsustainably, and that humans have changed Earth's ecosystems over the past 50 years more quickly and more extensively than comparable historical periods. Humans have increased the species extinction rate by as much as 1,000 times over background rates typical of the planet's history. In the last 100 years, 816 species have become extinct, and 11,046 more are threatened with extinction (United Nations, 2001). Nearly 25% of the world's most important marine fish stocks are depleted, overharvested, or just beginning to recover from overharvesting. Another 44% are being fished at their biological limit and are, therefore, vulnerable to depletion (World Resources Institute, 2000).

In short, the exploitative relationship between the economy and the natural and social environments, which took shape in the Industrial Revolution of the 19th century and that continues to grow with globalized industrial production in this century, cannot be sustained. We are today in the throes of a commons tragedy of global proportions, and this has caused a great deal of concern among many within society (Sandelands & Hoffman, 2008). This concern produced the modern sustainable development movement.

The Sustainable Development Movement and Sustainability Scholarship

The sustainable development movement and the interdisciplinary domain of sustainability scholarship emerged in the mid-1980s. The United Nations' World Commission on Environment and Development (1987) Brundtland Commission report, *Our Common Future*, promoted sustainable development by calling for economic growth to be pursued in a manner that assures the protection of both social and environmental systems. The report followed an environmental conservation movement

that can be traced back to the late 1800s, which led to the protection of large tracts of American land for national parks. The movement gained momentum throughout the 1900s, with events such as the publication of Rachel Carson's (1962) *Silent Spring*, the first Earth Day in 1970, and the 1972 United Nations Conference on Human Environment in Stockholm (the first UN conference to attend to global environmental issues).

The Brundtland Commission report advanced the sustainability issue by using the term "sustainable development" to highlight ways in which economic development was causing environmental degradation and social inequities. Nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), policy makers, scholars, and members of the general public have taken inspiration from the Brundtland report and advocated for organizations to address environmental and social issues in communities and the economy, while sustainability scholars investigated the interconnections between business strategy and issues such as ecosystem protection, species extinction, pollution, community development, and human health and well-being.

Sustainability scholarship is an interdisciplinary domain that encompasses a holistic view of firms and their relationships with the natural environment and societies in which they operate, and includes topics such as corporate social responsibility and environmental management. Work has progressed over the past 15 years to identify how organizations can reduce their impact on both society and the natural environment. For instance, pollution prevention, product stewardship, and sustainable development have been identified as strategic organizational capabilities (Hart, 1995), as have the ability to integrate matters concerning the natural environment into strategic planning processes (Judge & Douglas, 1998), process innovation (Christmann, 2000), stakeholder integration, higher-order learning, and continuous innovation (Sharma & Vredenburg, 1998) to reduce environmental impact. In many cases, the strategic importance of these capabilities has been measured through correlations with company profitability or cost advantages (Christmann, 2000; Judge & Douglas, 1998; Menguc & Ozanne, 2005; Russo & Fouts, 1997). One of the most widely used concepts for measuring sustainability action has been the notion of the triple bottom line (TBL) (Elkington, 1997), which advocates for companies to maximize three bottom lines: the three e's (equity, environment, and economy) or the three p's (people, planet, and profit).

But, with its focus on operating *less unsustainably* rather than *more sustainably*, or on addressing the deficit gaps rather than identifying and addressing abundance gaps (Cameron, 2007), sustainability has drawn criticism both from the left and right, and both from advocates and opponents. The harshest criticisms come from those who believe that pursuing sustainability misappropriates the purpose of the corporation and is contrary to the true intentions of capitalism. For example, *The Economist* magazine published a cover story in January 2005 that derided sustainability and corporate social responsibility as misguided concepts driven by people with little knowledge or a downright fear of capitalism. Similarly, when the U.S. Climate Action Partnership, a consortium of ten blue-chip corporations (including DuPont, Alcoa, BP America, GE, Lehman Brothers, PG&E, and two environmental NGOs) called for federal standards on greenhouse gas emissions in early 2007, a *Wall Street Journal* editorial ridiculed them as the "10 jolly green giants" and challenged their motives as being economically opportunistic rather than environmentally altruistic (Strassel, 2007). In 2005, when GE announced plans to publish its first "Citizenship Report," the *Wall Street Journal* wrote that environmentalists had made their "biggest catch yet" and pondered whether "capitalists are abandoning capitalism" (Murray, 2005, p. A2). Such critics believe that economic growth remains the primary goal of development planning, whereas sustainability is a social and political constraint (Colby, 1991). Rather than harmonizing economic, environmental, and social considerations into a synergistic whole, such critics believe the prevailing regimen remains one of making trade-offs while holding to economic growth as the paramount objective.

At the opposite extreme, some advocates of sustainability argue that the TBL does not go far enough. They argue alongside opponents that sustainability is nothing but a label for actions or strategies that are actually driven by the standard social, economic, and institutional mechanisms (e.g., Jacobs, 1993; Schnaiberg, 1980). They further argue that simple metrics, such as internal rate of return or net present value, contribute significantly to present-day sustainability problems by obscuring broader responsibilities that cannot be measured easily, if at all. Thus, it seems beyond optimistic to suppose that metrics for sustainability, such as the TBL, could resolve these problems. And, if they could, it seems beyond hopeful to suppose they would be embraced when opposition to intertwining environmental,

social, and economic development remains (and many still assume they are mutually exclusive). In short, the sustainability movement could be seen as having become as intractable as the problems it aims to solve, because it has been defined and enacted using the same logics that created the problem in the first place—a focus on the deficit gaps—and attempts to explore abundance gaps and operate more sustainably remain outweighed by challenges and underexplored opportunities.

Positive Deviance in Practice

Today, at the onset of the 21st century, a growing number of individuals and organizations have begun to alter their lifestyles and business models to enact their vision of sustainability toward “intentional behaviors that depart from the norms . . . in honorable ways” (Spreitzer & Sonenshein, 2004, p. 828). They act as positive deviants seeking to change the organizations, industries, and socioeconomic systems of which they are a part. There are several proposed explanations as to why this shift is happening at this point in time (Hoffman, 2003). First, society has advanced in terms of leisure time, such that people are searching for more meaning in the work realm of their lives (Neck & Milliman, 1994). Many people are reaching a stage in their development in which they feel secure in their basic needs, such that they are striving for the highest stage of human development, self-actualization (Maslow, 1954). These individuals derive a sense of self-actualization through their actions, and a sense of sacredness and purpose through their work that allows them to feel more genuine and authentic (Ray & Anderson, 2000). They tend not to spend their whole career within a single company. Instead, their career path represents a more personal journey of self-discovery (Hall & Mirvis, 1996). For this demographic, leading a sustainable lifestyle may be explained as a calling or vocation (Wrzesniewski, McCauley, Rozin, & Schwartz, 1997) on that journey. People now strive to develop and express their entire selves at work (Mitroff & Denton, 1999) and therefore bring their personal values into the workplace (Hoffman, 2003; McDonald, 1999).

Second, many in the current workforce are Baby Boomers, who grew up in the idealistic 1960s and 1970s and are trying to maintain their idealistic roots (Cash, Gray, & Rood, 2000; Hall & Richter, 1990). These people may be among the many who search for ways to leave a legacy and the satisfaction of knowing their lives made the world a better place (Covey, 1995). Third, as educational experience, social values,

and religious doctrine increasingly support sustainability, it becomes more tightly tied to individual identity and becomes an important motivator of personal action (Wade-Benzoni et al., 2002).

By observing the actions of proactive individuals and organizations through a POS lens, we can begin to explain why and how sustainability can be achieved through discrete shifts in values, beliefs, skills, capabilities, and strategies. In the next sections, we will discuss key examples of individual and organizational positive deviance within the sustainability domain, and explore how using a POS lens can help to explain them.

Positive Sustainability Deviance At the Individual Level

To address sustainability issues and their frustration with policy solutions, many people are taking direct action that reflects their personal beliefs and values about their proper role within the natural environment and among fellow human beings. These positive deviants have been recognized as a growing demographic segment within America, with labels such as Cultural Creatives (Ray & Anderson, 2000) or Lifestyles of Health and Sustainability (LOHAS) consumers (LOHAS, 2009; The Natural Marketing Institute, 2008). These are people who value design, health, environmental and social justice, and ecological sustainability in the products they purchase, the careers they pursue, and the lifestyles they lead.

Rather than acquiesce to societal values, these positive deviants act and seek meaning according to their beliefs, and growth in the segment suggests that, in doing so, they are affecting those same societal values. This segment values authenticity, nature, and community (Ray & Anderson, 2000). They actively pursue a life they feel is environmentally and socially fulfilling by expressing themselves and making a practical difference (Neal, 2000). They are careful consumers who reject products that are imitations, of poor quality, disposable, or cliché in style, and they want to know where products originate, how they are manufactured, by whom, and what becomes of them in disposal (Ray & Anderson, 2000). In 2001, the LOHAS demographic was estimated at 50 million people, approximately 25% of American adults. By 2003, that figure had grown to 68 million Americans, or about 33% of the adult population (Cortese, 2003). In 2008, LOHAS consumers represented an estimated \$209 billion U.S. industry for goods and services focused on health, green building, eco-tourism, alternative energy and transport, and natural lifestyles (LOHAS, 2009).

Not content to project their values and beliefs only in the safety of their homes, these individuals often take them into the workplace. Many choose to pursue careers in companies with values that match their own. Or, if the values of the organization clash with their own, they seek to change the organization's culture in ways that fit their personal beliefs, rather than succumb to organizational pressures (Hall & Richter, 1990).

For example, Interface Inc. CEO Ray Anderson describes having a personal epiphany after reading *The Ecology of Commerce* by Paul Hawken (1993), which changed how he thought about the legacy of his company, its products, and manufacturing processes. With an increasing awareness of the environmental destructiveness of the carpets and fabrics it manufactured, Anderson came to believe the company could no longer pursue profits in the way it had. He not only changed the materials and processes it used to manufacture carpet to be less environmentally impactful and to recycle all materials, but went further and introduced a service business model to the carpet industry by leasing rather than selling carpet to consumers (therefore retaining responsibility for refurbishing worn carpet) without forgoing profitability (Anderson, 2007; Fishman, 1998).

Sustainability scholars and practitioners have celebrated Anderson's work and the change he continues to orchestrate in and through Interface, Inc., and have held him up as an example of what is possible. However, the field has done less to explain the shift he initiated. Through a POS lens, several explanations become available. First, the combination of reducing environmental impact *and* developing new markets in sustainable goods can be explained as organizing in a way that not only addresses deficit gaps, but also addresses abundance gaps (Cameron, 2007). Second, we can investigate the change that Anderson implemented in Interface as a result of switching to positive meaning making (Dutton & Sonenshein, 2008). Anderson realized that Interface's ways of operating were not sustainable, but rather than seeing this only as a threat (and considering ways to reduce environmental impact to avoid consequences), he also saw opportunities. Anderson identified how a service business model could work in a manufacturing industry and identified ways of operating that were both significantly more sustainable and full of profit potential and market leadership.

Third, there are significant leadership components to Anderson's actions. By combining sustainability and profitability through innovative business models,

Anderson's style embodies positive leadership through his demonstration of virtuousness and focus on creating positive outcomes from negative situations, and his determination to drive his organization to exceptional achievement (Cameron & Lavine, 2006; Cameron, 2008; Flynn, 2008). Interface embodies Flynn's (2008, p. 359) argument that "[t]he coalescence of virtue and profit is possible only when daring, creative, and insightful business leadership is practiced in society."

But not all change emerges from positive deviants at the top of the corporate hierarchy, like Anderson. Often, sustainability-driven individuals are rank-and-file members who find themselves in the middle, mediating between conflicting value sets—their personal beliefs and those of the organizations in which they work. To resolve this tension, they seek to "fit" within both cultures. Known to both sustainability and POS scholars, these "tempered radicals" succeed according to the rules, protocols, and reward systems of the organization, but act in ways that concur with their personal beliefs (Meyerson & Scully, 1995). They continue to look like what the organization determines to be valid and appropriate, but are ambivalent to these norms. Through discrete, visible, positively biased actions that reflect individualized motivations, their programs of positive deviance become infectious and help to sculpt new beliefs and behaviors in the workplace that align with their own.

Peter Grant, an African American who had worked his way up to an executive-level banking position, is an example of a tempered radical identified by Meyerson (2001). Grant had a long-term aim of hiring highly qualified minorities and helping them to be successful in the bank. He did this at every opportunity, "chipping away at the organization's demographic base," one person at a time over a 30-year career (Meyerson, 2001, p. 95).

Tempered radicalism is a powerful concept for exploring the challenges that individuals face as they reconcile the competing demands and expectations of different value systems (Meyerson & Scully, 1995). For instance, they may be perceived (or perceive themselves) as hypocritical (Goffman, 1969), and feel isolated from both value systems. They must also withstand pressures for co-optation, to forfeit one side or the other. These perceptions and pressures may lead to emotional burdens of guilt or self-doubt about their effectiveness and importance (Kolb & Williams, 1993). Tempered radicals overcome these challenges by programmatically "chipping away" at them with initiatives that act as "small wins" on a path

toward lasting organizational change (Hammonds, 2000). These individuals bring energy, creativity, and vitality to the organization and spiritual satisfaction for themselves. By thinking differently than the organizational norm, these positive deviants can also be critics of the status quo; identifying opportunities for change that may be overlooked by others.

Cultural creatives, LOHAS consumers, positive leaders, and tempered radicals use their positive deviance to pursue sustainability in their personal lives, organizations, and society. These change agents remind us (in the spirit of Gandhi) that individuals can be the change they want to see in the world. Drawing upon concepts and models from POS, sustainability scholars can gain greater insights into the ways that individuals play these key roles in the pursuit of sustainability. The next section will consider ways in which positive deviance manifests at the organizational level of analysis.

Positive Sustainability Deviance at the Organizational Level

Moving beyond the level of the individual, we can also observe organizations that are playing instrumental roles in changing industrial norms by addressing social and environmental issues, and competing on the basis of sustainability to yield positive social, environmental, and economic benefits. The most evocative examples of positive organizational deviance can be found among companies with business models that blur the boundary between the for-profit and nonprofit worlds. These companies have been described as *fourth sector*, *blended value*, *for-benefit*, *values driven* or *mission driven organizations*, or *B-corporations*—or, what we use in this chapter: *hybrid organizations* (Alter, 2004; Boyd, Henning, Reyna, Wang, & Welch, 2009; Hoffman, Badiene and Haigh, forthcoming). These new organizational forms adopt social missions like a nonprofit but generate income to accomplish that mission like a for-profit entity. They operate on the notion that traditional nonprofit operating models are no longer adequate to address the environmental and social problems of our day (Boyd, et al., 2009) and that a new emphasis on social enterprise models provides promise for achieving sustainability goals. Their business models do not seek to comply with prevailing environmental regulation or community expectations, or address the ills of the past. Rather, they seek to build profitable organizations and markets in the service of addressing their causes while creating broad-scale institutional change. In effect, sustainability is simply a core aspect of their

organizational identity (Hamilton & Gioia, 2009) that enhances their ability to innovate and generate revenues in ways that enrich the social and environmental systems in which they operate.

One such example is Guayakí, a for-profit company that sells organic, fair trade, rainforest-grown Yerba maté (a type of tisane, or herbal tea) to deliver products that are beneficial to well-being and health while using business models that drive and facilitate reforestation and provide employees with living wages that benefit farmers and indigenous communities (Boyd et al., 2009). Guayakí pays its farmers above-market wages and devotes significant time and resources to training them in sustainable farming techniques. There are easier and cheaper ways to obtain their raw materials and resources, and CEO Chris Mann acknowledges that his company could expand faster if it were willing to compromise its mission and source the ingredients in ways that do not promote the protection of Atlantic rainforests. But the social mission of the company holds equal prominence with the profit mandate. For instance, Mann noted that the company had struggled with the decision to bring on partner financing, because venture capitalists want high percentages of control, which would make it more difficult to maintain Guayakí's mission (Boyd et al., 2009).

Hybrid organizations like Guayakí are becoming a force for social change by resetting the norms of business practice—one of their stated goals. Their mission is about driving change in the norms, values, and beliefs of organizational and market systems. Sustainability scholars have studied their business models, strategies, structures, missions, market tactics, and measures of success. However, by examining hybrid organizations through a POS lens, we can begin to explore the ways in which they pursue profit to support sustainability-oriented missions through positive deviance.

Another example of positive sustainable deviance is Green Mountain Coffee Roasters (GMCR). GMCR competes on the basis of its ethical and environmental principles, and has been rated by *Forbes* magazine as the leading ethical company in the United States, while growing to \$180 million in sales revenue (Neville, 2008). GMCR takes the view that “knowledgeable and dedicated farmers and distributors are just as important to GMCR as employees within the corporate headquarters,” and that they all contribute to an exceptional coffee experience for consumers (Neville, 2008, p. 565). Employees retell stories of how they travel to where the coffee is grown to help them appreciate the natural environment, and of how

an executive personally extended a \$3,000 interest-free loan to a new employee whose partner was diagnosed with cancer. Such stories reflect a culture embedded in values of compassion, integrity, optimism, and corporate success. They represent a shift to an “abundance approach” to management (Cameron & Lavine, 2006) and demonstrate that organizational virtuousness can be correlated with high performance (Cameron, Bright, & Caza, 2004).

Neville (2008, p. 569) termed the philosophy of GMCR as “conscience capitalism,” which recognizes the interconnectedness between people, organizations, and society; sees wealth as stretching far beyond financial status; and operates on organizational time horizons that span multiple generations. A key mechanism underpinning GMCR’s ability to flourish was its use of appreciative inquiry methods. In this case, the use of Whitney and Cooperrider’s (2000) 4-D discovery, dream, design, and destiny process helped to facilitate strategy development within the company and enabled it to affirm an image infused with positive meaning. This, in turn, yielded action that had positive implications for how stakeholders interrelated and related to the natural environment.

These examples, and the use of the POS lens to understand them, are in counterpoint to the predominant sustainability research that investigates ways in which individuals and organizations address their negative deviance—focusing on how they become less unsustainable. They represent a redirection toward understanding how and why companies become more sustainable and positively deviate. This shift is vastly open to future research (Neville, 2008). The holistic and interconnected thinking found at hybrid organizations like GMCR and Guayakí leads to a critical linkage between sustainability and POS perspectives; the relationship between human/organizational flourishing and natural environmental flourishing.

Environmental and Human/Organizational Flourishing

Positive organizational scholars recognize that human flourishing is contextually embedded (Dutton & Glynn, 2008), whereas sustainability scholars recognize that the ability for people and organizations to flourish is embedded within a stable and balanced natural and social environment (Stead & Stead, 2009). As Harper (2001, p. 37) explains:

[H]umans and human systems are unarguably embedded in the broader webs of life in the

biosphere. We are one species among many, both in terms of our biological makeup and our ultimate dependence for food and energy provided by the earth.

At the most rudimentary level, the natural environment provides people and organizations with raw materials, water, air, energy, and the bare physical context in which life and business is conducted (Haigh & Griffiths, 2009; Starik, 1995; Stead & Stead, 2004). Services provided by the natural environment, such as air and water purification provided by forests, waste assimilation, and air and water currents provided by oceans and wind, makes many of these resources renewable (therefore making our relationship with them more sustainable).

But, at a deeper level, the connection between the natural environment and flourishing extends and enhances POS principles and demonstrates the embeddedness of human flourishing in the natural environment. If humans can learn to work with natural systems rather than exploit them, both humans and nature will flourish. The difficulty is in avoiding the temptation to think of ways to “fix” nature (beyond restoring ecosystems that have been severely affected by humans), since nature is not broken. If sustainability is to be achieved, the need is for humans to understand, work with, and flourish within the bounds and dynamics presented by biophysical systems. Below, we offer to two examples to explain this connection.

Individual Flourishing and the Natural Environment

Richard Louv (2005) studied the reasons and implications for people (children specifically) losing their connection to the natural environment through modern Western lifestyles. Similar to what Wilson describes as “biophilia,” the “the innate tendency [in human beings] to focus on life and lifelike processes” (Wilson, 1984), and Kaplan and Kaplan’s (1989, p. 119) work showing that time spent in natural settings “restores depleted mental energies,” Louv argued that the loss of connection to the natural environment could be a factor in the rise in emotional, mental, and physical maladies, such as attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder, childhood heart and circulatory problems, and diminished use of the senses. Louv (2005) cited a host of reasons for children spending less time in nature, including stranger danger fears, liability concerns, a reduced appreciation by parents of unstructured playtime, computer games, increased homework, and the

simple fact of there being less nature available. He argued that all these factors have contributed to the growing divide between children and nature, or “nature-deficit disorder,” and advocated for the restorative power of nature and the importance that time spent in nature has for the emotional and mental development of children. As an example of nature’s positive influences, Louv highlighted that children who attend schools sited within natural settings “are more physically active, more aware of nutrition, more civil to one another, and more creative” (Louv, 2005, p. 220).

Teachers of these students also benefit, expressing “renewed enthusiasm for teaching” and a realization of their passion for teaching when doing so outdoors and at schools with more green space (Louv, 2005, p. 220). Thus, natural settings appear to have strong implications for the ability of these teachers to thrive at work. Extending Spreitzer et al.’s (2005) work on the social aspects of the work unit and resources produced in doing work, there appears an opportunity to explore how nature (or natural settings) is an equally important element of the work context. Human thriving at work can be seen as both socially and environmentally embedded by complementing POS and sustainability perspectives. For example, exposure to natural settings could moderate the ability of work contexts to facilitate the agentic work behaviors that Spreitzer et al. (2005) argue contribute to thriving.

The processual aspects of Louv’s (2005) work are also worth highlighting, as natural settings appear to enhance key processes that the POS literature advocates as being central to flourishing: positive meaning making, positive emoting, and positive interrelating (Dutton & Glynn, 2008; Dutton & Sonenshein, 2008). Specifically, this work shows positive meaning making and positive emoting among teachers through statements about “renewed enthusiasm” and “passion” for their chosen profession, and positive interrelating among students as they treat each other with more civility if they have experienced schools with green spaces.

Organizational Flourishing and the Natural Environment

Organizations also have a very close relationship with the natural environment, although this is often overlooked outside the sustainability literature. For instance, it has been shown that the reintroduction of previously lost species (e.g., salmon into Lake Erie and the Thames; Harper, 2001) can play a significant role in rejuvenating heavily degraded ecosystems.

The rejuvenation improves the health of surrounding communities and industry by improving the ability to utilize resources from the ecosystem (in the salmon example, these resources may be fresher water, the salmon themselves, predators of salmon, etc.). Sustainability is not about helping to “save the planet,” since Earth has survived significant previous stresses to its systems (e.g., the comet or meteor credited with dinosaur extinction). Rather, sustainability is about reestablishing and sustaining a “human-friendly habitat” on the planet (Stead & Stead, 2009, p. 3).

To exemplify this key point, we turn to companies that seek not only to understand their relationship with the natural environment, but also to actively use an understanding of natural dynamics to enhance their business models. For example, PAX Scientific is an engineering research and development company that uses *biomimicry* (Benyus, 2002) to design improved air- and fluid-handling equipment (Boyd et al., 2009). Biomimicry is the practice of learning from and imitating nature’s designs and/or processes in man-made systems. Well-known products that are the result of biomimicry include hypodermic needles and Velcro® (Environment, 2002; Post, 2007). The founder of PAX Scientific calls nature the “supreme designer” (Boyd et al., 2009, p. 129), and the company leveraged the design and efficient function of nature’s vortices and spirals (e.g., hurricanes) to develop technologies such as water mixers, air fans, propellers, and turbines, which they patent and license. In addition to using nature’s design principles, these products also have positive environmental and health outcomes. For instance, one potable water mixer designed by PAX Scientific provided higher-quality water that averted bacterial growth, thus enhancing health not only through bacteria control, but also by enabling an 85% reduction in the use of chemical disinfectant.

Just as Louv (2005) argued that nature nurtures creativity among children, PAX Scientific demonstrates that nature also provides design templates for creativity and innovation (Boyd et al., 2009) for organizations, topics of great interest within the POS literature (Dutton & Glynn, 2008). Such considerations potentially extend to studies of the role of nature in innovation. For instance, in their study of the relationship between trust, connectivity, thriving, and employees’ innovative behaviors at work, Carmeli and Spreitzer (2009) found that connectivity mediated the relationship between trust and thriving, and thriving mediated the relationship

between connectivity and innovative behaviors. Louv's (2005) observations and PAX Scientific's (Boyd et al., 2009) practices prompt us to ask questions about the role that human connectivity with the natural environment might play in innovation. More broadly, the PAX Scientific case study and Louv's (2005) work lead us to consider the possibility that connectivity encompasses not only that between humans (Dutton & Heaphy, 2003; Losada & Heaphy, 2004), but also that between humans and the natural environment.

Human flourishing is embedded in the natural environment. People and organizations draw value from and generate new ideas through connections with the natural environment, as well as better connections with each other. The two comprise a complete system managing the complexity, diversity, and irreducibility of sustainability issues and the relationship of organizations to them (Cooperrider, Sorenson, Whitney, & Yeager, 2000; Shrivastava & Cooperrider, 1999). This encompassing system generates an ecological perspective in which "all the pieces of the puzzle come together in one place and everyone can gain an appreciation for the whole" and "environmental and social performance [becomes] an opportunity for innovation, profit, and growth" (Laszlo & Cooperrider, 2008, p. 18).

These examples show how the sustainability domain can provide ground for POS scholars to not only explain human and organizational flourishing in a social sense, but to extend this expertise to exploring ways in which human and organizational flourishing is embedded within the condition of the natural world. In this sense, we see that POS capabilities, such as generativity, resilience, thriving, and endogenous resourcing, may enable a fuller appreciation of how humanity and our economic activity relates to the natural environment, and we see potential value in both fostering them on a practical level within organizations and communities, and studying them to track their sustainability.

Future Directions

The objective of this chapter is to invite POS and sustainability scholars to further examine the linkages between their domains, and to identify and pursue ways in which the two may complement and improve each other. These linkages highlight ways in which complementing POS and sustainability research domains can help scholars to revisit existing research questions in their own domain and generate new questions.

Revisiting Existing Research Questions and Developing New Ones

This chapter motivates us to revisit existing research questions and develop new questions in three ways. First, it prompts us to consider ways in which a POS perspective can help to shift sustainability from a focus on people and organizations being less unsustainable, to becoming more sustainable, from explaining deficit gaps to instead addressing abundance gaps (Cameron, 2007). Questions in this track include: What is the form of the shift from addressing less unsustainable ways of organizing to more sustainable ways? What contexts, processes, and mechanisms can explain the dynamics that lead to this shift? What are the antecedents and implications of this shift for organizations? What measures track the move? What can firms that were established under the traditional (rational) premises of organizing learn from organizations (such as hybrids) that were established under sustainability premises? What are the tactics and strategies that can be used by positive deviants to facilitate this shift? What are the underlying cognitive and cultural beliefs that may impede this shift in consciousness, and how can they be overcome?

The second track in which existing research questions are revisited involves an expansion of the POS perspective beyond a focus on human flourishing to include an appreciation for its embeddedness within the natural environment. This linkage raises questions such as: What underpins individual and organizational learning about and from nature's systems, communities, designs, and dynamics? What can organizations borrow from nature's ecosystems and communities? How do natural contexts and dynamics explain human flourishing? How does an integration of human flourishing within the natural environment change basic conceptions of what it means to be human?

Third, this chapter raises new research questions and opens a new stream of research that challenges POS and sustainability scholars to identify new variables, explanatory mechanisms, processes, and measures. In this area, key new questions are: Does working toward environmental sustainability simultaneously enhance human flourishing? What aspects of social and environmental sustainability sustain positive deviance? Does concern for the natural environment alter conceptions or tactics of positive deviance? How do we measure human flourishing in conjunction with natural environment flourishing?

Before closing, we consider one final issue in our examination of the POS–sustainability linkages.

Since academic scholars live not only in the world of research, but also in the world of business education, the linkages between these domains offer critical opportunities for addressing pressing issues in management education.

Future Directions in Business Education

At the time of writing this chapter, confidence in the business world is very low and resentment is directed toward MBA education programs that do not promote critical thinking and moral reasoning skills development among their students, that take a fragmented approach to management, and that have trained graduates who played central roles in scandals such as Enron and Worldcom, and in the financial crisis (Podolny, 2009). Calling attention to these issues means asking questions about what and who managers are and asking about the purpose of leadership (Khurana, 2007). Today, within modern business schools, little sustained attention is paid to critical sustainability issues like poverty, climate change, species extinction, social unrest, equity, and fairness in a rapidly globalized world. These social and environmental ills present challenges to the dominant organizing models of business education (such as agency theory and investor capitalism) that POS and sustainability can begin to address.

Although scholars can begin to push this shift in emphasis, change may also be promoted from within. New MBA applicants are increasingly drawn from the cultural creatives, tempered radicals and LOHAS consumers demographic sectors noted earlier. Students are driving business school administrators to address environmental and social awareness in curricula, operations, and development. The rise of alternative business school and university rankings, such as The Aspen Institute's *Beyond Grey Pinstripes* and the Sierra Club's *Cool Schools* list, and the introduction of sustainability into Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) requirements are testament to this.

Linked, sustainability and POS scholars can help to address the growing issues facing business schools today by bringing a more holistic and humanistic approach to business education. Positive organizational scholarship and sustainability curricula and research have the scope to help students and managers understand the complexity of businesses and issues facing them without becoming overwhelmed by them, to learn ways to develop and meet short- and long-term business goals that extend beyond earning money, and to learn ways in which organizations

can be naturally generative, competitive, and innovative. A broader educational approach that addresses sustainability and is guided by POS works toward developing managers who have the ability to question dominant mindsets and play the role of social or institutional entrepreneur to develop innovative solutions to intractable global issues (in which firms have historically only played a negative role).

Conclusion

Perspectives from the POS research domain provide sustainability scholars with an avenue to investigate the role that individuals and organizations play in shifting society toward becoming *more sustainable* rather than *less unsustainable*. Correspondingly, perspectives from the sustainability research domain push POS scholars beyond an appreciation of human flourishing, to recognizing its embeddedness within the natural world. In this sense, POS traits such as generativity, resilience, and endogenous resourcing can enable a fuller appreciation of how humanity relates to the natural environment, and may be viewed as measures of our ability to pursue and achieve sustainability.

The empirical platform that grounds sustainability scholars—the natural environment—is the essence of generativity and abundance without waste. This platform also provides POS scholars with great destructive and regenerative polar contexts and a full range of states from birth/generation through to growth, maturity, decay, death, and rebirth/regeneration to study topics such as resilience, vitality, endogenous resourcing, meaningfulness and flourishing. Sustainability challenges us to develop a vision, mission, purpose, calling, or vocation through work that will sustain a positively deviant balance between social, environmental, and competitive realms. Positive organizational scholarship challenges us to ensure that we, our colleagues, and our organizations develop or retain high levels of compassion, virtue, resourcefulness, and care, with the understanding that the vision is not achievable or sustainable without them. Together, the two domains can enrich each other, their mutual research agendas, and practical contributions toward achieving a sustainable world.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to acknowledge the financial support of the Frederick A. and Barbara M. Erb Institute for Global Sustainable Enterprise at the University of Michigan.

References

- Alter, K. (2004). *Social enterprise typology*. Seattle: Virtue Ventures LLC.
- Anderson, R.C. (2007). Refining the vision. *Environmental Design & Construction*, 10(2), 28–30.
- Benyus, J.M. (2002). *Biomimicry: Innovation inspired by nature*. New York: Harper Collins Publishers.
- Boyd, B., Henning, N., Reyna, E., Wang, D.E., & Welch, M.D. (2009). *Hybrid organizations: New business models for environmental leadership*. Sheffield, UK: Greenleaf Publishing.
- Cameron, K., Bright, D., & Caza, A. (2004). Exploring the relationships between organizational virtuousness and performance. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 47(6), 1–24.
- Cameron, K., & Lavine, M. (2006). *Making the impossible possible: Leading extraordinary performance: The Rocky Flats story*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Cameron, K.S. (2007). Positive organizational scholarship. In S. Clegg, & J. Bailey (Eds.), *International encyclopedia of organizational studies*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Cameron, K.S. (2008). *Positive leadership: Strategies for extraordinary performance*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Carmeli, A., & Spreitzer, G. (2009). Trust, connectivity, and thriving: Implications for innovative work behavior. *Journal of Creative Behavior*, 43(3), 169–191.
- Carson, R. (1962). *Silent spring*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Cash, K., Gray, G., & Rood, S. (2000). A framework for accommodating religion and spirituality in the workplace. *Academy of Management Executive*, 14, 124–134.
- Christmann, P. (2000). Effects of “best practices” of environmental management on cost advantage: The role of complementary assets. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(4), 663–680.
- Colby, M. (1991). Environmental management in development: The evolution of paradigms. *Ecological Economics*, 3, 193–213.
- Cooperrider, D.L., Sorenson, P.E., Whitney, D., & Yeager, T.E. (Eds.). (2000). *Appreciative inquiry*. Champaign, IL: Jossey Bass.
- Cortese, A. (2003, July 20). Business: They care about the world (and they shop, too). *New York Times*.
- Covey, S. (1995). *First things first*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Crossette, B. (1998, September 27). Kofi Annan’s astonishing facts. *New York Times*, 4–16.
- Dutton, J.E., & Glynn, M.A. (2008). Positive organizational scholarship. In J. Barling, & C.L. Cooper (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of organizational behavior* (pp. 693–712). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Dutton, J.E., & Heaphy, E.D. (2003). The power of high-quality connections. In K.S. Cameron, J.E. Dutton, & R.E. Quinn (Eds.), *Positive organizational scholarship: Foundations of a new discipline*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Dutton, J.E., & Sonenshein, S. (2008). Positive organizational scholarship. In S. Lopez, & A. Beauchamps (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of positive psychology*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing.
- Ehrenfeld, J.R. (2008). *Sustainability by design*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Elkington, J. (1997). *Cannibals with forks: The triple bottom line of 21st century business*. Oxford, UK: Capstone.
- Environment. (2002). Natural designs. *Environment*, 44(2), 4.
- Fishman, C. (1998). Sustainable growth - Interface, Inc. *Fast Company*. Retrieved from <http://www.fastcompany.com/magazine/14/sustaing.html>.
- Flynn, G. (2008). The virtuous manager: A vision for leadership in business. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 78(3), 359–372.
- Goffman, E. (1969). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. New York: Doubleday.
- Haigh, N.L., & Griffiths, A. (2009). The natural environment as primary stakeholder: The case of climate change. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 18(6), 347–359.
- Hall, D.T., & Mirvis, P. (1996). The new protean career: Psychological success and the path with a heart. In D.T. Hall (Ed.), *The career is dead, long live the career: A relational approach to careers* (pp. 15–45). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hall, D.T., & Richter, J. (1990). Career gridlock: Baby boomers hit the wall. *Academy of Management Executive*, 4, 7–22.
- Hamilton, A., & Gioia, D.A. (2009). Fostering sustainability-focused organizational identities. In L.M. Roberts, & J.E. Dutton (Eds.), *Exploring positive identities and organizations: Building a theoretical and research foundation* (pp. 162–174). New York: Routledge.
- Hammonds, K. (2000). Practical radicals: You say you want a business revolution? Not so fast. *Fast Company*, September, 162–174.
- Harper, C.L. (2001). *Environment and society: Human perspectives on environmental issues*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Hart, S.L. (1995). A natural-resource-based view of the firm. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(4), 986–1014.
- Hawken, P. (1993). *The ecology of commerce: A declaration of sustainability*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Hoffman, A. (2003). Reconciling professional and personal value systems: The spiritually motivated manager as organizational entrepreneur. In R. Giacalone, & C. Jurkiewicz (Eds.), *The handbook of workplace spirituality and organizational performance* (1st ed., pp. 193–208). New York: M.E. Sharpe.
- Hoffman, A., Badiene, K., & Haigh, K. (forthcoming). Hybrid organizations as agents of positive social change: Bridging the for-profit & non-profit divide. In K. Golden-& J. Dutton (Eds.), *Exploring positive social change and organizations: Building and theoretical and research foundation*. New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group.
- Jacobs, M. (1993). *The green economy: Environment, sustainable development and the politics of the future*. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.
- Judge, W.Q., & Douglas, T.J. (1998). Performance implications of incorporating natural environmental issues into the strategic planning process: An empirical assessment. *Journal of Management Studies*, 35(2), 241–262.
- Kaplan, R., & Kaplan, S. (1989). *The experience of nature: A psychological perspective*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Khurana, R. (2007). *From higher aims to hired hands: The social transformation of American business schools and the unfulfilled promise of management as a profession*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Kolb, D., & Williams, S. (1993). Professional women in conversation: Where have we been and where are we going? *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 2, 14–26.
- Laszlo, C., & Cooperrider, D. (2007). Design for sustainable value: A whole system approach. In M. Avital, R. Boland, & D. Cooperrider (Eds.), *Designing information and organizations with a positive lens (Advances in Appreciative Inquiry, Volume 2)*, (pp. 15–29). Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

- LOHAS. (2009). *Lifestyles of health and sustainability*. Retrieved from <http://www.lohas.com/>.
- Losada, M., & Heaphy, E. (2004). The role of positivity and connectivity in the performance of business teams: A nonlinear dynamics model. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 47(6), 740–765.
- Louv, R. (2005). *Last child in the woods: Saving our children from nature-deficit disorder*. Chapel Hill, NC: Algonquian Books of Chapel Hill.
- Maslow, A. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York: HarperCollins.
- McDonald, M. (1999). Shush. The guy in the next cubicle is meditating. *U.S. News & World Report*, 126(7), 46.
- McDonough, W., & Braungart, M. (2002). *Cradle to cradle: Remaking the way we make things*. New York: North Point Press.
- Menguc, B., & Ozanne, L.K. (2005). Challenges of the “green imperative”: A natural resource-based approach to the environmental orientation—business performance relationship. *Journal of Business Research*, 58(4), 430–438.
- Meyerson, D.E. (2001). Radical change the quiet way. *Harvard Business Review*, 79(9), 92–100.
- Meyerson, D.E., & Scully, M.A. (1995). Tempered radicalism and the politics of ambivalence and change. *Organization Science*, 6(5), 585–600.
- Mitroff, I., & Denton, E. (1999). A study of spirituality in the workplace. *Sloan Management Review*, 40(Summer), 83–92.
- Murray, A. (2005, May 18). Will “social responsibility” harm business? *Wall Street Journal*, A2.
- National Center for Health Statistics. (2004). *Health, United States, 2004*. Washington, DC: Department of Health and Human Services.
- Neal, J. (2000). Work as service to the divine. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 43, 1316–1334.
- Neck, C., & Milliman, J. (1994). Thought self-leadership: Finding spiritual fulfillment in organizational life. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 9, 9–16.
- Neville, M.G. (2008). Positive deviance on the ethical continuum: Green Mountain Coffee as a case study in conscientious capitalism. *Business & Society Review*, 113(4), 555–576.
- Podolny, J.M. (2009). The buck stops (and starts) at business school. *Harvard Business Review*, 87(6), 62–67.
- Post, N.M. (2007). Designers begin to look to nature to render buildings in harmony with the planet. *ENR: Engineering News-Record*, 258(6), 23.
- Ray, P.H., & Anderson, S.R. (2000). *The cultural creatives: How 50 million people are changing the world*. New York: Harmony Books.
- Reid, W.V., Mooney, H.A., Cropper, A., Capistrano, D., Carpenter, S.R., Chopra, K., et al. (2005). *Millennium ecosystem assessment synthesis report*. London: World Resources Institute. Retrieved from www.millenniumassessment.org.
- Russo, M.V., & Fouts, P.A. (1997). A resource-based perspective on corporate environmental performance and profitability. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40(3), 534–559.
- Sandelands, L., & Hoffman, A.J. (2008). Sustainability, faith and the market. *Worldviews: Global Religions, Culture and Ecology*, 12, 129–145.
- Schnaiberg, A. (1980). *The environment: From surplus to scarcity*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sharma, S., & Vredenburg, H. (1998). Proactive corporate environmental strategy and the development of competitively valuable organizational capabilities. *Strategic Management Journal*, 19, 729–753.
- Shrivastava, S., & Cooperrider, D.L. (1999). *Appreciative management and leadership: The power of positive thought and action in organization*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Spreitzer, G., Sutcliffe, K., Dutton, J., Sonenshein, S., & Grant, A.M. (2005). A socially embedded model of thriving at work. *Organization Science*, 16(5), 537–549.
- Spreitzer, G.M., & Sonenshein, S. (2004). Toward the construct definition of positive deviance. *The American Behavioral Scientist*, 47(6), 828–847.
- Starik, M. (1995). Should trees have managerial standing? Toward stakeholder status for non-human nature. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 14(3), 207–217.
- Stead, J.G., & Stead, W.E. (2004). *Sustainable strategic management*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Stead, J.G., & Stead, W.E. (2009). *Management for a small planet*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharp.
- Strassler, K. (2007, January 26). If the cap fits. *Wall Street Journal*, A10.
- The Natural Marketing Institute. (2008). Excerpts from the 2006 understanding the LOHAS market report. In M.V. Russo (Ed.), *Environmental management: Readings and cases*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Thomas, W. (2002, June). Business and the journey towards sustainable development: Reflections on progress since Rio. *Environmental Law Reporter*.
- United Nations. (2001). *Global status of biological diversity*. New York: United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development.
- Wade-Benzoni, K., Hoffman, A., Thompson, L., Moore, D., Gillespie, J., & Bazerman, M. (2002). Barriers to resolution in ideologically based negotiations: The role of values and institutions. *Academy of Management Review*, 27(1), 41–57.
- Whitney, D., & Cooperrider, D.L. (2000). The appreciative inquiry summit: An emerging methodology for whole system positive change. *Journal of the Organization Development Network*, 32, 13–26.
- Wilson, E.O. (1984). *Biophilia*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- World Business Council on Sustainable Development. (1997). *Exploring sustainable development: WBCSD global scenarios*. London: World Business Council on Sustainable Development.
- World Commission on Environment and Development. (1987). *Our common future*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- World Resources Institute. (1994). *World resources*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- World Resources Institute. (2000). *World resources, 2000–2001: People and ecosystems*. Washington, DC: World Resources Institute.
- Wrzesniewski, A., McCauley, C., Rozin, P., & Schwartz, B. (1997). Jobs, careers, and callings: People’s relations to their work. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 31, 21–33.