Mäkelä, M., Apostol, O., Heikkilä, K. 2018. Chapter 6: Pride and fear: Emotions in sustainability. In: Escobar-Pérez, B., del Mar Miras-Rodríguez, M. (eds.) Corporate social responsibility: Challenges in diversity, accountability and sustainability. Management Science - Theory and Applications. Nova Science Publishers, New York. pp. 121-147.

Chapter

PRIDE AND FEAR: EMOTIONS IN SUSTAINABILITY

Marileena Mäkelä[1,], Oana Apostol[2]*
and Katariina Heikkilä[1]

[1]Finland Futures Research Centre, Turku School of Economics,
University of Turku, Turku, Finland
[2]Department of Accounting and Finance, Turku School of Economics,
University of Turku, Turku, Finland

ABSTRACT

Although researching emotions is not a new topic, they have not received much attention in the literature on sustainability. We add to this narrow field by addressing a research question: 'what emotions do employees have when they describe the sustainability work of their employer?' We interviewed 19 employees of a large manufacturing company. Our results show that the employees had both positive and negative emotions while they described the sustainability work conducted by their employer: the positive emotions related to pride and the negative to fear. Both these emotions covered the product, ownership, their

---
[*] Corresponding Author Email: marileena.makela@utu.fi.

business, suppliers, and society at large. The aspects the employees are proud about are certainly aspects on which sustainability work can be easily built. Concurrently, the aspects of fear are equally important, as they might hinder the success of sustainability work.

Keywords: <mark>sustainability, emotions, employees, pride, fear</mark>

INTRODUCTION

… There is one thing that separates this, from almost every other industry, from manufacturing industry, is the fact that we have a product that we are practically manufacturing for one year…everybody is working with it, it is very concrete, that it is not a bulk, or something that gurgles in the pipes, or something small gadgets in millions, instead our product is little by little born here and then we take it to a test drive, and then it leaves the premises with fluttering flags and it honks away and we raise a toast. There is something, this builds the image that 'hey, this is our product' or…if you compare to [building] a big mill or even to a nuclear power plant but it is not as impressive to build a nuclear power plant nowadays anymore.

The above extract articulates one interviewee's view on the industry where the person works. Although our research interest was the company's sustainability work, it quickly became evident that the interviewees were extremely proud of their work. We, as researchers, then became interested in the emotions that the interviewees expressed while talking about sustainability. In the following sections, we will explain why it is important to study emotions in connection to sustainability.

Emotions are a normal part of human life and research has highlighted their significance to working life as well. For example, emotions have been a part of management and organisational studies for over 20 years. However, the prestigious *Academy of Management Review* dedicated a special issue to emotions in 2017 (see Ashkanasy et al. 2017), calling for refreshing theoretical perspectives on the role of emotions in organisational

dynamics. We will provide a more detailed overview of the literature in Section 'Emotions in Management Literature'.

As shown by Gond et al. (2017) and Russell and Griffiths (2008), emotions have received little focus in sustainability studies. We also noticed this as we browsed through existing literature (see Section 'Emotions in Sustainability') and found only a handful of studies focusing on sustainability and emotions. However, previous literature has shown that sustainability issues – especially environmental – raise intense emotions, which can either encourage or discourage sustainability adoption by individuals or organisations (e.g., Russell and Ashkanasy 2007). We need to know more about the emotions that organisational members experience during their endeavours to implement sustainability and how, in turn, these affect the outcomes of such actions. For this reason, in this study, we intend to identify the range of emotional reactions in a case organisation while it is trying to formalize its sustainability discourse by making it visible throughout its different units and departments. Examining employees' emotions is important, as we claim that emotions are linked with processes of implementation and the development of sustainability in an organisation. A contested understanding of sustainability among employees, marked by a variety of emotions, does not help an organisation in its sustainability work.

In addition to emotions, a key concept of our study is sustainability. Literature offers multiple different definitions of this term and Dahlsrud (2008) and Sarkar and Searcy (2016) have analysed these in-depth. Dahlsrud (2008) concluded that there are five common aspects – economic, environmental, social, voluntariness, and stakeholder dimension – whereas, Sarkar and Searcy (2016) highlighted six aspects (economic, ethical, social, stakeholders, sustainability, and discretionary). In this article, we acknowledge Dahlsrud's and Sarkar and Searcy's analysis, but we follow Aguinis (2011) proposed definition of sustainability as 'context-specific organisational actions and policies that take into account stakeholders' expectations and the triple bottom line of economic, social, and environmental performance' since, in our view, this better suits our setting.

The aim of our paper is to map the emotions that employees express when they describe the sustainability work of their company. This paper addresses two research questions: What emotions do employees have when they describe their employer's sustainability work? How do these emotions affect the sustainability work of the company?

The structure of the paper is as follows. The next section reviews the previous research on emotions in management studies and in sustainability studies. In the materials and methods section, we shall present our case company, the interviews, and the analysis. The third section presents our results, namely the positive and negative feelings the employees had. We will end our paper with discussion and conclusions.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Emotions in Management Literature

Although research on emotions in management studies spans over a period of 20 years, the topic continues to attract much interest. Thus, there is rich prior research examining how emotions are implicated in organisational processes (Creed et al. 2014), how they regulate the relationships between organisational members (Cropanzano et al. 2017, Oh and Farh 2017) and how they shape action and decision-making (Huy 2011, Rothman and Melwani 2017). This stream of literature deviates from long-lived views of organisations as sites of rational decision-making, driven by managerial or employee self-interest (Boedker and Chua 2013). It shows that the outcome of organisational action and decision-making can be affected by emotions experienced by organisational members (Huy 2011, Rothman and Melwani 2017, Lebel 2017) and pledges for an integration of affect in theories of management as a pre-condition to better informed practices (Ashkanasy et al. 2017). Different organisational levels have been examined in prior research on affect, ranging from individual (micro), to group or interpersonal relationships (meso) and organisational (macro) levels (Ashkanasy 2003, Ashkanasy et al. 2017).

A spectrum of emotions has been researched in management literature. In general, positive emotions have been associated with effective leadership, creativity, and productivity (Gooty et al. 2010, Van Kleef et al. 2010). Recent studies claim that negative emotions are not necessarily harmful under certain circumstances, but able to support pro-active managerial conduct (Rothman and Melwani 2017, Lebel 2017). Similarly, management scholarships have also undergone the challenge of fine-grained analysis of different emotions. There are studies examining gratitude (Fehr et al. 2017), shame (Creed et al. 2014), fear, anger and sadness (Oh and Farh 2017), anger and fear (Lebel 2017), or a combination of other emotions. In fact, recent studies claim that a mix of emotions is experienced in contemporary organisations, which would be better approached as complex emotional sites (Rothman and Melwani 2017, Hamilton and McCabe 2016).

While much has been studied about emotions in management literature, the research field of sustainability has been slow to catch up. This is surprising, as sustainability is by nature a very sensitive topic that elicits a lot of emotional reactions on the part of both believers and deniers of human impact on climate change or the health of ecosystems, for example. If, as a society, we aim to make major transformations in individual and organisational practices, then aligning them with sustainability goals may be a reasonable way to proceed. Hence, we need to know more about the emotions that organisational members experience during their organisational endeavour to implement sustainability and how, in turn, these affect the outcomes of such actions.

Emotions in Sustainability

Emotions in sustainability is a fairly new field of interest; therefore, there is scarce research available, although some interesting examples can be found. In the 1990s, Fineman (1996, 1997) studied emotions regarding corporate environmentalism, but only recently has this area gained new momentum. The previous contributions can be broadly categorized into

two groups. First, there are theoretical contributions that create categories or models of emotions and sustainability based on previous literature. The second group consists of contributions that analyse emotion(s) in corporate contexts. Examples of the previous contributions will be described in the following.

For the first group, two theoretical contributions were found. First, Bodolica and Spraggon (2010) analysed pride and they challenged the commonly held assumption that pride is seen in the business context only as a negative trait. However, they show pride can be divided into authentic and hubristic pride. Hubristic pride is a trait to be avoided among employees, as it often is based on overconfidence, and conflictual and problematic personalities, whereas authentic pride is based on confidence, self-esteem, and adaptive and collaborative characteristics. Their conclusion is that corporate success is easily built on employees with authentic pride. Second, Sekerka and Stimel (2012) built a model of environmental decision-making based on moral emotions. They describe moral emotions as emotions 'that are linked to the interests or welfare either of society as a whole or at least of persons other than the judge or agent,' based on Haidt's (2003) definition. In Sekerka and Stimel's (2012) model, the decision-making process begins with organisational identity, which can be either stakeholder or shareholder oriented. The external regulation (either incentives or penalties) affects the awareness of issues, and values (other or self-interest directed) cause the desire to act, which is also affected by either positive or negative collective moral emotions. Then, the regulation focus (promotion or prevention) causes a decision to act and, before the actual action is taken, change can have an effect, and the change can be either aspiration and transformational or problem-solving and incremental.

For the second group, we identified seven practical contributions regarding emotions in sustainability. Already in 1990s, Fineman studied emotions. First, he found that the managers relied on four emotion-related arguments to justify their attitude towards (non-)greening of the organisation (Fineman 1996): enacting green commitment (e.g., expressing 'pride' about the environmental commitment of their organisation);

contesting green boundaries (e.g., manifesting 'frustration' that they are not able to engage more with environmental issues for business reasons); defending autonomy (e.g., negative feelings such as 'threat' and 'irritability' surfaced at the intrusion of outside environmental campaigners); and avoiding embarrassment (e.g., 'embarrassment' about bad publicity for not performing well). Second, in 1997, Fineman studied managers in the UK automotive industry. Despite his target being to study emotions the managers experienced in performing their environmental actions, he found the managers to be techno-rationalized and divorced from emotions in their work. In 2004, Ketola analysed the eco-psychological profiles of employees of an oil company as they reacted to a recent oil spill. She used a predefined framework consisting of 12 different organisational personality types to examine the employees' conduct as they attempted to defend the incident. Ketola claims that organisational values and beliefs are shared within organisations, making it possible to draw an overall organisational profile.

Then, Russell and Ashkanasy (2007) focused on Australian senior managers' emotions regarding the pro-environmental behaviour in three perspectives. First, they identified the environmental issues that generated emotions for the managers. These environmental issues included biodiversity, future generations, major global events, limited resources, and pollution and waste. Second, they analysed the pro-environmental behaviours together with the emotions. The pro-environmental behaviour included the following: 'advocating environmental change,' 'conservation of natural biodiversity,' 'eco-efficiency,' 'environmental compliance and reporting,' and 'environmental leadership.' Lastly, they looked at the emotional intensity of the pro-environmental behaviour. Their analysis was based on Shaver's emotion category of six emotions: namely love, joy, surprise, anger, sadness, and fear. Concerning environmental issues, joy (including emotions like satisfaction, excitement, and pride) and fear (covering emotions like fear, cynical, and sceptical) were the most often expressed emotions. On the other hand, love and sadness were not expressed at all. Then regarding pro-environmental behaviour, joy was the main emotion expressed by the interviewees and surprise was not

expressed at all. Russell and Ashkanasy concluded that environmental issues do provoke emotional reactions, especially expression of embarrassment, guilt, and pride. However, they conclude that one needs more knowledge on how emotional expressions turn into pro-environmental behaviour.

Later, Wright and Nyberg (2012) studied the 'emotionology' around climate change discussions in Australian companies. They emphasized how societal emotions have an impact on organisational discourses. The emotions are adapted by internal actors to suit business needs, while tackling the most important environmental problem of the time, namely climate change. One article closely related to our research interest is Onkila's (2015) study on employees' emotions regarding sustainability. She found that the employees had both negative feelings (e.g., cynicism and irritation), and positive emotions (e.g., pride, good will, distinction from greed, and avoidance of shame) when they talked about sustainability in their company. Lastly, Friedrich and Wüstenhagen (2017) studied managers' emotions during a time of change by applying the five stages of grief model. They focused on grief as one emotion experienced in organisations, and found that emotions have concrete effects on managerial decision-making. They underlined the significance of analysing emotions related to sustainability as a precursor of managerial action and, for this reason, called for further research.

As a summary, one can conclude that emotions in relation to sustainability have been scarcely researched. However, we can highlight a few aspects from the previous research. First, research has shown that environmental issues cause emotions (the only exception was Fineman (1997), where managers separated emotions from their work) and, recently, Onkila (2015) showed that emotions are experienced also in the context of sustainability. We add further insights as we focus not only on environmental responsibility but all sustainability work in a company. Second, previous research has shown that pride is one of the typical positive emotions that the employees have towards their work. Bodolica and Spraggon (2010) focused on the analysis of pride and concluded that authentic pride is one of the building blocks of an organisation's success.

We will show in our analysis that employees in our case company are also unanimously proud of their work. Lastly, only four of the previous studies have addressed the variety of emotions (see Table 1). We will analyse and contribute by offering an analysis of the spectrum of emotions employees can feel in relation to sustainability work.

Table 1. Positive and negative feelings in previous sustainability-related literature

Reference	Recognized positive feelings	Recognized negative feelings
Fineman (1996)	Pride ('enacting green commitment')	Frustration ('contesting green boundaries') Threat, irritation ('defending autonomy') Embarrassment ('avoiding embarrassment')
Russell and Ashkanasy (2007)	Love (caring, compassion) Joy (happiness/satisfaction, enthusiasm/excitement, hope, pride) Surprise (amazement)	Anger (anger/frustration, annoyance) Sadness (sadness, hopelessness/depressed, embarrassment/guilt) Fear (fear/alarm, cynical/sceptical)
Wright and Nyberg (2012)	Compassion/empathy Excitement Pride Hope Passion Satisfaction	Anxiety, apprehension Hostility Exasperation Despair Fear Guilt
Onkila (2015)	Pride, enthusiasm ('close to one's heart and pride') Liking, comfort ('shared goodwill') Gentleness, respect ('distinction from greed') Pride, happiness, trust ('avoidance of shame')	Cynicism, frustration ('cynicism and discomfort in one's own work') Annoyance, cynicism ('irritation and lack of shared courage')

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Case Company

This research is based on interviews conducted in a large manufacturing company located in Europe. The company produces complex industrial products that can be also called luxury products, and retains about 1500 employees. The nature of its complex products necessitates the use of a vast network of suppliers. The case company became a part of a larger, family-owned company in 2014, whereas it previously was owned by international investors.

The company has only recently started to organise its sustainability efforts. The different aspects of sustainability have received different focus throughout the history of the company, but a comprehensive mapping of them was lacking. Occupational health and safety, environmental issues, and social responsibility have been a focus of the company for years. Due to its position as a member of the heavy, manufacturing industry, the company has a long tradition in paying attention to occupational health and safety (OHS). This is natural for this type of company due to the high risk of occupational accidents. Also, the environmental issues of the production have already been addressed for years. For example, the company needs an environmental permit from the environmental authority in order to operate. The permit sets limits for, e.g., environmental noise and air and water emissions. For that matter, the social responsibility, i.e., responsibility of the employees and, to a certain extent, that of subcontractors, has been a significant aspect for the company. The employees' knowledge is essential for the success of the company. In addition, as the company is dependent on the expertise of the suppliers, it employs many supplier management practices, as will be discussed in below. But what is new for the company is that their customers and customers' customers are now interested in the entire sustainability performance of the company.

Interviews

Ten interviews were conducted with 19 employees, women and men, representing all the major departments of the company (see Annex), including procurement, sales and design, human resources, environmental management, administration, HSE (health, safety and environment) and risk management, investments, ICT, and top management. The interviews lasted 31–85 minutes and they were carried out March–September 2016. All the interviews were conducted face-to-face by one of the authors of this paper.

Interviews were semi-structured, allowing for open discussions between interviewer and interviewees. The aim of the interviews was to map sustainability understandings of the organisational members. For this purpose, the interview started with an exploration of the interviewees' own interpretation of sustainability concept and what kind of information they consider as sustainability-relevant in their work. They were, for example, slightly prompted to talk how they understand sustainability, and how the concept is relevant to their work. This open approach was followed by a discussion that was loosely structured around the major pillars of sustainability, i.e., social, environmental and economic factors, and how sustainability possibly had changed in the history of the company. If the interviewee made clear that sustainability was irrelevant or narrowly relevant for him or her, the follow-up questions did not 'suggest' additional interpretations but clarified some details relating to what had already been said.

Analysis

Interviews were transcribed *ad litteram* and the transcriptions were thematically analysed. The coding was performed by one of the authors of this paper, but was discussed and modified by the remaining two authors. The actual coding phase included multiple rounds of reading and interpretation of the transcribed interviews. The software NVivo 11 was

used in the analysis process. The transcription parts were coded where the employees 1) described their emotions; or 2) used strong adjectives while describing their sustainability work. In other words, those sections were coded where it was evident that the employees had strong feelings about the sustainability work or some aspects about it. No predetermined list of codes was used, as we wanted to really see which emotions our data emphasized, not trying to fit our data to a certain list.

After several rounds of coding and reading, it was evident that the employees had both positive and negative feelings when they talked about sustainability work. The positive feelings were mostly articulated in terms of pride. These sections were coded in detail with the question 'what are the employees proud about?' in mind. The negative feelings related to the problems, difficulties, or troubles that they faced in the sustainability work and were then coded with the question 'what worries the employees?' in mind.

FINDINGS

The employees expressed both positive and negative emotions while they described the sustainability work conducted by their employer. The positive emotions related to pride and negative emotions to fear. Both the pride and fear covered five aspects, namely the product, ownership, their business, suppliers, and society at large. The content of these aspects is described in detail in the following two sections.

Pride: 'We Are Responsible - We Are the Best'

The overwhelming sense of pride was evident in the interviews. In general, the employees were proud of working in that line of business. The aspects regarding pride are summarized in Table 2. Here, economic responsibility is strongly represented but aspects of social responsibility

also cause pride. On the contrary, environmental sustainability is not a very visible source of pride.

First, the employees felt proud about the product they are producing. It was seen as a high-quality product and was often referred to as 'luxury.' Some of the employees even used affective expressions when they described their feelings after having finished manufacturing the product. The high quality and superior sustainability performance was seen as a competitive advantage for future success as well. Of the dimensions of sustainability, this source related mostly to economic responsibility but also partly with environmental sustainability, as the environmental performance of their product was seen to be high-quality as well.

Table 2. The source and description of pride

Emotion	Source	Description	Dimension of sustainability
Pride	Product	The employees felt proud about the luxury, high-quality product they are producing. The product is excellent in environmental features.	Economic, environmental
	New owner	The employees valued the owner family, their soft values[1] and long-term perspective. Also, the economic stability brought by the owner was valued.	Economic, social
	Business	The employees were proud of working in that business sector. Also, the long tradition of certain sustainability aspects was valued.	Social
	Supply chain	The employees felt proud about the responsibility practices of their suppliers and their employees.	Economic, social
	Society	The company's role and responsibility as a member of society was valued.	Economic, social

---

[1] Soft values mean here that it is not only the materialistic, economic values that rule.

> … Our own employees are extremely proud of what we here, and with every reason, of what we manufacture here. That we are actually building the Mercedes Benz of our industry here. That is a good thing, and that can be used as a foundation, and of course it's good that also the persons in the neighbouring community are proud of and know that the world's best [name of the product] are built here and of course that is to us an extremely good thing and something to cherish.

Second, the employees were unanimously proud of having joined a family-owned company. Many of the employees had a long history of working in this location and had witnessed the economic problems of some of the previous owners. The new owner has restored their credibility in the markets and adopted a more long-term approach in comparison to seeking short-term profits. The second source relates to both economic and social responsibility.

> … But to close the theme of economic sustainability, the new owner, as [name of the other interviewee] said earlier, it is the biggest thing, that they [the new owner] have been in this business and there are staying in this business, they are not after some quick profits, this shows in everything. It reflects in the strategy and in attitude of this business, and they are prepared that there will be difficult times as they know that this business is what it is.

Third, as mentioned, many of the employees were proud of working in that particular field of business. The field has a long tradition in the country and has a 'hard labor is valued' mentality. Besides the business, some of the employees were proud to mention certain aspects of sustainability where they felt their company had a long tradition and good practices. For example, their long tradition of occupational health and safety (OHS) work was often mentioned. Also, their own occupational health care facilities were highlighted (although it is more typical nowadays to outsource this service). In addition, one employee talked at

length about their own academy which educates employees to work in their business[2]. The third source relates strongly to social responsibility.

> … Clearly one sustainability aspect is that we have invested a lot in the occupational health care. We have an exceptional situation here that we have our very own occupational health care here. So, our doctors are on our payroll and our nurses are on our payroll. It is not external, service provider that offers the service. The obvious benefit is that our health care personnel know very well our business, so they know what we do here. They know who does what and how the work is done, which obviously helps in that we are able to maintain our people's work ability and health here…Also, I cannot help saying that last year we then received a national award that our occupational health care has been of very high quality.

Fourth, most of the interviewees talked proudly about their responsibility toward their suppliers, focusing mainly two aspects: the multinationalism of the suppliers and economic responsibility. It is typical in this industry that the suppliers work at the site. In this case, the suppliers come with multiple different ethnicities. E.g., one of the interviewees mentioned that up to 40 different nationalities work at their site. For that reason the company provides training for the suppliers, not only about its environmental, health and safety aspects, but also about the general aspects of the society where the company operates. The second aspect relates with the economic responsibility: The interviewees did not only feel responsible for their own employees and their finances but also that of the suppliers' and their employees. The fourth source of pride relates to economic and social responsibility.

> … Well, in every day work it shows in that we have at best, I know, that we have had 43 nationalities here. We give a lot of occupational safety and environmental issue training. We aim to teach them our thinking of environmental issues as some of them [the supplier's

---

[2] The country in question has a formal, public education system. Most companies no longer educate their employees, but cooperate with the public education institutions.

employees] come from those kind of situations or countries where recycling or OHS is not a big theme. We also give a social training…which contains a lot of training of the [name of the country] society, how we operate here, those kinds of things, something else than just how we operate in this manufacturing site. In the training, we can go through e.g., how to use the toilet, so very basic things. This is the first thing that comes to my mind, of these concrete aspects of social responsibility.

The fifth and last source of pride was seen to originate from the outside of the company. The people living close by and the community in the region was felt to be proud of the company. Due to the economic situation in Europe, the company was considered an engine for the region–a source of good news in a difficult situation. Secondly, some of the employees had worries that the neighbors would complain about the noise and environmental impact, since the company has started the production again. The feedback received from the neighbors was mainly positive, complimenting, 'it is nice to hear that you are once more making noise [equaling with production].' Thus, the fifth source also relates with economic and social responsibility.

… We have received attention and that kind of interest from the media. In our neighbourhood, there are companies of our size or even bigger but, now we have received the attention. For many reasons. Of course, our story is pretty amazing.

When we look at the aspects that cause pride and analyze their impact on sustainability, it is easy to see that these could be labelled as the success factors. From the sustainability point of view, the story would go like this: Their product has superior environmental properties. The financial situation is good and therefore, they are able to also develop sustainability issues further. Social responsibility is particularly valued and both the company and suppliers' employees are appreciated and invested in. Also, the society thinks that the company is a responsible actor. When

sustainability work contains an aspect of pride for employees, it is easier to develop even further.

Fear: 'External Threats Could Affect Future Business'

The negative feelings were not as obvious as pride in the interviews, but the employees still shared their feelings about the fears they have. The employees' perspective implied fears of a negative aspect or harm related to sustainability or related to factors that impede their organisation's contribution to sustainability work. Similarly, the negative feelings have been divided into five categories: product, ownership, business, supply chain, and society (see Table 3). Also, regarding fear, aspects of economic responsibility were most often mentioned. However, in contrast with pride, both environmental and social aspects were also often mentioned.

Table 3. The sources and description of fear

Emotion	Source	Description	Dimensions of sustainability
Fear	Product	Some of the employees pondered whether their product is vain. It is a product that impacts the environment, thus affecting sustainability.	Environmental
	Old owners	The employees shared the feeling that many of their previous owners were not interested in investing in and improving the processes of the company.	Economic, social
	Business	Many of the employees felt that the key aspect is to have a profitable business; sustainability is only an add-on.	Economic
	Supply chain	The problems in the supply chain related with the spreading of sustainability thinking in the whole chain.	Economic, environmental, social
	Society	The society at large possesses current and future image problems, as the industry was viewed as old-fashioned and possibly associated with environmental impacts.	Economic, environmental, social

First, the employees did not have many negative feelings regarding their product. As mentioned, it was seen to be superior. Only a few employees discussed their personal value conflict between the product they were producing (it was thought to be vain) and personal appreciation of nature.

> … Well, surely to me personally those, value of nature is surely important, so that we try to build, first of all those kinds of [name of the product] that they are as energy efficient as possible and they would pollute as little as possible, and also that we build them in that way that we would not pollute the environment but to minimize all the emissions. That is for me important, all these values of nature. And this is a bit difficult, in that sense, to reason with myself, as I'm that what you call nature lover, why are we building [the name of the product]. But it is like this and I happened to study this topic [as a student] and I have always liked [the name of the product].

Second, the employees shared the feeling that some of their multiple previous owners were not interested in developing the production processes. Also, the employees felt that the employers did not consider the employees as important, and many were laid off or just let to leave. Some of the employees even described the anxious feelings that they had during the times when it was uncertain if the company would even exist the next day. This fear or anxiety relates to the past performance of the company, as the other fears (product, business, supply chain, and society) are current or future fears. However, in general, the long history of the company was seen positively, as some of the persons who left during the difficult years had returned to the company.

> … The strategy of [name of the company] is to create sustainable business in this site, so they [the new owner] are not like those opportunists, like some of the previous owners were that just seized the opportunity and did what they did and left.

Third, many of the employees felt that their task is only to manufacture the product. They thought that they should not concentrate on sustainability unless the customer requires it and, more importantly, pays for it. Some of the employees, however, pointed out that the company should concentrate more on environmental issues inside their manufacturing site (in comparison to the environmental performance of the product). A certain fear that many of the employees shared was the fear of international competition, especially coming from China which undermines the sustainability efforts of the case company. The employees fear that competitiveness of their employer may suffer because of dedicating resources to sustainability, when their Asian competitors do not.

> … I think this [sustainability] is foolishness, we should not be running after it. We need to focus, in my mind, on how to make some business here. In my mind, we can't be running after all these kinds of butterflies. Surely these all are good things and beautiful things, I'm not denying that, but it is not our business. Let someone else work with these and if they need our help we can give it, but it is not our core business. Our core business is, if we want to be involved in sustainability, to find that which we can turn into profits. This is a cold world, we are not here to save the world.

Fourth, the problems regarding the supply chain focused on spreading sustainability thinking to the whole chain. For example, one of the interviewees mentioned that she had visited many of their suppliers and just explained to them what is meant by the concept of sustainability. Many employees shared the fear that it is very difficult to collect sustainability-related data from all of the company's dozens of suppliers.

> … Yes, it is very difficult…we have there surely altogether 500 companies that operate here in different supply chains… but that we would be able to in a way spread the responsibility of a shared workplace to reach a bit further than just us. We surely do have the overall responsibility. But now we would need to have the first tier to

acknowledge that they have the same responsibility over their chain as we have over our chain.

Fifth, the employees also recognized threat arising from society. Although the closest neighbors had positive feelings about the business, the employees felt that they would not have a good image at large. For example, they felt that they had problems in acquiring new employees, as their image was a bit old-fashioned (hard, manual labor) and, therefore, not attractive to young people. In reality, in addition to manual labor, they also need a lot of IT experts in order to produce their product. Another potential image threat was seen as a threat. Some environmental NGOs have started to raise questions regarding the sustainability of their business. If this line of thought was to gain momentum, then it could threaten the business in the future.

> … Yes, and now we come to that what is, what is also important to us through that, kind of the building of the employer image. We are well aware of that out there, let's say in the market, is a very common misperception that [name of the industry] is two things. On the one hand, when we build the steel parts, the sparks are flying and torch is singing and burning. On the other hand, then we need only the [name of the industry] engineers for the design part. But this is not the case. We need all kinds of experts here. For example, we have recruited about 30 people from [name of a IT company] and they have very interesting knowhow of for example of RF [radio frequency] technology or of production planning or… we need to widen the general perception that today [name of the industry] is really high hi-tech and therefore we need many different kinds of experts here.

Implications of fear could be labelled as the worst case regarding sustainability in the company. The main focus of the company is to develop its financial aspects. The sustainability issues yield only minor focus. The situation inside the company is worsened by the rise of sustainability requirements outside the company: In general, their product

is assessed to be vain and society is condemning the industry, making it harder for them to get new employees.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Our results show that the employees have a variety of sources (product, ownership, business, supply chain, and society) for their emotions about sustainability work inside one company. Depending on the source, different dimensions of sustainability were highlighted by the interviewees. However, the most frequently mentioned aspects were in relation to economic sustainability. This study offers both academic contributions and managerial implications. These are elaborated in the following paragraphs.

This study offers three academic contributions. First, this study contributes to the narrow field of study of emotions in sustainability by showing that that sustainability issues clearly involve an emotional dimension when studied from the employee perspective. As was shown above, very few studies have researched the field so far. The previous studies have mainly focused only on environmental responsibility, the exception being the study of Onkila (2015) which also focused on sustainability. This research, together with Onkila's, shows that the wider sustainability issues also raise emotions among the employees, and we provided an in-depth view on how these emotions relate to different aspects of the sustainability of the case company investigated here. So far, the research has shown the nature of environmental issues as they connect with emotions, as was shown e.g., in Russell and Griffiths' (2008) review; however, we are able to claim that the entire spectrum of sustainability-related practices can induce emotions in employees. Second, some similarities with the previous literature were found. The authors here share the view of Bodolica and Spraggon (2010) about pride. The employees in the current research felt authentic pride regarding their work, employer, and certain sustainability aspects. As Bodolica and Spraggon (2010) highlighted, authentic pride can help companies to foster their business.

We agree that the authentic pride articulated by our case organisation's employees can be a success factor for both the company's profit and sustainability work. Fineman (1996) acknowledges this view, as well. He emphasizes that sustainability work should be based on pride and connected especially to those aspects that the employees commonly agree 'they are good at.' It can be said that the employees we interviewed had a shared feeling of being very good at producing the luxury product. Third, the current research also differs from the previous studies. For example, Onkila (2015) showed that the employees she interviewed expressed multiple different emotions when they talked about their company's sustainability work. However, in our company, the employees only had two main emotions, namely pride and fear.

The managerial implications of this research are important for a company. As this study is a single-case study, the aim here has not been in producing generalizable results; therefore, the managerial implications apply mainly to the studied company. However, some general implications can be made: The aspects the employees are proud about are aspects on which sustainability work can be easily built upon. Then again, the aspects of fear are equally important to be understood, as they might hinder the success of sustainability work. Moreover, fears might actually constitute social sustainability problems in themselves; identifying and solving them can in such cases directly enhance the sustainability of the company.

From the point of view of the case company, we suggest the following three managerial implications. First, the employees had a rather strong focus on economic sustainability. This can be easily understood with the history of the company, as it recently faced severe financial difficulties. However, now the financial situation has improved and the employees themselves were starting to expect e.g., more emphasis on the social responsibility. Second, the weak role of environmental issues was somewhat a surprise. The employees did not highlight environmental work that the company had evidently done. This could be an area to focus on in the future, in order to make the work more visible for the employees and an additional source of authentic pride. Third, the employees emphasized social responsibility. Many of the employees raised various aspects of

social responsibility as successes of the company. Also, many of them felt that besides its own employees, their employer has a responsibility over the suppliers' employees.

The current research is in line with the conclusions of Glavas (2012), when he analysed employee engagement with sustainability. He concluded that different employees are motivated by different aspects and, between employees, these might be contradictory. This was evident in our data as well, e.g., while many of the employees are proud of the high-quality product that they are producing, a few thought that it was vain and, therefore, had a visible value-conflict with the matter. This is also an important managerial implication of our research. Although our sample is small, we were able to show that opinions and emotions differ between the employees. The managers and sustainability communications inside companies should bear this in mind; they should not think they would be able to reach every employee with one single message or be certain that the message elicits the same emotions in each employee and, therefore, the same reactions. While it is important to construct a homogeneous value system inside a firm, the process of doing so should consider different typologies of employees and their personal relationship with sustainability aspects.

Based on our results, it seems that it is very important for the employees to connect themselves to a meaningful narrative regarding sustainability. If the narrative is that 'I'm working in a company that strives for continuous improvements in its sustainability work,' there is less need to be defensive of criticism. In this case, the employees are more open to take that criticism as a cause for further action. If an employee thinks of sustainability as a process, it is easier to have positive feelings and think of oneself and one's organisation as sustainable. Whereas if sustainability is an on/off state (i.e., invested only during the prosperous times), the fear of not achieving it may make employees resentful of the whole idea. The on/off state approach also gives a signal to the employees that there are more important aspects (such as economic sustainability) to be taken care of than sustainability. Both aspects were visible in our case company. The overwhelming sense of pride of their work and the

sustainability aspects emphasize the shared understanding of the process nature of the sustainability work. However, as some of the employees had a fear about sustainability taking too big of a role in comparison to the economic side of doing business, there are signs of on/off state of sustainability as well. In addition, as the economic responsibility seemed to dominate the discussions, this is another proof of the on/off state of sustainability.

Although the starting point of our research was the pride that the employees in our case organisation described, we want to bring into discussion other aspects as well. We want to highlight also the role of negative emotions that employees have in a company. As Russell and Griffiths (2008) point out, previous research has often found that negative feelings are needed in order to create behavioural changes. We add to this that in our research the negative emotions can be used as one sort of risk analysis or horizon scanning, as the topics that the employees mentioned often related to future threats of the company.

What is interesting in our findings is that the employees had a strong feeling of pride regarding their work. Closer analysis revealed that the employees' pride had multiple sources. The analysis of the negative feelings was not that intuitive, but surely one could recognize that the employees' negative feelings mostly related to fear that either had affected, affects now, or could affect in the future their company or their business.

The current research has some limitations. The obvious limitation of our research is that we studied the employees of only one company. This means that our data and our approach of a single-case case study does not allow us to make generalizable conclusions. Our next step is to widen the focus to the employees of the supplier companies. Naturally, we encourage more researchers to analyse this topic in various organisations. In our analysis, we also categorized the emotions narrowly into only one positive (pride) and one negative feeling (fear). Regarding the positive feelings, pride mainly covers all the positive feelings that the employees had. Some of the employees had more negative feelings than just fear, but, typically, they were visible only in one or few sections of their discussion; those are

disregarded here. The future analysis should focus on elaborating the feelings more.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

ANNEX 1. DETAILS ON INTERVIEWS AND INTERVIEWEES

Code	Department	Date	Length of interview
I1	Environmental manager (1 person)	10.03.2016	59 min
I2	Environmental manager and procurement (3 persons)	10.03.2016	54 min
I3	Deputy to the CEO (1 person)	26.05.2016	31 min
I4	Sales and Design (2 persons)	13.05.2016	49 min
I5	Investments and Process Development (1 person)	3.06.2016	44 min
I6	HSE & Risk Management (2 persons)	9.06.2016	56 min
I7	Human Resources & Administration (2 persons)	27.05.2016	73 min
I8	Procurement (4 persons)	8.06.2016	42 min
I9	Project Management, Design & Engineering (2 persons)	9.06.2016	85 min
I10	ICT (2 persons)	15.06.2016	65 min

REFERENCES

Aguinis, H. (2011). 24. Organizational responsibility: Doing good and doing well. In *APA handbook of industrial and organizational*

psychology, edited by Zedeck, S. American Psychological Association. Vol. 3. Pp. 855–879

Ashkanasy, N. M. (2003). Emotions in organizations: A multilevel perspective. In *Multi-Level Issues in Organizational Behavior and Strategy* (*Research in Multi Level Issues, Volume 2),* edited by Dansereau, F. and Yammarino, F. J. Emerald Group Publishing Limited. Pp. 9–54.

Ashkanasy, N. M., Humphrey, R. H. and Huy, Q. N. (2017). Integrating emotions and affect in theories of management. *Academy of Management Review,* 42 (2): 175–189.

Bodolica, V. and Spraggon, M. (2010). Behavioral governance and self-conscious emotions: Unveiling governance implications of authentic and hubristic pride. *Journal of Business Ethics,* 100: 535–550.

Boedker, C. and Chua, W. F. (2013). Accounting as an affective technology: A study of circulation, agency and entrancement. *Accounting, Organizations and Society,* 38: 245–267.

Creed, W. E. D., Hudson, B. A., Okhuysen, G. A. and Smith-Crowe, K. (2014). Swimming in a sea of shame: Incorporating emotion into explanation of institutional reproduction and change. *Academy of Management Review,* 39 (3): 275–301.

Cropanzano, R., Dasborough, M. T. and Weiss, H. M. (2017). Affective events and the development of leader-member exchange. *Academy of Management Review,* 42: 233–258.

Dahlsrud, A. (2008). How corporate social responsibility is defined: An analysis of 37 definitions. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management,* 15: 1–13.

Fehr, R., Fulmer, A., Awtrey, E. and Miller, J. A. (2017). The grateful workplace: A multilevel model of gratitude in organizations. *Academy of Management Review,* 42: 361–381.

Fineman, S. (1996). Emotional subtexts in corporate greening. *Organization Studies,* 17 (3): 479–500.

Fineman, S. (1997). Constructing the green manager. *British Journal of Management,* 8: 31–38.

Friedrich, E. and Wüstenhagen, R. (2017). Leading organizations through the stages of grief: The development of negative emotions over environmental change. *Business & Society,* 56 (2): 186–213.

Glavas, A. (2012). Employee engagement and sustainability: A model for implementing meaningfulness at and in work. *The Journal of Corporate Citizenship,* 46: 13–29.

Gond, J.-P., El Akremi, A., Swaen, V. and Babu, N. (2017). The psychological microfoundations of corporate social responsibility: A person-centric systematic review. *Journal of Organizational Behavior,* 38: 225–246.

Gooty, J., Connelly, S., Griffith, J. and Gupta, A. (2010). Leadership, affect and emotions: A state of the science review. *Leadership Quarterly,* 21: 979–1004.

Hamilton, L. and McCabe, D. 2016. 'It's just a job': Understanding emotion work, de-animalization and the compartmentalization of organized animal slaughter. *Organization,* 23 (3): 330–350.

Huy, Q. N. (2011). How middle managers' group-focus emotions and social identities influence strategy implementation. *Strategic Management Journal,* 32: 1387–1410.

Ketola, T. (2004). Eco-psychological profiling: An oil company example. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management,* 11: 150–166.

Lebel, R. D. (2017). Moving beyond fight and flight: A contingent model of how the emotional regulation of anger and fear sparks proactivity. *Academy of Management Review,* 42: 190–206.

Oh, J. K. and Farh, C. I. C. (2017). An emotional process theory of how subordinates appraise, experience, and respond to abusive supervision over time. *Academy of Management Review,* 42: 207–232.

Onkila, T. (2015). Pride or embarrassment? Employees' emotions and corporate social responsibility. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management,* 22: 222–236.

Rothman, N. B. and Melwani, S. (2017). Feeling mixed, ambivalent, and in flux: The social functions of emotional complexity for leaders. *Academy of Management Review,* 42 (2): 259–282.

Russell, S. and Griffiths, A. (2008). The role of emotions in driving workplace pro-environmental behaviors. In *Emotions, Ethics and Decision-Making. Research on Emotion in Organizations*, edited by Zerbe, W. J., Härtel, C. E. J. and Ashkanasy, N. M. Emerald Group Publishing Limited. Pp. 83–107.

Russell, S. and Ashkanasy, N. M. (2007). Feeling the heat of global warming: Emotion as an antecedent of pro-environmental behavior. In *21st ANZAM 2007 Conference Proceedings: Managing our Intellectual and Social Capital,* edited by Chapman, R. 21st Annual Meeting of the Australian and New Zealand Academy of Management (ANZAM), Sydney, New South Wales, December 4–7 December.

Sarkar, S. and Searcy, C. (2016). Zeitgeist or chameleon? A quantitative analysis of CSR definitions. *Journal of Cleaner Production,* 135: 1423–1435.

Sekerka, L. E. and Stimel, D. (2012). Environmental sustainability decision-making: clearing a path to change. *Journal of Public Affairs,* 12 (3): 195–205.

Van Kleef, G. A., De Dreu, C. K. and Manstead, A. S. (2010). An interpersonal approach to emotion in social decision making: The emotions as social information model. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology,* 42: 45–96.

Wright, C. and Nyberg, D. (2012). Working with passion: Emotionology, corporate environmentalism and climate change. *Human Relations,* 65 (12): 1561–1587.