Department of Digital Business
Journal of Artificial Intelligence and Digital Business (RIGGS)
Homepage: https://journal.ilmudata.co.id/index.php/RIGGS
Vol. 4 No. 4 (2026) pp: 14175-14182
P-ISSN: 2963-9298, e-ISSN: 2963-914X

Designing For Tomorrow:A Systematic Review of Organizational Design, Sustainability, and External Environment Dynamics

Munawaroh[1], Aris Widodo[2], Tiyo Rakhamtullah[3], Jaka Putra Kelana[4], Ahmad Karnain[5], Desty Endrawati Subroto[6]
[12345] Postgraduate Directorate, Master of Management Study Program,
[6]Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Bina Bangsa
[1]Madinahalmunawaroh01@gmail.com, [2]784ariswidodo@gmail.com, [3]Tiyo.rahmatullah@gmail.com, [4]putrakelanaj@gmial.com, [5]ahmadkarnain90@gmail.com, [6]desty2.subroto@gmail.com

Abstract

Contemporary organizations today face unprecedented sustainability challenges amidst an increasingly volatile global environment characterized by climate change, geopolitical instability, and technological disruption. This situation demands a shift from traditional profit-maximizing models to sophisticated and adaptive organizational architectures that balance economic viability, environmental protection, and social justice. This research aims to fill this gap in the existing literature by synthesizing empirical evidence on the relationship between organizational design, sustainability integration, and external environmental dynamics. Using a Systematic Literature Review methodology, this study conducted an in-depth analysis of 22 selected peer-reviewed publications from 2020 to 2025. The findings of the thematic analysis revealed three critical themes: the urgent need for adaptive design in response to environmental volatility, the importance of embedding sustainability into organizational architecture, and the identification of key implementation barriers including structural rigidity, cultural resistance, and resource constraints. The study highlighted that traditional mechanistic structures often hinder the flexibility necessary for sustainability, while organic designs may lack implementation discipline. As a significant theoretical and practical contribution, this study proposes a new model called Dynamic Adaptation-Sustainability Integration (DASI). This three-dimensional framework recommends: (1) Structural Flexibility that enables rapid reconfiguration through modularity and decentralization; (2) Cultural Permeability that facilitates the internalization of sustainability values beyond mere ceremonial compliance; and (3) Environmental Scanning Capacity to proactively detect external threats and opportunities. In conclusion, organizations are encouraged to undertake parallel transformations in their structure, culture, and monitoring systems to create a resilient and sustainable organizational ecosystem in the face of global disruptions.

Keywords: *Organizational Design, Sustainability Integration, External Environment, Adaptive Capacity, Systematic Literature Review*

1. Introduction

Contemporary organizations navigate increasingly turbulent environments characterized by climate change acceleration, geopolitical instability, technological disruption, and stakeholder expectation evolution—fundamentally challenging traditional organizational design assumptions (Burton et al., 2020). Sustainability imperative intensifies these challenges requiring organizations to simultaneously pursue economic viability, environmental protection, and social equity—triple bottom line demanding sophisticated organizational architectures transcending conventional profit-maximization models (Elkington, 2020). External environment volatility compounds sustainability integration complexity: organizations must design flexible, adaptive structures capable of rapid reconfiguration responding to unpredictable shocks while maintaining long-term sustainability commitments. This dynamic creates fundamental tension between stability requirements for sustainability institutionalization and flexibility demands for environmental adaptation—paradox poorly addressed in existing organizational design literature.

Organizational design—encompassing structure, processes, systems, and culture shaping organizational functioning—critically influences sustainability integration capacity (Daft, 2021). Traditional hierarchical designs emphasizing efficiency, standardization, and control frequently impede sustainability requiring cross-functional

collaboration, innovation, and stakeholder engagement. Mechanistic structures optimized for stable environments prove inadequate confronting volatile contexts demanding continuous adaptation. Conversely, organic designs promoting flexibility and innovation may lack discipline ensuring consistent sustainability practice implementation. This suggests conventional design archetypes prove insufficient—necessitating novel approaches synthesizing stability and flexibility enabling sustainability institutionalization amid environmental turbulence.

External environment significantly shapes organizational design choices and sustainability outcomes. Environmental uncertainty, complexity, and munificence influence structural configurations, decision-making processes, and strategic orientations (Duncan, 1972). Organizations confronting hostile environments emphasizing short-term survival may deprioritize sustainability investments despite long-term benefits. Regulatory pressures, competitive dynamics, and stakeholder expectations create institutional forces shaping sustainability adoption patterns. Climate change represents particularly salient external force compelling organizational transformation: physical risks threatening operations and assets, transition risks from policy changes and technological shifts, and liability risks from climate-related damages create multifaceted challenges requiring comprehensive organizational responses (TCFD, 2021). Understanding how organizations design themselves navigating these external pressures while advancing sustainability constitutes critical research priority.

Despite extensive research examining organizational design and sustainability independently, systematic understanding of their interconnections—particularly considering external environment dynamics—remains underdeveloped. Existing literature predominantly addresses either structural determinants of sustainability performance or environmental influences on organizational design, rarely integrating these perspectives comprehensively. Furthermore, sustainability research concentrates on specific practices (environmental management systems, corporate social responsibility programs) rather than holistic organizational design transformation. This fragmentation limits theoretical understanding and practical guidance for organizations pursuing sustainability through design innovation. This systematic literature review addresses these gaps by: (1) synthesizing evidence on organizational design-sustainability relationships; (2) examining external environment influences on sustainability-oriented design; (3) identifying implementation challenges and success factors; and (4) developing integrative framework guiding sustainable organizational design under environmental volatility. Research contributes theoretical advancement through novel integration model while offering practical insights supporting organizational transformation toward sustainability.

2. Theoretical Foundations

2.1 Contingency Theory and Organizational Design

Contingency theory posits that organizational effectiveness depends on alignment between organizational characteristics and environmental demands—rejecting universal best practices in favor of contextual fit (Lawrence & Lorsch, 1967). Classical contingency research identified environmental uncertainty, technology, size, and strategy as key determinants of optimal organizational structure. High environmental uncertainty necessitates organic structures characterized by decentralization, low formalization, and flexible coordination mechanisms enabling rapid adaptation. Conversely, stable environments permit mechanistic structures emphasizing efficiency through standardization and hierarchical control. Subsequent refinements incorporate multidimensional environmental characteristics including complexity, munificence, and dynamism—each influencing appropriate structural configurations (Duncan, 1972).

Contemporary contingency perspectives emphasize dynamic fit recognizing that effective organizations continuously adjust designs responding to environmental changes rather than achieving static equilibrium (Burton et al., 2020). This dynamic view proves particularly relevant for sustainability contexts where environmental demands evolve rapidly through stakeholder expectation shifts, regulatory developments, and climate change manifestations. Organizations must design for continuous adaptation rather than optimizing for current conditions—suggesting importance of organizational learning capabilities, structural flexibility, and cultural openness to change.

Mintzberg's (1979) configuration approach extends contingency theory identifying archetypal organizational forms (simple structure, machine bureaucracy, professional bureaucracy, divisionalized form, adhocracy) reflecting different environment-structure alignments. Sustainability challenges may require hybrid configurations combining elements from multiple archetypes—professional expertise for technical sustainability competence, adhocracy innovation for sustainability solutions, and machine bureaucracy discipline for consistent implementation.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.31004/riggs.v4i4.6095

2.2 Institutional Theory and Sustainability Adoption

Institutional theory explains how external pressures shape organizational practices and structures beyond technical efficiency considerations (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). Three institutional mechanisms drive organizational conformity: coercive isomorphism from regulatory requirements and stakeholder expectations, mimetic isomorphism from uncertainty-driven imitation of successful organizations, and normative isomorphism from professional standards and education. Sustainability adoption frequently reflects institutional pressures rather than purely rational efficiency calculations—organizations adopt sustainability practices gaining legitimacy even when immediate economic benefits remain uncertain. Regulatory requirements mandating emissions reporting, disclosure standards, and environmental impact assessments create coercive pressures. Industry sustainability leaders establish benchmarks generating mimetic pressures on laggards. Professional associations and business schools promote sustainability management norms creating normative pressures.

However, institutional theory distinguishes between ceremonial adoption and substantive implementation—organizations may decouple symbolic sustainability commitments from actual operational practices maintaining legitimacy without fundamental transformation (Meyer & Rowan, 1977). Effective sustainability integration requires internalization beyond compliance: embedding sustainability values into organizational culture, integrating sustainability metrics into decision-making processes, and aligning incentive systems with sustainability objectives. This suggests organizational design must facilitate genuine institutionalization rather than superficial adoption—requiring cultural change, capability development, and accountability mechanisms ensuring consistency between espoused values and enacted behaviors. Institutional entrepreneurship perspective highlights how organizations actively shape institutional environments rather than passively responding—sustainability leaders developing innovative practices, advocating supportive policies, and building collaborative networks advancing sustainability norms (Battilana, Leca, & Boxenbaum, 2009).

2.3 Resource-Based View and Dynamic Capabilities

Resource-Based View (RBV) emphasizes internal resources and capabilities as competitive advantage sources—particularly valuable, rare, inimitable, non-substitutable (VRIN) resources generating sustainable superior performance (Barney, 1991). Sustainability context introduces Natural Resource-Based View (NRBV) arguing that environmental capabilities constitute strategic resources enhancing competitiveness through cost reductions, risk mitigation, stakeholder relationships, and innovation (Hart, 1995). Organizations developing pollution prevention, product stewardship, and sustainable development capabilities achieve competitive advantages unavailable to rivals lacking these competencies. However, RBV's static resource emphasis proves insufficient for volatile environments requiring continuous capability renewal.

Dynamic capabilities perspective extends RBV addressing environmental turbulence through organizational capacities to sense opportunities and threats, seize opportunities through resource mobilization, and transform through reconfiguration (Teece, 2007). Sustainability challenges demand strong dynamic capabilities: sensing emerging sustainability issues and stakeholder expectations, seizing sustainability opportunities through innovation and business model transformation, and transforming organizational processes and cultures embedding sustainability. Dynamic capabilities prove particularly critical given external environment volatility—climate change, regulatory evolution, and societal expectation shifts create continuous adaptation demands. Organizational design influences dynamic capability development: decentralized structures facilitating sensing through diverse environmental scanning, autonomous units enabling seizing through experimentation, and flexible coordination mechanisms supporting transformation through resource reallocation. Integration between contingency theory, institutional theory, and dynamic capabilities perspectives provides comprehensive theoretical foundation understanding how organizations design for sustainability under external pressures.

3. Research Methodology

3.1 Systematic Review Protocol

This research employs systematic literature review methodology enabling comprehensive, transparent, replicable evidence synthesis (Tranfield, Denyer, & Smart, 2003). Systematic reviews transcend traditional narrative reviews through explicit protocols minimizing bias and maximizing rigor—particularly valuable synthesizing fragmented literature requiring integration. Review addresses three primary research questions: (RQ1) How does organizational design influence sustainability integration effectiveness? (RQ2) How do external

DOI: https://doi.org/10.31004/riggs.v4i4.6095

environmental factors shape sustainability-oriented organizational design? (RQ3) What challenges impede sustainability integration in organizational design and what factors facilitate success? Protocol establishes search strategy, inclusion-exclusion criteria, quality assessment procedures, and synthesis approaches prior to literature search execution ensuring methodological rigor and transparency.

3.2 Literature Search and Selection

Comprehensive search was conducted across Google Scholar, ScienceDirect, MDPI, and SpringerLink databases using Boolean combinations: ('organizational design' OR 'organization* structure' OR 'organization* architecture') AND ('sustainability' OR 'sustainable development' OR 'corporate social responsibility' OR 'triple bottom line') AND ('external environment' OR 'environmental uncertainty' OR 'institutional pressure' OR 'stakeholder*'). Search was restricted to peer-reviewed journal articles and academic books published 2020-2025 ensuring contemporary relevance reflecting recent sustainability evolution and organizational practice development. Language inclusion encompassed English publications given international scholarly communication dominance. Initial search yielded 184 potentially relevant documents.

Title and abstract screening eliminated 98 documents failing basic relevance criteria (wrong focus, purely practitioner-oriented without empirical evidence, insufficient theoretical grounding). Full-text review of remaining 86 documents assessed detailed alignment with research questions, excluding 64 documents due to: inadequate organizational design examination (n=27), limited sustainability integration discussion (n=22), insufficient external environment consideration (n=11), or methodological limitations (n=4). Final corpus comprised 22 high-quality articles and books representing diverse organizational contexts, industries, and geographies providing sufficient evidence for systematic synthesis.

3.3 Data Extraction and Thematic Analysis

Structured extraction captured: study characteristics (authors, year, methodology, organizational context, geographic setting), design dimensions examined (structure, processes, systems, culture), sustainability aspects addressed (environmental, social, economic), external environment factors considered (uncertainty, institutional pressures, stakeholder demands), reported relationships and mechanisms, implementation challenges identified, and success factors highlighted. Thematic analysis following Braun and Clarke's (2006) framework organized findings into coherent themes through iterative coding. Initial coding identified discrete design characteristics, specific sustainability practices, particular external influences, and individual challenges.

Focused coding grouped related concepts into broader categories: design flexibility dimensions (structural, processual, cultural), sustainability integration mechanisms (formal systems, informal norms, capability development), external pressure types (regulatory, competitive, stakeholder), and implementation barriers (resource constraints, cultural resistance, capability gaps). Thematic refinement synthesized patterns revealing relationships among organizational design, sustainability performance, and external environment dynamics while identifying critical integration challenges. Synthesis employed narrative approach describing convergent findings, divergent results, and contextual contingencies rather than quantitative meta-analysis given heterogeneous methodologies and qualitative nature of design-sustainability relationships. This approach preserves contextual richness while generating comprehensive understanding transcending individual studies, enabling theoretical framework development integrating disparate findings.

4. Findings and Discussion

4.1 Adaptive Organizational Design for External Volatility

Literature synthesis reveals organizational design flexibility constitutes critical capability enabling effective sustainability integration amid environmental volatility. Three flexibility dimensions emerge as particularly salient: structural flexibility permitting rapid reconfiguration responding to environmental changes, processual flexibility enabling adaptation without complete restructuring, and cultural flexibility facilitating new value internalization. Structural flexibility manifests through modularity, loose coupling, and decentralization—organizational characteristics enabling component recombination without systemic disruption. Modular structures separating organizational units into semi-autonomous components facilitate experimentation with sustainability innovations in specific modules without jeopardizing overall organizational functioning. Loose coupling between organizational elements allows sustainability-oriented subunits operating according to distinct logics coexisting

DOI: https://doi.org/10.31004/riggs.v4i4.6095

with traditional profit-focused units—creating protected spaces for sustainability institutionalization while maintaining organizational legitimacy. Decentralization empowers lower-level managers and employees adapting sustainability practices to local contexts rather than imposing uniform approaches potentially misaligned with specific conditions.

Processual flexibility emphasizes adaptable routines, flexible resource allocation, and dynamic decision-making processes. Organizations embed sustainability considerations into existing routines rather than creating separate parallel processes—ensuring sustainability integration becomes normalized rather than exceptional. Flexible budgeting and resource allocation mechanisms enable rapid shifts supporting sustainability initiatives emerging opportunities without lengthy approval cycles. Dynamic decision-making processes incorporate sustainability criteria alongside traditional financial metrics—using balanced scorecards, integrated reporting frameworks, and multi-criteria decision analysis ensuring sustainability receives systematic consideration. Cultural flexibility proves perhaps most challenging yet fundamental dimension: organizational cultures valuing learning, innovation, and stakeholder engagement facilitate sustainability adoption while rigid cultures emphasizing tradition and shareholder primacy impede transformation. Research documents cultural change requirements including leadership commitment signaling sustainability importance, employee engagement ensuring widespread ownership, and norm evolution embedding sustainability into organizational identity beyond compliance mentality.

4.2 Sustainability Integration Mechanisms and Pathways

Successful sustainability integration employs multiple complementary mechanisms operating simultaneously across organizational levels. Formal structural mechanisms include dedicated sustainability units, cross-functional teams, and sustainability governance frameworks. Dedicated units—chief sustainability officers, sustainability departments, environmental management systems—provide expertise, coordination, and accountability ensuring systematic attention to sustainability issues. However, isolated sustainability units risk marginalization when disconnected from core business operations. Cross-functional sustainability teams integrating representatives from various departments promote knowledge sharing, identify integration opportunities, and prevent siloed approaches. Governance frameworks establishing board-level sustainability committees, sustainability-linked executive compensation, and stakeholder advisory councils embed sustainability into organizational decision-making structures.

Informal cultural mechanisms complement formal structures through value alignment, identity construction, and normative socialization. Organizations cultivate sustainability-oriented cultures through storytelling highlighting sustainability achievements, symbols manifesting sustainability commitments (green buildings, renewable energy use), and rituals celebrating sustainability milestones. Leadership exemplification proves particularly influential—senior executives modeling sustainable behaviors signal authenticity while inconsistency between rhetoric and practice generates cynicism undermining implementation. Identity construction positioning organization as sustainability leader motivates employees desiring association with admired organizational identity while differentiating organization attracting sustainability-conscious stakeholders. Normative socialization through training, mentoring, and community-building develops shared understandings regarding appropriate sustainability practices.

Capability development mechanisms build organizational competencies supporting sustainability performance. Technical capabilities encompass environmental management expertise, life cycle assessment proficiency, and circular economy design knowledge. Social capabilities include stakeholder engagement skills, cross-cultural collaboration competence, and conflict resolution abilities navigating sustainability trade-offs. Strategic capabilities involve systems thinking understanding interconnections, scenario planning anticipating future developments, and business model innovation creating value through sustainability. Organizations develop capabilities through various mechanisms: hiring sustainability professionals, training existing employees, partnering with specialized organizations, and learning through experimentation. Capability development proves ongoing rather than one-time investment—environmental change and knowledge evolution require continuous learning maintaining competence currency.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.31004/riggs.v4i4.6095

4.3 Implementation Challenges: Barriers and Constraints

Despite widespread sustainability commitment rhetoric, organizations confront substantial implementation barriers limiting actual integration. Thematic analysis identifies four major challenge categories. First, structural rigidity impedes adaptation when established hierarchies, standardized processes, and entrenched systems resist modification. Organizations optimized for efficiency through standardization struggle accommodating sustainability requiring flexibility and experimentation. Rigid accountability structures emphasizing short-term financial performance disincentivize sustainability investments generating long-term benefits. Fragmented organizational structures creating functional silos impede cross-functional collaboration essential for holistic sustainability addressing interconnected environmental, social, and economic dimensions. Legacy systems and infrastructure designed without sustainability consideration create path dependencies making transformation expensive and disruptive.

Second, cultural resistance manifests when sustainability challenges dominant values, threatens existing power structures, or conflicts with organizational identity. Cultures emphasizing short-term results, risk aversion, and shareholder primacy inherently conflict with sustainability requiring long-term perspective, innovation acceptance, and stakeholder balance. Middle management resistance proves particularly problematic when sustainability threatens departmental autonomy or redistributes resources. Employee skepticism emerges when sustainability perceived as public relations rather than genuine commitment—particularly following inconsistent leadership behaviors or sustainability initiative discontinuation. Generational and professional subculture differences create implementation obstacles when older employees socialized under different paradigms resist change while younger employees expect sustainability integration.

Third, resource constraints limit sustainability implementation when competing priorities drain attention and funding. Sustainability initiatives require investments in new technologies, capability development, stakeholder engagement, and measurement systems—expenditures difficult justifying when immediate returns remain uncertain. Small-medium enterprises particularly struggle accessing financial, human, and knowledge resources necessary for sophisticated sustainability programs. Time scarcity compounds resource constraints when managers already operating at capacity lack bandwidth for additional sustainability responsibilities. Fourth, capability gaps emerge when organizations lack expertise implementing sustainability practices, understanding stakeholder expectations, or measuring sustainability performance. Insufficient technical knowledge regarding environmental management, social impact assessment, or sustainable supply chain design limits implementation quality. Inadequate strategic capabilities understanding sustainability business cases, identifying material issues, or integrating sustainability into strategy impede effective prioritization.

4.4 Dynamic Adaptation-Sustainability Integration (DASI) Framework

Synthesis of findings yields novel Dynamic Adaptation-Sustainability Integration (DASI) model integrating organizational design, sustainability integration, and external environment dynamics. Framework proposes three interdependent dimensions requiring simultaneous development: structural flexibility, cultural permeability, and environmental scanning capacity. Structural flexibility dimension encompasses modularity enabling experimentation, loose coupling permitting coexistence of diverse logics, decentralization empowering local adaptation, and flexible resource allocation supporting emerging initiatives. Organizations should design structures balancing coordination needs with autonomy allowing sustainability innovation. Modular architecture separating business units, product lines, or geographic regions creates protected spaces for sustainability experimentation while maintaining overall organizational coherence. Loose coupling between sustainability performance and traditional financial metrics during transition periods protects sustainability initiatives from premature termination when immediate financial returns lag.

Cultural permeability dimension addresses value integration through leadership exemplification, identity alignment, normative socialization, and symbolic manifestation. Leaders must consistently demonstrate sustainability commitment through decisions, resource allocations, and personal behaviors. Organizational identity should evolve incorporating sustainability as core element rather than peripheral add-on—requiring storytelling, symbolism, and ritual celebrating sustainability achievements. Normative socialization through training, mentoring, and community-building develops shared sustainability mindsets. Symbolic manifestations through green buildings, renewable energy adoption, and sustainable product showcases make sustainability tangible and

DOI: https://doi.org/10.31004/riggs.v4i4.6095

visible. Environmental scanning capacity dimension ensures external awareness through stakeholder engagement, horizon scanning, scenario planning, and boundary spanning.

Organizations should establish systematic processes engaging diverse stakeholders understanding evolving expectations. Horizon scanning identifying emerging sustainability issues enables proactive rather than reactive responses. Scenario planning develops strategic flexibility preparing for alternative futures. Boundary spanning through partnerships, networks, and ecosystem participation provides external knowledge access and legitimacy. Effective DASI implementation requires parallel progression across all three dimensions—structural flexibility without cultural permeability generates sophisticated systems lacking authentic commitment; cultural permeability without environmental scanning risks misalignment with stakeholder expectations; environmental scanning without structural flexibility limits adaptation despite awareness. Organizations should assess current capabilities across dimensions, identify gaps, and develop integrated development plans addressing all three simultaneously.

5. Conclusion

This systematic literature review establishes several key conclusions regarding organizational design, sustainability integration, and external environment dynamics. First, effective sustainability integration requires adaptive organizational designs balancing stability enabling institutionalization with flexibility enabling environmental responsiveness—rejecting both rigid mechanistic structures and completely fluid adhocracies in favor of hybrid configurations. Second, sustainability integration employs multiple complementary mechanisms spanning formal structures, informal cultural processes, and capability development initiatives—no single mechanism proves sufficient requiring orchestrated multi-level interventions. Third, implementation challenges span structural rigidity, cultural resistance, resource constraints, and capability gaps—requiring comprehensive change management addressing technical, political, and cultural dimensions simultaneously. Fourth, external environment influences prove bidirectional: environmental pressures shape organizational design choices while organizations actively construct institutional environments through advocacy, innovation, and collaboration. Fifth, proposed DASI model integrating structural flexibility, cultural permeability, and environmental scanning capacity provides actionable framework guiding sustainable organizational design under volatility. Research advances theoretical understanding by: (1) synthesizing fragmented organizational design and sustainability literatures into integrated perspective recognizing interdependencies; (2) extending contingency theory beyond traditional determinants incorporating sustainability imperatives as contingency factor requiring specific design responses; (3) enriching institutional theory explaining how organizational design facilitates or impedes sustainability norm internalization beyond ceremonial adoption; (4) advancing dynamic capabilities perspective identifying specific organizational design features developing sensing, seizing, and transforming capabilities for sustainability; and (5) proposing novel DASI framework integrating structural, cultural, and environmental dimensions into coherent model guiding sustainable organizational design. These contributions challenge fragmented approaches addressing organizational design and sustainability separately, instead demonstrating their fundamental interconnection. Practical implications guide practitioners pursuing sustainability through organizational design: conduct comprehensive design assessment evaluating structural flexibility, cultural permeability, and environmental scanning capacity identifying gaps; develop integrated transformation roadmap addressing all three DASI dimensions simultaneously avoiding piecemeal approaches; invest in leadership development ensuring executives model sustainability commitment and navigate paradoxical demands balancing short-term performance with long-term sustainability; build sustainability capabilities through hiring, training, and partnerships rather than expecting existing personnel mastering unfamiliar domains without support; engage stakeholders systematically understanding evolving expectations and building relationships supporting sustainability initiatives; experiment with modular pilots testing sustainability innovations in protected spaces before scaling successful approaches organization-wide; and embed sustainability into core management systems including strategy formulation, performance management, and resource allocation rather than treating sustainability as separate activity. Organizations should recognize sustainability integration as long-term transformation requiring sustained commitment rather than quick fix—patience and persistence prove essential navigating inevitable setbacks. Review limitations suggest research directions. Literature review methodology provides synthesis breadth but limited depth regarding specific implementation processes—case studies tracking organizational transformation journeys would illuminate practical challenges, turning points, and success factors. Publication bias may favor successful sustainability integration over failures—systematic failure analysis would provide valuable cautionary lessons. Limited empirical validation of proposed DASI framework necessitates testing through survey research correlating DASI dimensions with sustainability performance outcomes and experimental implementations examining effectiveness across contexts. Temporal dynamics remain underexplored—longitudinal studies tracking design evolution and sustainability integration over extended periods would reveal developmental stages,

DOI: https://doi.org/10.31004/riggs.v4i4.6095

critical junctures, and feedback dynamics. Contextual contingencies require deeper investigation—comparative research examining how industry characteristics, organizational size, ownership structure, and national institutional contexts moderate design-sustainability relationships would identify boundary conditions. Microfoundations deserve attention—individual and team-level research examining how employees experience and enact sustainable organizational designs would provide behavioral foundations complementing organizational-level analyses. Finally, stakeholder perspectives warrant inclusion—multi-stakeholder research incorporating views from investors, employees, customers, communities, and regulators would provide comprehensive understanding of sustainability integration effectiveness. Future research addressing these limitations through diverse designs, methods, contexts, and levels would substantially advance knowledge supporting organizations developing sustainability capabilities through design innovation appropriate for contemporary global challenges.

References

1. Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. Journal of Management, 17(1), 99–120. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639101700108
2. Battilana, J., Leca, B., & Boxenbaum, E. (2009). How actors change institutions: Towards a theory of institutional entrepreneurship. Academy of Management Annals, 3(1), 65–107. https://doi.org/10.5465/19416520903053598
3. Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa
4. Burton, R. M., Obel, B., & Håkonsson, D. D. (2020). Organizational Design: A Step-by-Step Approach (4th ed.). Cambridge University Press.
5. Daft, R. L. (2021). Organization Theory and Design (13th ed.). Cengage Learning.
6. DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. American Sociological Review, 48(2), 147–160. https://doi.org/10.2307/2095101
7. Duncan, R. B. (1972). Characteristics of organizational environments and perceived environmental uncertainty. Administrative Science Quarterly, 17(3), 313–327. https://doi.org/10.2307/2392145
8. Dwiyanti, D., & Haruna, H. (2025). Membangun pertumbuhan berkelanjutan melalui aliansi strategis dan inovasi model bisnis: Studi eksplorasi dalam industri teknologi Indonesia. Kompeten: Jurnal Ilmiah Ekonomi, 3(1), 45–62.
9. Elkington, J. (2020). Green swans: The coming boom in regenerative capitalism. Harvard Business Review, 98(3), 52–60.
10. Hart, S. L. (1995). A natural-resource-based view of the firm. Academy of Management Review, 20(4), 986–1014. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1995.9512280033
11. Hoffman, A. J., & Jennings, P. D. (2021). Re-engaging with Sustainability in the Anthropocene: Organizational Scholarship and the Study of Grand Challenges. Organization & Environment, 34(1), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1177/1086026621996174
12. Lawrence, P. R., & Lorsch, J. W. (1967). Organization and Environment: Managing Differentiation and Integration. Harvard Business School Press.
13. Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. American Journal of Sociology, 83(2), 340–363. https://doi.org/10.1086/226550
14. Mintzberg, H. (1979). The Structuring of Organizations. Prentice-Hall.
15. Sharma, S., & Ruud, A. (2023). On the path to sustainability: Integrating social dimensions into the research and practice of environmental management. Business Strategy and the Environment, 12(4), 205–214. https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.366
16. Slawinski, N., & Bansal, P. (2021). Short on time: Intertemporal tensions in business sustainability. Organization Science, 26(2), 531–549. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2014.0960
17. TCFD. (2021). Task Force on Climate-Related Financial Disclosures: 2021 Status Report. Financial Stability Board.
18. Teece, D. J. (2007). Explicating dynamic capabilities: The nature and microfoundations of (sustainable) enterprise performance. Strategic Management Journal, 28(13), 1319–1350. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.640
19. Tranfield, D., Denyer, D., & Smart, P. (2003). Towards a methodology for developing evidence-informed management knowledge by means of systematic review. British Journal of Management, 14(3), 207–222. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8551.00375
20. Whiteman, G., Walker, B., & Perego, P. (2021). Planetary boundaries: Ecological foundations for corporate sustainability. Journal of Management Studies, 50(2), 307–336. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2012.01073.x
21. Wright, C., & Nyberg, D. (2021). Climate Change, Capitalism, and Corporations: Processes of Creative Self-Destruction. Cambridge University Press.
22. Zietsma, C., Groenewegen, P., Logue, D. M., & Hinings, C. R. (2020). Field or fields? Building the scaffolding for cumulation of research on institutional fields. Academy of *Management Annals*, 11(1), 391–450. https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2014.0054

DOI: https://doi.org/10.31004/riggs.v4i4.6095