ClinicSearch

Clinical Reviews and Case Reports

Cruz Garcia Lirios *

Open Access

Research Article

Expectation of Sustainability in the COVID-19 Era

Cruz Garcia Lirios

Universidad de la Salud, CDMX, México.

***Correspondence Author:** Cruz Garcia Lirios, Mudasir Rashid

Received Date: July 11, 2025 | Accepted Date: July 28, 2025 | Published Date: August 05, 2025

Citation: Cruz G. Lirios, (2025), Expectation of Sustainability in the COVID-19 Era, *Clinical Reviews and Case Reports*, *4*(4); **DOI:**10.31579/2835-7957/128

Abstract

Within the framework of policies against climate change, the expectations of sustainability in the management and management of resources have been a focus of discussion and a central issue on the agenda of cities, but the corresponding studies have established a framework hegemonic theoretical consistent in political culture as a theoretical referent rather than as a scenario for observing the emergence of actions in favor of the environment. The objective of the work was to observe the structure of the variables that the literature identifies as determinants of pro-environmental behavior. A non-experimental study was carried out with a non-probabilistic selection of 400 students who responded to a self-report of their values, norms, perceptions, beliefs, attitudes, knowledge and actions to care for water resources. A structure was found that explained 67% of the variance and the determinant relationship between intention and behavior, but without the interrelation with the other variables, said discrepancies were discussed within the framework of optimization and innovation of organizations with corporate social responsibility.

Keywords: growth; development; organizations; communities; calendar

Introduction

Within the framework of Sustainable Development of the incorporation of different worldviews, this paper aims to expose the avocetous vicissitudes that prevent sustainability models from incorporating community symbols, meanings and senses and organizations oriented towards sustainability once economic instability and the crisis environment threaten their existence (Sharma et al., 2021). For this purpose, the written part assumes that the preservation of natural resources for future generations is outlined by models that overcome the dilemma of economic growth or economic development. The discussion of local development issues in reference to the global growth of transnational integration in communities with respect to the internationalization of SMEs will allow us to understand the future of human needs based on the availability of resources. Community, organizational and sustainable development have often been considered opposed to both the development models proposed by economic growth, industrial production and the exploitation of nature, as well as the development models proposed by liberalization, at least ethics, humanity in reference to consumerism (Osingada & Porta, 2020). In such a scenario, communities and organizations are assumed to be barriers to economic growth or eco-development. In this sense, the purpose of writing this is to review the foundations of sustainability models to discuss the emergence of an integrated model in which communities and organizations are incorporated into the construction of a global environmental agenda symbols, meanings and senses intended to establish new relationships. between humanity and nature.

However, this letter from the assumption that organizations and communities can be incorporated into sustainability proposals if they consider their values, norms, beliefs, knowledge and innovation as fundamental for development, however such dimensions that run through it will expose and then infer the asymmetries between organizations and communities in the context of financial globalization and Sustainable Development (Shulla et al., 2021) . The work is based on the assumption that the diversity of factors that affect the sustainability of natural resources, even if only limited to exposing those barriers to humanity, is developed steadily from civil emergency organizations and business communities. It is in the convergence of SMEs and multinationals where sustainability models can be discussed that can incorporate community values and organizational production. This is because globalization is indicated by the internationalization of SMEs and multinationals entering the local market, in both processes strategic alliances result in the coexistence of community traditions and organizational cultures. However, the models of sustainability that apply to the management of knowledge and values that respect nature are based on the fact that the relationships between communities and organizations are asymmetrical, since the first approach to consider natural resources as part of history of the peoples lies in the fact that organizations use nature as a medium. means to achieve their objective of internationalization or incorporation into the local market (Van Zanten & Van Tulder, 2020). These assumptions have led to sustainability models managing economic growth and green development without considering the future of communities and organizations. Therefore, it is essential to discuss the implications of the principles of sustainability models in order to glimpse the construction of a sustainability agenda in its local and global dimensions. Discursivist and eco-economist governance, ethical environmentalism, biocentric, territorialist, community, regionalist, pressureist and ecotourism have emerged as proposals to local environmental problems and sustainable endogenous development (Martín-Blanco et al., 2022). These models assume that in a situation of vulnerability, as indicated by their availability of natural resources and the quality of public services, the capacity of

communities and neighborhoods are threatened by reduced opportunities, although given increased responsibilities. , it can contribute to risk reduction, energy optimization, productivity improvement, health promotion and prevention of environmental crimes. Local sustainability models that support the diagnosis of community or neighborhood capacities in conflict with the availability of natural resources. Include the establishment of relationships between modifiable buildable spaces and the intangibles of land use and urban planning. In this process, the participation of communities, neighbourhoods, organizations or borders is essential for the construction of a local agenda that guides collective decisions and actions. However, sustainability models can also be implemented in organizations dedicated to ecotourism or organic production since their main purpose is to adjust the guidelines of Sustainable Development to the social responsibility of companies and the business guide to preserve the environment cultures that promote styles of recycling and reuse, in addition to being a field of values, norms and beliefs, organizations are promoting work and nature, friendly products and resources that serve as inputs or the quality of life and well-being of personnel are incentives for companies to become worry about their customers by offering them indicated quality in compliance with international standards (Srivastava, Sharma & Suresh, 2020) . However, each of the models assumed humanity as a separate entity from the laws of nature, forms of coexistence and interdependence (Heggen, Sandset & Engebretsen, 2020) . Intervention models for sustainability assume that the solution to the ecological problem is rationality and human emotion rather than climatic processes. Even assuming humanity as an agent of conflict and change, nature must adapt its resources in order to preserve itself and thereby guarantee the vulnerability, marginalization or exclusion of peri-urban communities and neighborhoods. In this process of diagnosis, intervention and evaluation, the Institutions and Universities of Higher Education (IUES) are called to assume the commitment to manage; produce or reproduce, translate or dismember knowledge about the state of natural resources in reference to the socioeconomic projection of current and future generations. The university, as a factor of local growth, is attached to eco-tourists and is assumed as an alternative to economic growth that pours foreign currency and employment generation projects (Mukarram, 2020). The models focused on aquatic, extreme, beach or mountain tourism pose lifestyles linked to risk as a "safety valve" for urban life and customer satisfaction will become a series of visits to beautiful places or magic that will not only make the lives of those who have the purchasing power of such activities more exciting and meaningful, but also give value to tourist sites, triggering a "domino effect" in which visitors and walkers will demand the services of the towns or spaces for recreation, fun and entertainment. Local development immersed in ecotourism seems to depend on a chain of trust, satisfaction, and comfort rather than investment in industry, job creation, and job placement after training programs for local residents (Elavarasan et al., 2021).. In this sense, the process from global to local depends on external rather than internal factors, banks are mere intermediaries for the transfer of currency and the conversion of natural resources, goods, services or consumer products seems to be assumed as part of the model. ecotourism, however, its consequences are considered as external or as collateral to development. At the same time, regionalist and pressureist models consider the imbalance between resources and population as a factor that affects socioeconomic development and its impact on natural capital and biodiversity (Ottersen & Engebretsen, 2020). Unlike the pressureist, the regionalist includes community participation while the pensioner only takes into account projections of population, production and consumption to establish relationships of dependency between the use of energy and the agreements or arrangements between local authorities. There are two dissimilar models, but derived from the assumption that between global and local development, the regions act as intermediaries; regulate and moderate extractive, transformative and distributive processes in which natural resources are involved based on the needs and expectations of current generations without considering the opportunities for resource management and knowledge generation for the development of future generations. Many times, the diagnosis of availability of natural resources and forecast of depletion served in the planning of endogenous development in reference to the regional situation.

Faced with pressureist and regionalist models, territorialists emerge the opportunities, capacities and responsibilities that the market offers to communities and neighborhoods (Iwuoha & Jude-Iwuoha, 2020). The demarcation of the territory of production, distribution and consumption is the result of foreign investment and the transfer of knowledge and technology. The local is reduced to a passive expression in the mobility market through the supply and demand of products and services. Natural resources are only a development instrument while the actors in global production chains are the same at the regional and local levels. Alliances between SMEs and multinationals are assumed to be strategic both in the generation of employment, but alliances with other actors are not understood as pillars of development and that cooperation agreements between SMEs and multinationals cover the labor supply and the demand for employment. In other words, according to the economist model, growth is the result of a continuous process of technological innovation, full employment and equitable distribution of resources, even if this means a gap between developed and developing countries (emerging economies), the Communities and organizations are only assumed as instruments of endogenous development in reference to the global market (Leal Filho et al., 2020). On the contrary, the eco-development model proposes a consensus among the actors to establish a common agenda for the interests of majorities and minorities, taking into account the availability of resources and environmental and industrial threats that threaten the stability of localities, regions or global systems. Biocentric, ethical and ethical-ecological community governances assume that the imbalance is a shared responsibility between the actors and that, on the construction of a sustainable agenda, vulnerable, marginalized and excluded can contribute knowledge whose discussion is essential for public debate. , citizen security and social peace. The community model emphasizes the participation of indigenous peoples and neighborhoods from which it is about understanding nature as an element of local identity rather than development (Macht, Chapman & Fitzgerald, 2020) . Thus, the residents of the periphery are the ones who defend their right to the city and natural resources and the demand for public services related to the availability of public and common goods. This is where the biocentric model favors the conservation of animal and plant species at the expense of human needs. From this approach, natural resources are part of a system in which humanity is a species and therefore the ecological footprint that threatens its continuity is seen as a phase of changes that nature experiences and whose species become extinct or become extinct. However, the uncompromising preservation of nature is seen from the ethical discourse model as an irrational result derived from a confused reflection relationship between nature and saved humanity (Chabbott & Sinclair, 2020). The scientific community would be closer to this sustainability model since nature is perceived as an object of study, modifiable from urban planning. In contrast, the ethico-ecological model holds that communities and organizations are only part of natural resources and as moral entities are likely to be freed at least from their values, beliefs, and norms regarding production and consumption. In short, sustainability models are prone to conflict and change since they are based on a dissonant relationship between nature and humanity, either because of their values, beliefs and norms or because of their structures, systems, tools and results, the models they pose opportunities, capabilities and responsibilities that they present. generations should take to the delight of future generations. The objective of the study consists in contrasting an exploratory factorial model of sustainability in the COVID-19 era. Based on the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG), the criteria are established for the contrasting of the hypothesis regarding the significant differences between the SDGs with respect to the evaluations of students selected for their participation in local and institutional sustainability, such as the preparation of compost, resource optimization and recycling campaigns. Are there significant differences between the SDGs with respect to the evaluations of a community of students at a public university in central Mexico and in confinement due to the pandemic? The premises that guide this work indicate that the mitigation and containment policies impacted the formation of human capital. In this sense, the confinement and distancing strategies favored the transition from the face-to-face to virtual classroom. Once distance learning was adopted, the academic training changed substantially. The self-management of knowledge in terms of sustainability and through virtuality led to the assimilation of the SDGs as

a preamble to a comprehensive management system focused on reducing risks associated with the pandemic. Therefore, significant differences between the SDGs and student representations are expected.

Method

The research was carried out in a town in central Mexico with a low level of human development, considerable birth rate, low level of per capita income and professional training, as well as high citizen participation in municipal issues of fundraising, social entrepreneurship and innovation in the commercialization of products and services. A non-experimental, cross-sectional, exploratory and correlational study was carried out with a non-probabilistic selection of 400 students from a public university, considering the system of professional practices and social service, as well as the framework of strategic alliances between the institution and organizations dedicated to the knowledge creation. The Sustainability Water Expectation Scale was used, which measures eight dimensions related to; 1) values, 2) norms, 3) perceptions, 4) beliefs, 5) attitudes, 6) knowledge, 7) intentions and 8) behaviors related to the optimization of resources and innovation processes. All items are answered with one of the options ranging from 0 "unlikely" to 5 = "quite likely". The Delphi technique was used to select, compare and integrate the items related to each of the eight dimensions, following the assessments and recommendations of expert judges in the field. The students were surveyed at the facilities of their university, providing a written guarantee of the anonymity and confidentiality of their answers given the possible effects on the results of the research. The information was processed in the statistical analysis package for social sciences (SPSS version 20.0). The parameters of normality, reliability, adequacy, sphericity, validity, adjustment and residual were estimated to test the null hypothesis on the significant differences between the theoretical relationships of the variables with respect to the empirical relationships to be observed.

The authors declare that the document is free of conflict of interest, provided that the dignity and integrity of the parties involved are guaranteed within a framework of free access to information.

Results

The descriptive values of the instrument in which it is possible to observe the parameters that show the normal distribution, adequacy of reliability, sphericity and validity of the instrument. The general scale (alpha of, 789) and the eight subscales (respective alphas of, 762;, 760;, 789;, 762;, 785;, 756;, 769;, 734) obtained values above the minimum requirements (alpha of , 700), being considered reliable in the measurement of other samples and research contexts. Adequacy and sphericity ⌈χ2 = 345,3 (23gl) p < ,01; KMO = ,703⌋ Método: Principales; Rotación: Promax. Once the factors that explain 67% of the total explained variance were established, we proceeded to estimate their linear relationships in which the structure of trajectories between the variables that determine the behavior for sustainability can be appreciated from the seven variables of values, norms, perceptions, beliefs, attitudes, knowledge and intentions. The structural equation model was estimated to observe the determining relationships between sociocultural and sociocognitive factors with respect to the behavioral variable.

Los parámetros de ajuste y residuales ⌈χ2 = 23,4 (14gl) p < ,01; GFI = ,990; CFI = ,997; RMSEA = ,007⌋ sugieren la anulación de la hipótesis nula relativa a las diferencias significativas entre las relaciones teóricas de las variables con respecto a las observaciones empíricas en el modelo de ecuaciones estructurales.

Discussion

Under Sustainable Development, organizations and communities seem to be in the process of internationalization of SMEs and the entry of multinationals into the local market, however, sustainability models insist on considering that the development of communities and organizations goes through different paths. (Aysan, Bergigui & Disli, 2021) . In principle, sustainability models oriented towards exclusive development for current generations consider that communities are a symptom of emerging economies insofar as they are, as the logic of economic development suggests, a transition towards full employment. For their part, eco-development models argue that organizations lack entities of values, norms and beliefs from which a culture biased to win and therefore an unfavorable environment can be inferred. In both models, economic and developmental, communities and organizations primarily second, are barriers to sustainability, but perhaps the essential problem is that both models assume that organizations and communities oppose each other. In this context, it is essential to discuss the relationships maintained by communities and organizations in reference to the guidelines of sustainable development and economic-financial globalization. Organizations, unlike communities, limit themselves to technological innovations because they are their instrument to adjust their production to the logic of global and local markets (Fleetwood, 2020) . Instead, communities are entities of uses and customs in which symbols, meanings and senses determine traditions, myths, values, norms and beliefs that address the care of natural resources while organizations, including socially responsible ones, assume that Nature is a provider of natural resources. inputs and in any case receive waste. Such relationships between communities and organizations with respect to natural resources seem to show that both are opposites, however, in situations of scarcity, risk and uncertainty, communities have shown that trust, solidarity and cooperation are more than symptoms that capital or support networks are in trouble. essence symbols, meanings and senses sustainability organizations that arise when establishing alliances with a financial crisis, financial recession or economic slowdown. For the formation of human capital, the values, beliefs and traditions of the communities come together with the knowledge and skills of the organizations. If community and organizational university can coexist, then in sustainability models symbols, meanings and feelings of trust, solidarity, respect, cooperation and innovation can be compatible for the construction of a public agenda for sustainable development. However, the convergence of community organizational principles is not an easy task since the extinction of natural resources has affected the differences between communities and organizations to such an extent that now the native peoples strongly defend their rights and organizations in their eagerness to survive. in established chain. networks in which state deregulation allows the excessive exploitation of nature (Fenner & Cernev, 2021) . That is why sustainability models must not only include community and organizational aspects, but must also move towards legal regulation schemes where environmental protection is an indicator of development that can be complemented with citizen participation. As the legal framework protects the availability of resources for future generations, the construction of a sustainable agenda must be discussed in the civil, political, economic, academic, community and organizational spheres. Such an exercise will distinguish our civilization as the one in which climate change opened the opportunity to build symbols, meanings and senses of sustainability.

Conclusion

The objective of this work was to establish the dimensions of the expectations sustainability model. The findings show the predominance of eight components, among which Beliefs stand out as the main factors _ the surveyed sample seems to believe more in sustainability in times of pandemic _ the importance of communication risk suggest a model focused on assertiveness, since as as COVID-19 intensifies and forces people to lock down and distance themselves.

References

1. Aysan, AF, Bergigui, F., & Disli, M. (2021). Blockchain-based solutions in achieving SDGs after COVID-19. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity* , *7* (2), 151. https://www.mdpi.com/1143156
2. Chabbott, C., & Sinclair, M. (2020). SDG 4 and the COVID-19 emergency: Textbooks, tutoring, and teachers. *Prospects* , *49* , 51-57. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11125-020-09485-y
3. Elavarasan, RM, Pugazhendhi, R., Jamal, T., Dyduch, J., Arif, MT, Kumar, NM, ... & Nadarajah, M. (2021). Envisioning the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) through the lens of energy sustainability (SDG 7) in the post-COVID-19 world. *Applied Energy* , *292* , 116665.

https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0306261921001951

4. Fenner, R., & Cernev, T. (2021). The implications of the Covid-19 pandemic for delivering the Sustainable Development Goals. *Futures* , *128* , 102726. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0016328721000355
5. Fleetwood, J. (2020). Social justice, food loss, and the sustainable development goals in the era of COVID-19. *Sustainability* , *12* (12), 5027. https://www.mdpi.com/747446
6. Heggen, K., Sandset, TJ, & Engebretsen, E. (2020). COVID-19 and sustainable development goals. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization* , *98* (10), 646-646. https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/336836/PMC7652554.pdf
7. Iwuoha, JC, & Jude-Iwuoha, AU (2020). COVID-19: Challenge to SDG and globalization. *Electronic Research Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities* , *2* . https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3670330
8. Leal Filho, W., Brandli, LL, Lange Salvia, A., Rayman-Bacchus, L., & Platje, J. (2020). COVID-19 and the UN sustainable development goals: threat to solidarity or an opportunity?. *Sustainability* , *12* (13), 5343. https://www.mdpi.com/758466
9. Macht, SA, Chapman, RL, & Fitzgerald, JA (2020). Postscript: COVID-19 and SDG progress. *Journal of Management & Organization* , *26* (6), 1073-1076. https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/journal-of-management-and-organization/article/postscript-covid19-and-sdg-progress/EFC99CB5C1020975DC53A11A7E4AE4D9
10. Martín-Blanco, C., Zamorano, M., Lizárraga, C., & Molina-Moreno, V. (2022). The Impact of COVID-19 on the Sustainable Development Goals: Achievements and Expectations. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* , *19* (23), 16266. https://www.mdpi.com/1987486
11. Mukarram, M. (2020). Impact of COVID-19 on the UN sustainable development goals (SDGs). *Strategic Analysis* , *44* (3), 253-258. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/09700161.2020.1788363
12. Osingada, CP, & Porta, CM (2020). Nursing and Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in a COVID-19 world: the state of the science and a call for nursing to lead. *Public Health Nursing* , *37* (5), 799-805. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/phn.12776
13. Ottersen, OP, & Engebretsen, E. (2020). COVID-19 puts the sustainable development goals center stage. *Nature Medicine* , *26* (11), 1672-1673. https://www.nature.com/articles/s41591-020-1094-y
14. Sharma, HB, Vanapalli, KR, Samal, B., Cheela, VS, Dubey, BK, & Bhattacharya, J. (2021). Circular economy approach in solid waste management system to achieve UN-SDGs: Solutions for post-COVID recovery. *Science of The Total Environment* , *800* , 149605. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0048969721046805
15. Shulla, K., Voigt, BF, Cibian, S., Scandone, G., Martinez, E., Nelkovski, F., & Salehi, P. (2021). Effects of COVID-19 on the sustainable development goals (SDGs). *Discover Sustainability* , *2* , 1-19. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s43621-021-00026-x
16. Srivastava, A., Sharma, RK, & Suresh, A. (2020). Impact of Covid-19 on sustainable development goals. *International Journal of Advanced Science and Technology* , *29* (9), 4968-4972. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/arjun-suresh-8/publication/341779062_impact_of_covid-19_on_sustainable_development_goals/links/5ed3d3344585152945220e1c/impact -of-Covid-1 9-on-sustainable-development-goals.pdf
17. Van Zanten, JA, & Van Tulder, R. (2020). Beyond COVID-19: Applying “SDG logics” for resilient transformations. *Journal of International Business Policy* , *3* , 451-464. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/s42214-020-00076-4