Workplace environment and its concordance with the culture of peace in the companies and institutions of the department of Chontales and Rio San Juan
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**SUMMARY**

The main objective of this article is to associate the conflicts as a variable of the workplace environment, associated with the implementation of the culture of peace, in the collaborators of the MSMEs of the department of Chontales and Rio San Juan. The approach that was used is cognitive, historical and explanatory. The study sample is intentional, with six participants, three are MSMEs and three are state institutions as public servants, for a total of 203 employees. The instruments that were used were: semi-structured interviews and surveys, applied and analyzed. As a result, it is obtained that the data reflect the pertinent relationship between the pleasant workplace environment existing in companies and institutions, based on the minimum of conflicts generated and the adequate implementation of communication, motivation and extra financial remuneration to employees.
It is concluded that companies and institutions work in the implementation of the culture of peace from the internal environment allowing flexibility and adaptability to changing market environments, communication, working conditions and clear and widespread compensation policies, which ensure that employees are committed to the organization, to its objectives, that they feel comfortable with the command structure and the position they hold; In the same way, if the organization is a source of well-being towards employees, they will be a source of joy, energy, and peace towards their families and towards the company. Hence the contribution of the culture of peace, to the external environment and to the local and national economy.

INTRODUCTION

The workplace environment “is an issue that was raised in the ‘60s along with the emergence of organizational development and the application of systems theory to the study of organizations” (Prado, 2015, p. 202).

In the labor context that is lived in MSMEs, it is remarkable to highlight the link between the different factors of the workplace environment with the work environment and beyond with the key element of life, which is peace, from the individual point of view, family and work, in the understanding that one must work in harmony, with motivation, and in close communication to avoid uncertainty generating conflicts for both management and employees, which although small in number, are the driving force of the functioning of the economy in our country.

The main purpose of the article was to link the factors of the workplace environment with the culture of peace, demonstrating that work is carried out in a harmonious environment with assertive communication, generating well-being between employees and management.

Finally, it demonstrates the close relationship that exists in the working environment of MSMEs.

DEVELOPING

The workplace environment affects organizations and can put their survival at risk, directly affecting their human resources (Furnham, 2001).

It is indisputable that problems with people have always been and will continue to be difficult to solve, leading to Chief Executive Officers (CEO) spending most of their time in resolving them, and they must also take into account the perceptions of each of the collaborators regarding the various aspects of the organization.

According to Furnham (2001) states that:

(...) it is possible that the workplace environment is one of the most important causes of job satisfaction and performance in organizations. According to some authors, it is a moderating
variable between the structure and processes in an organization and the main results of the employees. In essence, this implies that the structure of the organization and the daily procedures and processes influence and determine the environment that, in turn, affects the performance and satisfaction of the employees. (page 601)

The same author points out that an internal environment includes the nature of organizations’ communication networks, reward systems, and leadership style, wanting to know how effective they are in mobilizing their human resources. (Furnham, 2001)

Likewise, “The environment is the focal point of a complex set of forces in an organization that affects those who work in it” (Furnham, 2001, page 601). The knowledge of these variables will allow CEOs to take advantage of these forces and achieve the proposed organizational goals.

Similarly, Chiavenato (2009) states that the workplace environment refers to:

Environment existing among the members of the organization, is closely linked to the degree of motivation of the employees and specifically indicates the motivational properties of the organizational environment. Therefore, it is favorable when it provides the satisfaction of the personal needs and the moral elevation of the members, and unfavorable when it is not possible to satisfy those needs. (p.86)

Mankind has always wanted to live in peace: peace in oneself, peace at home, peace at school, peace at work, peace in the street, in the city (...) throughout the world.

The Culture of Peace Foundation, Citizenship Foundation (2012) reaffirms: What is the culture of peace? “It is a set of values such as respect for life, freedom, democracy, education, tolerance, cooperation, equality between men and women, or respect for the environment.” (p.14)

From the perspective of the workplace environment in companies and institutions, when measuring the main variables studied, the results obtained consisted of:

Regarding motivation as a substantial element in the workplace environment, Robbins & Coulter (2010) refers to:

The process is responsible for the individual to make a great effort to achieve organizational objectives, conditioned by the ability of the effort to meet some individual needs. Although motivation generally refers to the effort exerted towards any objective, we refer to organizational objectives because our focus is on work-related behavior. (p. 392)

Similarly, motivational factors refer to the profile of the position, which details the activities that must be carried out, these generate levels of satisfaction in people who are reflected in the productivity and time management of employees. For organizations, it is a duty
to maintain the motivation of the staff which will allow them to have responsible partners with
the goals and organizational growth (Chiavenato, 2009).

It is important to highlight the results observed in graph No. 1, revealing that the
employees of these companies and institutions on average 68% are always motivated and only
28.72% are sometimes motivated and in a minimum percentage the collaborators are never
motivated. It is clear that although companies implement different motivational factors, there
will always be those who do not feel motivated, as a result of which motivation is related to the
mood of the employees.

Concerning communication, it is associated “with the interpersonal process of sending
and receiving symbols that contain messages” (Schermernhorn, 2006, page 328)

Other authors point out that “Interpersonal communication can be described as a
behavioral approach to communication because it enhances the importance of this among
individuals” (Rue & Byars, 2006, page 284)

It is important to highlight the results shown in graph No.2, visualizing that the
employees of these companies and institutions on average 72.35% always communicate with
their bosses, colleagues, thereby demonstrating an upward and horizontal communion, which
guarantees the process improvement within these organizations.
Similarly, about non-financial remuneration in organizations and institutions, non-tangible aspects such as verbal, private or public recognition are considered. As Mondy (2012) points out, that non-financial remuneration is based on the satisfaction experienced by a collaborator derived from the work itself and the psychological and physical environment in which he works.

In turn, Chiavenato (2009), the extra-financial rewards offered by the organization can be pride, self-esteem, recognition, job security, which affect the satisfaction that people derive from the remuneration system.

It is notorious that extra-financial remuneration is not always applied both in companies and institutions, in graph No. 3 it is displayed on average, that 43% of the time employees receive this extra-financial remuneration, 27% they always receive it, making it clear that extra-financial remuneration is an element that has a great impact on employees, however, not all organizations incorporate this type of benefit and, therefore, they do not express disagreement.
When referring to the culture of peace as a perspective from the conflict, the companies and institutions that dream of being an example of coexistence for society must externalize the ability to handle the conflict properly, since the problems generated over time can become conflicts, without, however, all employees must learn to live together, being people with different ways of being, feeling, thinking and acting, becoming a challenge for CEOs.

In this regard, according to Huntosborn (2006), he states that the conflict “is where there are disagreements in a social situation on important issues or that antagonisms create friction between individuals or groups” (p.386).

Notoriously, employees in companies and institutions have confirmed the minimum expression of conflicts in their areas of collaboration, since the results of graph No. 4 reflect that on average, 67% of employees do not face conflicts, 21% face conflicts sometimes and only 12% always have conflicts. Although the data seems contradictory, it is a very favorable element that demonstrates that the conflicts did not generate a greater impact on the culture of peace, since the conflict in its positive connotation will allow permanent questioning and criticism, to reflect and seek individual strategies. and groups that contribute to good organizational living.
Finally, the culture of peace and the workplace environment are key elements in the life of companies and institutions, strengthened from the collective vision, since dialogue and thought are transmitted through human actions.

Zambrano (2006) asserts that:

The word is collective because it unites individuals in the common dialogue. In it, each one finds the world, its things, its powers and transmits it to the other, which informs us about the way of thinking, of saying, of acting. The word is thought as he speaks to language, and in it, there is a universe to discover (p.57)

The results expressed in graph No. 5 express that 64% on average of the companies under study always experience a pleasant working environment, while others 24%, their employees experience a pleasant working environment sometimes.

For organizations, it is important to have a pleasant working environment; This makes people feel comfortable and calm and therefore be a source of leadership, entrepreneurship, agility, joy, empathy, and respect with colleagues and customers.

Besides, as human beings are the center of development of society and therefore the collaborators who work in companies and institutions. Corporate social responsibilities as part of the actions must focus their different efforts in the interior to promote a culture of peace, which in turn has a profound impact and is visualized in the establishment of profitable relationships with the client.

Recalling Mahatma Gandhi with his expression: “The person who is not at peace with himself, will be a person at war with the whole world”, so that each collaborator, each manager,
each entrepreneur, must consider the key elements that establish the Workplace environment that entails the strengthening of the culture of peace, thus obtaining inner peace, benefits to the client and economic resources to the entrepreneur.

The reflection of a pleasant workplace environment and culture of peace is visualized in graph No. 6, where the collaborators stated that they are always satisfied in their work performance in these companies and institutions.

Job satisfaction is considered as: “The positive feeling about one’s work, which results from an evaluation of its characteristics, represents an attitude instead of a behavior” (Robbins and Judge, 2009, p.31).
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CONCLUSIONS

The data of the variables under study confirm that there is a workplace environment favorable to the internal and external.

From the organizational context, the workplace environment is perceived from the internal environment; combining culture, assertive communication, generating fewer conflicts every day, achieving daily coexistence and that employees feel motivated to continue contributing to the development of the organization and the economy. From an external point of view with quality and customer satisfaction.

Working to form a culture of peace that leads to a pleasant workplace environment, contributes to the prevention of violence from within organizations if components such as flexibility, adaptability to changing market environments, communication, conditions are promoted. of work, clear and widespread compensation policies, which guarantee that the employees are committed to the organization, to the objectives and to feel comfortable with the command structure and the position they hold.

If the organization is a source of well-being towards employees, it will be a source of joy, energy, and peace towards their families and the company.

Finally, peace in organizations is the result of the combination of communication, leadership style, desired culture, and work environment.
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