

Employee's green behavior for environmental sustainability: a case of banking sector in Pakistan

Qaisar Iqbal, Siti Hasnah Hassan, Sohail Akhtar and Shahid Khan
School of Management, Universiti Sains Malaysia, George Town, Malaysia

Abstract

Purpose – The purpose of this paper is to find out the relationship between employee's green behaviors (EGBs) and environmental sustainability (ES). Presently, many ES issues have impact on organizations, e.g., energy cost and climate change. In business world, there is a positive trend among organizations to start reporting over performance of ES keeping their role as corporate social responsibility alive.

Design/methodology/approach – Self-administered questionnaires were floated to gather data from employees of manufacturing and service industry. In order to analyze the collected data, regression analysis and correlation coefficient were employed to check hypotheses. Statistical Package of Social Sciences has been used for data analysis.

Findings – Results reveal that there is a direct positive relationship between EGB and environment sustainability. The five dimensions of EGB, i.e., working sustainability, conserving, avoiding harm, influencing others and taking initiative also have significant association with ES. ES carries with itself sensational openings for the HRM role and with the opportunity originates responsibility.

Practical implications – This study emphasizes the revised planning of training and development programs to create awareness among employees and strategies to improve ES and corporate social responsible level of organizations in competitive world.

Originality/value – This research carries a new horizon to explore the association of EGBs with ES in banking sector. The study presents first-ever empirical evidence about the relationship between ES and EGBs from developing countries.

Keywords Corporate social responsibility, Environmental sustainability, Employee green behaviours

Paper type Research paper

Introduction

Environmental pollution can be traced back to the origin of civilization. Wherever people started living for a long time, the piling process of their wastes became speedier than its consuming rate of nature. As long as people dispersed for working with no permanent existence of cities, environmental conditions remained normal. When people found high cost associated with pollution as compared to migration cost, they simply moved away from that vicinity. Meanwhile, natural recycling process transformed the leftover wastes into working form. World population is increasing day-by-day at a high rate and now it is inevitable to cope with pollution and the problems caused by it. Both academic researchers and practitioner are looking toward development of control measures in diversified forms of pollution. Increase in population and rising demand of towns and cities have built three-fold pressures on environment:

- (1) Population and demand for natural resources are directly related. Increase in population requires demand for rise in natural resources.
- (2) Demand for construction has negative impact over forests. Demand of land for housing and industrial units will deplete forests of the world.
- (3) Rising pile of human and industrial waste has severe consequences over living beings.

Natural environment drives organizational environment, firms are dependent upon increasingly insufficient resources. Pressures on the carrying capacity of natural resources



of planet will definitely create disruptive impacts on organizations, their employees and the society in which they live.

Presently, many environmental sustainability (ES) issues have negative impact on organizations, e.g., energy cost and climate change. Increasing rise in energy displays market dynamics as supply is struggling to keep up with demand because of the world population. Continued energy cost requires organization to face variation as it has impact over employees' behavior, operations and transportation. Adaptations to such implementation like change of energy resources, transportation and buildings efficiency can take years or decades to be fully launched. Similarly, global climate change is a big challenge to business organizations. Historically, changes to global climate have happened slowly but human activities have speeded up the process of change dramatically, bringing an exacerbating shift in atmosphere, temperature, sea level, storm and ocean acidification changes (US Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA), 2011b). Researchers are very conscious about large, unforeseeable storms and significant changes to environment that affect plant growth, human lives, wildlife and agriculture (Dilchert and Ones, 2011). These conditions have severe direct impacts over the existence of an organization as well as those involved in supply chain area. Investment community, insurance and governments endeavor to decrease the speed of climate change have led to both voluntary and requisite efforts to manage carbon emissions. As risks and initiatives associated with climate change shape the business environment, they provide competitive edge for those organizations that effectively manage these challenges. As such, adversity offers opportunity.

Higher management of organizations sees sustainability very crucial to their success (Kell and Lacy, 2010). It has been found out that organizations have now started to disclose their sustainability performance (Apotheker, 2010). Laszlo and Zhexembayeva (2011) put sustainability into researchers' hand by saying that three factors will force organizations to deal with it, i.e., declining resources, increase in expectations and fundamental transparency. These three trends are bringing substantial change in business climate. HRM literature is lacking currently powerful voice in sustainability area. Researchers have affirmed pivotal role of employees in environment sustainability (Jackson and Seo, 2010).

In response, organizations are developing and adopting new methods and processes to mitigate deleterious effects from their operations to maintain ES, which requires multiple stakeholders to handle deficiencies in working processes and add green jobs to existing HRM. Bringing novice and hot topic from practitioner and researcher's perspective, there is a need to investigate role of GHRM enhancing sustainable working environment.

Background of ES

ES has severe consequences over the performance of organizations in the form of climate change and energy crises. The rise in energy costs exhibits how market forces are struggling to keep up with increasing demand where world population growth and the impact of "peak oil" has intensified the situation. Rise in energy costs requires adaptation from organization in the areas extending from workforce behavior to operations, transportation and building use. Additionally, oil purchase from unstable or hostile countries results in volatile prices ultimately producing instable markets (Friedman, 2008). Adaptation at organizations end such as substitute energy sources can take years to fully implement.

Global climate changes have also made adaptation hard for organization. Changes in the natural environment happens slowly but human actions have speeded up the whole process dramatically creating an irregular swing in the progression of atmospheric temperature, precipitation, sea level and ocean acidification (DuBois and Dubois, 2012; National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), 2011; US Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA), 2011a, b). Now, scientist expect more unpredictable storms as well as significant varying patterns of weather that will affect human life, agriculture, wildlife and plant growth.

These circumstances have severe consequences for the organization directly linked or those involved in the supply chain. Government, insurance and investment companies have tried to reduce speed of climate change in the form of carbon emission management. Business environment is dependent over the risk and initiatives associated with climate change. These climate changes offer competitive edge for those who tackle them effectively than other market players. Employees' green behavior (EGB) is one form of the strategy adopted by organizations to improve their environment sustainability performance (DuBois and Dubois, 2012).

Research objectives

Existing literature review suggests that determinants of EGBs are needed to be elaborated. Ones and Dilchert (2013) also suggested working over it employing taxonomies of EGBs, theory of planned behaviors and voluntary workplace green behaviors of individual employees.

Research questions

Research work is required to carry on the connections of training and development measures with ES (Ji *et al.*, 2012). Jackson and Seo (2010) concluded that a comprehensive research work may improve relationship of EGBs with environmental outcomes on the basis of green practices. Keeping in mind these suggestions and extant literature, it is significant to trace out strength and type of linkedness between EGBs with ES. The research question is:

RQ1. How do EGBs influence ES?

Literature review

Extant literature presents a variety of views about which aspects of human resource management have significant impact over the environmental performance of an organization. Daily and Huang determined that four actors – role of senior management, empowerment, training and rewards – play very vital role in environmental management and have strong influence over the ES and financial performance of organization (O'Donohue and Torugsa, 2015). Research also shows that work- and non-work-related activities have opposite type of impact over the green behavior of employees (Muster and Schrader, 2011). According to Aragón-Correa *et al.* (2013), sharing of information among employees regarding development of strategy of ES has positive impact on environmental performance. Extending the role of information sharing, Torugsa *et al.* (2013) elaborated three definite roles of organizations, i.e., shared vision, strategic proactivity and stakeholder management, concerned with bringing out green management practices.

EGB

Green behavior (pro-environmental behavior (PEB)) is defined as behavior that has a positive impact over environment (Unsworth *et al.*, 2013). According to Stern (2000), intentional behavior that plays its role in the reduction of negative impacts of actions of human resource on environment is called green behavior. Eight constructs, i.e., problem awareness, internal attribution, social norms, feelings of guilt, perceived behavioral control, attitudes, moral norms, and intentions have been found to be interacted with PEB (Bamberg and Moser, 2007). Impact of these eight constructs over environment is very much dependent upon the context in which these are taken. Ones and Dilchert (2012b) concluded EGBs as measurable behaviors that are linked with the ES. Ones and Dilchert (2013) said that whenever proactive environmental behaviors are taken in the context of individual's job, they become EGBs.

Green taxonomy of Ones and Dilchert (2013) just encompasses the behavior type but it shows no relationship between green behavior and job descriptions. There is a significant difference between the ways one adopts usual tasks to make it greener and the other, in which individual goes beyond their roles that are not required as part of their jobs to enhance ES.

Bissing-Olson *et al.* (2013) suggested a distinction between an EGB that is directly related to job descriptions and optional, more proactive behavior. They proposed a task-related PEB as an “extent to which individuals complete their tasks in environmentally useful ways.” Proactive PEB is concerned with the initiatives taken by employees that go beyond the sphere of their required work task in order to sustain environment. This approach suggests that there are different levels of employee involvement with EGB. Some employees may just do what is perceived necessary for his work, while others go beyond what is required and engage in more proactive EGB. The difference between choosing one, both and neither behavior may be connected to the motivations to engage in EGB (Felipe, 2012).

Researchers are always interested about the behaviors of employees at workplace, both positive and negative behaviors that can have an impact over the environmental performance. For this purpose, taxonomy of behavior is mandatory. This need has been fulfilled by Deniz S. Ones and Dilchert (2012a), who gave a model of employee behavior that classifies them into psychologically meaningful categories. There are the following five broad functional categories of employee behaviors (Ones and Dilchert, 2012a):

- (1) conserving;
- (2) work sustainably;
- (3) avoiding harm;
- (4) influencing others; and
- (5) taking initiative.

First, the conserving category of EGBs covers all those actions that are considered mostly as prime causes of PEBs, i.e., reusing, recycling, repurposing and reducing. While parallel individual behaviors in personal lives mainly focus on waste reduction, on professional side it is about sensible use of raw materials, conservation of energy and avoiding wastefulness (Ones and Dilchert, 2013).

Second, work sustainably is concerned about performance of one's job duties and responsibilities in such a way that it has a positive environmental performance. This category of behaviors is relevant to both workplace and work itself. People of this category are always in search of optimization or setting of processes to minimize the environmental impact, also looking for new products and services (Ones and Dilchert, 2013). When employees are provided with job crafting opportunity in their organizations, it enhances their organizational commitment (Iqbal, 2016).

Third, avoiding harm is associated with avoidance and hanging up of negative environmental behaviors at work. Positive side of these behaviors contains behaviors that impede the pollution or enhance the ecosystem. Negative side of this category is driven by a lack of prudence, motivated by financial gains. Positive EGBs that avoid environmental harm tend to be driven by altruism, feelings of responsibility to future generations and a general concern for the future (Klein *et al.*, 2012). Personality traits except extrovert types of individuals have negative influence over counterproductive work behavior of employees (Iqbal and Hassan, 2016).

Fourth, influencing others stands for the extent to which employees educate, engage and motivate individuals to involve in minimizing environmental impacts and participate in pro-environmental initiatives. These behaviors encompass a variety of stakeholders but in the ambit of definition, it takes into account only employees. These behaviors do not have

any direct or immediate environmental benefit but have a big potential to affect environmental bottom line by influencing multiple organizational members (Ones and Dilchert, 2013).

Finally, taking initiative is defined by a willingness to take measuring, understanding and influencing employees risks for environmental benefit. Behaviors in this category reflect the initiating, entrepreneurial spirit of the employee action as the seed for a respective initiative or program. Actions that involve self-sacrifice are also found here. Taking initiative behaviors can be directed at other behavioral categories. For example, employees who lobby for or organize an organizational recycling program are not simply conserving resources; they are taking an active step to take a bigger, longer lasting change than what they could achieve by engaging in the behavior on their own. Employees who engage in these kinds of activities are change agents, not only on an interpersonal level but also on organizational level.

The five broad categories of EGBs described here are conceptually and empirically distinguishable. Many of the conceptual distinctions arise from the functions that behaviors in each category serve as well as the psychological basis of the respective behaviors. Moreover, functional motives and individual difference characteristics that determine people's engagement in each type of EGB vary. Of course, even though the different types of green behaviors can be distinguished, and even though employees within the same organization and job will differ in terms of which behaviors they typically engage in, they are positively inter-correlated, in part due to common antecedents (Dilchert and Ones, 2011).

ES

Sustainability refers to the way to meet present needs without compromising ability of future generations to fulfill their own needs. The sustainability model is based on three columns – economic, social and environment. Based on the triple bottom line-profit, people, and planet (Elkington and Fennell, 1998), long-term interest of an organization encompasses ES but short-term goals just talk about economic profit (DuBois and Dubois, 2012). To date, many organizations are facing new changes and challenges concerning their sustainability (Akhtar *et al.*, 2017).

Changing working conditions are just leading toward one and only Friedman (1970) advice, i.e., social responsibility of business is to use only its resources and involve in activities to increase its profits which are unable to give sustainable victory (DuBois and Dubois, 2012).

ES presents change in organization that is different from other factors like globalization and technology change. Technology and globalization change have impacts only over the employees who are engaged in their ambit. However, entrenching ES into an organization requires change in thinking and behavior of all employees in all areas of an organization. Obviously, without efforts of a single employee, organizations are unable to achieve ES (Laszlo and Zhexembayeva, 2011). Embedding ES in an organization requires real-time considerations of economic, social and ES. In fact, triple bottom line requires connecting silos of functional efficiency with that of organizational effectiveness and sustainability (DuBois and Dubois, 2012). ES has given very little focus as available in HRM literature. Most of the extant literature talks about economic sustainability. A substantial literature also includes social sustainability comprising issues like diversity, safety and health, organizational justice and recently taken up corporate social responsibility (Kolk, 2004).

Research hypotheses

There is a significant importance of environment sustainability in business world based on research evidences: first, increased frequency of sustainability reporting, second, generalized proactive environmental initiatives and finally, higher management of organizations are

showing high positive attitudes toward environment. Employees have a vital role in the ES. Without their involvement, it is hard for organization to complement its responsibility regarding ES (Kolk, 2008). Research also concludes that external rating agencies have a considerable influence over the reporting of leading indicators of ES besides only outcomes and impacts over organizations. A genuine rise in endeavors taken by organizations for ES has been observed (Wensen *et al.*, 2011). Management has also noted about significant change in attitudes and behaviors relating to natural environment. Higher management of organizations is now taking pro-environmental initiatives more pro-actively (Ones and Dilchert, 2010).

People become very receptive about their actions once they come to know about their implications. It is very difficult to get success in any program unless individual's beliefs and outlook are changed. Before employees become environmental friendly and start cooperating and contributing toward ES, they must be introduced to implications of each single action they show. There are research evidences that more than 90 percent employees are not aware of implications of their non-environmental actions on both themselves and their next generations (Seyal, 1997).

Performance is considered as a function of an individual and their environment, on the other hand, behavior is taken as a function of one's capacity and willingness to perform along with relative factors outside of individual's control. Job performance is concerned with required and voluntary behaviors. Based on the concept of job performance, we conceptualize EGB as a specific type of job performance that is linked with ES. Organizations are taking expenses over sustainability as investment rather than cost. A positive trend has been observed on job behaviors of employees associated with ES. Thus, we have proposed alternative hypotheses as below:

H1. EGBs are positively related to ES.

As EGBs have been classified into five categories, these sub-groups will have definitely positive impact over ES:

H1a. Conserving behaviors are positively related to ES.

H1b. Work sustainably behaviors are positively related to ES.

H1c. Avoiding harm behaviors are positively related to ES.

H1d. Influencing other behaviors are positively related to ES.

H1e. Taking initiative behaviors are positively related to ES.

Research methodology

Proposed framework

EGB is independent variable (Predictor). Green HRM is taken as moderator and ES has been employed as dependent variable (outcome) (Figure 1).



Figure 1.
Chemistry of
employees' green
behaviors and
environment
sustainability

Research design

Population of our study constitutes employees working in banking sector of Pakistan. Convenience sampling technique was used to gather data through self-administered questionnaire. Data were collected from employees of MCB Bank Ltd and HBL located in vicinity of District Attock. Reliability test was run to know internal reliability of items used in questionnaire based on Cronbach's α value. Correlation coefficient and regression analysis were employed to check association of EGB with environment sustainability in organization. Google application was employed to create an online link for data collection. Response rate in this study is 78 percent.

Pilot testing and data screening

Pilot testing was performed to identify the instrument's reliability using Cronbach's α values based on 30 cases. Missing values were explored through frequency table in Statistical Package of Social Sciences for each variable. Cases with missing data for each variable were deleted leaving 225 cases with complete data for analysis. Outliers in the study were addressed using winsorizing techniques. No extreme outlier was diagnosed in data.

Measurement scale

EGB. A 27-item descriptive norms scale is developed by McConaughy (2014). This scale measures all the five categories of EGBs, i.e., conserving, working sustainably, avoiding harm, influencing others and taking initiative. Cronbach's α value of EGB is 0.933. Cronbach's α values of five dimensions, i.e., working sustainability, conserving, avoiding harm, influencing others and taking initiative are 0.810, 0.794, 0.896, 0.904 and 0.704, respectively.

ES. A scale developed by Khan and Quaddus (2015) having 15 items was used to measure ES. This scale measures sustainability in terms of economic, social and environmental sustainability. Cronbach's α value of environment sustainability is 0.823.

Data analysis and interpretation

From Pearson correlation coefficient table, it is clear that EGBs and all its five dimensions have positive association with ES of organization. EGB has strong positive association with ES of organization, i.e., Pearson $r = 0.720$. Working sustainability, influencing others and taking initiative have moderate positive relationship with ES. Avoiding harm and conserving dimensions have positive linkage to the ES within organizations, i.e., Pearson $r = 0.536$ and Pearson $r = 0.502$, respectively (Table I).

It is obvious from above regression analysis that EGB has significant positive impact over ES of organization, i.e., $R^2 = 0.518$, $\beta = 0.568$, $F = 33.300$ and $p = 0.000$. Therefore, *H1* is accepted (Table II).

Conserving dimension of EGB has significant positive impact over environment sustainability of organization, i.e., $R^2 = 0.502$, $\beta = 1.498$, $F = 12.803$ and Sig. = 0.001. Thus, *H1a* is accepted (Table III).

There is significant positive impact of working sustainability over ES of organization, i.e., $R^2 = 0.639$, $\beta = 1.653$, $F = 24.836$ and Sig. = 0.000. Hence, *H1b* is accepted (Table IV).

Avoiding harm has significant positive influence over ES of organization, i.e., $R^2 = 0.536$, $\beta = 1.709$, $F = 14.531$ and Sig. = 0.001. Therefore, *H1c* is accepted (Table V).

Because of influencing other dimensions, there is high influence, i.e., $R^2 = 0.600$, $F = 20.253$, $\beta = 2.641$ and Sig. = 0.000. There is significant positive impact of influencing other dimensions over ES; thus, *H1d* is accepted (Table VI).

It is clear from regression analysis that ES is positively influenced by "taking initiative" behavior of employees, i.e., $R^2 = 0.329$, $\beta = 1.973$, $F = 18.148$ and Sig. = 0.000. Hence, *H1e* is accepted (Table VII).

Correlations								Employee's green behavior for ES
Working sustainably	Avoiding harm	Conserving	Influencing others	Taking initiative	Employee's green behaviors	EnvirnS		
<i>Working sustainably</i>								
Pearson correlation	1	0.710**	0.506**	0.608**	0.658**	0.873**	0.639**	
Sig. (2-tailed)		0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
<i>Avoiding harm</i>								
Pearson correlation		1	0.596**	0.499**	0.643**	0.869**	0.536**	
Sig. (2-tailed)			0.000	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.001	
<i>Conserving</i>								
Pearson correlation			1	0.620**	0.664**	0.837**	0.502**	
Sig. (2-tailed)				0.000	0.000	0.000	0.001	
<i>Influencing others</i>								
Pearson correlation				1	0.702**	0.771**	0.600**	
Sig. (2-tailed)					0.000	0.000	0.000	
<i>Taking initiative</i>								
Pearson correlation					1	0.874**	0.574**	
Sig. (2-tailed)						0.000	0.000	
<i>Employee's green behaviors</i>								
Pearson correlation						1	0.720**	
Sig. (2-tailed)							0.000	
<i>EnvirnS</i>								
Pearson correlation							1	
Sig. (2-tailed)								
Note: **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)								

Table I.
Pearson's correlation
coefficient

125

Table I.
Pearson's correlation
coefficient

<i>Model summary</i>						
Model	<i>R</i>	<i>R</i> ²	Adjusted <i>R</i> ²	SE of the estimate		
1	0.720 ^a	0.518	0.502	6.43542		
<i>ANOVA^c</i>						
Model	Sum of squares		df	Mean ²	<i>F</i>	Sig.
1						
Regression	1,379.117		1	1,379.117	33.300	0.000 ^b
Residual	1,283.853		31	41.415		
Total	2,662.970		32			
<i>Coefficients</i>						
Model	Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients			
	<i>B</i>	SE	<i>β</i>	<i>t</i>	Sig.	
1						
(Constant)	21.598	5.166		4.181	0.000	
Employee's green behaviors	0.568	0.098	0.720	5.771	0.000	

Notes: Model summary: ^aPredictors: (Constant), employees' green behaviors. ANOVA: ^aDependent variable: environmental sustainability; ^bPredictors: (Constant), employees' green behaviors. Coefficients: ^aDependent variable: environment sustainability; ^cSpearman's correlations coefficient and ^avery high significance

Table II.
Regression analysis

Table III.
Results of *H2*

<i>Model summary</i>						
Model	<i>R</i>	<i>R</i> ²	Adjusted <i>R</i> ²	SE of the estimate		
1	0.502 ^a	0.252	0.232	7.77716		
<i>ANOVA^c</i>						
Model	Sum of squares		df	Mean ²	<i>F</i>	Sig.
1						
Regression	774.376		1	774.376	12.803	0.001 ^b
Residual	2,298.399		38	60.484		
Total	3,072.775		39			
<i>Coefficients</i>						
Model	Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients		<i>t</i>	Sig.
1	<i>B</i>	SE	<i>β</i>			
(Constant)	31.077	5.723			5.431	0.000
Conserving	1.498	0.419	0.502		3.578	0.001
Notes: Model summary: ^a Predictors: (Constant), conserving. ANOVA: ^a Dependent variable: environmental sustainability; ^b Predictors: (Constant), conserving. Coefficients: ^a Dependent variable: environment sustainability; ^c Spearman's correlations coefficient and ^a very high significance						

Table IV.
Results of *H3*

<i>Model summary</i>						
Model	<i>R</i>	<i>R</i> ²	Adjusted <i>R</i> ²	SE of the estimate		
1	0.639 ^a	0.408	0.392	6.78116		
<i>ANOVA^c</i>						
Model	Sum of squares		df	Mean ²	<i>F</i>	Sig.
1						
Regression	1,142.046		1	1,142.046	24.836	0.000 ^b
Residual	1,655.428		36	45.984		
Total	2,797.474		37			
<i>Coefficients</i>						
Model	Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients		<i>t</i>	Sig.
	<i>B</i>	SE	<i>β</i>			
1						
(Constant)	28.674	4.511			6.357	0.000
Working sustainably	1.653	0.332	0.639		4.984	0.000

Notes: Model summary: ^aPredictors: (Constant), working sustainability. ANOVA: ^aDependent variable: environmental sustainability; ^bPredictors: (Constant), working Sustainability. Coefficients: ^aDependent variable: environment sustainability; ^cSpearman's correlations coefficient and ^avery high significance

Conclusion

Data analysis reveals that there is a strong positive association between EGB and ES of organization. All five categories of EGB are strongly positively associated with environmental sustainability but working sustainably dimension of EGB has highest direct influence over it. Environmental experts often make use of words such as pollution, ozone depletion, greenhouse effect, environmental degradation, acid rain and global warming. However, what is impact level of such government rhetoric and NGO debates over routine operations and progress of institutes and organizations? What is awareness level of employees about what is happening around and how does it hurt them and their future generations? A one-dimensional approach is currently employed by the Government of Pakistan. However, there is a need of multidimensional approach by including organizations and communities in order to create strong level of awareness and commitment in addition to on-going NGOs programs.

<i>Model summary</i>					
Model	<i>R</i>	<i>R</i> ²	Adjusted <i>R</i> ²	SE of the estimate	
1	0.536 ^a	0.288	0.268	7.69452	
<i>ANOVA^c</i>					
Model	Sum of squares	df	Mean ²	<i>F</i>	Sig.
1					
Regression	860.309	1	860.309	14.531	0.001 ^b
Residual	2,131.402	36	59.206		
Total	2,991.711	37			
<i>Coefficients</i>					
Model	Unstandardized coefficients <i>B</i>	SE	Standardized coefficients β	<i>t</i>	Sig.
1					
(Constant)	34.679	4.506		7.696	0.000
Avoiding harm	1.709	0.448	0.536	3.812	0.001

Notes: Model summary: ^aPredictors: (Constant), avoiding harm. ANOVA: ^aDependent variable: environmental sustainability; ^bPredictors: (Constant), avoiding harm. Coefficients: ^aDependent variable: environment sustainability; ^cSpearman's correlations coefficient and ^avery high significance

Table V.
Results of *H4*

<i>Model summary</i>					
Model	<i>R</i>	<i>R</i> ²	Adjusted <i>R</i> ²	SE of the estimate	
1	0.600 ^a	0.360	0.342	7.32245	
<i>ANOVA^c</i>					
Model	Sum of squares	df	Mean ²	<i>F</i>	Sig.
1					
Regression	1,085.952	1	1,085.952	20.253	0.000 ^b
Residual	1,930.259	36	53.618		
Total	3,016.211	37			
<i>Coefficients</i>					
Model	Unstandardized coefficients <i>B</i>	SE	Standardized coefficients β	<i>t</i>	Sig.
1					
(Constant)	33.316	4.172		7.985	0.000
Influencing others	2.641	0.587	0.600	4.500	0.000

Notes: Model summary: ^aPredictors: (Constant), influencing others. ANOVA: ^aDependent variable: environmental sustainability; ^bPredictors: (Constant), influencing others. Coefficients: ^aDependent variable: environment sustainability; ^cSpearman's correlations coefficient and ^avery high significance

Table VI.
Results of *H5*

Discussion, limitations and implications

Discussion

In today's world, no alternative is available with organizations to avoid ES. More than 80 percent of organizations exhibit report about their annual ES performance. Management of various organizations has even initiated to allocate funds for ES management. Growing number of organizations has started employing sustainable practices to attract clients and improve their profitability margin.

Now it is time to consider the behavioral aspects for the optimum performance of ES of organizations. Extensive training sessions and workshops are required to be conducted to create extensive awareness in each employee of all segments of life. Let us go with a persistent, strong commitment and flexible approach to convert a dream "A Green World" into reality.

Table VII.
Results of *H6*

<i>Model summary</i>						
Model	<i>R</i>	<i>R</i> ²	Adjusted <i>R</i> ²	SE of the estimate		
1	0.574 ^a	0.329	0.311	7.45384		
<i>ANOVA^c</i>						
Model	Sum of squares		df	Mean ²	<i>F</i>	Sig.
1						
Regression	1,008.289		1	1,008.289	18.148	0.000 ^b
Residual	2,055.711		37	55.560		
Total	3,064.000		38			
<i>Coefficients</i>						
Model	Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients		<i>t</i>	Sig.
	<i>B</i>	SE	<i>β</i>			
1						
(Constant)	32.533	4.496			7.236	0.000
Taking initiative	1.973	0.463	0.574		4.260	0.000
Notes: Model summary: ^a Predictors: (Constant), taking initiative. ANOVA: ^a Dependent variable: environment sustainability; ^b Predictors: (Constant), taking initiative. Coefficients: ^a Dependent variable: environment sustainability; ^c Spearman's correlations coefficient and ^a very high significance						

Research is lacking regarding work on EGBs with reference to factors at the organizational level. Researchers are suggested to work on EGB with reference to personal factors and environmental context. Current research suggests that management should think about training and development needs of employees in order to enhance scope of their green behaviors. Motivation factor is very crucial within personal predictor of job performance. Motivational theories such as self-determination theory need to be analyzed in relation to EGBs. Referring to voluntary and required EGBs, different types of motivation can moderate the association of EGB and ES.

Limitations

This study has elaborated direct association of EGBs with ES. Further research needs to analyze effect of moderator and mediator over their relationship. This study is also inevitable to limitations of research. This study has been conducted within specific domain of the banking sector (branch banking) and in one country (Pakistan). However, concept of ES has wide and complex implications varied from service sector to industrial sector. Thus, there might be fluctuation in results of research over diverse areas of study. Repetition of results in other context would enhance confidence in research model and their association. Data were collected under a cross-sectional design (questionnaire) so the study has typical limitations associated with this kind of research methodology. Respondents may give biased feedback because of confidentiality issue and lack of trust. A longitudinal study can overcome this constraint by providing a reflective understanding.

Implications

Organizational ES emphasizes to communicate the ES-related job changes, innovative opportunities and culture changes with employees. A special message recommended by ES experts needs to be shared with non-experienced professionals so that they could know on time what dots to be connected and what not, i.e., management should focus on the level of their employees and conduct various workshops and training sessions to enhance their capacity building through ES experts.

References

- Akhtar, S., Arshad, M.A., Mahmood, A. and Ahmed, A. (2017), "Spiritual quotient towards organizational sustainability: the Islamic perspective", *World Journal of Entrepreneurship, Management and Sustainable Development*, Vol. 13 No. 2, pp. 163-170.
- Apotheker, L. (2010), "Sustainability is the new mantra", *Bloomberg Businessweek*, Davos, January 29.
- Aragón-Correa, J.A., Martín-Tapia, I. and Hurtado-Torres, N.E. (2013), "Proactive environmental strategies and employee inclusion: the positive effects of information sharing and promoting collaboration and the influence of uncertainty", *Organization & Environment*, Vol. 26 No. 2, pp. 139-161.
- Bamberg, S. and Moser, G. (2007), "Twenty years after Hines, Hungerford, and Tomera: a new meta-analysis of psycho-social determinants of pro-environmental behaviour", *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, Vol. 27 No. 1, pp. 14-25.
- Bissing-Olson, M.J., Iyer, A., Fielding, K.S. and Zacher, H. (2013), "Relationships between daily affect and pro-environmental behavior at work: the moderating role of pro-environmental attitude", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 34 No. 2, pp. 156-175.
- Dilchert, S. and Ones, D.S. (2011), "Personality and its relationship to sustainable and unsustainable workplace behaviors", paper presented at the Focusing on Employees to Achieve Environmentally Sustainable Organizations, Chicago, IL.
- DuBois, C.L. and Dubois, D.A. (2012), "Strategic HRM as social design for environmental sustainability in organization", *Human Resource Management*, Vol. 51 No. 6, pp. 799-826.
- Elkington, J. and Fennell, S. (1998), "Partners for sustainability", *Greener Management International*, p. 48.
- Felipe, F.d.A. (2012), "Do I look good in green?: a conceptual framework integrating employee green behavior, impression management, and social norms", *Amazon, Organizations and Sustainability*, Vol. 2 No. 3, pp. 7-23.
- Friedman, M. (1970), "A theoretical framework for monetary analysis", *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 78 No. 2, pp. 193-238.
- Friedman, T.L. (2008), *Hot, Flat, and Crowded: Why We Need a Green Revolution – and How It Can Renew America*, Farrar, Straus & Giroux Publishers, New York, NY.
- Iqbal, Q. (2016), "Job-crafting and organizational commitment: person-job fit as moderator in banking sector of Pakistan", *International Journal of Management, Accounting and Economics*, Vol. 3 No. 312, pp. 837-851.
- Iqbal, Q. and Hassan, S.H. (2016), "Role of workplace spirituality: personality traits and counterproductive workplace behaviors in banking sector", *International Journal of Management, Accounting and Economics*, Vol. 3 No. 12, pp. 806-821.
- Jackson, S.E. and Seo, J. (2010), "The greening of strategic HRM scholarship", *Organization Management Journal*, Vol. 7 No. 4, pp. 278-290.
- Ji, L., Huang, J., Liu, Z., Zhu, H. and Cai, Z. (2012), "The effects of employee training on the relationship between environmental attitude and firms' performance in sustainable development", *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 23 No. 14, pp. 2995-3008.
- Kell, G. and Lacy, P. (2010), "Sustainability a priority for CEOs", *Bloomberg Businessweek*, June 25.
- Khan, E.A. and Quaddus, M. (2015), "Development and validation of a scale for measuring sustainability factors of informal microenterprises -a qualitative and quantitative approach" *Entrepreneurship Research Journal*, Vol. 5 No. 4, pp. 347-372.
- Klein, R.M., Ones, D.S., Wiernik, B.M., Dilchert, S., D'Mello, S. and Hill, L. (2012), "Understanding the causes of environmentally responsible and irresponsible behavior at work", paper presented at the Sustainability Preconference of the Annual Conference of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, CA.
- Kolk, A. (2004), "Ethics in international business multinational approaches to child labor", *Journal of World Business*, Vol. 39 No. 1, pp. 49-60.

- Kolk, A. (2008), "Sustainability, accountability and corporate governance: exploring multinationals' reporting practices", *Business Strategy and the Environment*, Vol. 17, pp. 1-15.
- Laszlo, C. and Zhexembayeva, N. (2011), *Embedded Sustainability: The Next Big Competitive Advantage*, Greenleaf Publishing, Routledge.
- McConaughy, J.C. (2014), "Development of an employee green behavior descriptive norms scale", (Master), California State University, San Bernardino.
- Muster, V. and Schrader, U. (2011), "Green work-life balance: a new perspective for green HRM", *Zeitschrift Fu"r Personalforschung*, Vol. 25 No. 2, pp. 140-156.
- National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) (2011), "Global climate change: vital signs of the planet", available at: <https://climate.nasa.gov/news/565/japans-tsunami-created-icebergs-in-antarctica/>
- O'Donohue, W. and Torugsa, N. (Ann) (2015), "The moderating effect of 'green' HRM on the association between proactive environmental management and financial performance in small firms", *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 27 No. 2, pp. 239-261.
- Ones, D.S. and Dilchert, S. (2010), "A taxonomy of green behaviors among employees", paper presented at the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Atlanta, GA.
- Ones, D.S. and Dilchert, S. (2012a), "Employee green behaviors", *Managing HR for Environmental Sustainability*, Jossey-Bass/Wiley, San Francisco, CA, pp. 85-116.
- Ones, D.S. and Dilchert, S. (2012b), "Environmental sustainability at work: a call to action", *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 5 No. 4, pp. 444-466.
- Ones, D.S. and Dilchert, S. (2013), "Measuring, understanding, and influencing employee green behavior", *Green Organizations: Driving Change With I.O. Psychology*, pp. 115-148.
- Seyal, F.H. (1997), "Towards a green Pakistan: a behavioral approach", *Pakistan Journal of Statistics – All Series*, Vol. 13 No. 1, pp. 149-162.
- Stern, P.C. (2000), "New environmental theories: toward a coherent theory of environmentally significant behavior", *Journal of Social Issues*, Vol. 56 No. 3, pp. 407-424.
- Torugsa, N.A., O'Donohue, W. and Hecker, R. (2013), "Proactive CSR: an empirical analysis of the role of its economic, social and environmental dimensions on the association between capabilities and performance", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 115 No. 2, pp. 383-402.
- Unsworth, K., Dmitrieva, A. and Adriasola, E. (2013), "Changing behaviour: increasing the effectiveness of workplace interventions in creating pro-environmental behaviour change", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 34 No. 2, pp. 211-229.
- US Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA) (2011a), "Climate change science: past climate change", available at: www.epa.gov/climatechange/science/pastcc.html (accessed October 30, 2017).
- US Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA) (2011b), "Climate change science: recent climate change", available at: www.epa.gov/climatechange/science/recentcc.html (accessed October 30, 2017).
- Wensen, K.V., Broer, W., Klein, J. and Knopf, J. (2011), "The state of play in sustainability reporting in the EU", Publication commissioned under the European Union's programme for employment and social solidarity – PROGRESS (2007-2013), Amsterdam, Berlin.