



University of
Massachusetts
Amherst

Exploring environmentally counterproductive behaviours

Item Type	event;event
Authors	Martins, Antje;Robinson, Richard N.S.;Solnet, David J.
Download date	2024-10-06 11:29:47
Link to Item	https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14394/49188

Exploring environmentally counterproductive behaviours

Antje Martins, Richard N.S. Robinson and, David J. Solnet

UQ Business School, The University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia

Author details:

Antje Martins, UQ Business School, The University of Queensland, Colin Clark, 39 Blair Dr, St Lucia QLD 4067, Australia (presenting author)

Email: a.martins@business.uq.edu.au

Phone: +617 3346 0754

Richard Robinson, UQ Business School, The University of Queensland, Colin Clark, 39 Blair Dr, St Lucia QLD 4067, Australia

Email: richard.robinson@uq.edu.au

Phone: +617 3346 7091

David Solnet, UQ Business School, The University of Queensland, Colin Clark, 39 Blair Dr, St Lucia QLD 4067, Australia

Email: david.solnet@uq.edu.au

Phone: +617 3346 6245

Exploring environmentally counterproductive behaviours

Introduction

Sustainable operations have become an integral part of business however business leaders agree that more needs to be done to achieve sustainability goals (United Nations Global Compact & Accenture Strategy, 2019). To support sustainable operations employee engagement and behaviour is considered critical by business leaders (Davis-Peccoud, Stone, & Tovey, 2016). Organizational entities *per se* do not use resources or produce waste - it is the humans operating within these entities that make decisions on resources consumption and pollution (Ones, Wiernik, Dilchert, & Klein, 2015). Most employee work behaviours have an environmental impact that needs to be understood and managed (Lamm, Tosti-Kharas, & King, 2015). Additionally, employees are executors of sustainability initiatives thus their engagement is crucial (cf. Bohdanowicz, Zientara, & Novotna, 2011; Chan & Hawkins, 2010; Zientara & Zamojska, 2018). Travel and tourism leaders, as surveyed by the United Nations Global Compact and Accenture Strategy (2019), believe that over the coming five years governments and employees will be the main stakeholders in sustainable management, with consumers only placing third. Understanding how employees behave environmentally (or not) is thus an important field of research for the future. However, not all disciplines pay a lot of attention to employee environmental behaviours at work. Hall et al. (2016) criticise for example the hospitality literature for providing an inadequate understanding of employee attitudes and behaviours within the sustainability debate.

Literature Review

In the hospitality literature much attention has been paid to consumers as participants in sustainability initiatives but not to employees (Hall et al., 2016). Employee environmental behaviour at work has however been increasingly researched in other disciplines, such as Industrial and Organisational Psychology (I/O Psychology) as part of employee work performance (cf. Ones & Dilchert, 2012). Work performance, a latent construct, determines to what degree an employee contributes to organisational goals (Carpini, Parker, & Griffin, 2017), including an organisation's sustainability goals. Thus, with increasing sustainability pressures, especially for tourism and hospitality (cf. Lenzen et al., 2018) understanding and managing environmental work performance of employees is important to manage overall organisational sustainability performance.

There are three dimensions that comprise an employee's work environmental performance: task performance (i.e. required, in-role behaviours), organisational citizenship behaviour (OCBs, i.e. voluntary, extra-role behaviours) (Organ, 1988) and counterproductive work behaviours (i.e. not following processes or guidelines) (Koopmans et al., 2011). Some authors (cf. Boiral & Paillé, 2012) argue that employee environmental behaviours fit most suitably into the OCB category as these behaviours are predominantly not required of employees (Yuriev, Boiral, Francoeur, & Paillé, 2018). Other authors support that environmental behaviours can be required (task performance) and voluntary (OCBs) within an employee's day-to-day work behaviours (cf. Norton, Parker, Zacher, & Ashkanasy, 2015). However, only focusing on these two dimensions of work performance ignores the fact that employees do not always do as they are told (cf. Lugosi, 2019 for hospitality literature; Robinson & Greenberg, 1998 for general literature). They deviate from organisational norms and requirements. Hence, a last group of authors postulate that environmental behaviours can be conceptualised across all three dimensions of work performance, including not only required or voluntary but also counterproductive behaviours (CWBs) (Ones & Dilchert, 2012).

CWBs have been defined as employee actions and behaviours that detract from organisational goals or well-being by producing negative consequences for the organisation and its stakeholders (Ones & Dilchert, 2012). Within the sustainability context they would thus include behaviours that result in negative environmental impact (Dilchert, 2018). Overall research into these behaviours is scarce (Dilchert, 2018). In hospitality for example the academy seems to focus on positive rather than negative contributions to sustainable operations (cf. Chan, Hon, Okumus, & Chan, 2017; Chou, 2014; Zientara & Zamojska, 2018) despite evidence to the contrary. For example, nearly half of all housekeepers do continue to change towels despite their guests having indicated the wish to reuse their towels (Baca-Motes, Brown, Gneezy, Keenan, & Nelson, 2013). Studies allude to potential negative impacts of employee behaviour (cf. Chan & Hawkins, 2010) but the literature continues to emphasise how to support positive environmental behaviours (cf. Zientara & Zamojska, 2018). A better understanding of the negative side of environmental behaviours may however allow to develop interventions to make sustainability initiatives more successful (Dilchert, 2018). Hence the first research objective of this work is to understand when and where employees act unsustainably.

Dilchert (2018) argues that a failure to engage in positive environmental behaviour (i.e. not recycling, failing to embrace sustainability innovations) does not constitute CWBs due to a lack in severity. This is counterintuitive as a failure to engage in environmental behaviours is counterproductive if the behaviour is required as part of the job performance (task behaviours). Additionally, overall job performance measures how well an employee contributes to organisational goals (Campbell & Wiernik, 2015). If these include sustainability goals, then a failure to engage in environmental behaviours would be counterproductive as it conflicts with the organisation's overarching sustainability goals. This may be different for voluntary behaviours as these are considered extra-role. Hence an important question to ask as part of research objective one is which environmental behaviours are required and which are voluntary within organisations.

More importantly however is to understand how these negative environmental behaviours arise. As Wiernik and colleagues put it: "Employees cannot act sustainably if they do not know how, but knowledge itself does not imply that employees are motivated to choose to perform green behaviours" (Wiernik, Ones, Dilchert, & Klein, 2018, p. 65). In general, work performance is a function of ability and motivation (Van Iddekinge, Aguinis, Mackey, & DeOrtentiis, 2018). Additionally, Blumberg and Pringle (1982) argue that opportunity, as a reflection of the working environment, is equally important. Two employees may have the knowledge and skills and may be motivated by the same factors however their work performance can be vastly different depending on their work environment and if it allows them to perform to the best of their abilities and motivation (Blumberg & Pringle, 1982). As a dimension of work performance environmental counterproductive behaviours show similar antecedents (see Norton et al., 2015 for application to task performance and OCBs). The second research objective is thus to understand the reasons employees engage in behaviour that detracts from organisational sustainability goals.

Contribution

The contribution of this research project is two-fold:

- Understanding where employee environmental behaviours are situated within the wider work performance concept, including counterproductive behaviours; and

- Exploring the concept of environmental counterproductive behaviours and its antecedents to be able to design useful interventions for more sustainable operations.

Study design

The study uses a sequential case study design to understand what environmental behaviours are required, exhibited and how negative behaviours may arise. Organisations differ in what behaviours are expected from employees as part of their role (Dumont, Shen, & Deng, 2017). To reduce this discrepancy the study thus focuses on one set of employees, housekeepers, within the same hotel group, however across different properties.

For each property and the overarching hotel group, job requirements based on standard operating procedures, job descriptions and similar documents are reviewed in a first step to identify task behaviour requirements for housekeepers. Interviews with management provide further insight into these expectations. In a second step housekeepers will be observed to understand actual work behaviours. Observed behaviours will then be analysed based on environmental impact. In a last step, scaffolded around Blumberg and Pringle’s (1982) capacity, willingness and opportunity model, interviews with housekeepers will inform the reasons behind these behaviours.

Table 1

Sequence, methods and aims of investigation

Sequence	Research method	Research aim
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document analysis of corporate documents, SOPs, Job descriptions • Interviews with management 	Understand the expectations of housekeeping employees, differentiate required and voluntary behaviours
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Observation of behaviour <i>in situ</i> 	Understand exhibited behaviours, especially focusing on counterproductive behaviours
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employee interviews 	Understanding how negative behaviours arose

The research is in progress. Stage 1 suggests that environmental behaviour and engagement in sustainability initiatives are expected and required of housekeeping employees. It is expected that stage 2 will thus reveal counterproductive behaviours where expectations are not followed. This substantiates existing evidence and thus the need for an exploration of antecedents of environmentally counterproductive behaviours as planned for stage 3.

References

- Baca-Motes, K., Brown, A., Gneezy, A., Keenan, E. A., & Nelson, L. D. (2013). Commitment and Behavior Change: Evidence from the Field. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 39(5), 1070–1084. <https://doi.org/10.1086/667226>
- Blumberg, M., & Pringle, C. D. (1982). The missing opportunity in organizational research: Some implications for a theory of work performance. *Academy of Management. The Academy of Management Review (Pre-1986)*, 7(000004), 560. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/257222>
- Bohdanowicz, P., Zientara, P., & Novotna, E. (2011). International hotel chains and environmental protection: an analysis of Hilton's we care! programme (Europe, 2006-2008). *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 19(7), 797. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2010.549566>
- Boiral, O., & Paillé, P. (2012). Organizational Citizenship Behaviour for the Environment: Measurement and Validation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 109(4 LB-Boiral2012), 431–445. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-1138-9>
- Campbell, J. P., & Wiernik, B. M. (2015). The Modeling and Assessment of Work Performance. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 2(1), 47–74. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032414-111427>
- Carpini, J. A., Parker, S. K., & Griffin, M. A. (2017). A Look Back and a Leap Forward: A Review and Synthesis of the Individual Work Performance Literature. *Academy of Management Annals*, 11(2), 825–885. <https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2015.0151>
- Chan, E. S. W., & Hawkins, R. (2010). Attitude towards EMSs in an international hotel an exploratory case study. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 29(4), 641–651. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2009.12.002>
- Chan, E. S. W., Hon, A. H. Y., Okumus, F., & Chan, W. (2017). An Empirical Study of Environmental Practices and Employee Ecological Behavior in the Hotel Industry. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 41(5), 585–608. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1096348014550873>
- Chou, C.-J. (2014). Hotels' environmental policies and employee personal environmental beliefs: Interactions and outcomes. *Tourism Management*, 40, 436–446. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2013.08.001>
- Davis-Peccoud, J., Stone, P., & Tovey, C. (2016). *Achieving Breakthrough Results in Sustainability* (Vol. 2018). Vol. 2018. Retrieved from <https://www.bain.com/insights/achieving-breakthrough-results-in-sustainability/>
- Dilchert, S. (2018). Counterproductive sustainability behaviors and their relationship to personality traits. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 26(1), 49–56. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1111/ijasa.12204>
- Dumont, J., Shen, J., & Deng, X. (2017). Effects of Green HRM Practices on Employee Workplace Green Behavior: The Role of Psychological Green Climate and Employee Green Values. *Human Resource Management*, 56(4), 613–627. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1002/hrm.21792>
- Hall, C. M., Dayal, N., Majstorović, D., Mills, H., Paul-Andrews, L., Wallace, C., & Truong, V. D. (2016). Accommodation Consumers and Providers' Attitudes, Behaviours and Practices

- for Sustainability: A Systematic Review. *Sustainability*, 8(7), 625. Retrieved from <http://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/8/7/625>
- Koopmans, M. L., Bernaards, H. C., Hildebrandt, B. V., Schaufeli, J. W., De Vet Henrica, J. C. W., & Van Der Beek, J. A. (2011). Conceptual Frameworks of Individual Work Performance: A Systematic Review. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 53(8), 856–866. <https://doi.org/10.1097/JOM.0b013e318226a763>
- Lamm, E., Tosti-Kharas, J., & King, C. E. (2015). Empowering Employee Sustainability: Perceived Organizational Support Toward the Environment. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 128(1 LB-Lamm2015), 207–220. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-014-2093-z>
- Lenzen, M., Sun, Y.-Y., Faturay, F., Yuan-Peng, T., Geschke, A., & Malik, A. (2018). The carbon footprint of global tourism. *Nature Climate Change*, 8(6), 522–528. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-018-0141-x>
- Lugosi, P. (2019). Deviance, deviant behaviour and hospitality management: Sources, forms and drivers. *Tourism Management*, 74, 81–98. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2019.02.014>
- Norton, T. A., Parker, S. L., Zacher, H., & Ashkanasy, N. M. (2015). Employee Green Behavior: A Theoretical Framework, Multilevel Review, and Future Research Agenda. *Organization & Environment*, 28(1), 103–125. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1086026615575773>
- Ones, D. S., & Dilchert, S. (2012). Employee Green Behaviours . In S. E. Jackson, D. S. Ones, & S. Dilchert (Eds.), *Managing human resources for environmental sustainability* (pp. 85–116). San Franiso, Calif.: Jossey-Bass.
- Ones, D. S., Wiernik, B. M., Dilchert, S., & Klein, R. (2015). Pro-Environmental Behavior. In J. D. Wright (Ed.), *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences (Second Edition)* (pp. 82–88). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-097086-8.22008-4>
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior : the good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, Mass. : Lexington Books.
- Robinson, S. L., & Greenberg, J. (1998). Employees behaving badly: Dimensions, determinants and dilemmas in the study of workplace deviance. In *Trends in organizational behavior, Vol. 5*. (pp. 1–30). New York, NY, US: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- United Nations Global Compact, & Accenture Strategy. (2019). *The Decade To Deliver - A Call To Business Action*. Retrieved from https://www.accenture.com/_acnmedia/PDF-109/Accenture-UNGC-CEO-Study.pdf#zoom=50
- Van Iddekinge, C. H., Aguinis, H., Mackey, J. D., & DeOrtentiis, P. S. (2018). A Meta-Analysis of the Interactive, Additive, and Relative Effects of Cognitive Ability and Motivation on Performance. *Journal of Management*, 44(1), 249–279. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206317702220>
- Wiernik, B. M., Ones, D. S., Dilchert, S., & Klein, R. M. (2018). Individual antecedents of proenvironmental behaviours: implications for employee green behaviours. In V. Wells, D. Gregory-Smith, & D. Manika (Eds.), *Research Handbook on Employee Pro-Environmental Behaviour* (pp. 63–83). Retrieved from <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/uql/detail.action?docID=5430237>

- Yuriev, A., Boiral, O., Francoeur, V., & Paillé, P. (2018). Overcoming the barriers to pro-environmental behaviors in the workplace: A systematic review. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *182*, 379–394. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.02.041>
- Zientara, P., & Zamojska, A. (2018). Green organizational climates and employee pro-environmental behaviour in the hotel industry. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, *26*(7), 1142–1159. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2016.1206554>