Middlesex University Research Repository

An open access repository of

Middlesex University research

http://eprints.mdx.ac.uk

Copyright:

Tables

Table 1. Factor loadings and Descriptive statistics.

Constructs/items	Factor loading	Mean
Green performance management		
Employees know the specific environmental targets, goals and responsibilities	0.754	3.581
Employee's environmental behavior and contributions to hotels' environmental performance are assessed	0.767	3.615
Providing regular feedback to employees or teams to achieve environmental goals or improve hotel's environmental performance	0.765	3.711
Achievement of environmental goals is seen as one of the criteria in system of employee performance appraisal	0.825	3.787
Roles of managers in achieving environmental outcomes included in appraisals	0.803	3.728
Green reward		
Link suggestion schemes into reward system by introducing rewards for innovative environmental initiative/performance	0.847	3.575
Hotel has non-monetary rewards for environmental achievements	0.844	3.542
Hotel has monetary rewards based on environmental achievements	0.850	3.475
Environmental performance is recognized publicly	0.880	3.528
Organizational citizenship behavior for the environment		
I suggest new practices that could improve the hotel's environmental performance	0.760	3.605
I encourage my colleagues to adopt more environmentally conscious behaviors	0.717	3.684
I stay informed of the hotel's environmental efforts	0.772	3.648
I make suggestions about ways to protect the environment more effectively	0.761	3.678
I volunteer for projects or activities that address the hotel's environmental issues	0.718	3.608
I spontaneously give my time to help colleagues take the environment	0.726	3.605

			0.760	3.661

into account

I undertake environmental actions that contribute positively to the hotel's image | 0.760 | 3.661

Employee in-role green performance

I complete the environmental duties specified in the job | 0.875 | 3.598

I fulfill all environmental responsibilities required by the job | 0.911 | 3.635

I never neglect environmental aspects of the job which I am obligated to perform. | 0.887 | 3.575

Table 2. Reliability and validity assessment

	CR	CrA	AVE	REW		PEM		OCBE		EIGP	
				FLC	*HTMT*	FLC	*HTMT*	FLC	*HTMT*	FLC	HTMT
REW	0.916	0.878	0.732	**0.855**	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PEM	0.888	0.843	0.614	0.507	*0.591*	**0.783**	-	-	-	-	-
OCBE	0.897	0.867	0.555	0.587	*0.667*	0.499	*0.574*	**0.745**	-	-	-
EIGP	0.921	0.870	0.794	0.594	*0.678*	0.556	*0.647*	0.669	*0.766*	**0.891**	-

Note: CR = Composite Reliability. CrA = Cronbach's Alpha. FLC = Fornell-Larcker Criterion. HTMT = Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio. Square roots of AVE in bold font are on the main diagonal.

Table 3. Path coefficients of direct effects.

Paths	Coefficient(b)	P-value
REW -> EIGP	0.420*	0.000
PEM -> EIGP	0.342*	0.001
REW -> OCBE	0.448*	0.000
PEM -> OCBE	0.274*	0.009

Note: * Confidence interval at the 0.05 level.

Table 4. Path coefficients of indirect effects.

Paths	Coefficient(b)	P-value
REW -> OCBE -> EIGP	0.183*	0.012
PEM -> OCBE -> EIGP	0.300*	0.000

Note: * Confidence interval at the 0.05 level.

Table 5. Path coefficients of moderation analysis.

Paths	Coefficient(b)	P-value
Culture x REW -> EIGP	0.551*	0.000
Culture x PEM -> EIGP	0.022	0.859
Culture x REW -> OCBE	0.397*	0.000
Culture x PEM -> OCBE	0.038	0.678

Note: * Confidence interval at the 0.05 level.

Table 6. Conditional effect at moderators.

Moderator	Coefficient(b)	P-value	LLCI – ULCI
Culture x REW -> EIGP			
Local	0.386*	0.000	0.253 – 0.518
Western	0.936*	0.000	0.797 – 1.076
Culture x REW -> OCBE			
Local	0.259*	0.000	0.166 – 0.352
Western	0.656*	0.000	0.558 – 0.754

Note: * Confidence interval at the 0.05 level.