

Green Behavior of Civil Servants

Subjects: Behavioral Sciences

Contributor: Tsung-Lin Wu, Hsiang-Te Liu

The green behavior of civil servants in the workplace is influenced by personal moral reflectiveness and green conscientiousness. Group discussions and initiatives within organizations can also influence individual green behavior. Civil servants with greener lifestyles are more likely to demonstrate green behaviors.

Keywords: moral reflectiveness ; green conscientiousness ; green lifestyle ; green advocacy

1. Introduction

Green behavior is environmentally friendly or beneficial behavior, including behavior that promotes the protection of the environment ^[1]. In short, behaviors that reduce harm to the environment are green behaviors. Ones and Dilchert brought green behaviors into the office, arguing that an organization's green policy is related to the green behaviors of its employees ^[2]. Ones and Dilchert defined workers' green behaviors as those behaviors that attain the organization's sustainability goals ^[2]. Green behavior in the office not only contributes to the physical and mental well-being of an organization's members, but also reflects the organization's sustainability goals ^[3].

Deci and Ryan identified motivation as a continuum of self-determination ^[4]. At one end is the control of external punishment, and at the other end is the internal incentive of the self. When an organization's green policy is driven by punishments and incentives, this is an external control ^[5]. When moral reflectiveness influences the green behavior of civil servants, it serves as intrinsic motivation ^[6]. Civil servants comply with organizational norms to avoid inconsistency between personal and organizational values ^[7]. Civil servants who perceive green behavior as consistent with their moral values from personal introspection are more likely to agree with the organization's green policy. Some scholars have explored voluntary green behaviors while others have explored green behaviors required by organizations ^{[8][9]}. Green behaviors include avoiding waste and protecting resources, such as reusing and recycling; green office behaviors also include saving water, energy, and materials, bringing your own eco-cup, and using double-sided printing ^[10].

An individual's participation in what is considered to be moral behavior is influenced by whether the individual's moral judgements are typically right or wrong ^[11]. Moral reflectiveness is the process by which an individual thinks about moral issues and is considered to be related to moral behavior ^[12].

The origin of conscientiousness is one's "conscience," which is a standard of moral judgment ^[13]. Being conscientious is defined as following or being governed by one's conscience ^[14]. Conscientiousness has also been found to be an antecedent of an individual's morality ^[15]. Conscientiousness is part of an individual's personality traits. Research in corporate society has found that individual personality traits affect prosocial behavior ^[16].

The process of moral reflectiveness requires individuals to control their behavior through their conscience. Civil servants with green conscientiousness are more committed to the expectations of the organization ^[17]. Past research has also confirmed that employees possessing conscientiousness will engage in behaviors outside their roles ^{[18][19]}. Morality and conscientiousness have been suggested as antecedents of green behavior ^{[13][20]}.

Cognitive consistency theory suggests that individuals have a tendency to be cognitively consistent ^[21]. Cognitive dissonance occurs when an individual has cognitive disorders ^{[22][23]}. Individual cognition is influenced by many different sources of information ^[24]. The average person tries to maintain cognitive consistency and avoid potential cognitive disorders ^[25]. When civil servants have higher moral reflectiveness and green conscientiousness, they are more likely to perform green behaviors.

The cognitive consistency theory explains not only the psychological state with respect to individual behavior, but also how individuals make decisions under the influence of different signals ^[24]. Organizational members receive a lot of informal information that affects their cognition. Green advocacy by organizational members is believed to enhance green

behavior and organizational sustainability performance ^[13]. Foster et al. and Fraj and Martinez suggest that a green lifestyle positively influences green behavior ^{[26][27]}. When green behaviors are already practiced in the home life of the organization's members, they are more likely to be carried over to the office.

2. Green Behavior of Civil Servants

2.1. The Relationship between Green Conscientiousness, Moral Reflectiveness, and Green Behavior

Green behavior among members of an organization reflects their long-term commitment to environmental sustainability ^[2]. Green behavior in the workplace reflects the meaning of environmental sustainability in an organization, including saving electricity, conserving paper, limiting the temperature settings of air conditioners, and promoting the use of eco-cups among employees ^[13]. Conscientious civil servants will reflect on the meaning of environmental sustainability in their own organizations and engage in green behavior in the workplace ^[13]. Environmental psychologists understand that environmental attitudes and behavior change by first understanding the personality of individuals ^[28]. Conscientiousness is part of the personality traits that make individuals systemic, self-regulating, and responsible in following norms ^[29]. Green conscientiousness is thought to be associated with environmental protection and commitment ^[30]. Responsible and conscientious personalities make individuals willing to comply with environmentally friendly norms in society and in the workplace ^[31]. Moral reflectiveness is seen as a proximate cause of green behavior, which leads individuals to be concerned with environmental issues ^[32].

The study of green behavior cannot ignore the moral values of individuals ^[6]. Green behavior involves the correct and incorrect judgments of individuals regarding the value of environmental protection ^{[13][33]}. Moral reflectiveness is a moral concept that differs from that of being non-moral or amoral ^[34]. The meaning of moral reflectiveness is an individual's long-term reflection on morality and moral elements based on his or her own experience ^[12]. From the perspective of the social cognitive theory, individual behavior is primarily influenced by cognitive processes ^[12]. Moral reflectiveness is influenced by the individual's perception of morality ^[35]. When a civil servant's moral reflectiveness is high, they are more likely to perform behaviors that are beneficial to society. In other words, the higher the moral reflectiveness of civil servants, the more likely they are to engage in green office behavior.

Many ethical decisions of an individual are influenced by ethical perceptions ^[36]. Social cognitive theory states that an individual's behavior is influenced by the interaction of self and environmental factors ^{[37][38]}. The way that issues related to environmental protection policies within the office are perceived is influenced by the ethical judgment of each individual ^[35]. According to social cognitive theory, organizational members are more likely to reflect on ethical behavior in their own experiences in an environment with ethical structures ^[39]. Previous research has shown that moral reflectiveness has a positive effect on green behaviors, and Reynolds suggests that moral reflectiveness has an effect on an individual's decisions regarding environmental protection ^[12]. Evidently, moral reflectiveness also tends to increase green behavior in the office ^[35].

Previous studies have hypothesized that green conscientiousness and moral reflectiveness are related ^{[13][40]}. Some studies suggest that conscientiousness is a precursor to moral behavior in individuals ^[15], and that conscientious individuals tend to pursue their own moral values ^[41]. Previous research has found that individual conscientiousness and organizational citizenship behavior are positively correlated ^{[42][43]}. Conscientious organizational members are more willing to engage in extra-role behaviors ^{[18][19]}.

Barrick, Stewart, and Piotrowski suggest that an individual's personality traits influence their behavior ^[17]. An individual's green conscientiousness is a more distant antecedent of green behavior, and moral reflectiveness is a more proximate antecedent of green behavior. Both green conscientiousness and moral reflectiveness trigger the latter green behavior ^[32]. Green conscientiousness reinforces green behavior through moral reflectiveness, and Reynolds argues that moral reflectiveness is the reflection of an individual's moral guidance in everyday life ^{[12][40]}.

2.2. The Relationship between Green Lifestyle and Green Behavior

Axsen et al. defined a green lifestyle as a lifestyle in which an individual is committed to protecting the environment ^[44]. Aydın and Ünal stated that an individual's lifestyle affects both their attitude and behavior towards the environment ^{[45][46]}. A green lifestyle is also a pro-social behavior, which indicates one's responsibility towards nature ^{[47][48]}. Individuals who live a green lifestyle are more likely to use environmentally friendly products and implement recycling, energy-saving, and conservation programs ^[49]. Sony and Ferguson point out that individuals who emphasize environmental protection in their daily activities are more likely to exhibit green behavior ^[50].

Kumar and Ghodeswar found that people who are environmentally conscious in their daily lives are more likely to adopt green behaviors ^{[48][51]}. Individuals who adopt a green lifestyle in their daily life are more aware of environmental protection ^[48]. Mohd Suki suggested that people who are green, environmentally friendly, and recycling-oriented in their daily lives are more likely to demonstrate green behavior ^[49].

2.3. The Relationship between Green Advocacy and Green Behavior

Group discussions within an organization can influence an individual's green behavior ^[2]. Influencing and persuading others to adopt certain behaviors is advocacy ^[52]. The discussion and sharing of knowledge and perspectives on environmental sustainability among workplace groups influence members' green behavior ^[13]. Green advocacy is considered to be an important factor influencing green behavior ^{[53][54][55]}. Green advocacy by members of an organization refers to the extent to which members of an organization are able to convince their employees to engage in green behavior by openly discussing environmental knowledge and skills ^[56]. Green advocacy by members of an organization will help to improve an organization's pro-environmental climate and further contribute to the sustainability of the organization ^{[55][57]}.

Individuals within an organization can also be affected by green advocacy. Past research on organizational citizenship behavior has found that individuals advocating for organizational citizenship behavior have an effect on other members ^[58]. Through social interactions within organizations, mutual environmental sustainability values are developed ^[59]. The more environmental issues and knowledge are discussed within an organization, the greater the impact on the green behavior of its members. Therefore, it is hypothesized that green advocacy will reinforce green behavior ^[4].

2.4. The Relationship between Ritualized Performance Appraisals and Perceived Formalism

Formalism is characterized by ritualistic methods ^[60], which makes employee appraisal a formality. For decades, civil servants in Taiwan have been graded as Grade A and Grade B on a rotating basis, with no assessment based on actual performance ^[61]. Civil servants who received a grade of A accounted for 75% of the total appraisals, while those who received a grade of B accounted for 25% ^[61]. Civil servants can score three A grades and one B grade in four years, and almost all civil servants are eligible for promotion ^[61]. Riggs also argues that there are no objective standards for the job performance of civil servants in developing countries. As a result, civil servants are reluctant to work productively because of the lack of performance standards ^[60]. Consequently, government agencies are fraught with formalism. The cognitive consistency theory explains that individuals have a tendency to be cognitively consistent ^[21]. When civil servants perceive personnel appraisal as a formality, they are more likely to feel the ritualistic nature of administrative procedures, and the formalistic approach to personnel appraisal causes civil servants to be more accustomed to formalism.

2.5. The Relationship between Perceived Formalism, Moral Reflectiveness, and Green Advocacy

Burns and Stalker argue that in organic model organizations, the responsibilities of professionals are not clearly listed and must be formed through constant interaction with colleagues ^[62]. In a mechanistic system, the supervisor decides whether the professional's work is consistent with the organization's goals. The green behavior is considered moral spontaneity. Until supervisors develop the norms of green behavior, civil servants will not actively engage in green advocacy, and formalism can reduce the moral reflectiveness of civil servants when they are not concerned with the public interest.

The previously mentioned cognitive consistency theory advocates that individuals have a tendency to be cognitively consistent ^[21]. When cognitive dissonance occurs in an individual, cognitive disorders arise ^{[22][23]}. The general population tries to maintain cognitive consistency in order to avoid potential cognitive disorders ^{[25][55]}. When civil servants perceive that regulations and practices are not the same, they will not discuss environmental protection issues seriously. Even if the organization requires green behavior, they will not think it will be seriously assessed and enforced. The need for cognitive consistency among civil servants makes them less likely to actually engage in green advocacy. When civil servants believe that environmental protection will not be taken seriously, they will not engage in moral reflectiveness, and the negative relationship between formalism and green advocacy and moral reflectiveness is less likely to cause cognitive dissonance.

Civil servants in developing countries see themselves as different from the general public. Civil servants are primarily concerned with their own interests and not the public interest ^[62]. As a result, they do not place much emphasis on environmental issues in their organizations, resulting in a lack of enthusiasm for green advocacy and a failure to exchange and communicate skills and knowledge regarding environmental protection. Formalist civil servants are less empathetic to the public ^[62]. A lack of compassion causes civil servants to have a lower level of moral reflectiveness. Conscientiousness

and formalism are different in that conscientiousness enhances moral reflectiveness; formalism, on the other hand, reduces civil servants' moral reflectiveness.

References

1. Unsworth, K.L.; Dmitrieva, A.; Andiasola, E. Changing behavior: Increasing the effectiveness of work-place interventions in creating pro-environmental behavior change. *J. Organ. Behav.* 2013, 34, 211–229.
2. Ones, D.S.; Dilchert, S. Environmental Sustainability at Work: A Call to Action. *Ind. Organ. Psychol.* 2012, 5, 444–466.
3. Bauer, T.N.; Aiman, S.L. Green Career Choices: The Influence of Ecological Stance on Recruiting. *J. Bus. Psychol.* 1996, 4, 445–458.
4. Deci, E.L.; Ryan, R.M. Conceptualizations of intrinsic motivation and self-determination. In *Intrinsic Motivation and Self-determination in Human Behavior Perspectives in Social Psychology*; Springer: Boston, MA, USA, 1985; pp. 11–40.
5. Norton, T.A.; Zacher, H.; Ashkanasy, N.M. Organizational sustainability policies and employee green behavior: The mediating role of work climate perceptions. *J. Environ. Psychol.* 2014, 38, 49–54.
6. Yang, L.; Jiang, Y.; Zhang, W.; Zhang, Q.; Gong, H. An empirical examination of individual green policy perception and green behaviors. *Int. J. Manpow.* 2020, 41, 1021–1040.
7. Raineri, N.; Paillé, P. Linking corporate policy and supervisory support with environmental citizenship behaviors: The role of employee environmental beliefs and commitment. *J. Bus. Ethics* 2016, 137, 129–148.
8. Boiral, O. Greening the corporation through organizational citizenship behaviors. *J. Bus. Ethics* 2009, 87, 221–236.
9. Dierdorff, E.C.; Norton, J.J.; Gregory, C.M.; Rivkin, D.; Lewis, P. O*NET's national perspective on the greening of the world of work. In *Green Organizations: Driving Change with I-O Psychology*; Huffman, A.H., Klein, S.R., Eds.; Routledge: New York, NY, USA, 2013; pp. 348–378.
10. Ones, D.S.; Wiernik, B.M.; Dilchert, S.; Klein, R.M. Multiple domains and categories of employee green behaviors: More than conservation. In *Research Handbook on Employee Pro-Environmental Behaviour*; Wells, V., Gregory-Smith, D., Manika, D., Eds.; Edward Elgar: Cheltenham, UK, 2017; pp. 13–38.
11. Kohlberg, L. *The Philosophy of Moral Development*; Harper and Row: San Francisco, CA, USA, 1981.
12. Reynolds, S.J. Moral attentiveness: Who pays attention to the moral aspects of life? *J. Appl. Psychol.* 2008, 93, 1027–1041.
13. Kim, A.; Kim, Y.; Han, K.; Jackson, S.E.; Ployhart, R.E. Multilevel Influences on Voluntary Workplace Green Behavior: Individual Differences, Leader Behavior, and Coworker Advocacy. *J. Manag.* 2017, 43, 1335–1358.
14. Costa, P.T., Jr.; McCrae, R.R. Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO FFI) Professional Manual; Psychological Assessment Resources: Odessa, FL, USA, 1992.
15. Gössling, T. The price of morality: An analysis of personality, moral behavior, and social rules in economic terms. *J. Bus. Ethics* 2003, 45, 121–131.
16. Aguinis, H.; Glavas, A. What we know and don't know about corporate social responsibility: A review and research agenda. *J. Manag.* 2012, 38, 932–968.
17. Barrick, M.R.; Stewart, G.L.; Piotrowski, M. Personality and job performance: Test of the mediating effects of motivation among sales representatives. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 2002, 87, 43–51.
18. Chiaburu, D.S.; Oh, I.; Berry, C.M.; Li, N.; Gardner, R.G. The five-factor model of personality traits and organizational citizenship behaviors: A meta-analysis. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 2011, 96, 1140–1166.
19. Ilies, R.; Fulmer, I.S.; Spitzmuller, M.; Johnson, M.D. Personality and citizenship behavior: The mediating role of job satisfaction. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 2009, 94, 945–959.
20. Milfont, T.L.; Sibley, C.G. The big five personality traits and environmental engagement: Associations at the individual and societal level. *J. Environ. Psychol.* 2012, 32, 187–195.
21. Osgood, C.; Tannenbaum, P. The principle of congruity in the prediction of attitude change. *Psychol. Rev.* 1955, 62, 42–55.
22. Festinger, L. *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance*; Stanford University Press: Redwood City, CA, USA, 1957.
23. Brehm, J.W.; Cohen, A.R. *Explorations in Cognitive Dissonance*; John Wiley & Sons Inc.: Hoboken, NJ, USA, 1962.
24. Simon, D.; Snow, C.; Read, S. The redux of cognitive consistency theories. *J. Personal. Soc. Psychol.* 2004, 86, 814–837.

25. Korman, A. Toward a hypothesis of work behavior. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 1970, 54, 31–41.
26. Foster, B.; Muhammad, Z.; Yusliza, M.Y.; Faezah, J.N.; Johansyah, M.D.; Yong, J.Y.; Ul-Haque, A.; Saputra, J.; Ramayah, T.; Fawehinmi, O. Determinants of Pro-Environmental Behaviour in the Workplace. *Sustainability* 2022, 14, 4420.
27. Fraj, E.; Martinez, E. Environmental values and lifestyles as determining factors of ecological consumer behaviour: An empirical analysis. *J. Consum. Mark.* 2006, 23, 133–144.
28. Thomas, L. How Personality Traits Are Associated with Environmental Engagement. 2014. Available online: <https://environment-review.yale.edu/how-personality-traits-are-associated-environmental-engagement-0>. (accessed on 16 December 2022).
29. McCrae, R.R.; Costa, P.T., Jr. Comparison of EPI and psychoticism scales with measures of the five-factor model of personality. *Personality Individ. Differ.* 1985, 6, 587–597.
30. Milfont, T.L.; Wilson, J.; Diniz, P. Time perspective and environmental engagement: A meta-analysis. *Int. J. Psychol.* 2012, 47, 325–334.
31. Hirsh, J.B. Personality and environmental concern. *J. Environ. Psychol.* 2010, 30, 245–248.
32. Feinberg, M.; Willer, R. The moral roots of environmental attitudes. *Psychol. Sci.* 2013, 24, 56–62.
33. Flannery, B.L.; May, D.R. Environmental ethical decision making in the US metal-finishing industry. *Acad. Manag. J.* 2000, 43, 642–662.
34. Dawson, D. Organizational virtue, moral attentiveness, and the perceived role of ethics and social responsibility in business: The case of UK HR practitioners. *J. Bus. Ethics* 2018, 148, 765–781.
35. Zhao, H.; Zhou, Q. Socially responsible human resource management and hotel employee organizational citizenship behavior for the environment: A social cognitive perspective. *Int. J. Hosp. Manag.* 2021, 95, 102749.
36. Trevino, L.K. Ethical decision making in organizations: A person-situation interactionist model. *Acad. Manag. Rev.* 1986, 11, 601–617.
37. Bandura, A. Social Foundation of Thought and Action. In *A Social Cognitive Theory*; Prentice Hall: Newark, NJ, USA, 1986.
38. Fiske, S.T. Social cognition and social perception. *Annu. Rev. Psychol.* 1993, 44, 155–194.
39. Bargh, J.A.; Thein, R.D. Individual construct accessibility, person memory, and the recall-judgment link: The case of information overload. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 1985, 49, 1129–1146.
40. Becker, T.E. Integrity in organizations: Beyond honesty and conscientiousness. *Acad. Manag. Rev.* 1998, 23, 154–161.
41. Collins, J.M.; Schmidt, F.L. Personality, integrity, and white collar crime: A construct validity study. *Pers. Psychol.* 1993, 46, 295–311.
42. Ilies, R.; Scott, B.A.; Judge, T.A. The interactive effects of personal traits and experienced states on intraindividual patterns of citizenship behavior. *Acad. Manag. J.* 2006, 49, 561–575.
43. Organ, D.W.; Ryan, K. A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Pers. Psychol.* 1995, 48, 775–802.
44. Axsen, J.; Bailey, J.; Castro, M.A. Preference and lifestyle heterogeneity among potential plug-in electric vehicle buyers. *Energy Econ.* 2015, 50, 190–201.
45. Lubowiecki-Vikuk, A.; Dąbrowska, A.; Machnik, A. Responsible consumer and lifestyle: Sustainability insights. *Sustain. Prod. Consum.* 2021, 25, 91–101.
46. Aydın, H.; Ünal, S. A study on the effects of the consumer lifestyles on sustainable consumption. *Inquiry* 2015, 2, 133–152.
47. Ninh, T.; Lobo, A. Pro-environmental purchase behaviour: The role of consumers' biospheric values. *J. Retail. Consum. Serv.* 2016, 33, 98–108.
48. Yusliza, M.Y.; Amirudin, A.; Rahadi, R.A.; Nik Sarah Athirah, N.A.; Ramayah, T.; Muhammad, Z.; Dal Mas, F.; Massaro, M.; Saputra, J.; Mokhlis, S. An Investigation of Pro-Environmental Behaviour and Sustainable Development in Malaysia. *Sustainability* 2020, 12, 7083.
49. Mohd Suki, N. Green products usage: Structural relationships on customer satisfaction and loyalty. *Int. J. Sustain. Dev. World Ecol.* 2017, 24, 88–95.
50. Sony, A.; Ferguson, D. Unlocking consumers' environmental value orientations and green lifestyle behaviors: A key for developing green offerings in Thailand. *Asia Pac. J. Bus. Adm.* 2017, 9, 37–53.

51. Kumar, P.; Ghodeswar, B.M. Factors affecting consumers' green product purchase decisions. *Mark. Intell. Plan.* 2015, 33, 330–347.
52. Cialdini, R.; Goldstein, N. Social influence: Compliance and conformity. *Annu. Rev. Psychol.* 2004, 55, 591–621.
53. Czarnecki, S.; Emilia, P.; Riedel, R. Green advocacy and the climate and energy policy access in Central Eastern Europe. In *Exploring Organized Interests in Post-Communist Policy-Making*; Dobbins, M., Riedel, R., Eds.; Routledge: London, UK, 2021; pp. 127–144.
54. Egri, C.; Herman, S. Leadership in the North American environmental sector: Values, leadership styles, and contexts of environmental leaders and their organizations. *Acad. Manag. J.* 2000, 43, 571–604.
55. Cheng, Y.; Liu, H.; Yuan, Y.; Zhang, Z.; Zhao, J. What Makes Employees Green Advocates? Exploring the Effects of Green Human Resource Management. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* 2022, 19, 1807.
56. Paillé, P.; Chen, Y.; Boiral, O.; Jin, J. The impact of human resource management on environmental performance: An employee level study. *J. Bus. Ethics* 2014, 121, 451–466.
57. Ren, S.; Tang, G.; Jackson, S.E. Green human resource management research in emergence: A review and future directions. *Asia Pac. J. Manag.* 2018, 35, 769–803.
58. Bommer, W.H.; Miles, E.W.; Grover, S.L. Does one good turn deserve another? Coworker influences on employee citizenship. *J. Organ. Behav.* 2003, 24, 181–196.
59. Klein, K.J.; Conn, A.B.; Smith, D.B.; Sorra, J.S. Is everyone in agreement? An exploration of within-group agreement in employee perceptions of the work environment. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 2001, 86, 3–16.
60. Riggs, F.W. An ecological approach: The 'Sala' model. In *Papers in Comparative Administration*; Heady, F., Stokes, S., Eds.; University of Michigan Press: Ann Arbor, MI, USA, 1962; pp. 19–36.
61. Tseng, W.Y.; So, W.Y. Inevitability of Errors, Justifiability of Hidden Rules: Behavior of Performance Appraisal under Institutional Constraints. *J. Civ. Serv.* 2017, 9, 79–107. (In Chinese)
62. Milne, R. Mechanistic and organic models of public administration in developing countries. *Adm. Sci. Q.* 1970, 15, 57.

Retrieved from <https://encyclopedia.pub/entry/history/show/119365>