

**ECO-FRIENDLY PRACTICES – EXAMINING FOR DIFFERENCES**

**Dr. Ajith Kumar. V.V,**  
Associate Professor – HR & OB,  
Symbiosis Institute of Business Management, Bangalore  
(Constituent of Symbiosis International University)  
Symbiosis International University  
#95/1, 95/2, Electronics City, Phase-1, Hosur Road, Bangalore, India.

**Aarti Mehta Sharma,**  
Assistant Professor – Statistics,  
Symbiosis Institute of Business Management, Bangalore  
(Constituent of Symbiosis International University)  
Symbiosis International University  
#95/1, 95/2, Electronics City, Phase-1, Hosur Road, Bangalore, India.

**A. Vidyasagar,**  
Professor - Marketing  
Symbiosis Institute of Business Management, Bangalore  
(Constituent of Symbiosis International University)  
Symbiosis International University  
#95/1, 95/2, Electronics City, Phase-1, Hosur Road, Bangalore, India.

**ABSTRACT**

*More and more people in India are becoming aware of the eco-friendly practices that would reduce the collective damage being done to our planet. Needless to add, there are substantial financial benefits that would accrue by adopting certain eco-friendly practices that are not only easy to put into place but would start showing positive results within a very short period. There is general belief that once there is awareness of eco-friendly practices, there is a desire to adopt them. This paper attempts to study the awareness and implementation of eco-friendly practices among managers and future managers (students of MBA). It will also attempt to test several hypotheses of eco-friendly behavior based on Educational Background, Age, place of origin, work-experience etc. Data for the same will be collected from primary and secondary sources and will be analyzed using suitable statistical techniques on SPSS.*

**Keywords:** Awareness, Managers, Future Managers, *eco-friendly*.

**Introduction:**

In the new millennium concern about the environment has become not only a significant public issue but also a crucial topic in academic research. A positive change with consumers' behavior towards environmental related products can be seen due to the increased level of environmental awareness since the 1970s (Alwitt and Pitts, 1996). This change contributed to the start of the green practices revolution to prevent further damage to the environment. More and more people in India are becoming aware of the eco-friendly practices that would reduce the collective damage being done to our planet. There are substantial financial benefits that would accrue by adopting certain eco-friendly practices that are not only easy to put into place but would start showing positive results within a very short period.

Green practices refer to actions that protect the environment and/or products made with little environmental harm because they are produced in an environmentally and ecologically friendly way (Tzschentke et al., 2004, 2008). Examples of green practices include using renewable resources, conserving water and implementing a recycling program.

In Bangalore itself there are several organizations who have taken concrete steps to not only spread awareness about eco-friendly practices but have implemented some of the practices in their organization for eg. Energy savings by using CFL's, encouraging car-pools, providing transportation to employees, recycling of waste & segregation, reusing paper that has printing on only one side, reduction in paper usage etc.

**Review of Literature:**

Kaplan (1991) found that a person's knowledge about an issue significantly influences one's decision making regarding that issue. For example, people's knowledge about green practices and their own use of them will influence their decision to choose a business that also follows green practices. Moreover, numerous studies have shown that knowledge about the environment generally motivates people to behave in an environmentally responsible manner and choose businesses that do likewise (Diamantopoulos et al., 2003; Hu et al., 2010). A number of studies

have looked at the impact of demographic factors and how they relate to the perception of green practices and consumer behavior (Gronhoj and Olander , 2007; Hu et., 2010; Newell and Green, 1997; Roberts. 1996; Schubert et al., 2010 Zimmer et al., 1994). The studies have found that in general demographic factors are significantly related to consumer beliefs about green practices and environmental practices by organizations, but the results are not always consistent.

The research related to gender and perception of green practices is also not consistent. In a study done in the USA by Schubert et al. (2010) the research found that female respondents thought that restaurants that utilize green practices are healthier for them. They also consistently rated the importance of green practices higher than males. In a different study done in Taiwan, Hu et al. (2010) found no significant differences between the genders in their study of restaurant patrons regarding customers intention to patronize a green restaurant. Another study that was done in Denmark with 100 families surveyed male and female spouses in order to determine if there were any differences between them (Gronhoj and Olander , 2007). This study showed that though there were differences between the genders related to the roles and role behaviors in the family, there were not statistically significant differences related to consumer behavior and perception of green behaviors quantitatively. Females in this study were more apt to consider their environmental actions as they relate to society as a whole and to be more cognizant of green behaviors (Gronhoj and Olander, 2007). Research related to education level has shown that the more educated a person is , the more that they tend to know about green practices and the higher value that they place on those green practices (Hu et al., 2010). Another study by Newell and Green (1997) analyzed the racial differences that exist between people related to their perceptions of environmental behaviors. Their study found that there is not as much of a difference between races as the education and income level of the people increased. The study found that higher education and income levels of people are related to stronger positive opinions about green practices and environmental concern (Newell and Green, 1997).

The current paper aims to study the awareness of managers and future managers about eco friendly practices. It also examines if there are differences between demographic variables such as age, gender and education levels related to eco friendly practices. The study also focuses on

awareness of eco friendly practices at the work place with respect to the designation and specialization of the respondents.

### **Research Methodology**

This study analyzed the awareness of green practices among managers and would be managers (students). The study used a convenience sample of 199 respondents who responded via email in January 2014. The survey was sent to 1000 email addresses with two reminder emails. The data were analyzed with SPSS version 17 using descriptive statistics, independent samples t test, Chi Square test, Cross tabs, ANOVA and post hoc tests in order to respond to the research questions.

The survey asked respondents about the eco friendly practices they were aware of and the ones they followed, especially at the workplace. The idea being that higher awareness would lead to higher implementation of eco friendly practices at the workplace. The survey asked 197 respondents about the level of importance using a Likert type scale that they placed on various practices ranging from 1 Strongly Disagree, to 5 Strongly Agree. Respondents were also asked to indicate their level of agreement with regard to a variety of statements about the use of green practices in various industries. Data was analysed with respect to age, gender, education, seniority at workplace and functional area.

### **Objective**

The primary objective of this paper was to study the awareness and implementation of eco-friendly practices among managers and future managers (students of MBA). To help achieve this primary objective, the following research questions were analyzed for this study.

H1: There are no differences between demographic variables such as age related to respondents awareness and usage of eco friendly practices

H2: There are no differences between demographic variables such as gender related to respondents awareness and usage of eco friendly practices

H3: There are no differences between different functional areas (operations/finance/HR/Marketing) related to respondents awareness and usage of eco friendly practices

### **Findings**

The results have shown remarkable level of consistency with earlier studies where the responses are uniform with respect to age, management levels in organizations and educational backgrounds. There are differences in some parameters with respect to gender and area of specialization. Unlike in the west, it has been noticed that *the female gender is by and large more eco friendly. In the same vein, it was noticed that students as well as working managers in the area of Operations come out as being more eco-friendly.*

The reliability test was carried out for four dimensions- based on Likert. The resulting Cronbachs Alpha was 0.900 which showed that there was high internal consistency.

A simple descriptive analysis was carried out on all the data.

Tables 1 to 7 present the demographic profile of the respondents. There were a total of 197 respondents with a larger part of the sample belonging to the age group 20-25. Respondents were equally divided among the two genders with 97 female and 100 male respondents. Approximately 26 % of the sample was from the IT industry and about 50 % of the sample consisted of students. Other respondents were from the manufacturing, services and trading industries. The size of the company varied from less than 100 to 5000. Half of the sample consisted of students and half of working people with the largest share (21.3 %) belonging to lower management levels. Respondents were drawn nearly equally from various specializations with 26.4% from Operations, 27.9 % from marketing, 22.3 % from Finance and 23.4 % from Human Resources.

In Table 8 we have presented a cross tab to analyze if consumers actually consider the effect on the environment before purchasing day to day products. A Likert scale has been used for the responses and a chi-square test has been applied. It was analysed that consideration is irrespective of gender.

In Table 9, the same data was analysed with respect to age, area of specialization and educational levels. There was no significant statistical difference among the various demographic variables.

Table 10 checked the eco-friendly practices the respondents were following. There were six statements to which respondents had to give their degree of concurrence on a 5 point Likert scale. Out of the six statements that were responded to, there were differences with respect to gender on only two parameters i.e for walking short distances and behavior at traffic stops. Women were more eco friendly than men.

Table 12 checked for differences on the same parameters with respect to specializations; out of the six attributes there were differences with respect to three attributes. Ratings on three attributes i.e on usage of plastic bags, cycling/ walking to work and turning off vehicle engines at traffic stops were statistically significant.

Respondents with Operations specialization were the most eco friendly (Table 11) with the highest mean on all statements.

Further Tukeys post hoc test (Table 13) was applied to see in which specializations the differences were Statistically significant. It was seen that Operations scores on all 3 statements were significantly different and higher form all other specializations.

In Table 14 & 15, we tried and estimated the price sensitiveness to eco-friendly products. Irrespective of gender or specialization, a large majority of respondents – approximately 56%, were willing to pay 6-10 % more for eco friendly products.

While analyzing for awareness a Likert type scale was applied to 7 statements on a scale of 1-5 which varied from ‘not at all’ eco friendly to ‘highly’ eco friendly.

Student's t-test was applied (Table 16) to check for differences on all parameters with respect to gender. There was statistically significant difference between the genders on two parameters i.e to the usage of paper plates (0.08) and to throwing away of shopping bags (.006) By applying ANOVA (Table 18) with respect to specializations it was found there was no significant difference between the different specializations. However, while examining means (Table 17) it was again analyzed that Operations people were the most eco friendly.

We then moved to looking at organizations overall philosophy regarding sustainability. Students t-test was applied to the data (Table 19). Out of the 8 parameters tested, Men and women reacted the same way except on one ( $p=0.03$ ) “we evaluate our policies/ procedures to reduce negative impact on the environment”. ANOVA was applied to check for differences with respect to specializations (Table 20). There was statistical difference in two parameters only. The difference was in the statement

**“Organizations in developing countries need to worry about sustainable growth” ( $p=.045$ )**

**and**

**“We feel environmentally friendly practices can help to save money in the long run” ( $p=0.44$ )**

Applying Tukey’s test it was found that the difference ( $p=0.49$ ) was between Operations and finance specializations only (Table 21)

In any research, it is imperative to check if there is an inclination to be proactive when it came down to actually implementing green practices. In this context, we restricted the final question only to managers and probed on how much they thought that they will be able to influence decisions regarding eco friendly practices in their organizations.

Again more women than men felt that they would be able to influence decisions. A t-test analysis showed that the two genders differed significantly on only three out of eight parameters (Table 22). Chi Square and ANOVA did not yield significant results hence simple cross tabs were done by tabulating across specializations (Table 23).

## **Data Analysis**

### **Descriptives**

Table 1

**Age of respondent**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 20-25	118	59.9	59.9	59.9
25-35	40	20.3	20.3	80.2
35-45	21	10.7	10.7	90.9
45-55	17	8.6	8.6	99.5
above 55	1	.5	.5	100.0
Total	197	100.0	100.0	

Table 2

**Gender**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid female	97	49.2	49.2	49.2
male	100	50.8	50.8	100.0
Total	197	100.0	100.0	

Table 3

**Industry**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid IT	52	26.4	26.4	26.4
Mfg	26	13.2	13.2	39.6
Services	15	7.6	7.6	47.2



Student	97	49.2	49.2	96.4
Trading	7	3.6	3.6	100.0
Total	197	100.0	100.0	

Table 4

**Size of Company**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid less than 100	22	11.2	11.2	11.2
100 to 1000	28	14.2	14.2	25.4
1001 to 5000	28	14.2	14.2	39.6
greater than 5000	22	11.2	11.2	50.8
NA	97	49.2	49.2	100.0
Total	197	100.0	100.0	

Table 5

**Edn Qualification**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid engg	81	40.9	41.1	41.1
arts	46	23.2	23.4	64.5
commerce	42	21.2	21.3	85.8
others	28	14.1	14.2	100.0
Total	197	99.5	100.0	

Total	198	100.0		
-------	-----	-------	--	--

Table 6

**Position occupied**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid student	97	49.2	49.2	49.2
lower management	42	21.3	21.3	70.6
middle management	31	15.7	15.7	86.3
senior management	27	13.7	13.7	100.0
Total	197	100.0	100.0	

Table 7

**Operational Area**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid operations	52	26.4	26.4	26.4
marketing	55	27.9	27.9	54.3
finance	44	22.3	22.3	76.6
Human resources	46	23.4	23.4	100.0
Total	197	100.0	100.0	

Table 8

**As a consumer consider the effect on environment \* Gender Cross tabulation**

	Gender		Total
	female	male	
As a consumer consider strongly Disagree	2	2	4
the effect on Disagree	18	29	47
environment Neither	57	50	107
Agree	18	13	31
strongly Agree	2	6	8
Total	97	100	197

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.795 <sup>a</sup>	4	.215
Likelihood Ratio	5.914	4	.206
Linear-by-Linear Association	.491	1	.483
N of Valid Cases	197		

**Chi-Square Tests**

		Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	Chi-Square	5.795 <sup>a</sup>	4	.215
	Likelihood Ratio	5.914	4	.206
	Linear-by-Linear Association	.491	1	.483
N of Valid Cases		197		

*a. 4 cells (40.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.97.*

Table 9

**Independent Samples Test**

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
eco	16.330	.000	.130	195	.897	.021	.161	-.297	.339

friendly practises followed - paper			.130	179.515	.896	.021	.161	-.296	.338
eco friendly practices followed - appliances	9.176	.003	.567	195	.572	.090	.159	-.223	.403
			.569	182.097	.570	.090	.158	-.222	.402
eco friendly practices followed- plastic bags	.040	.841	1.257	195	.210	.166	.132	-.094	.425
			1.259	192.816	.209	.166	.131	-.094	.425
eco friendly practices followed - cycle / walk	.334	.564	2.150	195	.033	.234	.109	.019	.448
			2.149	193.801	.033	.234	.109	.019	.448
eco friendly practices followed - computer	.325	.569	.641	195	.522	.061	.095	-.126	.247
			.642	194.063	.521	.061	.094	-.126	.247
eco	5.738	.018	2.631	195	.009	.347	.132	.087	.606

friendly practices followed - traffic			2.625	187.875	.009	.347	.132	.086	.607
---------------------------------------	--	--	-------	---------	------	------	------	------	------

Table 10

**Descriptives**

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
eco friendly operations	52	3.37	1.085	.150	3.06	3.67	1	5
practises marketing	55	2.98	1.298	.175	2.63	3.33	1	5
followed - finance	44	2.86	.852	.128	2.60	3.12	1	5
paper Human resources	46	2.83	1.141	.168	2.49	3.16	1	5
Total	197	3.02	1.129	.080	2.86	3.18	1	5
eco friendly operations	52	3.62	1.032	.143	3.33	3.90	1	5
practices marketing	55	3.11	1.301	.175	2.76	3.46	1	5
followed - finance	44	3.18	.896	.135	2.91	3.45	1	5
appliances Human resources	46	3.22	1.094	.161	2.89	3.54	1	5
Total	197	3.28	1.111	.079	3.13	3.44	1	5
eco friendly operations	52	3.46	.999	.139	3.18	3.74	2	5

practices	marketing	55	3.15	.911	.123	2.90	3.39	2	5
followed-	finance	44	2.77	.711	.107	2.56	2.99	2	4
plastic bags	Human	46	2.96	.918	.135	2.68	3.23	2	5
	resources								
	Total	197	3.10	.926	.066	2.97	3.23	2	5
eco friendly operations		52	4.10	.721	.100	3.90	4.30	2	5
practices	marketing	55	4.07	.539	.073	3.93	4.22	2	5
followed	finance	44	3.86	.765	.115	3.63	4.10	2	5
computer	Human	46	3.89	.605	.089	3.71	4.07	2	5
	resources								
	Total	197	3.99	.662	.047	3.90	4.08	2	5
eco friendly operations		52	4.04	.740	.103	3.83	4.24	2	5
practices	marketing	55	3.62	.782	.105	3.41	3.83	2	5
followed	finance	44	3.43	.759	.114	3.20	3.66	2	5
cycle / walk	Human	46	3.52	.658	.097	3.33	3.72	2	5
	resources								
	Total	197	3.66	.769	.055	3.56	3.77	2	5
eco friendly operations		52	3.19	1.067	.148	2.90	3.49	2	5
practices	marketing	55	2.44	.764	.103	2.23	2.64	2	5
followed	finance	44	2.70	.930	.140	2.42	2.99	2	5
traffic	Human	46	2.50	.782	.115	2.27	2.73	2	5
	resources								
	Total	197	2.71	.938	.067	2.58	2.84	2	5

Table 11 with operational area

**ANOVA**

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	
eco friendly practises followed - paper	Between Groups	9.089	3	3.030	2.428	.067
	Within Groups	240.830	193	1.248		
	Total	249.919	196			
eco friendly practices followed - appliances	Between Groups	8.057	3	2.686	2.215	.088
	Within Groups	234.025	193	1.213		
	Total	242.081	196			
eco friendly practices followed- plastic bags	Between Groups	12.570	3	4.190	5.204	.002
	Within Groups	155.400	193	.805		
	Total	167.970	196			
eco friendly practices followed - computer	Between Groups	2.113	3	.704	1.621	.186
	Within Groups	83.867	193	.435		
	Total	85.980	196			
eco friendly practices followed - cycle / walk	Between Groups	10.710	3	3.570	6.551	.000
	Within Groups	105.179	193	.545		
	Total	115.888	196			
eco friendly practices followed - traffic	Between Groups	18.244	3	6.081	7.609	.000



Within Groups	154.263	193	.799		
Total	172.508	196			

Table 12

**Intention to buy \* Gender Crosstabulation**

Count

		Gender		Total
		male	female	
intention to buy	to 5 % or less	5	3	8
	6 % - 10 %	49	61	110
	11 % - 15 %	35	21	56
	16% - 20 %	8	14	22
	irrespective of price	0	1	1
<b>Total</b>		<b>97</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>197</b>

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.902 <sup>a</sup>	4	.095
Likelihood Ratio	8.352	4	.079
Linear-by-Linear Association	.021	1	.885
N of Valid Cases	197		

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.902 <sup>a</sup>	4	.095
Likelihood Ratio	8.352	4	.079
Linear-by-Linear Association	.021	1	.885
N of Valid Cases	197		

a. 4 cells (40.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .49.

Table 13

**Intention to buy \* Operational Area Crosstabulation**

Count

		Operational Area				Total
		operations	marketing	finance	Human resources	
intention to buy	to 5 % or less	1	1	3	3	8
	6 % - 10 %	26	34	24	26	110
	11 % - 15 %	19	12	13	12	56
	16% - 20 %	5	8	4	5	22
	irrespective of price	1	0	0	0	1
Total		52	55	44	46	197

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.256 <sup>a</sup>	12	.681
Likelihood Ratio	9.148	12	.690
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.676	1	.195
N of Valid Cases	197		

a. 9 cells (45.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .22.

Table 14

Eco Friendly practices (Q11) by gender

**Independent Samples Test**

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper

eco friendly Equal practices variances aware of - assumed showers Equal variances not assumed	1.121	.291	-.127	195	.899	-.011	.084	-.175	.154
eco friendly Equal practices variances aware of - assumed glass bottles Equal variances not assumed	.904	.343	- 2.430	195	.016	-.225	.093	-.408	-.042
eco friendly Equal practices variances aware of - assumed switch off Equal lights variances not assumed	.211	.647	-.849 - -850	195	.397 194.453	-.083 -.083	.098 .098	-.277 -.277	.110 .110
eco friendly Equal practices variances aware of - assumed car pooling Equal variances not assumed	3.133	.078	-.860 - -.861	195	.391 193.576	-.156 -.156	.182 .182	-.515 -.515	.202 .202

eco friendly Equal practices variances aware of - assumed	7.083	.008	-	195	.208	-.117	.092	-.299	.065
			1.264						
paper plates Equal variances not assumed			-	192.953	.207	-.117	.092	-.299	.065
			1.267						
eco friendly Equal practices variances aware of - assumed	7.699	.006	-	195	.215	-.137	.110	-.354	.080
			1.245						
shopping Equal bags variances not assumed			-	187.329	.213	-.137	.110	-.353	.079
			1.249						
eco friendly Equal practices variances aware of - assumed	2.415	.122	-.533	195	.595	-.056	.105	-.262	.151
printing Equal multiple variances copies not assumed			-.534	192.507	.594	-.056	.104	-.262	.150

Table 15  
Q11 by operational areas

**Report**

Operational Area		eco friendly practices aware of showers	eco friendly practices aware of glass bottles	eco friendly practices aware of switch off lights	eco friendly practices aware of car pooling	eco friendly practices aware of paper plates	eco friendly practices aware of shopping bags	eco friendly practices aware of printing multiple copies
operations	Mean	3.10	2.69	3.92	3.65	4.19	3.62	3.50
	N	52	52	52	52	52	52	52
	Std. Deviation	.693	.875	.763	1.153	.715	.796	.728
Marketing	Mean	2.98	2.67	4.02	3.65	4.25	3.56	3.56
	N	55	55	55	55	55	55	55
	Std. Deviation	.561	.579	.707	1.542	.645	.811	.764
Finance	Mean	2.89	2.45	3.91	3.36	4.14	3.36	3.36
	N	44	44	44	44	44	44	44
	Std. Deviation	.538	.548	.640	.865	.554	.718	.685
Human resources	Mean	2.96	2.59	3.85	3.41	4.04	3.43	3.57
	N	46	46	46	46	46	46	46

	Std. Deviation	.515	.541	.631	1.392	.665	.750	.750
Total	Mean	2.98	2.61	3.93	3.53	4.16	3.50	3.50
	N	197	197	197	197	197	197	197
	Std. Deviation	.584	.658	.689	1.276	.650	.773	.733

Table 16

**ANOVA**

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
eco friendly practices aware of - showers					
Between Groups	1.108	3	.369	1.083	.357
Within Groups	65.846	193	.341		
Total	66.954	196			
eco friendly practices aware of - glass bottles					
Between Groups	1.656	3	.552	1.280	.282
Within Groups	83.247	193	.431		
Total	84.904	196			
eco friendly practices aware of - switch off lights					
Between Groups	.760	3	.253	.530	.662
Within Groups	92.245	193	.478		
Total	93.005	196			

eco friendly practices Between aware of - car pooling Groups	3.496	3	1.165	.713	.545
Within Groups	315.540	193	1.635		
Total	319.036	196			
eco friendly practices Between aware of - paper plates Groups	1.194	3	.398	.941	.422
Within Groups	81.608	193	.423		
Total	82.802	196			
eco friendly practices Between aware of - shopping bags Groups	1.928	3	.643	1.075	.361
Within Groups	115.321	193	.598		
Total	117.249	196			
eco friendly practices Between aware of - printing multiple copies Groups	1.235	3	.412	.764	.515
Within Groups	104.013	193	.539		
Total	105.249	196			

Table 17

Q12 by gender

### Independent Samples Test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances	t-test for Equality of Means
--	---	------------------------------



	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
we evaluate Equal to reduce variances negative assumed impact Equal variances not assumed	9.379	.003	- 2.123	195	.035	-.255	.120	-.493	-.018
			- 2.129	191.325	.035	-.255	.120	-.492	-.019
too costly Equal variances assumed Equal variances not assumed	.943	.333	- .982	195	.327	-.117	.120	-.353	.118
			- .982	194.735	.328	-.117	.120	-.353	.119
concerned Equal variances assumed Equal variances not assumed	1.998	.159	- 3.598	195	.000	-.404	.112	-.625	-.182
			- 3.609	190.151	.000	-.404	.112	-.624	-.183

responsible	Equal	.854	.357	-.287	195	.774	-.030	.106	-.239	.179
	variances assumed									
	Equal			-.287	194.628	.774	-.030	.106	-.239	.178
	variances not assumed									
costly, but necessary	Equal	2.388	.124	-.743	195	.458	-.086	.115	-.313	.142
	variances assumed									
	Equal			-.745	191.211	.457	-.086	.115	-.313	.141
	variances not assumed									
developing countries sustainable growth	Equal	.094	.760	.811	195	.418	.072	.088	-.102	.246
	- variances assumed									
	Equal			.812	194.888	.418	.072	.088	-.102	.245
	variances not assumed									
save money	Equal	2.215	.138	.850	195	.397	.085	.100	-.113	.284
	variances assumed									
	Equal			.850	194.799	.396	.085	.100	-.113	.283
	variances not assumed									

educate employees	Equal variances assumed	.010	.921	-.854	195	.394	-.076	.089	-.251	.099
	Equal variances not assumed			-.854	194.890	.394	-.076	.089	-.251	.099

Table 18  
Q12 by operational areas

**ANOVA**

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
we evaluate to reduce negative impact	Between Groups	1.554	3	.518	.712	.546
	Within Groups	140.527	193	.728		
	Total	142.081	196			
too costly	Between Groups	3.256	3	1.085	1.554	.202
	Within Groups	134.795	193	.698		
	Total	138.051	196			
concerned	Between Groups	1.496	3	.499	.756	.520
	Within Groups	127.316	193	.660		
	Total	128.812	196			

responsible	Between Groups	3.651	3	1.217	2.253	.084
	Within Groups	104.237	193	.540		
	Total	107.888	196			
costly, but necessary	Between Groups	4.642	3	1.547	2.420	.067
	Within Groups	123.409	193	.639		
	Total	128.051	196			
developing countries - sustainable growth	Between Groups	3.045	3	1.015	2.724	.045
	Within Groups	71.909	193	.373		
	Total	74.954	196			
save money	Between Groups	3.982	3	1.327	2.746	.044
	Within Groups	93.297	193	.483		
	Total	97.279	196			

Table 19

Q 13 by gender

### Independent Samples Test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances	t-test for Equality of Means
--	---	------------------------------

		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2- tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
separation of waste	Equal variances assumed	.007	.935	- 1.417	195	.158	-.236	.167	-.565	.093
	Equal variances not assumed			- 1.418	194.681	.158	-.236	.167	-.565	.092
switch off computers	Equal variances assumed	4.551	.034	- 2.292	195	.023	-.379	.165	-.705	-.053
	Equal variances not assumed			- 2.289	192.523	.023	-.379	.165	-.705	-.052
eliminating paper cups and plates	Equal variances assumed	1.919	.168	- 1.841	195	.067	-.306	.166	-.634	.022
	Equal variances not assumed			- 1.840	194.137	.067	-.306	.166	-.634	.022

eco friendly cleaning agents	Equal variances assumed	3.124	.079	-	195	.055	-.371	.192	-.749	.008
	Equal variances not assumed			1.933						
	Equal variances not assumed			-	190.945	.055	-.371	.192	-.750	.008
	Equal variances not assumed			1.930						
encouraging car pooling among staff	Equal variances assumed	7.811	.006	-	195	.008	-.482	.181	-.839	-.125
	Equal variances not assumed			2.663						
	Equal variances not assumed			-	187.674	.009	-.482	.182	-.840	-.124
	Equal variances not assumed			2.656						
reduction of printing	Equal variances assumed	.011	.917	-	195	.141	-.281	.190	-.657	.094
	Equal variances not assumed			1.479						
	Equal variances not assumed			-	194.843	.141	-.281	.190	-.657	.094
	Equal variances not assumed			1.479						
recycling of partly used paper	Equal variances assumed	2.063	.153	-	195	.053	-.406	.209	-.818	.006
	Equal variances not assumed			1.943						
	Equal variances not assumed			-	193.806	.054	-.406	.209	-.818	.006
	Equal variances not assumed			1.942						

introduce an Equal eco friendly variances prog for assumed staff Equal variances not assumed	1.226	.270	- 2.016	195	.045	-.277	.137	-.548	-.006
			- 2.015	193.644	.045	-.277	.138	-.549	-.006

**Limitations of the Research:**

1. Sample chosen has been restricted to management students and working managers. There are other stake holders for an organization to be truly eco-friendly which cannot be captured in a research of this size.
2. The size of the sample is quite small and skewed and therefore not truly representative of the population.
3. This study should also be carried out over an extended period like a longitudinal study, where a comparison can be made and a progressive analysis done.

**Conclusions of the Research:**

1. Women both among the student and in the organizations come out quite strongly as more eco-friendly.
2. People who are in operations appear to be more eco-friendly, unlike in the other disciplines.
3. By and large, the awareness among all groups seem to be slightly around the average and any increase in this would automatically result in affirmative action in the right direction.

**Future Plans for the research:**

Given that this was more in the nature of a pilot study, we propose to expand the research in terms of regions across the country and over an extended period of time to check on the evolution of eco-friendly practices in the country.

**References**

1. Alwitt, L.F., Pitts, R.E. (1996), "Predicting purchase intentions for an environmentally sensitive product", *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, Vol.5 No.1, pp.49-64.
2. Diamantopoulos, A., Schlegelmilch, B., Sinkovics, R., Bohlen, G. (2003), "Can socio-demographics still play a role in profiling green consumers? A review of the evidence and an empirical investigation", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 56 No.6, pp.465-473.
3. Gronhoj, A., Olander, F. (2007), "A gender perspective on environmentally related family consumption", *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, Vol. 6 No.4, pp.216-228.
4. Hu, H.H., Parsa, H.G., Self, J. (2010), "The dynamics of green restaurant patronage", *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, Vol. 51 No.3, pp.344-362.
5. Kaplan, S. (1991), "Beyond rationality: clarity-based decision making", in Garling, T., Evans, G. (Eds), *Environment, Cognition and Action*, Oxford University Press, New York, NY, pp.171-190.
6. Newell, S.J., Green, C.L. (1997), "Racial differences in consumer environmental concern", *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, Vol. 31 No.1, pp.53-69.
7. Peattie, K. (1995), *Environmental Marketing Management: Meeting the Green Challenge*, Pitman, London, .
8. Roberts, J.A. (1996), "Green consumers in the 1990s: profile and implications for advertising", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 36 No.3, pp.217-231.
9. Schubert, F., Kandampully, J., Solnet, D., Kralj, A. (2010), "Exploring consumer perceptions of green restaurants in the US", *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, Vol. 10 No.4, pp.286-300.



10. Tzschentke, N., Kirk, D., Lynch, P.A. (2004), "Reasons for going green in serviced accommodation establishments", *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol. 16 No.2, pp.116-124.
11. Welford, R. (2000), *Hijacking Environmentalism*, Earthscan, London, .
12. Zimmer, M., Stafford, T., Stafford, M. (1994), "Green issues: dimensions of environmental concern", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 30 No.1, pp.63-74.