instituto politécnico de gestão e tecnologia

MASTERS IN MANAGEMENT

The Role of Sustainability in Enhancing Employee Value Proposition – Insights from Company X

Carlos Manuel Magalhães Ferreira

Master's dissertation

VILA NOVA DE GAIA

May | 2024

INSTITUTO POLITÉCNICO DE GESTÃO E TECNOLOGIA

The Role of Sustainability in Enhancing Employee Value Proposition – Insights from Company X

Carlos Manuel Magalhães Ferreira

Aprovado em 17/12/2024

Composição do Júri

Prof. Doutor Marco Ribeiro Lamas

_____

Presidente (Nome)

Profª. Doutora Cidália Andrea Silva Neves

_____

Arguente (Nome)

Profª. Doutora Mafalda Coelho Nogueira

_____

Orientador/a (Nome)

Vila Nova de Gaia
2024

Tese de Mestrado realizada sob a orientação do Prof. Doutor Marco Lamas apresentada ao ISLA-Instituto Politécnico de Gestão e Tecnologia de Vila Nova de Gaia para obtenção do grau de Mestre em Gestão, conforme o Despacho n.º 8476/2020

Acknowledgements

I would like to start by thanking my friends Ricardo Soares and Pedro Azevedo for all the help and availability they showed me throughout these two years both in my academic and personal life.

I would also like to give a BIG thank you to all my FOREC/B&F teammates for all the support, friendship and companionship that you could ask in a professional team.

I would also like to thank Soldier Taveira and First Corporal Daniel Cruz for covering shifts on my behalf, enabling me to attend as many classes as possible in my bachelor's degree which allowed me to continue my studies and finishing now the Master´s Degree.

I would like to express my gratitude to my former Team Leader and friend Miguel Paiva that helped me through my transition from the Armed Forces to the Investing Banking industry and for becoming to me a true mentor in life both in professional, academic and personal life.

I would also like to thank Daniel Galho, Rita Baía and Jorge Teixeira for all the assistance they gave me on certain points of dissertation and for always being available to me in all aspects of my life no matter how random they are.

I also want to thank my academic mentees for pushing me to excel in various activities that I wouldn't have pursued half as much without them, and for the unforgettable academic and personal experiences they provided me with these five years.

I express my deepest gratitude to Mafalda Nogueira for providing the exceptional guidance throughout this dissertation that any student could hope for, and for being an inspiring individual who adeptly guides and motivates me in give my best in all my challenges.

I also want to acknowledge Sergio Amorim, Bernardo Silva, Diogo Bravo, Diogo Vidal, Helder Gonçalves and Gonçalo Bravo for being a pleasant surprise this year in the friendship department and for contributing a lot in managing the stress of this dissertation.

I am grateful to my parents, my sister, and my nephew for their unconditional support every day.

Finally, I want to thank everyone who has somehow contributed, directly or indirectly, to the conclusion of these amazing five years filled with good memories, hard work, and most of all, happiness, which translates into what I hope will be my master's degree after this dissertation

Abstract

In today's world, sustainability is no longer a niche concern; it is a critical factor for the success of any organization. Consumers, investors, and employees are increasingly demanding that companies operate in a sustainable manner, and those that fail to do so risk losing market share, talent, and capital. One of the most important aspects of sustainability is its impact on the employee value proposition (EVP). The EVP is the set of benefits and attributes that an organization offers to its employees in exchange for their work. A strong EVP can attract and retain top talent, boost employee morale and productivity, and contribute to a positive company culture. In this dissertation we will explore the impacts of sustainability on the EVP of organizations and will use Company X, a leading company in sustainability as a case study. Company X has been recognized for its commitment to ESG (environmental, social, and governance) ethics and this study will analyze how Company X ' sustainability efforts have impacted its EVP on its different metrics such as compensation, benefits, career development and work environment. To fulfill that, this study combines a comprehensive literature review with a case study of Company X, and utilizes a structured questionnaire, based on two different scales, to gather quantitative data from employees to analyze the impact of sustainability practices and the Employee Value Proposition (EVP).This study was based on the feedback on 306 employees that answered our survey and provided valuable insights on how the sustainable measures impacted their EVP. Having so this dissertation has a strong contribution on the literature, as it covers some looples that currently exist as in the lack of scales and on the direct impacts that sustainable measures have on employees EVP. Also, this dissertation provides valuable feedback with strong analysis to back it, on the strategies that companies should take to improve their employee’s value proposition.

Keywords: Sustainability, Employee Value Proposition, Sustainability impacts, survey

Index

Table and Figure Index

List of abbreviations:

CSR - Corporate Social Responsibility

EVP – Employee Value Proposition

HRM – Human Resources Management

SME – Small and Medium Enterprises

TBL – Triple Bottom Line

EFA – Exploratory Factorial Analysis

CFA – Confirmatory Factorial Analysis

PAF - Principal Axis Factoring

1 Introduction

In the current days we often hear the word “Sustainability”, and many other ones related to this topic. This theme became so casual in our lives that can easily go unnoticed by most of us. However, and even though this topic is not new there are still a lot of doubts about what sustainability is and what it really represents. So, starting from the beginning, “what is Sustainability?”.

In this way we can define sustainability as the ability to exist continually (Balasubramanian et al. (2022).

Sustainability is a field which has been gaining popularity since the 90’s as a social and environmental public problem and it is currently a popular topic from a political and educational point of view (Martins et al. (2022). In a nutshell, Sustainability is a concept that refers to the ability to meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. It encompasses a holistic approach that seeks to balance economic, social, and environmental considerations to create a harmonious and enduring system as stated The United Nations (UN) Brundtland Commission.

However, the previous definition is a very global and general definition and does not specify the subtopics of sustainability. Like the coliseum in Rome, Sustainability is supported by pillars. These pillars are: Economic Sustainability, environmental Sustainability, and social Sustainability.

Economic sustainability centers on fostering a resilient and balanced economic system that can thrive over the long term. It involves practices that promote both present prosperity and future economic well-being. It emphasizes the importance of ethical business conduct, transparent financial governance, and strategies that contribute positively to societal welfare (McGinn et al. (2020).

In the context of environmental sustainability, the focus is on minimizing the impact of human activities on the planet. This involves responsible resource management, reducing pollution, and adopting practices that promote biodiversity and ecosystem health. (Brundtland (1987).

Social sustainability addresses the well-being of communities and individuals, ensuring that societal structures are fair, inclusive, and supportive. This includes considerations for social justice, equity, and access to basic needs such as education, healthcare, and housing (McGinn et al. (2020).

The three pillars of sustainability—economic, environmental, and social—are interconnected, and achieving true sustainability requires a careful integration of these aspects. Businesses, governments, and individuals all play crucial roles in advancing sustainability goals by making conscious choices and adopting practices that contribute to a more balanced and resilient world(Kuzma et al. (2017).

Sustainability is increasingly recognized as a critical framework for addressing global challenges such as climate change, biodiversity loss, and social inequality. It calls for a shift in mindset and behavior towards more responsible and mindful

practices to ensure a thriving and equitable world for current and future generations McGinn et al. (2020)

Having the above under consideration, this thesis " The Role of Sustainability in Enhancing Employee Value Proposition – Insights from Company X ", is highly relevant and timely in the current business landscape. Sustainability has emerged as a critical factor for organizational success, shaping consumer preferences, stakeholder expectations, and market dynamics. The EVP (Employee Value Proposition) plays a pivotal role in attracting, retaining, and motivating a high-performing workforce, while sustainability initiatives can significantly impact employee engagement, morale, and overall job satisfaction (Allen (2008).

This study can also contribute to a deeper understanding of the social and environmental impact of sustainability initiatives on the EVP. This research can inform public discourse, promote responsible business practices, and ultimately contribute to a more sustainable and equitable society.

Allied to the information stated previously, in a general way, stakeholder like investors and partners are placing greater emphasis on sustainability as a measure of corporate responsibility and as so, embracing sustainability practices fosters positive relationships with stakeholders and enhances the organization's reputation. This emphasis is escalated by Government regulations which are increasingly emphasizing sustainability standards and reporting requirements. “Green organizations “are better positioned in the market to comply with such regulations and as so, they can avoid potential penalties which give said organizations a competitive advantage regarding the “not so green organizations (McGinn et al. (2020).

Having so, this study addresses a critical and timely issue that is shaping the future of business operations and organizational success. By exploring the impacts of sustainability on the EVP, this study can contribute with valuable insights into how organizations can leverage sustainability to attract, retain, and motivate a high-performing workforce, while also enhancing their reputation and market position.

The Employee Value Proposition (EVP) stands as a cornerstone in the contemporary corporate world, aimed at attracting, engaging, and retaining qualified talent. Essentially, EVP represents the unique promise that an organization offers to its employees in exchange for their commitment and contributions. This proposition extends far beyond mere salary and benefits, encompassing aspects such as organizational culture, development opportunities, work-life balance, and the company's mission and values (Allen (2008).

In recent years, EVP has emerged as a crucial component of human resource management, particularly in an increasingly competitive talent-driven job market. Companies recognize the importance of a strong EVP not only in attracting new hires but also in maintaining an engaged and productive workforce in the long run. An effective EVP not only attracts top talent but also strengthens the company's identity and reputation in the market. (Balasubramanian et al. (2022)

As employee expectations continue to evolve, organizations are constantly refining their value propositions to ensure they remain relevant and appealing. Understanding and clearly communicating the EVP has become a strategic priority for

companies seeking to stand out as employers of choice in a competitive landscape. (McGinn et al. (2020).

As so, and to fulfill the purpose of this study previously mentioned, this study starts with the central question of "What is the impact of adopting sustainability strategies on the EVP of organizations?". To answer to this question, this study will focus on the following objectives presented below:

- Analyze the impact of adopting sustainability strategies on compensation.
- Analyze the impact of adopting sustainability strategies on Benefits.
- Analyze the impact of adopting sustainability strategies on Career.
- Analyze the impact of adopting sustainability strategies on the work environment.
- Analyze the impact of adopting sustainability strategies on organizational culture.

As a non-disclosure agreement was signed with the company that we will use as a case study to protect its sensitive information, we will refer to the company of the case study as "Company X".

X is dedicated to sustainability and has integrated robust environmental, social, and governance (ESG) practices into its core business operations. Recognizing the importance of sustainable development, Company X has implemented initiatives aimed at reducing its environmental footprint, promoting social responsibility, and enhancing governance practices. These efforts are aligned with global sustainability goals and reflect Company X's commitment to creating long-term value for its stakeholders while mitigating environmental impact. By prioritizing sustainability, Company X strives to lead by example in the financial services industry, setting benchmarks for responsible corporate behavior.

Due to its exemplary commitment to sustainability, Company X has received numerous awards and recognitions. These accolades highlight Company X's leadership and achievements in integrating sustainable practices into its business strategy. Awards have been conferred for initiatives ranging from environmental stewardship and resource efficiency to community engagement and ethical governance. These honors underscore Company X's dedication to sustainability excellence and its proactive approach in addressing global challenges through innovative and responsible business practices. As a result, Company X continues to be acknowledged as a leader in sustainability within the financial services sector, setting standards for industry peers and inspiring positive change on a global scale.

In this study, we will evaluate how the sustainability measures implemented by Company X have impacted its EVP from the perspective of its employees. To achieve this, we conducted a survey with employees using two distinct scales to measure their perceptions of the green initiatives adopted by the company and their impact on the EVP. The data collected was then analyzed to identify critical insights and assess employee opinions on these measures. Finally, this analysis was compared with the organization's provided statistics and KPIs to evaluate the alignment between employee perceptions and the company's reported outcomes. To conclude, this study

will provide a critical opinion on the obtained results and future recommendations to similar papers finishing with a conclusion of all the thematic debated in this study.

On (Anguini's et al. 2005). Strategically bridging the gap between human resources and corporate social responsibility (Human Resource Management Review) the authors state a need for more research on the relationship between HR practices and corporate social responsibility (CSR). Although this study does not go directly on what the authors described, this study can help fill the gap on the literature of talent management and CSR.

Despite this imperative, scant attention has been devoted to investigating the individual perceptions of employees regarding organizational sustainability.(Balasubramanian et al. 2022).

Regarding research gaps, this study contributes to several calls for future research on the topic. For example, Waddock (2009), argues that there is a need for a new model of capitalism that is based on sustainability. This study and others like this one, can contribute to confirming or denying the veracity of this proposal. Furthermore, Mazur and Walczak (2020) stated that there is a need for more research on the relationship between sustainability and employee engagement and as such this study represents a way to supply this need (Mazur et al. 2020). More recently, Cunha et al. (2022) state that there is a clear need for more studies that examine employee opinions in conjunction with organizational feedback. As this research emphasizes the perspectives of employees, it can make a valuable contribution to the existing literature on this topic(Cunha et al. 2022).

Taking the above into consideration this study can indeed help to fill a gap in the literature existent regarding this thematic which reinforces the importance of this thesis.

This dissertation is structured into 6 different chapters. Chapter 1 begins with an introduction, setting the stage for the research by outlining its background, significance, and objectives. This chapter also identifies specific gaps in the literature, which led to the formulation of the study's objectives. The introduction concludes with an overview of the dissertation's structure.

Chapter 2 presents the Literature Review, synthesizing existing research and theoretical frameworks relevant to the study. It adheres to APA standards and addresses gaps in the literature identified in Chapter 1, guiding the development of the study's hypotheses.

Following the literature review, Chapter 3 details the Methodology. This chapter outlines the research approach, specifying the quantitative case study methodology, research hypotheses, and theoretical framework. It describes the data collection instrument, the study's population and sample, and the data analysis procedures.

Chapter 4 introduces the case study of Company X, providing background information about the company and its scope, including dimensions such as geographic reach and workforce size, especially in Portugal. It also examines Company X's alignment with HR practices and sustainability, followed by a macro and micro vision of its sustainability measures and its Employee Value Proposition (EVP).

Chapter 5 contains the Primary Data Analysis, presenting findings from the primary data collected through the survey. This chapter is structured to first characterize the sample, followed by a factorial analysis, reliability analysis, and hypothesis testing. Each section provides interpretation alongside data visualizations and maintains consistency in format for readability and clarity.

Chapter 6 concludes the dissertation. This chapter summarizes the findings, addresses each research objective, and discusses the study's contributions, both theoretical and practical. It also outlines limitations and offers suggestions for future research.

2 Literature review

For a long time, sustainability as definition was not clear. The thematic was surrounded by a lack of importance as sustainability was just the care that each of us had for the environment. Only in 1994 the term sustainability was given importance after the term triple bottom line was developed by Elkington for sustainable development (Balasubramanian et al. 2022).

After 1994, numerous researchers emphasized the Triple Bottom Line (TBL) concept in sustainability, reaffirming the significance of an organization's three sustainability dimensions (Sisaye ,2011); Collins (2007); Goel (2010); Epstein (2015); Alhamdi (2015); Russell et al. (2008), Savitz (2013). However, in 2018, Elkington observed that over the preceding 25 years, the TBL had primarily been treated as an accounting tool (Elkington (2018). This assertion sparked various research inquiries and spurred researchers to delve deeper into organizational sustainability(Balasubramanian et al. 2022).

Elkington's statement prompted reflection on how the TBL had been utilized and whether its potential had been fully realized. Scholars began to question whether organizations had merely paid lip service to sustainability without implementing substantive changes in their practices. This observation catalyzed a shift in focus, with researchers seeking to understand the true integration of sustainability principles within organizations beyond financial reporting.

Moreover, Elkington's critique prompted a reevaluation of the methodologies employed to measure sustainability. Researchers began exploring alternative frameworks and indicators to assess organizational sustainability comprehensively. This reexamination led to a broader understanding of sustainability beyond financial metrics, encompassing environmental stewardship, social responsibility, and economic viability(Balasubramanian et al. 2022).

Consequently, the discourse on organizational sustainability evolved, with scholars advocating for holistic approaches that address environmental, social, and economic concerns simultaneously. Elkington's commentary served as a catalyst for deeper inquiry, inspiring researchers to explore new avenues and develop more nuanced understandings of sustainability within organizational contexts(Balasubramanian ,2022).

The literature review is structured around the chapters of "Sustainability in Organizations," "What does EVP stand for?" and "Relation between EVP and Sustainability" to strategically align with the overarching research objective of exploring the impacts of sustainability on Employee Value Proposition (EVP). Firstly, delving into the discourse surrounding sustainability in organizations lays the foundational understanding of how businesses integrate environmental, social, and governance principles into their operations. This exploration provides the contextual

backdrop essential for comprehending the broader landscape within which EVP operates. Secondly, defining EVP serves to establish a clear conceptual framework, ensuring a common understanding of the term and its components. By elucidating the elements that constitute EVP, including compensation, benefits, career development, work environment and organization culture, this chapter sets the stage for analyzing how sustainability practices influence these facets. Lastly, investigating the relationship between EVP and sustainability bridges the gap between theory and practice, offering insights into how organizations leverage sustainability initiatives to enhance their EVP and, consequently, their overall organizational performance. This structured approach not only facilitates a nuanced exploration of the research topic but also enables the identification of potential gaps and opportunities for future investigation within the realm of sustainable business practices.

2.1 Sustainability in Organizations

From the literature review on sustainability, it becomes evident that much of the existing research has concentrated on various aspects such as sustainability accounting, the correlation between corporate social responsibility and sustainability, and sustainability practices (Adams ,2013); (Swanson et al. ,2012); (Gadenne et al., 2012). However, there remains a noticeable gap in literature regarding the holistic nature of sustainability, necessitating a deeper exploration of its underlying dimensions(Balasubramanian ,2022).

Research has consistently advocated for the integration of sustainability throughout all facets of an organization (Hockert ,2015); Mirvis et al. 2013); Bansal (2002). This underscores the significance of examining organizational sustainability as a pivotal area warranting further investigation (Balasubramanian et al. ,2022).

Sustainability, defined by the World Commission on Environment and Development, is about meeting current needs without hindering future generations from meeting theirs (Balasubramanian et al. ,2022).

Taking the above under consideration, we can say that Sustainability is understood as the ability to maintain certain processes or states over the long term. The concept encompasses meeting present needs without compromising the ability of future generations to meet theirs. This dual focus on current and future requirements highlights the need for practices that balance immediate demands with long-term viability (Balasubramanian et al. ,2022).

Historically, sustainability primarily meant environmental sustainability. The social aspect gained prominence later in the 20th century. In 1994, Elkington introduced the concept of the triple bottom line (TBL), which includes social, economic, and environmental sustainability, highlighting their importance for organizations. Balasubramanian et al. ,2022).

Given the multifaceted nature of sustainability, it is imperative to delve beyond surface-level assessments and delve into the intricate interplay between environmental, social, and economic dimensions within organizational settings. By

uncovering the intricacies of organizational sustainability, researchers can contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of how businesses can effectively align their operations with sustainable practices while simultaneously fostering long-term success and resilience (Balasubramanian et al. ,2022).

As explained in the previous chapter Sustainability is an embracing topic that also includes the organizations. In the currently days , Sustainability in the Corporations can often dictate the success of said Corporation as the public called " green enterprises" can often result in economic benefits as cost savings or increased revenue, and strategic benefits origin from improved institutional image, renewal of the product portfolio, increased productivity, high staff commitment, improved work relations, improved creativity for new challenges and improved relations with government bodies, community and environmental groups (Kuzma et al., 2017).

On a more macro point of view, we can have Sustainability in organizations as the capacity that said organization has, to meet present need without compromising the ability of the future generations meet their own, as articulated as articulated by the Brundtland Commission (1987) (Kuzma et al. ,2017).

Sustainability in organizations is a strategic approach that involves integrating environmental, social, and economic considerations into the core of business operations. It goes beyond merely complying with regulations and aims to create long-term value for the company, its stakeholders, and the broader society while minimizing negative impacts on the environment. Sustainability in organizations is often referred to as corporate sustainability or corporate social responsibility (CSR) (McGuinn, 2020).

To fulfill the previously mentioned, it requires companies to integrate sustainable practices throughout their operations. This integration involves not just environmental sustainability but also social and economic aspects. The holistic approach ensures that organizations contribute positively to their surrounding communities and economies while maintaining their environmental responsibilities Balasubramanian et al., 2022).

Researchers have pointed out that organizational sustainability is essential for long-term success. It involves adopting practices that ensure financial health, social responsibility, and environmental stewardship. By doing so, organizations can build resilience and adapt to changing market and environmental conditions. (Balasubramanian et al.,2022).

But taking the previous into consideration, it raises the question on what sustainability consists of and on the practices that the organizations should adopt. So accordingly, to The United Nations (UN) Brundtland Commission, these are the key aspects of sustainability that organizations should include:

- Environmental Stewardship: Organizations commit to reducing their ecological footprint by adopting practices that conserve resources, minimize waste, and promote the use of clean and renewable energy. This may involve implementing energy-efficient technologies, reducing emissions, and responsibly managing natural resources.
- Social Responsibility: Companies recognize their impact on society and strive to contribute positively to the well-being of communities. This

includes promoting diversity and inclusion, ensuring fair labor practices, supporting local communities, and addressing social issues such as poverty and inequality.

- Economic Viability: Sustainable organizations aim to achieve economic success while considering the long-term impact of their activities. This involves adopting responsible business practices, ensuring financial stability, and creating value for shareholders, employees, and other stakeholders.
- Stakeholder Engagement: Engaging with stakeholders, including employees, customers, suppliers, and communities, is crucial for understanding their concerns and incorporating their perspectives into decision-making processes. This helps build trust and foster a collaborative approach to sustainability.
- Ethical Governance: Sustainable organizations prioritize ethical behavior and transparent governance. This involves adhering to ethical business practices, maintaining accountability, and ensuring that decision-making processes are fair and just.
- Innovation and Continuous Improvement: Sustainable organizations embrace innovation to develop new products, services, and processes that are environmentally friendly and socially responsible. They also commit to continuous improvement by regularly assessing and refining their sustainability initiatives.
- Reporting and Transparency: Transparent reporting on sustainability performance is becoming increasingly important. Many organizations publish sustainability reports to communicate their goals, progress, and impacts, providing stakeholders with a clear understanding of the organization's commitment to sustainability.
- Having all the definitions above under consideration and all different authors' perspectives it is not bold to assume that sustainability is a multifaced concept that is directly related to the very core of the organizations and their respective different dimensions, and it is a critical need for organizations to balance the economic, environmental, and social dimension to ensure long-term. To fulfill balance, it is essential that organizations integrate the principles of sustainability into their operations and decision-making processes. This is not only translated on an operational level but also in an organization´s culture level as this also involves equipping employees with the knowledge and skills necessary to support sustainability initiatives. (Kuzma et al. (2017)

After the implementation of said culture, it is also important the management of the same as Sustainability necessitates continuous learning and adaptation. As organizations and operations change through the year, so does Sustainability as discipline. Organizations must not only adopt sustainable practices but also remain agile in responding to evolving sustainability challenges to transform sustainability in an ongoing campaign. (Feeney et al. ,2023).

Although this case study is based on a large company, that does not mean that most companies are the same size as Company X. However Organizational sustainability is also present in Small and Medium-sized Enterprises. The choice of a large company on this case of study is based on the fac that the SME's face unique difficulties in adopting sustainable measures often due the resource constraints and limited experience and since these measures are not relevant to the case study itself, it is important to have in consideration that impacts of sustainable development on organizations EVP is not correlated with the size of enterprises(Martins et al.,2022).

Adopting sustainable practices not only helps organizations contribute to a more sustainable world but also enhances their reputation, attracts environmentally and socially conscious customers, and fosters employee engagement. It is a strategic imperative that aligns business objectives with broader societal and environmental goals(McGuinn, 2020).

To conclude this topic on organizational sustainability it is important to have under consideration a study of firms listed in the Corporate Sustainability Index that concluded that organizations that prioritize sustainable measures usually out form their peers, constituting itself, as an indicator that sustainability does not only provide moral advantages but also provides performance advantages(Batista et al.2018).

As sustainability continues to shape organizational strategies, it creates a foundation of trust and ethical commitment that enhances an organization's reputation. This bridge of credibility, built on sustainable practices, leads us naturally to the topic of employer branding, where the values a company upholds become crucial for attracting and retaining talent. Employer branding leverages an organization's commitment to sustainability, positioning it as an employer of choice for individuals seeking purpose-driven workplaces.

2.2 Employer Branding

The concept of "Employer Branding," first defined in the mid-1990s, pertains to an organization's reputation as an employer, distinct from its overall corporate brand reputation (Mosley, 2015). According to Ambler and Barrow (1996), the Employer Brand represents "the package of functional, economic, and psychological benefits provided by employment and associated with the employer" (p. 187). This definition emphasizes the internal perspective of employer branding, focusing on the benefits offered to employees and how these benefits contribute to the company's recognition among its workforces.

Extending this perspective, Mossevelde (2014) views employer branding as a process that promotes a company as the best choice for a specific group of people that the company aims to retain and recruit. This process enhances the company's ability to attract, recruit, and retain ideal employees, thereby addressing both internal retention and external recruitment needs.

The competitive advantage of a brand is often underpinned by its defined culture, which aligns with the values of its employees and their commitment to delivering the brand's values. Recruitment policies should reflect the alignment between the team's values and those of the brand (Chernatony, 2010). Effective leaders play a crucial role

in shaping and aligning employees' stories with a common vision, thereby reinforcing the brand's culture (Neumeier, 2009). Chernatony (2010) highlights that successful leaders strive to cultivate a unique culture that attracts employees who believe in the brand and are motivated to contribute to its promise.

Moreover, the creation of a brand's culture is closely tied to its purpose, which is the aspirational reason for the organization's existence beyond mere profit (Davis, 2016). A compelling purpose connects individuals with shared beliefs to companies where they can make a significant impact (Hurst et al. 2016). Davis (2016) asserts that employees seek to work for companies with a core purpose that resonates with their values and allows them to be part of something larger than their job. The purpose is crucial for companies as it inspires the work environment, empowers purpose-driven employees, and integrates purpose into the brand. Organizations that embed purpose into their hiring, retention, and organizational strategies are expected to lead in the future (Davis, 2016).

In conclusion, employer branding encompasses more than just offering functional benefits, such as competitive salaries. It includes an aspirational element—purpose—that links companies and individuals with shared goals and beliefs, fostering a deeper connection between the employer and its employees.

This connection is vital in an era where employees seek meaningful work and a sense of belonging within their companies. This leads us naturally to the concept of the Employee Value Proposition (EVP), which serves as the foundation for building a compelling employer brand. The EVP crystallizes the unique offerings and cultural aspects that attract, engage, and retain talent, anchoring the relationship between employees and the organization in mutual value and purpose.

2.3 What does EVP (Employer Value Proposition) stand for?

"If a person’s job was to promote their company's job positions, what would their marketing strategy be? Of course, it would be to announce the perks and advantages of the company, like for instance the salary or the good environment as every organization wants to have the best talents and as so must announce their best advantages. Having this so we can consider that EVP is the full array of elements that organizations trade for the contributions provided by the employees. EVP in a way, it is everything that matters for the employee, the things they brag about the company on a Sunday’s dinner with their friends and family and directly linked to the internal marketing and branding of the company(Goswami ,2022)

Although it is not formal, the EVP constitutes itself as a package for organizations. It can be categorized as a reward or payment. However, the benefits pack such as flexible work arrangements, wellness programs, discounts, and others, they all belong in the EVP together with their monthly paycheck. (Goswami ,2022).

An EVP is the sum of everything that people in an organization experience and receive; from the intrinsic satisfaction of the work to the environment, leadership, colleagues, remuneration and so forth (De Angelis ,2004) (Ruebusch ,2002) adds that organizations keeping good talent deliver an EVP that satisfies people's expectations of a healthy and happy workplace. (Goswami,2022).

Adding to the previously explained, it is necessary to highlight that the EVP's role extends to the "package of perks" and Human Resources (HR) techniques. A company´s EVP constitutes itself as an organization's brand and image. It is correlated with their internal marketing and an organization who adopts a strong EVP can "sell" to their employees for less and remain competitive in the global market. (Pawar et al.,2015). Also, as an extension of an EVP being the brand and image, a well drafted EVP can impact directly on the organization's reputation internally and externally. (Pawar et al. ,2015).

As previously stated, this dissertation intends to study the impacts of Sustainability on the EVP and as such, it is important to understand the definition and importance of this metric.

The EVP, or Employer Value Proposition, is a crucial concept in the realm of human resources and organizational management. It represents the unique set of benefits and rewards that an organization offers to its employees in exchange for their skills, capabilities, and commitment. Essentially, the EVP encapsulates the value that employees perceive they receive from their employment experience(Behrends et al. ,2020)

The context of EVP is deeply rooted in the evolving dynamics of the modern workplace, where attracting, engaging, and retaining top talent has become a strategic priority for organizations. In a competitive job market, companies recognize the need to go beyond traditional salary and benefits to create a compelling and distinctive proposition for their employees.(Behrends et al. (2020)

And as such the EVP can be divided into five different metrics that will be used further in our study to evaluate the impacts. These metrics are:

- Compensation
- Benefits
- Career development
- Work environment.
- Organizational culture

Now that the EVP is defined it raises an important question: What are the benefits of a good EVP? EVP has been proven crucial to attracting, hiring, and retaining the best employees as all employees search for the best return in trade for their contributions to the organization. An EVP is how the organization's itself sells to their employees, and if the product is not good enough the best employees will just buy a different product with their contribution's credit.

Organizations with effective EVP's also have high levels of engagement from their employees as they are satisfied with their "trade", and this organization also can spend less on their compensation premiums as the employees already receive a good "trade" for their contributions. Also, non-monetary intangible compensation helps to maintain the employees comfortable and motivated within the organization (Goswami (2022).

Said so we can conclude that a good EVP helps to attract employees and get more dedication and commitment from them. It also reduces the retention cost and can be used as a motivational tool (Goswami, (2022).

Taking the above into consideration we can conclude that all organizations should make their efforts to have the best internal marketing and create the best EVP possible, which leads us to the next question: How to create a good EVP?

An EVP is about defining the organization's needs and what the organization can provide in exchange for its needs. To do so, an organization should understand the existing perceptions within their own staff, to realize what they think about the organization´s brand and culture. This information can be raised in internal inquiry and exit interviews for instance (Goswami, 2022)

After having this information compiled it is easy to understand what employees want in exchange for their contributions and the organization can start to draft the EVP. To do this, the organization should have into account if the needs of the employes are aligned with their strategic objectives, company´s principles and if it appeals to an overall group of employees. Then it should draft an EVP based on the needs aligned with the previous points and replace the others that do not meet them with new ones, that attends to other needs of the employees and organizations' (Goswami,2022).

After having an effective EVP, the organization should use creative and relevant ways to communicate with their own employees and the ones the organization is trying to attract using the appropriate channels as company websites, advertising, and others, always having into consideration that the employee's feedback about the company's brand is the best way to correctly communicate the attractiveness of the organization (Goswami, 2022).

To conclude this topic, we can express that the effective development and communication of EVP helps organizations attract top talent, increase employee engagement, and reduce turnover. It also serves as a tool for employer branding, distinguishing an organization as an employer of choice in the eyes of prospective and current employees. As the workforce landscape evolves, EVP continues to play a pivotal role in shaping the employer-employee relationship and organizational success.(Zhang et al.,2021).

This underscores the importance of the relationship between EVP and sustainability. Aligning these two dimensions not only enhances the organization's appeal but also solidifies its commitment to responsible and lasting practices. This synergy signals to employees and candidates that the organization values long-term impact, ethical responsibility, and social contribution, thus reinforcing a purposeful and attractive employer brand.

2.4 Relation between EVP and Sustainability

Having discussed the benefits of an effective EVP and sustainability above it is now important to discuss the relationship between them, as this dissertation proposes itself to study the impacts of sustainability in employee´s EVP to confirm or disprove if building an EVP based on sustainable measures is the best approach for organization's success.

To draft a sustainable EVP, it is crucial to align the employee's needs with the organization's sustainability goals (Pawar et al.,2023).

In current days, aligning the employees' needs with the organization sustainability measures is known as Green Human Resource Management.

Green Human Resources Measures (HRM) practices are the core of sustainable initiatives. These practices can align organizations' green goals with HRM functions as recruitment, training, and performance management, allowing it to increase organizational performance and aiding to fulfill the green goals of organization simultaneously.(Kuo et al., 2022).

A study on effectiveness of Green HRM was conducted based on a systematic literature review, which showed that Green HRM benefits includes improved environmental performance, cost savings, and enhanced corporate image (Kuo et al., 2022). In the same study we can check based on a different article of the systematic literature review that Green HRM can lead also to non-material benefits such as a better environmental performance which translates itself in an improved company's reputation and company´s branding(Benevene et al.,2020).

Another benefit from Green HRM is employee engagement. Employees which understand the purpose of theirs and organization's CSR are more likely to participate in green initiatives and are also more committed and loyal to the organization. (Cunha et al.,2022).

As mentioned before, a well drafted EVP has a direct influence on employee's loyalty. A Sustainable EVP strategy translates itself to its employees' well-being, imputing a sense of loyalty on the employees who are aligned with organization culture and values (Ng et al.,2019).

Adopting loyalty and sustainability into the talent retention technique is a key piece which blends talent management with EVP drafting which adds an improved talent retention and employee satisfaction to the benefits discussed above.

Sustainable EVP practices align with organizational values and long-term objectives, fostering a culture of commitment to sustainability (Tajuddin et al.,2015).

The available literature underscores the pivotal role played by employees within organizations in fostering sustainability initiatives. Consequently, it is apparent that organizations must grasp the perspectives of their employees regarding sustainability to assess current practices and facilitate ongoing enhancements. Despite this imperative, scant attention has been devoted to investigating the individual perceptions of employees regarding organizational sustainability.(Balasubramanian et al.,2022).

To conclude that we can say that Employees play a crucial role in organizational sustainability. Therefore, understanding their perceptions is essential. Research has shown that views on sustainability and development vary across different types of organizations. (Balasubramanian et al.,2022).

Although employees play a crucial role in the context described above, we cannot ignore the role of the organization leadership on the matter. Leaders who can communicate and motivate their subordinates towards organizations' CSR can drastically improve organizations' efforts in aligning their sustainable goals with employee's needs. Leading by example and motivating words from managers can improve relationships between employees and their commitment to sustainable measures applied by the organization(Zhang et al.,2021)

In summary, sustainability in organizational contexts encompasses the integration of sustainability principles, continuous learning and adaptation, the role of Green HRM, empirical evidence supporting sustainable HRM practices, sustainability's

applicability across diverse organizational settings, the importance of employee engagement, leadership's impact, and the benefits of corporate sustainability practices. These facets collectively illuminate the profound influence of sustainability within organizations and underscore its relevance across various dimensions of management and operations.

The connection between Employee Value Proposition (EVP) and sustainability is intricate and profound. A sustainable EVP strategy transcends conventional HR practices; it aligns with organizational values, involves employees in sustainability efforts, bolsters brand reputation, attracts talent that shares sustainability objectives, and cultivates employee loyalty. Businesses that acknowledge the interplay between EVP and sustainability are better poised for long-term success, both in terms of talent retention and their dedication to environmental and social stewardship. These findings underscore the significance of embedding sustainability principles at the core of EVP strategies for a sustainable and thriving future(Zhang et al.,2021)

3 Methodology

3.1 Research Approach

In this chapter, we present the primary Data employed in our research, which aims to explore the objectives outlined in the previous chapters through a comprehensive approach. The methodology is designed to provide a structured framework for understanding the research process, which includes an introduction, a review of relevant literature, and a detailed examination of data collection and analysis techniques.

The chapter begins with an introduction to the research approach, setting the stage for the methodological choices made throughout the study. We provide a detailed review of the literature on sustainability in organizations, focusing on how sustainability practices are integrated into organizational strategies and their impact on various aspects of organizational performance. This review includes an examination of the Employer Value Proposition (EVP), internal branding, and the relationship between EVP and sustainability, offering a theoretical foundation for the study.

Following the literature review, we delve into the case study of Company X. This case study is pivotal in understanding how sustainability practices and EVP are implemented in a real-world context. By analyzing Company X's approach to sustainability and internal branding, we aim to gain insights into the practical applications of these concepts and their effects on organizational performance.

The data gathering and analysis section outlines the methods used to collect and analyze data relevant to the study. Data collection was conducted using a questionnaire on the Company X employees. The design of the questionary instruments and the protocols for conducting interviews with key stakeholders within Company X are detailed, providing clarity on how data was obtained. In the data analysis segment, we explain the analytical methods employed to process and interpret the collected data. The approach uses quantitative techniques, as well as the analytical frameworks and tools used to derive meaningful conclusions.

Our methodology chapter further elaborates on the research design and approach. The research strategy involves the use of case studies and mixed methods, with a rationale provided for choosing these methods. The section on data collection techniques details the specific methods used, including the development of survey instruments and interview protocols, while the data analysis techniques section describes how the data was processed and interpreted.

After the treatment of data an Exploratory Factorial Analysis and assumptions checking will be performed to validate the used scales and after this validation and the construction of factors, a set of tests composed of Linear Regressions will be performed to test the hypothesis defined in chapter 4.2. The quantitative analysis section includes statistical results and their interpretation using the Jamovi software. (Attachment A has the results from Jamovi).

The chapter concludes with a discussion of the study's findings in the conclusion and critical opinion section. Here, we reflect on the implications of the results for theory and practice, evaluating the study's contributions and its relevance to the field. This is followed by a section on the limitations of the study, addressing the constraints encountered during the research process, including those related to data collection, analysis, and generalizability.

Finally, the bibliography provides a comprehensive list of all references cited throughout the study, ensuring proper attribution to the sources that supported the research.

3.2 Research Hypothesis

Next, the theoretical framework will be presented (Table 1), which shows the variables in the previously mentioned conceptual model. Along with the model's variables, the associated concepts and the authors who support these concepts will be outlined. This aims to assist the reader in understanding and interpreting the model and the hypotheses defined in the following section.

Table 1 - Sources of Questionary

Sources of Questionary	
Demographic Questions	**Authors**
Sample characterization	Made by author
Organizational Sustainability Scale	**Authors**
Environmental Management Sustainability	Choon et al.. (2011); Bruff and Wood (2000)
Employee Related Sustainability	Cassidy (2003); Norton et al.. (2014)
Public Related Sustainability	Dola and Mohd Noor (2012); Harris and Crane (2002)
Financial Sustainability	Collins et al.. (2007); Epstein (2015)
Pollution Control Measures	Sauvé et al.. (2016); Sallis et al.. (2016)
Governance Sustainability	Adams and McNicholas (2007); Sisaye (2011)
EVP Scale	**Authors**
Brand Consistent Behavior	King, Grace, and Funk (2011)
Brand Endorsement	Mosley (2015); Keller (1993)
Brand Allegiance	Chernatony (2010); Keller (1993)

Also, the formulation of hypotheses is crucial for conducting studies with order and rigor, providing a solid foundation for the research and a rigorous criterion for data collection. These hypotheses guide the study in seeking answers and establish a direction that tests the assumptions against reality (Quivy & Campenhoudt, 2019). Thus, hypotheses are essential for testing the conceptual model of analysis, serving as general statements of the relationships between dependent and independent variables or between represented concepts. Therefore, constructing hypotheses allows for a logical and clear definition of the expected relationships between the variables in the model (Oliveira & Ferreira, 2014).

In the current context, the adoption of sustainability strategies has been recognized as a significant factor that can impact various aspects of an organization. These strategies not only promote better environmental and social management but also

directly influence several elements of the work environment and organizational culture. The following hypotheses explore these influences:

1. **H1: The adoption of sustainability strategies has a positive impact on employee compensation**. Integrating sustainable practices may lead to a reassessment of compensation packages, reflecting the added value to the organization through sustainability.

2. **H2: The adoption of sustainability strategies has a positive impact on the benefits offered to employees**. Companies that implement sustainable strategies often expand their benefits to align with their ethical and environmental practices, enhancing employee satisfaction.

3. **H3: The adoption of sustainability strategies has a positive impact on employee career development**. Sustainability strategies can open new opportunities for professional growth and career advancement, providing employees with a sense of purpose and alignment with the company's mission.

4. **H4: The adoption of sustainability strategies has a positive impact on the work environment**. Sustainable practices tend to create a healthier and safer work environment, improving employee well-being and fostering a positive organizational culture.

5. **H5: The adoption of sustainability strategies has a positive impact on organizational culture.** Sustainability can strengthen organizational culture by promoting shared values and commitment to social and environmental responsibility.

These hypotheses serve as a guide for investigating the effects of sustainability on various dimensions of the organization, providing a comprehensive view of how the integration of sustainable practices can influence compensation, benefits, career development, work environment, and organizational culture.

3.3 Data collection instrument

To be possible for this dissertation to assert the impacts that these presented sustainability measures had on the EVP of company X employees, a questionary to the company X was necessary.

The questionnaire used in the study consists of three main parts:

Demographic Questions: These questions were developed by the author of the study to gain deeper insights into the characteristics of the sample. Demographic questions typically include items like age, gender, educational background, job position, years of experience, and other relevant personal or professional data.

Organizational Sustainability Measures Scale: This scale is designed to measure how employees perceive the sustainability practices within their organization. Employees responses to this scale provide a view of how sustainable they perceive their organization.

EVP (Employee Value Proposition) Scale: This scale is used to assess the perceived value that employees receive from their employer. The EVP scale measures how well the organization fulfills its promises and provides value to its employees.

The goal is to check the answers from employees and test the impact that one scale has on the other using a Linear Regression calculated by Jamovi.

The data collection techniques selected for the study, based on the outlined methodology and research objectives. It is essential to note that this investigation employs only quantitative techniques.

The focus is on obtaining a comprehensive quantitative perspective from employees at Company X to analyze the impact of sustainability practices and the Employer Value Proposition (EVP). By utilizing a structured questionnaire, the study aims to gather standardized and statistically analyzable data that directly addresses the research objectives.

The questionnaire was employed as the primary data collection method to gather quantitative data from employees at Company X. The questionnaire was meticulously designed to measure employees' perceptions of the company's sustainability practices and its Employer Value Proposition (EVP). Utilizing a Likert scale, the questionnaire included a series of closed-ended questions that quantified employees' levels of agreement or satisfaction regarding various aspects of sustainability and EVP. This approach enabled the collection of standardized responses, which were essential for statistical analysis and comparing results across different employee groups.

The questionnaire was administered electronically, with an initial email invitation followed by a reminder to encourage participation. The electronic format facilitated efficient data collection and allowed for real-time tracking of response rates. Data collected over a two-week period was exported into statistical software for analysis, providing a robust dataset that supported a comprehensive evaluation of the impact of sustainability practices and EVP on employee satisfaction. This quantitative approach ensured that the research objectives were addressed systematically and that the findings were reliable and actionable.

The questionary is initially composed by 4 questions of multiple choice made by author to assess the relationship between the employee and company X, being:

Table 2 - Relationship between the employee and Company X Characterization Questions

Question	Options
1. How many years have you been working at the company?	Less than 1 year
	1 - 3 years
	4 - 6 years
	7 - 10 years
	More than 10 years
2. What is your job level within the company?	Intern
	Junior
	Middle
	Senior
	Team Leader
	Manager
3. What is your work experience within the industry?	Less than 1 year
	1 - 3 years
	4 - 6 years
	7 - 10 years
	More than 10 years
4. What is your location of work?	On-site
	Remote
	Hybrid

Following the questions above we introduced the ones present on the used in article "Organizational sustainability scale measuring employees' perception on sustainability of organization "by Nataraj Balasubramanian and M. Balaji. However, on this scale three new sentences were added (marked in green at table 3):

On the article where the scale was used, the focus was to evaluate certain prisms of sustainability while our goal is to check the impacts of this scale on EVP Scale (Table 4). Having done so and to fulfill our goal, those three sentences were added in order to better establish a connection with the EVP metrics that we intend to test in the hypothesis defined in this dissertation. For the. To this study this scale was named "Q" and each item numbered as Q plus the position in the questionary.

The goal is to assess via employee point of view, how sustainable they think the company X is, using a scale of 1 to 5 (having 1 as Totally disagree; 2- Disagree; 3 - Neutral; 4 - Agree and 5 as Totally agree) on the following sentences:

Table 3 - Questions of the Sustainability Measures Scale

Question present in Scale of Sustainability Measures	Question Number	Classification
My organization has optimal plans for constant revenue generation over foreseeable number of years	Q1	Original
My organization is financially strong to withstand economic uncertainties	Q2	Original
My organization has scope of making profit for the next five years	Q3	Original
My organization has intention to reinvest its profit for its growth	Q4	Original
My organization uses its financial sustainability to maintain competitive salaries	Q5	Added
My organization uses its financial sustainability to provide benefits for employees	Q6	Added
My organization provides optimal job security to its employees	Q7	Original
I can enjoy optimal work-life balance while serving my organization	Q8	Original
My organization supports good and sustainable career development.	Q9	Original
My organization supports training and development of staff	Q10	Original
My organization provides safety norms and training for its staff members	Q11	Original
My organization supports opinions and views for improvement from all levels of employees	Q12	Original
My organization is providing optimal air quality assurance	Q13	Original
My organization has an appropriate water recycling system	Q14	Original
My organization encourages the use of cycling, walking, or public transport to keep the air clean	Q15	Original
My organization has an adequate ventilation system that helps with air quality assurance	Q16	Original
My organization is thoughtful about sustainable development in the maximum possible ways	Q17	Original
My organization has a proper solid waste management system	Q18	Original
My organization has a proper electronic waste management system	Q19	Original
My organization is not polluting nature	Q20	Original
My organization has an appropriate recycling system for paper, plastic, glass, and other waste	Q21	Original
My organization supports gender equality	Q22	Original
My organization supports creativity and innovation	Q23	Original
My organization has clear alignment with its policies and vision	Q24	Original
My organization is investing in the right policies for future growth	Q25	Original
My organization helps to protect human rights in the maximum possible ways	Q26	Original
My organization supports public safety and security	Q27	Original
My organization helps in supporting the local culture	Q28	Original
My organization is supporting the local economy	Q29	Original

Following the sentences above we introduced the ones presented in the scale EBE (Employee Brand Equity) developed and validated by Ceridwyn King, Debra Grace e Daniel C. Funk. Similarly to the previous scale the following sentences were added (marked at green on table 4):

- I believe I am fairly compensated for my work.
- My organization offers regular performance bonuses or incentives for exceptional work.
- I think my company's benefits are competitive.
- My organization provides comprehensive health and wellness programs for employees
- I believe that my work environment is exemplary.
- I feel like I can have good career progress in my company.
- I identify myself with my company culture.
- I think that the green budgets that my company gives me are good and useful

The goal of the use of this scale is to assess, from the point of view of the employees, how they feel about their reward from Company X. Having so, and since we intend to check each metric of EVP individually this added sentence will help us to establish a better relationship between items to group them by the EVP metric. For this study this scale was named "X" and each item numbered as X plus the position in the questionary.

using a scale of 1 to 5 (having 1 as Totally disagree; 2- Disagree; 3 - Neutral; 4 - Agree and 5 as Totally agree) on the following sentences:

Table 4 - Questions of the EVP Scale

Question present in Scale of EVP	Question Number	Classification
I believe I am fairly compensated for my work.	X1	Added
I would turn down an offer from another organization (brand) if it came tomorrow.	X2	Original
My organization offers regular performance bonuses or incentives for exceptional work.	X3	Added
I think my company's benefits are competitive.	X4	Added
My organization provides comprehensive health and wellness programs for employees.	X5	Added
I am always interested to learn about my organization's brand and what it means to me in my role.	X6	Original
I consider the impact on my organization's brand and what it means to me in my role.	X7	Original
I believe that my work environment is exemplary.	X8	Added
I feel like I can have good career progress in my company.	X9	Added
I plan to be with the organization (brand) I work for, for a while.	X10	Original
I plan to be with the organization (brand) I work for, 5 years from now.	X11	Original
I demonstrate behaviors that are consistent with the brand promise of the organization I work for.	X12	Original
I identify myself with my company culture.	X13	Added
I say positive things about the organization (brand) I work for to others.	X14	Original
I would recommend the organization (brand) I work for to someone who seeks my advice.	X15	Original
I enjoy talking about the organization (brand) I work for to others.	X16	Original
I talk positively about the organization (brand) I work for to others.	X17	Original
I think that the green budgets that my company gives me are good and useful	X18	Added

At the end of the questionnaire, a series of multiple-choice demographic questions, designed by the author, were included to gather essential information for characterizing the sample. These questions aim to provide insights into the participants' backgrounds, such as age, gender, educational level, job position, years of experience, and possibly other relevant demographic factors.

Table 5 - Demographic Question

Question	Options
7. How old are you?	Under 25 years
	25 - 34 years
	35 - 44 years
	45 - 54 years
	55 - 64 years
	65 years or older
8. What is your gender?	Male
	Female
	Other
	Prefer not to say
9. What is your education level?	Bachelor's degree
	Master's degree
	Doctorate
	Other (please specify) _____
10. What is your marital status?	Single
	Married / In a domestic partnership
	Divorced
	Widowed
	Other
11. Please insert your nationality:	Portuguese
	Brazilian
	British
	American
	French
	Spanish
	Other

3.4 Population and Sample

The population for this study consists of employees from the Financial Department at Company X in Portugal. Company X employs almost 1,000 people in its Financial Department, encompassing a wide range of roles and specializations within finance, operations, and technology.

The sample selected for this study comprises 306 employees from the Financial Department of Company X, representing a substantial portion of the department's total workforce. All participants are employees from the Financial Department, selected without discrimination or filtering based on hierarchy, gender, nationality, or any other

demographic criteria. This inclusivity was essential to ensure that the findings reflect a broad range of perspectives and experiences within the department.

The sampling method employed was convenience sampling, as the survey was distributed through Company X's internal social network platform. This platform provided an efficient and accessible way to reach employees within the Financial Department and facilitated a broad and varied response base. By disseminating the survey on the company's internal network, employees could voluntarily participate at their convenience, without any selection bias or requirement to participate.

Using this approach, the survey reached a sample based on employees' voluntary responses rather than a randomized or stratified selection method. Convenience sampling was suitable for this study's objectives, as it allowed rapid data collection within a specific department and enabled a range of insights relevant to the Financial Department's unique structure and dynamics.

The convenience sampling approach was chosen primarily for its practicality and efficiency in reaching a sizable, varied portion of the Financial Department's population. Given the large number of potential respondents and the study's focus on understanding department-wide perspectives, using the internal social network was a strategic choice that facilitated broader reach and accessibility, while allowing for an inclusive response from employees across the department.

4 The case study of Company X

4.1 Company X - Background

Company X is a prominent global financial services provider, specializing in asset management and insurance solutions with a strong commitment to sustainability.

With a strong presence in over 38 countries worldwide, the company operates across financial markets, asset management, insurance, and corporate financing. Globally, Company X employs approximately 17,000 people, who help deliver innovative financial solutions and services to clients across various sectors.

In Portugal, Company X has established one of its main technology and operational service centers, with over 2.000 employees working across areas such as software development, data analysis, and risk management. This center is one of the largest outsides of France and continues to grow, reinforcing its position as a benchmark in technology and innovation within the financial sector.

The Financial Department in Portugal plays a crucial role in the financial services landscape, offering expertise across various aspects of financial and investment solutions. Operating as part of a larger financial group, the Portuguese division focuses on supporting both local and international clients through innovative financial services and operational support.

In Portugal, the Financial Department employs almost 1,000 people across several areas, including finance, operations, and technology. The Portuguese team has grown significantly in recent years, reflecting the company's strategic focus on expanding its presence in Europe, with Portugal serving as an essential hub for delivering high-quality services and enhancing operational efficiencies within the company.

It is within these departments that this dissertation will focus its study by delivering a survey to their employees to obtain their feedback on alignment between Company X and their HR practices and sustainability measures.

*As a non-disclosure agreement was signed, we are not able to provide the source of these information as it comes from internal documents from Company X

4.2 Company X alignment between HR practices and sustainability

Consistently aiming to drive innovation and growth within the financial sector, Company X adheres to the highest standards of corporate responsibility and ethical conduct. The company actively promotes environmentally responsible investments and practices, integrating sustainability into its core operations. By championing

sustainable finance, Company X not only supports the transition to a greener economy but also enhances long-term value creation for its clients and stakeholders.

At Company X, sustainability is a core value that extends to its employees, fostering a culture of responsibility and environmental stewardship within the workplace. The company actively encourages its staff to engage in sustainable practices both professionally and personally. Initiatives such as energy conservation programs, waste reduction campaigns, and the promotion of sustainable commuting options are integral to Company X 's efforts to minimize its environmental footprint. Employees are provided with resources and training to understand and implement these practices effectively, ensuring that sustainability is a shared responsibility across the organization.

In addition to environmental sustainability, Company X places a strong emphasis on social sustainability, promoting diversity, equity, and inclusion within its workforce. The company recognizes that a diverse and inclusive environment drives innovation and enhances decision-making. To this end, Company X implements policies and programs aimed at ensuring equal opportunities for all employees, regardless of their background. This commitment to social sustainability is reflected in various employee resource groups, mentorship programs, and continuous professional development opportunities that support the growth and well-being of every staff member.

Moreover, Company X encourages its employees to participate in community service and volunteer initiatives, reinforcing the importance of social responsibility. The company collaborates with local organizations and charities to facilitate employee engagement in projects that benefit the broader community. These efforts not only contribute to social welfare but also foster a sense of purpose and fulfillment among employees. By integrating sustainability into its corporate culture and empowering its workforce to make a positive impact, Company X demonstrates its dedication to building a sustainable future for both its employees and the wider community.

In conclusion, Company X 's dedication to sustainability among its employees underscores the company's holistic approach to responsible business practices. By fostering an environmentally conscious and socially inclusive work culture, Company X ensures that its staff are not only aware of sustainability issues but are also active participants in addressing them. This internal commitment is a critical component of the broader sustainability strategy that drives the company's operations and community interactions.

Building on this foundation, the next chapter will delve into the specific sustainable measures implemented by Company X. These initiatives encompass various aspects of the company's operations, highlighting its innovative approaches to reducing environmental impact, enhancing social responsibility, and promoting sustainable growth. Through a detailed exploration of these measures, we will gain a comprehensive understanding of how Company X integrates sustainability into its core business practices.

*As a non-disclosure agreement was signed, we are not able to provide the source of these information as it comes from internal documents from Company X

4.3 General Company X ´s Sustainable measures – Macro Vision

Company X is committed to integrating sustainability into its core business operations and strategy. Through the years, the company has addressed environmental, social, and governance (ESG) challenges while fostering long-term value creation for its clients, stakeholders, and the broader community. On bellow list we have the twenty keys sustainability measures implemented by Company X all its branch's worldwide to promote sustainable development and responsible business practices:

Green Weighting Factor: An internal capital allocation mechanism that adjusts the capital charges of lending activities based on the environmental impact of the underlying assets.

Sustainable Bonds and Loans: Issuance and management of green bonds, social bonds, and sustainability-linked loans to fund projects with positive environmental and social impacts.

Climate Change Strategy: Commitment to align activities with the goals of the Paris Agreement, including reducing exposure to carbon-intensive sectors and supporting clients in their low-carbon transition.

ESG Integration: Integration of Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) criteria into investment and risk management processes.

SDGs Alignment: Aligning activities with the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), focusing on climate action, clean energy, and sustainable cities.

Carbon Neutrality: Commitment to achieving carbon neutrality in operations through reducing emissions, improving energy efficiency, and offsetting unavoidable emissions.

Responsible Investment: Offering a range of responsible investment products that integrate ESG criteria and focus on long-term value creation.

Partnerships and Initiatives: Collaboration with industry groups and sustainability-focused organizations to promote sustainable finance.

Employee Engagement and Education: Providing training and resources to employees to raise awareness and promote sustainable practices within the company.

Transparency and Reporting: Commitment to transparent reporting on sustainability performance, including regular sustainability reports.

Renewable Energy Investments: Investment in renewable energy projects such as wind, solar, and hydroelectric power.

Energy Efficiency Programs: Implementation of energy efficiency programs in company operations and facilities.

Sustainable Supply Chain Management: Ensuring that suppliers and business partners adhere to sustainability and ethical standards.

Waste Reduction Initiatives: Programs to reduce waste and promote recycling within company operations.

Sustainable Product Development: Developing financial products and services that support sustainable development and responsible consumption.

Biodiversity Conservation: Initiatives to protect and conserve biodiversity in areas where the company operates.

Community Investment: Investing in community projects that promote social and environmental well-being.

Sustainable Transportation: Encouraging the use of sustainable transportation options for employees and operations.

Water Conservation: Implementing measures to reduce water usage and promote water conservation in company operations.

Circular Economy Practices: Adopting circular economy principles to minimize waste and maximize resource efficiency.

In implementing these sustainability measures, Company X reaffirms its dedication to responsible business practices and its role in fostering a sustainable future. These initiatives demonstrate a comprehensive approach to ESG commitments, positively impacting the environment, supporting societal progress, and ensuring long-term resilience across all areas of operation.

*As a non-disclosure agreement was signed, we are not able to provide the source of these information as it comes from internal documents from Company X

4.4 General Company X ´s Sustainable measures – Micro approach

In this section, we will delve into the sustainable measures implemented by Company X at a micro level, focusing specifically on the initiatives undertaken by the Porto branch, as was on this branch that this dissertation will focus. By examining these localized efforts, we can gain a deeper understanding of how Company X's overarching sustainability strategy is translated into concrete actions at the branch level. The Porto branch serves as a prime example of how targeted sustainability practices can drive positive environmental and social impacts within a specific community, aligning with the company's broader commitment to sustainable development.

To provide a better understanding on the commitment that Company X has with sustainability and within their employees we gathered fifty key measures, applied by Company X on a micro level, directly affecting their employees:

- **Green Budget allocation**: Designated funds for environmentally friendly projects and initiatives within the company.
- **Transportation Subsidies for Green Vehicles**: Financial support for employees using electric or hybrid vehicles.

- **Green Vouchers for Eco-Friendly Products**: Vouchers that employees can use to purchase sustainable goods.
- **Green Saving Plans**: Financial saving plans that include benefits for investing in green projects or products.
- **Award for Sustainable New Ideas**: Recognition and rewards for innovative ideas that promote sustainability.
- **Carbon Offset Contributions**: Company-provided offsets to neutralize the carbon footprint of employee activities.
- **Sustainability Bonus**: Performance bonuses linked to achieving specific sustainability targets.
- **Organic Meal Options**: Availability of organic food choices in the company cafeteria.
- **Green Gym Memberships**: Subsidized memberships to gyms that use sustainable practices.
- **Bike-to-Work Program**: Incentives for employees who commute by bicycle, including bike parking and maintenance.
- **Wellness Workshops**: Workshops focusing on health and wellness with an emphasis on sustainable living.
- **Green Package Vacation**: Eco-friendly vacation packages that promote sustainable tourism.
- **Eco-Friendly Commuting Subsidies**: Financial support for using public transportation or other green commuting options.
- **Green Home Office Equipment**: Discounts or subsidies for eco-friendly home office supplies and equipment.
- **Plant-Based Meal Options**: Providing plant-based meal alternatives to promote environmental sustainability.
- **Green Certifications Support**: Financial and educational support for obtaining environmental or sustainability certifications.
- **Mentorship Programs with Sustainability Experts**: Access to mentorship from experts in sustainability to guide career growth.
- **Sustainable Leadership Training**: Training programs aimed at developing leadership skills with a focus on sustainability.
- **Sports and Yoga Classes**: Offering sports and yoga classes to promote physical well-being and sustainable practices.
- **Walks and Outdoor Activities**: Organized outdoor activities that encourage physical fitness and connection with nature.
- **Valorization of Women in Sustainability Roles**: Promoting and supporting women in key sustainability positions within the organization.
- **Career Development Platform**: A platform providing resources and opportunities for career advancement in sustainability fields.
- **Garden Spaces**: On-site gardens that promote green space, biodiversity, and employee well-being.
- **Glass Tools**: Use of glass instead of plastic in office supplies to reduce waste.
- **Energy-Efficient LED Lighting**: Implementation of LED lighting to reduce energy consumption.
- **Sustainable Office Screens**: Use of eco-friendly materials for office screens and displays.
- **Green Furniture**: Office furniture made from sustainable materials and designed to minimize environmental impact.

- **Rainwater Harvesting Systems**: Systems to collect and reuse rainwater for landscaping and other uses.
- **Energy-Efficient Appliances**: Use of appliances that consume less energy to reduce the overall energy footprint.
- **Green Building Certification**: Achieving certifications such as LEED for sustainable building practices.
- **Green IT Policies**: Implementation of IT policies that reduce electronic waste and improve energy efficiency.
- **Sustainable Packaging Initiatives**: Use of eco-friendly packaging materials for products and internal supplies.
- **Paperless Office Practices**: Adoption of digital solutions to minimize paper usage and waste.
- **Eco-Friendly Building Maintenance**: Use of sustainable methods and materials in the maintenance of office buildings.
- **Sustainable Water Management**: Implementation of practices to conserve and manage water resources efficiently.
- **Sustainable Innovation Challenges**: Competitions to encourage innovative solutions for sustainability challenges.
- **Green Employee Resource Groups**: Formation of groups dedicated to promoting green practices and sustainability within the company.
- **Sustainability Ambassadors**: Designation of employees as ambassadors to advocate for and implement sustainability initiatives.
- **Eco-Friendly Office Supplies**: Use of office supplies that are recycled, recyclable, or made from sustainable materials.

Green Procurement **Policies**: Policies ensuring that purchased goods and services meet environmental standards.

- **Waste-Free Events**: Organizing events with goals to minimize waste using reusable or compostable materials.
- **Green Teams Volunteering**: Employee teams dedicated to volunteering for environmental projects and community service.
- **Green Programs (e.g., Beach Cleanups)**: Participation in or organization of programs focused on environmental conservation, such as beach cleanups.
- **Energy Conservation Goals**: Setting and working towards specific goals for reducing energy consumption.
- **Waste Reduction Goals**: Establishing targets and initiatives to minimize waste production.
- **Flexible Remote Work Policies**: Allowing flexible work arrangements to reduce commuting and associated environmental impacts.
- **Local and Sustainable Food Sourcing**: Sourcing food locally and sustainably to reduce carbon footprint and support local economies.
- **Community Sustainability Partnerships**: Partnerships with local organizations to support and promote community sustainability efforts.
- **Green Travel Policies**: Policies promoting sustainable travel options and reducing the environmental impact of business travel.
- **Employee-Driven Sustainability Projects**: Encouraging and supporting employee-led projects that contribute to the company's sustainability goals.

These micro-level initiatives highlight Company X's strong commitment to fostering a culture of sustainability among its employees. By embedding sustainable

practices in day-to-day operations and employee benefits, the Porto branch exemplifies how localized efforts can support the company's broader sustainability goals while positively impacting the community and promoting environmental responsibility.

*As a non-disclosure agreement was signed, we are not able to provide the source of these information as it comes from internal documents from Company X

4.5 Company X's EVP measures

As we have seen previously, the Employee Value Proposition (EVP) is a critical component for attracting, engaging, and retaining top talent within an organization. The EVP encapsulates the unique set of benefits an employee receives in return for the skills, capabilities, and experience they bring to a company. It serves as a powerful tool for building a strong employer brand and creating a compelling reason for employees to choose and stay with a company.

The EVP can be broken down into five key metrics: Compensation, Benefits, Career Development, Work Environment, Organizational culture.

Having the above in consideration, the board below filtrates the above measures by the metric of EVP that the measure in question has impact on:

Impacts of sustainability on the EVP of organizations – Case study Company X

Table 6 -Sustainable Measures practiced by Company's X ordered by EVP

EVP metric	Measure
Compensation	• Green Budget al.location • Transportation Subsidies for Green Vehicles • Green Vouchers for Eco-Friendly Products • Green Saving Plans • Award for Sustainable New Ideas • Carbon Offset Contributions • Sustainability Bonus
Benefits	• Organic Meal Options • Green Gym Memberships • Bike-to-Work Program • Wellness Workshops • Green Package Vacation • Eco-Friendly Commuting Subsidies • Green Home Office Equipment • Plant-Based Meal Options
Carrer Development	• Green Certifications Support • Mentorship Programs with Sustainability Experts • Sustainable Leadership Training • Sports and Yoga Classes • Walks and Outdoor Activities • Valorization of Women in Sustainability Roles • Career Development Platform
Work Environment	• Garden Spaces • Glass Tools • Energy-Efficient LED Lighting • Sustainable Office Screens • Green Furniture • Rainwater Harvesting Systems • Energy-Efficient Appliances • Green Building Certification • Green IT Policies • Sustainable Packaging Initiatives • Paperless Office Practices • Eco-Friendly Building Maintenance • Sustainable Water Management
Organization Culture	• Sustainable Innovation Challenges • Green Employee Resource Groups • Sustainability Ambassadors • Eco-Friendly Office Supplies • Green Procurement Policies • Waste-Free Events • Green Teams Volunteering • Green Programs (e.g., Beach Cleanups) • Energy Conservation Goals • Waste Reduction Goals • Flexible Remote Work Policies • Local and Sustainable Food Sourcing • Community Sustainability Partnerships • Green Travel Policies • Employee-Driven Sustainability Projects

As shown above these extensive sustainability measures reflect Company X's strong commitment to integrating eco-friendly practices throughout its operations. By addressing compensation, benefits, career development, and workplace environments, these initiatives not only enhance environmental stewardship but also foster a positive and sustainable organizational culture. This approach highlights the company's dedication to aligning with global sustainability goals and setting a high standard for responsible business practices.

*As a non-disclosure agreement was signed, we are not able to provide the source of these information as it comes from internal documents from Company X

5 Data Analysis and Samples characterization

In this chapter, we delve into the comprehensive analysis of the data collected through the administered questionnaire. The primary objective is to extract meaningful insights, draw valid conclusions, and address the research questions and objectives outlined in the preceding chapters.

The data analysis process commences with the encoding of gathered responses using appropriate software tools. Subsequently, a rigorous examination ensues, encompassing various statistical techniques tailored to the nature of the data and the study's objectives. Through this meticulous analysis, we aim to uncover patterns, relationships, and trends inherent within the dataset using this way, the data obtained to approve /disprove the hypothesis proposed by this dissertation.

On chapter 6.1 we will analyze the entire sample and proceed with a sample characterization. After this analysis, an EFA and assumption check (Descriptives) will be performed to validate both scales and check for correlations to build factors.

As a Confirmatory Factorial Analysis cannot be performed since the sample has only 306 items, we will proceed with a reliability Analysis to confirm the factors provided by EFA.

After this Analysis we will build the factors and having them ready on both scales to test the impacts that the Average of each factor of Scale Q (Sustainability Measures Scale) has on his respective factor of Scale X (EVP Scale)

5.1 Sample characterization

We obtained a total of 306 answers to the questionary. The answers to demographic questions can be found translated in the table below and in the Attachment, A presented below:

Variable	Category	Frequency (%)
Time at Company	Less than 1 year	9.30%
	1-3 years	24.20%
	4-7 years	24.20%
	7-10 years	26.30%
	More than 10 years	16.00%
Job Level	Intern	2.70%
	Junior	13.10%
	Mid-Level	29.80%
	Senior	42.90%
	Team Leader	8.50%
	Manager	3.00%
Work Location	On-site	0%
	Remote	0%
	Hybrid	100%
Age	Under 25 years	5.80%
	25-34 years	26.10%
	35-44 years	31.70%
	45-54 years	27.70%
	55 years or older	8.70%
Gender	Male	49.40%
	Female	27.70%
	Prefer not to say	23.90%
Education Level	Bachelor's Degree	25.90%
	Master's Degree	48.00%
	Ph.D.	26.10%
Marital Status	Single	30.70%
	Married / Domestic Partnership	36.70%
	Divorced	16.70%
	Widowed	16.00%
Nationality	Portuguese	24.20%
	Brazilian	19.00%
	British	18.80%
	American	13.80%
	French	5.80%
	Spanish	18.30%

Table 7 - Results of the 306 Demographic Question's Answers

As we can see in table 7 11.4%, or 35 individuals, are under 25 years old. The largest age group is those between 35 and 44 years, making up 27.5% (84 people). Employees aged 25 to 34 account for 26.1% (80 people), while those between 45 and 54 years represent 25.5% (78 individuals). The smallest age group is those aged 55 to 64, comprising 9.5% (29 people).

In terms of gender, 23.9% of respondents identify as male, equating to 73 employees. A larger portion, 49% or 150 individuals, identify as female. Additionally, 27.1% of employees, representing 83 people, chose not to disclose their gender.

Regarding educational attainment, 26.1% (80 employees) hold a bachelor's degree, while nearly half of the respondents, 48%, or 147 individuals, have a master's degree. Additionally, 25.8% (79 employees) have achieved a doctoral degree.

As for marital status, 16.3% (50 people) of the employees reported being single. The majority, 36.3%, or 111 individuals, are married or in a domestic partnership. Those who are divorced make up 30.7% (94 employees), and 16.7% (51 people) reported being widowed.

In terms of nationality, the largest group of employees is Spanish, representing 24.2% (74 individuals), followed by British employees at 19.6% (60 people). Americans make up 19% (58 people), while 18.6% (57 employees) are French. A smaller portion of the workforce consists of Brazilians, accounting for 9.8% (30 employees), and Portuguese nationals, who represent 8.8% (27 people).

When considering the length of time employees have been with Company X, 9.5% (29 employees) have been with the company for less than a year. Those who have been employed for 1 to 3 years make up 24.2% (74 people), while 24.8% (76 employees) have been with the company for 4 to 6 years. A larger group, representing 26.5% (81 individuals), has worked at the company for 7 to 10 years. The smallest group, 15% (46 employees), consists of those who have been with the company for over a decade.

Regarding job levels within Company X, 13.1% (40 employees) are interns, and the same percentage applies to those at the mid-level (Pleno) and team leader positions. Junior-level employees make up the largest group at 29.4% (90 people), while senior-level employees represent another 29.4% (90 people). Additionally, 13.1% (40 individuals) hold managerial roles.

In terms of experience within the industry, 12.1% (37 employees) have less than a year of experience, while 22.9% (70 employees) have been in the industry for 1 to 3 years. A substantial portion of employees, 26.5% (81 people), have 4 to 6 years of industry experience. Those with 7 to 10 years of experience represent 26.8% (82 employees), and finally, 11.8% (36 individuals) have more than 10 years of experience in the industry.

All employees who responded to the questionnaire work in a hybrid setup, representing 100% of the 306 respondents.

5.2 Factorial Analysis

Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) is a technique used in the initial phase of research to simplify the interpretation of complex data by reducing the number of

items. Through this process, highly correlated variables are grouped into sets—called factors—that represent different dimensions of the data. EFA explores the data and identifies the factors that best represent the information contained within. The identification of these factors results from statistical procedures, following the guidelines for EFA described in Hair et al.,2022), which are outlined below.

Before extracting the factors, in the diagnostic phase of the data, assumptions were assessed: the existence of correlations between variables and the adequacy of the sample for EFA. For the first assumption, Bartlett's test of sphericity was conducted to test the null hypothesis that there are no correlations between the variables in the population. For the second, the sampling adequacy measure (MSA) was evaluated to identify if each variable is a candidate for removal (MSA<0.50), and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure was used to quantify the degree of intercorrelation among the observed variables. A KMO value below 0.50 indicates unacceptable sample adequacy for EFA, values between 0.50 and 0.60 are considered very poor, 0.60 to 0.70 mediocre, 0.70 to 0.80 average, 0.80 to 0.90 good, and between 0.90 and 1 very good adequacy.

Once the sample is deemed suitable for the procedure, a method for factor extraction is selected—here, the principal components analysis method was used. Communalities, which represent the proportion of common variance shared with the other variables in the factor structure, are then analyzed. Variables with communalities lower than 0.50 are candidates for removal. The decision on the number of factors to retain was based on Kaiser's criterion (factors with eigenvalues greater than 1), and the extracted factors should ideally explain at least 60% of the total variance. To simplify the factor structure and facilitate interpretation, Varimax orthogonal rotation was applied.

The reliability of the scale defined by each factor was assessed through Cronbach's alpha, with a generally accepted lower limit of 0.70, although it can decrease to 0.60 in exploratory research. A value above 0.70 is a positive indicator of the scale's reliability, showing that the items are internally consistent and effectively measure the construct (Hair et al., 2022).

Next, the results of the EFA and the reliability analysis applied to the items of the scales are presented as the database contains 306 samples which is perfect for the EFA however it is insufficient to divide and make a Confirmatory Factorial Analysis (CFA) Validation of EVP Scale

5.2.1 Descriptives and Assumptions Checking

Before conducting further analysis, is necessary to assure that the sample is suitable for the EFA-Having so, we performed a factorial analysis on the EVP scale to determine its suitability for exploratory factor analysis (EFA). In this process, we examined the descriptive statistics and assessed key assumptions, including skewness, kurtosis, and the Shapiro-Wilk test. The results of these tests are presented in Attachment A and in the table below:

Table 8 - Descriptives of EVP Scale

Item	N	Missing	Mean	SE	Lower CI	Upper CI	Median	SD	Variance	Range	Min	Max	Skewness	SE	Kurtosis	SE	Shapiro-Wilk W	P
X1	306	0	3.35	0.0594	3.23	3.47	3.00	1.040	1.081	4	1	5	-0.2639	0.139	-0.5033	0.278	0.906	<.001
X2	306	0	3.17	0.0589	3.06	3.29	3.00	1.030	1.062	4	1	5	-0.1715	0.139	-0.3901	0.278	0.910	<.001
X3	306	0	3.32	0.0593	3.20	3.43	3.00	1.037	1.076	4	1	5	-0.3278	0.139	-0.4008	0.278	0.904	<.001
X4	306	0	3.11	0.0559	3.00	3.22	3.00	0.978	0.956	4	1	5	-0.1543	0.139	-0.2411	0.278	0.905	<.001
X5	306	0	3.44	0.0591	3.32	3.56	3.00	1.033	1.067	4	1	5	-0.2455	0.139	-0.5096	0.278	0.904	<.001
X6	306	0	3.60	0.0543	3.50	3.71	4.00	0.950	0.902	4	1	5	-0.2683	0.139	-0.4365	0.278	0.891	<.001
X7	306	0	3.71	0.0549	3.60	3.81	4.00	0.961	0.923	4	1	5	-0.3417	0.139	-0.5196	0.278	0.884	<.001
X8	306	0	3.11	0.0574	2.99	3.22	3.00	1.008	1.008	4	1	5	-0.2180	0.139	-0.3235	0.278	0.905	<.001
X9	306	0	3.06	0.0575	2.95	3.17	3.00	1.006	1.013	4	1	5	-0.0602	0.139	-0.5009	0.278	0.910	<.001
X10	306	0	3.44	0.0592	3.32	3.56	4.00	1.086	1.074	4	1	5	-0.3936	0.139	-0.2820	0.278	0.900	<.001
X11	306	0	3.28	0.0570	3.17	3.39	3.00	0.997	0.995	4	1	5	-0.1810	0.139	-0.4620	0.278	0.907	<.001
X12	306	0	3.81	0.0518	3.71	3.92	4.00	0.906	0.821	4	1	5	-0.4220	0.139	-0.3224	0.278	0.872	<.001
X13	306	0	3.30	0.0737	3.18	3.41	3.00	1.002	1.003	4	1	5	-0.1708	0.139	-0.3006	0.278	0.906	<.001
X14	306	0	3.09	0.0561	2.98	3.21	3.00	0.982	0.965	4	1	5	0.0241	0.139	-0.4584	0.278	0.907	<.001
X15	306	0	3.81	0.0518	3.71	3.92	4.00	0.906	0.821	4	1	5	0.3421	0.139	-0.4345	0.278	0.872	<.001
X16	306	0	3.52	0.0563	3.41	3.63	4.00	0.986	0.972	4	1	5	-0.2295	0.139	-0.5705	0.278	0.897	<.001
X17	306	0	3.83	0.0524	3.72	3.93	4.00	0.916	0.839	4	1	5	-0.5520	0.139	0.0391	0.278	0.868	<.001
X18	306	0	3.55	0.0580	3.44	3.67	4.00	1.014	1.028	4	1	5	-0.3046	0.139	-0.5854	0.278	0.896	<.001

5.2.2 Sample Size and General Summary

As we can see in table 8, all variables (X1 to X18) have 306 cases with no missing values, indicating a strong and robust sample size that exceeds the minimum threshold required for conducting Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA). The absence of missing data ensures the analysis has sufficient statistical power and that all variables contribute fully to the factor solution.

5.2.3 Skewness

As we can see in table 8, the skewness values for most variables are close to 0, indicating reasonably symmetrical distributions.

The skewness values range from -0.0602 (for X9) to -0.5520 (for X17). X9 shows the smallest skewness, suggesting near symmetry, while X17 exhibits the most negative skewness, indicating a slight leftward skew. However, none of the skewed values are extreme, suggesting that the variables do not exhibit significant asymmetry in their distributions.

Overall, the skewness values fall within acceptable ranges for conducting EFA, supporting the assumption that the variables are not highly skewed.

5.2.4 Kurtosis

As we can see in table 8, Kurtosis, which measures the shape of the tails of the distribution, shows some variation across the variables:

- X6 (-0.4365) and X11 (-0.4620) have moderately negative kurtosis values, suggesting flatter distributions with lighter tails compared to a normal distribution. Meanwhile, X17 (0.0391) has a slightly positive kurtosis, indicating a distribution that is more peaked with heavier tails.

Most other variables display kurtosis values close to 0, indicating that the distributions are relatively normal, with no severe deviations and as so none of the items were removed.

5.2.5 Shapiro-Wilk Test

As shown in table 8, the Shapiro-Wilk test results indicate that for all variables, the p-values are less than 0.001, suggesting a rejection of the null hypothesis of normal distribution. However, in large datasets like this one, the Shapiro-Wilk test is highly sensitive and may detect even minor deviations from normality as statistically significant. Thus, while the test indicates non-normality, this is not necessarily a concern in the context of EFA, which tends to be robust to such deviations in large samples.

5.2.6 Suitability for EFA

As demonstrated in table 8, the skewness and kurtosis values suggest that the variables are mostly within acceptable ranges for conducting EFA, with only minor deviations observed in a few variables. Although the Shapiro-Wilk test indicates non-normality for all variables, this is common with large sample sizes and should not impact the validity of the EFA.

To conclude, the dataset appears suitable for Exploratory Factor Analysis, with a robust sample size that helps mitigate the effects of minor deviations from normality and as so all items were considered for EFA.

5.2.7 EFA on EVP Scale (X Scale)

Taking the above into consideration, we conducted an Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) on all the items of the Employee Value Proposition (EVP) Scale. This analysis aimed to identify the underlying factor structure of the scale, helping us determine how various items group together and contribute to different dimensions of the EVP. The results provide valuable insights into the internal consistency and validity of the scale, offering a clearer understanding of the key factors influencing the employee experience. Detailed results of the EFA, generated using Jamovi, can be found in Attachment A as well as in the table provided below. These results will assist in interpreting the factors and their respective loadings, allowing for more informed conclusions about the scale's structure and its impact. On table below there are the results of Barlett's Sphericity test:

Table 9 - Bartlett's test of Sphericity on EVP Scale

χ^2	df	p
3020	153	<.001

Following Table 9, bellow there is the Table 10 with the results for EFA in the EVP Scale:

Table 10 - Exploratory Factor Analysis on Employee Value Proposition Scale

Item	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Uniqueness
X1	0.841					0.287
X2	0.808					0.353
X3	0.848					0.276
X4		0.893				0.202
X5		0.930				0.136
X6				0.750		0.435
X7				0.758		0.430
X8				0.802		0.351
X9			0.766			0.407
X10					0.839	0.289
X11					0.790	0.376
X12	0.809					0.342
X13	0.776					0.398
X14	0.782					0.387
X15	0.789					0.382
X16	0.776					0.387
X17	0.791					0.366
X18	0.919					0.151

Following results of EFA, on the table below we have the results for - KMO measure of sampling adequacy:

Table 11 - EVP Scale - KMO measure of sampling adequacy

Item	MSA
Overall	0.808
X1	0.731
X2	0.746
X3	0.719
X4	0.801
X5	0.743
X6	0.725
X7	0.690
X8	0.673
X9	0.741
X10	0.708
X11	0.721
X12	0.907
X13	0.900
X14	0.905
X15	0.879
X16	0.916
X17	0.909
X18	0.755

5.2.8 Assumption Check

Before conducting the Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA), key assumptions were verified:

- Bartlett's Test of Sphericity: Bartlett's: test results are significant ($\chi^2 = 3020$, $p < .001$), indicating that the correlation matrix is not an identity matrix. This suggests that the variables have significant correlations with each other, making the data appropriate for factor analysis.
- Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) Measure of Sampling Adequacy: The overall KMO value is 0.808, which falls into the "meritorious" category according to Kaiser's classification. This indicates that the sample size and correlations between variables are sufficient for EFA. Individual KMO values range from 0.673 to 0.916, with all values being above the acceptable threshold of 0.6, confirming the adequacy of the data for factor analysis.

5.2.9 Extraction Method used: Principal Axis Factoring (PAF)

The chosen extraction method was Principal Axis Factoring (PAF), which is particularly suited when the goal is to identify latent constructs that explain the shared

variance among observed variables while accounting for measurement error. Unlike Principal Component Analysis (PCA), which focuses on total variance, PAF seeks to identify underlying factors based on common variance and as so, PAF was selected due to its ability to handle real-world data where normality assumptions may not hold strictly. PAF is also more appropriate when the objective is to uncover latent variables, rather than simply reducing dimensionality.

5.2.10 Rotation Method: Promax

The rotation method used was Promax, an oblique rotation that allows for factors to correlate. Promax is preferred when there is an expectation that the latent factors are not orthogonal (i.e., independent), which is common in psychological and behavioral constructs and as so, Promax was chosen because the factors are likely to be correlated, as is often the case in psychological scales and as so, allowing the factor correlations provides a more realistic representation of the underlying data structure.

5.2.11 Factor Loadings

The factor loadings indicate a clear structure with items clustering well onto their respective factors:

- Items such as X1 to X5 load strongly onto Factor 1, with loadings ranging from 0.808 to 0.930. Similarly, items like X6 to X11 show strong loadings on Factor 2, with loadings from 0.750 to 0.839.
- The uniqueness values (variance not explained by the factors) are relatively low, indicating that the factors account for a substantial portion of the variance in most variables. For example, X5 has a uniqueness of 0.136, meaning the factor explains most of its variance, while X6 has a slightly higher uniqueness of 0.435, indicating that a smaller portion of its variance is explained by the factor.

Even so, as the values all match the requirements, no item was excluded.

5.2.12 Validation of EVP Scale

The Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA), utilizing Principal Axis Factoring (PAF) and Promax rotation, was deemed suitable based on the characteristics of the dataset. The adequacy of the data for factor analysis was confirmed by two key tests: Bartlett's Test of Sphericity, which indicated that the correlations between items were sufficiently large, and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure, which demonstrated a high level of sampling adequacy. Together, these tests verified that the data structure was appropriate for identifying underlying factors.

The factor loadings obtained were substantial, meaning that the items were strongly associated with their respective factors, enhancing the interpretability and

reliability of the results. The use of Promax rotation—which allows for correlated factors—was consistent with the theoretical assumption that the underlying dimensions of the scale are related, rather than orthogonal. This rotation method further facilitated a more nuanced understanding of the relationships between the factors.

The results indicate that the items on the scale are well-suited to group into coherent and meaningful factors, confirming the theoretical framework upon which the scale was built. These factors provide a solid basis for future analyses and applications of the scale. As a result, the scale, with all its items, is validated, offering a strong foundation for further research into the dimensions of organizational sustainability (or the EVP scale, depending on the context). This validation suggests that the scale is a reliable tool for assessing the constructs it was designed to measure.

5.3 Validation of Sustainability Measures Scale (Q Scale)

5.3.1 Descriptives and Assumptions Checking

Equally to the EVP Scale, is necessary to assure that the sample is suitable for the EFA-Having so, we performed a factorial analysis on the EVP scale to determine its suitability for exploratory factor analysis (EFA). In this process, we examined the descriptive statistics and assessed key assumptions, including skewness, kurtosis, and the Shapiro-Wilk test. The results of these tests are presented in Attachment A and in the tables below. On the table below there are the descriptives for the sustainability Scale:

Table 12 - Descriptives of Sustainability Scale

Item	N	Missing	Mean	SE	Lower CI	Upper CI	Median	SD	Variance
Q1	306	0	3.99	0.0552	3.88	4.1	4.0	0.965	0.931
Q2	306	0	4.02	0.0539	3.91	4.12	4.0	0.942	0.888
Q3	306	0	3.98	0.0539	3.87	4.08	4.0	0.942	0.888
Q4	306	0	4.0	0.0566	3.89	4.11	4.0	0.99	0.98
Q5	306	0	3.94	0.055	3.84	4.05	4.0	0.962	0.926
Q6	306	0	3.86	0.0517	3.75	3.96	4.0	0.905	0.819
Q7	306	0	3.82	0.0532	3.72	3.93	4.0	0.931	0.867
Q8	306	0	3.83	0.0526	3.73	3.94	4.0	0.921	0.848
Q9	306	0	4.09	0.0498	3.99	4.19	4.0	0.875	0.759
Q10	306	0	4.08	0.048	3.98	4.17	4.0	0.84	0.706
Q11	306	0	4.04	0.0495	3.94	4.13	4.0	0.857	0.735
Q12	306	0	3.88	0.0513	3.78	3.98	4.0	0.889	0.789
Q13	306	0	3.94	0.0519	3.84	4.04	4.0	0.907	0.822
Q14	306	0	3.9	0.0535	3.8	4.01	4.0	0.936	0.876
Q15	306	0	3.89	0.0529	3.78	3.99	4.0	0.925	0.856
Q16	306	0	3.85	0.0542	3.75	3.96	4.0	0.945	0.893
Q17	306	0	3.88	0.0539	3.77	3.98	4.0	0.943	0.889
Q18	306	0	3.83	0.0557	3.72	3.94	4.0	0.974	0.948
Q19	306	0	3.91	0.0511	3.81	4.01	4.0	0.893	0.798
Q20	306	0	3.85	0.0519	3.75	3.95	4.0	0.908	0.823
Q21	306	0	3.91	0.0514	3.8	4.01	4.0	0.914	0.835
Q22	306	0	3.93	0.0529	3.83	4.04	4.0	0.925	0.856
Q23	306	0	3.91	0.0522	3.8	4.01	4.0	0.913	0.834
Q24	306	0	3.89	0.0509	3.79	3.99	4.0	0.891	0.794
Q25	306	0	3.87	0.0513	3.77	3.97	4.0	0.889	0.789
Q26	306	0	3.87	0.0513	3.77	3.97	4.0	0.889	0.789
Q27	306	0	3.89	0.0494	3.8	3.99	4.0	0.876	0.768
Q28	306	0	3.94	0.0492	3.84	4.03	4.0	0.874	0.763
Q29	306	0	3.97	0.0499	3.87	4.07	4.0	0.874	0.763

Following the descriptives, the results for Distribution and Normality tests can be found on the table below:

Table 13 - Distribution and Normality Test of the Sustainability Scale Items

Item	Range	Min	Max	Skewness	SE	Kurtosis	SE	Shapiro-Wilk W	P
Q1	4	1	5	-0.767	0.139	0.0597	0.278	0.844	<.001
Q2	4	1	5	-0.742	0.139	-6.77e-05	0.278	0.841	<.001
Q3	4	1	5	-0.593	0.139	-0.4668	0.278	0.845	<.001
Q4	4	1	5	-0.802	0.139	-0.0163	0.278	0.837	<.001
Q5	4	1	5	-0.512	0.139	-0.7497	0.278	0.847	<.001
Q6	4	1	5	-0.487	0.139	-0.2454	0.278	0.867	<.001
Q7	4	1	5	-0.451	0.139	-0.404	0.278	0.872	<.001
Q8	4	1	5	-0.501	0.139	-0.1772	0.278	0.87	<.001
Q9	4	1	5	-0.718	0.139	-0.0301	0.278	0.831	<.001
Q10	4	1	5	-0.51	0.139	0.0391	0.278	0.833	<.001
Q11	4	1	5	-0.571	0.139	-0.2786	0.278	0.882	<.001
Q12	4	1	5	-0.505	0.139	-0.2003	0.278	0.868	<.001
Q13	4	1	5	-0.388	0.139	-0.5492	0.278	0.85	<.001
Q14	4	1	5	-0.48	0.139	-0.4485	0.278	0.863	<.001
Q15	4	1	5	-0.471	0.139	-0.396	0.278	0.865	<.001
Q16	4	1	5	-0.445	0.139	-0.511	0.278	0.869	<.001
Q17	4	1	5	-0.387	0.139	-0.6037	0.278	0.863	<.001
Q18	4	1	5	-0.426	0.139	-0.4454	0.278	0.865	<.001
Q19	4	1	5	-0.43	0.139	-0.4697	0.278	0.862	<.001
Q20	4	1	5	-0.52	0.139	0.0343	0.278	0.866	<.001
Q21	4	1	5	-0.479	0.139	-0.4776	0.278	0.861	<.001
Q22	4	1	5	-0.621	0.139	-0.0619	0.278	0.857	<.001
Q23	4	1	5	-0.436	0.139	-0.3101	0.278	0.857	<.001
Q24	4	1	5	-0.452	0.139	-0.3049	0.278	0.863	<.001
Q25	4	1	5	-0.43	0.139	-0.3222	0.278	0.865	<.001
Q26	4	1	5	-0.348	0.139	-0.7067	0.278	0.862	<.001
Q27	4	1	5	-0.282	0.139	-0.5803	0.278	0.859	<.001
Q28	4	1	5	-0.377	0.139	-0.4698	0.278	0.856	<.001
Q29	4	1	5	-0.478	0.139	-0.3855	0.278	0.853	<.001

5.3.2 Sample Size and General Summary

As displayed in table 12, all variables (Q1 to Q29) have 306 cases with no missing values, indicating a strong and robust sample size that exceeds the minimum threshold required for conducting Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA). The absence of missing data ensures that the analysis will have sufficient statistical power and that all variables will contribute fully to the factor solution.

5.3.3 Skewness

As shown in table 12, the skewness values for most variables are close to 0, indicating reasonably symmetrical distributions.

The skewness values range from -0.767 (for Q1) to -0.282 (for Q27). While Q1 exhibits some degree of negative skewness and Q27 has the lowest skewness value, these are not extreme, suggesting that the variables do not demonstrate significant asymmetry in their distributions. These values are within acceptable ranges for skewness, implying that the data is suitable for factor analysis.

5.3.4 Kurtosis

As we can see om table 12, Kurtosis, which measures the shape of the tails of the distribution, varies more across the variables, with a few showing minor deviations.

instance, variables like Q12 (-0.2030) and Q1 (0.0597) have kurtosis values close to 0, suggesting distributions that are relatively normal. Other items, such as Q10 (-0.3901) and Q11 (-0.4458), show slight negative kurtosis values, indicating slightly flatter distributions with lighter tails.

Overall, most variables exhibit kurtosis values near zero, indicating distributions that do not deviate drastically from the normal distribution and are appropriate for inclusion in EFA.

5.3.5 Shapiro-Wilk Test

The Shapiro-Wilk test results indicate that, for all variables, the p-values are less than 0.001, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis of normal distribution. However, it is important to note that in large datasets, such as this one, the Shapiro-Wilk test can be overly sensitive and detect even minor deviations from normality as statistically significant. Therefore, although the test flags non-normality, this is not necessarily a concern in the context of EFA, which is typically robust to such deviations in large samples.

5.3.6 Suitability for EFA

The skewness and kurtosis values indicate that the variables are generally within acceptable ranges for conducting Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA), with only minor deviations observed in a few cases. Although the Shapiro-Wilk test suggests non-normality across all variables, this result is typical in large sample sizes and is not expected to significantly impact the validity of the EFA.

Consequently, no items were removed from the dataset, as these minor deviations from normality are considered acceptable in the context of a large sample, which helps mitigate their potential effects. In summary, the dataset is deemed suitable for conducting an Exploratory Factor Analysis, given its robust sample size, which compensates for the slight departures from normality.

5.3.7 EFA on Sustainability Measures Scale

Taking the above into consideration, we conducted an Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) on all the items of the Sustainability Measures Scale.

Detailed results of the EFA, generated using Jamovi, can be found in Attachment A as well as in the tables provided below. These results will assist in interpreting the factors and their respective loadings, allowing for more informed conclusions about the scale's structure and its impact. On table below are the results for the Bartlett's Test of sphericity:

Table 14 - Bartlett's test of Sphericity on Sustainability Measures Scale

χ^2	df	p
7949	406	<.001

Following Barlett's test, the following table contains the results of the EFA on Sustainability Measures Scale:

Table 15 - EFA on Sustainability Measures Scale

Item	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Uniqueness
Q1	0.905					0.193
Q2	0.881					0.214
Q3	0.883					0.219
Q4	0.892					0.212
Q5	0.901					0.166
Q6		0.879				0.223
Q7		0.876				0.234
Q8		0.883				0.219
Q9				0.857		0.265
Q10				0.845		0.291
Q11					0.899	0.181
Q12	0.829					0.309
Q13	0.848					0.279
Q14	0.856					0.260
Q15	0.811					0.338
Q16	0.836					0.289
Q17	0.842					0.289
Q18	0.855					0.266
Q19	0.840					0.303
Q20	0.850					0.271
Q21	0.869					0.246
Q22				0.869		0.239
Q23				0.856		0.273
Q24				0.851		0.270
Q25	0.892					0.219
Q26	0.865					0.236
Q27	0.856					0.262
Q28	0.850					0.274
Q29	0.859					0.253

On the table below are the results for KMO measure of sampling adequacy on the Sustainability Measures Scale:

Table 16 - Sustainability Measures Scale - KMO measure of sampling adequacy

Item	Fator 1	Fator 2	Fator 3	Fator 4	Fator 5	MSA (KMO)
Q1			0,905			0,905
Q2			0,881			0,899
Q3			0,883			0,912
Q4			0,892			0,903
Q5			0,901			0,891
Q6				0,879		0,744
Q7				0,876		0,748
Q8				0,883		0,709
Q9					0,857	0,749
Q10					0,845	0,746
Q11					0,899	0,727
Q12	0,829					0,956
Q13	0,848					0,965
Q14	0,856					0,964
Q15	0,811					0,956
Q16	0,836					0,966
Q17	0,842					0,954
Q18	0,855					0,96
Q19	0,84					0,959
Q20	0,85					0,965
Q21	0,869					0,969
Q22		0,869				0,94
Q23		0,856				0,946
Q24		0,851				0,948
Q25		0,892				0,94
Q26		0,865				0,953
Q27		0,856				0,942
Q28		0,85				0,948
Q29		0,859				0,945

5.3.8 Assumption Checks

Before proceeding with the Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA), key assumptions were verified:

- Bartlett's Test of Sphericity: Bartlett's test results are significant (χ^2 = 7949, $p < .001$), indicating that the correlation matrix is not an identity matrix, and there are sufficient relationships between the variables to justify factor analysis.
- KMO Measure of Sampling Adequacy: The overall KMO value is 0.927, which is excellent based on Kaiser's criterion, suggesting that the sample size and the intercorrelations between the variables are appropriate for EFA. The KMO values for individual items range from 0.709 to 0.969, confirming that all variables are suitable for inclusion in the analysis, as they exceed the commonly accepted threshold of 0.6.

5.3.9 Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring (PAF)

The extraction method used in the analysis was Principal Axis Factoring (PAF). This method is particularly suitable when the objective is to identify latent constructs that account for the shared variance among observed variables, rather than just reducing the dataset's dimensionality. Unlike Principal Component Analysis (PCA), which focuses on total variance, PAF emphasizes the common variance, making it a more accurate choice for exploring latent factors and as so the selection of PAF is appropriate in this context because it allows for the identification of underlying constructs while accounting for potential measurement error. This method is also more robust to deviations from normality, which is often the case with real-world data, making it ideal for this study.

5.3.10 Rotation Method: Promax

The rotation method chosen was Promax, an oblique rotation that allows for factors to be correlated. This is a realistic assumption in psychological research where constructs often exhibit some level of interdependence and as so, Promax was selected due to the expectation that the factors measured by the scale are likely to be correlated. Oblique rotations like Promax provide a more accurate representation of the underlying data structure when the factors are not orthogonal (i.e., independent), as is often the case in behavioral sciences.

5.3.11 Factor Loadings

The factor loadings demonstrate a clear factor structure:

- Items have strong loadings on their respective factors, with many values above 0.8. For instance, items such as Q1 to Q5 load heavily on Factor 1, indicating a strong relationship between these items and their underlying factor.
- Variables such as Q9 to Q11 load onto Factor 2, showing a clear differentiation from other factors.
- Uniqueness values, which represent the variance in each item that is not explained by the factors, are relatively low, indicating that the extracted factors explain a substantial portion of the variance in each variable.

5.3.12 Validation of Sustainability Measures Scale

The Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA), conducted using Principal Axis Factoring (PAF) with Promax rotation, was determined to be an appropriate method given the characteristics of the data. The results of both Bartlett's test of sphericity and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy confirmed that the data was well-suited for factor analysis. Specifically, the KMO value exceeded the commonly accepted threshold of 0.6, and Bartlett's test yielded a significant result, indicating sufficient correlations among the variables to justify factor extraction.

The use of Principal Axis Factoring (PAF) was chosen because it is particularly effective when the goal is to identify latent constructs from data that may not strictly follow normal distribution assumptions. Additionally, the Promax rotation was applied to account for the potential correlation between factors, aligning with the theoretical framework of the study, which anticipated that the factors would not be orthogonal but rather related in some meaningful way. The resulting factor loadings revealed distinct and interpretable clusters of items, indicating that the scale measures multiple underlying constructs as hypothesized. These well-defined factors contribute to a deeper understanding of the latent structure of the dataset. Furthermore, since all items on the scale loaded meaningfully onto the identified factors, the scale was validated in its entirety, supporting its continued use in future research or practical applications. This validation reinforces the scale's utility in capturing the intended constructs and provides a solid basis for potential refinements or extensions in subsequent studies.

5.4 Reliability Analysis - Grouping by Factors

Since the sample size consists of only 306 responses, it is not large enough to conduct a Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA), which typically requires a larger dataset to ensure reliable and stable results. Instead, we performed a reliability analysis to assess the internal consistency of the items within each factor identified by the Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA).

The reliability analysis process involves calculating internal consistency measures to evaluate how well the items within each factor correlate with one another, indicating whether they measure the same underlying construct. One common approach is to use reliability coefficients, such as Cronbach's alpha, which provides an estimate of the consistency across items within a factor. The higher the value of the reliability coefficient, the more closely related the items are, suggesting that they are all capturing a similar concept.

In this analysis, for each factor, we examined the impact of removing individual items and assessed whether the overall reliability would improve or decline if a particular item was dropped. This step helps ensure that all items within each factor

contribute meaningfully to the overall construct being measured. Based on this process, we confirmed that the items within each factor display strong internal consistency, providing further validation of the factor structure identified by the EFA.

Thus, although CFA could not be applied due to the sample size limitation, the reliability analysis offers a robust alternative to confirm the appropriateness of the item groupings and the consistency of the scale.

5.4.1 EVP Scale

The results of the Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) suggest that the sample is best organized into five distinct factors, each comprising specific items that naturally group together as in below:

- **Factor 1** consists of items X12 through X17, indicating a strong internal consistency within this grouping.
- **Factor 2** includes items X4, X5, and X18, which form a coherent factor, with the items closely related.
- **Factor 3** is composed of items X1, X2, and X3, showing a clear and meaningful grouping that reflects the underlying construct.
- **Factor 4** includes items X9, X10, and X11, forming a distinct factor that demonstrates internal alignment.
- **Factor 5** is formed by items X6, X7, and X8, rounding out the five-factor structure with its own coherent set of items.

Having so, a Reliability test was performed on the factors, and the results can be consulted in Attachment A and in tables below. The results of factor **1** are presented in table below:

Table 17 - Reliability Analysis on Factor 1

Scale Reliability Statistics	SD	Cronbach's α	McDonald's ω
Scale	0.784	0.906	0.907

Item Reliability Statistics	If item dropped (Cronbach's α)
X12	0.886
X13	0.891
X14	0.890
X15	0.891
X16	0.891
X17	0.889

Regarding the Factor 2, the results for the Reliability Analysis can be found on the following Table:

Table 18 - Reliability Analysis on Factor 2

Scale Reliability Statistics	SD	Cronbach's α	McDonald's ω
Scale	0.952	0.938	0.939

Item Reliability Statistics	If item dropped (Cronbach's α)
X4	0.922
X5	0.902
X18	0.906

Regarding the Factor 3, the results for the Reliability Analysis can be found on the following Table:

Table 19-Reliability Analysis on Factor 3

Scale Reliability Statistics	SD	Cronbach's α	McDonald's ω
Scale	0.923	0.871	0.871
Item Reliability Statistics	**If item dropped (Cronbach's α)**		
X1	0.811		
X2	0.834		
X3	0.808		

Regarding the Factor 4, the results for the Reliability Analysis can be found on the following Table:

Table 20 - Reliability Analysis on Factor 4

Scale Reliability Statistics	SD	Cronbach's α	McDonald's ω
Scale	0.881	0.839	0.840
Item Reliability Statistics	**If item dropped (Cronbach's α)**		
X9	0.796		
X10	0.748		
X11	0.784		

Regarding the Factor 5, the results for the Reliability Analysis can be found on the following Table:

Table 21 - Reliability Analysis on Factor 5

Scale Reliability Statistics	SD	Cronbach's α	McDonald's ω
Scale	0.829	0.813	0.813
Item Reliability Statistics	**Cronbach's α**		
X6	0.753		
X7	0.756		
X8	0.720		

The internal consistency of the scale was assessed using Cronbach's α and McDonald's ω. All factors demonstrated acceptable to excellent reliability, with α values above 0.7, indicating good internal consistency across all items.

Factor 1 (Items X6, X7, X8):

The reliability analysis yielded α = 0.813 and ω = 0.813, suggesting a good level of internal consistency. The α value would decrease slightly if any item were removed, indicating that all items contribute positively to the factor.

Factor 2 (Items X9, X10, X11):

This factor demonstrated α = 0.839 and ω = 0.840, reflecting good reliability. Notably, the α value for item X10 was 0.748, the lowest in this factor. This can be attributed to the redundancy between items X9 and X10, as they likely measure very similar constructs. Despite this, overall reliability remains acceptable, and no changes to the item structure are necessary.

Factor 3 (Items X1, X2, X3):

The reliability coefficients for this factor were α = 0.871 and ω = 0.871, indicating excellent internal consistency. Removing any item would reduce the α value, suggesting all items contribute equally to the factor's consistency.

Factor 4 (Items X4, X5, X18):

This factor showed outstanding internal consistency, with α = 0.938 and ω = 0.939. Removing any item would result in a lower α value, reinforcing the importance of each item in the factor.

Factor 5 (Items X12, X13, X14, X15, X16, X17):

The reliability of this factor was also high, with $\alpha = 0.906$ and $\omega = 0.907$. Removing any of the items would not significantly improve the α value, indicating that all items contribute effectively to the reliability of the factor.

In conclusion, the results of the reliability analysis confirm the factor structure identified by the EFA. Each factor demonstrates strong internal consistency, validating the grouping of items and suggesting that the scale is reliable for further use in research or practical applications.

5.4.2 Sustainability Measures Scale

The results of the Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) suggest that the items are best grouped into five distinct factors, each representing a coherent set of related items as in below:

- **Factor 1** consists of items Q1 through Q5. These items group together naturally, reflecting a strong internal consistency, with each item contributing meaningfully to the overall factor.
- **Factor 2** includes items Q6, Q7, and Q8. The grouping of these items indicates a clear and consistent factor, with all items aligned closely with the underlying construct they measure.
- **Factor 3** is composed of items Q9, Q10, and Q11, showing a well-defined factor structure. These items work together to form a cohesive group that represents a specific dimension of the scale.
- **Factor 4** consists of a larger set of items, Q12 through Q21. This factor demonstrates a clear internal alignment, with all items contributing strongly to the factor's structure, indicating a reliable and interpretable grouping.
- **Factor 5** includes items Q22 through Q29. These items form a distinct and reliable factor, showing internal coherence and consistency across all included items.

Having so, a Reliability test was performed on the factors, and the results can be consulted in Attachment A and in tables below. Like the last chapter structure, the results for the Reliability analysis on **Factor 1** are displayed in table below:

Table 22-Reliability Analysis on Factor 1

Scale Reliability Statistics	SD	Cronbach's α	McDonald's ω
Scale	0.878	0.951	0.951

Item Reliability Statistics	If item dropped (Cronbach's α)
Q1	0.939
Q2	0.941
Q3	0.941
Q4	0.940
Q5	0.937

Regarding the **Factor 2**, the results for the Reliability Analysis can be found on the following Table:

Table 23- Reliability Analysis on Factor 2

Scale Reliability Statistics	SD	Cronbach's α	McDonald's ω
Scale	0,846	0.911	0.911

Item Reliability Statistics	If item dropped (Cronbach's α)
Q6	0.869
Q7	0.873
Q8	0.873

Regarding the **Factor 3**, the results for the Reliability Analysis can be found on the following Table:

Table 24 - Reliability Analysis on Factor 3

Scale Reliability Statistics	SD	Cronbach's α	McDonald's ω
Scale	0.784	0.900	0.901

Item Reliability Statistics	If item dropped (Cronbach's α)
Q9	0.865
Q10	0.872
Q11	0.834

Regarding the **Factor 4**, the results for the Reliability Analysis can be found on the following Table:

Table 25- Reliability Analysis on Factor 4

Scale Reliability Statistics	SD	Cronbach's α	McDonald's ω
scale	0.796	0.961	0.961

Item Reliability Statistics	If item dropped (Cronbach's α)
Q12	0.957
Q13	0.957
Q14	0.956
Q15	0.958
Q16	0.957
Q17	0.957
Q18	0.956
Q19	0.957
Q20	0.957
Q21	0.956

Regarding the **Factor 5**, the results for the Reliability Analysis can be found on the following Table:

Scale Reliability Statistics	SD	Cronbach's α	McDonald's ω
Scale	0.784	0.959	0.959

Item Reliability Statistics	If item dropped (Cronbach's α)
Q22	0.952
Q23	0.954
Q24	0.954
Q25	0.952
Q26	0.952
Q27	0.953
Q28	0.954
Q29	0.953

The internal consistency of the scale was evaluated using Cronbach's α and McDonald's ω. All factors exhibited high reliability, with Cronbach's α and McDonald's ω values above the 0.9 threshold, indicating excellent internal consistency across all items. Below is a detailed analysis of each factor:

- **Factor 1 (Items Q1, Q2, Q3, Q4, Q5):** The scale showed α = 0.951 and ω = 0.951, reflecting excellent internal consistency. The removal of any individual item would slightly reduce Cronbach's α, confirming that all items contribute meaningfully to the scale.
- **Factor 2 (Items Q6, Q7, Q8):** The reliability coefficients for this factor were α = 0.911 and ω = 0.911, indicating good internal consistency. Removing any of the items would reduce the α value to between 0.869 and 0.873, suggesting that all items contribute positively to overall reliability.
- **Factor 3 (Items Q9, Q10, Q11):** This factor demonstrated α = 0.900 and ω = 0.901, indicating good reliability. Notably, item Q11 has a lower α value of 0.834 if removed, which suggests that Q11 contributes slightly less than the other items but still falls within acceptable limits.
- **Factor 4 (Items Q12, Q13, Q14, Q15, Q16, Q17, Q18, Q19, Q20, Q21):** This factor exhibited α = 0.961 and ω = 0.961, signifying excellent internal consistency. Removal of any item would cause minimal changes, as α values remain very high, ranging from 0.956 to 0.958. This indicates a high level of redundancy between items but still very strong reliability.
- **Factor 5 (Items Q22, Q23, Q24, Q25, Q26, Q27, Q28, Q29):** The reliability coefficients for this factor were α = 0.959 and ω = 0.959, both demonstrating excellent consistency. The α values remain between 0.952 and 0.954 when individual items are removed, highlighting that the items are highly correlated and contribute equally to the scale.

In conclusion, the results of the reliability analysis confirm the factor structure identified by the EFA. Each factor demonstrates strong internal consistency, validating the grouping of items and suggesting that the scale is reliable for further use in research or practical applications.

5.5 Factors Confirmation – Correlation Matrix

After confirming the relevant factors, we proceeded with the creation of constructs by developing a new metric for each factor. To achieve this, we calculated the average value for each row, using the items that comprise each factor. This process allowed us to generate a representative value for every factor, ensuring that the constructs accurately reflect the underlying data patterns.

As a result, 10 new constructs were created, each corresponding to one of the identified factors. These constructs will serve as key inputs for the subsequent stages of our analysis.

Table 26 - Constructs for Correlation Matrix

Construct	Description
X_F1	Average of items that compose the Factor 1 in Scale X
X_F2	Average of items that compose the Factor 2 in Scale X
X_F3	Average of items that compose the Factor 3 in Scale X
X_F4	Average of items that compose the Factor 4 in Scale X
X_F5	Average of items that compose the Factor 5 in Scale X
Q_F1	Average of items that compose the Factor 1 in Scale Q
Q_F2	Average of items that compose the Factor 2 in Scale Q
Q_F3	Average of items that compose the Factor 3 in Scale Q
Q_F4	Average of items that compose the Factor 4 in Scale Q
Q_F5	Average of items that compose the Factor 5 in Scale Q

To assess the impact of the factors within Scale Q on Scale X, we first examined the correlation between these factors. We used the averages of the variables to create constructs, allowing us to determine which factors from Scale Q are most strongly associated with Scale X. To achieve this, we applied a correlation matrix to the previously defined constructs.

By analyzing these correlations, we can identify the most influential factors, which will serve as the basis for the subsequent linear regression analysis. This process helps clarify the relationships between variables and guides the next steps in the study. The results of the correlation matrix can be found in Attachment A and are summarized in the table below:

Table 27 - Correlation Matrix results

Matrix	X_F1	X_F2	X_F3	X_F4	X_F5	Q_F1	Q_F2	Q_F3	Q_F4	Q_F5
X_F1	-	-0.048	0.064	0.054	-0.110	0.064	-0.017	0.031	0.123	0.366
p-value	-	0.400	0.263	0.351	0.055	0.266	0.762	0.589	0.031	<0.001
X_F2	-	-	-0.020	0.017	-0.026	-0.012	0.933	0.045	-0.096	-0.128
p-value	-	-	0.724	0.765	0.648	0.831	<0.001	0.438	0.092	0.025
X_F3	-	-	-	0.101	-0.065	0.956	0.003	0.081	-0.033	0.038
p-value	-	-	-	0.078	0.254	<0.001	0.963	0.160	0.570	0.506
X_F4	-	-	-	-	0.050	0.093	0.064	0.933	0.047	0.065
p-value	-	-	-	-	0.383	0.105	0.262	<0.001	0.589	0.260
X_F5	-	-	-	-	-	-0.046	0.006	0.084	-0.004	0.021
p-value	-	-	-	-	-	0.426	0.916	0.142	0.942	0.720
Q_F1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-0.040	0.087	-0.091	0.026
p-value	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.491	0.128	0.114	0.654
Q_F2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.084	-0.004	-0.129
p-value	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.085	0.942	0.025
Q_F3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.066	0.034
p-value	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.247	0.552
Q_F4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-0.084
p-value	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.141

Checking the 5 strongest correlations we have the following setup:

- **Q_F1 e X_F3**: r=0.956r = 0.956r=0.956, p<0.001p < 0.001p<0.001
- **Q_F2 e X_F2**: r=0.933r = 0.933r=0.933, p<0.001p < 0.001p<0.001
- **Q_F3 e X_F2**: r=0.933r = 0.933r=0.933, p<0.001p < 0.001p<0.001
- **Q_F5 e X_F1**: r=0.366r = 0.366r=0.366, p<0.001p < 0.001p<0.001
- **Q_F4 e X_F1**: r=−0.123r = -0.123r=−0.123, p=0.031p = 0.031p=0.031

Having the above into consideration, below it follows the analysis of these 5 correlations:

Q_F1 and X_F3

Statistical Significance: The Pearson correlation coefficient of 0.956 indicates a very strong positive relationship between Q_F1 and X_F3. With a p-value of less than 0.001, this correlation is statistically significant at conventional levels (e.g., α=0.05\alpha = 0.05α=0.05). The likelihood of observing such a high correlation due to random chance is extremely low.

Scientific Interpretation: The strong positive correlation suggests a direct, nearly linear relationship between these two variables. Given the statistical significance, we can reliably conclude that an increase in X_F3 is strongly associated with an increase in Q_F1. This relationship might indicate a close functional or theoretical connection between the factors represented by Q_F1 and X_F3, making it worth further investigation.

Q_F2 and X_F2

Statistical Significance: A Pearson correlation coefficient of 0.933 demonstrates another very strong positive correlation between Q_F2 and X_F2. The p-value confirms this correlation as highly statistically significant ($p < 0.001$).

Scientific Interpretation: Such a high correlation implies that these variables measure almost the same underlying construct or exhibit a very tight linear relationship. The statistical strength of this relationship supports the idea that these variables should be closely studied, either for potential causal links or shared variance in their measurement.

Q_F3 and X_F2

Statistical Significance: Similarly, the correlation between Q_F3 and X_F2, at $r=0.933r = 0.933r=0.933$, represents a very strong positive relationship. The statistical significance ($p < 0.001$) ensures that this is not due to chance.

Scientific Interpretation: Given this strong positive correlation, it is likely that Q_F3 and X_F2 are measuring very similar phenomena or that one is strongly predictive of the other. This correlation merits further exploration to identify whether any theoretical or practical explanations account for this strong relationship.

Q_F5 and X_F1

Statistical Significance: The Pearson correlation of $r=0.366r = 0.366r=0.366$ indicates a moderate positive relationship between Q_F5 and X_F1. The p-value of less than 0.001 confirms the statistical significance of this correlation, even though it is of a smaller magnitude compared to the others.

Scientific Interpretation: A moderate positive correlation like this suggests a meaningful but less pronounced relationship between Q_F5 and X_F1. The statistical significance means this correlation is reliable, though the practical implications may be more nuanced. The relationship might be indirect or reflect secondary influences between these variables.

Q_F4 and X_F1

Statistical Significance: After adjusting the value, the Pearson correlation of r=0.123r = 0.123r=0.123 indicates a weak positive correlation between Q_F4 and X_F1. With a p-value of 0.031, this correlation is still statistically significant at the α=0.05\alpha = 0.05α=0.05 level.

Scientific Interpretation Although the correlation between Q_F4 and X_F1 is weak (r=0.123r = 0.123r=0.123), it is still statistically significant, indicating that the relationship is not due to random variation. While the magnitude is not ideal for robust predictions, the significance suggests that the relationship may still hold relevance.

The lower correlation could be explained by different items measuring the same underlying construct, such as organizational commitment or brand loyalty, rather than distinct, independent factors. This overlap might dilute the strength of correlations with other variables like X_F1. Finally, this relationship could reflect a nonlinear or indirect association, which might only become fully apparent in a more nuanced analysis or when combined with other variables. Therefore, despite the modest strength, this relationship should not be dismissed outright and may still contribute valuable insights in specific theoretical or applied contexts.

Given that all the correlation values meet the necessary statistical significance thresholds ($p < 0.05$), and the correlations themselves, ranging from moderate to very strong, indicate meaningful relationships between the variables, we will proceed to use these variables in our linear regression models. The strength and significance of these correlations suggest that the variables are appropriate for further analysis, providing a solid foundation for exploring potential predictive relationships through linear regression.

5.5.1 Factors Alignment

After reviewing the results of the correlation matrix and revisiting the metrics from the EVP Scale (Employee Value Proposition) and the Sustainability Measure Scale, we conducted a thorough analysis of the items from each of these scales that make up the factors. We then assigned each metric from the EVP Scale to the corresponding correlations identified in the previous analysis. This allowed us to map the relationships between the scales and their respective factors. By carefully aligning the relevant metrics, we have reorganized the correlations into the tables below for a clearer representation of how these variables interrelate.

Taking the above into consideration, we now have a solid statistical basis to link the factors between the EVP Scale and the Sustainability Measure Scale, as demonstrated in the tables below. This linkage provides a more structured and informed understanding of the connections between employee value proposition metrics and sustainability outcomes, which can guide further regression analysis and interpretation of the dataset.

Table 28 - Scale Q with Factors attributed to EVP

Factor 1	Compensation
Q1	My organization has optimal plans for constant revenue generation over foreseeable number of years
Q2	My organization is financially strong to withstand economic uncertainties
Q3	My organization has scope of making profit for the next five years
Q4	My organization has intention to reinvest its profit for its growth
Q5	My organization uses its financial sustainability to maintain competitive salaries
Factor 2	Benefits
Q6	My organization uses its financial sustainability to provide benefits for employees
Q7	My organization provides optimal job security to its employees
Q8	I can enjoy optimal work-life balance while serving my organization
Factor 3	Career Development
Q9	My organization supports good and sustainable career development.
Q10	My organization supports training and development of staff
Q11	My organization provides safety norms and training for its staff members
Factor 4	Work Environment
Q12	My organization supports opinions and views for improvement from all levels of employees
Q13	My organization is providing optimal air quality assurance
Q14	My organization has an appropriate water recycling system
Q15	My organization encourages the use of cycling, walking, or public transport to keep the air clean
Q16	My organization has an adequate ventilation system that helps with air quality assurance
Q17	My organization is thoughtful about sustainable development in the maximum possible ways
Q18	My organization has a proper solid waste management system
Q19	My organization has a proper electronic waste management system
Q20	My organization is not polluting nature
Q21	My organization has an appropriate recycling system for paper, plastic, glass, and other waste
Factor 5	Work Culture
Q22	My organization supports gender equality
Q23	My organization supports creativity and innovation
Q24	My organization has clear alignment with its policies and vision
Q25	My organization is investing in the right policies for future growth
Q26	My organization helps to protect human rights in the maximum possible ways
Q27	My organization supports public safety and security
Q28	My organization helps in supporting the local culture
Q29	My organization is supporting the local economy

Table 29 - Table 27 - Scale X with Factors attributed to EVP

Factor 1	Work Culture
X12	I demonstrate behaviors that are consistent with the brand promise of the organization I work for.
X13	I identify myself with my company culture.
X14	I say positive things about the organization (brand) I work for to others.
X15	I would recommend the organization (brand) I work for to someone who seeks my advice.
X16	I enjoy talking about the organization (brand) I work for to others.
X17	I talk positively about the organization (brand) I work for to others.
Factor 2	**Benefits**
X4	I think my company's benefits are competitive.
X5	My organization provides comprehensive health and wellness programs for employees.
X18	I think that the green budgets that my company gives me are good and useful
Factor 3	**Compensation**
X1	I believe I am fairly compensated for my work.
X2	I would turn down an offer from another organization (brand) if it came tomorrow.
X3	My organization offers regular performance bonuses or incentives for exceptional work.
Factor 4	**Career Development**
X9	I feel like I can have good career progress in my company.
X10	I plan to be with the organization (brand) I work for, for a while.
X11	I plan to be with the organization (brand) I work for, 5 years from now.
Factor 5	**Work Environment**
X6	I am always interested to learn about my organization's brand and what it means to me in my role.
X7	I consider the impact on my organization's brand and what it means to me in my role.
X8	I believe that my work environment is exemplary.

Having the above tables in to consideration, we have the factors and EVP metrics linked as explained below:

- Factor 1 (Compensation) in the Sustainability Measures Scale corresponds to Factor 3 (Compensation) in the Scale of EVP. Checking the items of

factors we can see that both address employee perceptions of compensation, fairness, and financial incentives.

- Factor 2 (Benefits) in the Sustainability Measures Scale corresponds to Factor 2 (Benefits) in the Scale of EVP. Checking the items of factors we can see that both factors cover the company's provision of employee benefits, job security, and work-life balance.
- Factor 3 (Career Development) in the Sustainability Measures Scale corresponds to Factor 4 (Career Development) in the Scale of EVP. Checking the items of factors we can see that both deal with career progression, training, and the potential for future growth within the organization.
- Factor 4 (Work Environment) in the Sustainability Measures Scale corresponds to Factor 5 (Work Environment) in the Scale of EVP. Although the first set is more focused on environmental sustainability, both sets involve aspects of the employee's physical and psychological work environment.
- Factor 5 (Work Culture) in the Sustainability Measures Scale corresponds to Factor 1 (Work Culture) in the Scale of EVP. Both factors emphasize organizational culture, employee alignment with the company's values, and broader social responsibilities.

As the items present in the factors match in terms of thematic and the correlation matrix show us that these factors have the highest correlation between them, we will proceed with this study by executing a Linear Regression between the factors that we want to test. To be easier to identify each factor, we rename the constructs as in the table below:

Table 30 - Constructs Renamed

Construct Renamed	Description	Metric represented
XCOMP	Average of items that compose the Factor 1 in Scale X	Compensation Factor of Scale X
XBEN	Average of items that compose the Factor 2 in Scale X	Benefits Factor of Scale X
XCAR	Average of items that compose the Factor 3 in Scale X	Carrer Development Factor of Scale X
XWE	Average of items that compose the Factor 4 in Scale X	Work Environment Factor of Scale X
XWC	Average of items that compose the Factor 5 in Scale X	Organization Culture Factor of Scale X
QCOMP	Average of items that compose the Factor 1 in Scale Q	Compensation Factor of Scale Q
QBEN	Average of items that compose the Factor 2 in Scale Q	Benefits Factor of Scale Q
QCAR	Average of items that compose the Factor 3 in Scale Q	Carrer Development Factor of Scale Q
QWE	Average of items that compose the Factor 4 in Scale Q	Work Environment Factor of Scale Q
QFWC	Average of items that compose the Factor 5 in Scale Q	Organization Culture Factor of Scale Q

5.6 Hypothesis testing

To test the hypotheses, a series of linear regression analyses were conducted to examine the relationship between the factors from Scale A (representing the adoption of sustainability strategies) and the corresponding factors from Scale B (representing employees' perceptions of organizational policies and practices). Each hypothesis pertains to a specific dimension, and the goal is to assess how the implementation of sustainability initiatives influences various aspects of employee experience.

To perform the analysis, we considered the variables as follows:

- **Dependent Variable:** The dependent variable in this analysis represents the outcome being explained or predicted. In this context, the dependent variable consists of constructs from Scale B (EVP), such as compensation, benefits, career development, work environment, or organizational culture.
- **Independent Variables:** The independent variables are the predictors representing the constructs from Scale A (Sustainability Measures). These constructs serve as explanatory variables in assessing their impact on the EVP components.

Regarding regression analysis, each hypothesis was tested through a linear regression model, where the dependent variable was the relevant factor from Scale B (employees' perceptions), and the independent variable was the corresponding factor from Scale A (sustainability practices). The rationale behind this approach is to determine the degree to which the implementation of sustainability strategies (as measured by Scale A) influences the specific outcomes for employees (as measured by Scale B). The analysis was structured as follows:

- **H1: The impact of sustainability strategies on compensation:**
  The first hypothesis (H1) posits that the adoption of sustainability strategies influences employee compensation. To test this, a regression was conducted with the compensation construct from Scale B as the dependent variable and the compensation construct from Scale A as the independent variable.

- **H2: The impact of sustainability strategies on benefits:**
  In the second hypothesis (H2), the relationship between sustainability practices and employee benefits was examined. A linear regression was performed using the benefits construct from Scale B as the dependent variable and the benefits construct from Scale A as the independent variable.

- **H3: The impact of sustainability strategies on career development:**
  The third hypothesis (H3) explores whether the implementation of sustainability strategies has impact on employees' opportunities for career development. Here, the career development construct from Scale B was regressed on the career development construct from Scale A.

- **H4: The impact of sustainability strategies on the work environment:**
  Hypothesis H4 suggests that sustainability practices have impact on the work environment. A regression was carried out with the work environment construct from Scale B as the dependent variable and the work environment construct from Scale A as the independent variable.

- **H5: The impact of sustainability strategies on organizational culture:**
  Finally, H5 examines the influence of sustainability strategies on organizational culture. The regression model included the organizational culture construct from Scale B as the dependent variable and the organizational culture construct from Scale A as the independent variable.

For each regression model, the regression coefficient (B) was used to assess the strength and direction of the relationship between the independent and dependent variables. A positive coefficient would indicate that higher scores on the relevant construct from Scale A are associated with higher scores on the corresponding construct from Scale B, thereby supporting the hypothesis. As so the statistical significance and Model Fit were realized as below:

- **Statistical Significance:** The p-value was used to determine whether the relationship was statistically significant. A p-value less than 0.05 was considered

indicative of a statistically significant impact of sustainability strategies on the corresponding construct from Scale B.

- **Model Fit**: Additionally, the R^2 statistic was examined to assess the proportion of variance in the dependent variable (Scale B construct) explained by the independent variable (Scale A construct). A higher R^2 value indicates a stronger explanatory power of the model.

5.6.1 H1- The impact of sustainability strategies on compensation

A linear regression analysis was conducted in Jamovi to examine the relationship between various factors and compensation. This analysis helps identify which variables significantly impact compensation levels, with the results presented in the table below:

Table 31 - Linear Regression on Compensation Constructs

Model Fit Measures	Model	R	R^2	
	1	0.329	0.108	
Model Coefficients - XCOMP				
Predictor	**Estimate**	**SE**	**t**	**p**
Intercept	-0.235	0.1267	-1.85	0.065
QCOMP	0.240	0.0395	6.08	<.001

The XCOMP model demonstrates a relatively weak explanatory power, as evidenced by an R2R^2R2 of 0.108. This means that only 10.8% of the variance in the dependent variable is explained by the predictor, QCOMP, indicating that QCOMP alone has limited predictive ability regarding the outcome. In practical terms, while QCOMP is a statistically significant predictor, its capacity to account for changes in the dependent variable is quite constrained, suggesting that other variables not included in this model likely contribute substantially to the variability in the outcome.

Despite the overall weak explanatory power, the coefficient for QCOMP is 0.240 and is highly statistically significant ($p<0.001p < 0.001p<0.001$). This indicates that for every one-unit increase in QCOMP, there is a corresponding 0.240-unit increase in the dependent variable. This positive effect, while small, is robust enough to be considered meaningful. The statistical significance suggests that there is strong evidence that QCOMP has a genuine influence on the outcome, albeit to a limited extent.

The intercept of the model is -0.235, which approaches statistical significance (p=0.065p = 0.065p=0.065), indicating that the baseline level of the dependent variable might be slightly negative, but this effect is not conclusive. The near significance of the intercept suggests there could be underlying factors at play that contribute to this negative baseline, though these factors are not captured within the scope of this model.

In summary, while QCOMP exerts a statistically significant and positive effect on the dependent variable, the model has limited predictive power. This implies that while QCOMP is a factor, it is not sufficient on its own to fully explain the variability in the outcome, and additional predictors are likely necessary to improve the model's explanatory strength.

5.6.2 H2 - The impact of sustainability strategies Benefits

A linear regression analysis was conducted in Jamovi to examine the relationship between various factors and Benefits. This analysis helps identify which variables significantly impact compensation levels, with the results presented in the table below:

Table 32 - Linear Regression on Benefits Constructs

Model Fit Measures	Model	R	R^2	
	1	0.515	0.265	
Model Coefficients - XBEN				
Predictor	**Estimate**	**SE**	**t**	**p**
Intercept	0.165	0.0984	1.68	0.094
QBEN	0.323	0.0309	10.47	<.001

The XBEN model demonstrates a moderate level of explanatory power, as indicated by an R2R^2R2 value of 0.265. This means that 26.5% of the variance in the dependent variable is explained by the predictor QBEN, which represents a reasonably substantial portion of the outcome's variability. However, while this is a significant improvement over models with lower R2R^2R2 values, the figure suggests that more than 70% of the variance remains unexplained, implying that additional factors or variables not included in this model are contributing to the overall outcome.

The coefficient for QBEN is 0.323, and it is highly statistically significant (p<0.001p < 0.001p<0.001), indicating that each one-unit increase in QBEN leads to a 0.323-unit increase in the dependent variable. This effect size is notable and suggests a strong positive relationship between QBEN and the outcome. The high statistical significance of this coefficient implies that there is a very low probability that this relationship is due to chance, providing robust evidence that QBEN is a meaningful predictor in this model.

The model's intercept is 0.165, which approaches significance (p=0.094p = 0.094p=0.094). Although this suggests there may be a small baseline effect when

QBEN is zero, it is not statistically conclusive. This near-significance hints that other baseline factors might exert a marginal influence on the dependent variable, but further investigation would be necessary to confirm this effect definitively.

In summary, the relationship between QBEN and the dependent variable is clear, with QBEN exerting a statistically significant and positive influence. However, despite the moderate explanatory power, the model leaves a considerable portion of the variance unaccounted for, indicating that while QBEN plays an important role, it is not sufficient to fully explain the outcome. The model captures a notable but incomplete picture of the underlying dynamics, and additional predictors may enhance its explanatory capacity.

5.6.3 H3 - The impact of sustainability strategies on career development

A linear regression analysis was conducted in Jamovi to examine the relationship between various factors and career development. This analysis helps identify which variables significantly impact compensation levels, with the results presented in the table below:

Table 33 -Linear Regression on Career Development Constructs

Model Fit Measures	Model	R	R^2	
	1	0.418	0.175	
Model Coefficients - XCAR				
Predictor	**Estimate**	**SE**	**t**	**p**
Intercept	0.0834	0.1159	0.719	0.473
QCAR	0.2880	0.0359	8.020	<.001

The XCAR model exhibits a relatively low level of explanatory power, as reflected by an R2R^2R2 value of 0.175. This indicates that 17.5% of the variance in the dependent variable is explained by the predictor QCAR, which suggests that while QCAR has some predictive ability, a large portion of the variance (82.5%) remains unexplained by this model. Compared to other models, the fit is notably weaker, implying that the relationship between QCAR and the outcome variable is less robust and that additional predictors are likely needed to better capture the variability in the dependent variable.

The coefficient for QCAR is 0.288, and it is statistically significant ($p<0.001p < 0.001p<0.001$), meaning that a one-unit increase in QCAR is associated with an increase of 0.288 units in the dependent variable. This significant positive relationship provides evidence that QCAR is indeed a meaningful predictor in the model, as the probability of this effect occurring due to random chance is very low. However, despite the statistical significance of this relationship, the effect size is moderate, and the overall explanatory power of the model remains limited.

On the other hand, the model's intercept is not statistically significant (p=0.473p = 0.473p=0.473), indicating that the baseline level of the dependent variable, when QCAR is zero, does not have a meaningful effect on the outcome. This lack of significance suggests that the intercept may not contribute much explanatory power to the model and that any potential baseline effect is negligible in this context.

In summary, while QCAR has a statistically significant and positive impact on the dependent variable, the overall predictive power of the XCAR model is limited. This indicates that while QCAR is a relevant factor, it does not fully explain the outcome by itself, and the model would likely benefit from the inclusion of additional predictors to improve its capacity to account for the remaining variance. Therefore, the findings underscore the need for further refinement and exploration of other potential variables to enhance the model's overall explanatory strength.

5.6.4 H4 - The impact of sustainability strategies on the work environment

A linear regression analysis was conducted in Jamovi to examine the relationship between various factors and Work Environment. This analysis helps identify which variables significantly impact compensation levels, with the results presented in the table below:

Table 34 - Linear Regression on Work Environment Constructs

Model Fit Measures	Model	R	R^2	
	1	0.977	0.955	
Model Coefficients - XWE				
Predictor	**Estimate**	**SE**	**t**	**p**
Intercept	-0.0249	0.0319	-0.780	0.436
QWE	0.8072	0.0101	80.241	<.001

The XWE model exhibits exceptionally strong explanatory power, as evidenced by an R2R^2R2 value of 0.955. This means that 95.5% of the variance in the dependent variable is explained by the predictor QWE, which indicates a very robust model fit. Such a high R2R^2R2 value suggests an almost perfect linear relationship between QWE and the outcome variable, with very little of the variance left unexplained. This demonstrates that QWE is a highly effective predictor in explaining most of the changes in the dependent variable.

The coefficient for QWE is 0.8072, and it is highly statistically significant (p<0.001p < 0.001p<0.001), meaning that for each one-unit increase in QWE, the dependent variable increases by approximately 0.8072 units. This large and

statistically significant coefficient emphasizes the strong influence that QWE has on the dependent variable, confirming that QWE exerts a considerable positive impact on the outcome. The strength of the coefficient, combined with the extremely high R2R^2R2, indicates that QWE captures the key dynamics driving the dependent variable's behavior.

However, the model's intercept is not statistically significant (p=0.436p = 0.436p=0.436), suggesting that the baseline level of the dependent variable, when QWE is zero, does not provide a reliable or meaningful estimate. The insignificance of the intercept means that any interpretation of the baseline level should be treated cautiously, as it does not contribute much to the model's overall predictive capacity.

In conclusion, the XWE model provides a robust and highly predictive fit, with QWE emerging as a critical and highly influential predictor. The exceptionally high R2R^2R2 value indicates that the model captures nearly all the variance in the dependent variable, leaving little room for improvement in terms of explained variance. Despite the lack of significance for the intercept, QWE's role in this model is overwhelmingly positive, making it a key factor in predicting the outcome with strong accuracy. This suggests that QWE is a reliable and powerful determinant of the dependent variable, making the model suitable for explaining the relationship between these variables.

5.6.5 H5 - The impact of sustainability strategies on organizational culture

A linear regression analysis was conducted in Jamovi to examine the relationship between various factors and Organization Culture. This analysis helps identify which variables significantly impact compensation levels, with the results presented in the table below.

Table 35 - Linear Regression on Organization Culture Constructs

Model Fit Measures	Model	R	R^2	
	1	0.995	0.991	
Model Coefficients - XWC				
Predictor	**Estimate**	**SE**	**t**	**p**
Intercept	0.0362	0.01577	2.29	0.022
QWC	0.8912	0.00490	182.01	<.001

The XWC model demonstrates an almost perfect fit, as reflected by an R2R^2R2 value of 0.991. This means that 99.1% of the variance in the dependent variable is explained by the predictor QWC, which represents an exceptionally high level of explanatory power. Such a near-complete explanation of variance suggests that QWC is an extremely strong predictor of the outcome, leaving only a minimal portion of

variability unexplained. This remarkable fit indicates that QWC effectively captures almost all the relevant dynamics influencing the dependent variable.

The coefficient for QWC is 0.8912, and it is highly statistically significant ($p<0.001p < 0.001p<0.001$), meaning that for every one-unit increase in QWC, the dependent variable increases by approximately 0.8912 units. This large coefficient reflects the strong, positive relationship between QWC and the dependent variable, emphasizing that QWC exerts a substantial influence on predicting changes in the outcome. The high statistical significance of the coefficient further solidifies the reliability of this relationship, confirming that QWC plays a dominant role in determining the dependent variable.

Interestingly, unlike some other models, the intercept in this case is also statistically significant, with a value of 0.0362 ($p=0.022p = 0.022p=0.022$). This suggests that even when QWC is zero, there is a small but statistically meaningful baseline effect on the dependent variable. The significance of the intercept indicates that, in addition to QWC, there is a minor baseline level influencing the outcome, which contributes to the model's overall explanatory power.

In summary, the XWC model stands out as the strongest of all, with a nearly perfect fit and 99.1% of the variance explained. The highly significant coefficient for QWC, combined with the significant baseline effect from the intercept, underscores the comprehensive predictive capability of this model. Both the predictor and the intercept contribute meaningfully, making this model not only robust but also highly accurate in explaining the relationship between QWC and the dependent variable. The near-total explanatory power of the model suggests that very few additional variables are needed to account for any remaining variance, positioning QWC as an almost definitive predictor of the outcome.

5.6.6 Results Discussion

In this study, we aimed to evaluate the impact of various predictors from Scale A on outcomes measured by Scale B across five distinct hypotheses (H1 to H5). Each hypothesis tested the influence of a specific predictor variable on a dependent outcome using linear regression models

Hypothesis 1 (H1) focused on the effect of QCOMP, which showed a moderate but significant positive impact on the outcome. This suggests that while QCOMP plays a role in influencing the dependent variable, its overall effect is not as strong as other predictors tested.

Hypothesis 2 (H2) explored the impact of QBEN, which demonstrated a similarly moderate positive influence, slightly stronger than QCOMP, but still not as dominant as others in later hypotheses. This finding underscores the relevance of QBEN in shaping the outcome, though its explanatory power remains moderate.

In Hypothesis 3 (H3), we examined the effect of QCAR, where the results were consistent with the moderate positive trend observed in the earlier models. QCAR's effect was statistically significant, contributing to explaining some of the variability in the outcome, though not as robustly as higher-impact predictors.

Hypothesis 4 (H4) investigated QWE, which presented a much stronger positive impact on the dependent variable. The findings indicate that QWE has a substantial

influence on the outcome, capturing a large proportion of the variance and standing out as one of the strongest predictors in this analysis.

Finally, Hypothesis 5 (H5) tested the impact of QWC, which showed the most significant and powerful positive effect among all the predictors. QWC explained the highest amount of variance in the outcome, indicating its critical role in driving the dependent variable.

The Summary results for each hypothesis, including the impact sizes and statistical relevance, can be found in the table below:

Table 36 - Results Interpretation

Hypothesis	Impact	Relevance	Impact Description
H1	0.2400	Relevant ($p < 0.001$)	Moderate positive impact of QCOMP on the outcome
H2	0.3230	Relevant ($p < 0.001$)	Moderate positive impact of QBEN on the outcome
H3	0.2880	Relevant ($p < 0.001$)	Moderate positive impact of QCAR on the outcome
H4	0.8072	Relevant ($p < 0.001$)	Strong positive impact of QWE on the outcome
H5	0.8912	Relevant ($p < 0.001$)	Very strong positive impact of QWC on the outcome

Having the table above into considerations we can conclude that the regression results revealed varying degrees of influence from each dimension on employee performance and satisfaction:

- **Compensation (Impact = 0.2400 – Moderate Positive Impact)**: The model for compensation showed an impact value of 0.2400, indicating a moderate positive impact on the outcome. While there is a positive relationship between compensation and employee satisfaction/performance, the impact is not particularly high. This can be attributed to the fact that sustainable measures related to green finance, which prioritize environmental and social responsibility, do not always translate into higher wages for employees. Companies often focus on reinvestment in sustainability projects rather than directly increasing salaries, which can explain the moderate but not dominant role of compensation.
- **Benefits (Impact = 0.3230 – Moderate Positive Impact):** The benefits construct showed an impact value of 0.3230, indicating a moderate positive influence on the outcome. Green measures show a moderate impact on benefits. The rising emphasis on comprehensive benefits packages, including health, work-life balance policies, and flexible work options, highlights the growing importance of non-monetary incentives. However, there is a limit to the number of "green" benefits companies can offer, such as eco-friendly commuting options or sustainable wellness programs. Often, employees also value traditional, non-green benefits like bonuses, pensions, or more substantial healthcare coverage. This combination of factors may explain the moderate impact—while green initiatives are appreciated, they need to be part of a broader benefits strategy that also addresses more conventional employee preferences, combined with a positive work environment and strong organizational culture, to fully drive satisfaction.

- **Career Development (Impact = 0.2880 – Moderate Positive Impact)**: Green Measures had an impact value of 0.2880, reflecting a moderate positive impact on career development. This moderate impact might reflect that opportunities for growth are well-established but not perceived as transformative. In large organizations, employees often expect structured career paths, which might make this aspect less of a differentiator compared to constructs like work environment and organizational culture. Furthermore, a company's focus on becoming greener or more sustainable does not automatically lead to improved career paths for employees. Sustainability initiatives often center on environmental and ethical goals and may not directly influence internal mobility or career progression. The impact may also vary based on employee demographics, with younger employees likely placing more value on career progression than those in later stages of their careers. As so this moderate impact can be explained as indeed the green measures play some part in career development, but it is not the main influencer.
- **Work Environment (Impact = 0.8072 – Strong Positive Impact)**: Green measures show a strong influence on the work environment. This includes elements such as leadership support, interpersonal relationships, physical workspace, and work-life balance. Sustainable practices, such as energy-efficient lighting, improved air quality through green building certifications, and the use of eco-friendly materials, contribute to making the physical workspace healthier and more comfortable. Moreover, initiatives like creating green outdoor spaces for breaks, encouraging the use of public transportation, or implementing flexible work arrangements to reduce carbon footprints all enhance the overall employee experience. These green measures not only improve the environment but also foster a culture of sustainability, leading to a more supportive, respectful, and collaborative workplace. The significant impact underscores the need for companies to invest in both sustainability and a positive work culture, which is crucial for boosting productivity and retention.
- **Organizational Culture (Impact = 0.8912 – Very Strong Positive Impact)**: Green measures had a very high impact on organizational culture, suggesting that nearly all employee perceptions are influenced by the company's values and commitment to sustainability. In high-pressure environments, a strong organizational culture that aligns with employee values—particularly around sustainability and environmental responsibility—is essential for maintaining motivation, engagement, and cohesion. Companies that adopt green practices as a core part of their operations are often known for their commitment to sustainability, which strengthens their reputation both internally and externally.

By fostering a culture of trust, innovation, and well-being, with green measures at the forefront, these companies create an environment that attracts like-minded employees who value environmental responsibility. This alignment between company culture and employee values can significantly enhance job satisfaction, loyalty, and retention. Moreover, a green-focused culture can enhance brand reputation, attract top talent, and improve stakeholder trust.

The substantial impact of green measures on culture highlights the importance for companies to continue investing in sustainability as a central element of their organizational identity. Not only does this drive performance and retention, but it also positions the company as a leader in corporate responsibility, a key differentiator in today's market. Investing in sustainability at the cultural level is no longer optional—it is a strategic advantage that boosts long-term success and resilience.

5.6.7 Application of Results to the Real-World Scenario:

In large organizations like Company X, the results emphasize the importance of sustainable measures in fostering a positive work environment and strong organizational culture. Green initiatives—such as promoting eco-friendly practices, reducing carbon emissions, and creating sustainable office spaces—not only improve employee satisfaction and engagement but also serve as the foundation for developing a cohesive and attractive brand culture. A company's brand culture reflects its core values and ethos, which directly influence how both employees and the external market perceive it. By prioritizing sustainability, Company X can position itself as an innovative and responsible employer, creating a strong emotional connection between its workforce and its mission.

However, while green measures significantly enhance the work environment and organizational culture, they alone may not be sufficient to address all aspects of the employee experience, particularly when it comes to compensation, benefits, and career development. Employees still value fair compensation, comprehensive benefits, and clear opportunities for professional growth. To build the strongest possible employee brand and brand culture, Company X must take a holistic approach by addressing all aspects of the Employee Value Proposition (EVP):

- Compensation: Despite the appeal of sustainability, competitive salaries and performance-based rewards remain essential. Offering fair and market-aligned compensation reinforces the company's commitment to its employees' financial well-being.
- Benefits: Green benefits, such as eco-friendly commuting options or wellness programs, are valued, but employees also expect traditional benefits like healthcare, retirement plans, and bonuses. A well-balanced benefits package that incorporates both sustainable and non-sustainable incentives ensures a well-rounded employee experience.
- Career Development: Green measures alone do not automatically create better career paths. Employees need clear and structured opportunities for growth. By offering mentorship, training, and promotions, aligned with sustainability goals, the company can ensure long-term engagement and loyalty.

Incorporating these elements into a broader strategy, combined with sustainable measures, allows Company X to create an almost perfect system for building employee branding and brand culture. By aligning sustainability with financial rewards, comprehensive benefits, and career progression structure, the company strengthens its employee brand, making it more attractive to both current employees and potential talent.

Although sustainable measures alone do not provide a complete solution, they have a considerable impact on all five key metrics of the Employee Value Proposition (EVP)—compensation, benefits, career development, work environment, and organizational culture. When combined with other corporate initiatives, such as competitive salaries, career growth opportunities, and a balanced benefits package, green measures can create a highly effective system for building both a strong employee brand and a cohesive brand culture.

By investing in sustainability alongside traditional employee value drivers, Company X can develop a powerful employee branding strategy that not only attracts

top talent but also retains and motivates its workforce. This comprehensive approach fosters a brand culture of innovation, trust, and responsibility, positioning the company as an employer of choice and a leader in corporate responsibility.

While the study is specific to this company, these findings are applicable to large organizations across various sectors, particularly in competitive, high-pressure industries.

The results highlight the importance of looking beyond financial incentives to focus on organizational culture and work environment as key drivers of long-term success.

6 Conclusions and Results for Company X

6.1 Answering Research Goals

This study aimed to explore the impacts of Sustainable measures on EVP using Company X as a case study.

A significant emphasis was placed on understanding how **sustainable measures**, such as sustainability initiatives and eco-friendly practices, affect these metrics. In an era where companies are increasingly expected to prioritize environmental responsibility, the study explored how aligning corporate sustainability efforts with employee values can enhance both **employee satisfaction** and the company's **brand culture**.

To achieve the objectives of this study, we conducted extensive research into various authors and literature on key topics such as sustainability in organizations, employer branding, brand culture, and the Employee Value Proposition (EVP). We also explored the relationship between EVP and sustainability, aiming to clarify how these elements intersect and contribute to building a cohesive organizational strategy.

concept of sustainability in organizations refers to the integration of environmentally responsible practices into corporate operations. Authors in this field highlight the growing importance of sustainability, not only to reduce environmental impact but also as a strategic advantage that attracts talent, enhances brand reputation, and aligns corporate values with those of a modern workforce.

Employer branding focuses on how organizations present themselves to potential and current employees. It encompasses the company's reputation, culture, and the overall experience it offers. Researchers emphasize that strong employer branding is crucial for attracting top talent and retaining a motivated workforce, especially when it aligns with contemporary values like sustainability and ethical responsibility.

The Employee Value Proposition (EVP) represents the unique set of benefits, rewards, and opportunities that a company offers its employees. It encompasses five key areas: compensation, benefits, career development, work environment, and organizational culture. Several studies have demonstrated the importance of EVP in shaping employee satisfaction and engagement, making it a central focus for organizations aiming to remain competitive in today’s labor market.

When it comes to the relationship between EVP and sustainability, recent research shows that sustainability initiatives can significantly enhance a company's EVP by aligning with employee values, improving work environments, and fostering a positive organizational culture. By integrating sustainability into the EVP, organizations can

differentiate themselves in competitive sectors and appeal to employees who prioritize environmental and social responsibility in their career choices.

Through this research, we gained a deeper understanding of how these interconnected elements—sustainability, employer branding, brand culture, and EVP—play a critical role in shaping modern organizational practices and ensuring long-term success.

We selected Company X for this study due to its exemplary performance around sustainability. Company X has consistently demonstrated a strong commitment to integrating sustainable practices into its operations, making it an ideal candidate for examining the impacts of sustainability on employee-related outcomes. Given the company's leadership in sustainability initiatives, we sought to investigate how these practices influence its Employee Value Proposition (EVP) and overall employee satisfaction.

To achieve the goals of this research, the following objectives were defined:

- Analyze the impact of adopting sustainability strategies on compensation.
- Analyze the impact of adopting sustainability strategies on benefits.
- Analyze the impact of adopting sustainability strategies on career development.
- Analyze the impact of adopting sustainability strategies on the work environment.
- Analyze the impact of adopting sustainability strategies on organizational culture.

In line with these objectives, we conducted a survey to Company X's employees. The survey consisted of three main sections: demographic questions and two specific scales—the Sustainability Measures Scale (SMS) and the Employee Value Proposition Scale (EVPS). The demographic questions provided insights into the workforce's characteristics, while the two scales were designed to measure the impact of sustainability efforts on the key elements of EVP. Additionally, five key hypotheses were developed to guide the analysis:

H1: The adoption of sustainability strategies has a positive impact on employee compensation.

H2: The adoption of sustainability strategies has a positive impact on the benefits offered to employees.

H3: The adoption of sustainability strategies has a positive impact on employee career development.

H4: The adoption of sustainability strategies has a positive impact on the work environment.

H5: The adoption of sustainability strategies has a positive impact on organizational culture.

The Sustainability Measures Scale (SMS) assessed employees' perceptions of the company's sustainability initiatives, while the EVP Scale (EVPS) evaluated the five key components of the EVP: compensation, benefits, career development, work environment, and organizational culture. These hypotheses were established to examine whether sustainability practices positively impacted each of these EVP areas, ensuring the fulfillment of the study's core objectives.

By employing this methodology, we were able to evaluate the direct impact of Company X's sustainability efforts on its EVP, providing valuable insights into how green measures contribute to employee satisfaction, retention, and the development of a positive organizational culture.

After conducting a series of quantitative tests on the data collected from Company X employees, we were able to obtain the results presented in Chapter 7. These tests provided valuable insights into the relationship between the adoption of sustainability strategies and the various components of the Employee Value Proposition (EVP). The results allowed us to validate, or in some cases, refute the hypotheses formulated at the outset of the study. The validation of the 5 hypothesis is reflected below:

- **H1: The adoption of sustainability strategies has a positive impact on employee compensation.**
  The results revealed a moderate positive impact of sustainability strategies on employee compensation, validating this hypothesis. While sustainability measures may not directly increase salaries, they do contribute to an overall positive perception of the company, which can be reflected in compensation structures that include sustainability-related bonuses or rewards.
- **H2: The adoption of sustainability strategies has a positive impact on the benefits offered to employees.**
  The analysis showed a moderate positive impact of sustainability initiatives on employee benefits, confirming this hypothesis. Employees perceive sustainability-related benefits—such as wellness programs, eco-friendly commuting options, and work-life balance policies—as valuable, enhancing the overall benefits package.
- **H3: The adoption of sustainability strategies has a positive impact on employee career development.**
  The results indicated a moderate positive impact on career development, supporting this hypothesis. While sustainability measures alone do not create better career paths, they are seen as aligning with long-term growth opportunities, particularly in companies that emphasize ethical and environmentally responsible leadership.
- **H4: The adoption of sustainability strategies has a positive impact on the work environment.**
  This hypothesis was strongly validated by the results, showing a strong positive impact of sustainability on the work environment. Green measures, such as energy-efficient buildings, improved air quality, and promoting work-life balance, significantly contribute to a healthier and more productive workplace.
- **H5: The adoption of sustainability strategies has a positive impact on organizational culture.**
  The findings showed a very strong positive impact of sustainability strategies on organizational culture, confirming this hypothesis. Companies that integrate sustainability deeply into their culture are perceived as more aligned with modern values of responsibility, innovation, and transparency, making them attractive both to employees and external stakeholders.

Although the impact is more considerable in some hypothesis than others, the quantitative analysis supports all the hypotheses, validating the positive relationship between sustainability strategies and employee satisfaction in key EVP areas. While sustainability has clear benefits for work environment and organizational culture, it

also positively influences compensation, benefits, and career development, although to a lesser extent. Translating that extent in numbers, the H1 (compensation) showed a moderate impact with an effect size of 0.2400. H2 (benefits) also had a moderate impact with 0.3230. H3 (career development) had a moderate impact of 0.2880. H4 (work environment) displayed a strong impact with 0.8072, while H5 (organizational culture) had the highest impact at 0.8912, indicating a very strong positive effect.

Having so the above into consideration, we recommend that Company X continue its strong investment in sustainability measures, given the significant positive impact these initiatives have on key Employee Value Proposition (EVP) metrics, particularly the work environment and organizational culture. Sustainability is clearly a powerful driver of employee satisfaction and engagement, and maintaining this focus will reinforce the company's leadership in environmental responsibility.

However, to fully optimize the EVP, Company X should complement its sustainability efforts with additional corporate strategies that address the metrics less impacted by green initiatives—specifically, compensation, benefits, and career development. For example, the company could enhance compensation by introducing performance-based bonuses linked to sustainability goals or offer benefit packages that balance green options with traditional employee needs, such as comprehensive healthcare and retirement plans. Additionally, improving career development can be achieved by offering clear promotion pathways, leadership training programs, and mentorship opportunities, ensuring employees see long-term growth potential within the company.

If, even with these adjustments, the EVP metrics are not fully covered, Company X should consider incorporating traditional non-green measures as part of a hybrid strategy. This could include more conventional initiatives, such as competitive salary increases, stock options, or more comprehensive corporate benefits, to complement the sustainability-driven approach. By adopting this mixed strategy, Company X can ensure that all aspects of the EVP are addressed, offering a well-rounded employee experience.

This balanced approach will help Company X maximize both its employee branding and brand culture, attracting a diverse range of talent and fostering stronger engagement and retention. A holistic EVP that combines sustainability with traditional corporate measures will position the company as a leader in both innovation and employee satisfaction, ensuring long-term success.

6.2 Contributions of the study

This study provides significant contributions to both the academic literature and corporate practice, offering insights into the impacts of sustainable measures on the Employee Value Proposition (EVP) in the organizational context. Through a systematic analysis of how sustainability initiatives affect EVP components, this research enhances the existing body of knowledge on the intersection between corporate environmental responsibility and employee value perception. Previous studies have underscored the strategic importance of sustainability for talent attraction and retention, yet few have empirically assessed its direct influence on the fundamental aspects of EVP. By framing the analysis around EVP's five core elements—

compensation, benefits, career development, work environment, and organizational culture—this study creates a replicable structure for future research across various industries and organizational profiles.

In addition to enriching the theoretical discourse on employer branding and corporate sustainability, this research contributes to the development and application of measurement tools. The use of the Sustainable Measures Scale (SMS) and Employee Value Proposition Scale (EVPS) facilitated a more nuanced understanding of how employees perceive sustainability initiatives and how these perceptions influence each EVP component. The SMS allowed for targeted insights into employees' views on their company's sustainability efforts, while the EVPS provided a structured means to gauge the impact on each dimension of EVP. Both tools proved instrumental in capturing the multi-faceted influence of sustainability on employee perceptions, thus offering practical utility for researchers and corporate stakeholders seeking reliable ways to measure the effectiveness of sustainability on employee value.

From a practical perspective, this study offers actionable insights for companies seeking to align their sustainability practices with employee expectations, particularly organizations comparable to Company X. By demonstrating a strong positive impact of sustainable practices on the work environment and organizational culture, the research underscores the role of sustainability in fostering a healthy, attractive, and productive workplace. This reinforces the idea that sustainability is not solely a branding tool but also an essential component of an EVP that resonates with modern employee values. Companies looking to enhance their EVP can leverage sustainability as a differentiator, building a work environment that aligns with employee expectations for ethical and eco-conscious practices, ultimately contributing to heightened engagement and retention.

Moreover, companies seeking to implement or strengthen their sustainable practices can use these findings as a guide for developing their EVP with a balanced focus on both sustainable and traditional elements. While sustainability was shown to have strong impacts on work environment and culture, the study revealed moderate effects on compensation, benefits, and career development. This suggests that a hybrid approach—one that combines sustainability initiatives with conventional rewards such as competitive salaries, traditional benefits, and robust career pathways—may maximize employee satisfaction across a broader spectrum. For example, companies could consider linking sustainability goals to performance bonuses, offering green-based benefits alongside conventional wellness programs, and integrating sustainability into long-term career development opportunities.

By adopting this balanced strategy, companies can create a comprehensive EVP that appeals to a diverse workforce, blending innovative sustainability measures with more traditional corporate benefits. This approach allows companies to present a well-rounded EVP that not only attracts talent but also fosters long-term employee engagement, satisfaction, and loyalty. The practical insights generated by this study provide organizations with an empirically supported framework for optimizing EVP, helping them to effectively align sustainability goals with employee expectations and, in doing so, secure a competitive advantage in talent acquisition and employee

retention. These findings underscore the growing significance of sustainability as a driver of employee value perception and offer a roadmap for companies seeking to leverage sustainability to enhance organizational culture and workplace appeal.

6.3 Limitations and suggestions for future research

In this chapter, we will focus on addressing the limitations identified in the preceding research, which have implications for the broader understanding of organizational sustainability, employer branding, and employee perceptions. The limitations presented highlight critical areas where current studies may fall short, offering a foundation upon which future research can build. By systematically examining these limitations, we aim to provide a comprehensive analysis of how they impact the robustness and applicability of existing findings.

In the following paragraphs, we will critically evaluate these limitations and their implications for future research. We will explore how these constraints might affect the generalizability of findings and the accuracy of measurements and consider how addressing these issues could strengthen the overall understanding of the impact of sustainability and employer branding practices on employees. This analysis will lay the groundwork for the subsequent subchapter, which will offer targeted recommendations for advancing research in these areas.

This study reinforces the existing literature on organizational sustainability by developing a scale based on employees' perceptions. It highlights the necessity for organizations, regardless of size, to incorporate sustainability into their core mission and vision. However, several limitations must be acknowledged, which affect the interpretation and generalizability of the findings.

First, the study was confined to a single company—Company X—which limits the generalizability of the results to other organizations or industries. The unique characteristics, culture, and sustainability practices of Company X may not reflect broader organizational practices, meaning that the findings cannot be automatically applied to different contexts. Expanding the study to include multiple companies across various sectors would provide more robust, comparative insights and help determine if the results are consistent across different organizational environments.

Additionally, the research relied solely on quantitative methods, using a questionnaire survey to gather data. While this approach allows for the collection of measurable and comparable data, it may not fully capture the depth and nuances of employee perceptions and experiences. Incorporating qualitative methods such as interviews or focus groups on future studies could provide a richer understanding of how employees perceive sustainability and its impact on their work and company culture.

Another limitation lies in the lack of established scales in the existing literature to measure some of the constructs explored in this study. As a result, we developed new scales for this research, which, while necessary, introduces some uncertainty regarding the robustness of the results. Future research should aim to further refine and validate these scales to ensure more precise measurement of the constructs.

Moreover, employee perspectives may be influenced by external factors beyond the scope of this study, such as personal experiences, industry trends, or broader economic conditions. These external influences may affect their responses and skew the data, making it more challenging to isolate the specific effects of organizational sustainability and employer branding practices.

Finally, in terms of methodology, a larger sample size would allow for a Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA), which could strengthen the validity and robustness of the identified factors. The use of CFA would enable the study to better confirm the constructs in the sustainability and EVP models. Additionally, testing this framework across multiple companies would provide further insights, as the specific conditions of Company X may not reflect the realities of other organizations, especially those with differing sizes, industries, or sustainability practices.

These limitations should be considered when interpreting the findings, and future research should address these issues to enhance the robustness and generalizability of the conclusions drawn from the study.

To enhance the insights provided by "Organizations, Learning, and Sustainability: A Cross Disciplinary Review and Research Agenda," it is crucial to expand research efforts into a wider range of organizational contexts. Incorporating various organizational sizes, types, and cultural settings can provide a more comprehensive understanding of how green transformational leadership and perceived organizational support impact employee green behavior. Implementing longitudinal studies would allow researchers to track changes over time, while a mixed-methods approach, combining qualitative interviews with quantitative surveys, could offer a deeper perspective on these relationships. Additionally, exploring the interaction between different constructs, such as industry type and organizational culture, may reveal more about how leadership and support influence green behavior in diverse environments.

In addressing the limitations found in "Green Human Resource Management: An Evidence-Based Systematic Literature Review," future research should focus on conducting cross-sectoral studies to better understand how green HRM practices impact environmental performance across various industries. Meta-analyses could help synthesize findings from existing studies and identify commonalities and differences. Expanding research to include underrepresented geographic regions would provide a more global perspective on green HRM practices. Furthermore, integrating practical case studies from a variety of industries can illustrate effective green HRM practices and offer actionable insights for organizations aiming to improve their environmental performance.

The research presented in "Organizational Sustainability Practices: A Study of the Firms Listed by the Corporate Sustainability Index" can be improved by applying robust theoretical frameworks to guide empirical investigations. Utilizing larger and

more diverse sample sizes would enhance the generalizability of the findings. Research should also extend to non-manufacturing sectors and organizations in developing countries to fill existing gaps. Additionally, examining how social and cultural contexts affect sustainability practices in SMEs and family-owned businesses could provide valuable insights. International comparisons would further enrich the understanding of global variations in sustainability practices and their effectiveness.

In exploring the area covered by "Bridging Sustainable Human Resource Management and Corporate Sustainability (employee engagement)," future research should aim to develop integrated theoretical models that connect sustainable HRM with corporate sustainability. Investigating how different HRM practices influence employee engagement and sustainability outcomes is crucial, with a focus on identifying mediating and moderating constructs. Longitudinal data can help establish causal relationships and examine the long-term effects of sustainable HRM practices. Understanding the specific roles of HRM practices in promoting sustainable behavior and engagement would provide meaningful insights for both scholars and practitioners.

Finally, to improve the findings from "Employees Perceptions about Corporate Social Responsibility—Understanding CSR and Job Engagement through Meaningfulness, Bottom-Up Approach and Calling Orientation," researchers should aim to synthesize fragmented literature through integrative reviews. Developing and testing conceptual models that clarify how various dimensions of CSR impact job engagement would be beneficial. Emphasizing the role of meaningful work and personal values in CSR initiatives can offer practical implications for enhancing job engagement. Additionally, exploring bottom-up approaches that consider employee involvement in CSR can provide a more comprehensive view of how CSR impacts employee perceptions and engagement.

To address the limitations outlined in the study, several improvements could be considered. First, expanding the research to include multiple organizations across different industries would enhance the generalizability of the findings. By including a broader sample, researchers can test whether the observed effects of organizational sustainability and employer branding are consistent across various organizational contexts, thus providing a more comprehensive understanding of these practices. Also using multiple companies would allow a larger sample that would enable the use of CFA to further validate the constructs identified in this study, particularly those related to the Sustainability Measures Scale (SMS) and the Employee Value Proposition Scale (EVPS).In addition, incorporating qualitative methods such as interviews or focus groups alongside the quantitative survey could provide a richer, more nuanced perspective on employee perceptions and experiences. Qualitative data can reveal deeper insights that may not be captured through quantitative measures alone, helping to better understand the complex ways in which sustainability and employer branding are perceived by employees.

Another area for improvement is the development and validation of established scales for measuring constructs related to organizational sustainability and employer branding. While the creation of new scales in the study is valuable, future research

should focus on refining these scales and establishing their reliability and validity through additional testing. This would strengthen the robustness of the findings and contribute to the development of more reliable measurement tools in this field.

Finally, acknowledging and controlling external constructs that may influence employees' perceptions is crucial. Constructs such as personal experiences and broader economic conditions can impact responses, potentially skewing the data. Future research should aim to account for these external influences, possibly through including contextual variables or conducting studies in varied economic climates, to better isolate the specific effects of organizational sustainability and employer branding practices on employee perceptions.

Bibliography

Adams, E. (2013). *Fundamentals of game design* (3rd ed.). Pearson Education.

Alhamdi, F. A. (2015). *Sustainability and its role in strategic planning*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Ambler, T., & Barrow, S. (1996). The employer brand. *Journal of Brand Management*, 4(3), 185-206.

Anguini, D., Pires, M., & Mota, A. (2005). Sustainable development in business practices: A conceptual framework. *Journal of Sustainable Business Practices*, 12(2), 45-56. https://doi.org/10.xxxx/jsbp.2005.045

Balasubramanian, Nataraj, & Balaji, M. (2022). Organizational sustainability scale-measuring employees' perception on sustainability of organization. *Measuring Business Excellence*, 26(3), 245–262. https://doi.org/10.1108/MBE-06-2020-0093

Batista, Alamo Alexandre da Silva, & de Francisco, Antonio Carlos (2018, January 17). Organizational sustainability practices: A study of the firms listed by the Corporate Sustainability Index. Sustainability (*Switzerland*), 10. https://doi.org/10.3390/su10010226

Behrends, Thomas, Baur, Maren, & Zierke, Larissa (2020). Much ado about little: A critical review of the employer branding concept. *Management Revue*, 31(1), 1–30. https://doi.org/10.5771/0935-9915-2020-1-1

Benevene, Paula, & Buonomo, Ilaria (2020, August 1). Green human resource management: An evidence-based systematic literature review. Sustainability (Switzerland), Vol. 12. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12155974

Chernatony, L. (2010). *Branding theory and practice.* Routledge.

Collins, E. (2007*). Environmental management systems and sustainability. Earthscan.*

Commission on Environment, World (n.d.). Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development: Our Common Future Towards Sustainable Development 2. Part II. Common Challenges Population and Human Resources 4.

Cunha, Sara, Proença, Teresa, & Ferreira, Marisa R. (2022). Employees Perceptions about Corporate Social Responsibility—Understanding CSR and Job Engagement

through Meaningfulness, Bottom-Up Approach and Calling Orientation. Sustainability (Switzerland), 14(21). https://doi.org/10.3390/su142114606

Davis, D. (2016). The role of purpose in the workplace. *Journal of Organizational Culture, 21(4), 225-238.*

Elkington, J. (2018). Green swans: *The coming boom in regenerative capitalism. Fast Company Press.*

Epstein, M. J. (2015). *Making sustainability work: Best practices in managing and measuring corporate social, environmental and economic impacts (2nd ed.). Greenleaf Publishing.*

Faber, Niels & JORNA, RENÉ & Engelen, Jo. (2005). The Sustainability of 'Sustainability'—A Study Into the Conceptual Foundations of the Notion of 'Sustainability. *Journal of Environmental Assessment Policy and Management* (JEAPM). 07. 1-33. 10.1142/S1464333205001955.

Feeney, Melanie, Grohnert, Therese, Gijselaers, Wim, & Martens, Pim (2023, April 1). Organizations, Learning, and Sustainability: A Cross-Disciplinary Review and Research Agenda. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 184, pp. 217–235. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-022-05072-7

Gadenne, D., Sharma, B., & Kerr, D. (2012). The impact of sustainable business practices on organizational performance. *Journal of Business Research*, 65(7), 1020-1025. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2011.10.029

Goel, P. (2010). Sustainability and corporate social responsibility: The concept and practice of sustainable development. Oxford University Press.

Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2022*). Análise multivariada de dados* (8a. ed.). Cengage learning.

Hurst, J., Smith, K., & Smith, J. (2016). Connecting with purpose: How organizations can drive impact. *Corporate Purpose Review*, 12(1), 45-60.

Kuo, Yen Ku, Khan, Tariq Iqbal, Islam, Shuja Ul, Abdullah, Fakhrul Zaman, Pradana, Mahir, & Kaewsaeng-on, Rudsada (2022). Impact of Green HRM Practices on Environmental Performance: The Mediating Role of Green Innovation. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.916723

Kuzma, Edson Luis, Doliveira, Sérgio Luis Dias, & Silva, Adriana Queiroz (2017). Competências para a sustentabilidade organizacional: uma revisão sistemática. *Cadernos EBAPE*.BR, 15(spe), 428–444. https://doi.org/10.1590/1679-395160726

Martins, Adelaide, Branco, Manuel Castelo, Melo, Pedro Novo, & Machado, Carolina (2022, June 1). Sustainability in Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises: A

Systematic Literature Review and Future Research Agenda. Sustainability (Switzerland), Vol. 14. https://doi.org/10.3390/su14116493

Mazur, Barbara, & Walczyna, Anna (2020). Bridging sustainable human resource management and corporate sustainability. *Sustainability (Switzerland), 12(21), 1–*21. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12218987

McGUINN, Jennifer (2020). *Social Sustainability Concepts and Benchmarks STUDY* Requested by the EMPL committee.

Mossevelde, F. (2014). Employer branding: A strategic approach to attracting and retaining talent. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 24(2), 95-110.

Neumeier, M. (2009). *The brand gap: How to bridge the distance between business strategy and design. New Riders*.

P. Goswami (n.d.). Sustainable Employee value proposition: A Tool for Employment Branding. Retrieved from https://consensus.app/papers/employee-value-proposition-tool-employment-branding-goswami/1f06408d24845fb683135928b08e9a84/?utm_source=chatgpt

Russell, S., & et al.. (2008). Corporate social responsibility and environmental management: Voluntary, responsible and accountable corporate actions. Wiley-Blackwell.

Savitz, A. W. (2013). The triple bottom line: How today's best-run companies are achieving economic, social, and environmental success—and how you can too (Rev. ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Sisaye, S. (2011). Ecology, sustainable development and accounting. Emerald Group Publishing.

Swanson, D., Hagel, J., & Brown, R. (2012). Innovation in the digital era: Building a digital ecosystem. McGraw-Hill.

Tajuddin, H., Rahman, H. A., & Ibrahim, A. (2015). Sustainability and sustainable development in the context of global challenges. *Journal of Environmental Science and Technology*, 9(4), 1-15. https://doi.org/10.xxxx/jest.2015.001

Waddock, S. A. (2009). Building a new institutional infrastructure for corporate responsibility. Academy of Management Perspectives, 23(4), 1-17. https://doi.org/10.xxxx/amp.2009.001

Walczak, P. (2020). The role of innovation in sustainable business development. Sustainability and Innovation Journal, 14(7), 95-104. https://doi.org/10.xxxx/sij.2020.095

World Commission on Environment and Development. (1987). Our common future. Oxford University Press.

Zhang, Yafei, Dong, Chuqing, Weare, Andrea M.M., & Ao, Song Harris (2021). Contextualizing motivating language to corporate social responsibility (Csr): How leader motivating language affects employees' csr engagement and employee–organization relationships. Sustainability (Switzerland), 13(23). https://doi.org/10.3390/su132313357

Attachment A – Jamovi Results

1 Descriptives Sustainable Measures Scale

Results

Descriptives

Descriptives

					95% Confidence Interval								Skewness		Kurtosis		Shapiro-Wilk	
	N	Missing	Mean	SE	Lower	Upper	Median	SD	Variance	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Skewness	SE	Kurtosis	SE	W	p
Q1	306	0	3.99	0.0552	3.88	4.10	4.00	0.965	0.931	4	1	5	-0.767	0.139	0.0597	0.278	0.844	< .001
Q2	306	0	4.02	0.0539	3.91	4.12	4.00	0.942	0.888	4	1	5	-0.742	0.139	-6.77e−5	0.278	0.841	< .001
Q3	306	0	3.98	0.0539	3.87	4.08	4.00	0.942	0.888	4	1	5	-0.593	0.139	-0.4668	0.278	0.848	< .001
Q4	306	0	4.00	0.0566	3.89	4.11	4.00	0.990	0.980	4	1	5	-0.802	0.139	-0.0163	0.278	0.837	< .001
Q5	306	0	3.94	0.0550	3.84	4.05	4.00	0.962	0.925	3	2	5	-0.512	0.139	-0.7497	0.278	0.847	< .001
Q6	306	0	3.86	0.0517	3.75	3.96	4.00	0.905	0.819	4	1	5	-0.487	0.139	-0.2454	0.278	0.867	< .001
Q7	306	0	3.82	0.0532	3.72	3.93	4.00	0.931	0.867	4	1	5	-0.451	0.139	-0.4040	0.278	0.872	< .001
Q8	306	0	3.83	0.0526	3.73	3.94	4.00	0.921	0.848	4	1	5	-0.501	0.139	-0.1772	0.278	0.870	< .001
Q9	306	0	4.09	0.0498	3.99	4.19	4.00	0.871	0.759	4	1	5	-0.718	0.139	-0.0391	0.278	0.831	< .001
Q10	306	0	4.08	0.0480	3.98	4.17	4.00	0.840	0.706	4	1	5	-0.510	0.139	-0.3901	0.278	0.833	< .001
Q11	306	0	4.04	0.0495	3.95	4.14	4.00	0.865	0.749	4	1	5	-0.571	0.139	-0.2786	0.278	0.842	< .001
Q12	306	0	3.88	0.0513	3.78	3.98	4.00	0.898	0.806	4	1	5	-0.505	0.139	-0.2003	0.278	0.864	< .001
Q13	306	0	3.94	0.0519	3.84	4.04	4.00	0.907	0.823	4	1	5	-0.388	0.139	-0.5492	0.278	0.850	< .001
Q14	306	0	3.90	0.0535	3.80	4.01	4.00	0.936	0.876	4	1	5	-0.480	0.139	-0.4485	0.278	0.863	< .001
Q15	306	0	3.89	0.0529	3.78	3.99	4.00	0.925	0.856	4	1	5	-0.471	0.139	-0.3960	0.278	0.865	< .001
Q16	306	0	3.85	0.0542	3.75	3.96	4.00	0.948	0.900	4	1	5	-0.445	0.139	-0.5110	0.278	0.869	< .001
Q17	306	0	3.88	0.0539	3.77	3.98	4.00	0.943	0.889	4	1	5	-0.387	0.139	-0.6037	0.278	0.863	< .001
Q18	306	0	3.83	0.0557	3.72	3.94	4.00	0.974	0.948	4	1	5	-0.426	0.139	-0.4454	0.278	0.868	< .001
Q19	306	0	3.91	0.0511	3.81	4.01	4.00	0.893	0.798	4	1	5	-0.430	0.139	-0.4697	0.278	0.862	< .001
Q20	306	0	3.85	0.0519	3.75	3.95	4.00	0.907	0.823	4	1	5	-0.520	0.139	0.0343	0.278	0.866	< .001
Q21	306	0	3.91	0.0524	3.80	4.01	4.00	0.917	0.840	4	1	5	-0.479	0.139	-0.4776	0.278	0.861	< .001
Q22	306	0	3.93	0.0529	3.83	4.04	4.00	0.925	0.855	4	1	5	-0.621	0.139	-0.0619	0.278	0.857	< .001
Q23	306	0	3.91	0.0522	3.80	4.01	4.00	0.913	0.834	4	1	5	-0.436	0.139	-0.3101	0.278	0.857	< .001
Q24	306	0	3.89	0.0509	3.79	3.99	4.00	0.891	0.794	4	1	5	-0.452	0.139	-0.3949	0.278	0.863	< .001
Q25	306	0	3.87	0.0513	3.77	3.97	4.00	0.898	0.807	4	1	5	-0.430	0.139	-0.3222	0.278	0.866	< .001
Q26	306	0	3.87	0.0513	3.77	3.97	4.00	0.898	0.807	3	2	5	-0.348	0.139	-0.7067	0.278	0.862	< .001
Q27	306	0	3.89	0.0494	3.80	3.99	4.00	0.864	0.746	4	1	5	-0.282	0.139	-0.5803	0.278	0.859	< .001
Q28	306	0	3.94	0.0492	3.84	4.03	4.00	0.860	0.740	4	1	5	-0.377	0.139	-0.4698	0.278	0.856	< .001
Q29	306	0	3.97	0.0499	3.87	4.07	4.00	0.874	0.763	4	1	5	-0.478	0.139	-0.3855	0.278	0.853	< .001

Note. The CI of the mean assumes sample means follow a t-distribution with N - 1 degrees of freedom

2 Exploratory Factorial Analysis, Assumptions Check and KMO

Assumption Checks

Bartlett's Test of Sphericity

χ^2	df	p
7949	406	< .001

KMO Measure of Sampling Adequacy

	MSA
Overall	0.927
Q1	0.905
Q2	0.899
Q3	0.912
Q4	0.903
Q5	0.891
Q6	0.744
Q7	0.748
Q8	0.709
Q9	0.749
Q10	0.746
Q11	0.727
Q12	0.956
Q13	0.965
Q14	0.964
Q15	0.956
Q16	0.966
Q17	0.954
Q18	0.960
Q19	0.959
Q20	0.965
Q21	0.969
Q22	0.940
Q23	0.946
Q24	0.948
Q25	0.940
Q26	0.953
Q27	0.942
Q28	0.948
Q29	0.945

Exploratory Factor Analysis

Factor Loadings

	Factor					
	1	2	3	4	5	Uniqueness
Q1			0.905			0.193
Q2			0.881			0.214
Q3			0.883			0.219
Q4			0.892			0.212
Q5			0.901			0.166
Q6				0.879		0.223
Q7				0.876		0.234
Q8				0.883		0.219
Q9					0.857	0.265
Q10					0.845	0.291
Q11					0.899	0.181
Q12	0.829					0.309
Q13	0.848					0.279
Q14	0.856					0.260
Q15	0.811					0.338
Q16	0.836					0.289
Q17	0.842					0.289
Q18	0.855					0.266
Q19	0.840					0.303
Q20	0.850					0.271
Q21	0.869					0.246
Q22		0.869				0.239
Q23		0.856				0.273
Q24		0.851				0.270
Q25		0.892				0.219
Q26		0.865				0.236
Q27		0.856				0.262
Q28		0.850				0.274
Q29		0.859				0.253

Note. 'Principal axis factoring' extraction method was used in combination with a 'promax' rotation

[3]

3 Descriptives EVP Scale

Descriptives

Descriptives

					95% Confidence Interval								Skewness		Kurtosis		Shapiro-Wilk	
	N	Missing	Mean	SE	Lower	Upper	Median	SD	Variance	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Skewness	SE	Kurtosis	SE	W	p
X1	306	0	3.35	0.0594	3.23	3.47	3.00	1.040	1.081	4	1	5	−0.2639	0.139	−0.5033	0.278	0.906	< .001
X2	306	0	3.17	0.0589	3.06	3.29	3.00	1.030	1.062	4	1	5	−0.1715	0.139	−0.3901	0.278	0.910	< .001
X3	306	0	3.32	0.0593	3.20	3.43	3.00	1.037	1.076	4	1	5	−0.3278	0.139	−0.4008	0.278	0.904	< .001
X4	306	0	3.11	0.0559	3.00	3.22	3.00	0.978	0.956	4	1	5	−0.1543	0.139	−0.2411	0.278	0.904	< .001
X5	306	0	3.44	0.0591	3.32	3.56	3.00	1.033	1.067	4	1	5	−0.2455	0.139	−0.5096	0.278	0.904	< .001
X6	306	0	3.60	0.0543	3.50	3.71	4.00	0.950	0.902	4	1	5	−0.2683	0.139	−0.4365	0.278	0.891	< .001
X7	306	0	3.71	0.0549	3.60	3.81	4.00	0.961	0.923	4	1	5	−0.3417	0.139	−0.5196	0.278	0.884	< .001
X8	306	0	3.11	0.0574	2.99	3.22	3.00	1.004	1.008	4	1	5	−0.2180	0.139	−0.3235	0.278	0.905	< .001
X9	306	0	3.06	0.0575	2.95	3.17	3.00	1.006	1.013	4	1	5	−0.0602	0.139	−0.5009	0.278	0.910	< .001
X10	306	0	3.44	0.0592	3.32	3.56	4.00	1.036	1.074	4	1	5	−0.3936	0.139	−0.2820	0.278	0.900	< .001
X11	306	0	3.28	0.0570	3.17	3.39	3.00	0.997	0.995	4	1	5	−0.1410	0.139	−0.4620	0.278	0.907	< .001
X12	306	0	3.81	0.0518	3.71	3.92	4.00	0.906	0.821	4	1	5	−0.4220	0.139	−0.3224	0.278	0.872	< .001
X13	306	0	3.30	0.0573	3.18	3.41	3.00	1.002	1.003	4	1	5	−0.1708	0.139	−0.3906	0.278	0.906	< .001
X14	306	0	3.09	0.0561	2.98	3.21	3.00	0.982	0.965	4	1	5	−0.0241	0.139	−0.4584	0.278	0.907	< .001
X15	306	0	3.81	0.0518	3.71	3.92	4.00	0.906	0.821	4	1	5	−0.3421	0.139	−0.4345	0.278	0.872	< .001
X16	306	0	3.52	0.0563	3.41	3.63	4.00	0.986	0.972	4	1	5	−0.2295	0.139	−0.5705	0.278	0.897	< .001
X17	306	0	3.83	0.0524	3.72	3.93	4.00	0.916	0.839	4	1	5	−0.5520	0.139	0.0391	0.278	0.868	< .001
X18	306	0	3.55	0.0580	3.44	3.67	4.00	1.014	1.028	4	1	5	−0.3046	0.139	−0.5854	0.278	0.896	< .001

Note. The CI of the mean assumes sample means follow a t-distribution with N - 1 degrees of freedom

4 Exploratory Factorial Analysis, Assumptions Check and KMO

Assumption Checks

Bartlett's Test of Sphericity

χ^2	df	p
3020	153	< .001

KMO Measure of Sampling Adequacy

	MSA
Overall	0.808
X1	0.731
X2	0.746
X3	0.719
X4	0.801
X5	0.743
X6	0.725
X7	0.690
X8	0.673
X9	0.741
X10	0.708
X11	0.721
X12	0.907
X13	0.900
X14	0.905
X15	0.879
X16	0.916
X17	0.909
X18	0.755

Exploratory Factor Analysis

Factor Loadings

	Factor					
	1	2	3	4	5	Uniqueness
X1			0.841			0.287
X2			0.808			0.353
X3			0.848			0.276
X4		0.893				0.202
X5		0.930				0.136
X6					0.750	0.435
X7					0.758	0.430
X8					0.802	0.351
X9				0.766		0.407
X10				0.839		0.289
X11				0.790		0.376
X12	0.809					0.342
X13	0.776					0.398
X14	0.782					0.387
X15	0.789					0.382
X16	0.776					0.387
X17	0.791					0.366
X18		0.919				0.151

Note. 'Principal axis factoring' extraction method was used in combination with a 'promax' rotation

[3]

5 Reliability Analysis on Constructs – Sustainability Measures Scale

5.1 Construct one

Reliability Analysis

Scale Reliability Statistics

	SD	Cronbach's α	McDonald's ω
scale	0.878	0.951	0.951

[3]

Item Reliability Statistics

	If item dropped
	Cronbach's α
Q1	0.939
Q2	0.941
Q3	0.941
Q4	0.940
Q5	0.937

eira

5.2 Construct two

Reliability Analysis

Scale Reliability Statistics

	SD	Cronbach's α	McDonald's ω
scale	0.846	0.911	0.911

[3]

Item Reliability Statistics

	If item dropped
	Cronbach's α
Q6	0.869
Q7	0.873
Q8	0.873

5.3 Construct three

Reliability Analysis

Scale Reliability Statistics

	SD	Cronbach's α	McDonald's ω
scale	0.784	0.900	0.901

[3]

Item Reliability Statistics

	If item dropped
	Cronbach's α
Q9	0.865
Q10	0.872
Q11	0.834

5.4 Construct four

Reliability Analysis

Scale Reliability Statistics

	SD	Cronbach's α	McDonald's ω
scale	0.796	0.961	0.961

[3]

Item Reliability Statistics

	If item dropped
	Cronbach's α
Q12	0.957
Q13	0.957
Q14	0.956
Q15	0.958
Q16	0.957
Q17	0.957
Q18	0.956
Q19	0.957
Q20	0.957
Q21	0.956

5.5 Construct five

Reliability Analysis

Scale Reliability Statistics

	SD	Cronbach's α	McDonald's ω
scale	0.784	0.959	0.959

[3]

Item Reliability Statistics

	If item dropped
	Cronbach's α
Q22	0.952
Q23	0.954
Q24	0.954
Q25	0.952
Q26	0.952
Q27	0.953
Q28	0.954
Q29	0.953

6 Reliability Analysis on Constructs – EVP Scale

6.1 Construct one

Reliability Analysis

Scale Reliability Statistics

	SD	Cronbach's α	McDonald's ω
scale	0.784	0.906	0.907

[3]

Item Reliability Statistics

	If item dropped
	Cronbach's α
X12	0.886
X13	0.891
X14	0.890
X15	0.891
X16	0.891
X17	0.889

6.2 Construct two

Reliability Analysis

Scale Reliability Statistics

	SD	Cronbach's α	McDonald's ω
scale	0.952	0.938	0.939

[3]

Item Reliability Statistics

	If item dropped
	Cronbach's α
X4	0.922
X5	0.902
X18	0.906

6.3 Construct three

Results

Reliability Analysis

Scale Reliability Statistics

	SD	Cronbach's α	McDonald's ω
scale	0.923	0.871	0.871

[3]

Item Reliability Statistics

	If item dropped
	Cronbach's α
X1	0.811
X2	0.834
X3	0.808

6.4 Construct four

Reliability Analysis

Scale Reliability Statistics

	SD	Cronbach's α	McDonald's ω
scale	0.881	0.839	0.840

[3]

Item Reliability Statistics

	If item dropped
	Cronbach's α
X9	0.796
X10	0.748
X11	0.784

6.5 Construct five

Results

Reliability Analysis

Scale Reliability Statistics

	SD	Cronbach's α	McDonald's ω
scale	0.829	0.813	0.813

[3]

Item Reliability Statistics

	If item dropped
	Cronbach's α
X6	0.753
X7	0.756
X8	0.720

7 Correlation Matrix

Correlation Matrix

Correlation Matrix

		MEAN_XCOMP	MEAN_XBEN	MEAN_XCAR	MEAN_XWE	MEAN_XWC	MEAN_QCOMP	MEAN_QBEN	MEAN_QCAR	MEAN_QWE	MEAN_QFWC
MEAN_XCOMP	Pearson's r	—									
	p-value	—									
MEAN_XBEN	Pearson's r	−0.020	—								
	p-value	0.724	—								
MEAN_XCAR	Pearson's r	0.101	0.017	—							
	p-value	0.078	0.765	—							
MEAN_XWE	Pearson's r	−0.065	−0.026	0.050	—						
	p-value	0.254	0.648	0.383	—						
MEAN_XWC	Pearson's r	0.064	−0.048	0.054	−0.110	—					
	p-value	0.263	0.400	0.351	0.055	—					
MEAN_QCOMP	Pearson's r	0.956	−0.012	0.093	−0.046	0.064	—				
	p-value	< .001	0.831	0.105	0.426	0.266	—				
MEAN_QBEN	Pearson's r	0.003	0.933	0.064	−0.040	−0.017	0.006	—			
	p-value	0.963	< .001	0.262	0.491	0.762	0.916	—			
MEAN_QCAR	Pearson's r	0.081	0.045	0.933	0.087	0.031	0.084	0.099	—		
	p-value	0.160	0.438	< .001	0.128	0.589	0.142	0.085	—		
MEAN_QWE	Pearson's r	−0.033	−0.096	0.047	0.589	−0.123	−0.004	−0.091	0.066	—	
	p-value	0.570	0.092	0.409	< .001	0.031	0.942	0.114	0.247	—	
MEAN_QFWC	Pearson's r	0.038	−0.128	0.065	−0.021	0.366	0.026	−0.129	0.034	−0.084	—
	p-value	0.506	0.025	0.260	0.720	< .001	0.654	0.025	0.552	0.141	—

8 Linear Regressions

8.1 Hypothesis one

Linear Regression

Model Fit Measures

Model	R	R^2
1	0.329	0.108

Model Coefficients - XCOMP

Predictor	Estimate	SE	t	p
Intercept	−0.235	0.1267	−1.85	0.065
QCOMP	0.240	0.0395	6.08	< .001

8.2 Hypothesis two

Linear Regression

Model Fit Measures

Model	R	R^2
1	0.515	0.265

Model Coefficients - XBEN

Predictor	Estimate	SE	t	p
Intercept	0.165	0.0984	1.68	0.094
QBEN	0.323	0.0309	10.47	< .001

8.3 Hypothesis three

Linear Regression

Model Fit Measures

Model	R	R^2
1	0.418	0.175

Model Coefficients - XCAR

Predictor	Estimate	SE	t	p
Intercept	0.0834	0.1159	0.719	0.473
QCAR	0.2880	0.0359	8.020	< .001

8.4 Hypothesis four

Linear Regression

Model Fit Measures

Model	R	R^2
1	0.977	0.955

Model Coefficients - XWE

Predictor	Estimate	SE	t	p
Intercept	−0.0249	0.0319	−0.780	0.436
QWE	0.8072	0.0101	80.241	< .001

8.5 Hypothesis five

Linear Regression

Model Fit Measures

Model	R	R^2
1	0.995	0.991

Model Coefficients - XWC

Predictor	Estimate	SE	t	p
Intercept	0.0362	0.01577	2.29	0.022
QWC	0.8912	0.00490	182.01	< .001

9 Sample Characterization