
CORPORATE SUSTAINABILITY IN COMPANIES: COMPARISON OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE¹

Ahmet FİDANOĞLU

Dr., řanlıurfa Bykřehir Belediyesi, řanlıurfa,
ORCID: 0000-0001-5626-8856

Bekir DEĐİRMENÇİ

Đr.Gr.Dr., Adıyaman niversitesi, Besni Ali ErdemoĐlu Meslek Yksekokulu, Bro
Hizmetleri ve Sekreterlik Blm,
ORCID: 0000-0001-5236-5245

Abstract

The adoption of corporate sustainability policies and practices by companies is important in today's management approach. Despite the increasing academic studies on corporate sustainability in recent years, we have not come across any study comparing this concept in the public and private sectors. So, this research, it is proposed to give to the literature by analyzing the sustainable processes of public companies and private companies. Within the scope of the investigation, we collected the data according to the simple random sampling method. The data collected from public and private sector employees in řanlıurfa province were analyzed by quantitative method. When the findings obtained were examined, it Dec determined that there is a significant difference in the dimensions of social, economic and environmental sustainability between public and private enterprises. However, it has been determined that there is no significant difference between public and private enterprises in terms of managerial and cultural sustainability.

Keywords: Corporate Sustainability, Corporate Social Responsibility, Environmental Sustainability, Public And Private Companies.

İřLETMELERDE KURUMSAL SRDRLEBİLİRLİK: KAMU VE ZEL SEKTR KARřILAřTIRMASI

z

Gnmz ynetim anlayıřında kurumsal srdrlebilirlik politika ve uygulamalarının řirketler tarafından benimsenmesi nem arz etmektedir. Kurumsal

¹This study is the updated and expanded version of the paper presented at the 21st International Business Congress held on 12-14 May 2022.

sürdürülebilirlik konusunda son yıllarda artan akademik çalışmalara rağmen, kamu ve özel sektörde sürdürülebilirliği kamu ve özel sektör boyutunda karşılaştıran herhangi bir çalışmaya rastlamadık. Dolayısıyla bu araştırmanın, kamu şirketlerinin ve özel şirketlerin sürdürülebilir süreçleri analiz edilerek literatüre kazandırılması amaçlanmıştır. Araştırma kapsamında verileri basit tesadüfi örnekleme yöntemine göre topladık. Şanlıurfa ilinde kamu ve özel sektör çalışanlarından toplanan veriler nicel yöntemle analiz edilmiştir. Elde edilen bulgular incelendiğinde, kamu ve özel işletmeler arasında sosyal, ekonomik ve çevresel sürdürülebilirlik boyutlarında anlamlı bir farklılık olduğu tespit edilmiştir. Ancak yönetsel ve kültürel sürdürülebilirlik açısından kamu ve özel işletmeler arasında anlamlı bir farklılık olmadığı tespit edilmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Kurumsal Sürdürülebilirlik, Kurumsal Sosyal Sorumluluk, Çevresel Sürdürülebilirlik, Kamu ve Özel İşletmeler.

1. INTRODUCTION

The pressure of globalization has increased social concerns about environmental protection. As a result, businesses use sustainability as a strategic weapon in order to fulfill their legal obligations and to compete in general. In the academic field, important studies on corporate sustainability have been revealed in recent years (Ayril and Saracel, 2021; Selimoğlu and Yazıcı, 2021; Chatzitheodorou et al. 2021; Nwoba et al., 2021). The first studies on corporate sustainability were generally investigations aimed at understanding environmental sustainability. However, research in this area has evolved over time and has included various aspects of sustainability as well as environmental issues (for example, environmental sustainability, social sustainability and legal sustainability). A deficiency in this direction has been noticed in the international and national literature.

The focus of corporate sustainability was first mentioned in the Brundtland World Commission report (1987). In this report, it is explained as "seeing the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs". On the other hand, businesses have an important mission to ensure both their own existence and the sustainability of humanity. Businesses should transform into structures that are more beneficial to society and the environment with the "economic, environmental and social" practices they implement.

At the point of implementation of corporate sustainability, public officials are called for to be sensitive about the energy and environmental resources consumed in the daily activities of a public institution. Many public institutions develop policies to reduce the environmental impact of their actions. However, even in the absence of formal rules, individual public servants can engage in a variety of optional, environmentally friendly behaviors known as eco-initiatives.

What are the motivational factors that cause employees to exhibit eco-initiative? In order to answer this question, the concept has been frequently

discussed in the literature in a theoretical framework based on commitment to nature, organizational commitment, public service motivation and organizational citizenship behavior. When corporate sustainability is related in the situation of the public and private sectors, it is thought that the public sector is given more importance in the private sector (Guthrie et al. 2010:149). In the afterward part of the study, respectively; conceptual framework, method, findings and conclusion parts are mentioned.

2. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

In this part of the study, we examined the concepts of corporate sustainability and sustainability in the public and private sectors, respectively.

2.1. Corporate Sustainability

In recent years, corporate sustainability has been one of the issues emphasized in the business literature. In the first years of the industrial revolution, businesses adopted a production-oriented management approach and neglected the employees. Although the employee-oriented neo-classic development was dealt with necessary for a while in the afterward process, this process broke down. In the next period, modern organizations and horizontal models gained importance. Teamwork and understanding of quality have become important agenda items today. In recent years, the concept of corporate sustainability has become popular. In particular, the expectations of society and the environment have become important in the extension of the existence of the enterprises and in the growth axis.

Dalgıç Turhan (2018:20), while the understanding of sustainable development is transferred to the organizational level with the expression of corporate sustainability, it can be defined as "development provided without compromising the ability of an institution to meet the needs of its direct and indirect stakeholders (partners, employees, customers, pressure groups, society, etc.)". At the corporate level, implementing sustainability requires networking and long-term success not only with the support of top management but also some other corporate systems such as legal, research and development, quality management, human resources and communications management (Akbayır, 2019:5). When the sub-dimensions of corporate sustainability are examined, the concept of environmental sustainability highlights the responsibilities of businesses towards the natural environment. What is meant by the concept of economic sustainability is the development of some solution proposals that will contribute to the welfare of societies, one of the most important duties of enterprises (For example, providing employment to young people, extending a helping hand to people in need). Managerial sustainability, on the other hand, refers to the policies related to management strategies in the life cycle of businesses. With this concept, it is estimated that it will be logical to contribute to sustainability and which of the different approaches should be preferred, such as more business management should be involved or more democratic. Social sustainability, on the other hand, refers to the contributions of enterprises to education, training of employees, social

support projects and policies developed by enterprises for the continuation of social existence. By cultural sustainability, it is meant the policies developed to transfer the heritage of the society to generations and to protect cultural values.

At the corporate level, implementing sustainability requires networking and long-term success not only with the support of top management but also some other corporate systems such as legal, research and development, quality management, human resources and communications management.

It is seen that there are different definitions of the concept of sustainability in the literature. There are various uses of sustainability practices in businesses. At the same time, the concept has a complex structure. Some researchers have associated sustainability with the responsible behavior of organizations. Interestingly, the corporate sustainability structure is also an intertwined structure of economic, social, and ecological systems. This system has a complex that encompasses society, where the economy is also a fundamental part of the greater ekologic system. In this context, the imperatives of corporate sustainability can be structured within value systems that can result in better financial performance (Salzmann, et al. 2005:61, Van Marrewijk, 2003:23). Some researchers have developed (self)assessment tools to audit, analyze and interpret corporate sustainability (Van Marrewijk, 2003:23; Clarkson, 1995:356). However, corporate sustainability depends on different parameters; may have characteristics that may vary between industries, facilities, and countries (such as technology, systems, and R&D) (Salzmann, et al. 2005:62). It has a structure that aims to improve corporate sustainability, eco-efficiency, health and safety performance. Therefore, it helps to avoid operational risk (Porter and Kramer, 2014). Sustainable business practices help economic sustainability activities (Weber, 2008:112).

2.2. Sustainability in the Public and Private Sector

Public and private enterprises have contributed significantly to building and strengthening the economy of many countries, including developing countries. On the other hand, it plays a important role in the global economy in the procurement process of products and services. Public and private sector businesses help stimulate the development of societies (Islam and Karim, 2011:243). If enough attention is paid off to the concept of sustainability, it is possible to encounter some negative pictures. These; Due to the speed experienced in production activities, it is possible to see formations that negatively affect the structure of the natural environment, such as careless use of natural resources and excessive use of energy.

Sustainable production practices of public and private enterprises are primary environmental initiatives (Abdul Rashid, et al., 2008:21). Scientists agree that sustainable production practices will increase environmental performance. Rusinko (2007) examined the sustainable production practices of enterprises and their relationship with competitive production results, and reported that, as a result,

activities to reduce environmental pollution associate with a decrease in production costs. Porter and Van Der Linde (1995) have argued that environmentally proactive practices can achieve competitive gains, claim by Ramayah et al. (2013) are consistent with their findings. Ramayah et al. (2013) argued in their research that the aggressive position in the market brought about through green technologies and sustainable business practices.

Include sustainability policies and practices in public enterprises; It takes place at different levels depending on the country, the level of government (e.g. local vs. national/central), or the activities and objectives of each organization. It includes established that the highest progress in sustainable practices for government agencies has been at the local government level (OECD, 1998). The Council of Europe sees public enterprises as the most active units in situation environmental and sustainability policies of local governments. However, there are different opinions on this issue (Joas and Grönholm, 2004:35). In an academic study in the literature, it was reported that sustainability activities differ according to European countries, for example, such sustainable policies are realized at a higher level in countries such as Italy and Estonia, but on the contrary, it is lower in Germany and France (Hammer Schmid et al., 2013:255).

Businesses are more likely to adopt sustainability policies, especially in private organizations higher in public enterprises. In the literature, it is seen that sustainability strategies in the public sector have developed more slowly (Lundberg et al. 2009:36). This passive role of public institutions is quite remarkable (Guthrie, 2010:25). When we examined the literature, it reported in many studies that sustainable practices in public institutions were rejected (Lozano et al., 2017:36, Ramos et al., 2015:58). Although it is claimed that sustainable policies should be under the responsibility of public enterprises, it is seen that this claim is not sufficiently supported in practice. In the supervisory policies of the companies, proposed at developing the productivity of the operation; further weight is given on sustainability, economic, social and environmental studies. Enticott and Walker (2008) mentioned that the integration of sustainability has important contributions to environmental policies and sustainability of business existence. Sustainability principles; It is mentioned that they have made significant contributions to operations, activities and practices (Byrch et al. 2007). This increasing concern about sustainability in the management and activities of businesses contributes to the development of new approaches and methods that institutions can use to evaluate their sustainability profiles (Guthrie et al. 2010:149; Coutinho et al. 2018:68).

The transition to sustainability in public enterprises has revealed the need for the public sector to adapt policies towards technological innovations and to restructure institutionally (Haley, 2017:78). Therefore, the public sector understood that it was necessary to change the way it works for sustainability activities (Ramos et al., 2007b:11). Public enterprises are not only a service provider, but also an employer and resource consumer, who play an important role in achieving goals and

objectives related to sustainable development (GRI, 2005). Within the scope of sustainability, it should aim not only to protect public resources, but also to meet the expectations of stakeholders, to support public interests, to encourage participation of stakeholders, to provide more public commitment and to increase transparency in public administration (GRI, 2005:12; Sanchez et al., 2011:32). Within the scope of the 2030-Sustainable Development Goals, governments should develop new strategies in a limited number of sustainability policies (Spangenberg, 2016:255).

Corporate sustainability plays a key role in private sector businesses. Because private enterprises, as productive actors in the economy, contribute to the system to the extent that sustainability can be achieved (Jennings and Zandbergen, 1995:24). The key role of businesses in societies has led to the development of the concept of corporate sustainability (Dyllick and Hockerts, 2002:41). Corporate sustainability requires businesses to consider their environmental and social impacts in line with their economic goals. In this context, businesses need to know and analyze initiatives and measures that help them improve their proactive socio-environmental practices and thus their economic performance (Wagner, 2015:9). Some academics have put forward the corporate sustainability activities of enterprises in a resource-based structure, focusing mainly on the environmental dimension (Russo, 2003:23). These studies emphasized that businesses should have different abilities to develop proactive environmental practices (Russo & Fouts, 1997, p. 45; Christmann, 2000:12). There are limited studies on how corporate sustainability contributes to economic sustainability (Gelhard and Von Delft, 2016:21; Hart and Dowell, 2011:22). Business values that "keep up with the rapidly changing system" against the difficulties and pressures brought by adaptation to sustainability activities, corporate sustainability should be implemented effectively (Tece et al., 1997:63).

3. METHOD

This research is based on taking the opinions of public and private sector employees on corporate sustainability and comparing the opinions of these two sector employees. In our study, in which we used the quantitative research method, we used the survey method as the data collection method. The scale used in the study was taken from the study by Gültekin and Argon (2020). Before data collection, we received ethics committee approval in line with the decision of the "Adiyaman University Social and Human Sciences Ethics Committee" dated 7 December 2021 and numbered 195. "Exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis" was applied to the collected data, and "t-test and anova test" were used to test the hypotheses. We then reported the findings collected and analyzed within the scope of the study.

3.1. Purpose of the Research

The main purpose of this research is to make a comparison based on the data set obtained from the sample groups in terms of corporate sustainability for businesses operating in the public and private sectors.

3.2. Research Problem and Hypotheses

In the literature review, no study was found that applied the opinions of employees on corporate sustainability and compared these opinions at the level of public and private sector employees. In this direction, the main problem statement of the study is "Does the corporate sustainability practice differ in terms of public and private enterprises?" The hypotheses developed within the scope of the study are listed as follows.

H1: Corporate sustainability activities of public and private sector enterprises differ in terms of environmental sustainability.

H2: Corporate sustainability activities of public and private sector enterprises differ in terms of economic sustainability.

H3: Corporate sustainability activities of public and private sector enterprises differ in terms of managerial sustainability.

H4: Corporate sustainability activities of public and private sector enterprises differ in terms of social sustainability.

H5: Corporate sustainability activities of public and private sector enterprises differ in terms of cultural sustainability.

3.3. Research Population and Sample

The universe of the research consists of all public employees and private sector employees operating in Şanlıurfa. We reached 360 people using face-to-face and online interview methods for public sector employees. Participants were informed that they would mark the most appropriate options for them and that their personal information would be kept confidential in the questionnaire they were asked to fill out voluntarily. 5 of the 360 questionnaire forms returned were not included in the study due to careless filling. The research continued with 355 questionnaires.

4. FINDINGS

4.1. Demographic Characteristics

Table 1. Demographic Findings Regarding the Employees of Public Institutions Participating in the Survey

Variables					
	<25	26-35	36-40	41-45	≥ 46
Age	% 10	% 19	% 20	% 24	% 27
Sex	Female	Male			
	% 13	% 87			
Education	Primary	Highschool	Associate Degree	Licence	Postgraduate

	% 31	% 24	% 22	%18	% 5
Level of income	≤ 4250 TL	4250-4500	4501-5000	5001-5500	≥ 5501
	% 10	% 16	% 17	% 37	% 20
Working year	≤ 5	6-10	11-15	16-20	≥ 21
	% 6	% 13	% 20	% 31	% 30

When Table 1 is examined, it is seen that the highest participant age range is 46 years and over (27%). The sex of 87% of the participants is male. When examined in terms of education, it is seen that the participants are primary school graduates with a maximum rate of 31%. When examined in terms of income level, it is seen that the highest participation rate is between the "5001-5500" income group with a rate of 37%. When the working hours of the participants were examined, it was determined that the "16-20" employee group had the highest participation rate of 31%.

4.2. Reliability and Validity Analysis

We used exploratory factor analysis to test the validity of the structural model of the study (Akgün & Çevik, 2005, p. 423). Considering the exploratory factor loads, it is ".550" under the environmental sustainability dimension. 920", under the economic sustainability dimension, values between "0.486 and 0.935", under the managerial sustainability dimension; Under the social sustainability dimension, where it has values between "0.476 and 0.846"; Loads of items under the cultural sustainability dimension, with values between "0.475 and 0.896"; It is seen that it takes values between "0.490 and 0.910". The factor loading values of each item related to the sub-dimensions of the scale are above the lower limit of "0.32" explained by Değirmenci and Aytekin (2021: 100), that is, within the acceptable limits.

Table 2. Factor Load Values

Maddeler	M. S.	Eco. S.	C. S.	Soc. S.	Env. S.
Env. 1					.856
Env. 2					.750
Env. 3					.550
Env. 4					.920
Env. 5					.890

Env. 6					.746
Cor. S.1			.786		
Cor. S.2			.935		
Cor. S.3			.486		
Cor. S.4			.578		
Cor. S.5			.661		
Soc. S.1				.460	
Soc. S.2				.476	
Soc. S.3				.700	
Soc. S.4				.524	
Soc. S.5				.568	
Soc. S.6				.520	
Soc. S.7				.590	
Soc. S.8				.935	
Eco. S.1		.497			
Eco. S. 2		.846			
Eco. S.3		.676			
Eco. S.4		.607			
MS1	.462				
MS2	.651				
MS3	.644				
MS4	.490				
MS5	.476				
MS6	.619				

MS7	.846				
MS8	.820				
MS9	.726				
MS10	.761				
MS11	.756				
MS12	.800				
MS13	.600				
MS14	.696				
MS15	.646				
MS16	.726				
Kaiser-Meyer- Olkin (KMO)	.890				
Barlett Sphericity Test	$\chi^2 = 12624.120, p = .000$				
Total Explained Variance %	72.80				

Abbreviations: Eco. S. = Environmental Sustainability, C. S.= Cultural Sustainability, Soc. S. = Social Sustainability, Eco. S= Economic Sustainability, MS= Managerial Sustainability

As seen in Table 2, we found that the factors explained 72.80% of the total variance explained. Among the multidimensional scales, 50% obtained as the lower limit (Değirmenci and Aytekin, 2021: 92), and it known that the total explained variance rate in this study is well above this limit. In the investigation, the model is collected under five dimensions by the original, and we did not find cross load values. The sample adequacy and sample size of the study are at tolerable standard (Akgül, 2005: 448). We noticed Bartlett test complies with the assumption ($p < .000$) that the universe correlation matrix should be different from the unit matrix. With the results of the reliability analysis (.890), it is understood that it is highly reliable (Kalaycı, 2008: 45). As a result of the analysis, we concluded that the scale used in the study is valid.

4.3. Findings from the Hypotheses Testing

Table 3 shows the findings related to testing the hypotheses.

Table 3. Independent Sample T-test Results

Corporate Sustainability Scale	Public Companies			Private Companies			t	P
	N	Mean	S.D.	N	Average	S.D.		
H1: Environmental Sustainability	355	2.06	1,320	278	1,96	1,210	2,560	.000
H2: Economic Sustainability	355	2,50	1,232	278	2,02	1,310	2,314	.001
H3: Managerial Sustainability	355	2,32	1,123	278	2,10	1,250	2,341	.121
H4: Social Sustainability	355	2,65	1,980	278	2,03	1,232	2,001	.000
H5: Cultural Sustainability	355	2,06	1,967	278	1,99	1,311	2,540	.098

In the research, we applied the Independent Sample T test to compare public and private sector enterprises in terms of corporate sustainability (Table 3). As a result of the analysis of the obtained data; The hypothesis of "H1: Corporate sustainability activities of public and private sector enterprises differ in terms of environmental sustainability" was supported ($t=2,56$; $p<0.05$). Also, it was performed to test public and private sector enterprises in terms of economic sustainability of corporate sustainability; "H2: Corporate sustainability activities of public and private sector enterprises differ in terms of economic sustainability." hypothesis was supported ($t=2.314$; $p< 0.05$).

"H3: Corporate sustainability activities of public and private sector enterprises differ in terms of managerial sustainability." hypothesis was not supported ($t=2.341$; $p> 0.05$). "H4: Corporate sustainability activities of public and private sector enterprises differ in terms of social sustainability." hypothesis was supported ($t=2.001$; $p< 0.05$). Created to test the institutional sustainability of public and private sector enterprises in terms of cultural sustainability; "H5: Corporate sustainability activities of public and private sector enterprises differ in terms of cultural sustainability." hypothesis was not supported ($t=2.540$; $p> 0.05$). As seen in Table 3, environmental sustainability perceptions of public employees ($m=2.06$) were found to be higher than those of private sector employees ($m=1.96$). Likewise, public employees' perceptions of economic sustainability ($m=2.50$) are higher than those of private sector employees ($m=2.02$). Finally, public employees' perceptions of social sustainability ($m=2.60$) are higher than those of private sector employees ($m=2.03$). The resulting picture shows that the perception of corporate sustainability of public employees is higher than that of private sector employees. It is claimed that

the main reason for this result is the perception that public employees have a job guarantee, whereas private sector employees are at a higher risk of being fired.

5. DISCUSSION and CONCLUSION

Sustainability, which is necessary for a more livable world today; It was better understood as a result of the negative tables that emerged. It has been noticed by humanity that the Covid-19 epidemic, which has swept the world in recent years, has led to the understanding of how important sustainable behavior is, and that even the smallest negativity that occurs anywhere in the world affects the whole world. In today's world, business-related environmental degradation is frequently encountered. In this research universe, we focused on public and private businesses that we think have a major impact on environmental pollution.

Within the scope of this research, a comparison of public and private enterprises in terms of corporate sustainability was made. In this direction, opinions of public and private sector employees on corporate sustainability were sought. As corporate sustainability sub-dimensions; We used the concepts of environmental sustainability, economic sustainability, social sustainability, managerial sustainability and cultural sustainability as criteria. This study was inspired by the empirical work of Gültekin and Argon (2020). The related study is an empirical study for the development of corporate sustainability scale. In this study, the scale developed in the related study was designed to consult the opinions of public and private sector employees. In addition, unlike the original study, the research population of this study consists of public and private sector employees throughout Şanlıurfa. Within the scope of the research, a public institution and private enterprises producing plastics were compared in terms of institutional sustainability. In terms of the method used in this research; Çınaroğlu and Şahin (2013), Aslan and Kayalar (2017), Özdevecioğlu (2002), Kolçak and Korkulu (2019), Özkan et al. (2020) researches.

The findings obtained within the scope of the study show that private sector employees are more concerned about corporate sustainability. In this direction, the owners and managers of enterprises in the private sector should provide their employees with more assurance about sustainable work.

Within the scope of the study, firstly, previous researches on corporate sustainability and sustainability activities in public and private enterprises were examined. In this direction, five hypotheses were developed by sticking to the literature. In the method part, we examined in detail the way the research was conducted, the scale used, the data set, the collection of data, the validity and reliability analysis of the scales used in the study, and the testing of hypotheses with demographic findings.

When the public and private sector employees are compared in terms of demographic characteristics, it is seen that the participation rate of the public

employees according to the age range consists of the "46 years and over" participant group, while the highest participation in the private sector covers the "36-40" age group. In other words, we found that while the employee turnover is faster in the private sector, the personnel turnover rate is slower in the public sector. When examined in terms of education level, we found that the highest level of participation on the basis of public and private sectors was "primary education" graduates. In both sectors, the participants are predominantly "men". When evaluated in terms of monthly income group, we noticed that the employees of both sectors predominantly have the "5001-5500" income group in terms of monthly income group. When the participants were compared in terms of working hours, we found that public employees had a service period of "16-20" years, while private sector employees had a working period of "11-15" years.

When the findings related to the hypotheses were examined within the scope of the study, we first determined that public and private sector employees had different opinions in terms of environmental sustainability. We have revealed that the environmental sustainability awareness of public employees is higher than that of private sector employees. Secondly, we found that the level of economic sustainability of public employees is higher than that of private sector employees. Third, we found that the social sustainability levels of public employees are higher than those of private sector employees. We have determined that there is no difference between the opinions of public and private sector employees in terms of managerial sustainability.

Another finding obtained within the scope of the study is the factor loading values of the expressions in the scale. We found that the lowest factor load value for the expressions used in the research belonged to the item "Activities should be organized for the orientation of newly recruited employees ($\lambda=0.460$)". According to this, the participants have the opinion that the workplaces do not carry out sufficient job orientation activities when starting a new job in the workplace where they work. We found that the highest factor loading values ($\lambda = 0.935$) concentrated on two items. We have revealed that these are respectively "our company respects the values of its employees" and "our company expresses its culture with certain symbols". Here, we noticed that among the sub-dimensions of corporate sustainability, social sustainability and managerial values come to the fore.

When the participation levels of the participants in the sub-dimensions of corporate sustainability are examined, it is seen that public employees participate in the highest social sustainability (Avg. =2.65 and the lowest environmental and managerial sustainability (Avg. = 2.06), and private sector employees have the highest managerial (2.10) and the lowest environmental sustainability (Avg. = 1.96) in terms of sustainability." These findings are consistent with the academic study findings of Koçyiğit and Gök (2019:61).

We think that we have made significant contributions to the corporate sustainability literature in terms of purpose, method and findings within the scope of the study. We claim that frequent studies in different regions for the successors of this study will provide more support to the literature. In terms of corporate sustainability, business owners and managers have important duties. For example, businesses; It would be appropriate to develop policies based on sound environmental, economic and social foundations. In establishing a more livable world, workplace managers, lawmakers, non-governmental organizations, business owners and individuals forming the society have important duties. In this direction, measures should be taken to raise awareness of employees on environmental issues and to take measures that ensure their dignity and spiritual pleasure. Employees, business owners, lawmakers and consumers have important duties in leaving a more livable world to future generations. This study has some limitations. The study is a cross-sectional type of research. It is recommended that the studies planned to be done in the future should be done longitudinally. While comparing the public and private sector, municipal employees and private sector employees were compared. It is recommended that future studies be carried out in different sectors. In this study, data were collected from employees. Future studies are planned for supervisors and business owners. In order to generalize the findings obtained from this study, it is recommended to be conducted in different regions and to make comparisons between different countries.

REFERENCES

- Abdul Rashid, S. H., Evans, S., & Longhurst, P. (2008), **“A Comparison of Four Sustainable Manufacturing Strategies”**, International Journal of Sustainable Engineering, 1(3), pp. 214-229.
- Akbayır, Z. (2019). **“Halkla İlişkiler Perspektifinden Kurumsal Sürdürülebilirlik İletişimi ve Bir Örnek Olay İncelemesi”**, Uluslararası Halkla İlişkiler ve Reklam Çalışmaları Dergisi, 2 (1), ss.39-71. Retrieved From <https://Dergipark.Org.Tr/En/Pub/Hire/Issue/44401/515861>.
- Aslan, E.T. ve Kayalar, M. (2017), **“Kamu ve Özel Sektör Çalışanlarının İfşa (Whistleblowing) Niyeti: Karşılaştırmalı Bir Analiz”**, KMÜ Sosyal ve Ekonomik Araştırmalar Dergisi, 19 (32), ss. 15-26, Issn: 2147 – 7833.
- Ayral, G. ve Saracel, N. (2021), **“Etik İklimin Kurumsal İtibar ve Kurumsal Sürdürülebilirlik Yaklaşımına Etkisi”**, İşletme Araştırmaları Dergisi, 13(3), ss.2376-2395.
- Byrch, C., Kearins, K., Milne, M. and Morgan, R. (2007), **“Sustainable “What”? A Cognitive Approach to Understanding Sustainable Development Remain”**, Res. Account. Manage, 4, pp. 26 – 52.
- Chatzitheodorou, K., Tsalis, T. A., Tsagarakis, K. P., Evangelos, G. and Ioannis, N. (2021), **“A New Practical Methodology for the Banking Sector to Assess Corporate Sustainability Risks with an Application in the Energy Sector”**, Sustainable Production and Consumption, 27, pp.1473-1487.
- Çınaroğlu, S. ve Şahin, B. Özel (2013), **“Kamu Hastanelerinin Algılanan Kurumsal İtibar Ve İmaj Açısından Karşılaştırılması”**, Uluslararası Yönetim İktisat ve İşletme Dergisi, Cilt 9, Sayı 18, ss. 283-298.
- Clarkson, M. E. (1995), **“A Stakeholder Framework for Analyzing and Evaluating Corporate Social Performance”**, Academy of Management Review, 20(1), pp. 92-117.
- Collins, E., Lawrence, S., Pavlovich, K. and Ryan, C. (2007), **“Business Networks and Adoption of Sustainability Practices: The New Zealand example J. Clean”**, Product, 15, pp. 729 – 740.
- Coutinho, V., Domingues, A.R., Caeiro, S., Videira, N., Antunes, P., Santos, R., Painho, M., Walker, R.M. Huisingh, D. and Ramos (2018), **“T.B. Employee-**

- Oriented Sustainability Performance Evaluation in Public Institutions Corp. Soc. Responsible**", Environment Management, 25, pp. 29 – 46.
- Dalgıç Turhan, G., Özen, T. ve Albayrak, R. S. (2018), "**Kurumsal Sürdürülebilirlik Kavramı, Stratejik Önemi ve Sürdürülebilirlik Performansı Ölçümü**", Ege Stratejik Araştırmalar Dergisi, 9 (1), ss.17-37. Doi: 10.18354/Esam.304155.
- Değirmenci, B. ve AYTEKİN, M. (2021), **Çalışanların Çevreci Davranışları: Merinos A.Ş. Uygulaması (Kavram- Teori- Uygulama)**, Gazi Kitabevi, Ankara.
- Dyllick, T. And Hockerts, K. (2002), "**Beyond the Business Case for Corporate Sustainability**", Business Strategy And The Environment, 11(2), pp. 130-141.
- Eğİnli, A. T. (2000), "**Çalışanlarda İş Doyumu: Kamu ve Özel Sektör Çalışanlarının İş Doyumuna Yönelik Bir Araştırma**", Atatürk Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi, Cilt: 23, Sayı: 3, ss. 35-56.
- Enticott, G. and Walker, R. M. (2008), "**Sustainability, Performance and Organizational Strategy: An Empirical Analysis of Public Organizations**", Business Strategy and the Environment, 17(2), pp. 79-92.
- Gimenez, C., Sierra, V. and Rodon, J. (2012), "**Sustainable Operations: Their Impact On the Triple Bottom Line**", International Journal of Production Economics, Vol. 140 No. 1, pp. 149-159.
- Green, K.W. Jr, Zelbst, P.J., Meacham, J. and Bhaduria, V.S. (2012), "**Green Supply Chain Management Practices: Impact On Performance**", Supply Chain Management: An International Journal, Vol. 17 No. 3, pp. 290-305.
- GRI. (2005), "**Global Reporting Initiative Industry Supplement for Public Sector Organizations: Pilot Version 1.0**", Global Reporting Initiative, Amsterdam: Netherlands.
- Gültekin, G. S. ve Argon, T. (2020), "**Development OF Organizational Sustainability Scale Sakarya University**", Journal of Education, 10(3), ss.506-529.
- Guthrie, J., Ball, A. and Farneti, F. (2010), "**Advancing Sustainable Management Of Public And Not For Profit Organizations**", Public Management Review, 12(4), pp.449-459.
- Haley, B. (2007), "**Designing The Public Sector to Foster Sustainability Transitions: Corporate Principles and an Arpa-E Case Study Environment**", Innovation. Soc. Trance, 25, pp. 107–121.
- Hammerschmid, G., Van de Walle, S., and Stimac, V. (2013), "**Internal And External Use Of Performance Information In Public Organizations: Results From An International Survey**", Public Money & Management, 33(4), pp.261-268.
- İslam, M. and Karim, A. (2011), "**Manufacturing Practices and Performance: Comparison Among Small-Medium and Large Industries**", International Journal of Quality& Reliability Management, Vol. 38 No. 1, pp. 43-61.
- Kardeş Selimoğlu, S. ve Yazıcı, R. (2021), "**Türkiye'de Kurumsal Yönetişim ve Sürdürülebilirlik**", Muhasebe ve Finansman Dergisi, Ağustos 2021 (Özel

- Sayı), ss.113-136, Retrieved from, <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/mufad/issue/64484/982425>.
- Koçyiğit, Ç. S. ve Gök, G. (2019), **Kurumsal Sosyal Sorumluluk (KSS)**, İksad, Ankara.
- Kolçak, M. ve Korkulu, A. (2019), **"Kamu ve Özel Sektör Ayırımında İstihdam Edilenlerin Bazı Rahatsızlıklara Yatkinlik Düzeyi"**, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 201, ss.381-391.
- Lawrence, S. R., Collins, E., Pavlovich, K. and Arunachalam, M. (2006), **"Sustainability Practices of SMEs: The Case of NZ"**, Business Strategy and The Environment, 15(4), pp.242-257.
- Lundberg, K., Balfors, B. and Folkeson L. (2009), **"Framework for Environmental Performance Measurement in A Swedish Public Sector Organization"**, J. Clean. Product, 17, pp. 1017-1024.
- Maignan, I., Ferrell, O. C., & Hult, G. T. M. (1999), **"Corporate Citizenship: Cultural Antecedents And Business Benefits"**, Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 27(4), pp. 455-469.
- Nwoba, A. C., Boso, N. And Robson, M. J. (2021), **"Corporate Sustainability Strategies in Institutional Adversity: Antecedent, Outcome, and Contingency Effects"**, Business Strategy and the Environment, 30(2), pp.787-807.
- OECD (1998), **Environmental Management Systems Workshop for Government Agencies.**
- Özdevecioğlu, M. (2002), **"Kamu ve Özel Sektör Yöneticileri Arasındaki Davranışsal Çalışma Koşulları ve Kişilik Farklılıklarının Belirlenmesine Yönelik Bir Araştırma"**, Erciyes Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi, Sayı: 19, ss. 115-134.
- Özkan, B. Tuğluk, M.N. and Yiğitalp, N. (2020), **"Environmental Sustainability Scale for Children 60-72 Months Old: A Validity and Reliability Study"**, Journal of Education and Training Studies, Vol. 8, No. 1; Issn 2324-805x E-Issn 2324-8068.
- Porter, M. E. and Kramer, M. R. (2014), **"A response to Andrew Crane et al.'s Article"**, California Management Review, 56(2), pp.149-151.
- Porter, M.E. ve Van Der Linde, C. (1995), **"Toward a New Conception of the Environment-Competitiveness Relationship"**, Journal of Economic Perspectives, Vol. 9 No. 4, pp. 97-118.
- Ramayah, T., Mohamad, O., Omar, A., Marimuthu, M., & Leen, J. Y. A. (2013), **"Determinants of Technology Adoption Among Malaysian Smes: An Idt Perspective"**, Journal of Information and Communication Technology, 12, pp.103-119.
- Ramos, T. B., Alves, I., Subtil, R. and De Melo, J. J. (2007), **"Environmental Pressures and Impacts of Public Sector Organisations: The Case of the Portuguese Military"**, Progress in Industrial Ecology, An International Journal, 4(5), pp.363-381.
- Rusinko, C.A. (2007), **"Green Manufacturing: An Evaluation of Environmentally Sustainable Manufacturing Practices and Their**

- Impact On Competitive Outcomes**", Engineering Management, Vol. 54 No. 3, pp. 445-454.
- Salzmann, O., Ionescu-Somers, A. and Steger, U. (2005), "**The Business Case for Corporate Sustainability: Literature Review and Research Options**", European Management Journal, 23(1), pp.27-36.
- Spangenberg, J. Hot (2016), "**Weather or Sweeping Progress? A Critical Assessment of the Goals to Continue**", Developer, 25 (4), pp. 311 – 321.
- Van Marrewijk, M. And Werre, M. (2003), "**Multiple Levels of Corporate Sustainability**", Journal of Business ethics, 44(2), pp. 107-119.
- Weber, M. (2008), "**The Business Case for Corporate Social Responsibility: A Company-Level Measurement Approach for CSR**", European Management Journal, 26(4), pp. 247-261.
- Welford, R., Young, W. and Ytterhus, B. (1998), "**Towards Sustainable Production and Consumption: Literature Review and Conceptual Framework for the Service Sector**", Eco-Management Audit, 5, pp. 38 – 56.
- Zailani, S., Jeyaraman, K., Vengadasan, G. And Premkumar, R. (2012), "**Sustainable Supply Chain Management (SSCM) in Malaysia: A Survey**", International Journal of Production Economics, Vol. 140 No. 1, pp. 330-340.