DEVELOPING STRATEGIC EMPLOYEE GREEN BEHAVIOR SCALE FOR MALAYSIAN INDUSTRY

[1]Mukhiffun Mukapit, [2]*Siti Fardaniah Abdul Aziz, [3]Mohd. Nasir Selamat,
[4]Mostafa Kamal Mokhtar

ABSTRACT--The aim of this paper is to report the development of Strategic Employee Green Behavior Scale (SEGBS) to measure standard green attitudes in workplace. There are very limited instruments that can measure the standard of employee green behavior (EGB) in the workplace. Therefore, eight steps suggested by previous scholar were followed to develop an instrument named SEGBS. The instrument's reliability, face validity, content validity, and exploratory factor analysis were done. There are 22 items in the first stage of SEGBS development but only 17 items left in the final version of SEGBS.A pilot study was conducted among the ISO14001 certified company's employees; result indicated a high reliability value. This demonstrated that SEGBS can be used to measure green behavior in a workplace.

Keyword-- Green Behavior, Employee Green Behavior, Strategic Employee Green Behavior, Scale, Strategic Planning, ISO14001.

I.   INTRODUCTION

Industrial pollution is increasingly high and becomes a threat to the modern world balance(Xiange et al., 2011). More pollution issues was raised in urban development issues (Mazifah et al., 2015)However these conditions are challenging and difficult to avoid as industrial and manufacturing has become the main source of economic growth (Hezri, 2011), Hence, the green concept approach has been widely used in the organization to reduce pollution (Ambec & Lanoie, 2008). Green concept has become a main component of life (Jusoh et al, 2014).Private organization and government has been implemented regulation and policies of green environment (Abd Aziz & Tengku Sarina, 2019).The green issue now became aglobal issue (Rahim et al., 2012). The convergence of green

[1]Center for Research in Psychology and Human Well-Being, Faculty of Social Science and Humanities, The National University of Malaysia (Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia), Faculty of Technology Management & Technopreneurship, Universiti Teknikal Malaysia.

[2]*Center for Research in Psychology and Human Well-Being, Faculty of Social Science and Humanities, The National University of Malaysia (Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia), Siti Fardaniah Abdul Aziz,daniah@ukm.edu.my.

[3]Center for Research in Psychology and Human Well-Being, Faculty of Social Science and Humanities, The National University of Malaysia (Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia).

[4]Center for Research in Psychology and Human Well-Being, Faculty of Social Science and Humanities, The National University of Malaysia (Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia).

study field has also been widespread in organizational research such as concept of green management, green technology, green industry and green engineering (Rajiani et al., 2015). Green concept can reduce organizational costs and energy sources (Abdullah & Ahmad, 2014).Organizations and researchers are become more interested to organize many studies about green behavior at workplace. However, the understanding ofEmployee Green Behavior (EGB) and strategic planning in organization is very limited due to the lack of instruments in measuring it.

ISO 14001 is one of strategic planning that provides guideline for organization to achieve strategic business that aims to incorporate environmental issue into business management. ISO 14001 is the most accepted and well known environmental standard in Malaysia and worldwide(Kadir et al., 2006).Besides, employees' commitment is very important to ensure this ISO 14001 can be implemented and subsequently obtained the ratification of its practice (Boiral et al., 2018). The study of EGB among employees working at those organizations involved in ISO 14001 is very limited either in Malaysia or overseas because most studies has only been focusing on management and institutions(Sharma et al., 2014). Hence, there is a need to develop an instrument to explain the green behavior phenomenon in the ISO 14001 organization.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Green behavior at workplace was coined by Ones and Dilchert (2013)that focus on job taxonomy as an EGB measurement by introducing five taxonomy in environmental work performance. By identifying the EGB domain, the Green Five taxonomy helps define future research about dimensions in EGB. Because this study is something new, the definition and taxonomy was defined based on the psychology inspection(Mcconnaughy, 2014).

Generally, green behavior is an individual behaviors that are relatively positive to the environment known as Pro-Environmental Behavior(Safari et al., 2018), these behaviors are also related and identified as environmental responsibility behaviors, environmental sustainability behaviors, environmental friendly behavior and ecological behavior(Mohammed Noor et al., 2015). Employee Green Behavior (EGB) can be defined as the behavior of individuals that can be measured to achieve environmental sustainability at the workplace (Norton, 2016; Ones & Dilchert, 2012).

Researchers who have been studying about environmental sustainability behavior including Bissing-Olson(2015), Norton (2016)and Ones and Dilchert(2013)emphasized that green behaviormust be implemented at the workplace. Previous study on green behavior has demonstrated EGB into two groups of situations; these are the green behavior at work and at homesetting. Based on a systematic review study, it is found that this behavior was conceptualized by a voluntary behavior(Norton et al, 2015).

Nevertheless, organizational psychologists have found that not all EGB are voluntary behaviors (Ones & Dilchert, 2013). Pascal and Mejía (2014) reported that the use of resources, sustainability and avoidance of harm are initiatives developed in work-setting to stimulate indirect, non- work related EGB. Similarly, in the study of Smith and O'sullivan (Smith & O'Sullivan, 2012) had categorized green behavior in the work placeinto two

different perspectives, which are directly and indirectly. The indirect EGB has more impact on large scale over to changes in the organization. So in the study they divided the EGB into two behaviors i.e. work and also voluntary or proactive (Bissing-Olson et al, 2013; Norton et al., 2015; Robertson & Barling, 2013)

But Norton et al. (2015) found that green behavior is a requirement for any organization that can lead to the success of core business achievement if implemented asstrategic planning rather than work and proactive EGB. Several models and theories are used to describe this phenomenon at a multi-level integration. Model for EGB by Norton (2016), combines factors affecting proactive EGB and the five green taxonomy by Ones and Dilchert(2013); the modelalso describes factors related to EGB. Nonetheless, Bissing-olson (2015) argue that the multi-level integration Model of EGB areassociated with voluntary and working behavior only. However, EGB is more specific to environmental sustainability strategy around the organization;study that integrates EGB as organizationalstrategic planning based on ISO 14001 is still limited.

On the other hand, although EGB is applied as organizational strategic planning, these behaviors become symbolic or non-real behavior in the organization, and it cannot enforce the policy, mission and vision of theenvironment's conservation(Ferrón-Vílchez, 2016). In fact, previous research shows that the environment's conservation within organization is highly dependent on individual participation (Ramus & Killmer, 2007; Sharma et al., 2014). Therefore,there is a need to develop an instrument to measure strategic employee green behavior by combining three important components including: 1) Work Green Behavior; 2)Proactive Green Behavior; and 3) Standard Green Behavior. This is important feature inEGB in order to meet the organization's green strategic planning(Mukapit et al, 2018).Therefore, this study aims to develop and validate an instrument named *Strategic Employee Green Behavior Scale*(SEGBS); the instrument can evaluatethe level of EGB at the workplace based on environmental strategic planning. This study is important to answer several research questions including:

1) Can previous literature help in constructing new measurement of SEGBS?
2) How SEGB is reliable and validated to measure EGB effectiveness?

III. METHOD

The development ofSEGBSis based on suggestion by Colton and Covert (2007) to develop an instrument; the suggestion was used by many researchers including Aziz and Zakaria (2019). Eight steps were suggested by them to construct an instrument including: (I) finding research question, (II) gaining feedback from stakeholder, (III) identifying research method, (IV) formulating research question, (V) pre-test items and preliminary draft, (VI) revise instrument based on feedback, (VII) pilot study and revise instrument, and (VIII) administer instrument, analyze, and report result.

In line with Colton and Covert (2007) suggestion, the construction of SEGBS began with step I by identifying the purpose of study by finding a research questions through the systematic literature review in the previous section. After finishing step I, step II was followed by collecting feedbackinfocus groupstudy to determine relevant indicators in terms of conceptual and operational definition. Step III was organized by defining the best research

methods and type of instrument to use for data collection. Further, step IV was followed by constructingSEGBS' items based onrelevant subject. In addition, step V was followed by validating SEGBS among the Subject Matter Expert from academic, industry and potential raters for jury validation to refine the items. Next, step VI was followed by revising instrument based on feedback. Later, step VII was followed by organizing a pilot study to revise items using Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA). Finally, step VIII was followed by administering instrument, analyzing and reporting results.

IV.   RESULT AND DISSCUSION

As suggested by Colton and Covert (2007), the first step find research question on the needs of developing SEGBS. This was done in literature review previous; in which, 1) there is a need to develop SEGBS because previous literature has very limited instrument to measure EGB that can effectively measure the implementation of EGB; 2) to date, there is no instrument that can measure EGB by combining the three important dimensions including Work Green Behavior, Proactive Green Behavior, and Standard Green Behavior; 3)some research questions appeared including i) can previous literature help in constructing new measurement of SEGBS? ii) How SEGBSis reliable and validated to measured EGB effectiveness?

Step II was followed by obtaining feedback from supervisors and panels of stakeholder comprising four PhD holders in psychology, human resource development and community development for clarity of purpose and focus of the study. Then,Step III was followed by determining appropriate methodology to develop theSEGBS. Quantitative method was chosen to test the instrument usingsuggestion by Hinkin et al. (1997); in which, instrument's items were developed after defining the conceptual and operational definition and an EFA is used for item reduction. In addition tothe validation and reliability was tested based on suggestion Neuman (2011).Both Step I and Step demonstrated SEGBS's face and content validity.

Next, in Step IV, 10 items was adapted from previous study and 12 items was self-constructed. A total of 22 items was constructed on first version on SEGBS to determine work green behavior, proactive green behavior and standard green behavior. Five items wereadapted to measure Work Green Behavior from Norton (2016) and Bissing-olson (2015),five items were adapted from Norton (2016) andBissing-olson (2015) to measure Proactive Green Behavior, and 12 items were self-constructed to measure Standard Green Behavior by adapting rules in ISO14001 standard documentation (as explained by Mori and Welch, 2008). All 22 items were developed with 10 points scale (1 = strongly disagree, 10 =strongly agree). The SEGBS was developed by using dual language which are Malay and English language.

Step V was organized usingassessment by relevantjuriesselected among academician, industry and potential respondent. Nineteen juries were selected; five are Subject Matter Expert (SME) from academician which holdPhD. in Human Resource (UTeM), Psychology and Counselling (UTeM), Environmental and Biodiversity (Research

Centre of Science and Environment, IKIM);, and Nanoethics and Future Research (IKIM); fourare practitioners from industries that holding management position at Department of Environment (DOE) and Standard and Industrial Research Institute of Malaysia (SIRIM); and 10are potential rater employee from SunPower Corporation Melaka.

Table 1: Jury validation to verify content validity in SEGBS

Components	Number of Item	Types of Juries	Average Score Percentage	Total Average Percentage
Work Green Behavior	5	SME	0.90	0.87
		Practitioner	0.88	
		PR	0.84	
Proactive Green Behavior	5	SME	0.91	0.87
		Practitioner	0.86	
		PR	0.85	
Standard Green Behavior	12	SME	0.91	0.88
		Practitioner	0.88	
		PR	0.84	

Notes: SME = Subject Matter Expert; PR=Potential Rater

These relevant juries have agreed to help as juries. Quantitative approach was carried out to fulfill this step, in which, these juries will give their scores from one to 10, and noted comments for each item for improvement purposes. Scale one represent "strongly disagreed" and 10 represent "strongly agreed" for these items. These scores were calculated into coefficient validity; in which, item that was rated 0.8 and above will be included in SEGBS. According to Sekaran (2003) and Hair, Jr, (2015), the reliability value of less than 0.70 is considered low and unacceptable, the alpha value between 0.60 and 0.80 is accepted while the alpha value of more than 0.80 is considered good. Based on the above description, this study has used the cut-off point that equivalent with Cronbach Alpha value to select appropriate items. Table 1 shows the value of coefficient validity calculated based on Study V. In Step V, all 22 items remain in SEGBS.

Further, in Step VI, itemswere revised based on language, sentences and grammatical improvement as recommended in jury feedback.Furthermore, in Step VII, SEGBS was revised by validating the instrument's reliability and factor analysis. To achieve this, a pilot study was doneby testing SEGBS among 235 employees working with those organization certified with ISO14001.Based on MacCallum et al. (1999), the number of sample size should be five times greater than the total number of items used in EFA. Therefore, in Step VI, sample size should be at least 110 samples (22 x 5 = 110), however, 235samples were used to improve EFA result.Hair et al, 2010) and Pallant (2013) suggest that the value of Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO)should be greater than 0.6 and the

Bartlett's Test of Sphericity (BTS) should be significant at $\alpha < .00$. Hence, EFA analysis is at acceptable assumption (see Table 2). Lastly, the communalities of 22 the items were range from 0.527 to 0.795.

Table 2: KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy		.800
	Approx. Chi-Square	5050.782
	df	231
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Sig.	.000

The EFA analysis was forced into three factors of SEGBS to determine appropriate items for every dimension. Table 3 present results of EFA; in which, only 17 items left in the analysis. Item 19, 20, 21, 14 and 13 failed to meet minimum requirement of factor loading greater than 0.5 and was removed. The Oblimin Rotation was used and the pattern matrix indicates item loading for every component. Result indicated that only four items are suitable to measure Work Green Behavior, four items are suitable to measure Proactive Green Behavior and nine items are suitable to measure Standard Green Behavior.

Table 3: Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) Result in SEGBS

Number	Item for Factor Loading	Factor Loading
Work Green Behavior		
1	SEGBS1	.853
2	SEGBS3	.827
3	SEGBS4	.821
4	SEGBS2	.757
Proactive Green Behavior		
5	SEGBS 9	.906
6	SEGBS12	.865
7	SEGBS11	.788
8	SEGBS10	.718
Standard Green Behavior		
9	SEGBS22	.892
10	SEGBS17	.877
11	SEGBS15	.854
12	SEGBS18	.846
13	SEGBS16	.822
14	SEGBS7	.766
15	SEGBS8	.761
16	SEGBS5	.687
17	SEGBS6	.659

The reliability of SEGBSwas tested using the same 235 samples used in EFA.Cronbach Alpha test was used to determine the reliability ofSEGBS. Findings showed that the average value all dimension or the Cronbach Alpha value for SEGBSis 0.893. Meanwhile, the Cronbach Alpha value for Work Green Behavior's dimension is 0.808,

Teamwork Skill's dimension is 0.875, and Standard Green Behavior's dimensionis 0.930. The reliability test has shown that SEGBSis a reliable instrument and can be used. Finally, Step VIII was followed by reporting all findings in this article.

V. CONCLUSION

The aim of this study was to report on the development of new instrument to measure green behavior at workplace namedStrategic Employee Green BehaviorScale (SEGBS). Result has demonstrated that SEGBSis a valid and reliable instrument. Seventeen items were indicated to measure three dimensions in SEGBS. Strategic Employee Green Behavior Scale was developed by following the eight steps suggested by Colton and Covert (2007). All the eight stepswere followed and SEGBS passed the face validity, content validity, reliability, and EFA. This instrument was constructed specifically to measure EGB amongcompany that certified by ISO14001 to make sure employee have ideal EGB to achieve environmental strategic planning. In addition, future researchers are suggested to verify SEGBS in other ISO14001 green certified company and using other method to validate the instrument.

REFERENCES

1. Abd Aziz, R., & Tengku Sarina, A. T. K. (2019). Peranan Konsep 'Surau Hijau' dalam Membentuk Komuniti Lestari di Sekolah. Akademika, 89(3), 99–112.

2. Abdullah, K., & Ahmad, J. (2014). Impak Pemerkasaan Teknologi Hijau terhadap Amalan Pengamal Perhubungan Awam Hijau di Malaysian Green Technology Corporation (Impact of Green Technology Empowerment towards Green Public Relations Practice at the Malaysian Green Technology Corporation). Akademika, 84(3), 29–40. https://doi.org/10.17576/akad-2014-8403-03

3. Ambec, S., & Lanoie, P. (2008). Does It Pay to Be Green? A Systematic Overview Executive Overview. Academy of Management Perspectives, 22(4), 45–62. https://doi.org/10.5465/AMP.2008.35590353

4. Aziz, S. F. A., & Zakaria, U. K. (2019). Developing teamwork training impact scale: Constructing an instrument to determine the impact of training on teamwork effectiveness using Malaysian sample. International Journal of Recent Technology and Engineering, 8(2 Special issue 3), 1478-1483.

5. Bissing-olson, M. J. (2015). Affect and Pro-environmental Behavior in Everyday Life. University of Queensland.

6. Wagh MP, Patel JS, Baheti DR. "Authorized Generics Practice." Systematic Reviews in Pharmacy 1.1 (2010), 106-110. Print. doi:10.4103/0975-8453.59520

7. =Bissing-Olson, M. J., Iyer, A., Fielding, K. S., & Zacher, H. (2013). Relationships between daily affect and pro-environmental behavior at work: The moderating role of pro-environmental attitude. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 34(2), 156–175. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1788

8. Boiral, O., Guillaumie, L., Heras-Saizarbitoria, I., & Tayo Tene, C. V. (2018). Adoption and Outcomes of

ISO 14001: A Systematic Review. International Journal of Management Reviews, 20(2), 411–432. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12139

9. Raman, R.A., Soh, K.G., Soh, K.L., Japar, S., Ong, S.L., Ghiami, Z.Rural primary school children body fat and their parents' physical image perceptions(2018) International Journal of Pharmaceutical Research, 10 (4), pp. 9-14.

10. Colton, D., & Covert, R. W. (2007). Designing and Constructing Instruments for Social Research and Evaluation. Retrieved from https://books.google.com.my/books?id=nBK0NAEACAAJ

11. Ferrón-Vílchez, V. (2016). Does symbolism benefit environmental and business performance in the adoption of ISO 14001? Journal of Environmental Management, 183, 882–894. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2016.09.047

12. Hair, Jr, J. F. (2015). Essentials of Business Research Methods. In Essentials of Business Research Methods. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315704562

13. Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). Multivariate Data Analysis. Vectors, p. 816. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpharm.2011.02.019

14. Hezri, A. A. (2011). Sustainable shift: institutional challenges for the environment in Malaysia. Akademika, 81(2), 59–69.

15. M. I. Niyas ahamed (2014) ecotoxicity concert of nano zero-valent iron particles- a review. Journal of Critical Reviews, 1 (1), 36-39.

16. Hinkin, T. R., Tracey, J. B., & Enz, C. A. (1997). Scale construction: Developing reliable and valid measurement instruments. Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research, 21(1), 100–120. https://doi.org/10.1177/109634809702100108

17. Jusoh, H., Ahmad, H., Buang, A., Zoolberi, F. A., & Nik, N. M. (2014). Impak kawasan hijau terhadap persekitaran sosial komuniti Putrajaya. Malaysia Journal of Society and Space, 10(8), 26–39.

18. Kadir, A., Jamaluddin, M. J. &, & Abd Rahim, M. N. (2006). Perlaksanaan ISO 14000 dan Kesannya Terhadap Peningkatan Kos Di Kalangan Organisasi Di Malaysia. Malaysian Journal of Environmental Management, 7, 77–92.

19. MacCallum, R. C., Widaman, K. F., Zhang, S., & Hong, S. (1999). Sample size in factor analysis. Psychological Methods. https://doi.org/10.1037/1082-989X.4.1.84

20. Mazifah, S., Azahan, A., & Kadir, A. (2015). Menafsir keperluan masyarakat dalam perancangan pembangunan bekas tapak pelupusan di sekitar kawasan perbandaran di Malaysia. Geografia: Malaysian Journal of Society & Space, 11(6), 120–132.

21. Mcconnaughy, J. C. (2014). Development of an Employee Green Behavior Descriptive Norms Scale. California State University, San Bernardino.

22. Mohammed Noor, A. H., Farhan, M. P., Almsafir, M. K., & Rosima, A. (2015). Exploring Environmental Behavior At Green Office Building Using Theory Of Planned Behavior (TPB). The 3rd National Graduate Conference, (April), 8–9.

23. Mori, Y., & Welch, E. (2008). The ISO 14001 environmental management standard in Japan: Results from a

national survey of facilities in four industries. Journal of Environmental Planning and Management, 51(3), 421–445. https://doi.org/10.1080/09640560801979683

24. Mukapit, M., Abdul Aziz, S. F., Selamat, M. N., & Tambi, N. (2018). Ciri-ciri Pekerja Bertingkah laku Hijau: Satu Tinjauan Awal (Characteristics of Employee Green Behaviour: Preliminary Study). Jurnal Psikologi Malaysia, 32(4), 44–54. Retrieved from http://spaj.ukm.my/ppppm/jpm/article/view/439

25. Neuman, W. L. (2011). Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches. In Pearson Education.

26. Norton, Thomas A., Parker, S. L., & Ashkanasy, N. M. (2015). Employee Green Behavior and Aging. In A. N. Pachana (Ed.), Encyclopedia of Geropsychology (pp. 1–7). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-080-3_308-1

27. Norton, Thomas A., Parker, S. L., Zacher, H., & Ashkanasy, N. M. (2015). Employee Green Behavior: A Theoretical Framework, Multilevel Review, and Future Research Agenda. Organization & Environment, 28(1), 103–125. https://doi.org/10.1177/1086026615575773

28. Norton, Thomas Andrew. (2016). A multilevel perspective on employee green behaviour. The University of Queensland.

29. Ones, D. S., & Dilchert, S. (2012). Environmental Sustainability at Work: A Call to Action. Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 5(4), 444–466. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1754-9434.2012.01478.x

30. Ones, D. S., & Dilchert, S. (2013). Measuring, understanding, and influencing employee green behaviors. Green Organizations: Driving Change with IO Psychology, 115–148.

31. Pallant, J. (2013). SPSS survival manual: a step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS. In McGraw-Hill Education.

32. Pascal, P. a, & Mejía-Morelos, J. H. (2014). Antecedents of pro-environmental behaviours at work: The moderating influence of psychological contract breach. Journal of Environmental Psychology, 38, 124–131. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2014.01.004

33. Rahim, M. H. A., Zukni, R. Z. J. A., Ahmad, F., & Lyndon, N. (2012). Green advertising and environmentally responsible consumer behavior: The level of awareness and perception of Malaysian youth. Asian Social Science, 8(5), 46–54. https://doi.org/10.5539/ass.v8n5p46

34. Rajiani, I., Yahya, S., Yunus, A. R., Ahamat, A., Budiono, & Mohtar, N. S. (2015). Conceptualizing strategic green human resources management to boost environmental performance. 25th International Business Information Management Association Conference - Innovation Vision 2020: From Regional Development Sustainability to Global Economic Growth, IBIMA 2015, (April), 50–56. https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.1.1724.0805

35. Ramus, C. A., & Killmer, A. B. C. (2007). Corporate greening through prosocial extrarole behaviours - A conceptual framework for employee motivation. Business Strategy and the Environment, 16(8), 554–570. https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.504

36. Robertson, J. L., & Barling, J. (2013). Greening organizations through leaders' influence on employees' pro-environmental behaviors. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 34(2), 176–194.

https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1820

37. Safari, A., Salehzadeh, R., Panahi, R., & Abolghasemian, S. (2018). Multiple pathways linking environmental knowledge and awareness to employees' green behavior. Corporate Governance: The International Journal of Business in Society, 18(1), 81–103. https://doi.org/10.1108/CG-08-2016-0168

38. Sekaran, U. (2003). Research Methods for Business. In Research methods for business. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004

39. Sharma, M., Paillé, P., Chen, Y., Boiral, O., & Jin, J. (2014). The Role of Employees' Engagement in the Adoption of Green Supply Chain Practices as Moderated by Environment Attitude: An Empirical Study of the Indian Automobile Industry. Global Business Review , 15(4 suppl), 25S-38S. https://doi.org/10.1177/0972150914550545

40. Smith, A. M., & O'Sullivan, T. (2012). Environmentally responsible behaviour in the workplace: An internal social marketing approach. Journal of Marketing Management, 28(3–4), 469–493. https://doi.org/10.1080/0267257X.2012.658837

41. Xiang, W. N., Stuber, R. M. B., & Meng, X. (2011). Meeting critical challenges and striving for urban sustainability in China. Landscape and Urban Planning, 100(4), 418–420. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2011.02.018

42. Meharban, M.S., & Dr. Priya, S. (2016). A Review on Image Retrieval Techniques. Bonfring International Journal of Advances in Image Processing, 6(2), 07-10.

43. Ravindaranaath, R.J., Karthik, K., Vishnupriyan, R., Suryakumar,S., &Thamaraiselvi,G. (2017). Automated Trolley System for Airport. International Journal of Communication and Computer Technologies, 5(1), 32-35.

44. Conte, E., Khrennikov, A.Y., Todarello, O., De Robertis, R., Federici, A., Zbilut, J.P. A preliminary experimental verification on the possibility of Bell inequality violation in mental states (2008) NeuroQuantology, 6 (3), pp. 214-221.

45. Altunkaynak, B.Z., Önger, M.E., Altunkaynak, M.E., Ayranci, E., Canan, S. A brief introduction to stereology and sampling strategies: Basic concepts of stereology (2012) NeuroQuantology, 10 (1), pp. 31-43.