

Article

Environmentally Responsible Business Approaches in Azerbaijan

Mubariz Mammadli 

Department of Economics and Business Management, UNEC Business School,
Azerbaijan State University of Economics, Baku AZ1001, Azerbaijan; mubariz.mammadli@unec.edu.az

Abstract: In the study; the eco-entrepreneurship and environmental sensitivity of companies operating in Azerbaijan were examined within the scope of environmental practices. For this purpose, companies operating in the country were invited to participate in a survey, and their sensitivity to the environment was examined from four main dimensions—consumption, production, financial, and technology. The mentioned dimensions were analyzed according to four aspects; namely, business field of activity, business size, operating year, and the level of implementation of environmentally friendly policies. According to the results of a one-way analysis of variance, carried out by field of activity, operating year, and the level of implementation of eco-friendly policy; it was found that there was no group that significantly differed from the overall group mean. A difference was found only in terms of the size of the enterprise. The study found that large businesses were more aware of environmental sensitivity than small- and medium-sized businesses.

Keywords: green business; consumption dimension; production dimension; financial dimension; technological dimension



Citation: Mammadli, M.

Environmentally Responsible
Business Approaches in Azerbaijan.
Sustainability **2022**, *14*, 6227.

<https://doi.org/10.3390/su14106227>

Academic Editors: Elkhan
Richard Sadik-Zada and
Andrea Gatto

Received: 7 March 2022

Accepted: 16 May 2022

Published: 20 May 2022

Publisher's Note: MDPI stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.



Copyright: © 2022 by the author. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

Today, one of the most fundamental problems of the world we live in is environmental pollution. Namely, different environmental problems such as acid rain, contamination of agricultural foods, GMO products, pollution of drinking water, and global warming problems endanger the lives of both people and all living things. Since the environment is the interaction of all living organisms with air, water, and soil, problems in the environment can naturally create different risks in the lives of living organisms [1].

Generally, different factors can be the source of environmental problems. Today, one of these main factors is business activity. In fact, when business activities and their results are taken into account, two main market participants should be considered, namely the consumer and the producer, because one of these two actors' decisions influence and shapes the activity of the other. In other words, both consumers and producers have a greater responsibility to reduce or prevent activities that exacerbate environmental problems [2–5]. Today's consumers may be more sensitive to environmental issues and may require businesses to recognize their responsibility and implement practices that will better protect nature [6–8].

However, this article will only discuss producers and their environmental behavior. Companies' activities affect not only their owners, managers, and shareholders but also various communities and other entities with which they have direct and indirect contact [9]. Increasing concern about environmental degradation and its impact on the environment has encouraged many businesses to adopt sustainable business models and environmental standards.

Many companies today are trying to solve environmental problems. According to Antolin-Lopez et al. [10], this is about entrepreneurs' emotional commitment to environmental issues and their commitment to being involved in sustainable business practices.

Thus, in the academic literature, there are approaches in which environmental problems are often associated with entrepreneurial practices [11–13]. The main reason for this is that enterprises continue their production using various resources obtained from the environment. Enterprises that attach great importance to environmental responsible activities, that respect nature and that are sensitive to society have a good image in society [14]. Therefore, enterprises must strive to meet the expectations and needs of society, while profiting from the goods or services they put on the market.

Thus, companies should improve resource efficiency and reduce the environmental impact of waste by focusing on cleaner production. To achieve this goal, companies need to identify, evaluate, and manage the waste stream at the stage of process design and production planning before starting their activities [15]. In other words, companies must first prevent environmental pollution through activities that do not harm the environment. For such initiatives, companies should use appropriate technologies [16]. Entrepreneurship can contribute to the implementation of these guiding principles in a variety of ways. Eco-entrepreneurs can change the environment in a sustainable way by effectively using innovative skills [17]. Innovation, an important driver of entrepreneurship [18], can be used to find ways to increase recycling, conserve resources, and minimize waste [19]. Thus, the obligations of companies to protect the environment have a significant impact on the management of companies; the use of technology, financial, and consumer decisions; and other aspects of business [20,21].

In the article, the green management approach is studied using the example of Azerbaijani producers, taking into account consumption, production, financial, and technological aspects. The survey assessed the prospects of companies with different characteristics in relation to green business.

2. Green Business

Defining green entrepreneurship is a difficult task. The concept itself is relatively new and has attracted increasing attention since the 1990s [22,23]. Even today, this topic is still being studied and divided into different branches [24,25]. The reason for this division is related to the fact that the subject includes urban studies, political economy, sociology, business ethics, and other different subjects [26,27].

Essentially, entrepreneurs are trying to identify problems in the marketplace, find visible or invisible needs, and satisfy them through their own efforts. That is why they have been classified as prime movers of innovation [18,28]. In other words, entrepreneurs must be aware of gaps in areas that other market participants need and must engage in activities to fill them.

Entrepreneurs are the driving force behind the next industrial revolution [29]. Therefore, their impact on the environment must always be monitored. There are many scientific studies in the literature on the environmental aspect of business [30–41].

Green businesses take a more holistic approach to environmental aspects. In general, “green” business approaches differ from those of traditional entrepreneurs [42]. The main goals of environmental entrepreneurs are the planet and profit, and they focus on the future, while traditional entrepreneurs, on the contrary, are profit-oriented and look to the present [43]. It should be emphasized that, contrary to traditional opinion, reducing environmental problems does not decrease the economic benefits of the company. On the contrary, such behaviors increase enterprise profits [14,44].

Green business covers the entire process of enterprise. Various concepts, such as green marketing and green management, fall under the scope of green business and cover all business activities. Thus, green business, also called eco-business, considers the ecological environment as an important element in decision-making processes. This type of business is aimed at minimizing or completely eliminating environmental damage in its activities [45,46]. The activities carried out in this context change the various processes, from product design to packaging, and seek to instill the philosophy of environmental protection into the culture of enterprises.

The concept of eco-entrepreneurship, used in parallel with green business [47], was considered by Shaper [48] as a new type of entrepreneurship. The concept of eco-entrepreneurship embraces eco-entrepreneurship and reflects the market success of businesses with eco-innovation focused on the talents and skills of entrepreneurs [49]. Simply put, eco-entrepreneurship includes activities that will provide a positive contribution to society while realizing the entrepreneurial goals of enterprises and minimizing the negative impact on people and the environment [48]. In other words, eco-entrepreneurship includes environment-oriented practices that include all stakeholders (customers, suppliers, business partners, employees, etc.) with whom businesses interact.

In his study “Ecopreneurship: Rationale, Current Issues and Future Challenges”, Voleri [50] divided business into 2 groups. Firstly, these are “environmentally-conscious entrepreneurs.” Eco-entrepreneurs included in this category are generally aware of environmental issues but do not operate in the environmental market. These entrepreneurs are taking advantage of business-oriented opportunities while taking into account the environmental aspect of their activities. In this context, they are trying to produce better goods and services and use fewer resources [51]. At the same time, they are trying to achieve eco-efficiency with less environmental impact. We see entrepreneurs included in this category in all sectors. The type of entrepreneurship known as “green entrepreneurship” falls into the second category. This group becomes aware of environmental issues. Their business ventures also take place in the environmental market. Green entrepreneurs are actively looking for eco-centric opportunities that offer good profit prospects.

In addition, green entrepreneurs refrain from activities that cause environmental problems and increase the social responsibility of the company through these activities. The main reason why we touched on the topic of social responsibility here is that the emphasis on social responsibility is a prerequisite for green behavior [52,53]. As is known, the products that enterprises put on the market, the resources and methods used in the production of these products [54,55], as well as the social responsibilities of the company, affect the behavior of consumers in the market [56–59]. Therefore, consumer behavior affects the determination of the market value of the company, its image, and its continuity. Society expects social benefits from business. As long as this benefit is produced, companies will continue their business in the long run and make a profit [60]. On the other hand, there is a growing understanding that environmental activities reduce corporate risks, such as waste management fees and fines for accidents [61]. Moreover, a good public reputation will help companies attract more customers and better employees. The business of companies that produce the values expected by society has continuity. That is why the number of studies in the field of sustainable entrepreneurship has increased today [62].

Companies striving for sustainability must also transform in accordance with the changing values and expectations of society, that is, keep pace with changing socio-cultural norms [63]. Innovation policies and various practices lead to an increase in shareholder profits [64,65]. Using their resources more efficiently, enterprises can take on a new role [66] and develop social and environmental policies due to their existing capabilities. At the same time, they can find innovative solutions to problems and increase their own profits by turning crises into opportunities. Finally, prevention is easier than cure. Therefore, it would be more beneficial for the company to address social and environmental issues before they arise or escalate.

Thus, there are different factors that push companies to implement environmentally friendly policies and turn to eco-entrepreneurship. We can generalize these factors as individual factors [8,67] (customers, employees, shareholders, etc.), institutional factors [67] (business environment, media, etc.), and legal factors [68] (laws, international agreements, decisions of local governments, etc.). In fact, these factors are not independent of each other. For example, social media seriously affect consumers, and they focus on the green activities of companies on social media. Studies in this area have found that the use of social media encourages pro-environmental action among consumers [69,70]. In this case, the media influences the environmental activities of the company through consumers.

Legal procedures are one of the main factors affecting the environmentally friendly activities of companies. Sometimes entrepreneurs use environmentally friendly methods because they are mandatory, i.e., required by the laws or regulatory systems in force in the country [68,71]. Environmental entrepreneurs want the majority of the population to support their business vision while enforcing the requirements of laws, regulatory systems, or financial pressure [72]. Today, the increase in information about the environment and continuing education has made people more conscious about this issue. People's lifestyles began to change positively towards environmentally friendly products [73,74]. As the demand for organic products increased, many new eco-entrepreneurs turned to this field [75].

Moreover, environmental awareness has affected people's consumption habits throughout the world, where everyone is a consumer. For example, environmentally conscious people avoid the misuse of electricity and oil and conserve resources by using products that consume less electricity [76]. That is, some consumers have an attitude towards the environment that we can accept as green purchasing behavior [77,78]. In other words, they strive for sustainable products and services that cause the least damage to the environment. All these have increased the importance of the environmental policy of companies in entrepreneurship and made it necessary for businesses to make radical changes in their own fields [79].

In addition, eco-entrepreneurship should use innovative technologies in its business models while taking into account consumer behavior [8]. Because another important factor that makes the emergence of green businesses important is related to the effective use of natural resources. In other words, the scarcity of natural resources makes efficiency important in the use of resources [80]. Efficiency makes the use of new technologies important. So, the eco-entrepreneur should realize fair development with the right management of natural resources in the business world [81] and create economic and social values by applying technological innovations from an environmental perspective [13]. Such behaviors will increase the performance of companies.

An empirical study by Zhang and Berhe shows the impact of green marketing and green investment on business performance. The researchers examined the impact of green marketing and green investment on the business performance of Ethiopian Chinese textile companies. Based on the responses of 237 participants, the researchers found that green marketing and green investment positively affect the firm's business performance [82]. For this reason, the environmental practices of companies provide them with many advantages. In other words, by providing access to specific markets, using environmentally friendly technologies such as pollution control, waste treatment, and reducing energy costs, companies either increase their revenues or reduce their costs [83] and improve their image.

An empirical study was conducted by Kushwaha and Sharma involving 306 young entrepreneur candidates. In this study, they found that green marketing factors, changing consumer behavior towards green products and favorable market conditions, have a significant and positive effect on ecological entrepreneurship [84]. One of the other important studies on this topic is the study by Silajic et al. for countries with economies in transition. According to this study, entrepreneurs in such countries are reluctant to invest in green activities. The lack of financial support is also one of the most important factors hindering green entrepreneurship [85]. Based on a survey of 12 nonprofit organizations, Gliedt and Parker [86] found that green entrepreneurship in an environmentally conscious country like Canada is driven by two factors. These factors are the loss of external government funding and the consequent market collapse. Moreover, three main factors contribute to the need for green entrepreneurship. These include external social capital flows, internal human capital stocks, and strategic partnerships. Another study by these authors [87] showed that green entrepreneurship accelerates in environmental organizations when companies face the risk of funding cuts.

In particular, SMEs face financial problems. According to the empirical results of a study conducted by Nizayeva and Coskun [88], the size and age of firms have a significant

impact on the ability of SMEs to obtain financial resources. Other researchers also highlight the importance of funding green businesses. Noh [89] argues that governments should especially encourage private investment in green businesses.

In 2020, the European Commission and the OECD conducted a survey to examine current and planned green budget practices in member states of the two organizations. The results of the survey provided important information on environmental budgeting practices in member countries. That is, while about 14 out of 39 countries have a green budget practice, 9 of them plan to introduce some environmental practices in the future. The most frequently used tools in evaluating the questionnaire were ex-ante and ex-post environmental policy assessment, green budget labeling, environmental cost-benefit analysis, and carbon assessment. On the other hand, one of the important results of the study was that the main reason for the use of “green” budgets in countries was the fulfillment of international obligations. Many countries seek support from international organizations for various purposes [90].

3. Hypotheses

This section aims to develop a set of hypotheses to explore companies’ approaches to eco-entrepreneurship in Azerbaijan from different angles. These parameters are consumption dimension, production dimension, financial dimension, and technological dimension, and they have been investigated depending on the size of the business, the field of activity, the duration of the activity, and whether the enterprise is carrying out environmentally friendly commercial activities. The study has four main hypotheses.

3.1. Responsible Business Varies by Business Size

The first hypothesis was aimed at determining whether a company’s environmental performance varies depending on the size of the company. Some literature studies have shown that environmentally friendly activities vary by company size. According to a study by Wagner [91], there is a positive correlation with firm size and the likelihood of being classified as an eco-entrepreneur. So, the larger the firm, the more likely it is to become an eco-entrepreneur.

Thus, the first hypothesis can be derived, stating that:

Hypothesis 1 (H1). *The dimensions of an environmentally responsible business differ in terms of business size.*

Hypothesis 1a (H1a). *The consumption dimension of an environmentally responsible business differs in terms of business size.*

Hypothesis 1b (H1b). *The production dimension of an environmentally responsible business differs in terms of business size.*

Hypothesis 1c (H1c). *The financial dimension of an environmentally responsible business differs in terms of business size.*

Hypothesis 1d (H1d). *The technology dimension of an environmentally responsible business differs in terms of business size.*

3.2. Responsible Business Varies by Business Area

The strategies of successful companies must be compatible with the business environment in order to achieve high performance [92]. In other words, companies should provide eco-activities in accordance with the business environment of the areas they work in. According to Balatbat et al., this is not easy for construction companies because the construction sector is more uncertain and risky [93]. Meanwhile, the activities of the companies in the field they work in affect their incomes. For example, Goodwin and Francis analyzed the tourism industry in the United Kingdom and found that 59% of consumers

are willing to pay more for some activities [94]. While 35% of consumers reported that they would support activities aimed at protecting the environment, 29% reported that employees would pay more to improve their working conditions. On the other hand, 21% of consumers reported that they want to support activities related to support. Such results can encourage companies to take more environmentally friendly steps in the field they work in.

Shin and Cho [95] have looked at the green activities of restaurants from different perspectives in their empirical research. Researchers have found that some of the restaurant's activities (information sharing and flexibility in arrangement) significantly improve their environmental performance. Furthermore, in the research conducted by Ceyhan and Ada [96], it was concluded that environmentally friendly business in Turkey's Kahramanmaraş province differed according to the company's field of activity. As a result, the study aimed to examine whether the dimensions of an environmentally friendly business differ according to the field of activity of the business. The hypotheses were developed as follows:

Hypothesis 2 (H2). *The dimensions of an environmentally responsible business differ in terms of the field of activity of the enterprise.*

Hypothesis 2a (H2a). *The consumption dimension of an environmentally responsible business differs in terms of the field of activity of the enterprise.*

Hypothesis 2b (H2b). *The production dimension of an environmentally responsible business differs in terms of the field of activity of the enterprise.*

Hypothesis 2c (H2c). *The financial dimension of an environmentally responsible business differs in terms of the field of activity of the enterprise.*

Hypothesis 2d (H2d). *The technology dimension of an environmentally responsible business differs in terms of the field of activity of the enterprise.*

3.3. Responsible Business Differ in Terms of the Operating Year of the Business

The year of operation of the enterprise is important in many respects. This indicator affects the financial strength of the company, the formation of its image, the level of acceptance of risks, and other factors. For example, according to the empirical results of the research conducted by Nizaeva and Coskun [88], firm age has a significant impact on a firm's capacity to obtain financial resources. On the other hand, brand trust and loyalty, which sometimes takes many years to develop, was described by Lerro et al. as a great influence on the decision of consumers [97].

Considering that such factors are important in its environmentally friendly practice, a third hypothesis can be derived, stating that:

Hypothesis 3 (H3). *The dimensions of an environmentally responsible business differ in terms of the operating year of the business.*

Hypothesis 3a (H3a). *The consumption dimension of an environmentally responsible business differs in terms of the operating year of the business.*

Hypothesis 3b (H3b). *The production dimension of an environmentally responsible business differs in terms of the operating year of the business.*

Hypothesis 3c (H3c). *The financial dimension of an environmentally responsible business differs in terms of the operating year of the business.*

Hypothesis 3d (H3d). *The technology dimension of an environmentally responsible business differs in terms of the operating year of the business.*

3.4. Responsible Business Differ in Terms of Whether the Business Is Operating Environmentally Sensitively

Today, the demand for corporate social responsibility has increased excessively. The world's leading companies state that they will not invest in companies that do not engage in ecological activities or companies that have high climate risks [98]. This means that investors are reviewing and evaluating companies' environmentally friendly activities. That is, if companies want to receive investment, they must have their own business model with environmentally friendly practices [40]. In relation to this, a second hypothesis can be formulated:

Hypothesis 4 (H4). *The dimensions of an environmentally responsible business differs depending on whether the business is operating environmentally sensitive.*

Hypothesis 4a (H4a). *The consumption dimension of an environmentally responsible business differs depending on whether the business is operating environmentally sensitive.*

Hypothesis 4b (H4b). *The production dimension of an environmentally responsible business differs depending on whether the business is operating environmentally sensitive.*

Hypothesis 4c (H4c). *The financial dimension of an environmentally responsible business differ depending on whether the business is operating environmentally sensitive.*

Hypothesis 4d (H4d). *The technology dimension of an environmentally responsible business differs depending on whether the business is operating environmentally sensitive.*

4. Material and Methods

In the study, primary data-collection techniques were used as a scientific research method. The research was sent to 75 companies operating in Azerbaijan. Owners, partners, or managers of businesses filled out the questionnaire prepared by us. Businesses operating in the textile, food, tourism, heavy industry, and other sectors participated in the surveys. The survey was conducted by the author between September and December 2021.

The IBM SPSS Statistics Version 26 (Baku, Azerbaijan) was used in the analysis and evaluation of the data. Before performing the ANOVA analysis, it was determined whether the data showed a normal distribution. One of the general assumptions regarding the normal distribution is that at least 30 ($n \geq 30$) samples are required, to ensure the normal distribution. This acceptance is based on the central limit theorem [99].

It is possible to evaluate whether a quantitative variable has a normal distribution or not according to different criteria. In this study, the normal distribution of the variables according to the skewness and kurtosis coefficients is discussed. Skewness indicates the degree of symmetry in the distribution of a variable. On the other hand, kurtosis is a measure that reflects whether the distribution is too high [100]. The fact that the skewness and kurtosis coefficients are in the range of -1 to $+1$ indicates that the variable has a normal distribution.

According to the data presented in Table 1, skewness and kurtosis values ranged from -1 to $+1$ for all variables. Since the data shows a normal distribution, we can do the ANOVA test.

Simple random sampling is used to meet the condition of random sampling. Simple random sampling is a type of sampling in which several different subjects are randomly selected so that each unit has an equal chance of being selected [101]. 57 out of 75 survey participants were randomly selected using a computer.

Table 1. Skewness and kurtosis coefficients of the variables.

Descriptives		Statistic	Std. Error
Consumption dimension	Skewness	0.509	0.346
	Kurtosis	−0.768	0.613
Production dimension	Skewness	−0.605	0.386
	Kurtosis	−0.834	0.629
Financial dimension	Skewness	0.703	0.416
	Kurtosis	−0.721	0.643
Technology dimension	Skewness	0.703	0.416
	Kurtosis	−0.721	0.643

4.1. Data Analysis and Findings

In the study, first of all, the reliability of the scales used in the analysis of the variables was measured with the Cronbach's alpha method. According to Cronbach's alpha method, for a scale to be considered reliable, its alpha value must be at least 0.70. Scales with a Cronbach value of less than 0.70 are classified as low-reliability or unreliable scales.

Table 2 shows that the reliability values of each variable are greater than the generally accepted value (0.70).

Table 2. Reliability statistics.

	Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
Consumption_dimension	0.927	0.927	4
Production_dimension	0.706	0.719	4
Financial_dimension	0.754	0.754	4
Technology_dimension	0.748	0.759	4

4.2. Findings Regarding the Demographic Characteristics of the Survey Participants

In this section, the data obtained according to demographic variables such as gender, educational status, position in the enterprise, as well as business field, company scale, operating year, and environmentally friendly business practices of the companies, are presented.

According to the results presented in Table 3, 30.0% of the enterprises continue their activities for 1 to 5 years, 46.0% for 5 to 10 years, and 28% for 10 and more years.

Considering the spheres of activity of the surveyed companies, it can be seen that 25.0% operate in the food industry, 33.0% in the textile industry, 12.0% in heavy industry, 18.0% in the tourism industry, and 12.0% in other industries. Looking at the scale of enterprises, it can be seen that 19.0% of respondents are large companies, that 30.0% are mid-size enterprise, and that 51.0% are small companies.

When asked whether the surveyed enterprises are green entrepreneurs, 12% of the enterprises stated that they are green entrepreneurs, 42% that they are not green entrepreneurs, and 15% that they have partially worked in this field.

Table 3. Demographic characteristics.

	Number	Percent (%)
Business field of activity		
Food industry	14	25
Textile industry	19	33
Heavy industry	7	12
Tourism	10	18
Other	7	12
Business size		
Large enterprise	11	19
Mid-size enterprise	17	30
Small enterprise	29	51
Operating year		
Up to 5 years	17	30
Between 5–10 years	24	42
More than 10 years	16	28
I'm a green entrepreneur		
Yes	7	12
No	24	42
Partially	26	46
<i>N</i> = 57		

5. Results

The results of the ANOVA analysis of the environmentally friendly business dimensions according to different variables are given, and it is attempted to prove the hypotheses of the research.

5.1. Verification of Hypothesis 1

In order to prove the hypothesis, one by one, the approaches of the businesses to eco-entrepreneurship are handled one by one from different dimensions and examined in terms of business size.

Table 4 shows the ANOVA results related to the size of the firm and the consumption dimension.

When the ANOVA table is examined, it is seen that the “Sig.” values are less than 0.05 for all components. Based on this result obtained by performing a one-way analysis of variance, the H_{1a} hypothesis is accepted. In other words, with 95% confidence, it has been found that the approaches to the consumption dimension according to the size of the enterprises are different from each other.

The one-way ANOVA test does not show us between which groups the difference is. In other words, it does not indicate how it changes depending on the size of enterprises. So, a Tukey post-hoc test is used.

According to the Tukey post-hoc test, there is a difference between the approaches of participants of large-scale companies and small-scale companies (see Appendix A Table A1). That is, although the participants of large-scale companies had a more positive view of the choices given in the consumption dimension, the participants of small-scale companies did not show the same attitude. This attitude of small businesses has also been observed for medium-sized companies. Namely, the choice of “The wishes of green consumers must be heeded” and “Promotions should be carried out to raise consumer awareness of

eco-friendly products” was not considered favorably by medium-sized companies. Thus, H_{1a} was accepted depending on the result obtained.

As it can be seen in Table 5, since the values of “Sig.” in the ANOVA analysis were less than 0.05 in all options, it was found that the production dimension also differed in terms of the size of the enterprise.

Table 4. ANOVA results regarding consumption dimension and business size.

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
The wishes of green consumers must be heeded.	Between Groups	47.633	2	23.816	14.417	0.000
	Within Groups	89.209	54	1.652		
	Total	136.842	56			
Promotions should be carried out to raise consumer awareness of eco-friendly products.	Between Groups	27.466	2	13.733	8.577	0.001
	Within Groups	86.464	54	1.601		
	Total	113.930	56			
Green labeling method must be used.	Between Groups	37.329	2	18.664	10.630	0.000
	Within Groups	94.812	54	1.756		
	Total	132.140	56			
There should be laws regulating environmental awareness.	Between Groups	33.135	2	16.567	11.482	0.000
	Within Groups	77.918	54	1.443		
	Total	111.053	56			

Table 5. ANOVA results regarding production dimension and business size.

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Cooperation should be made with international and local organizations on eco-production.	Between Groups	28.594	2	14.297	11.919	0.000
	Within Groups	64.774	54	1.200		
	Total	93.368	56			
In the production process, environmental factors must be taken into account.	Between Groups	32.710	2	16.355	13.741	0.000
	Within Groups	64.273	54	1.190		
	Total	96.982	56			
Renewable energy sources must be used in production.	Between Groups	30.228	2	15.114	7.846	0.001
	Within Groups	104.017	54	1.926		
	Total	134.246	56			
Used products must be recycled.	Between Groups	23.628	2	11.814	6.173	0.004
	Within Groups	103.354	54	1.914		
	Total	126.982	56			

According to the results of the Tukey post-hoc test, participants of small-scale companies generally did not have a positive attitude towards environmentally friendly policies compared to participants of large-scale companies (see Appendix A Table A2). Participants of medium-sized companies, on the other hand, approached positively the “Renewable energy sources must be used in production” and “Used products must be recycled” options, while they did not show the same reaction to other options. Within the scope of these results, H_{1b} was accepted.

The next ANOVA analysis was performed in terms of financial dimension to prove Hypothesis $1c$. The obtained results are given in Table 6.

Table 6. ANOVA results regarding financial dimension and business size.

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
The production of eco-friendly products increases the company's revenues in the long run.	Between Groups	39.065	2	19.532	17.634	0.000
	Within Groups	59.813	54	1.108		
	Total	98.877	56			
The production of eco-friendly friendly products increases the chances of finding new investors.	Between Groups	32.601	2	16.301	14.925	0.000
	Within Groups	58.978	54	1.092		
	Total	91.579	56			
Financial support should be provided by the state for the green entrepreneurs.	Between Groups	40.874	2	20.437	21.065	0.000
	Within Groups	52.389	54	0.970		
	Total	93.263	56			
Green entrepreneurs should receive cheaper funding.	Between Groups	10.584	2	5.292	6.657	0.003
	Within Groups	42.925	54	0.795		
	Total	53.509	56			

As seen in Table 6, the “Sig.” value took values less than 0.05 in all four cases. This reflects that the size of finance differs in terms of business size.

According to the results of the Tukey post-hoc test used to determine the direction of the difference, the main difference was observed between large enterprises and small enterprises (see Appendix A Table A3). The approach of small businesses in terms of environmental sensitivity has not been positive in general.

Medium-sized businesses, on the other hand, viewed approaches such as “the production of eco-friendly friendly products increases the chances of finding new investors”, “the state should provide financial support for green entrepreneurs”, and “green entrepreneurs should receive cheaper funding” favorably. H_{1c} was accepted within the scope of these results.

The relationship between technology dimension and business size is shown in Table 7.

Table 7. ANOVA results regarding technology dimension and business size.

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Technologies that consume less energy should be used in production.	Between Groups	14.228	2	7.114	6.940	0.002
	Within Groups	55.351	54	1.025		
	Total	69.579	56			
Tax incentives should be provided for the purchase of green technologies.	Between Groups	20.167	2	10.084	9.275	0.000
	Within Groups	58.710	54	1.087		
	Total	78.877	56			
Various supports should be provided on e-marketing, e-sales and e-payment for the green entrepreneurs.	Between Groups	15.514	2	7.757	7.778	0.001
	Within Groups	53.854	54	0.997		
	Total	69.368	56			
Technologies should be used that prevent the waste of resources.	Between Groups	32.306	2	16.153	11.814	0.000
	Within Groups	73.834	54	1.367		
	Total	106.140	56			

As can be seen from Table 7, the “Sig.” value of all of the options took values less than 0.05. This means that any group separated by business size differs significantly from the overall group average. According to the results of the Tukey post-hoc test, small businesses treated these options more negatively than large and medium businesses (see Appendix A Table A4). Thus, H_{1d} was adopted within these results.

5.2. Verification of Hypothesis 2

The research sought to ascertain whether business approaches had shifted in terms of the business's field of activity. In the second hypothesis, the first ANOVA analysis was conducted in terms of the consumption dimension.

In the ANOVA analysis, it was concluded that the consumption dimension did not differ in terms of the business field, since the "Sig." value was greater than 0.05 (Table 8). Within the scope of this result obtained, H_{2a} was rejected.

Table 8. ANOVA results regarding consumption dimension and business field.

		ANOVA				
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
The wishes of green consumers must be heeded.	Between Groups	10.186	4	2.547	1.046	0.393
	Within Groups	126.656	52	2.436		
	Total	136.842	56			
Promotions should be carried out to raise consumer awareness of eco-friendly products.	Between Groups	7.069	4	1.767	0.860	0.494
	Within Groups	106.861	52	2.055		
	Total	113.930	56			
Green labeling method must be used.	Between Groups	19.428	4	4.857	2.241	0.077
	Within Groups	112.712	52	2.168		
	Total	132.140	56			
There should be laws regulating environmental awareness.	Between Groups	10.754	4	2.689	1.394	0.249
	Within Groups	100.298	52	1.929		
	Total	111.053	56			

A similar result was observed in the approaches of the groups that differed in terms of business field regarding the production dimension. Namely, in the ANOVA analysis, the "Sig." value was greater than 0.05 (Table 9). These values reflect that the responses of companies to the choices given in terms of business fields do not differ. As a result, H_{2b} was rejected.

Table 9. ANOVA results regarding production dimension and business field.

		ANOVA				
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Cooperation should be made with international and local organizations on eco-production.	Between Groups	2.908	4	0.727	0.418	0.795
	Within Groups	90.461	52	1.740		
	Total	93.368	56			
In the production process, environmental factors must be taken into account.	Between Groups	7.840	4	1.960	1.143	0.347
	Within Groups	89.143	52	1.714		
	Total	96.982	56			
Renewable energy sources must be used in production.	Between Groups	25.926	4	6.482	3.112	0.023
	Within Groups	108.320	52	2.083		
	Total	134.246	56			
Used products must be recycled.	Between Groups	0.849	4	0.212	0.088	0.986
	Within Groups	126.133	52	2.426		
	Total	126.982	56			

The following analysis was performed to test Hypothesis 2c. Table 10 shows the results of the analysis of variance in terms of financial dimension and the business field of companies.

Table 10. ANOVA results regarding financial dimension and business field.

		ANOVA				
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
The production of eco-friendly products increases the company's revenues in the long run.	Between Groups	17.307	4	4.327	2.758	0.037
	Within Groups	81.570	52	1.569		
	Total	98.877	56			
The production of eco-friendly friendly products increases the chances of finding new investors.	Between Groups	4.861	4	1.215	0.729	0.576
	Within Groups	86.718	52	1.668		
	Total	91.579	56			
Financial support should be provided by the state for the green entrepreneurs.	Between Groups	12.656	4	3.164	2.041	0.102
	Within Groups	80.607	52	1.550		
	Total	93.263	56			
Green entrepreneurs should receive cheaper funding.	Between Groups	5.691	4	1.423	1.547	0.202
	Within Groups	47.817	52	0.920		
	Total	53.509	56			

The values given in Table 10 reflect that there is no difference in terms of business outcomes across all four approaches. In other words, there was no significant difference between the averages of the answers given by the companies grouped according to the business field. As a result of the ANOVA analysis, H_{2c} is rejected.

The results of the analysis of variance presented in Table 11 show that the attitudes of participants of companies grouped by business field do not differ according to the technological dimension. According to the ANOVA results, H_{2d} was rejected.

Table 11. ANOVA results regarding technology dimension and business field.

		ANOVA				
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Technologies that consume less energy should be used in production.	Between Groups	3.203	4	0.801	0.627	0.645
	Within Groups	66.376	52	1.276		
	Total	69.579	56			
Tax incentives should be provided for the purchase of green technologies.	Between Groups	5.188	4	1.297	0.915	0.462
	Within Groups	73.689	52	1.417		
	Total	78.877	56			
Various supports should be provided on e-marketing, e-sales, and e-payment for the green entrepreneurs.	Between Groups	4.953	4	1.238	1.000	0.416
	Within Groups	64.415	52	1.239		
	Total	69.368	56			
Technologies should be used that prevent the waste of resources.	Between Groups	2.456	4	0.614	0.308	0.871
	Within Groups	103.684	52	1.994		
	Total	106.140	56			

5.3. Verification of Hypothesis 3

In order to prove Hypothesis 3, different dimensions were handled one by one and analyzed in terms of the operating year of the companies. ANOVA results related to the operating year of the business and consumption dimensions are shown in Table 12.

Table 12. ANOVA results regarding consumption dimension and operating year of the business.

		ANOVA				
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
The wishes of green consumers must be heeded.	Between Groups	0.318	2	0.159	0.063	0.939
	Within Groups	136.525	54	2.528		
	Total	136.842	56			
Promotions should be carried out to raise consumer awareness of eco-friendly products.	Between Groups	0.522	2	0.261	0.124	0.883
	Within Groups	113.408	54	2.100		
	Total	113.930	56			
Green labeling method must be used.	Between Groups	6.116	2	3.058	1.310	0.278
	Within Groups	126.025	54	2.334		
	Total	132.140	56			
There should be laws regulating environmental awareness.	Between Groups	2.528	2	1.264	0.629	0.537
	Within Groups	108.525	54	2.010		
	Total	111.053	56			

The companies that participated in the survey were divided into three groups depending on the length of their activities. It can be seen that the average values of the attitudes of the companies in the groups “up to 5 years”, “between 5–10 years”, and “more than 10 years” in terms of the consumption dimension do not differ from each other. Within the scope of this result obtained, H_{3a} was rejected.

ANOVA results for the production dimension and operating year of the enterprise are given in Table 13. The data in Table 13 shows that there is no difference between the groups divided according to the operating year of the enterprise. Thus, H_{2b} was rejected according to ANOVA results.

Table 13. ANOVA results regarding production dimension and operating year of the business.

		ANOVA				
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Cooperation should be made with international and local organizations on eco-production.	Between Groups	2.424	2	1.212	0.720	0.492
	Within Groups	90.945	54	1.684		
	Total	93.368	56			
In the production process, environmental factors must be taken into account.	Between Groups	0.593	2	0.296	0.166	0.847
	Within Groups	96.390	54	1.785		
	Total	96.982	56			
Renewable energy sources must be used in production.	Between Groups	8.113	2	4.057	1.737	0.186
	Within Groups	126.132	54	2.336		
	Total	134.246	56			
Used products must be recycled.	Between Groups	9.594	2	4.797	2.207	0.120
	Within Groups	117.388	54	2.174		
	Total	126.982	56			

Another ANOVA analysis was performed to prove H_{3c} . The results obtained are given in Table 14.

Table 14. ANOVA results regarding financial dimension and operating year of the business.

		ANOVA				
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
The production of eco-friendly products increases the company's revenues in the long run.	Between Groups	2.364	2	1.182	0.661	0.520
	Within Groups	96.513	54	1.787		
	Total	98.877	56			
The production of eco-friendly friendly products increases the chances of finding new investors.	Between Groups	3.448	2	1.724	1.056	0.355
	Within Groups	88.131	54	1.632		
	Total	91.579	56			
Financial support should be provided by the state for green entrepreneurs.	Between Groups	7.103	2	3.551	2.226	0.118
	Within Groups	86.161	54	1.596		
	Total	93.263	56			
Green entrepreneurs should receive cheaper funding.	Between Groups	0.709	2	0.354	0.362	0.698
	Within Groups	52.800	54	0.978		
	Total	53.509	56			

In ANOVA analysis, the lowest “Sig.” value among the components was “0.118”. Since this value is greater than 0.05, it is concluded that the financial dimension does not differ in terms of the operating year of the business. Within the scope of these results, H_{3c} was rejected.

Table 15 presents companies’ approaches to technological measurement depending on the year of operation.

Table 15. ANOVA results regarding technology dimension and operating year of the business.

		ANOVA				
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Technologies that consume less energy should be used in production.	Between Groups	7.259	2	3.630	3.145	0.051
	Within Groups	62.320	54	1.154		
	Total	69.579	56			
Tax incentives should be provided for the purchase of green technologies.	Between Groups	5.381	2	2.690	1.977	0.148
	Within Groups	73.496	54	1.361		
	Total	78.877	56			
Various supports should be provided on e-marketing, e-sales, and e-payment for green entrepreneurs.	Between Groups	4.960	2	2.480	2.079	0.135
	Within Groups	64.408	54	1.193		
	Total	69.368	56			
Technologies should be used that prevent the waste of resources.	Between Groups	5.399	2	2.699	1.447	0.244
	Within Groups	100.741	54	1.866		
	Total	106.140	56			

As in other analyses made according to the operating year of the companies, no significant difference among group means was found in the technological dimension either. Therefore, H_{3d} is also rejected.

5.4. Verification of Hypothesis 4

The last thesis put forward to measure the environmental awareness of companies operating in Azerbaijan is Hypothesis 4. Based on this hypothesis, the attitudes of companies towards the environment have been evaluated according to whether they actually implement an environmentally friendly policy.

In Table 16, the companies’ approaches to consumption vary depending on their green business practices.

Table 16. ANOVA results regarding consumption dimension and green entrepreneur.

		ANOVA				
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
The wishes of green consumers must be heeded.	Between Groups	9.410	2	4.705	1.994	0.146
	Within Groups	127.432	54	2.360		
	Total	136.842	56			
Promotions should be carried out to raise consumer awareness of eco-friendly products.	Between Groups	10.103	2	5.052	2.627	0.081
	Within Groups	103.826	54	1.923		
	Total	113.930	56			
Green labeling method must be used.	Between Groups	21.378	2	10.689	5.211	0.009
	Within Groups	110.762	54	2.051		
	Total	132.140	56			
There should be laws regulating environmental awareness	Between Groups	12.091	2	6.046	3.299	0.044
	Within Groups	98.962	54	1.833		
	Total	111.053	56			

The results of the ANOVA, which are presented in Table 16, show that “Sig.” values are higher than 0.05 at all options. So, according to the results of one-way analysis of variance, there is no group that differs significantly from the overall group mean. H_{4a} was rejected.

In the following ANOVA analysis, the production aspects of companies were examined in terms of their level of compliance with environmentally sensitive policies.

Since the data given in Table 17 shows that the “Sig.” value is greater than 0.05 over all approaches, it has been concluded that the production size does not differ in terms of whether the companies are green entrepreneurs or not. As a result, hypothesis H_{4b} is rejected.

Table 17. ANOVA results regarding production dimension and green entrepreneur.

		ANOVA				
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Cooperation should be made with international and local organizations on eco-production.	Between Groups	12.930	2	6.465	4.340	0.018
	Within Groups	80.438	54	1.490		
	Total	93.368	56			
In the production process, environmental factors must be taken into account.	Between Groups	6.836	2	3.418	2.047	0.139
	Within Groups	90.147	54	1.669		
	Total	96.982	56			
Renewable energy sources must be used in production.	Between Groups	11.594	2	5.797	2.552	0.087
	Within Groups	122.652	54	2.271		
	Total	134.246	56			
Used products must be recycled.	Between Groups	6.638	2	3.319	1.489	0.235
	Within Groups	120.344	54	2.229		
	Total	126.982	56			

The next ANOVA test was performed to prove H_{4c} in terms of the financial dimension. The results are given in Table 18.

Table 18. ANOVA results regarding financial dimension and green entrepreneur.

		ANOVA				
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
The production of eco-friendly products increases the company's revenues in the long run.	Between Groups	12.077	2	2.752	1.531	0.225
	Within Groups	86.800	54	1.797		
	Total	98.877	56			
The production of eco-friendly friendly products increases the chances of finding new investors.	Between Groups	11.130	2	2.565	3.736	0.992
	Within Groups	80.449	54	1.490		
	Total	91.579	56			
Financial support should be provided by the state for green entrepreneurs.	Between Groups	11.363	2	5.682	3.746	0.136
	Within Groups	81.900	54	3.511		
	Total	93.263	56			
Green entrepreneurs should receive cheaper funding.	Between Groups	3.294	2	3.224	1.771	0.180
	Within Groups	50.214	54	1.993		
	Total	53.509	56			

As can be seen from Table 18, the “Sig.” value exceeded 0.05 in all components. This value, found in the ANOVA analysis, indicates that the financial aspect does not differ depending on the nature of the business following an environmentally responsible policy.

The final ANOVA analysis of the research aimed to determine whether there is a differentiation between the responses given to the technological dimension depending on the green business feature. The connection between these two variables is given in Table 19.

Table 19. ANOVA results regarding technology dimension and green entrepreneur.

		ANOVA				
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Technologies that consume less energy should be used in production.	Between Groups	1.183	2	0.592	0.467	0.629
	Within Groups	68.396	54	1.267		
	Total	69.579	56			
Tax incentives should be provided for the purchase of green technologies.	Between Groups	4.544	2	2.272	1.650	0.201
	Within Groups	74.333	54	1.377		
	Total	78.877	56			
Various supports should be provided on e-marketing, e-sales, and e-payment for green entrepreneurs.	Between Groups	3.732	2	1.866	1.535	0.225
	Within Groups	65.636	54	1.215		
	Total	69.368	56			
Technologies should be used that prevent the waste of resources.	Between Groups	6.554	2	3.277	1.777	0.179
	Within Groups	99.586	54	1.844		
	Total	106.140	56			

The values given in Table 19 reflect that there is no difference between the attitudes of the companies grouped according to the level of implementation of green policies. This result, obtained according to the ANOVA test, rejects H_{4d} .

6. Discussion

As a result of the research, it has been determined that there is no difference between the dimensions of the business according to the fields in which the companies operate. This result obtained from the research differs from the results of the research conducted by Ceyhan and Ada [96]. At the same time, there is no difference between the dimensions

of an environmentally responsible business and the period of activity and the level of implementation of environmentally friendly policies.

However, it has been found that large enterprises have more awareness of environmental sensitivity compared to small enterprises. Namely, the relevant hypothesis, which includes only the size of the enterprise, was accepted. This result obtained from the research is similar to the results of the research conducted by Wagner's [91].

That is, the participants of large enterprises argued, in comparison with the participants of other enterprises, that the wishes of green consumers must be heeded; promotions should be carried out to raise consumer awareness of eco-friendly products; green labeling method must be used, and there should be laws regulating environmental awareness. In addition, in the production dimension, cooperation should be made with international and local organizations on eco-production; environmental factors must be taken into account; renewable energy sources must be used, and used products must be recycled.

On the financial dimension, large companies believe that, in the long run, the production of eco-friendly products increases the company's revenues in the long run, that the production of eco-friendly products increases the chances of finding new investors, that green entrepreneurs should receive cheaper funding, and that financial support should be provided by the state for green entrepreneurs. The attitudes of large companies are usually not observed in the approaches of small companies, but they are partially observed in medium-sized companies.

Medium-sized businesses, on the other hand, viewed approaches such as "the production of eco-friendly friendly products increases the chances of finding new investors", "the state should provide financial support for green entrepreneurs", and "green entrepreneurs should receive cheaper funding" favorably.

Large- and medium-sized businesses also welcomed the use of environmentally friendly technologies for the implementation of environmentally sensitive policies. In other words, they argued that technologies that use less energy should be used in production; for tax incentives for the purchase of green technologies; for various supports for e-marketing, e-sales, and e-payment for green entrepreneurs; and that technologies that prevent resource waste should be used.

7. Conclusions

Today, the expansion of environmentally responsible business is one of the most important issues. In this context, the approaches to the basic dimensions of business—consumption, production, finance, and technology—according to some characteristics of companies operating in Azerbaijan were analyzed.

The findings of the research are as follows: (1) the dimensions of an environmentally friendly business differ according to the size of the business, (2) the dimensions of an environmentally friendly business do not differ according to the field of activity of the business, (3) the dimensions of an environmentally friendly business do not differ according to the operating year of the business, and (4) the dimensions of an environmentally responsible business do not differ depending on whether the business is operating environmentally sensitively.

The results of the research show the need for various applications for small- and medium-sized companies in order to increase their environmental responsibility. For example, projects that include various incentives and grants can be developed by the government, NGOs, and other international and local organizations, and the environmental awareness of these companies can be raised.

The results of this article contribute to the development of eco-entrepreneurship in Azerbaijan, providing an empirical basis. Since there is an important gap in the literature on this subject in Azerbaijan, it is thought that this research will be beneficial to the literature. However, we cannot apply the findings to the whole country. With the same analysis, you can get different results because the environmentally friendly practices of companies change over time.

Limitations and future research. There are some limitations regarding the scope of the study. That is, conducting similar studies with a larger sample would give different results. Future research in similar areas may provide useful information on environmentally friendly practices in Azerbaijan by studying the impact on organizational performance.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement: The study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki, and approved by the Institutional Review Board (or Ethics Committee) of Economic Think (protocol code 202109 and date of approval 2 September 2021).

Informed Consent Statement: Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Appendix A

Table A1. Tukey HSD Results Regarding Consumption Dimension and Business Size.

Multiple Comparisons							
Tukey HSD							
Dependent Variable	(I) Business Size	(J) Business Size	Mean Difference (I–J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	Upper Bound
The wishes of green consumers must be heeded.	small enterprise	mid-size enterprise	0.24746	0.39261	0.804	−0.6987	1.1937
		large enterprise	−2.39185 *	0.45514	0.001	−3.4887	−1.2950
	mid-size enterprise	small enterprise	−0.24746	0.39261	0.804	−1.1937	0.6987
		large enterprise	−2.14439 *	0.49735	0.001	−3.3430	−0.9458
	large enterprise	small enterprise	2.39185 *	0.45514	0.001	1.2950	3.4887
		mid-size enterprise	2.14439 *	0.49735	0.001	0.9458	3.3430
Promotions should be carried out to raise consumer awareness of eco-friendly products.	small enterprise	mid-size enterprise	0.01623	0.38652	0.999	−0.9153	0.9477
		large enterprise	−1.76489 *	0.44808	0.001	−2.8448	−0.6850
	mid-size enterprise	small enterprise	−0.01623	0.38652	0.999	−0.9477	0.9153
		large enterprise	−1.74866 *	0.48964	0.002	−2.9287	−0.5686
	large enterprise	small enterprise	1.76489 *	0.44808	0.001	−0.6850	2.8448
		mid-size enterprise	1.74866 *	0.48964	0.002	0.5686	2.9287
Green labeling method must be used.	small enterprise	mid-size enterprise	1.05477	0.40475	0.031	−0.0793	2.0302
		large enterprise	−2.08150 *	0.46921	0.001	−3.2123	−0.9507
	mid-size enterprise	small enterprise	−1.05477	0.40475	0.031	−2.0302	0.0793
		large enterprise	1.02674	0.51273	0.121	−0.2089	2.2624
	large enterprise	small enterprise	2.08150 *	0.46921	0.001	0.9507	3.2123
		mid-size enterprise	−1.02674	0.51273	0.121	−2.2624	0.2089
There should be laws regulating environmental awareness.	small enterprise	mid-size enterprise	0.60446	0.36693	0.235	−0.2798	1.4887
		large enterprise	−2.03762 *	0.42536	0.001	−3.0627	−1.0125
	mid-size enterprise	small enterprise	−0.60446	0.36693	0.235	−1.4887	0.2798
		large enterprise	1.43316	0.46482	0.009	−0.3130	2.5534
	large enterprise	small enterprise	2.03762 *	0.42536	0.001	1.0125	3.0627
		mid-size enterprise	−1.43316	0.46482	0.009	−2.5534	0.3130

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Table A2. Tukey HSD Results Regarding Production Dimension and Business Size.

Multiple Comparisons							
Tukey HSD							
Dependent Variable	(I) Business Size	(J) Business Size	Mean Difference (I–J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Cooperation should be made with international and local organizations on eco-production.	small enterprise	mid-size enterprise	0.50304	0.33455	0.297	−0.3032	1.3093
		large enterprise	−1.89342 *	0.38783	0.001	−2.8281	−0.9588
	mid-size enterprise	small enterprise	−0.50304	0.33455	0.297	−1.3093	0.3032
		large enterprise	1.09037	0.42380	0.007	0.3690	2.4117
	large enterprise	small enterprise	1.89342 *	0.38783	0.001	0.9588	2.8281
		mid-size enterprise	−1.09037	0.42380	0.007	−2.4117	−0.3690
In the production process, environmental factors must be taken into account.	small enterprise	mid-size enterprise	−0.28803	0.33325	0.665	−1.0912	0.5151
		large enterprise	−1.78683 *	0.38632	0.001	−2.7179	−0.8558
	mid-size enterprise	small enterprise	0.28803	0.33325	0.665	−0.5151	1.0912
		large enterprise	0.07487	0.42216	0.007	−1.0575	3.0923
	large enterprise	small enterprise	1.78683 *	0.38632	0.001	0.8558	2.7179
		mid-size enterprise	−0.07487	0.42216	0.007	−3.0923	1.0575
Renewable energy sources must be used in production.	small enterprise	mid-size enterprise	−1.86004 *	0.42395	0.003	−2.1617	−0.8817
		large enterprise	−1.90282 *	0.49146	0.001	−3.0872	−0.7184
	mid-size enterprise	small enterprise	1.86004 *	0.42395	0.003	0.8817	2.1617
		large enterprise	1.04278	0.53705	0.137	−0.2515	2.3371
	large enterprise	small enterprise	1.90282 *	0.49146	0.001	0.7184	3.0872
		mid-size enterprise	−1.04278	0.53705	0.137	−2.3371	0.2515
Used products must be recycled.	small enterprise	mid-size enterprise	−1.44828 *	0.42259	0.001	−2.5702	−0.4667
		large enterprise	−1.72100 *	0.48989	0.003	−2.9016	−0.5404
	mid-size enterprise	small enterprise	1.44828 *	0.42259	0.001	0.4667	2.5702
		large enterprise	0.27273	0.53533	0.054	−0.0174	2.5629
	large enterprise	small enterprise	1.72100 *	0.48989	0.003	0.5404	2.9016
		mid-size enterprise	−0.27273	0.53533	0.054	−2.5629	0.0174

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Table A3. Tukey HSD Results Regarding Financial Dimension and Business Size.

Multiple Comparisons							
Tukey HSD							
Dependent Variable	(I) Business Size	(J) Business Size	Mean Difference (I–J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	Upper Bound
The production of eco-friendly products increases the company's revenues in the long run.	small enterprise	mid-size enterprise	0.95538	0.32148	0.010	0.1806	1.7301
		large enterprise	−2.16928 *	0.37268	0.001	−3.0674	−1.2711
	mid-size enterprise	small enterprise	−0.95538	0.32148	0.010	−1.7301	−0.1806
		large enterprise	1.21390	0.40725	0.012	0.2324	2.1954
	large enterprise	small enterprise	2.16928 *	0.37268	0.001	1.2711	3.0674
		mid-size enterprise	−1.21390 *	0.40725	0.012	−2.1954	−0.2324

Table A3. Cont.

Multiple Comparisons							
Tukey HSD							
Dependent Variable	(I) Business Size	(J) Business Size	Mean Difference (I–J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	Upper Bound
The production of eco-friendly friendly products increases the chances of finding new investors.	small enterprise	mid-size enterprise	−1.15619 *	0.31923	0.002	−1.9255	−0.3868
		large enterprise	−1.86207 *	0.37007	0.001	−2.7539	−0.9702
	mid-size enterprise	small enterprise	1.15619 *	0.31923	0.002	0.3868	1.9255
		large enterprise	0.70588	0.40439	0.198	−0.2687	1.6805
	large enterprise	small enterprise	1.86207 *	0.37007	0.001	0.9702	2.7539
		mid-size enterprise	−0.70588	0.40439	0.198	−1.6805	0.2687
Financial support should be provided by the state for green entrepreneurs.	small enterprise	mid-size enterprise	−1.19675 *	0.30087	0.001	−1.9218	−0.4717
		large enterprise	−2.13793 *	0.34879	0.001	−2.9785	−1.2974
	mid-size enterprise	small enterprise	1.19675 *	0.30087	0.001	0.4717	1.9218
		large enterprise	0.94118 *	0.38114	0.043	0.0226	1.8597
	large enterprise	small enterprise	2.13793 *	0.34879	0.001	1.2974	2.9785
		mid-size enterprise	−0.94118 *	0.38114	0.043	−1.8597	−0.0226
Green entrepreneurs should receive cheaper funding.	small enterprise	mid-size enterprise	−1.57404 *	0.27234	0.001	−1.0823	−0.2304
		large enterprise	−1.90345 *	0.31571	0.003	−1.8643	−0.3426
	mid-size enterprise	small enterprise	1.57404 *	0.27234	0.001	0.2304	1.0823
		large enterprise	0.52941	0.34500	0.283	0.3020	1.3609
	large enterprise	small enterprise	1.90345 *	0.31571	0.003	0.3426	1.8643
		mid-size enterprise	−0.52941	0.34500	0.283	−1.3609	−0.3020

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Table A4. Tukey HSD Results Regarding Technology Dimension and Business Size.

Multiple Comparisons							
Tukey HSD							
Dependent Variable	(I) Business Size	(J) Business Size	Mean Difference (I–J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Technologies that consume less energy should be used in production.	small enterprise	mid-size enterprise	−1.58201 *	0.30314	0.001	−1.0924	−0.5061
		large enterprise	−1.68643 *	0.32631	0.001	−2.4178	−0.7458
	mid-size enterprise	small enterprise	1.58201 *	0.30314	0.001	0.5061	1.0924
		large enterprise	0.5481	0.52846	0.085	1.0977	−0.0972
	large enterprise	small enterprise	1.68643 *	0.32631	0.001	0.7458	2.4178
		mid-size enterprise	−0.05481	0.52846	0.085	0.0972	−1.0977
Tax incentives should be provided for the purchase of green technologies.	small enterprise	mid-size enterprise	−1.02637 *	0.31850	0.001	−1.2084	−0.7927
		large enterprise	−1.37931 *	0.36923	0.001	−1.4895	−0.4691
	mid-size enterprise	small enterprise	1.02637 *	0.31850	0.001	0.7927	1.2084
		large enterprise	0.35294	0.40348	0.658	−0.6194	1.3253
	large enterprise	small enterprise	1.37931 *	0.36923	0.001	0.4691	1.4895
		mid-size enterprise	−0.35294	0.40348	0.658	−1.3253	0.6194

Table A4. Cont.

Multiple Comparisons							
Tukey HSD							
Dependent Variable	(I) Business Size	(J) Business Size	Mean Difference (I–J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Various supports should be provided on e-marketing, e-sales, and e-payment for green entrepreneurs.	small enterprise	mid-size enterprise	−1.79108 *	0.30505	0.001	−1.0580	−0.2294
		large enterprise	−1.28840 *	0.35363	0.002	−1.4362	−0.6406
	mid-size enterprise	small enterprise	1.79108 *	0.30505	0.001	0.2294	1.0580
		large enterprise	0.49733	0.38643	0.409	−0.4340	1.4286
	large enterprise	small enterprise	1.28840 *	0.35363	0.002	0.6406	1.4362
		mid-size enterprise	−0.49733	0.38643	0.409	−1.4286	0.4340
Technologies should be used that prevent the waste of resources.	small enterprise	mid-size enterprise	−2.01481 *	0.40210	0.001	−1.0953	−0.6595
		large enterprise	−2.01254 *	0.41406	0.001	−1.0147	−0.4045
	mid-size enterprise	small enterprise	2.01481 *	0.40210	0.001	0.6595	1.0953
		large enterprise	1.41850	0.45247	0.007	0.3481	−2.5289
	large enterprise	small enterprise	2.01254 *	0.41406	0.001	0.4045	1.0147
		mid-size enterprise	−1.41850 *	0.45247	0.007	2.5289	−0.3481

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

References

- Lilian, U.O. Are Environmental Rights Human Rights? Issues And Responses. *J. Intern. Hum. Rights Law* **2015**, *1*, 48–64.
- Zeynalova, Z.; Namazova, N. Revealing Consumer Behavior toward Green Consumption. *Sustainability* **2022**, *14*, 5806. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Dolan, P. The Sustainability of “Sustainable Consumption”. *J. Macromark.* **2002**, *22*, 170–181. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Webb, D.J.; Mohr, L.A.; Harris, K.E. A re-examination of socially responsible consumption and its measurement. *J. Bus. Res.* **2008**, *61*, 91–98. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Wise, G.F. Conservation-Based Green Marketing, 2000. Available online: <http://yosemite.epa.gov> (accessed on 11 December 2021).
- Sharma, R.; Jha, M. Values influencing sustainable consumption behaviour: Exploring the contextual relationship. *J. Bus. Res.* **2017**, *76*, 77–88. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Sustainable Development Commission. I Will If You Will: Towards Sustainable Consumption, 05/2006. Available online: https://www.sd-commission.org.uk/data/files/publications/I_Will_If_You_Will.pdf (accessed on 2 January 2022).
- Picazao-Tadeo, A.J.; Beltrán-Esteve, M.; Gómez-Limón, J.A. Assessing eco-efficiency with directional distance functions. *Eur. J. Oper. Res.* **2012**, *220*, 798–809. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Suska, M. Environmental Corporate Social Responsibility (ECSR) on the Example of Polish Champion Oil, Gas and Mining Companies. *Sustainability* **2021**, *13*, 6179. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Antolin-Lopez, R.; Martínez-del-Rio, J.; Céspedes-Lorente, J.J. Environmental entrepreneurship: A review of the current conversation after two decades of research. In Proceedings of the 2014 GRONEN Conference, Helsinki, Finland, 16–18 June 2014.
- Dobers, P.; Rolf, W. Competing with ‘soft’ issues—From managing the environment to sustainable business strategies. *Bus. Strategy Environ.* **2000**, *9*, 143–150. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- De Clercq, D.; Voronov, M. Sustainability in entrepreneurship: A tale of two logics. *Int. Small Bus. J.* **2011**, *29*, 322–344. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Wagner, M.; Maximilians, J. Ventures for the public good and entrepreneurial intentions: An empirical analysis of sustainability orientation as a determining factor. *J. Small Bus. Entrep.* **2012**, *25*, 519–531. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Cetindamar, D. Corporate Social Responsibility Practices and Environmentally Responsible Behavior: The Case of the United Nations Global Compact. *J. Bus. Ethics* **2007**, *76*, 163–176. Available online: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10551-006-9265-4> (accessed on 17 November 2021). [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Melynk, S.A.; Calantone, R.; Sroufe, C.; Montabon, F.L. Environmentally Conscious Manufacturing: Integrating Environmental Issues into Product Design, Planning and Manufacturing. In Proceedings of the NSF Design and Manufacturing Grantees Conference, Vancouver, BC, Canada, 3–6 January 2000; Volume 13.
- Matuszewska, A.; Hańdere, A.; Paczuski, M.; Biernat, K. Hydrocarbon Fractions from Thermolysis of Waste Plastics as Components of Engine Fuels. *Energies* **2021**, *14*, 7245. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Schlange, L.E. What drives sustainable entrepreneurs. In Proceedings of the 3rd Applied Business and Entrepreneurship Association International Conference, Kona, HI, USA, 16–20 November 2006.
- Harbison, F. Entrepreneurial organization as a factor in economic development. *Q. J. Econ.* **1956**, *70*, 364–379. [\[CrossRef\]](#)

19. Rennings, K. Redefining Innovation—Eco-Innovation Research and the Contribution from Ecological Economics. *Ecol. Econ.* **2000**, *32*, 319–332. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
20. Nair, S.R.; Ndubisi, N.O. Evaluating management's environmental commitment and link with firm's environmental orientation. *J. Manag. Res.* **2015**, *15*, 165–178.
21. Uddin, S.F.; Khan, M.N. Exploring green purchasing behaviour of young urban consumers: Empirical evidences from India. *S. Asian J. Glob. Bus. Res.* **2016**, *5*, 85–103. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
22. Fischetti, M. Green entrepreneurs. *Technol. Rev.* **1992**, *95*, 38–45.
23. OECD. Measuring Green Entrepreneurship. In *Entrepreneurship at a Glance 2011*; OECD Publishing: Paris, France, 2011.
24. Czarniewski, S. Small and medium-sized enterprises in the context of innovation and entrepreneurship in the economy. *Pol. J. Manag. Stud.* **2016**, *13*, 30–39. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
25. Dudun, M.; Ivashchenko, N.; Gurinovich, A.; Tolmachev, O.; Sonina, L. Environmental entrepreneurship: Characteristics of organization and development. *Entrep. Sustain. Issues* **2019**, *6*, 1861–1870. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
26. Galkina, T.; Hultman, M. Ecopreneurship: Assessing the field and outlining research potential. *Small Enterpr. Res.* **2016**, *23*, 58–72. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
27. Zemtsov, S.P. Institutions, entrepreneurship, and regional development in Russia. *Zhurnal Novaya Ekon. Assotsiatsiya-J. New Econ. Assoc.* **2020**, *2*, 168–180. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
28. Emami, A.; Dimov, D. Degree of Innovation and the Entrepreneurs' Intention to Create Value: A Comparative Study of Experienced and Novice Entrepreneurs. *Eurasian Econ. Rev.* **2017**, *7*, 161–182. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
29. Pacheco, D.F.; Dean, T.J.; Payne, D.S. Escaping the green prison: Entrepreneurship and the creation of opportunities for sustainable development. *J. Bus. Ventur.* **2010**, *25*, 464–480. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
30. Schaltegger, S. A framework for ecopreneurship: Leading bioneers and environmental managers to ecopreneurship. *Greener Manag. Int.* **2002**, *38*, 45–58. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
31. Dean, T.J.; McMullen, J.S. Toward a theory of sustainable entrepreneurship: Reducing environmental degradation through entrepreneurial action. *J. Bus. Ventur.* **2007**, *22*, 50–76. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
32. Anderson, A.R. Cultivating the garden of Eden: Environmental entrepreneuring. *J. Organ. Change Manag.* **1998**, *11*, 135–144. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
33. Gibbs, D. Sustainability Entrepreneurs, Ecopreneurs and the Development of a Sustainable Economy. *Greener Manag. Int.* **2009**, *55*, 63–78. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
34. Menon, A.; Menon, A. Enviropreneurial marketing strategy: The emergence of corporate environmentalism as marketing strategy. *J. Mark.* **1997**, *61*, 51–67. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
35. Berle, G. *The Green Entrepreneur: Business Opportunities That Can Save the Earth and Make You Money*; Liberty Hall Press: Blue Ridge Summit, PA, USA, 1991.
36. Ndubisi, N.O.; Nair, S.R. Green Entrepreneurship (GE) and Green Value Added (GVA): A conceptual framework. *Int. J. Entrep.* **2009**, *13*, 21–34.
37. Isaak, R. Globalisation and green entrepreneurship. *Greener Manag. Int.* **1997**, *18*, 80–91.
38. O'Neill, K.; Gibbs, D. Rethinking Green Entrepreneurship—Fluid Narratives of the Green Economy. *Environ. Plan. A* **2016**, *48*, 1727–1749. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
39. Dees, J.G.; Khanin, D.; Kruger, N.; Murphy, P.J.; Santos, F.; Scarlata, M.; Walske, J.; Zacharakis, A. Social entrepreneurship and broader theories: Shedding new light on the 'Bigger Picture'. *J. Soc. Entrep.* **2013**, *4*, 88–107.
40. O'Donnell, G. Climate Tech: How ESG Investing is Evolving into 'a Profitable Endeavor'. Available online: <https://news.yahoo.com/climate-tech-esg-investing-profitable-endeavor-191604271.html> (accessed on 22 October 2021).
41. Anderson, T.L.; Leal, D.R. *Enviro-Capitalists: Doing Good While Doing Well*; Rowman and Littlefield: Lanham, MD, USA, 2008.
42. Tilley, F.; Parrish, B. From poles to wholes: Facilitating an integrated approach to sustainable entrepreneurship. *World Rev. Entrep. Manag. Sustain. Dev.* **2006**, *2*, 281–294. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
43. Thompson, N.; Kiefer, K.; York, J. Distinctions not Dichotomies: Exploring Social, Sustainable, and Environmental Entrepreneurship. In *Social and Sustainable Entrepreneurship (Advances in Entrepreneurship, Firm Emergence and Growth)*; Lumpkin, G.T., Katz, J.A., Eds.; Emerald Group Publishing Limited: Bingley, UK, 2011; Volume 13, pp. 201–220.
44. Jayal, A.D.; Badurdeen, F.; Dillon, O.W., Jr.; Jawahir, I.S. Sustainable manufacturing: Modeling and optimization challenges at the product, process and system levels. *CIRP J. Manuf. Sci. Technol.* **2010**, *2*, 144–152. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
45. Allam, H. Green Entrepreneurship Success Stories in the Arab Countries, Center for Environment & Development in the Arab Region & Europe (CEDARE). Available online: https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---exrel/documents/genericdocument/wcms_235612.pdf (accessed on 2 January 2022).
46. Hennemann, J.N.; Draser, B.; Stofkova, K.R. The Green Business and Sustainable Development School—A Case Study for an Innovative Educational Concept to Prevent Big Ideas from Failure. *Sustainability* **2021**, *13*, 1943. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
47. Dixon, S.E.; Clifford, A. Ecopreneurship—A new approach to managing the triple bottom line. *J. Organ. Change Manag.* **2007**, *20*, 326–345. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
48. Schaper, M. The Essence of Ecopreneurship. *Greener Manag. Int.* **2002**, *38*, 26–30. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
49. Schaltegger, S. Research and Markets. In *Making Ecopreneurs: Developing Sustainable Entrepreneurship*; Schaper, M., Ed.; Gower Publishing: Surrey, UK, 2010.

50. Volery, T. Ecopreneurship: Rationale, current issues and future challenges. In Proceedings of the Conference Papers of Swiss Research Institute of Small Business and Entrepreneurship, St. Gallen, Switzerland; 2002; pp. 541–553. Available online: https://www.kmu-hsg.ch/rencontres/IGW_Rencontres/BAND2002_WEB/F_11_Volery.pdf (accessed on 11 December 2021).
51. Mammadli, M.; Sadik-Zada, E.R.; Gatto, A.; Huseynova, R. What Drives Public Debt Growth? A Focus on Natural Resources, Sustainability and Development. *Int. J. Energy Econ. Policy* **2021**, *11*, 614–621. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
52. Basdekidou, V.A. Green Entrepreneurship & Corporate Social Responsibility: Comparative and Correlative Performance Analysis. *Int. J. Econ. Financ.* **2017**, *9*, 1–12.
53. Jones, M.T. Social Responsibility and the “Green” Business Firm. *Ind. Environ. Crisis Q.* **1996**, *9*, 327–345. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
54. Mammadli, M.M. Prospects for the export of agricultural products in Azerbaijan. In Proceedings of the 55th International Scientific Conference on Economic and Social Development, Baku, Azerbaijan, 17–18 June 2020; Volume 4, pp. 496–505.
55. Sadik-Zada, E.R.; Gatto, A.; Blick, N. Rural Electrification and Transition to Clean Cooking: The Case Study of Kanyegaramire and Kyamugarura Solar Mini-Grid Energy Cooperatives in the Kyenjojo District of Uganda. In *Sustainable Policies and Practices in Energy, Environment and Health Research*; Springer: Berlin/Heidelberg, Germany, 2021.
56. Aragón-Correa, J.A.; Sharma, S. A contingent resource-based view of proactive corporate environmental strategy. *Acad. Manag. Rev.* **2003**, *28*, 71–88. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
57. Hart, S.L. A natural-resource-based view of the firm. *Acad. Manag. Rev.* **1995**, *20*, 986–1014. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
58. Lu, I.Y.; Kuo, T.; Lin, T.S.; Tzeng, G.H.; Huang, S.L. Multicriteria decision analysis to develop effective sustainable development strategies for enhancing competitive advantages: Case of the TFT-LCD industry in Taiwan. *Sustainability* **2016**, *18*, 646. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
59. Zeynalova, Z.; Mammadli, M. Analysis of the economic factors affecting household consumption expenditures in Azerbaijan. *J. Crit. Rev.* **2020**, *7*, 241–248. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
60. Davis, K. The Case for and Against Business Assumption of Social Responsibilities. *Acad. Manag. J.* **1973**, *16*, 312–322. Available online: <https://57ef850e78feaed47e42-3eada556f2c82b951c467be415f62411.r9.cf2.rackcdn.com/Davis-1973-ForAnd%20Against.pdf> (accessed on 5 November 2021).
61. Park, S.R.; Kim, S.T.; Lee, H.-H. Green Supply Chain Management Efforts of First-Tier Suppliers on Economic and Business Performances in the Electronics Industry. *Sustainability* **2022**, *14*, 1836. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
62. Terán-Yépez, E.; Marín-Carrillo, G.; Casado-Belmonte, M.; Capobianco-Uriarte, M. Sustainable entrepreneurship: Review of its evolution and new trends. *J. Clean Prod.* **2020**, *252*, 14–27. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
63. Emami, A.; Khajeheian, D. Social Norms and Entrepreneurial Action: The Mediating Role of Opportunity Confidence. *Sustainability* **2019**, *11*, 158. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
64. Delai, I.; Takahashi, S. Sustainability measurement system: A reference model proposal. *Soc. Responsib. J.* **2011**, *7*, 438–471. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
65. Khan, E.; Dewan, M.; Chowdhury, M. Reflective or formative measurement model of sustainability factor? A three industry comparison. *Corp. Ownersh. Control. J.* **2016**, *13*, 83–92. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
66. Sadik-Zada, E.R. Political Economy of Green Hydrogen Rollout: A Global Perspective. *Sustainability* **2021**, *13*, 13464. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
67. Carlson, J.; Rahman, M.; Voola, R.; Vries, N. De Customer engagement behaviours in social media: Capturing innovation opportunities. *J. Serv. Mark.* **2018**, *32*, 83–94. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
68. Kirkwood, J.; Walton, S. What motivates ecopreneurs to start businesses? *Int. J. Entrep. Behav. Res.* **2010**, *16*, 204–228. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
69. Ballew, M.T.; Omoto, A.M.; Winter, P.L. Using Web 2.0 and Social Media Technologies to Foster Proenvironmental Action. *Sustainability* **2015**, *7*, 10620–10648. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
70. Huang, H. Media use, environmental beliefs, self-efficacy and pro-environmental behavior. *J. Bus. Res.* **2015**, *69*, 2206–2212. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
71. Zeynalova, Z. The applying functions of tax regulation for state development. *Aust. Econ. Pap.* **2020**, *59*, 376–394. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
72. Zahraie, B.; Everett, A.M.; Walton, S.; Kirkwood, J. Environmental entrepreneurs facilitating change toward sustainability: A case study of the wine industry in New Zealand. *Small Enterp. Res.* **2016**, *23*, 39–57. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
73. Khare, A. Antecedents to green buying behaviour: A study on consumers in an emerging economy. *Mark. Intell. Plan.* **2015**, *33*, 309–329. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
74. Laroche, M.; Bergeron, J.; Barbaro-Forleo, G. Targeting consumers who are willing to pay more for environmentally friendly products. *J. Consum. Mark.* **2001**, *18*, 503–520. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
75. Santini, C. Ecopreneurship and Ecopreneurs: Limits, Trends and Characteristics. *Sustainability* **2017**, *9*, 492. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
76. Cleveland, M.; Kalamas, M.; Laroche, M. Shades of green: Linking environmental locus of control and pro-environmental behaviors. *J. Consum. Mark.* **2005**, *22*, 198–212. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
77. Greeno, J.L.; Robinson, S.N. Rethinking Corporate Environmental Management. *Columbia J. World Bus.* **1992**, *27*, 222–232.
78. Polonsky, M.J.; Mintu-Wimsatt, A.T. *Environmental Marketing: Strategies, Practice, Theory, and Research*; Haworth Press: New York, NY, USA, 1995.
79. Welford, R. *Environmental Strategy and Sustainable Development: The Corporate Challenge for the Twent First Century*; Routledge: Abingdon, UK, 1995.
80. Miao, C.; Fang, D.; Sun, L.; Luo, Q. Natural resources utilization efficiency under the influence of green technological innovation. *Resour. Conserv. Recycl.* **2017**, *126*, 153–161. [\[CrossRef\]](#)

81. Spence, M.; Gherib, J.B.B.; Biwolé, V.O. Sustainable entrepreneurship: Is entrepreneurial will enough? A north-south comparison. *J. Bus. Ethics* **2011**, *99*, 335–367. [CrossRef]
82. Zhang, Y.; Berhe, H.M. The Impact of Green Investment and Green Marketing on Business Performance: The Mediation Role of Corporate Social Responsibility in Ethiopia's Chinese Textile Companies. *Sustainability* **2022**, *14*, 3883. [CrossRef]
83. Ambec, S.; Lanoie, P. Does it pay to be green? A systematic overview. *Acad. Manag. Perspect.* **2008**, *22*, 45–62.
84. Kushwaha, G.S.; Sharma, N.K. Factors Influencing Young Entrepreneurial Aspirant's Insight towards Sustainable Entrepreneurship. *Iran. J. Manag. Stud.* **2017**, *10*, 435–466.
85. Silajdžić, I.; Kurtagić, S.M.; Vučijak, B. Green entrepreneurship in transition economies: A case study of Bosnia and Herzegovina. *J. Clean. Prod.* **2015**, *88*, 376–384. [CrossRef]
86. Gliedt, T.; Parker, P. Green community entrepreneurship: Creative destruction in the social economy. *Int. J. Soc. Econ.* **2007**, *34*, 538–553. [CrossRef]
87. Gliedt, T.; Parker, P. Green community entrepreneurship 2.0. *Int. J. Soc. Econ.* **2014**, *41*, 609–625. [CrossRef]
88. Nizaeva, M.; Coskun, A. Determinants of the financing obstacles faced by SMEs: An empirical study of emerging economies. *J. Econ. Soc. Stud.* **2018**, *7*, 81–99. [CrossRef]
89. Noh, H.J. *Financial Strategies to Activate Green Company Eco Systems*; KCMI: Seoul, Korea, 2014.
90. European Union. *Green Budgeting: Towards Common Principles*; Publications Office of the European Union: Luxembourg, 2021.
91. Wagner, M. Eco-entrepreneurship: An empirical perspective based on survey data. In *Frontiers in Eco-Entrepreneurship Research, Advances in the Study of Entrepreneurship, Innovation and Economic Growth*; Libecap, G.D., Ed.; Emerald Group Publishing Limited: Bingley, UK, 2009; Volume 20, pp. 127–152.
92. Dess, G.G.; Keats, B.W. Environmental Assessment and Organizational Performance: An Exploratory Field Study. In *Academy of Management Proceedings*; Academy of Management: Briarcliff Manor, NY, USA, 1987; pp. 21–25.
93. Balatbat, M.C.; Lin, C.Y.; Carmichael, D.G. Management efficiency performance of construction businesses: Australian data. *Eng. Constr. Archit. Manag.* **2011**, *18*, 140–158. [CrossRef]
94. Goodwin, H.; Francis, J. Ethical and responsible tourism: Consumer trends in the UK. *J. Vocat. Mark.* **2003**, *9*, 271–284. [CrossRef]
95. Shin, S.; Cho, M. Green Supply Chain Management Implemented by Suppliers as Drivers for SMEs Environmental Growth with a Focus on the Restaurant Industry. *Sustainability* **2022**, *14*, 3515. [CrossRef]
96. Ceyhan, S.; Ada, S. Environmentally Sensitive Business Administration in Terms of Business Functions. *Int. J. Manag. Econ. Bus.* **2015**, *11*, 26, 115–137.
97. Lerro, M.; Raimondo, M.; Stanco, M.; Nazzaro, C.; Marotta, G. Cause Related Marketing among Millennial Consumers: The Role of Trust and Loyalty in the Food Industry. *Sustainability* **2019**, *11*, 535. [CrossRef]
98. Landy, H. A Wall Street Powerhouse is Finally Matching Its Climate-Change Rhetoric with Action. Available online: <https://qz.com/1784949/blackrock-ceo-larry-finks-2020-letter-backs-up-climate-rhetoric-with-action/> (accessed on 10 April 2022).
99. Hair, J.F.; Hult, G.T.M.; Ringle, C.M.; Sarstedt, M. *A Primer on Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM)*, 3rd ed.; Sage: Thousand Oaks, CA, USA, 2022.
100. Jolliffe, I.T. Sample Sizes and the Central Limit Theorem: The Poisson Distribution as an Illustration. *Am. Stat.* **1995**, *49*, 3.
101. Everitt, B.; Skrondal, A. *The Cambridge Dictionary of Statistics*, 4th ed; Cambridge University Press: New York, NY, USA, 2010.