

## **The dynamics of ecological sustainability in housing delivery : Developers' perspectives**

Bamgbade J.A.<sup>a</sup>; Fung, Evena Shallonia<sup>a</sup>; Moshood, Taofeeq D.<sup>b</sup>; Kamaruddeen, Ahmed Mohammed<sup>c</sup>; Liew, SanChuin<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> *Faculty of Engineering, Computing and Science, Swinburne University of Technology, Kuching, Malaysia*

<sup>b</sup> *Faculty of Industrial Management, Universiti Malaysia Pahang, Kuantan, Malaysia*

<sup>c</sup> *Skyline University College, Sharjah, United Arab Emirates*

### **ABSTRACT**

Housing delivery is facing substantial environmental sustainability threats. Consequently, the housing industry is constantly adopting broad-based actions to sustain the environment and make delivery more efficient and risk-averse. Such regulatory models are sometimes targeted at the housing developers' readiness, the dimensions of market volatility, technology, and the firm's resources. These variables are more profound within an emerging economic context such as Malaysia, and previous research investigating sustainability agenda in housing delivery has neglected their impacts within the housing developer's perspective. This study tested regional-scale hypotheses regarding predictors of ecological sustainability across the state of Sarawak Malaysia. It was hypothesised that the critical dynamics of technology, developer's readiness, resources, regulatory framework, market turbulence, and uncertainty would increase the likelihood of cumulative environmental sustainability in housing delivery. A sample of 221 Housing developers registered under the Sarawak Housing and Real Estate Developers' Association and allied professionals were sent a self-report online survey instrument, and 144 completed questionnaires were returned, indicating a 65 per cent response rate. Subsequently, SPSS and SmartPLS were used for data analysis. SPSS was used for data screening, while SmartPLS was used to assess the measurement and structural models. Structural equation models show that improved technology, developer's readiness, and regulatory apparatus are the better correlated with environmental sustainability performance.

### **KEYWORDS**

Building and real estate; Ecological sustainability; Housing developers; Regulation and governance; Technology management

## REFERENCES

1. Abidin, N. Z. (2005). Using value management to improve the consideration of sustainability within construction. Loughborough University. [Google Scholar]
2. Abidin, N. Z. (2010). Investigating the awareness and application of sustainable construction concept by Malaysian developers. *Habitat International*, 34(4), 421–426. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
3. Abidin, N. Z., & Jaapar, A. (2008). Sustainable concept awareness in Malaysia construction practices. Paper presented at the The 3rd Built Environment and Natural Environment Conference. [Google Scholar]
4. Abidin, N. Z., Yusof, N. A., & Othman, A. A. (2013). Enablers and challenges of a sustainable housing industry in Malaysia. *Construction Innovation*, 13(1), 10–25. [Crossref], [Google Scholar]
5. Adjarko, H., Osei-Poku, G., & Ayarkwa, J. (2014). Challenges to the incorporation of environmental sustainability issues into construction procurement at the local government level of Ghana. *International Refereed Journal of Engineering and Science (IRJES)*, 3(11), 42–52. [Google Scholar]
6. Ajibike, W., Adeleke, A., Mohamad, F., Bamgbade, J., Nawji, M., & Moshood, T. (2021). An evaluation of environmental sustainability performance via attitudes, social responsibility, and culture: A mediated analysis. *Environmental Challenges*, 4, 100161. [Crossref], [Google Scholar]
7. Akadiri, P. O., & Fadiya, O. O. (2013). Empirical analysis of the determinants of environmentally sustainable practices in the UK construction industry. *Construction Innovation*, 13(4), 352–373. [Crossref], [Google Scholar]
8. Alaghbari, W., Al-Sakkaf, A. A., & Sultan, B. (2019). Factors affecting construction labour productivity in Yemen. *International Journal of Construction Management*, 19(1), 79–91. [Taylor & Francis Online], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
9. Ali, S. B. M., Hasanuzzaman, M., Rahim, N., Mamun, M., & Obaidellah, U. (2021). Analysis of energy consumption and potential energy savings of an institutional building in Malaysia. *Alexandria Engineering Journal*, 60(1), 805–820. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
10. Arora, S. (2019). Admitting uncertainty, transforming engagement: Towards caring practices for sustainability beyond climate change. *Regional Environmental Change*, 19(6), 1571–1584. [Crossref], [Google Scholar]
11. Bamgbade, J., Kamaruddeen, A., Nawji, M., Adeleke, A., Salimon, M., & Ajibike, W. (2019a). Analysis of some factors driving ecological sustainability in construction firms. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 208, 1537–1545. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
12. Bamgbade, J., Nawji, M., Kamaruddeen, A., Adeleke, A., & Salimon, M. G. (2019b). Building sustainability in the construction industry through firm capabilities, technology and business innovativeness: Empirical evidence from Malaysia. *International Journal of Construction Management*, 22(3), 473–488. [Taylor & Francis Online], [Google Scholar]
13. Bastas, A., & Liyanage, K. (2019). Setting a framework for organisational sustainable development. *Sustainable Production and Consumption*, 20, 207–229. [Crossref], [Google Scholar]
14. Centre for Environment, Technology and Development, Malaysia (CETDEM). 2006. DDC Project - Demonstration and Documentation Centre for Sustainable Urban Household Energy Usage. Available: [http://www.cetdem.org.my/sustainable\\_energy/ddc.html](http://www.cetdem.org.my/sustainable_energy/ddc.html) [Google Scholar]

15. Ch'ng, P.-C., Cheah, J., & Amran, A. (2021). Eco-innovation practices and sustainable business performance: The moderating effect of market turbulence in the Malaysian technology industry. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 283, 124556. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
16. Cohen, S. (1988). Perceived stress in a probability sample of the United States. [Google Scholar]
17. Cook, S. N., & Yanow, D. (2011). Culture and organizational learning. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 20(4), 362–379. [Crossref], [Google Scholar]
18. Davies, R. J., Pratama, M. M. A., & Yusuf, M. (2018). BIM adoption towards the sustainability of construction industry in Indonesia. Paper presented at the MATEC Web of Conferences. [Google Scholar]
19. Dean, T. J., & McMullen, J. S. (2007). Toward a theory of sustainable entrepreneurship: Reducing environmental degradation through entrepreneurial action. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 22(1), 50–76. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
20. Deckert, C. (2016). Ecological sustainability of material resources – why material efficiency just isn't enough. *uwf UmweltWirtschaftsForum*, 24(4), 325–335. [Crossref], [Google Scholar]
21. De Clercq, D., Thongpapanl, N., & Voronov, M. (2018). Sustainability in the face of institutional adversity: Market turbulence, network embeddedness, and innovative orientation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 148(2), 437–455. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
22. Delbecq, A. L., & Mills, P. K. (1985). Managerial practices that enhance innovation. *Organizational Dynamics*, 14(1), 24–34. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
23. Di Fabio, A., & Saklofske, D. H. (2019). The contributions of personality traits and emotional intelligence to intrapreneurial self-capital: Key resources for sustainability and sustainable development. *Sustainability*, 11(5), 1240. [Crossref], [Google Scholar]
24. Dunham, R., Grube, J., Gardner, D., Cummings, L., & Pierce, J. (1989). The development of an attitude toward change instrument, paper presented at Academy of Management Annual Meeting. Washington, DC. [Google Scholar]
25. Dyllick, T., & Hockerts, K. (2002). Beyond the business case for corporate sustainability. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 11(2), 130–141. [Crossref], [Google Scholar]
26. Frethey-Bentham, C. (2011). Pseudo panels as an alternative study design. *Australasian Marketing Journal*, 19(4), 281–292. [Crossref], [Google Scholar]
27. Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A. G., & Buchner, A. (2007). G\* Power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior research methods*, 39(2), 175–191. [Crossref], [PubMed], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
28. Gatignon, H., & Xuereb, J.-M. (1997). Strategic orientation of the firm and new product performance. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 34(1), 77–90. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
29. Green Building Index (GBI). (2011). “Green Building Index: GBI assessment criteria for Non-Residential Existing Building (NREB) version 1.1.” [https://www.greenbuildingindex.org/Files/Resources/GBI%20Tools/GBI%20Design%20Reference%20Guide%20-%20Non-Residential%20Existing%20Building%20\(NREB\)%20V1.01.pdf](https://www.greenbuildingindex.org/Files/Resources/GBI%20Tools/GBI%20Design%20Reference%20Guide%20-%20Non-Residential%20Existing%20Building%20(NREB)%20V1.01.pdf) [Google Scholar]
30. Goel, A. (2019). Sustainability in construction and built environment: A “wicked problem”? *Smart and Sustainable Built Environment*, 8(1), 2–15. [Crossref], [Google Scholar]

31. Hair, J. F., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2011). PLS-SEM: Indeed a silver bullet. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 19(2), 139–152. [Taylor & Francis Online], [Google Scholar]
32. Hair, J. F., Jr, Sarstedt, M., Matthews, L. M., & Ringle, M, C. (2016). Identifying and treating unobserved heterogeneity with FIMIX-PLS: Part I–method. *European Business Review*, 28(1), 63–76. [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
33. Hallstedt, S., & Pigosso, D. (2017). Sustainability integration in a technology readiness assessment framework. Paper presented at the DS 87-5 Proceedings of the 21st International Conference on Engineering Design (ICED 17) Vol 5: Design for X, Design to X, Vancouver, Canada, 21-25.08. 2017. [Google Scholar]
34. Henseler, J., Hubona, G., & Ray, P. A. (2016). Using PLS path modeling in new technology research: Updated guidelines. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, 116(1), 2–20. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
35. Hill, R. C., & Bowen, P. A. (1997). Sustainable construction: Principles and a framework for attainment. *Construction Management and Economics*, 15(3), 223–239. [Taylor & Francis Online], [Google Scholar]
36. Holt, D. T., Armenakis, A. A., Feild, H. S., & Harris, S. G. (2007). Readiness for organizational change. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 43(2), 232–255. [Crossref], [Google Scholar]
37. Hörisch, J., Johnson, M. P., & Schaltegger, S. (2015). Implementation of sustainability management and Company size: A knowledge-based view. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 24(8), 765–779. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
38. Hossain, M. U., Ng, S. T., Antwi-Afari, P., & Amor, B. (2020). Circular economy and the construction industry: Existing trends, challenges and prospective framework for sustainable construction. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 130, 109948. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
39. Jaworski, B. J., & Kohli, A. K. (1993). Market orientation: Antecedents and consequences. *Journal of Marketing*, 57(3), 53–70. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
40. Jnr, B. A., Majid, M. A., & Romli, A. (2018). Green information technology adoption towards a sustainability policy agenda for government-based institutions: An administrative perspective. *Journal of Science and Technology Policy Management*, 10(2), 274–300. [Google Scholar]
41. Khandwalla, P. N. (1976). The techno-economic ecology of corporate strategy. *Journal of Management Studies*, 13(1), 62–75. [Crossref], [Google Scholar]
42. Lam, M. L.-l., & Cook, M. J. (2017). A narrative on teaching sustainability. In Çaliyurt, K. & Yüksel, Ü. (eds.), *Sustainability and management* (pp. 227–238). London: Routledge. [Crossref], [Google Scholar]
43. Love, M. D. (2020). *Internet of Things and Sustainable Communities: Using Technology for Ecological Sustainability*. Robert Morris University. [Google Scholar]
44. Marsono, A. K. B., & Balasbaneh, A. T. (2015). Combinations of building construction material for residential building for the global warming mitigation for Malaysia. *Construction and Building Materials*, 85, 100–108. [Crossref], [Google Scholar]
45. Mohd Nawi, M. N., Noordin, A., Tamrin, N., Abdul Nifa, F. A., & Chong, K. L. (2019). An ecological study on enhancing the Malaysian construction ecosystem: Readiness implementation factors in industrialized building system (IBS) projects. *Ekoloji*, 28(107), 545–552. [Google Scholar]

46. Morris, A., Zuo, J., Wang, Y., & Wang, J. (2018). Readiness for sustainable community: A case study of green star communities. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 173, 308–317. [Crossref], [Google Scholar]
47. Moshood, T., Adeleke, A., Nawanir, G., Ajibike, W., & Shittu, R. (2020). Emerging challenges and sustainability of industry 4.0 era in the Malaysian construction industry. *International Journal of Recent Technology and Engineering*, 9(1), 1627–1634. [Google Scholar]
48. Mustafa, N. K., Isa, C. M. M., & Ibrahim, C. K. I. C. (2021). Top-down bottom-up strategic green building development framework: Case studies in Malaysia. *Building and Environment*, 203, 1 - 13. [Crossref], [Google Scholar]
49. Nestorović, O., & Petrović, V. (2019). Modern challenges of ecological sustainability. In J. Subić, M. Jeločnik, B. Kuzman, & J. Vasile Andrei (Eds.), *Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Development in Terms of the Republic of Serbia Strategic Goals Realization within the Danube Region: Sustainability and Multifunctionality* (pp. 671–685). Belgrade, Serbia: Institute of Agricultural Economics. [Google Scholar]
50. Ohueri, C., Enegbuma, W., Kuok, K., Wong, N., Ng, L., & Kenley, R. (2018). Preliminary evaluation of synergizing BIM and Malaysian carbon reduction and environmental sustainability tool. Paper presented at the International Conference on Sustainability in Energy and Buildings. [Google Scholar]
51. Omer, M. A., & Noguchi, T. (2020). A conceptual framework for understanding the contribution of building materials in the achievement of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). *Sustainable Cities and Society*, 52, 101869. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
52. Onuoha, I. J., Aliagha, G. U., & Rahman, M. S. A. (2018). Modelling the effects of green building incentives and green building skills on supply factors affecting green commercial property investment. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 90, 814–823. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
53. Osman, W. N., Mohd Nawawi, M. N., Yaakob, M., Radzuan, K., & Osman, N. N. (2015). The importance of project manager, project team towards and project related factors towards environmental management practices (EMP) success. *International Academic Research Journal of Business and Technology*, 1(2), 175–180. [Google Scholar]
54. Postnikova, O., Bamgbade, J. A., & Wong, N. H. (2021). Performance index for public housing in East Malaysia. *Architectural Engineering and Design Management*, 1–19. doi:10.1080/17452007.2021.1956418 [Taylor & Francis Online], [Google Scholar]
55. Qiu, L., Hu, D., & Wang, Y. (2020). How do firms achieve sustainability through green innovation under external pressures of environmental regulation and market turbulence? *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 29(6), 2695–2714. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
56. Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2016). Gain more insight from your PLS-SEM results: The importance-performance map analysis. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, 116(9), 1865–1886. [Crossref], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
57. Ross, B. E., Chen, D. A., Conejos, S., & Khademi, A. (2016). Enabling adaptable buildings: Results of a preliminary expert survey. *Procedia Engineering*, 145, 420–427. [Crossref], [Google Scholar]

58. Ruiz, J. J. (2020). Global pact negotiations: Building a normative framework for ecological sustainability in the Anthropocene<sup>1</sup>. *Environmental Policy and Law*, 50(1/2), 35–46. [Crossref], [Google Scholar]
59. Sarstedt, M., Ringle, C. M., Smith, D., Reams, R., & Hair Jr, J. F. (2014). Partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM): A useful tool for family business researchers. *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, 5(1), 105–115. [Crossref], [Web of Science<sup>®</sup>], [Google Scholar]
60. Sekaran, C. B., & Rani, A. P. (2010). Development and validation of spectrophotometric method for the determination of DPP-4 inhibitor, sitagliptin, in its pharmaceutical preparations. *Eclética Química*, 35, 45–53. [Crossref], [Google Scholar]
61. Shurrab, J., Hussain, M., & Khan, M. (2019). Green and sustainable practices in the construction industry: A confirmatory factor analysis approach. *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management*, 26(6), 1063–1086. [Crossref], [Web of Science<sup>®</sup>], [Google Scholar]
62. Song, M., Droge, C., Hanvanich, S., & Calantone, R. (2005). Marketing and technology resource complementarity: An analysis of their interaction effect in two environmental contexts. *Strategic Management Journal*, 26(3), 259–276. [Crossref], [Web of Science<sup>®</sup>], [Google Scholar]
63. Švajlenka, J., & Kozlovská, M. (2018). Houses based on wood as an ecological and sustainable housing alternative—case study. *Sustainability*, 10(5), 1502. [Crossref], [Google Scholar]
64. Tan, Y., Shen, L., & Yao, H. (2011). Sustainable construction practice and contractors' competitiveness: A preliminary study. *Habitat International*, 35(2), 225–230. [Crossref], [Web of Science<sup>®</sup>], [Google Scholar]
65. Tata, J., & Prasad, S. (2015). National cultural values, sustainability beliefs, and organizational initiatives. *Cross Cultural Management*, 22(2), 278–296. [Crossref], [Google Scholar]
66. Umer, A., Hewage, K., Haider, H., & Sadiq, R. (2016). Sustainability assessment of roadway projects under uncertainty using green proforma: An index-based approach. *International Journal of Sustainable Built Environment*, 5(2), 604–619. [Crossref], [Google Scholar]
67. Vakola, M. (2013). Multilevel readiness to organizational change: A conceptual approach. *Journal of Change Management*, 13(1), 96–109. [Taylor & Francis Online], [Google Scholar]
68. Wang, G., Dou, W., Zhu, W., & Zhou, N. (2015). The effects of firm capabilities on external collaboration and performance: The moderating role of market turbulence. *Journal of Business Research*, 68(9), 1928–1936. [Crossref], [Web of Science<sup>®</sup>], [Google Scholar]
69. Weidner, K., Nakata, C., & Zhu, Z. (2021). Sustainable innovation and the triple bottom-line: A market-based capabilities and stakeholder perspective. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 29(2), 141–161. [Taylor & Francis Online], [Web of Science<sup>®</sup>], [Google Scholar]
70. Wong, J. K. W., & Zhou, J. (2015). Enhancing environmental sustainability over building life cycles through green BIM: A review. *Automation in Construction*, 57, 156–165. [Crossref], [Web of Science<sup>®</sup>], [Google Scholar]
71. Yüksel, İ. (2017). A review of steel slag usage in construction industry for sustainable development. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, 19(2), 369–384. [Crossref], [Google Scholar]
72. Yusof, N. A., Iranmanesh, M., & Waziri, A. G. (2016). Exploring the dimensions of pro-environmental practices in construction firms. *International Journal of Environmental Science and Development*, 7(1), 69–72. [Crossref], [Google Scholar]