

Table 1. Constructs and Survey Items

Constructs	Survey Items	Source
External pressure	<p>How do you perceive the following characteristics of the environment in which your business unit operates?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Environmental pressure (e.g., stakeholders call for environmentally friendly products and processes) (1= very weak; 5=very strong) 2. Social pressure (e.g. stakeholders pay attention to companies' commitment on ethical issues, human rights respect, labour conditions) (1= very weak; 5=very strong) 	Sarkis <i>et al.</i> (2010), Porter and Kramer (2002)
Sustainable management	<p>Indicate the effort put in the last 3 years into implementing, and the current level of implementation of, action programs related to: (Effort in the last 3years: 1=none; 5=high)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Environmental certifications (e.g. EMAS or ISO 14001) 2. Social certifications (e.g. SA8000 or OHSAS 18000) 3. Formal sustainability oriented communication, training programs and involvement 4. Energy and water consumption reduction programs 5. Pollution emission reduction and waste recycling programs 	Kitazawa and Sarkis (2000), Longo <i>et al.</i> (2005), Daily and Huang (2001), Sarkis (1998), Klassen and Whybark (1999)
Manufacturing performance	<p>How has your manufacturing performance changed over the last three years? (Compared to three years ago the indicator has: 1=Decrease (- 5% or worse); 2=stayed about the same (- 5%/+5%); 3=slightly increased (+5- +15%); 4=increased (+15-25%); 6=strongly increased (+25% or better))</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Unit manufacturing cost 2. Ordering costs 3. Manufacturing lead time 4. Procurement lead time 	Pagell and Gobeli, (2009), Ferdows and De Meyer, (1990), Woo <i>et al.</i> (2001)
Environmental outcomes	<p>Consider the importance of the following attributes to win orders from your major customers: (Importance in the last three years: 1=not important; 5=very important)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. More environmentally sound products and processes 2. Higher contribution to the development and welfare of the society 3. More safe and health respectful processes 	Gimenez <i>et al.</i> (2012), Maxwell and van der Vorst (2003)

Table 2. Variables and Factor Loadings

Variables	No. of Items	Factor Loadings				
		Item 1	Item 2	Item 3	Item 4	Item 5
External pressure	2	0.875	0.875	Nil	Nil	Nil
Sustainable management	5	0.856	0.872	0.873	0.824	0.793
Manufacturing performance	4	0.842	0.844	0.852	0.779	Nil
Environmental outcomes	3	0.806	0.868	0.875	Nil	Nil

Table 3. Scale Validation - Reliability and Validity

	ME	SD	CA	CR	AVE	EP	SM	MP	EO
EP	3.462	0.959	0.700	0.867	0.766	0.875			
SM	3.593	0.958	0.898	0.925	0.713	0.306**	0.844		
MP	2.626	0.861	0.846	0.898	0.689	-0.046	0.133	0.830	
EO	3.650	0.922	0.808	0.887	0.722	0.434**	0.513**	0.068	0.850

Note: ME=Mean; SD= Standard Deviation; CA=Cronbach Alpha; CR= Composite Reliability; AVE= Average Variance Extracted; EP=External pressure; SM=Sustainable management; MP=Manufacturing performance; EO=Environmental outcomes. ** Correlations are significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed); Bold values in the diagonal row are square roots of the AVE.

Table 4: Results of Structural Equation Modeling Analysis for Emerging Countries

Hypotheses	Causal Path	Path Coefficients	Standard Errors	Critical Ratios	p-value
H1	External pressure → Environmental outcomes	0.410	0.085	3.439	0.000***
H2	External pressure → Manufacturing performance	-0.114	0.056	-1.084	0.278
H3	External pressure → Sustainable Management	0.335	0.082	3.038	0.002**
H4	Sustainable Management → Environmental outcomes	0.450	0.096	4.479	0.000***
H5	Sustainable Management → Manufacturing performance	0.182	0.072	1.816	0.069

Table 5: Mediation Test of Sustainable Management for Emerging Countries

Effects	Hypotheses	Estimate
Direct effect	External pressure → Sustainable Management	0.410
Indirect effect	External pressure → Sustainable Management → Environmental outcomes	0.151
Total effect		0.561

Table 6. Bootstrap Results for Indirect Effects

Constructs	Estimate	Lower 95% Confidence Interval	Upper 95% Confidence Interval
Sustainable Management	0.151	0.065	0.268