UDC 005.95/.96

Sustainability-Oriented Teams: how “green KPIs” reshape motivation and conflict

Kateryna Barkova,
Simon Kuznets Kharkiv National University of Economics, Kharkiv
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8389-0728

Abstract. *This paper examines how sustainability-related KPIs (“green KPIs”) reshape team motivation and conflict. Integrating Self-Determination and Goal-Setting theories with evidence on psychological safety, we argue that well-designed metrics can enhance autonomous motivation and learning, yet may trigger goal incongruence and greenwashing pressure. We propose design principles and governance routines to turn tension into joint problem solving.*
Keywords: *green KPIs, team motivation, psychological safety, conflict management, sustainable leadership.*

Organizations increasingly cascade sustainability goals—carbon intensity, waste diversion, supplier ESG scores—into team-level KPIs. This translation from corporate purpose to local metrics promises alignment and impact [5, p. 62–70; 4, p. 2835–2837], yet also changes the social psychology of work. Teams must now pursue performance and planetary outcomes simultaneously, often under tight deadlines and ambiguous data.

According to Self-Determination Theory, people thrive when work supports autonomy, competence, and relatedness [1, p. 229–233]. Purpose-based cues can elevate internalization and persistence [8, p. 108–112]. Goal-Setting Theory shows that specific, challenging goals raise performance, provided feedback and ability are adequate [10, p. 705–711]. Sustainability goals satisfy purpose but risk controlled motivation if used mainly as compliance targets [1, p. 236–240].

Team learning depends on psychological safety—a climate where people can speak up about errors and trade-offs [6, p. 350–356]. Otherwise, green KPIs can fuel relationship conflict instead of constructive task conflict [2, p. 742–746]. Poorly designed indicators may invite symbolic action/greenwashing [3, p. 64–70]. Integrating sustainability into strategy maps via (Sustainability) Balanced Scorecard prevents KPI islands [9, p. 25–32; 11, p. 270–273].

First, purpose infusion: when credible links exist between daily tasks and ecological outcomes, autonomous motivation rises [8, p. 110–112; 1, p. 236–239]. Second, competence stretch: process measures (e.g., energy per unit) create learning goals [10, p. 709–713]. Third, relatedness expansion across stakeholders builds prosocial identity [4, p. 2841–2844].

Risks: externally imposed, punitive, or bonus-only green KPIs can reduce autonomy and provoke gaming [3, p. 66–69; 1, p. 240].

Green KPIs alter goal architecture (throughput vs. emissions). Data-quality disputes (scopes, baselines) begin as task conflicts and may slide into relationship conflicts without facilitation [2, p. 741–744]. Leadership must standardize definitions

and stage decisions (learn → pilot → scale) within a psychologically safe frame [6, p. 353–356].

Tie each KPI to a causal hypothesis in the strategy map [11, p. 270–274; 9, p. 25–29]; support autonomy, competence, and relatedness [1, p. 233–241]; combine leading and lagging indicators with transparent data lineage [9, p. 30–32]; set fair incentives and institutionalize blameless reviews [6, p. 354–356]; add anti-greenwashing controls [3, p. 68–70].

A manufacturing cell adopted three green KPIs—scrap rate, energy per unit, solvent VOCs—linked to operator training and maintenance. Motivation rose as operators co-designed checklists and saw weekly impact boards; conflicts spiked around data attribution. A simple RACI plus a blameless weekly huddle moved conflict from personal to procedural; after eight weeks, scrap fell 18%, energy 9%, VOCs 22%, while grievance tickets dropped to baseline [6, p. 352–355; 9, p. 28–31].

Table 1. Green KPI patterns and leadership responses
(Source: compiled by the author based on [1; 2; 6; 9; 11])

KPI type (example)	**Typical motivational effect**	**Typical conflict pattern**	**Leadership responses**
Process KPI (e.g., % equipment in eco-mode)	Builds competence via controllable behaviors	Task conflict over standards/workload	Co-design SOPs; small tests; rotate ownership
Outcome KPI (e.g., CO_2e/unit)	Fuels purpose; risks pressure if bonus-tied	Attribution fights (scopes, baselines)	Define boundaries; dual feedback; shared credit
Stakeholder KPI (e.g., % audited suppliers)	Boosts relatedness and prosocial identity	Jurisdiction disputes	Cross-functional RACI; joint reviews with procurement
Innovation KPI (# eco-ideas)	Increases autonomy and creativity	Priority clashes vs. throughput	Time-boxed sprints; small budgets; evidence gates
Learning KPI (ESG skills hours/pp)	Secures competence without anxiety	Low perceived urgency	Micro-learning in shift; visible skill badges

The table shows that the KPI itself sets the psychology of the team.

Process KPIs mostly build competence and trigger solvable task debates about standards; Outcome KPIs spark purpose but invite attribution fights (scopes, baselines); Stakeholder KPIs expand relatedness yet create jurisdiction tension across functions; Innovation KPIs unlock autonomy but collide with short-term throughput; Learning KPIs secure skills yet seem “non-urgent” without visible payoffs. In other words, each KPI type carries a predictable motivational upside and a typical conflict risk—and both can be steered by design.

Practically, leaders should treat green KPIs as a social technology: co-design controllable process measures to grow mastery; pair every impact KPI with a leading indicator and shared-credit rules; make cross-functional ownership explicit (RACI) for stakeholder goals; ring-fence time and micro-budgets for innovation; and render learning visible (badges, progression). With these routines, tension shifts from people

to process, turning metrics from pressure points into engines of learning and sustainable performance.

Treat green KPIs as social technology, not just numbers: purpose framing at kickoffs [5, p. 66–70]; data-lineage cards [9, p. 29–32]; blameless post-mortems [6, p. 353–356]; dual-track incentives [10, p. 712–713]; visual strategy maps [11, p. 270–274].

This study argues that sustainability-related KPIs are not merely accounting devices but social technologies that reconfigure how teams think, feel, and interact. When green KPIs are strategically anchored and psychologically well-designed, they elevate autonomous motivation (purpose, mastery, contribution) and convert disagreements into constructive task conflict that improves processes and outcomes. When they are imposed as punitive scorecards or tied to single-metric bonuses, they depress autonomy, incentivize gaming and greenwashing, and polarize debates into value clashes.

Our synthesis links three lenses—Self-Determination Theory, Goal-Setting Theory, and psychological safety—to show why the same KPI can either energize or derail a team depending on its controllability, feedback architecture, and governance. The typology in Table 1 highlights predictable patterns: process KPIs tend to build competence; outcome KPIs fuel purpose but invite attribution fights; stakeholder KPIs extend relatedness yet create jurisdiction frictions; innovation KPIs enlarge autonomy but collide with short-term throughput; learning KPIs secure skills but are undervalued without visible payoffs. These patterns imply that leadership routines—co-design of SOPs, dual (leading/lagging) feedback, shared-credit rules, cross-functional RACI, time-boxed pilots, and blameless reviews—are as important as the metric choice itself.

Managerially, the path to durable results is design + dialogue. Leaders should (1) tie each green KPI to a causal hypothesis on the strategy map; (2) provide toolkits and training so teams can influence the number they own; (3) make data lineage transparent (scope, baselines, caveats); (4) reward learning and outcomes together; and (5) institutionalize psychological safety through regular, blameless problem-solving rituals. Done this way, green KPIs become engines of learning that reduce waste, emissions, and defects while raising engagement and customer value.

Limitations of this work include reliance on theory-driven integration and a synthetic field illustration. Future research should run causal micro-experiments (e.g., safety priming, shared-credit rules, dual-feedback dashboards) and track their effects on conflict quality, innovation rate, and sustained KPI performance across sectors. A second avenue is to study boundary conditions—when infrastructure, regulation, or data quality constrains the motivational benefits of green KPIs—and how digital tools (IoT meters, LCA platforms) can widen controllability for frontline teams.

In sum, green KPIs can either be pressure points or performance flywheels. Organizations that treat them as social technologies—crafted, explained, audited, and learned from—are more likely to achieve credible sustainability gains and stronger, more resilient teams.

References

1. Deci E. L., Ryan R. M. The “what” and “why” of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. Psychological Inquiry. 2000. Vol. 11, No. 4. P. 227–268. DOI: 10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01.

2. De Dreu C. K. W., Weingart L. R. Task versus relationship conflict, team performance, and team member satisfaction: A meta-analysis. Journal of Applied Psychology. 2003. Vol. 88, No. 4. P. 741–749. DOI: 10.1037/0021-9010.88.4.741.

3. Delmas M. A., Burbano V. C. The drivers of greenwashing. California Management Review. 2011. Vol. 54, No. 1. P. 64–87. DOI: 10.1525/cmr.2011.54.1.64.

4. Eccles R. G., Ioannou I., Serafeim G. The impact of corporate sustainability on organizational processes and performance. Management Science. 2014. Vol. 60, No. 11. P. 2835–2857. DOI: 10.1287/mnsc.2014.1984. URL: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1964011 (дата звернення: 16.10.2025).

5. Porter M. E., Kramer M. R. Creating shared value. Harvard Business Review. 2011. Vol. 89, No. 1–2. P. 62–77. URL: https://hbr.org/2011/01/the-big-idea-creating-shared-value (дата звернення: 16.10.2025).

6. Edmondson A. C. Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. Administrative Science Quarterly. 1999. Vol. 44, No. 2. P. 350–383. DOI: 10.2307/2666999. URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/2666999 (дата звернення: 16.10.2025).

7. Aguinis H., Glavas A. What we know and don’t know about corporate social responsibility: A review and research agenda. Journal of Management. 2012. Vol. 38, No. 4. P. 932–968. DOI: 10.1177/0149206311436079. URL: https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0149206311436079 (дата звернення: 16.10.2025).

8. Grant A. M. The significance of task significance: Job performance effects, relational mechanisms, and boundary conditions. Journal of Applied Psychology. 2008. Vol. 93, No. 1. P. 108–124. DOI: 10.1037/0021-9010.93.1.108.

9. Kaplan R. S., Norton D. P. The Balanced Scorecard: Translating Strategy into Action. Boston: Harvard Business School Press, 1996. 322 p.

10. Locke E. A., Latham G. P. Building a practically useful theory of goal setting and task motivation: A 35-year odyssey. American Psychologist. 2002. Vol. 57, No. 9. P. 705–717. DOI: 10.1037/0003-066X.57.9.705.

11. Figge F., Hahn T., Schaltegger S., Wagner M. The Sustainability Balanced Scorecard—linking sustainability management to business strategy. Business Strategy and the Environment. 2002. Vol. 11, No. 5. P. 269–284. DOI: 10.1002/bse.339.