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The Circular Economy (CE) is a proposal for new, more sustainable and durable economy model. As consequence, of this pro-environmental economic model induces visible changes on the labor market which are Green Jobs (GJ). This paper is focused on the creation of Green Jobs in the CE. The GJ are most visible in the Environmental Goods and Services Sector (EGSS). This study aims to investigate EGSS among 28 European Union countries in years 2009–2019. The adopted method was literature research complemented by the statistical analysis of secondary data from Eurostat in the linear regression method. Then, some Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and their measure were used as main indicators reflecting changes on the labor market. Results are presented as a model indicating which of the SDGs can support CE and enhance number of the ‘Green Jobs’. Presented results contribute to the science, because combine factors influencing GJ creation in EGSS, in CE perspective. This study underlines a lack of uniform methods for measuring and forecasting the effects of green jobs creation and indicate future research directions.

1. Introduction

Transition from the linear economy to the Circular Economy (CE) is process observed both in theory and practice (Ferasso et al. 2020; Gottinger et al. 2020; de Oliveira et al. 2021). The CE can be summarized as a paradigm shift aimed at preventing the depletion of resources (Barreiro-Gen and Lozano 2020) by closing the loops related to energy and materials consumption (Rincón-Moreno et al. 2020). This concept can be characterized at the micro- (customers and companies), meso- (economic agents that integrate into symbioses) and macro-levels (from national to regional and city-levels) (Prieto-Sandoval et al. 2018).

Striving for Sustainable Development (SD) is at the basis of creating contemporary socio-economic policy of the EU and many countries around the world (Ledoux et al. 2005; Rutkowski and Sulich 2020; Tortorella et al. 2020). This idea of economic development is based on the principle of maintaining the synergy and a balance between social, economic and environmental dimensions (Friant et al. 2021). The key role of the SD is crucial in the EU and is visible in multiple documents (Gottinger et al. 2020). Many EU’s action plans already referred to SD and emphasized the need to create a more sustainable and inclusive growth in Europe (Raszkowski 2013; Salvioni and Almici 2020). The EU’s documents concerns not only about the transition to the CE but also Green Jobs creation (Friant et al. 2020). The CE is also a solution for the environmental problems that expanded nowadays. The CE evolved from the Linear Economy (LE) often called Brown Economy (BE) which is an economic model based on extensive combustion of fossil fuels (Briguglio and Brown 2019).

The research gap identified in this paper is the lack of the Green Jobs creation econometric model connections with the CE. Such model should describe between theoretical assumptions of CE and empirical implications in the emerging GJ using indicators constructed upon the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

This research intends to fulfil indicated gap by investigating the EGSS in EU countries from 2009 to 2019. Therefore, the scope of the paper is focused on the GJ in the context of CE. The GJ are most visible in the Environmental Goods and Services Sector (EGSS). What is more, the scientific literature refers to EGSS as the ‘green sector’ (Sinclair-Desgagné 2008). The comprehensive desk research to complement the statistical analysis of secondary data from Eurostat for each member state was performed (Eurostat 2020a, b).

This manuscript is structured as follows. After, the research gap and aim of this paper presented in the introduction, the themes crucial for this research are discussed in the literature review in second point. Research method is described in the third section, then the results and their discussion are presented. The paper concludes by presenting limitations of the conducted research were discussed along with the managerial implications, contribution to the knowledge development, and further research avenues are addressed.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Circular Economy

The CE concept identifies new opportunities for the simultaneous achievement of environmental benefits and economic growth (Hopkinson et al. 2018; Durán-Romero et al. 2020; van Dam et al. 2020). The idea of CE was based on the observation of natural ecosystems, which are not linear (only energy flows), but resources (materials) circulate (Korhonen et al. 2018; Illic et al. 2020). Then, all production processes should be devised in such way to be more like natural closed cycles (Kirchherr et al. 2017).

Pearce, Barbier, & Markandya (1989) in their report entitled ‘Blueprint for a green economy’ presented and explained how to introduce the SD idea in social and economic processes (Pearce et al. 1990). The authors of this report have not explicitly defined the CE, underlining their idea that economy should support the natural environment protection policy. According to Green and McCann (2011), a CE is defined as the concept of an environmentally friendly economy that opens new opportunities for creative and innovative activities. In 2006, Friedman indicated that the CE is the future for the world (Green and McCann 2011) based on technological progress (Rutkowski and Sulich 2020). Therefore, the term "green" denotes activities considered essential and beneficial to the environment (Whitmash and O’Neill 2010). These views on CE are significantly influenced by the growing interest in the SD (Sauvé et al. 2016). In result of this increased attention reflected in many scientific studies (Sanguino et al. 2020) and governments’ documents different concepts and derivative definitions were founded (Kirchherr et al. 2017).

The CE is defined as an alternative for the LE (Sulich 2018; Sulich and Zema 2018), because CE aims to balance economic activities by closing the loops and creating an ecological system (Boulding 1966, Ruiz-Real et al. 2018). The CE characteristics are often presented in contrast to the linear model of the LE (Table 1). The CE is considered to be more sustainable, inclusive and pro-environmental model of growth and development (Moraga et al. 2019). The LE as a model of the economic development has failed because it leads towards the destruction of the biodiversity and resources depletion. As a linear system the LE is based on the false assumption that planet resources are unlimited. The LE caused three main consequences (Baer et al. 2015; Sulich and Zema 2018):
1) Environmental burden resulting from industrialization;
2) Political and bureaucratic inefficiency of the public sector;
3) Increasing income, cultural, racial and ethnic differences.

| Circular Economy                                      | Linear Economy                        |
|------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Separates the economic growth from the natural resources use | "Unlimited" economic growth          |
| Renewable energy sources                             | Non-renewable energy sources          |
| Energy efficiency                                     | Massive consumption of natural resources |
|                                                      | (like energy and raw materials)       |
| Clean production                                      | Greenhouse gas emissions              |
| Biodiversity protection                               | Biodiversity destruction              |
| Intergenerational and interregional justice           | Creates social inequalities at global scale |
| Sustainable consumption                               | Unlimited consumption (over consumption) |
| Corporate Social Responsibility from companies and stakeholders | Lack of Corporate Social Responsibility from companies and stakeholders |
| Rising social trust                                   | Awareness of social trust             |

Source: elaborated based on (Sulich and Zema 2018).

The CE is a foundation of the ‘green civilization’ concept, which is characterized by the human and natural environment coexistence, by the harmonious social development and by the technological innovation in the EGSS (Norgaard 1994). As presented in Fig. 1 the CE develops not only qualitatively but also quantitatively – the new processes and jobs are created to cover material cycles (Gottwald 2012; Tomić and Schneider 2020).

The CE is proposal for more sustainable and durable economic model (Castillo Castillo and Angelis-Dimakis 2019). What is more, the CE has defined processes which close resources loops (i.e., by recycling) and aims to reduce material losses by incineration and landfill (Hopkinson et al. 2018). The Circular Economy is a path of economic and social development which relies on investing in the ‘green recovery’. It means a transition from a LE in favor of creating Green Jobs and the shift towards the CE visible in Environmental Goods and Services Sector.

2.2. Environmental Goods and Services Sector in European Union

The definition of the EGSS, which is used in this paper, was published in 2009 in “EGSS handbook” (2016) in explaining what the Environmental Goods and Services are. In the proposed approach, these goods and services related to environmental protection are distinguished based on the main goal’s criterion. The aim is to protect the environment or manage resources (Moldvay et al. 2013; Steuer 2016). “Also critical is the producer’s awareness of environmental requirements and the creation of environmentally friendly products, the use of products in harmony with the environment, and offering them in markets that take environmental conditions into account” (Steuer 2016). The definition of EGSS is also stated in the Regulation (EU) No. 691/2011, when classifying environmental activities based on the objective criterion. These actions area can be divided into Environmental Protection (EP) and Resource Management (RM) activities (Steuer et al. 2016; Eurostat 2020c). Environmental goods are related to environmental services as they arise from environmental processes. Then environmental products can be the primary, secondary or auxiliary manufacturer's production and serve EP or RM. The green terminology also introduces the environmental producers' concept, which refers to producers involved in pro-environmental solutions (Steuer 2016).

The regulation EU No. 691/2011 lists the environmental activities and products under the EGSS (Eurostat 2020c). “The EGSS reporting collects, collates, and reports information on market output (including export), value-added of market activities, employment of market activities” (Eurostat 2020c). Among several outputs, there are the “non-market, for own final use, ancillary environment, and gross value added and employment” (UNEP 2008; Sulich et al. 2020). The EGSS considers the economic activities responsible for generating products which base are the environment, such as those produced for EP or RM. To support initiatives related to EP, the EU Commission has precisely defined environmental products and activities (Sugiyono and Dewancker 2020). “Products for EP prevent, reduce and eliminate pollution or any other degradation of the environment. They include measures undertaken to restore degraded habitats and ecosystems. Examples are electric vehicles, catalysts and filters to decrease pollutant emissions, wastewater and waste treatment services, or noise insulation works. Products for RM safeguard the stock of natural resources against depletion. Examples are renewable energy production, energy efficient and passive buildings, seawater desalination or rainwater recovery” (Eurostat 2020c).

The EGSS is the sector where Green Jobs are created next to the EP activities, which are categorized according to the Classification of Environmental Protection Activities (CEPA 2000). Also related to the EGSS is the list Classification of Resource Management Activities (CreMA) associated with Green Jobs (Eurostat 2020c). These classifications distinguishes sixteen categories and subcategories (Eurostat 2020c) which are in accordance with the Statistical Classification of Economic Activities in the European Community (NACE 2) (European Commision 2008).
The EGSS meets environmental goals, i.e., industry enterprises’ goods and services help preventing, reducing, and eliminating ecological degradation or protecting and maintaining natural resources (Livesey 2010; Eurostat 2015).

The EGSS is related to the CE, because of closing linear chains into loops creates direct and indirect (induced) Green Jobs based on the technology development. These expand the EGSS into new EP and RM related processes and creates new jobs (Karafyey and Agaoglu 2017; Xu et al. 2020). The EGSS is a part of strategic importance in building a CE in the EU (Durán-Romero et al. 2020).

Crowley (1999) notes, in the modern world, enterprises’ orientation towards environmental friendliness should be treated as a higher good. The approach to environmental protection changes, which is not treated as an economic burden, but constitutes a development opportunity and allows for jobs creation (Crowley 1999).

### 2.3. Green Jobs in Circular Economy model

Observed climate and technological changes not only generate threats but also open some opportunities associated with creation of the Green Jobs (GJ). On the other hand, investments in GJ bring relevant economic, environmental and social benefits. The benefits of GJ vary, as they generate environmental benefits in traditional and new sectors (Esposito et al. 2014). The GJ creation is associated with a new approach to business management, aiming to prevent environmental degradation and reduce unemployment (Sulich et al. 2020; McMahon et al. 2021). Therefore, GJ are essential for protecting the environment and the labor market, combining the sustainability principles (Paes et al. 2019; Unay-Gailhard and Bojnec 2019).

The GJ definition used in this article is accepted after the UNEP (2008) term. The Eurostat has not defined GJ explicitly but it appears in the context of the EGSS (Livesey 2010). Despite of the lack of the GJ definition in EU documents, its main assumptions are reflected in EU initiatives targeting the so-called balance of two major concerns: the environment and the economic growth. The potential of Green Jobs is promising as the CE should help protect the environment and ensures decent work (Toan et al. 2016). The International Labour Organization (ILO) has proposed the term of decent work. “Decent work sums up the aspirations of people in their working lives. It involves opportunities for work that is productive and delivers a fair income, security in the workplace and social protection for families, better prospects for personal development and social integration, freedom for people to express their concerns, organize and participate in the decisions that affect their lives and equality of opportunity and treatment for all women and men” (ILO 2020). Decent work is recognized as part of the Sustainable Development Goals’ achievement in the formulated by the EU document titled “2030 Agenda for the SD” (Raszkowski and Bartniczak 2019; Salvioni and Almici 2020; United Nations 2021). Therefore, each definition of GJ presented in Table 2 has a multidimensional impact (Pettinger 2017).

### Table 2
**Green Jobs definitions**

| Organization                                         | Definition                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
|------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS)                     | Green Jobs are:                                                                                                                                                                                            |
|                                                      | a) jobs related to the goods manufacturing/services providing that can benefit the environment or save natural resources.                                                                               |
|                                                      | b) jobs devoted to establishing environmentally friendly production processes and less use of resources from natural sources made by workers.                                                        |
|                                                      | Categories of green goods/services/technologies are available at the BLS Green Jobs definition.                                                                                                               |
| United Nations Environment Program (UNEP)           | “Green Jobs are workplaces in agricultural, manufacturing, research and development, administrative, and service activities that contribute substantially to preserving or restoring environmental quality. Specifically, but not exclusively, this includes jobs that help to protect ecosystems and biodiversity; reduce energy, materials, and water consumption through high-efficiency strategies; de-carbonize the economy; and minimize or altogether avoid generation of all forms of waste and pollution.” (UNEP 2008) |
| International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC)      | In the context of economic sectors, green jobs are responsible for reducing environmental impacts of such economic activities performed by for-profit companies. The green jobs also provide the support for decent work and improving workforce living conditions and greater considerations of the labor rights. |
| International Labor Office (ILO)                    | The green jobs relate those that reduces environmental impacts and promotes sustainability. Green jobs include those that are related to the reduction of several consumptions of energy/raw-materials, those related to decarbonization of the economy, those that promote ecosystems and biodiversity protection/restoration, and those that reduce waste and pollution generation. The broad focus of green jobs concept encompasses any new position that shows smaller than average environmental footprint. |
| Eurostat                                             | No definition of green jobs in the context of EGSS. However, consider EGSS employment for measuring procedures.                                                                                           |

Sources: (UNEP 2008, 2020; Rutkowska-Podolowska et al. 2016; Bureau of Labor Statistics 2020; Eurostat 2020a).

According to Table 2 and Harvey et.al. (2010) the organizations create GJ where resources, such as health, time, talent and money, are not wasted. This new trend responds to the particular need for organizations to be pro-ecologically involved and generating less waste and reducing emissions. Observed changes are challenge for employers, as it is necessary to reconcile the ‘eco’ and green approaches when managing the organization, making profits and being competitive (Soloducho-Pelc and Sulich 2020).

The idea of the CE development and the evolution of SD affects the work and competence of employees. The research carried out by Song and Xie (2019) has already shown that the economic development is influenced by the green labor participation rate, the GJ, and green talent (Song and Xie 2019). Therefore,
both the needs and expectations of new employee competencies are growing (Burger et al. 2019). Considering the aforementioned contributions, an analytical display of the different definitions relating GJ as in Fig. 2 were presented.

The Green Jobs Initiative (ILO 2021) was created by the international organizations the International Labor Organization (ILO) and the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP) and the International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC). The initiative is covering the impacts caused by climate change into the employment and how to mitigate undesirable consequences for future programs. This initiative also supports governments’ and employers’ all efforts in promoting sustainable and environmentally jobs targeting the climate change issues. This initiative has set of goals: “to promote awareness and dialogue; to identify and respond to knowledge gaps; to facilitate a “just transition” that reflects the environmental, economic and social pillars of sustainable development; to promote policies and measures to achieve Green Jobs; to catalyze employment and poverty alleviation within climate mitigation and adaptation programs; and to strengthen collaboration between UNEP/ILO/ITUC, within the UN system and with the international business community to establish a common ‘Green Jobs’ definition” (UNEP 2008).

The impact of the Green Jobs on the labor market and employment can be distinguished from a broad conceptual perspective, in at least four ways as the economy is oriented toward greater sustainability and CE. “First, in some cases, additional jobs will be created - as in the manufacturing of pollution-control devices added to existing production equipment. Second, some employment will be substituted - as in shifting from fossil fuels to renewables, or from truck manufacturing to rail car manufacturing, or from landfilling and waste incineration to recycling. Third, certain jobs may be eliminated without direct replacement - as when packaging materials are discouraged or banned and their production is discontinued. Fourth, it would appear that many existing jobs (especially such as plumbers, electricians, metal workers, and construction workers) will simply be transformed and redefined as day-to-day skill sets, work methods, and profiles are greened” (UNEP 2008).

The Fig. 3 shows the relations between the three areas employment: 1) production of green products and services, 2) Environmental Processes (EP), and 3) Resources Management (RM). There are GJ in the shaded part of Fig. 3 and these are part of the EGSS employment (Livesey 2010). They can be described as pure GJ because these jobs are created in a unique environment created by the sector related directly to the natural environment (Sulich and Zema 2018).

Presented in Table 2 definitions can be operationalized based on two core elements, which are consistent to the output and process approaches (BLS, 2020). In the EGSS context the EP and RM approaches bring focus on the goods and services outputs and indicators suitable for the CE (Piwowar-Sulej 2021). Additionally, the problem of measurability and objectivity in evaluation appears in scientific research and reporting on the GJ worldwide and in this context explanatory model combining CE and GJ is required (Gagliardi et al. 2016; Dordmond et al. 2021).

3. Research Design

The adopted research method is the statistical reference method. This method is mostly used in the research of the economic development comparisons (Kasztelan 2016; Raszkowski 2018; Moraga et al. 2019; Sulich et al. 2020) related to the usage of the full set of variables to create an econometric model. In this research data obtained from the Eurostat database for all 28 EU countries in years 2009-2019 were used, because of their reliability (Eurostat 2020). What is more the EGSS data are made available every year and these data are also part of the Sustainable Development Indicators (more than 100 overlapping variables in very wide context), gathered in the Eurostat database grouped in 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) (Schroeder et al. 2019). Then, among these indications, there is also distinguished group of the CE which consist of 15 indicators. In the research method the are considered as the describing independent variables (with symbols from CE_1 to CE_15) in relation to the variable with symbol GJ – Green Jobs (described variable). All variables related to the CE and EGSS employment were identified for further calculations performed with the Statistica® Software.

Presented in Table 3 variables are given by the Eurostat to measure CE transition among EU countries and were not result of authors choice. The Green Jobs variable (GJ) which is employment in the EGSS is adopted in this paper. Data on EGSS are widely applicable and are used in the economy, politics, and social activities. Both in microeconomics and macroeconomics, these data are used to formulate environmental management goals and to monitor them (Eurostat 2015). In Table 3 there are three variables marked with * symbol, which are not used in calculations due to their characteristics: CE_1 (cei_pc010); CE_7 (cei_wm020) and CE_11 (cei_srm010). These variables are not associated with EU member states, but with the specified resources and are listed by the Eurostat to describe CE. Therefore, continuous numeration of these indicators was kept to be in accordance with the Eurostat database (Eurostat 2020).

Table 3. Chosen indicators measured by the Eurostat. (Eurostat 2020b)
| Indicator group                      | Variable symbol | Indicator characteristic                                                                 | Eurostat symbol |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| Production and consumption          | CE_1*           | EU self-sufficiency for raw materials                                                   | (cei_pc010)     |
|                                     | CE_2            | Generation of municipal waste per capita                                                 | (cei_pc031)     |
|                                     | CE_3            | Generation of waste excluding major mineral wastes per GDP unit                          | (cei_pc032)     |
|                                     | CE_4            | Generation of waste excluding major mineral wastes per domestic material consumption      | (cei_pc033)     |
| Waste management                    | CE_5            | Recycling rate of municipal waste                                                        | (cei_wm011)     |
|                                     | CE_6            | Recycling rate of all waste excluding major mineral waste                                 | (cei_wm010)     |
|                                     | CE_7*           | Recycling rate of packaging waste by type of packaging                                    | (cei_wm020)     |
|                                     | CE_8            | Recycling rate of e-waste                                                                | (cei_wm050)     |
|                                     | CE_9            | Recycling of biowaste                                                                   | (cei_wm030)     |
|                                     | CE_10           | Recovery rate of construction and demolition waste                                       | (cei_wm040)     |
| Secondary raw materials             | CE_11*          | Contribution of recycled materials to raw materials demand - end-of-life recycling input rates (EOL-RIR) | (cei_srm010)     |
|                                     | CE_12           | Circular material use rate                                                               | (cei_srm030)     |
|                                     | CE_13           | Trade in recyclable raw materials                                                        | (cei_srm020)     |
| Competitiveness and innovation      | CE_14           | Private investments, jobs and gross value added related to Circular Economy sectors       | (cei_cie010)     |
|                                     | CE_15           | Patents related to recycling and secondary raw materials                                 | (cei_cie020)     |
| Labor market                        | GJ              | Employment in the Environmental Goods and Services Sector                                 | (env_ac_egss1)   |

Source: Authors elaboration based on (Eurostat 2020e, b).

* data unavailable or not in the geographical breakdown suitable for further research.

The presented division of the variables is in order with method adopted by the Eurostat (Eurostat 2020d). The performed multiple regression aim was to create the econometric model to cover described in the introduction section research gap and to propose a reliable model based on the variables proposed by the Eurostat.

### 4. Data Analysis And Discussion

This paper has researched the secondary data related to the CE indicators gathered for each EU member state in years 2009 – 2019 and published in Eurostat database in dedicated section entitled “Circular economy indicators” (Eurostat 2020b). The two sets of variables in total number of 13, which were based on the Eurostat database were defined. The first set of 12 variables (symbols as in Table 3) are describing and independent variables, when the one variable with symbol GJ is dependent and described variable.

The correlation (Table 4) and basic statistics (average and standard deviation values) for unstandardized data, aiming to check interdependencies between variables were examined. Moreover, it is intended to find out the directions of aforementioned variables relations. The main research assumption is the correlation examination of variables possesses a sense only a cause-and-effect relation is present. This research used calculations from the Statistica® software made available by StatSoft Poland programming environment. The dependent variable GJ is significantly correlated with variables: CE_5, CE_9, CE_12, CE_13, CE_14, and CE_15, as presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Correlations matrix between variables (Circular Economy indicators, CE) and Green Jobs (variable) for all EU-28 countries.
Variable Marked bold correlations are important $p < 0.05$; $N=28$ (lack of data were deleted by pairs)

| Variable | Average | Std. Dev. | CE_2 | CE_3 | CE_4 | CE_5 | CE_6 | CE_8 | CE_9 | CE_10 | CE_12 |
|----------|---------|-----------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|-------|
| CE_2     | 482,0   | 126,0     | 1,000000 |
| CE_3     | 110,2   | 137,8     | -0,375505 | 1,000000 |
| CE_4     | 12,3    | 6,9       | -0,122393 | 0,559462 | 1,000000 |
| CE_5     | 33,0    | 15,0      | 0,431254 | -0,212862 | 0,277876 | 1,000000 |
| CE_6     | 46,1    | 20,3      | 0,231103 | -0,354243 | 0,171651 | 0,646556 | 1,000000 |
| CE_8     | 35,4    | 14,4      | -0,096983 | 0,208936 | 0,208936 | -0,032149 | 0,010760 | 1,000000 |
| CE_9     | 56,6    | 50,0      | 0,568365 | -0,334167 | 0,178549 | 0,848741 | 0,611619 | 0,024558 | 1,000000 |
| CE_10    | 80,4    | 23,3      | 0,174276 | -0,024292 | 0,268182 | 0,342535 | 0,055036 | 0,247473 | 1,000000 |
| CE_12    | 8,6     | 6,1       | 0,117380 | -0,007353 | 0,699685 | 0,595384 | 0,593859 | -0,141969 | 0,582541 | 0,213106 | 1,000000 |
| CE_13    | 317705,8 | 479356,6 | 0,177678 | -0,202030 | 0,255277 | 0,461017 | 0,214565 | 0,079020 | 0,408805 | -0,039978 | 0,388470 |
| CE_14    | 4721,8  | 7965,0    | 0,182528 | -0,198114 | 0,259479 | 0,499358 | 0,280542 | -0,148438 | 0,380676 | 0,156818 | 0,506986 |
| CE_15    | 11,5    | 19,0      | 0,121241 | -0,161956 | 0,119587 | 0,487828 | 0,278448 | -0,133799 | 0,327494 | 0,163277 | 0,410916 |
| GJ       | 122821,8 | 148829,8  | 0,085337 | -0,180231 | 0,189012 | 0,442660 | 0,299066 | -0,203304 | 0,394094 | 0,209443 | 0,476181 |

Source: Authors' elaboration.

The regression aimed to identify the primary model based on the reduced number of variables as presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Dependent variable GJ regression summary and model characteristics

| N=28 | b* | Std. Err. b* | b | Std. Err. b | t(21) | p |
|------|----|--------------|---|-------------|-------|--|
| Intercept | 137303,8 | 46242,92 | 2,96919 | 0,007319 |
| CE_14 | 0,721735 | 0,101815 | 13,5 | 1,90 | 7,08871 | 0,000001 |
| CE_15 | 0,303899 | 0,102564 | 2386,0 | 805,26 | 2,96302 | 0,000001 |
| CE_2 | -0,169005 | 0,065845 | -199,6 | 77,76 | -2,56671 | 0,017977 |
| CE_9 | 0,388383 | 0,113577 | 1156,7 | 338,27 | 3,41956 | 0,000001 |
| CE_5 | -0,341973 | 0,112701 | -338,73 | 1116,32 | -3,03434 | 0,006306 |
| CE_10 | 0,071692 | 0,055855 | 457,5 | 356,41 | 1,28354 | 0,213286 |

Note: Model features: $R= 0.96934832$; $R^2= 0.93963617$; Corrected $R^2= 0.92238937$; $F(6,21)=54,482$; $p=0.000001$; Error std. estimation = 0.41462; symbols meaning: b* - standard coefficients, b – directional coefficient of equation.

Source: Authors' calculations.

In Table 5 only significant ($p<0.000001$) variables for the model were marked with bold text, and the others are insignificant: CE_2; CE_5; CE_10 and this can mean that these variables are collinear (CE_5) with the other independent variables or their correlations are weak with the dependent variable (as explained in
Table 4).

In a result, the simplified equation was obtained, representing the relations between GJ and its describing variables CE_14, CE_15 and C_9. The linear model formula (linear polynomial) is presented as Equation (1):

\[
GJ = CE_{14} \cdot 13.5 + CE_{15} \cdot 2386.0 + CE_9 \cdot 1156.7 \pm 0.41462
\]  

(1)

In the Equation 1, the variables' meaning is the same as in Table 3. The linearity of the presented model was checked in test \( F(6,21) = 54.482 \). We have verified the model, which consists of checking the model assumptions:

1. The significance of linear regression (note under Table 5) is \( p<0.000001 \);
2. The importance of partial regression coefficients;
3. No collinearity (redundancy) between independent variables;
4. Homoscedasticity assumption, which means that the variance of the random component \( (\epsilon_i) \) is the same for all observations;
5. No residual autocorrelation;
6. Normal residual distribution (Figure 4); and
7. The random term \( \epsilon_i \) has the expected value equal to 0.

The multiple regression coefficient \( R = 0.96934832 \) is a measure of the interdependencies between independent variables (12 qualified to research) and dependent variable (Green Jobs).

Then, the obtained calculations allowed the following results (Soloducho-Pelc and Sulich 2020):

1. Linear regression's significance was \( F = 54.48 \) with \( p<0.000001 \). This result proved that Equation 1 is significant. The coefficient of multiple correlation was \( R = 0.96 \), supporting the linear dependencies between variables (Equation 1);
2. The \( p<0.000001 \) value evidences the significance of partial regression coefficients;
3. No collinearity between independent variables was verified, with high tolerance values for both variables (close to 1);
4. Model linearity is supported by the fulfilled homoscedasticity;
5. No residual autocorrelation was identified (Table 8);
6. A normal residual distribution was identified (Figure 4); and
7. Random term \( \epsilon_i \) reported an expected value \( (\epsilon_i = 0) \) thanks to the average value of the Cook's distance \( (= 0) \) (Table 7).

In Table 6 the average values and standard deviations for each variable were calculated. For all variables all 28 cases (which refer to 28 EU countries) were important to calculate presented multiple regression model (Table 5). Variables symbols used in Table 6 are the same as in Table 3.

Table 6. Variables and their average and standard deviations values
| Variable | Average | Std. dev. | No. Important |
|----------|---------|-----------|---------------|
| CE_2     | 482,0   | 126,0     | 28            |
| CE_3     | 110,2   | 137,8     | 28            |
| CE_4     | 12,3    | 6,9       | 28            |
| CE_5     | 33,0    | 15,0      | 28            |
| CE_6     | 46,1    | 20,3      | 28            |
| CE_8     | 35,4    | 14,4      | 28            |
| CE_9     | 56,6    | 50,0      | 28            |
| CE_10    | 80,4    | 23,3      | 28            |
| CE_12    | 8,6     | 6,1       | 28            |
| CE_13    | 317705,8| 479356,6  | 28            |
| CE_14    | 4721,8  | 7965,0    | 28            |
| CE_15    | 11,5    | 19,0      | 28            |
| GJ       | 122821,8| 148829,8  | 28            |

Source: Authors' calculations.

The next step of the calculated model verification was to check the residuals normality distribution presented in Figure 4. The plot of the normal distribution of residuals shows that all residuals are arranged along a straight line. The outliers may be the cause of this, and it is assumed that the resulting distribution of residuals is a normal distribution.

The statistics shown in Table 7 calculated in regression for variable GJ are used to identify outliers: standardized residuals, residual values removed, Mahalanobis distances, Cook distances. If the observed values among one of these statistics are in the same order, this informs about lack outliers. If the observation of calculation results (Table 7) proved differences in these values, then probably the given case (1-28) and this order is related to the alphabetical order of EU member states as listed in Eurostat tables (Eurostat 2020d) has a significant influence on the regression bias.

Table 7. Expected values and residuals in regression for variable GJ (Green Jobs)
| Obs. Value | Predict. Value | Residual | Std. Predict. | Std. Residual | Std. Err. Predict. Value | Residual dist. | Deleted Residuals | Cook dist. |
|------------|---------------|----------|---------------|--------------|--------------------------|--------------|------------------|-------------|
| 33876,000000 | 45305,078125 | -11429,078125 | -0,537311 | -0,275652 | 27671,212891 | 11,061666 | -20607,994141 | 0,01571 |
| 38150,000000 | 6771,692871 | 31378,306641 | -0,804407 | 0,756797 | 14358,762695 | 2,273865 | 35654,390625 | 0,01267 |
| 113816,000000 | 77998,562500 | 35817,437500 | -0,310695 | 0,863862 | 17520,166016 | 3,856740 | 43603,042969 | 0,02821 |
| 68880,000000 | 57890,308594 | 10989,691406 | -0,450076 | 0,265054 | 24154,060547 | 8,198833 | 16635,289063 | 0,0078C |
| 517348,500000 | 560558,312500 | -43209,812500 | 3,034193 | -1,042154 | 36519,644531 | 19,982437 | -192732,781250 | 0,39477 |
| 30264,000000 | 43534,156250 | -13270,156250 | -0,549586 | -0,320056 | 14679,734375 | 2,420252 | -15172,018555 | 0,00235 |
| 24308,000000 | -11510,732422 | 35818,734375 | -0,931133 | 0,863893 | 19665,970703 | 5,109980 | 46216,097656 | 0,03993 |
| 36806,000000 | 50881,167969 | -14075,167969 | -0,498660 | -0,339471 | 12295,106445 | 1,409970 | -15432,205078 | 0,00174 |
| 380626,000000 | 329004,687500 | 51621,312500 | 1,429167 | 1,245027 | 18309,621094 | 4,300997 | 64126,687500 | 0,06664 |
| 0,000000 | -1393,591675 | 1393,591675 | -0,861005 | 0,033611 | 22036,017578 | 6,662284 | 1942,194824 | 0,0000E |
| 26767,500000 | 55095,511719 | -28328,011719 | -0,469448 | -0,683228 | 13874,701172 | 2,059216 | -31900,251953 | 0,00947 |
| 33121,500000 | 45034,687500 | -11913,187500 | -0,539185 | -0,287328 | 10761,227539 | 0,854521 | -12773,662109 | 0,00091 |
| 9837,500000 | 45711,902344 | -35874,402344 | -0,534491 | -0,865235 | 19152,716797 | 4,797058 | -45605,937500 | 0,0368E |
| 0,000000 | 49183,089844 | -49183,089844 | -0,510431 | -1,186221 | 12053,177734 | 1,317454 | -53723,175781 | 0,0202E |
| 3787,000000 | 31434,568359 | -27647,568359 | -0,633455 | -0,666817 | 25984,638672 | 9,640365 | -45530,246094 | 0,0676E |
| 137132,500000 | 181922,750000 | -44790,250000 | 0,409661 | -1,080272 | 18847,197266 | 4,614717 | -56455,671875 | 0,05472 |
| 169589,000000 | 146748,609375 | 22840,390625 | 0,165850 | 0,550875 | 25761,769531 | 9,459234 | 37202,746094 | 0,0444C |
| 203844,500000 | 199061,875000 | 4782,625000 | 0,528462 | 0,115350 | 23490,330078 | 7,702166 | 7043,419434 | 0,00132 |
| 102502,000000 | 89345,910463 | 13156,085938 | -0,232040 | 0,317305 | 12774,961914 | 1,598913 | 14536,040399 | 0,0016E |
| 171786,000000 | 117132,953125 | 54653,046875 | -0,039433 | 1,318147 | 20211,140625 | 5,451424 | 71687,304688 | 0,10147 |
| 23838,000000 | 354,105560 | 23483,894531 | -0,848891 | 0,566395 | 19622,796875 | 5,083339 | 30262,208984 | 0,01704 |
| 0,000000 | 88470,695313 | -88470,695313 | -0,238107 | -2,133777 | 18716,539063 | 4,537632 | -111112,648438 | 0,2090E |
| 134214,000000 | 82403,500000 | 51810,500000 | -0,280162 | 1,249590 | 10352,226563 | 0,718894 | 55255,105469 | 0,01581 |
| 55858,000000 | 67571,953125 | -11713,953125 | -0,382967 | -0,282523 | 17488,029297 | 3,839070 | -14248,854492 | 0,0030C |
| 364299,000000 | 400780,093750 | -36481,093750 | 1,926682 | -0,879868 | 31462,785156 | 14,583098 | -86005,632813 | 0,3539E |
In Table 8, the analysis proved the lack of autocorrelation of residuals and statistics value $d = 1.947$ and this means that there was enough data to calculate a statistically significant linear model in multiple regression procedure.

Table 8. The $d$ Durbin-Watson model verication

| Feature | $d$ Durbin - Watson | Residual Serial Correlation |
|---------|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| Estim.  | 1.947020            | 0.006487                    |

The Figure 5 proved the homoscedasticity assumption, which was fulfilled, supporting the model’s linearity. The assumption is met because the points on the graph form an even cloud, without any characteristic pattern of points.

The linear model (Equation 1) presents the two sets of variables. This equation presents regression results, reducing the number of variables that were used in the final model. Regression allowed the description of statistically significance relations between GJ (Employment in the Environmental Goods and Services Sector) and CE_14; CE_15; CE_9. Variables’ dependencies create a model presented in Equation 1 and Figure 6. The shape of the proposed model underlines the circularity feature of described economy.

The EGSS is a part of the Circular Economy and in this sector majority of the GJ is visible (Dordmond et al. 2021). However, the GJ can be created in the other sectors of the economy. Obtained results prove the unequivocal character of the three variables with described variable GJ. Thus, CE_14 (Private investments, jobs and gross value added related to circular economy sectors) represents crucial expenditures related to the development of EGSS. Also significant for the model is variable CE_15 (Patents related to recycling and secondary raw materials), which is also indicate that technological progress combined with investments can influence CE_9 (Recycling of biowaste). All these variables used in the model prove that GJ are part of the labor market influenced in the same matter by the inventions and investments, but they are very specific because their aim is reducing the anthropopressure (negative impact of human activity on the natural environment). In this perspective the GJ are part of the EGSS.

The GJ creation process in the literature is described mostly quantitatively which include (Bruyère and Filiberto 2013; Conlon et al. 2019):

1. “Generation of energy from renewable sources (solar, wind, biofuels) including manufacturing, installation, and maintenance;
2. Improving energy efficiency including services like home energy audits, home renovation and retrofitting, manufacture and provision of products like energy efficiency appliances;
3. Pollution reduction/removal recycling, greenhouse gas reduction;
4. Natural resources conservation including organic agriculture, sustainable forestry, storm water management;
5. Environmental compliance, education and training including regulations and public awareness”.

This list of the areas or factors influencing the GJ creation process then is not used into mathematical method to predict or calculate the number of the GJ but to prove transformation towards the CE (McMahon et al. 2021; Rojas Arboleda et al. 2021). The majority of the quantitative publications document the number of GJ (Ferrão et al. 2015) or are focused on the gap between demand and supply of GJ (Song et al. 2021). However in the literature there is similar to presented in this paper graphical approach describing the relations between GJ and CE (Horbach et al. 2015) these works are qualitative in their methods (Battaglia et al. 2018). Therefore, this paper brings novelty to the science and expands GJ creation process quantitative horizon. Contrary to presented in Equation 1 and Figure 6 model the other publication use one chosen indicator or factor like the final energy consumption from renewables and income in rural areas (Aceleanu et al. 2018) or utilized agricultural area (Unay-Gailhard and Bojnec 2019). The model presented in this paper is supported by findings of Luca i
in., (2019) which used multilevel logistic regression and confirmed their hypothesis that "the resources efficiency actions a company is taking, the more likely it is for employees to have green job" (Luca et al. 2019, p. 69). Contrary to the Luca i in., (2019) this paper cover the period of 2009 and 2019 for all EU member states and on the basis of secondary data form Eurostat the linear model of Green Jobs creation process has been proposed.

5. Conclusions And Implications

In the CE people prevent environmental damage, control pollution, and take measures to protect the enterprise's environment (Tang et al. 2018; Liu et al. 2020). Issues such as development in harmony between humanity and nature, the SD, wise science, and technology are gaining strategic importance. These concepts are crucial for CE development and indicate the need for agreement between the participants of economic processes at the various levels. Therefore, it is assumed that CE is related to the idea of "green civilization" coined by Norgaard, where societies' wisdom translates into civilization development regarding the natural environment and economic benefits for all. In the CE, the labor market can be shaped by activities at the macro and micro level associated with GJ creation.

As a post-industrial civilization, the "green civilization" requires a different approach to employees. The honesty of the organization towards its stakeholders, following the proclaimed principles and values, and high moral standards enforce enterprises towards the natural environment protection. The GJ must appear not only in politicians' messages but mainly in employees' minds. The recommended approach is an integrated one towards GJ, where the organization's standards translate into expectations towards employees and achieving specified SDGs. Closing production cycles requires implementing the CE indicators and measure of changes effects in culture and awareness at enterprises, employees, and individual recipient's level. The EGSS is a special environmental sector of economy where specifically but not exclusively GJ are created. Beside of that, this sector aims to reduce or eliminate environmental pressures. The GJ number is increasing due to technological changes and growing investments in EP and RM.

The literature review also underlines a lack of uniform methods for measuring and forecasting the effects of green jobs creation. This research contributes to science by identifying the green indicators of CE required in the GJ creation. The method used in this study comprises the variables identifies in earlier studies and that have been validated by the decision makers in 28 EU countries (Luca et al. 2019, p. 70). The presented in Fig. 6 model is a novelty, because it combines factors influencing GJ creation in EGSS, in CE perspective. Based on this model policy-makers should enhance the investments from private sectors, gross value added and jobs that are characterized as CE sectors (CE_14), which is most important variable in proposed model. The important for CE is a technology development which is also crucial for number of patents focusing the recycling and the use of secondary raw materials (CE_15). Proposed model can be used to predict the number of the GJ created in the CE with certain accuracy (Eq. 1).

Main findings revealed in proposed explanatory model of GJ creation is reflected in striving to implement the idea of CE. The model is indicating which strategic management fields can support a CE and enhance employment in EGSS which in this paper is described as GJ. Presented calculations are rare in the field of the CE scientific discussion about factors of GJ creation. Authors understand that each of the used indicators represent a process that support transformation towards the CE in EU. The limitation of this study lies in the initial number of variables describing the CE proposed by Eurostat and adopted to this study. On the other hand, this set is comparable and widely accepted due to the Eurostat methodology. These features allow to repeat whole research procedure with scientific objectivity. Then authors could not choose arbitrary variables, other than adopted in this study. Another limitation comes from the geographical characteristic of variables, they represent EU member states context only.

When pointing to the possibilities of implementing CE model in practice, it should be considered that the GJ are next to the pillar of these concept, and they are necessary to achieve SDGs. Green Jobs act as a CE implementation tool and are a strategic goal for organizations in economic model. The natural environment can be protected and restored by increasing the number of the GJ. The GJ importance is not only based in protecting and developing the natural environment. The Green Jobs are essential to employees because they ensure decent work and shape their destiny and the environmental protection level. Practitioners and entrepreneurs can focus also on the recycling of biowaste (CE_9) processes which also contribute to the GJ creation as presented in Fig. 6. Simplicity of proposed model can be suitable for the business, because it translates theoretical findings into business language and easy to implement business solutions. The GJ creation processes and factor are important because they offer a combined solution for climate, economic and social crises.

The future research direction can be based on the replication of the research the factor analysis usage, this type of method could better describe variability among observed and correlated variables used in this research. This study presents the dynamic changes in years 2009–2019 for GJ creation process in CE, and satisfy the demand for similar longitudinal studies (Luca et al. 2019) which should be continued in future.

Declarations

Acknowledgements

The project is financed by the National Science Centre in Poland under the program "Business Ecosystem of the Environmental Goods and Services Sector in Poland" implemented in 2020-2022 project number 2019/33/N/HS4/02957 total funding amount 120,900.00 PLN.

The project is financed by the Ministry of Science and Higher Education in Poland under the program "Regional Initiative of Excellence" 2019–2022, project number 015/RID/2018/19, total funding amount 10,721,040.00 PLN.

We are grateful to Prof. Marcos Ferasso form Institute of Scientific Research and Graduate School, Universidad de Lima in Peru for his consultations and discussion of this paper.

Availability of data and material
Author information

Affiliations
Adam Sulich (AS)
Faculty of Management, Wroclaw University of Economics and Business; Wroclaw, Poland

Letycja Soloducho-Pelc (LSP)
Faculty of Management, Wroclaw University of Economics and Business; Wroclaw, Poland

Contributions
AS and LSP conceptualized the research, designed and supervised material development, data collection, analysis, literature review, writing, and critical review processes of the research. AS and LSP was involved in supervision, material development, literature review, writing, and critical review processes. Finally, AS and LSP were active in supervision while also contributing to the literature review, writing, and critical review of the research and manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Corresponding author
Correspondence to Adam Sulich

Ethics declarations

Ethical approval
Not applicable

Consent to participate
Not applicable

Consent to publish
Not Applicable

Competing interests
The authors declare no competing interests.

References

1. Aceleanu MI, Şerban AC, Țîrcă DM, Badea L (2018) The rural sustainable development through renewable energy. The case of Romania. Technol Econ Dev Econ 24:1408–1434. doi: 10.3846/20294913.2017.1303650
2. Baer P, Brown MA, Kim G (2015) The job generation impacts of expanding industrial cogeneration. Ecol Econ 110:141–153. doi: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2014.12.007
3. Barreiro-Gen M, Lozano R (2020) How circular is the circular economy? Analysing the implementation of circular economy in organisations. Bus Strateg Environ 1–11. doi: 10.1002/bse.2590
4. Battaglia M, Cernini E, Annesi N (2018) Can environmental agreements represent an opportunity for green jobs? Evidence from two Italian experiences. J Clean Prod 175:257–266. doi: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.12.086
5. Boulding KE (1966) The economics of the Coming Spaceship Earth. In: Environmental Quality in a Growing Economy: Essays from the Sixth RFF Forum. pp 3–14
6. Briguglio M, Brown M (2019) Civil society perspectives on green jobs in sustainable energy: The case of European Malta. Energy Environ 30:867–881. doi: 10.1177/0958305X18813685
7. Bruyère S, Filiberto D (2013) The green economy and job creation: Inclusion of people with disabilities in the USA. Int J Green Econ 7:257–275. doi: 10.1504/IJGE.2013.058151
8. Burger M, Stavropoulos, Spyridon Ramkumar S, Dufourmont J, van Oort F (2019) The heterogeneous skill-base of circular economy employment. Res Policy 48:248–61
9. Bureau of Labor Statistics (2020) Green Jobs: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics
10. Castillo Castillo A, Angelis-Dimakis A (2019) Analysis and recommendations for European carbon dioxide utilization policies. J Environ Manag 247:439–448. doi: 10.1016/j.jenvman.2019.06.092

11. Conlon K, Jayasinghe R, Dasanayake R (2019) Circular economy: Waste-to-wealth, jobs creation, and innovation in the global south. World Rev Sci Technol Sustain Dev 15:145–159. doi: 10.1504/WRSTSD.2019.099377

12. Crowley K (1999) Jobs and environment: The “double dividend” of ecological modernisation? Int J Soc Econ 26:1013–1027. doi: 10.1108/03068299910245787

13. de Oliveira CT, Dantas TET, Soares SR (2021) Nano and micro level circular economy indicators: Assisting decision-makers in circularity assessments. Sustain Prod Consum 26:455–468. doi: 10.1016/spc.2020.11.024

14. Dordmond G, de Oliveira HC, Silva IR, Swart J (2021) The complexity of green job creation: An analysis of green job development in Brazil. Environ Dev Sustain 23:723–746. doi: 10.1007/s10668-020-00605-4

15. Durán-Romo G, López AM, Beliaeva T, et al (2020) Bridging the gap between circular economy and climate change mitigation policies through co-innovations and Quintuple Helix Model. Technol Forecast Soc Change 160:120246. doi: 10.1016/j.techfore.2020.120246

16. Esposito M, Haider A, Samaan D, Semmler W (2014) Enhancing job creation through green transformation. In: Schlegelmilch K, Eichel H, Pegels A (eds) Green Industrial Policy: Concept, Policies, Country Experiences. pp 469–491

17. European Commission (2008) NACE 2 REV - Regulamento Comissão Europeia Nº 1893/2006 do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho

18. Eurostat (2020a) Environmental economy-statistics on employment and growth Statistics Explained

19. Eurostat (2020b) Database - Eurostat. Cir. Econ. Indic.

20. Eurostat (2020c) Environmental Goods and Services Sector. Eurostat metadata

21. Eurostat (2015) A Practical Guide for the Compilation of Environmental Goods and Services (EGSS) Accounts

22. Eurostat (2020d) Main tables - Circular economy - Eurostat. Cir. Econ.

23. Eurostat (2020e) Which indicators are used to monitor the progress towards a circular economy? Indic. - Circ. Econ. - Eurostat

24. Ferasso M, Beliaeva T, Kraus S, et al (2020) Circular economy business models: The state of research and avenues ahead. Bus Strateg Environ bse.2554. doi: 10.1002/bse.2554

25. Ferrão P, Lorena A, Ribeiro P (2015) Industrial ecology and portugal’s national waste plans

26. Friant MC, Vermeulen WJV, Salomone R (2021) Analysing European Union circular economy policies: words versus actions. Sustain Prod Consum 27:337–353. doi: 10.1016/j.spcc.2020.11.001

27. Friant MC, Vermeulen WJV, Salomone R (2020) A typology of circular economy discourses: Navigating the diverse visions of a contested paradigm. Resour Conserv Recyl 161:104917. doi: 10.1016/j.resconrec.2020.104917

28. Gagliardi L, Marin G, Miriello C (2016) The greener the better? Job creation effects of environmentally-friendly technological change. Ind Corp Chang 25:779–807. doi: 10.1093/icc/dtv054

29. Gottinger A, Ladu L, Quitzow R (2020) Studying the Transition towards a Circular Bioeconomy—A Systematic Literature Review on Transition Studies and Existing Barriers. Sustainability 12:. doi: 10.3390/su12218990

30. Gottwald F-T (2012) Toward sustainable agriculture and food production: An ethically sound vision for the future

31. Green DD, McCann J (2011) Benchmarking a leadership model for the green economy. Benchmarking 18:445–465. doi: 10.1108/14635771111137804

32. Harvey DM, Bosco SM, Emanuele G (2010) The impact of “green collar workers” on organizations. Manag Res Rev 33:499–511. doi: 10.1177/00081256111041929

33. Hopkinson R Zils M, Hawkins P Roper S (2018) Managing a Complex Global Circular Economy Business Model: Opportunities and Challenges. Calif Manage Rev 60:71–94. doi: 10.1177/0008125618764692

34. Horbach J, Rennings K, Sommerfeld K (2015) Circular Economy and Employment. In: 3rd IZA Workshop: Labor Market Effects of Environmental Policies. pp 1–39

35. Ilić M, Šević NP, Bašić J, Ranković M (2020) Environmental protection and the circular economy; a new economic system for society and a business strategy - The case study of the Republic of Serbia. In: International Multidisciplinary Scientific GeoConference Surveying Geology and Mining Ecology Management, SGEM. pp 235–240

36. ILO (2020) Decent work. Decent Work

37. ILO (2021) The Green Jobs Initiative. https://www.ilo.org/beijing/what-we-do/projects/WCMS_182418/lang-en/index.htm. Accessed 15 May 2021

38. Karaferye F, Agaoglu E (2017) Perceptions of the Dilemma–Order versus Freedom at Managing Faculty: A Literature Review. J Educ Pract

39. Kasztelan A (2016) Green Competitiveness of the EU Countries. In: Kovářová E, Melecký L, Staníčková M (eds) Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on European Integration 2016. VŠB - Technical University of Ostrava, Ostrava, pp 415–424

40. Kirchherr J, Reike D, Hekkert M (2017) Conceptualizing the circular economy: An analysis of 114 definitions. Resour Conserv Recyl 127:221–232. doi: 10.1016/j.resconrec.2017.09.005

41. Korhonen J, Honkasalo A, Seppälä J (2018) Circular Economy: The Concept and its Limitations. Ecol Econ 143:37–46. doi: 10.1016/j.ececon.2017.06.041

42. Ledoux L, Mertens R, Wolff P (2005) EU sustainable development indicators: An overview. Nat Res Forum 29:392–403. doi: 10.1111/j.1477-8947.2005.00149.x
43. Liu Z, Mei S, Guo Y (2020) Green human resource management, green organization identity and organizational citizenship behavior for the environment: the moderating effect of environmental values. Chinese Manag Stud. doi: 10.1108/CMSt-10-2019-0366
44. Livesey D (2010) Measuring the environmental goods and services sector. Econ Labour Mark Rev 4:45–58. doi: 10.1057/elmr.2010.165
45. Luca F-A, Eparun G, Ciobanu C-I, Horodnic AV (2019) Green jobs creation - main element in the implementation of bioeconomic mechanisms | Crearea de locuri de muncă ecologice - componentă de bază pentru implementarea mecanismelor bioeconomice. Amfiteatru Econ 21:61–61. doi: 10.24818/EA/2019/50/60
46. McMahon K, Ryan-Fogarty Y, Fitzpatrick C (2021) Estimating job creation potential of compliant WEEE pre-treatment in Ireland. Resour Conserv Recycl 166:. doi: 10.1016/j.resconrec.2020.105230
47. Moldvay J, Hamann R, Fay J (2013) Assessing opportunities and constraints related to different models for supplying wind turbines to the South African wind energy industry. Dev South Afr 30:315–331. doi: 10.1080/0376835X.2013.817305
48. Moraga G, Huysveld S, Mathieux F, et al (2019) Circular economy indicators: What do they measure? Resour Conserv Recycl 146:452–461. doi: 10.1016/j.resconrec.2019.03.045
49. Norgaard RB (1994) Development betrayed. London - New York
50. Paes LAB, Bezerra BS, Deus RM, et al (2019) Organic solid waste management in a circular economy perspective – A systematic review and SWOT analysis. J Clean Prod 239:. doi: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.118086
51. Pearce D, Barbier EB, Markandya A (1990) Sustainable development. Economics and the Environment in the third world. London
52. Pettinger L (2017) Green collar work: Conceptualizing and exploring an emerging field of work. SocioL Compass 11:. doi: 10.1111/soc.12443
53. Piwowar-Sulek K (2021) Human resources development as an element of sustainable HRM – with the focus on production engineers. J Clean Prod 278:. doi: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.124008
54. Prieto-Sandoval V, Jaca C, Ormazabal M (2018) Towards a consensus on the circular economy. J Clean Prod 179:605–615. doi: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.12.224
55. Raszkowski A (2013) Creativity in the context of regional development - selected issues. Pr Nauk Univ Ekon we Wroclawiu 52–61
56. Raszkowski A (2018) Towards sustainable development of territorial units - the case of revitalisation projects in Jelenia Góra Agglomeration municipalities. Econ Environ Stud 18:341–351. doi: 10.25167/ees.2018.45.19
57. Raszkowski A, Bartniczak B (2019) On the Road to Sustainability: Implementation of the 2030 Agenda Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) in Poland. Sustainability 11:1–20. doi: 10.3390/su11020366
58. Rincón-Moreno J, Ormazabal M, Álvarez M.J, Jaca C (2020) Shortcomings of Transforming a Local Circular Economy System through Industrial Symbiosis: A Case Study in Spanish SMEs. Sustainability 12:. doi: 10.3390/su12208423
59. Rojas Arboleda M, Pfeiffer A, Bezama A, Thrän D (2021) Anticipatory study for identifying the key influential factors of the biogas system in Germany contributing to the energy system of 2050. Futures 128:. doi: 10.1016/j.futures.2021.102704
60. Ruiz-Real JL, Uribe-Toril J, Valenciano JDP, Gázquez-Abad JC (2018) Worldwide research on circular economy and environment: A bibliometric analysis. Int J Environ Res Public Health 15:. doi: 10.3390/ijerph15122699
61. Rutkowska-Podolowska M, Sulich A, Szczygiel N (2016) Green jobs. In: Kovářová E, Melecký L, Staničková M (eds) Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on European Integration 2016, ICEI 2016: May 19–20, 2016, Ostrava, Czech Republic. Pt. 2. VŠB - Technical University of Ostrava, Ostrava, pp 822–829
62. Rutkowska M, Sulich A (2020) Green Jobs on the background of Industry 4.0. In: Procedia Computer Science
63. Salvioni DM, Almici A (2020) Transitioning Toward a Circular Economy: The Impact of Stakeholder Engagement on Sustainability Culture. Sustainability 12:. doi: 10.3390/su12208641
64. Sanguino R, Barroso A, Fernández-Rodríguez S, Sánchez-Hernández MI (2020) Current trends in economy, sustainable development, and energy: a circular economy view. Environ Sci Pollut Res 27:1–7. doi: 10.1007/s11356-019-07074-x
65. Sauvé S, Bernard S, Sloan P (2016) Environmental sciences, sustainable development and circular economy: Alternative concepts for trans-disciplinary research. Environ Dev 17:48–56. doi: 10.1016/j.envdev.2015.09.002
66. Schroeder P, Anggraeni K, Weber U (2019) The Relevance of Circular Economy Practices to the Sustainable Development Goals. J Ind Ecol 23:77–95. doi: 10.1111/jiec.12732
67. Sinclair-Desgagné B (2008) The environmental goods and services industry. Int Rev Environ Resour Econ 2:69–99. doi: 10.1561/010.0000012
68. Soloduch-Pelic L, Sulich A (2020) Between sustainable and temporary competitive advantages in the unstable business environment. Sustain 12:. doi: 10.3390/su12218832
69. Song K, Kim H, Cha J, Lee T (2021) Matching and mismatching of green jobs: A big data analysis of job recruiting and searching. Sustain 13:. doi: 10.3390/su13074074
70. Song M, Xie Q (2019) How does green talent influence China's economic growth? Int J Manpow 41:1119–1134. doi: 10.1108/IJM-08-2019-0378
71. Steuer B (2016) Environmental Goods and Services Sector accounts - handbook. Eurostat Publ.
72. Steuer B, Broniewicz EE, Domańska W (2016) Environmental Goods and Services Sector accounts. In: 9th International Scientific Conference “Business and Management 2016” At: Vilnius Gediminas Technical University, Lietuva. pp 17–30
73. Sugiyono, Dewancker BJ (2020) Study on the Domestic Water Utilization in Kota Metro, Lampung Province, Indonesia: Exploring Opportunities to Apply the Circular Economic Concepts in the Domestic Water Sector. Sustainability 12:. doi: 10.3390/su12218956
Figures

Figure 1

Product life cycle and its linear and Circular Economy implications Source: Authors’ elaboration.
Figure 2
Relations between CE, EGSS and GJ definitions. Source: Authors’ elaboration.

Figure 3
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The residuals normality distribution chart Source: Authors’ calculations.
Figure 5

Observed values in relation to residuals’ squares Note: $\alpha = 0.95$ and $p<0.000001$ for the regression. Source: Authors’ calculations.
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Green Jobs creation model for Circular Economy Source: Authors’ elaboration