GREEN HRM PRACTICES: A TWO STUDY EXAMINATION OF THE PREDICTORS AND OUTCOMES AT BOTH INDIVIDUAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL LEVEL

Boonthong Uahiranyanon, Southeast Asia University
Wannaporn Buddhapoompitak, Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University
Chatchawan Phudthonamochaia, Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University
Narumol Limlahapun, Northern College

ABSTRACT

Purpose: The aim of the research was to provide perspectives on the antecedents and outcomes of Green Human Resource Management (GHRM) practices at both the organizational and individual levels. We also tried to investigate the mechanisms by which GHRM practices can contribute to positive outcomes for employees.

Design/Methodology/Approach: The data were obtained and analyzed using a two-study approach. Study 1 included 195 hotels at organizational level, whereas study 2 brought insights by means of an online questionnaire from 500 employees working in different a sector which is at individual level. In both studies, the study model was evaluated using partial least square structural equation modelling.

Findings: All the hypotheses of this study have been accepted. In particular, Organizational Environmental Culture (OEC) has a positive relationship with GHRM practices at organizational level, whereas GHRM management has a positive relationship with Organizational Environmental Performance (OEP). Similarly, Meaningfulness Through Work (MTW) has a significant mediating effect between GHRM practices and job satisfaction (JS). Likewise, GHRM practices have a positive impact on JS at individual level.

Originality/Value: The study contributes significantly to theory and practices with new insights into GHRM practices, its antecedents and outcomes at individual and organizational level as well as through two economies (developed and emerging). This also clarifies the outcomes of GHRM practices at individual level and the area still not well explored. This research leads to a deeper understanding of GHRM practices and positive outcomes of employees with its emphasis on MTW as a significant mediating variable.

Keywords: GHRM Practices, Organizational Environmental Culture, Job Satisfaction, Meaningfulness through Work, Environmental Performance

INTRODUCTION

Climate change and environmental degradation have become one of the most important challenges in the modern world, including extreme droughts, catastrophic hurricanes, wildfires and heat waves that lead to economic losses (Jermsittiparsert, 2019; Phrakhruopatnontakitti, 2020). It is estimated that human activities have caused around 1.0 ^{o}C above pre-industrial level of global warming (UN Environment Program, 2019). Businesses have often been central to all discussions on sustainable development and are considered to be a major issue for local, regional and international environmental damage (Jermsittiparsert, Pintobtang & Jumnianpol, 2019). Thus, business sector is expected to play an important role in addressing ecological issues. In addition to acquiring social licenses, the business sector is under increasing pressure from shareholders to take proactive action on ecological problems to ensure that future generation meet their aspirations and needs. They are also responsible for their environmental impact. That

needs business firms to go beyond conservatism and take a more constructive approach to sustainable the environment. Sustainable environment is an important pillar of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) for sustainable businesses growth in line with the business ethics working model. In addition, the climate substitutes one of the key factors of CSR in the creation of green businesses in line with the work model of business ethics. Corporate social responsibility is characterized as a voluntary engagement of a business in societal, economic and environmental wellbeing practices (Bhattacharya, Du & Sen, 2011). Achievement of sustainable environment needs improvement in market processes and the distribution of goods and services. In general, progress of any change process and improvement in environmental performance depends mainly on employees as key agents for change (Rabiei, Nejati & Jabbour, 2017). In this respect, GHRM practices can be regarded as a method for organizations to exercise corporate social responsibility. Green human resource management practices are important if environmental management practices and green strategies can be applied effectively and it can contribute positively to the sustainable environment of an organization. GHRM practices are described by literature as a collection of different human resource management practices that sustain and require a proactive environmental management approach and achieve high performance environmental sustainability outcomes (Huselid, 1998).

Green human resource management practices have evolved as critical to environmental sustainability (Rabiei et al., 2017; Shen, Dumont & Deng, 2017; Torugsa & O'Donohue, 2016). Current research remains, however, largely unclear in terms of GHRM practices and its impact on organizational outcomes (Tang, 2018). The lack of study findings is due to a lack of uncertainty regarding the factors that contribute to GHRM practices, such as the antecedents and mediator in which GHRM practices have achieved successful results. In addition, GHRM practices and the mediation process described by Tang, et al., (2018) need to be better understood in order to direct the design of GHRM practices in order to achieve long-term advantage. There is also a lack of research and ideas on how employees are affected by GHRM practices. This is vital as an important step in developing appropriate GHRM practices in organizations is to assess the effect of GHRM practices on employees (Tang et al., 2018).

In accordance with the present research, the aim of this research was to fill this void by determining how green human resource management practices contribute to significant results at individual (employee level) and organizational level. We first look at the antecedents and outcomes of GHRM practices at organizational level with a two-study review. Further, we analyze the mechanisms by which green human resource management practices contributes to significant employee's outcomes. Our research findings have supported the hypotheses. We add three ways to the current literature through a double-focused study approach. Firstly, we have developed a significant relationship between OEC and GHRM practices, which can lead to GHRM practices beyond coercion. Secondly, on the basis of job characteristics model, we have advanced the current study of GHRM practices at individual level. Thirdly, by exploring the significant role of MTW as a mediating variable in our conceptual framework, we are explaining the mechanism by which GHRM practices influences behavioural outcomes of employees.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Green human resource management studies have shown that the effect on organizational performance (*i.e.,* Financial and Environmental Performance) and behavioural outcomes of employees (*i.e.,* Satisfaction, Commitment and Wellbeing) are significant. Improving the environment of workplace and meeting the job needs of the 21st century and environmental sustainability demand benefits both employees and organizations (Al Bakri, 2018). This research therefore explores the GHRM practices and its following results in order to provide new insights into the area at both individual and organizational level. In particular, in study 1, researchers focused on green human resource management practices and their subsequent organizational

level outcomes, whereas in the second study, researchers focused on green human resource management practices at the individual level.

Relationship between OEC and GHRM Practices (Organizational Level)

OEC is defined as organizational employees' beliefs, values and behavior (Schen, 2009). Specifically, beliefs refer to "the way in which individuals perceive something as true or false" (Schen, 2009). Similarly, values refer to "the way individuals think about what is right and what should be done in compliance with ethical codes" (Anthony & Holt, 2000). Likewise, behaviors refer to the actual activity that employee performs on the basis of his or her beliefs and values. The synthesis of beliefs, values and behaviors is an organizational ideology or philosophy to be used as a guiding principle for the management of various organizational circumstances (Schen, 2009). The behaviors of employees thus strongly reflect the philosophy of the organization and over time, these behaviors become habits that shape the culture of the organization (Schen, 2009).

In addition, both formal and informal organizational environments have a profound impact on the environment and culture of the organization and make culture an important antecedent of GHRM practices. Particularly, GHRM practices are basically initiatives, strategies and processes that help organizations minimize their ecological impact, whereas enhancing their significant ecological impact (Opatha, 2016). Green human resource management practices are characterized as human resource (HR) practices focused on environmental sustainability by developing green workers who understand and support the environmental initiatives of organizations. It focuses on green recruitment and selection, green performance management, green training and career development and green rewards that expand the human resources of the organization (Kim, 2019; Nejati, 2018).

Research has shown the essential antecedents of GHRM practices are organizational structure, culture, strategy and leadership (Kim et al., 2019). Such defined predictors of GHRM practices are seen as proximal environmental signs that show the urgency, value and need of organization's green human resource management practices. In addition, organizational factors are essential drivers for environmental initiatives like the organizations' GHRM practices (Tang et al., 2018). Thus, the OEC promotes green recruitment, appraisal, training and compensation which are important factors of GHRM practices, by developing a culture in which GHRM practices are strongly recognized and valued (Bienstock, 2018). Therefore, we hypothesize that:

H1   OEC has a positive and significant relationship with GHRM practices.

The Relationship between GHRM Practices and OEP

HRM practices are important for increasing the competitive advantage of a company (Kim et al., 2019), and it is clear that companies are proactive in adopting strategies to improve the environmental management with lower costs and higher profits in order to achieve major business objectives in a sustainable manner (Torugsa & O'Donohue, 2016). Previous study has shown that GHRM practices are the best way to improve environmental performance in firms, as they provide a critical basis for controlling the environmental effect of businesses (Kim et al., 2019). OEP implies the commitment of organization, by the concept of observable operational standards, to protect the environment and demonstrate environmental responsibility (Subramanian, 2019). As a result, there is increased performance, reduced costs and increased engagement and employee retention in the GHRM process, including environmentally friendly human resource operations.

A significant body of literature demonstrates the important role of GHRM practices in achieving sustainable environmental growth (Bayraktar, 2019). Bishop, Daily & Massoud (2012), for example, focused on various levels of staff (individuals, groups, system and

organizations) and green workplace initiatives. A research by Singh, Chen, Del Giudice & El-Kassar (2019) considered the value of organizational and environmental training programs and their contribution to environmental success. It has been established that individuals with green environmental beliefs play a key role in managing firms to embrace and incorporate environmental sustainability standards proactively and to improve OEP (Jan, Tariq & Ahmad, 2016; Torugsa & O'Donohue, 2016). Therefore, the following hypothesis has been developed.

> *H2   GHRM practices have a positive and significant impact on OEP.*

The Relationship between GHRM Practices and JS (Individual Level)

Green human resource management practices are not only a critical strategic policy for improving OEP, it also play an important role in maximizing results for employees, including JS (Chan & Hawkins, 2010). Previous study has shown that workers assessment of their job traits is an important component in their work behavior (Rudolph, 2017). Precisely, a number of job characteristics, such as participation, pride, self-actualization, recognition, working conditions, advancement, work itself and fairness can affect the perception and final satisfaction of employees (Steijn & Joris, 2019). The lens of Job Characteristics Theory (JCT) (Oldham & Richard, 1976) makes this understandable. The main features that can instill various individual psychological conditions are task significance, skill variety, feedback and autonomy. In addition, when workers consider all the core characteristics of their job to be important, resulting in greater satisfaction in their work (Steijn & Joris, 2019).

As an instrumental approach, GHRM practices help companies to meet their sustainability goals by building sustainable employees and culture involved in sustainable issues. This is consistent with the GHRM objectives for the conservation of the environment by focusing on green practices that can reduce adverse consequences and enhance significant environmental impact. Green human resource management activities involve four steps: a guiding vision of the future, training workers in communicating environmental priorities and expectations, evaluating their environmental performance and identifying workers' environmental efforts and rewarding those (Kim et al., 2019). GHRM practices thus help employees change their working behavior by having key job characteristics. Thus, we hypothesize the following.

> *H3   GHRM practices positively and significantly impact on employee JS.*

The Mediating Role of Meaningfulness through Work

The central point of human activity is work, and many people also use work as a means of finding meaning in their lives. Sense making is described as giving meaning to working as a continuous practice (Wick, 1995). As per JCT, meaningfulness through work is defined as "degree to which the employee experiences the job as one which is generally meaningful, valuable and worthwhile" (Oldman & Hackman, 1975). JCT implies that employees can increase significance through work, with a variety of task identity, skill variety and task significance (Oldman & Hackman, 1975). This underlines the significance of job characteristics and the perception of individuals about jobs in achieving MTW (Oldham & Hackman, 1980). A research done by Glavas & Aguinis (2019) indicates that corporate social responsibility is one of the key predictors of MTW and sense-making, as workers develop a clear sense of organizational identity when they feel organization's concern and constructive role in addressing environmental issues. Thus, GHRM practices are expressed in job characteristics three core values: task identity, skill variety and task significance. The practice of GHRM is one of the several ways in which workers can find their core job values, thereby providing a sense of MTW.

Moreover, literature suggests that MTW results in employee's positive outcomes like employee engagement (Lee, Idris & Delfabbro, 2017), job satisfaction (Chaudhary & Akhouri, 2019), performance (Oldham & Hackman, 1980), organizational identification (Rockmann, Pratt & Kaufmann, 2006) and emotional well-being (Turner, Arnold, Barling, Kelloway & McKee, 2007). This is also consistent with the JCT, which incorporates job features that improve accountability, relevance and consistent outcomes that promote job satisfaction and employee motivation in the workplace. Therefore, the following hypothesis has been developed.

H4   The association between GHRM practices and JS is mediated by MTW.

METHODOLOGY

Study 1 was carried out in the hospitality sector in Thailand, a developing economy and intended to examine the trend from an organizational perspective. Due to its major environmental effects, the current study analyzed the hotel industry. As a consequence of increasing environmental awareness, the tourism sector is no longer considered to be a smokeless industry. Although the picture is green and cheerful, the tourism industry has surprisingly higher carbon multipliers, such as the amount of carbon emissions per customer dollar spent (Gros, 2018).

Using a stratified random sampling technique, we collected data from hotel industry in Thailand *via* questionnaire in the first study. A total of 195 questionnaires were received from the respondents, resulting in a research response rate of 78% out of 250 floated questionnaires. Second study was performed in Australia, a developed country. The focus of this research was on individual level full-time staff. In Australia, Cint, a third party online survey services firm, collected data from the respondents. This is a popular technique in research studies to data collection (Yam, 2019). A total of 500 questionnaires were received from the respondents, resulting in a research response rate of 86.95% out of 575 floated questionnaires.

Measurement Scales

This study assessed GHRM practices measurement scale with eight (8) items was selected from Jabour (2011). Likewise, this study also assessed OEP measurement scale with eight (8) items was selected from a study by Jamaludin & Yusof (2013). Similarly, we measured OEC measurement scale with three (3) items was selected from a study by Jabour, Nagano & Santos (2010). We selected MTW measurement scale with three (3) items developed by Spreitzar (1995).

Analysis of Data

The goal of the current study with a dual-perspective approach is to provide a deeper understanding of the predictors and outcomes of GHRM practices at organizational level as well as the outcomes of GHRM practices at individual level. It also explores whether the association between GHRM practices and JS at individual level can be mediated by MTW. This underlines the present research exploratory nature which also suggests the use of PLS–SEM technique. In particular, at organizational level, we would like to know how much variance in OEP is explained by green human resource management practices and OEC. Similarly, at individual level, how much variance in JS is explained by the green human resource management practices and MTW. We have therefore used PLS–SEM for the study of a hypothesized model by using smart-PLS 3.0 in compliance with the recommendations of Ringle, Hair & Sarstedt (2011). In the following section, data were analyzed in two stages, measurement model and structural model (Table 1).

Table 1 MEASUREMENT MODEL ANALYSIS (INDIVIDUAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL LEVEL)			
Constructs	Items Loadings	CR	AVE
Organizational level			
Green HRM		0.86	0.61
GHRM_1	0.84		
GHRM_2	0.8		
GHRM_3	0.91		
GHRM_4	0.93		
GHRM_5	0.94		
GHRM_6	0.57		
GHRM_7	0.58		
GHRM_8	0.59		
Environmental performance		0.92	0.48
EP_1	0.79		
EP_2	0.83		
EP_3	0.68		
EP_4	0.59		
EP_5	0.66		
EP_6	0.72		
EP_7	0.69		
EP_8	0.61		
Organizational Environmental Culture		0.89	0.78
OEC_1	0.94		
OEC_2	0.87		
OEC_3	0.88		
Individual level			
Green HRM		0.89	0.77
GHRM_1	0.85		
GHRM_2	0.87		
GHRM_3	0.86		
GHRM_4	0.94		
GHRM_5	0.89		
GHRM_6	0.88		
GHRM_7	0.91		
GHRM_8	0.92		
Job satisfaction		0.87	0.8
JS_1	0.86		
JS_2	0.82		
JS_3	0.89		
Meaningfulness through work		0.89	0.76
MFW_1	0.93		
MFW_2	0.87		
MFW_3	0.88		

RESULTS

Assessment of the Measurement Model

In order to evaluate the measurement model, at both individual level and organizational level, we evaluated items loading, Cronbach's alpha, Composite Reliability (CR) and Average Variance Extracted (AVE). We have tested convergent validity and discriminant validity of the latent variables in order to ensure that the items of every variable measures what is intended to measure. The items loading, CR, Cronbach's alpha value, AVE value of each variable at individual level as well as organizational level are shown in Table 2. The study results show that the items loading values were above the suggested threshold value of 0.70 except few items as shown in Table 2. Furthermore, the values of AVE range from 0.48 to 0.80, which surpass the threshold value of 0.50 (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). All constructs CR and Cronbach's alpha values were greater than the recommended value of 0.70 (Hair, 2006). We therefore affirm the reliability and convergent validity of the latent variables at individual as well as at organizational level.

The current study used Hetrotrait-Monotrait ratio (HTMT) criteria to assess constructs discriminant validity at individual level and organizational level as suggested by Ringle, Henseler, and Sarstedt (2015). All values of HTMT were below the cut-off value of 0.85 indicating that model did not have discriminant validity issues in the model as shown in Tables 3 and 4 (Watson & Clark, 1995).

Structural Model Assessment

We have tested collinearity before evaluating the structural model and found no issue in the model as the VIFs values were below the threshold value of 3.3 for all the predictors in the models (Feild, 2016; Henseler, 2017). In order to evaluate the structural model and analyze the values of path coefficients, we conducted a non-parametric bootstrapping process with 5000 subsamples. The findings indicate that OEC has a positive and significant relationship with GHRM practices at organizational level (β=0.412, t=6.715). Green human resource management practices have a positive and significant relationship with OEP (β=0.347, t=4.790). Thus, both H1 and H2 are supported. The OEP R^2 value is 0.15 which indicates GHRM practices and OEC can explain 15% of the organizational environmental performance variance.

Similarly, green human resource management practices positive and significantly related to JS (β=0.195, t=6.494) and MTW (β=0.320, t=5.881) at individual level. Furthermore, MTW positively and significantly associated with JS (β=0.616, t=14.42). The relationship between GHRM practices and JS is significantly mediated by MTW (β=0.201, t=5.207). Thus, hypothesis H3 and hypothesis H4 are also supported. In addition, the value of R^2 was 0.47, which indicates that 47% variance in JS was explained by MTW and GHRM practices. We conducted the blindfolding procedure in order to analyze the predictive relevancy of the model. The values of cross-validated redundancy (Q^2) for all latent constructs were developed, which further support the predictive relevancy of both models at individual and organizational level (Table 2, 3 & 4).

Table 2 DISCRIMINANT VALIDITY (HETEROTRAIT–MONOTRAITRATION (HTMT) – ORGANIZATIONAL LEVEL)			
Construct	EP	GHRM	OEC
EP	-	-	-
GHRM	0.42	-	-
OEC	0.35	0.41	-

Table 3
DISCRIMINANT VALIDITY (HETEROTRAIT–
MONOTRAITRATION (HTMT) – INDIVIDUAL LEVEL

Construct	GHRM	JS	MTW
GHRM	-	-	-
JS	0.39	-	-
MTW	0.32	0.67	-

Table 4
HYPOTHESES AND RESULTS (ORGANIZATIONAL AND
INDIVIDUAL LEVELS)

Relationships	Beta values	t values	Decisions
Organizational level			
OEC → GHRM	0.412	6.715	Accepted
GHRM → OEP	0.347	4.79	Accepted
Individual level			
GHRM → JS	0.195	6.494	Accepted
GHRM → MTW	0.32	5.881	Accepted
MTW → JS	0.616	14.42	Accepted
GHRM → MTW → JS	0.201	5.207	Accepted

CONCLUSION

The two-study approach was designed to determine the antecedents and outcomes of GHRM practices by emphasizing MTW as a mediator at individual level. The findings of the current study provide support for the research hypotheses developed. At organizational level, it is evident from the results that OEC is an important antecedent and OEP is an important outcome of GHRM practices. In addition, we also promoted the important position of JS as a result of GHRM practices and explained mechanisms by which GHRM practices are linked with JS. At individual level, the link between GHRM practices and JS is significantly mediated by MTW. The results of the current study provide support to theory and practice that are discussed below.

Organizational and Individual Level

The findings show that OEC which led to better OEP has a critical position to promote GHRM practices among organizations. Green environmental culture is important to shape the organizational environment as an instrument that incorporates employees' green beliefs, values and behaviors. As Kim, et al., (2019) have noted, OEC is an important predictor of GHRM practices and that relationship is supported by our study results. The basis for the implementation of GHRM practices rests with the OEC as the strategic focus of the businesses. In fact, the OEP has been demonstrated as a result of GHRM practices. This result is consistent with several previous studies in the field of GHRM practices (Bayraktar et al., 2019; Bishop et al., 2012; Subramanian et al., 2019). Green human resource management practice will also lead to an enhanced OEP by encouraging green practices from recruiting to compensating employees.

The correlation between GHRM practices and the employee's outcomes, such as JS is another significant finding of the current analysis. The mechanisms by which GHRM practices results in JS have also been explained, and MTW has proved to be an important mediating variable in the model of the study. Based on the current findings, Chaudhary & Akhouri (2019)

previous research found that a greater degree of MTW improves JS. Benson & Shen (2016), a core part of GHRM practices, develop a sense of identity in organizations with their workers and promote meaningful work and awareness in their organizations (Glavas & Aguinis, 2019). As a result, the green the workplace, the more productive the workforce will become, and the JS will be improved.

Implications

This study allows us to understand the antecedents and outcomes of GHRM practices at individual as well as at organizational level. In the context of GHRM practices, the present study results are important and timely, which led Tang et al. (2018) to call for more studies in the field of GHRM practices. In particular, they suggested that further studies on GHRM practices should look at various levels including employees, teams and organizational level, as the knowledge in this field is lacking. They have called upon green human resource management studies to define the predictors and behavioural outcomes of GHRM practices and to focus further on employee's attitudes and behaviors. One of the study's interesting outcomes is how significant MTW and how GHRM practices can boost JS of employees through meaningful work. Sense making and seeking meaning are important in work because work is an area of human activity. Therefore, the idea of GHRM practices at individual and organizational level is empirically understood by our two-study research, which takes a dual-perspective approach. This research therefore extends our knowledge and understanding of antecedents and outcomes of GHRM practices.

There are several important managerial and practical contributions to the study. GHRM practices should be used for the "United Nations Sustainable Development Goal 13 on Climate Change", as one of the most successful methods in improving the OEP. Nevertheless, it is critical for organizations to prepare a forum for environmental initiatives to incorporate green human resource management practices. Executives and top managers at the corporate level will be concerned about the organization's environmental footprint and will express total support for sustainable environment by including it on the agenda and making it the organization's goal and priority. Because individuals are key factors for organizations, they play an important role in helping business firms to achieve sustainable environmental development and are a powerful source of competiveness. It can be done by GHRM practices, in which environmental performance metrics are created, employees are trained to meet the environmental objectives and environmental performance is rewarded.

Limitations and Future Research Directions

Although a two-study approach is used to explain GHRM practices of research from an individual and organizational perspective and because of its research design, this research does not provide any causal evidence. However, the current study supported the empirical correlation between OEC and GHRM practices consistent with the theoretical relationship suggested by Tang, et al., (2018). The present study focused on self-ratings and its cross-sectional nature is another limitation. Although future studies should gather large sample size in order to increase the statistical power of the analysis. Moreover, in a single study, scholars should combine individual level and organizational level of analyses using multilevel analysis technique to improve the predictive and analytical ability of the proposed conceptual framework. Finally, further research will provide stronger and more concrete evidences of the positive results of GHRM practices by experimental design.

REFERENCE

Al Bakri, A.A., Obeidat, S.M., & Elbanna, S. (2018). Leveraging "Green" human resource practices to enable environmental and organizational performance: Evidence from the Qatari oil and gas industry. *Journal of Business Ethics, 164*, 1-18.

Anthony, S., & Holt, D. (2000). Exploring 'green'culture in Nortel and Middlesex University. *Eco-Management and Auditing: The Journal of Corporate Environmental Management, 7*(3), 143-154.

Bayraktar, E., Arda, O.A., & Tatoglu, E. (2019). How do integrated quality and environmental management practices affect firm performance? Mediating roles of quality performance and environmental proactivity. *Business Strategy and the Environment, 28*(1), 64-78.

Benson, J., & Shen, J. (2016). When CSR is a social norm: How socially responsible human resource management affects employee work behavior. *Journal of Management, 42*(6), 1723-1746.

Bhattacharya, C.B., Du, S., & Sen, S. (2011). Corporate social responsibility and competitive advantage: Overcoming the trust barrier. *Management Science, 57*(9), 1528-1545.

Bienstock, C.C., Amini, M., & Narcum, J.A. (2018). Status of corporate sustainability: A content analysis of Fortune 500 companies. *Business Strategy and the Environment, 27*(8), 1450-1461.

Bishop, J.W., Daily, B.F., & Massoud, J.A. (2012). The role of training and empowerment in environmental performance. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management, 32*(5), 631-647.

Chan, E.S., & Hawkins, R. (2010). Attitude towards EMSs in an international hotel: An exploratory case study. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 29*(4), 641-651.

Chaudhary, R., & Akhouri, A. (2019). CSR perceptions and employee creativity: Examining serial mediation effects of meaningfulness and work engagement. *Social Responsibility Journal, 15*(1), 61-74.

Feild, A. (2016). *An adventure in statistics.* The reality enigma: Sage.

Fornell, C., & Larcker, D.F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research, 18*(1), 39-50.

Glavas, A., & Aguinis, H. (2019). On corporate social responsibility, sensemaking and the search for meaningfulness through work. *Journal of Management, 45*(3), 1057-1086.

Gros, M. (2018). Global tourism's growing footprint. *Current Biology, 26*(17), 963-965.

Hair, J.F., Babin, B.J., Black, W.C., Tatham, R.L., & Anderson, R.E. (2006). *Multivariate Data Analysis: Pearson Prentice Hall*. Upper Saddle River, NJ.

Henseler, J. (2017). Partial least squares path modelling. In advanced methods for modelling markets: Springer.

Huselid, M.A., Becker, B.E., Huselid, M.A., & Becker, B. (1998). High performance work systems and firm performance: A synthesis of research and managerial implications. *Paper presented at the Research in personnel and human resource management*.

Jabour, C.J.C. (2011). How green are HRM practices, organizational culture, learning and teamwork? A Brazilian study. *Industrial and Commercial Training, 43*(2), 98-105.

Jabour, C.J.C., Nagano, M.S., & Santos, F.C.A. (2010). Contributions of HRM throughout the stages of environmental management: Methodological triangulation applied to companies in Brazil. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 21*(7), 1049-1089.

Jamaludin, M., & Yusof, Z.B. (2013). Green approaches of Malaysian green hotels and resorts. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 85*(1), 421-431.

Jan, F.A., Tariq, S., & Ahmad, M.S. (2016). Green employee empowerment: A systematic literature review on state-of-art in green human resource management. *Quality & Quantity, 50*(1), 237-269.

Jermsittiparsert, K. (2019). Climate change, growth determinants and tourism industry: Time series analysis from Malaysia. *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Social Sciences. Gent: European Alliance for Innovation*.

Jermsittiparsert, K., Pintobtang, P., & Jumnianpol, S. (2019). Ensuring green environment through sustainable development goals in thailand: mediating role of supply chain integration. *International Journal of Supply Chain Management, 8*(5), 635-646.

Kim, Y.J., Kim, W.G., Choi, H.M., & Phetvaroon, K. (2019). The effect of green human resource management on hotel employees' eco-friendly behavior and environmental performance. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 76*(1), 83-93.

Lee, M.C.C., Idris, M.A., & Delfabbro, P.H. (2017). The linkages between hierarchical culture and empowering leadership and their effects on employees' work engagement: Work meaningfulness as a mediator. *International Journal of Stress Management, 24*(4), 392-415.

Nejati, M., Yusoff, Y.M., Kee, D.M.H., & Amran, A. (2018). Linking green human resource management practices to environmental performance in hotel industry. *Global Business Review, 21*(3), 1-18.

Oldham, G., & Richard, H.J. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 16*(2), 250-279.

Oldham, G.R., & Hackman, J.R. (1980). *Work redesign*. Addison Wesley, Reading, MA.

Oldman, G., & Hackman, J. (1975). Development of the job diagnosic survey. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 60*(2), 159-164.

Opatha, H., Arulrajah, A.A., & Nawaratne, N. (2016). Employee green performance of job: A systematic attempt towards measurement. *Sri Lankan Journal of Human Resource Management, 6*(1), 37-62.

Phrakhruopatnontakitti, W.B., & Jermsittiparsert, K. (2020). Energy consumption, economic growth and environmental degradation in 4 asian countries: Malaysia, Myanmar, Vietnam and Thailand. *International Journal of Energy Economics and Policy, 10*(2), 529-539.

Rabiei, S., Nejati, M., & Jabbour, C.J.C. (2017). Envisioning the invisible: Understanding the synergy between green human resource management and green supply chain management in manufacturing firms in Iran in light of the moderating effect of employees' resistance to change. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 168*(1), 163-172.

Ringle, C.M., Hair, J.F., & Sarstedt, M. (2011). PLS-SEM: Indeed a silver bullet. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice, 19*(2), 139-152.

Ringle, C.M., Henseler, J., & Sarstedt, M. (2015). A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 43*(1), 115-135.

Rockmann, K.W., Pratt, M.G., & Kaufmann, J.B. (2006). Constructing professional identity: The role of work and identity learning cycles in the customization of identity among medical residents. *Academy of Management Journal, 49*(2), 235-262.

Rudolph, C.W., Katz, I.M., Lavigne, K.N., & Zacher, H. (2017). Job crafting: A meta-analysis of relationships with individual differences, job characteristics, and work outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 102*(1), 112-138.

Schen, E. (2009). Organizational culture and leadership Jossey-Bass San Francisco, 1992. Schmidt, NH, Erek, K., Kolbe, LM, and Zarnekow, R."Towards a procedural model for sustainable information systems management," IEEE, 1-10.

Shen, J., Dumont, J., & Deng, X. (2017). Effects of green HRM practices on employee workplace green behavior: The role of psychological green climate and employee green values. *Human Resource Management, 56*(4), 613-627.

Singh, S.K., Chen, J., Del Giudice, M., & El-Kassar, A.N. (2019). Environmental ethics, environmental performance, and competitive advantage: Role of environmental training. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 146*(1), 203-211.

Spreitzar, G.M. (1995). Psychological empowerment in the workplace: Dimensions, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal, 38*(5), 1442-1465.

Steijn, B., & Joris, v. d. V. (2019). Relational job characteristics and job satisfaction of public sector employees: When prosocial motivation and red tape collide. *Public Administration, 97*(1), 64-80.

Subramanian, N., Roscoe, S., Chong, T., & Jabbour, C.J. (2019). Green human resource management and the enablers of green organisational culture: Enhancing a firm's environmental performance for sustainable development. *Business Strategy and the Environment, 28*(5), 737-749.

Tang, G., Ren, S., & Jackson, S.E. (2018). Green human resource management research in emergence: A review and future directions. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management, 35*(3), 769-803.

Torugsa, N., & O'Donohue, W. (2016). The moderating effect of 'Green'HRM on the association between proactive environmental management and financial performance in small firms. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 27*(2), 239-261.

Turner, N., Arnold, K.A., Barling, J., Kelloway, E.K., & McKee, M.C. (2007). Transformational leadership and psychological well-being: The mediating role of meaningful work. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 12*(3), 193-203.

UN Environment Program (2019). Programme performance report 2018, UN Environment Program. Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/20.500.11822/27734.

Watson, D., & Clark, L.A. (1995). Constructing validity: Basic issues in objective scale development. *Psychological Assessment, 7*(3), 309.

Wick, K.E. (1995). *Sense making in organizations*. Sage.

Yam, K.C., Ng, T.W., & Aguinis, H. (2019). Employee perceptions of corporate social responsibility: Effects on pride, embeddedness, and turnover. *Personnel Psychology, 72*(1), 107-137.