An Empirical Study of Ecological Sustainability on Ecological Organizational Performance

*Dr. Swati Bhatia

Professor, Asian Business School, Noida, Email:
swatb1404@gmail.com

**Ms. Shipra Shrivastava

Assistant Professor, Asian Business School, Noida, Email:
shipra.trivedi2103@gmail.com

Abstract

Ecology requires the implementation of sustainable development. Ecological sustainability necessitates the combination of Human Resource Management (HRM) and Green Human Resource Management (GHRM), but it is not sufficient on its own. Although organizations have a significant role in causing ecological degradation, it is undeniable that no other organization possesses the authority to facilitate the essential reforms required for ecological sustainability. It would be fascinating to discover what measures organizations might take to enhance the ecosystem. While social and economic sustainability have been issues of research for decades, ecological sustainability has only recently gained attention. This study aims to examine the correlation between GHRM (Green Human Resource Management), ecological cultural sustainability, and ecological leadership, which ultimately impacts the Ecological Performance (EP). The researcher constructed a conceptual model and assumptions based on the existing literature. In order to conduct an empirical examination of the conceptual model, a self-administered questionnaire will be distributed to predominantly human resources (HR) senior and middle-management leaders. This research aims to contribute to the existing knowledge on ecological sustainability performance by providing guidance to organizations on how to achieve their Ecological Management (EM) targets through environmental ecological responsibility leadership, GHRM, and ecological culture. Managers can monitor ecological enhancements by utilizing this approach. This study is limited in that it will solely investigate the GHRM components that have been most frequently advocated in prior academic studies. Subsequent studies might conduct a comparative analysis of financial and non-financial incentives for employee performance.

Keywords: GHRM, Ecological Sustainability, Ecological Leadership, Ecological Culture, Ecological Performance

Introduction

Sustainability is derived from the word "sustainable development" that was coined for the first time in the year 1980 when the "International Union for Conservation of Nature, World Wide Fund for Nature, and United Nations Environment Programme," the three prominent environmental non-governmental organizations united to discuss the world conservation strategy with the primary intent of bringing the world together in conserving the natural resources. The term became more prominent just a few years later in the "first Rio Earth Summit held at the United Nation (UN) in 1987," when the "Brundtland Commission" defined sustainable development as "development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs." Since then, this topic has gained widespread recognition and attention and taken a more multi-disciplinary approach consisting of economy, society, and ecology (Anon, 2011).

Sustainable development differs from the traditional profit-based approach of the organizations since it simultaneously integrates economic, social, and ecological aspects in its approaches to growth (Connelly, Smith, Benson, and Saunders 2012). Despite its popularity, there is still a visible difference in the interpretation of sustainability, where many consider it nothing but a fad. It is rather alarming that until 2014, there were no international authorities that could fully take the responsibility of protecting the global ecology. On 23rd June 2014, the UN Environment Assembly was set up. This body presented a breakthrough platform for the leadership on international environmental policy (Lakshman, 2017). In an annual guide to corporate newspeak, sustainability was reported to be one of the most misused terms in corporate vernacular

(Morelli, 2011). This term has become a "buzzword" in the corporate world and is used so loosely that it is often used as a "synonym for everything that is positive" (Károly, 2011). But despite one's personal opinion, the concept is attracting the attention of many business leaders globally as they realize the importance that sustainable development holds for the smooth running of their company. Historically, sustainability was not considered an essential part of the business strategy. However, with the increasing demands of the stakeholders for economic, ecological, and social responsibility, companies have begun to take sustainability seriously. They realize the importance of adopting sustainability practices in their workplace and are also drawing out plans, but implementation remains a significant challenge.

"Despite many corporate sustainability reports that describe sustainability as the way we do things in an organization, most leaders fail to understand how to embed sustainability in their day-to-day decision-making processes" (Smith and Muller, 2016). Studies have shown the importance of human resources (HR) in helping organizations become environmentally sustainable. The link between HR and ecological management (EM) has attracted the attention of many researchers in the past decade (Thevanes and Arulrajah, 2020). Practitioners from numerous countries are already involved in advancing evidence-based practices in managing HR for meeting ecological sustainability goals, and many of these efforts are occurring in multinational organizations. However, organizations in developing countries like India are still taking baby steps to cultivate human resource strategies that meet ecological requirements in their organizations.

The HRM function is required as a core partner in the ecological sustainability efforts of the organization due to several reasons. First, HR managers can ensure effective implementation of the strategy. Development of vision and strategy is a typical starting point towards the ecological sustainability efforts of an organization. Achieving this requires a change in the behavioural patterns and work processes that is possible by bringing into play the essential competencies of HR managers. Secondly, HR managers are endowed with social management tools required for marshalling employee energy towards ecological sustainability goals. Finally, "the centrality of the HRM function positions it for strong leadership" in the ecological sustainability journey. HRM is the one function that impacts employees across all other organizational functions (Eisenstat, 1996).

It is clear that the integration of HRM and EM, popularly termed as green human resource management (GHRM), is a prerequisite for achieving ecological sustainability goals but it is undoubtedly not sufficient. To ensure that GHRM leads to ecological performance (EP) (Jabbour, and Chong, 2019), organizations must ensure that other organizational context such as leadership support and employees' green attitude and behavior (which is a part of the culture) is also in place. Towards this, Singh et. al., (2020) studied the HRM-Performance linkage. He propounded that "leadership plays a vital role as an antecedent than a mediator or moderating role" in the HRM-performance linkages. The implementation of GHRM, like other organizational strategies, is also within the leadership jurisdiction (Kim et.al., 2017). Thus, green leadership is a prerequisite (or an antecedent) to make GHRM an effective organizational process." Leadership is an important driver of sustainability". Top management support is a key facilitator of GHRM in organizations (Al-Minhas, Ndubisi and, Barrane, 2020).

Therefore, for ensuring that the GHRM strategies of the organization translate into improved EP, organizations cannot ignore the support from top management. Agarwal (2014) argued that GHRM would significantly impact the EP of organizations only when it is backed by leadership support.

Along with leadership and GHRM, culture too plays a significant role in implementing EM initiatives of organizations. Cohen (1995) emphasized the importance of defining and transforming the organizational culture to respond to environmental pressure. "A culture of sustainability is one in which organizational members hold shared assumptions and beliefs about the importance of balancing economic efficiency, social equity, and ecological accountability". Organizations attempting to transform into green organizations should primarily focus on creating a strong culture, i.e., a culture that pervades and binds the organizational members and makes them collectively sensitive toward the organization's environmental ecological goals. This is because studies have shown that an ecologically-oriented culture can lead to improved EP. Many researchers have studied sustainability and organizational culture. But these topics have mostly been

explored as individual concepts. Very few studies have examined how organizations can incorporate sustainability into their day-to-day operations.

Changing business conditions are rendering Milton Friedman's (1970) advice "there is one and only one social responsibility of business to use its resources and engage in activities designed to maximize its profits" incapable of creating sustainable success. A business might be doing a tremendous job by designing new and innovative products and services, every minute, that is making the lives of their consumer easier and exciting; it might be providing employment to people and by increasing the GDP of the economy, but on the other hand, their activities might also be enormously contributing to the ecological pollution. Therefore, organizations must take their responsibility towards sustainability seriously.

Sustainability meaning to organizations

A sustainable organization is one that is able to balance the conflicting interest of its stakeholders i.e., its customers, employees, communities, government, shareholders, etc., and ensure that they: Protect the ecology and create a positive impact.

Work towards social welfare and consider the needs of local communities. Maximize the value to their shareholders.

Sustainability has caught the attention of many companies over the past few years because the public today is not satisfied with those companies that focus only on short-term profit maximization objective. They are more inclined toward companies that consider broad human needs.

Companies that practice ecological sustainability at their workplace share certain common characteristics. They observe the ecology regularly for gaining insights and opinion, and then they inculcate the same in the company's own actions; they are constantly connected to their surroundings so that all the relevant matters on eco-efficiency are on their table at all times; they strive towards making a continuous improvement in what they do and how the work is done; they understand the rarity of natural resources that their organization consumes; they are responsible towards their customers and stakeholders; they have appropriate tools on management level to monitor their actions constantly.

Drivers of Ecological Sustainability in Organizations

The reason why organizations have been taking their EP seriously is that firstly, there is a tremendous amount of pressure from stakeholders (such as the company's employees, customers, investors, and also the government and from the communities in which the company operates) to become ecologically responsible companies. There is mounting pressure on the companies to consider the profit-related bottom line of its operations and incorporate a three-dimensional triple bottom line perspective in all its decisions. Research suggests that top management develops concern about the ecology when the market pressurizes them to do so, as a result of which they adopt ecological orientation to deal with those pressures (Chan, 2010). Secondly, for long organizations considered economic outcomes to be more captivating until recently when it became quite evident that organizations should take a front seat in handling ecological issues since they are the ones majorly responsible for causing ecological problems in the first place. Recently, there has been an increasing belief that business has interdependence on society and the ecology in which it operates. Although much literature shows that to date, many companies see CSR as simply a "marginal activity." Thirdly, over the years, many laws and legislations have been formulated at the national and international levels to address the issue of ecological pollution. This has put additional pressure on companies since they are required to comply with such laws.

Other forces that drive organizations towards EP are the increased pressure from employees for adopting ecological sustainability strategy (Jabbar and Abid, 2015) and changing trends in the labor market that increasingly acknowledges the relationship between HRM and corporate sustainability performance. Today the labor market is dominated by the "Facebook" generation. This generation is interested in working for companies whose value system aligns with their own values- the "baby-boomer" whose employees believe in making a living while giving back to the community, thus creating

a meaningful difference. The public has now become ecologically conscious and chooses to work for ecologically responsible organizations.

Another driving force of sustainability and CSR and HR link are the shareholders. Shareholders worldwide are also pressurizing the companies to link the executive compensation to sustainability performance in the short-term and short-term linked metrics. Companies are also encouraged to improve their sustainability performance since it brings them cost savings. For long, organizations thought that investment in improving their EP would only lead to a reduction in their profits, but this is not the case.

Key Roadblocks in implementing sustainability in organizations

There are many reasons why organizations fail when it comes to incorporating sustainability into their business operations. There is inadequate integration of sustainability with business strategy, lack of suitable leadership, lack of proper systems and processes to institutionalize sustainability, lack of suitable culture required to embrace sustainability, lack of employee involvement, etc. Another big reason for organizations failing in this area is sustainability is often viewed as a "nice to do" versus a "need to do" activity. Whereas it should be viewed as "a way of thinking, acting and operating, and it must permeate the fabric of the organization". Some other reasons why an organization is failing in implementation are that managers are busy coping with the "daily grind of business" and pay minimal attention to environmental issues. There is a half-hearted effort toward sustainability, as pointed out by Steger, Ionescu-Somers, and Salzmann (2007) and also. Another reason is that executives are themselves unclear as to what the term sustainability means to their business. The shareholders and the customers of the company have so far been ignorant of these issues. Also, there is a lack of common measurement criteria or standards against which a company can measure its performance.

Key Terms Definition

- Ecological Sustainability Leadership

  Ecological Sustainability Leadership refer to the attributes and behaviors of leaders that are required to promote change towards environmentally sustainable practices in organizations (Metcalf and Ben, 2013).

- Green Human Resource Management

  "Green human resource management is the use of HRM policies to promote the sustainable use of resources within organizations and, more generally, promotes the causes of ecological sustainability" (Marhatta and Adhikari, 2013).

- Green Recruitment and Selection

  Green recruitment and selection refer to the process of recruiting and selecting candidates who are sensitive to ecological issues and willing to contribute towards EP (Tang et al., 2018).

- Ecological Training

  Ecological training is defined as "the systematic process to improve the ecological knowledge, skills, and attitudes of employees to achieve the ecological goals of the organization" (Thevanes and Arulrajah, 2020).

- Green Reward and Recognition

  Green reward and recognition are a system of rewarding employees with both financial and non-financial rewards to attract, retain, and motivate employees to contribute to the EM goals of the organization (Mandip, 2012).

- Green Performance Management

  Green Performance Management refers to evaluating employees' performance and activities in the process of EM (Jabbour et al., 2008).

- Green Employee Engagement

  Green Employee Engagement is defined as "actions a company takes to secure the interest and attention of employees in their sustainability efforts" (Eccles et. al., 2012b).

- Ecological Sustainability Culture

  Ecological sustainability culture can be defined as the "values, beliefs, and behaviors of organizational members concerning the natural environment" (Roscoe et al., 2019, p. 739).

- Ecological Sustainability Performance

Ecological Sustainability Performance reflects "an output demonstrating the degree to which firms are committed to protecting the natural environment" (Paillé et al., 2014, p. 451).

Literature Review

Studies Involving Leadership

Tuan (2019)   Based on a sample of 892 employees nested with 144 managers, and by using MPlus's SEM, the researcher examined the relationship between environmentally-specific servant leadership and EP. He found that environmentally specific servant leadership impacts EP at both individual and team levels. In addition, although green climate-mediated between environmentally-specific servant leadership and team-level EP, it led to individual-level EP through green climate and green crafting. The researcher further found that green climate moderated the relationship between green crafting and individual green performance.

GHRM

Thevanes and Arulrajah (2020) The researchers studied whether employee attitude mediated between environmental training and environmental attitude of the employees. The result from correlation and simple mediation analysis showed a positive and significant relationship between environmental training and environmental attitude, and environmental orientation. Finally, environmental training and environmental orientation but environmental attitude did not mediate the relationship between environmental training and environmental orientation.

Ghouri, et al. (2020) The researchers studied the relationship between GHRM, EP, and business performance. Using the sample size of 179 employees working in Malaysian manufacturing industry and by using SmartPLS, they found a significant relationship between the GHRM practices such as "green recruitment and selection, green   training and development, green   performance management and appraisals, green employee empowerment and participation and green organizational culture." Moreover, EP significantly mediated in the above relationship.

Yusoff et al., (2020), The researchers explored the relationship between the "individual dimension of GHRM practices and EP." Using PLS- SEM and a sample size of 206 Malaysianian hotels, they found that while green-based recruitment and selection, training and development, and compensation significantly impacted the EP of the hotel industry, the impact of green performance management on EP was not significant.

Leadership and Culture

Chen (2011) based on a sample size of 138 Taiwanese manufacturing companies and by using SEM, the researcher studied the effects of "green organizational culture and green leadership on the green organizational identity and on the green competitive advantage." A found positively significant relationship was found between all the variables. He also found that with good leadership efforts, the organization's environmental competitive advantage improves. Moreover, green organizational identity partially mediated between green organizational culture and competitive advantage and between green leadership and competitive advantage".

Zheng, Wu et. al., (2019), Based on the idea of the person-organization fit and value Xie and Li congruence and with a sample size of 217 project members of construction companies in China, the researchers found that the congruence of leadership and organizational culture and the alignment and non-alignment of these two factors are important predictors of the innovative behavior of the members of the construction project.

GHRM and Leadership

Obeidat et al. (2020) GHRM and green passion and found it to be significant. Using a sample size of 144 managers from oil and gas industry in Qatar and by using PLS-SEM, the researchers found that top management support along with internal environmental orientation leads to GHRM in organizations that further lead to improved EP and EP further improves the organizational performance.

Huo et al. (2020) Drawing upon the upper echelons theory and a sample of Chinese coal enterprises, this study explored the impact of commitment to HRM on green creativity. They also studied whether GHRM mediated this relationship. The research revealed that GHRM fully mediated between commitment to HRM and green creativity. They further found that

environmental regulation positively moderates between commitment to HRM and GHRM and between top management commitment to HRM and green creativity.

Singh et al. (2020) The researchers conducted a study to find out the relationship between transformational leadership and EP, taking into account the mediating impact of GHRM and green innovation. They collected data from 309 manufacturing sectors (small and medium-sized enterprises). They found that green transformational leadership had a significant impact on green ability, motivation, and opportunity. Furthermore, these variables had a significant impact on green innovation, and green innovation had a significant impact on EP. The indirect effect was also significant, i.e., GHRM significantly mediated between Leadership and green innovation.

GHRM and Culture

Roscoe et al. (2019) Using a sample size of 204 employees at Chinese manufacturing firms and by using covariance-based SEM, the researchers studied the relationship between GHRM, the "enablers of green organizational culture," and EP. Based on their results, they found that GHRM was positively related to the "enablers of organizational culture, i.e., leadership emphasis, message credibility, peer involvement, and employee empowerment." Furthermore, organizational culture positively impacted EP and fully mediated between GHRM (hiring, training, appraisal, and incentivization) and EP.

Shafaei et al. (2020) The authors examined the antecedents and outcomes of GHRM at the organizational level. Using PLS-SEM and a sample size of 206 hotels in Malaysia, they found that environmental culture is an important antecedent of GHRM, while EP is the most significant outcome of GHRM.

Methodology

To accomplish the objectives of the present study, the researcher reviewed the literature. Ecological sustainability leadership, GHRM strategies, ecological sustainability culture was identified as the main constructs that are responsible for the sustainability ecological performance of organizations. Thus, a detailed review of these constructs was undertaken. Based on the outcome of the literature review, the researcher developed a conceptual model showing the relationships amongst these constructs and also proposed the related hypotheses. To test the hypothesis, a survey was conducted wherein a self-administered questionnaire was sent to the 140 top and middle-level managers (mostly from the HR background). For GHRM, ecological sustainability leadership, and ecological sustainability performance, the questionnaire items were taken from the previously established scales. The data were analysed descriptive and Independent Sample t-test and bootstrapping. The technique was executed using SPSS.

Data Analysis

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive	Groups	Frequency	Percent
Gender	Men	108	76.6
	Female	32	23.3
Educational Qualification	Diploma	5	4.3
	Bachelors	48	34.8
	Masters	86	61.9
Age	25-35	23	16.3
	35-45	37	26.7
	45-55	51	36.3
	55 and above	29	20.6
Experience	1-5 years	45	32.6
	6-10 years	46	33.2
	11-15 years	32	23.0
	More than 15 years	17	11.0

Table 2: Total Effect

Effect	Un-stand Estimate	Stand Estimate	Standard Error	Sig.	T-value	95% interval confidence (Bias corrected)	
						Lower Bounds	Upper Bounds
Total effect							
ESL-GAES	.526	. 619	.043	.004	14.395	.515	.692
ESL-GMES	.443	.512	.056	.002	9.142	.402	.617
ESL-GOES	.587	.563	.046	.002	12.239	.425	.652
GAES-ESP	.191	.179	.089	.040	2.011	.008	.356
GMES-ESP	.108	.103	.061	.073	1.688	.-011	.233
GOES-ESP	.185	.213	.082	.012	2.597	.061	.374
GAES-ESC	.232	.236	.093	.019	2.537	.053	.427
GMES-ESC	.103	.107	.065	.085	1.646	-.018	.241
GOES-ESC	.177	.221	.091	.022	2.428	.037	.399
ESL-ESP	.665	.733	.041	.003	17.878	.654	.809
ESL-ESC	.593	.710	.040	.002	17.75	.624	.787
ESC-ESP	.520	.477	.106	.003	4.5	.282	.715
ESL-GHRM	.516	.686	.041	.002	16.73	.599	.762
GHRM-ESP	.682	.566	.083	.002	6.819	.396	.732
GHRM-ESC	.721	.650	.090	.003	7.222	.473	.819

Taking the suggestion of Shrout and Bolger (2002), the bootstrapping techniques was used to generate the required statistics. Beta values, t values, p values, and bias-corrected confidence intervals were used to determine the hypotheses' acceptance or rejection.

The standard thresholds were adopted. To attain significance between the endogenous and exogenous variables, the t value must be ≥ 1.96. The p-value, on the other hand, must be <.05. Also, the bias-corrected confidence interval should not cross zero.

Although Kwon and Suh (2004) suggested a p-value of <.10 to be marginally significant, but since most researchers in social science use a p-value of <.05 as cut off for accepting significant relationships between constructs, the study has used this as a cut off value for accepting or rejecting hypotheses.

Findings

- H1a hypothesized that ESL (Ecological Sustainability Leadership) has a significant impact on GAES (Green Ability Enhancing Strategies). The research revealed a significant relationship between ESL and GAES (β=.619, SE=.043, t=14.395 p=.004 and CI=.515-.692) . H1b hypothesized that ESL (Ecological Sustainability Leadership) has a significant impact on GMES(Green Motivation Enhancing Strategies). The research revealed a significant relationship between ESL and GMES (β=.512, SE=.056, t=9.142, p=.002 and CI=.402-.617). H1c hypothesized that ESL (Ecological Sustainability Leadership) has a significant impact on GOES (Green Opportunity Enhancing Strategies). The research revealed a significant relationship between ESL and GOES (β=.563, SE=.046, t=12.239, p=.002 and CI=.468-.652)

- H2a hypothesized that GAES (Green Ability Enhancing Strategies) has a significant impact on ESP (Ecological Sustainability Performance). The research revealed significant relationship between GAES and ESP (β=.179, SE=.089, t=2.011, p=.040 and CI=.008-.356). H2b hypothesized that GMES (Green Motivation Enhancing Strategies) has a significant impact on ESP (Ecological Sustainability Performance). The research revealed that the relationship between GMES and ESP was not significant (β=.103, SE=.061, t=1.688, p=.073 and CI=-.011-.233). H2c hypothesized that GOES (Green Opportunity Enhancing Strategies) have a significant impact on ESP (Ecological Sustainability Performance). The research revealed a significant relationship between GOES and ESL (β=.221, SE=.091, t=2.428, p=.012 and CI=.061-.374).

- H3a hypothesized that GAES (Green Ability Enhancing Strategies) have a significant impact on ESC (Ecological Sustainability Culture). The research revealed a significant relationship between GAES and ESC (β=.236, SE=.093, t=2.537, p=.01 and CI=.053-.427). H3b hypothesized that GMES (Green Motivation Enhancing Strategies) have a significant impact on ESC (Ecological Sustainability Culture). The research revealed that the relationship between GMES and ESC is insignificant r (β=.107, SE=.065, t=1.646, p=.085 and CI=-.018-.241). H3c hypothesized that GOES (Green Opportunity Enhancing Strategies) have a significant impact on ESC (Ecological Sustainability Culture). The research revealed a significant relationship between GOES and ESL (β=.221, SE=.091, t=2.428, p=.022 and CI=.037-.299).

- H4 hypothesized that ESL (Ecological Sustainability Leadership) has a significant impact on the ESP (Ecological Sustainability Performance) of organizations. The research revealed a significant relationship between ESL and ESP (β=.733, SE=.041, t=17.878, p=.003 and CI=.654-.809).

- H5 hypothesized that ESL (Ecological Sustainability Leadership) has a significant impact on the ESC (Ecological Sustainability Culture) of organizations. The research revealed a significant relationship between ESL and ESC (β=.710, SE=.040, t=17.75, p=.002 and CI=.624-.787).

- H6 hypothesized that ESC (Ecological Sustainability Culture) has a significant impact on ESP (Ecological Sustainability Performance) of organizations. The research revealed a significant relationship between ESC and ESP (β=.477, SE=.106, t=4.5, p=.003 and CI=.282-.715).

- H7 hypothesized that ESL (Ecological Sustainability Leadership) has a significant impact on GHRM (as a system). The research revealed a significant relationship between ESL and GHRM (β=.686, SE=.041, t=16.73, p=.002 and CI=.599-.762)

- H8 hypothesized that GHRM (Green Human Resource Management) as a system has a significant impact on ESP (Ecological Sustainability Performance). The research revealed a significant relationship between GHRM and ESP (β=.566, SE=.083, t=6.819, p=.002 and CI=.396-.732)

- H9 hypothesized that GHRM (Green Human Resource Management) has a significant impact on ESC (Ecological Sustainability Culture). The research revealed significant relationship between GHRM and ESC (β=.650, SE=.090, t=7.222, p=.003 and CI=.473-.819).

Conclusion and Implications

Leaders with a drive to improve their organisations ESP must leverage both GHRM and green culture since both these constructs play a key role in the EM of organizations. The lack of integration between corporate sustainability strategy and the HR system and processes will lead to a disconnection between rhetoric and practice, and the sustainability vision of the organization will stand limited to the word-of-mouth publicity accompanied with no practical application. Only when the organizational policies are reflected in action will the employees feel the need to bring the desired change in their behavioural pattern. The leadership and HRM system should thus be modified to be aligned with the ecological policies of the organization.

The finding of the study presents a strong case for designing an HRM system would support the sustainability initiatives of organizations. But along with GHRM, the findings also suggest that managers should acknowledge the significant role that ESC plays in improving the ESP of the companies. This is because organizations require a platform (ESC) for implementing GHRM practices. This study informs that managers of organizations that are striving to reduce their ecological footprint should adopt green hiring practices. This is because when organizations recruit and select employees based on their ecological awareness and orientation, the employees become aware of the organization's beliefs and values even before joining the firm. by cultivating green leadership styles such as transformational leadership and servant leadership, top management can support the EM strategies of the organizations. Therefore, organizations should educate the top management on the importance of practicing these leadership styles while dealing with the managers and employees on green issues. While top management can use transformational leadership to provide clear vision, support, inspiration, and motivation to its employees to practice ecological sustainability, through green servant leadership, leaders can show focus on concern and service for others, thus promoting voluntary green behavior in organizations.

Through green hiring practices, organizations can get the right employees on board, but managers should also take utmost care while designing other GHRM strategies. Employers should also provide required green training and should also engage employees in green activities while managing their green performance and rewarding them for their green initiatives.

The study highlights the importance of including green management as a part of the curriculum in business schools. This is because the empirical findings in this study reinforce the importance of green leadership in supporting the organisation ESP initiatives.

References

1. Agarwal, U.A. (2014). Linking justice, trust, and innovative work behaviour to work engagement. Personnel Review, 43(1), 41 73.
2. Al-Minhas, U., Ndubisi, N. O., and Barrane, F. Z. (2020). Corporate environmental management: A review and integration of green human resource management and green logistics. Management of Environmental Quality, 31(2), 431-450.
3. Anon (2011). The concept of sustainable development. E-International Relations Studies. Retrieved from https://www.e-ir.info/2011/07/27/the-concept-of-sustainable-development/
4. Chan, R. (2010). Corporate environmentalism pursuit by foreign firms competing in China. Journal of World Business, 45(1), 80 92.
5. Cohen, J. E. (1995). How many people can the earth support? W. W. Norton, New York.
6. Connelly, J., Smith, G., Benson, D. and Saunders, C. (2012). Politics and the environment: from theory to practice. 3rd edition. London: Routledge.
7. Eisenstat, R. A. (1996). What corporate human resources brings to the picnic: Four models for functional management. Organizational Dynamics, 25(2), 7 22.
8. Eccles, R. G, Loannou, I., and Serafeim, G. (2012a). The Impact of a corporate culture of sustainability on corporate behaviour and performance. Working paper 17950, National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper Series, Cambridge, Massachusetts, March 2012.
9. Ghouri, A.M., Mani, V., Khan, M.R., Khan, N.R. and Srivastava, A.P. (2020). Enhancing business performance through green human resource management practices: empirical evidence from Malaysian manufacturing industry. International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management, 69(8), 1585-1607.
10. Huo, W., Li, X., Zheng, M., Liu, Y., and Yan, J. (2020). Commitment to human resource management of the top management team for green creativity, Sustainability, 12(3), 1008.
11. Jabbour C. J. C., and Santos, F. A. (2008). The central role of human resource management in the search for sustainable organizations. The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 19(12), 2133-2154.
12. Károly, K. (2011). Rise and fall of the Concept Sustainability. Journal of Environmental Sustainability. 1(1).

13. Kim, M. and Stepchenkova, S. (2018). Does environmental leadership affect market and eco performance? Evidence from Korean franchise firms, Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing, 33(4), 417-428.

14. Kim, A., Kim, Y., Han, K., Jackson, S. E., and Ployhart, R. E. (2017). Multilevel influences on voluntary workplace green behavior: Individual differences, leader behavior, and coworker advocacy. Journal of Management, 43, 1335 1358.

15. Lakshman, D. (2017). International environmental law in a nutshell fifth edition. St. Paul, MN: West Academic Publishing.

16. Mandip, G. (2012). Green HRM: People management commitment to environmental sustainability. Research Journal of Recent Sciences, 1(1), 244-252.

17. Metcalf, L., and Benn, S. (2013) Leadership for sustainability: An evolution of leadership ability. Journal of Business Ethics, 112(3), 369-384.

18. Morelli, J. (2011). Environmental Sustainability: A Definition for Environmental Professionals. Journal of Environmental Sustainability, 1(1).

19. Obeidat, S. M., Al Bakri, A. A., and Elbanna, S. (2020). Learning Green Human Resource Practices to enable environmental and organizational performance: evidence from the Qatari oil and gas industry. Journal of Business Ethics, 164(2), 371-388.

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

21. Shah, M. (2019). Green human resource management: Development of a valid measurement scale. Business Strategy and the Environment, 28(5), 771-785.

22. Shafaei A., Nejati M., and, Yusoff, Y. M. (2020). Green human resource management: A two-study investigation of antecedents and outcomes. International Journal of Manpower, 41(7), 1041-1060.

23. Singh, S. K., del Giudice, M., Chierici, R., and Graziano, D. (2020). Green innovation and environmental performance: The role of green transformational leadership and green human resource management. Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 150(C).

24. Smith, E .E. and Muller, R. J. (2016). Creating a culture of sustainability in organisations in nelson mandela bay, Proceedings of 28th Annual Conference of the Southern African Institute of Management Scientists, 72-87. ISBN: 978-0-620-71797-7.

25. Steger, U., Ionescu-Somers, A. and Salzmann, O. (2007). The economic foundations of corporate sustainability. Corporate Governance, 7(2), 162-77.

26. Shafaei A., Nejati M., and, Yusoff, Y. M. (2020). Green human resource management: A two-study investigation of antecedents and outcomes. International Journal of Manpower, 41(7), 1041-1060.

27. Tang, G., Chen, Y., Jiang, Y., Paille, P., and Jia, J. (2018). Green human resource management practices: scale development and validity. Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources, 56(1), 31 55.

28. Thevanes, N., and Arulrajah, A. A. (2020). Environmental training and environmental orientation of organization: the mediating role of environmental behavior of employee. Sri Lankan Journal of Human Resource Management, 10(2), 46-62.

29. Tuan, L. T. (2019). Effects of environmentally-specific servant leadership on green performance via green climate and green crafting. Asia Pacific Journal of Management.

30. Zheng, J., Wu, G., Xie, H., and Li, H. (2019). Leadership, organizational culture, and innovative behaviour in construction projects: The perspective of behaviour-value congruence. International Journal of Managing Projects in Business, 12(4), 888-918.