Cogent Business & Management

ISSN: 2331-1975 (Online) Journal homepage: www.tandfonline.com/journals/oabm20

From green human resource management to employee job performance: evidence from the Indonesian banking sector

Juliansyah Noor, Soleh Soleh & Yumhi Yumhi

To cite this article: Juliansyah Noor, Soleh Soleh & Yumhi Yumhi (2026) From green human resource management to employee job performance: evidence from the Indonesian banking sector, Cogent Business & Management, 13:1, 2742562, DOI: 10.1080/23311975.2026.2742562

To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2026.2742562

© 2026 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group

View supplementary material

Published online: 31 Oct 2026.

Submit your article to this journal

View related articles

View Crossmark data

Full Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at
https://www.tandfonline.com/action/journalInformation?journalCode=oabm20

COGENT BUSINESS & MANAGEMENT
2026, VOL. 13, NO. 1, 2742562
https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2026.2742562

HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT | RESEARCH ARTICLE

OPEN ACCESS

From green human resource management to employee job performance: evidence from the Indonesian banking sector

Juliansyah Noor, Soleh Soleh and Yumhi Yumhi

Faculty of Economics and Business, University of La Tansa Mashiro, Banten, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

Green human resource management (GHRM) has emerged as an important organizational strategy for enhancing sustainability and employee outcomes. This study examines the effect of GHRM on employee job performance through the mediating role of employee innovation and the moderating role of work environment in the Indonesian banking sector. Drawing on the resource-based view and ability–motivation–opportunity perspectives, data were collected from 272 employees working in Indonesian banks. The proposed model was analyzed using partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM). The results indicate that GHRM positively influences employee innovation and employee job performance. Employee innovation is also positively associated with employee job performance and partially mediates the relationship between GHRM and employee job performance. Furthermore, the findings reveal that work environment strengthens the positive effect of employee innovation on employee job performance, suggesting that supportive workplace conditions enhance the effectiveness of innovative employee behavior. These findings contribute to the growing GHRM literature by providing evidence of the mechanism through which GHRM improves employee performance and by highlighting the contextual role of work environment in translating innovation into performance outcomes. The study also offers practical insights for banking organizations seeking to improve employee performance while advancing sustainability-oriented human resource practices.

ARTICLE HISTORY
Received 7 July 2026
Revised 18 September 2026
Accepted 27 September 2026

KEYWORDS
Green human resource management; employee innovation; work environment; employee job performance; banking sector

SUBJECTS
Human Resources Management; Human Resource Development; Employment Relations; Business, Management and Accounting

1. Introduction

The banking sector has become an important actor in the transition toward environmental sustainability, as banks are increasingly expected to embed environmental considerations into their internal operations, service processes, and employee practices (Kabir et al., 2023; Ng et al., 2024). Sustainability has therefore become a major concern in this sector, and banks are increasingly integrating sustainability-oriented policies for employees into organizational practice (Alwali & Alwali, 2026; Javed et al., 2026). Within this setting, green human resource management (GHRM) has emerged as a critical component of corporate social responsibility and environmental management strategies (Joshi et al., 2023; Khanra et al., 2022). GHRM encompasses the processes, practices, and operational frameworks that promote environmental sustainability (Patwary et al., 2023), facilitating organizations in achieving environmental sustainability goals and improving overall performance (Aftab et al., 2023; Ghobakhloo et al., 2021).

GHRM has evolved from the environmental management literature into a strategic human resource approach that integrates environmental objectives into organizational systems and employee practices. Foundational GHRM literature conceptualizes GHRM as a mechanism through which organizations develop environmentally responsible employee capabilities and align sustainability objectives with long-term organizational performance (Jabbour & Jabbour, 2016; Renwick et al., 2013). From this

CONTACT Juliansyah Noor juliansyah.noor@unilam.ac.id Faculty of Economics and Business, University of La Tansa Mashiro, Banten, Indonesia

Supplemental data for this article can be accessed online at https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2026.2742562.

© 2026 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group
This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. The terms on which this article has been published allow the posting of the Accepted Manuscript in a repository by the author(s) or with their consent.

perspective, GHRM creates organizational value by fostering employee competencies, motivation, and opportunities that support both environmental and performance outcomes.

Although prior studies have established positive relationships among GHRM, employee innovation, and performance outcomes, these findings mainly explain whether GHRM is associated with better outcomes rather than how and under what conditions these outcomes are achieved. Prior research has linked GHRM with green behavior, innovation, and performance-related outcomes (Afsar et al., 2018; Aftab et al., 2022; Ragas et al., 2017). However, the mechanism through which GHRM is translated into employee job performance and the conditions that enable employees to convert innovation into performance remain less clear, particularly in service-intensive sectors.

The Indonesian banking sector provides an appropriate setting to examine this unresolved issue. Unlike manufacturing organizations, banks rely heavily on employee behavior, innovation, and sustainable service delivery to achieve organizational outcomes (Buallay, 2019; Tanova & Bayighomog, 2022). Indonesia provides a theoretically relevant context because its banking sector operates in an environmentally challenged developing-country setting where sustainable green practices are still being adopted. This context allows the study to examine how GHRM practices, employee innovation, and supportive work environments interact in translating sustainability-oriented HR practices into employee performance.

Accordingly, this study aims to examine how GHRM is translated into employee job performance and under what conditions this translation occurs in the Indonesian banking sector. Three objectives guide the study: first, to examine the relationship between GHRM and employee job performance; second, to examine whether employee innovation mediates this relationship; and third, to examine whether the work environment moderates the relationship between employee innovation and employee job performance.

This study contributes to the literature by clarifying how established relationships among GHRM, employee innovation, and employee job performance operate as a conditional process. First, it identifies employee innovation as an internal mechanism through which GHRM-related capabilities are translated into employee job performance, extending the explanation beyond the direct GHRM–performance relationship. Second, it shows that the performance value of employee innovation is conditional on the work environment, indicating that innovation alone is insufficient when employees lack supportive conditions to implement new ideas. Third, by integrating these relationships, the study extends the ability-motivation-opportunity (AMO) and resource-based view (RBV) by showing how GHRM provides ability, motivation, and opportunity conditions that develop employee innovation as a valuable employee capability, while a supportive work environment enables this capability to generate performance. The Indonesian banking context therefore serves not only as a setting but also as a service-oriented environment in which this mechanism can be observed.

2. Literature review and hypothesis development

2.1. Green human resource management

GHRM refers to the integration of environmental objectives into human resource functions such as recruitment, selection, training, performance appraisal, and reward systems (Jabbour & Jabbour, 2016; Renwick et al., 2013). Pham et al. (2019) noted that 'green management was closely tied to HRM because employees were the human capital of organization' (p. 865). GHRM practices are therefore designed to cultivate a sustainable workforce that endorses and understands environmental programs (Ahmad, 2015). From this perspective, GHRM creates organizational value by developing employee competencies, motivation, and opportunities that support both environmental and performance outcomes. Existing research has established that GHRM is associated with employee innovation and employee job performance (Ávila-Robinson et al., 2022; Do & Shipton, 2019; Gravina et al., 2021; Mensah et al., 2023; Oubrich et al., 2021), indicating that GHRM can influence both employee behavior and performance.

2.2. AMO and RBV Theory

This study uses AMO Theory and RBV to explain different parts of the proposed model. AMO Theory explains how GHRM develops employees' abilities, motivation, and opportunities to engage in innovative

behavior (Appelbaum et al., 2000). RBV explains how employee innovation represents a valuable employee-based capability that can contribute to job performance (Barney, 2001). Thus, AMO explains the development of employee innovation, whereas RBV explains how this capability creates performance value.

Meanwhile, RBV argues that sustainable competitive advantage emerges from valuable organizational capabilities and difficult-to-imitate resources (Barney, 2001). Accordingly, employee innovation represents the capability through which GHRM resources are converted into employee job performance. Work environment further provides the conditions that determine whether this capability can be effectively translated into performance. Thus, AMO primarily explains the development of innovative behavior, while RBV explains its value for performance.

2.3. GHRM and employee job performance

Employee job performance reflects the extent to which employees contribute to the achievement of organizational goals through effective execution of tasks and responsibilities (Ragas et al., 2017). In a sustainability-oriented context, job performance is increasingly associated with employees' ability to integrate environmental considerations into business operations and decision-making processes (Le et al., 2022). GHRM plays an important role in this regard by shaping employees' awareness and behavior toward environmental sustainability through human resource practices (Aggarwal & Agarwala, 2023). By aligning HR practices with environmental objectives, GHRM enhances employees' ability to contribute to both organizational performance and environmental outcomes (Doghan et al., 2022; Raza & Khan, 2022), thereby strengthening the role of GHRM in improving employee job performance. Accordingly, GHRM can be viewed as a strategic approach that optimizes human resource utilization while reducing environmental impact and improving employee job performance. Therefore, this research proposes the hypothesis below.

H1. GHRM enhances employee job performance.

2.4. Employee innovation and employee job performance

Employee innovation refers to the introduction and implementation of new ideas, technologies, and administrative practices aimed at improving production efficiency and organizational effectiveness (Scott & Bruce, 1994). Through innovative activities, employees can improve systems, processes, and products, thereby increasing work effectiveness and organizational outcomes (Engen et al., 2021). As innovative employees are better able to identify problems and develop effective solutions, employee innovation is expected to enhance job performance. This argument is supported by empirical evidence demonstrating a positive relationship between employee innovation and job performance (Jiang et al., 2012; Ouakouak & Ouedraogo, 2017).

GHRM fosters employees' environmental commitment and creates a supportive climate for innovative behavior (Verburg et al., 2007). Through green-oriented HR practices, employees are encouraged to adopt green technologies and optimize resource utilization, thereby enhancing innovation in the workplace (Albort-Morant et al., 2016). Such practices provide employees with the support and motivation needed to generate and implement new ideas. This argument is supported by empirical evidence showing a positive relationship between GHRM and employee innovation (Mensah et al., 2023). The relationship between GHRM and performance can be explained through employees' innovative behavior. By fostering environmental commitment and encouraging participation in green initiatives, GHRM creates conditions that support the generation and implementation of new ideas. Such innovative behavior enables employees to improve work processes and contribute to organizational effectiveness, ultimately enhancing performance outcomes. Previous studies have provided empirical support for these mechanisms by showing that GHRM promotes pro-environmental behavior, strengthens innovation capabilities, and improves organizational outcomes (Dumont et al., 2017; Kim et al., 2017; Tang et al., 2018)

Organizational activities impact the environment, influencing employee innovation and employee job performance (Dubey et al., 2015). Furthermore, employee job performance is impacted by the selection of raw materials, production energy sources, environment, and product development technology

(Darnall et al., 2008; Yasir et al., 2020). Employee innovation influences the implementation of work environment and the development of performance (Hermundsdottir & Aspelund, 2021). This enables banks to improve performance by adopting green processes, goods, and innovation activities (Le et al., 2022).

GHRM can stimulate employee innovation by fostering environmental responsibility, organizational learning, and a supportive climate for the generation and implementation of new ideas (Hermundsdottir & Aspelund, 2021). Through GHRM practices, employees are encouraged to engage in innovative activities that contribute to both organizational effectiveness and environmental objectives (Ahsan, 2025; Pham et al., 2019). Such practices provide employees with the motivation and resources needed to develop creative solutions and improve workplace processes (Elidemir et al., 2020; Ogiemwonyi et al., 2023).

Existing evidence therefore supports a positive relationship between GHRM and employee innovation. However, the literature provides less explanation of whether this innovation represents the main mechanism through which GHRM improves employee job performance. Thus, the unresolved issue is not the existence of the GHRM–innovation relationship, but how innovation converts GHRM practices into employee performance outcomes. Building on the insights, the following hypotheses are proposed.

H2a. GHRM is positively related to employee innovation.

H2b. Employee innovation is positively related to employee job performance.

GHRM provides employees with the abilities, motivation, and opportunities to develop and implement new ideas. Employee innovation therefore represents the process through which these GHRM-enabled capabilities are converted into improved work outcomes. Accordingly, employee innovation should mediate the relationship between GHRM and employee job performance. Accordingly, the following hypothesis is proposed.

H3. Employee innovation mediates the relationship between GHRM and employee job performance.

2.5. Work environment as a moderator

The work environment encompasses the physical, psychological, and organizational conditions that influence employees' work experiences and behaviors (Røssberg et al., 2004). A supportive work environment provides employees with resources, collaboration, empowerment, and opportunities to apply innovative ideas (Anjum et al., 2018). Therefore, employee innovation is more likely to improve job performance when employees have sufficient organizational support to implement their ideas. A supportive environment thus strengthens the conversion of innovative behavior into performance outcomes (Wei et al., 2018). As organizations increasingly recognize the importance of achieving environmental and organizational objectives, greater attention has been directed toward developing supportive work environments that facilitate employee effectiveness and goal attainment (Sarıköse & Göktepe, 2022; Zhou et al., 2019). Prior studies indicate that a supportive work environment facilitates the implementation of innovative ideas and improves employee outcomes (Ángeles López-Cabarcos et al., 2022). However, it remains unclear whether work environment changes the extent to which employee innovation is translated into job performance (Chaiyapruksayanonde & Ponchaitiwat, 2025). This distinction is important because generating innovative ideas does not necessarily ensure their successful implementation. Therefore, work environment is considered a boundary condition that may strengthen the effect of employee innovation on employee job performance (Shanker et al., 2017; Vuong et al., 2023). From the AMO perspective, a supportive work environment represents an opportunity condition that enables employees to implement innovative ideas. Therefore, the positive effect of employee innovation on job performance is expected to be stronger when the work environment provides sufficient support and opportunities. We propose the following hypotheses.

H4. Work environment positively moderates the relationship between employee innovation and employee job performance, such that the relationship is stronger under a supportive work environment.

Based on the preceding discussion and theoretical arguments, the proposed research model is presented in Figure 1.




Figure 1. Research model.

3. Methodology

3.1. Sample and procedure

Data were gathered from employees in Indonesia's medium to large (i.e. >150 employees) sized banks. The employees are the principal figures within the organizations and possess knowledge of critical information. The banking sector was selected preemptively as an important economic driver (Soleh & Noor, 2021). A self-administered survey method involving multiple participants was used to enhance data effectiveness. First, A list of 55 banks was compiled, and eligible banks were randomly selected after contacting the relevant Indonesian Bankers Association. Second, correspondence with human resources managers of the 55 banks was carried out to determine environmental education or training programs.

The initial list included 55 banks. After screening and contacting the respective human resource managers, 30 banks were excluded because they did not meet the study requirements or did not participate. The final sample therefore consisted of 25 participating banks. Within the participating banks, employees were recruited through the participating human resource departments, and participation was voluntary. Participant recruitment and data collection began after ethical approval was granted on 15 September 2024 and continued until December 2024. No participant data were collected before ethical approval. The study was approved by La Tansa Mashiro University Human Resources Research Ethics Commission under approval number UNILAM/REG/09/2024. Furthermore, 400 questionnaires were distributed from September to December 2024. Verbal informed consent was obtained because the study involved an anonymous, minimal-risk survey administered in the workplace. No personally identifiable information was collected, participation was entirely voluntary, and the ethics committee approved the use of verbal rather than written consent to protect participants' anonymity and reduce administrative burden. These procedures, together with clear survey instructions, were applied to reduce potential common method bias. Employees from 25 banking sectors received a sealed envelope containing the survey instrument and an introductory letter outlining the study's main aim and assuring anonymity. Subsequently, 290 completed questionnaires were obtained from employees. Of these, 272 correctly completed questionnaires were retained for analysis, resulting in a 68% usable response rate (272/400) and a 72.5% return rate (290/400). The source items were originally in English and were translated into Indonesian to ensure comprehensibility for the target respondents. The Indonesian version was then back-translated into English for verification. Differences between the versions were reviewed to maintain the original meaning and clarity of the items. The questionnaire was also reviewed for contextual suitability for employees in the Indonesian banking sector.

The final sample consisted of 272 usable responses from 25 participating banks. The number of respondents varied across the participating banks. Employees were treated as the unit of analysis, and the scales referred to employees' individual perceptions and experiences of their work environment and HR practices. Because respondents were nested within banks, their responses may share organizational

characteristics, including HR practices, leadership, and work environment. Among the banks considered, 60% were conventional, 28% were Shariah, and 12% were digital. The typical age of employees was 35.8 years, with a gender breakdown consisting of 65.1% male and 34.9% female. Educationally, 83.4% held undergraduate degrees, while 16.6% had completed postgraduate education.

The questionnaires were refined through two rounds of pilot testing involving 16 and 20 participants, respectively. The first pilot test focused on identifying ambiguous wording and unclear items, while the second assessed the clarity and straightforwardness of the revised questionnaire. Based on participant feedback, unclear wording was refined and items requiring greater contextual clarity were adjusted before the main survey.

3.2. Measurements

According to Hair et al. (2018), the survey instruments were adapted from established measures for GHRM, employee job performance, employee innovation, and work environment. A five-point Likert scale ranging from 'strongly disagree (1)' to 'strongly agree (5)' was employed to capture varying degrees of agreement with each statement. The reliability of the scales was considered acceptable, with Cronbach's alpha (α) values exceeding 0.70. To measure GHRM, Kim et al. (2023) used a six-item scale that included the statement, 'Employees fully understand the extent of corporate environmental policy.' The scale demonstrated acceptable reliability (α=0.824). Na-Nan et al. (2018) developed a 10-item scale to assess employee job performance, featuring the item, 'Tasks are completed as per the specifications and standards,' with a reliability coefficient of α=0.851. Welbourne et al. (1998) provided a four-item scale adapted to assess employee innovation. The scale included the item, 'Working to implement new ideas' and the reliability was confirmed with α=0.806. Røssberg et al. (2004) provided a 10-item scale to assess work environment. For this study, the items were contextually adapted to the Indonesian banking workplace while retaining their underlying meaning. Healthcare-specific references such as 'ward,' 'patient treatment,' and 'treatment problems' were replaced with workplace-relevant wording. The complete adapted items and reverse-scoring information are provided in Supplementary Appendix A. The adapted scale demonstrated acceptable reliability (α=0.836).

3.3. Data analysis

Data were analyzed using partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM). In addition, this study emphasizes prediction and theory extension by simultaneously examining direct, mediating, and moderating relationships, making PLS-SEM an appropriate analytical approach (Hair et al., 2020). In addition, PLS-SEM provides advantages over conventional regression techniques when examining mediation effects (Preacher et al., 2007). Following the two-step approach suggested by Anderson and Gerbing (1988), the analysis consisted of assessing the measurement model and the structural model. The measurement model was evaluated to examine the relationships between latent constructs and their indicators, whereas the structural model was used to test the hypothesized relationships among constructs (Hair et al., 2020).

4. Results

4.1. Respondent profile

Among the participating organizations, 60% were conventional banks, 28% were Shariah banks, and 12% were digital banks. The average age of respondents was 35.8 years. Male respondents accounted for 65.1% of the sample, while female respondents represented 34.9%. Regarding educational attainment, 83.4% held undergraduate degrees and 16.6% possessed postgraduate qualifications.

4.2. Common method bias

Because data were collected using a cross-sectional survey and a single respondent source, common method bias cannot be completely excluded. Following Kock and Lynn (2012), variance inflation factor

Table 1. Validity and reliability assessment.

Constructs	Items	Loadings	α	CR	AVE	VIF
Employee innovation	EIN1	0.825	0.848	0.898	0.687	1.673
	EIN2	0.853				
	EIN3	0.790				
	EIN4	0.846				
Employee job performance	EJP1	0.805	0.928	0.941	0.666	1.673
	EJP2	0.818				
	EJP4	0.832				
	EJP5	0.822				
	EJP7	0.817				
	EJP8	0.801				
	EJP9	0.798				
	EJP10	0.833				
GHRM	GHRM1	0.807	0.885	0.913	0.635	1.649
	GHRM2	0.753				
	GHRM3	0.837				
	GHRM4	0.771				
	GHRM5	0.826				
	GHRM6	0.785				
Work environment	WEV1	0.717	0.910	0.917	0.580	1.019
	WEV2	0.785				
	WEV3	0.789				
	WEV6	0.733				
	WEV7	0.773				
	WEV8	0.728				
	WEV9	0.717				
	WEV10	0.843				

Source: Developed by the authors.

(VIF) values were examined to assess full collinearity. The VIF values ranged from 1.000 to 3.000, below the 3.3 threshold (Kock & Lynn, 2012) (Table 1). This suggests that severe common method bias is unlikely. However, this test does not eliminate the possibility of common-method effects. To reduce potential common-method bias, the questionnaire emphasized anonymity and voluntary participation, and an introductory letter explained that responses would be used for research purposes. The instrument was also translated and back-translated and refined through two rounds of pilot testing to improve item clarity and reduce potential response ambiguity.

4.3. Convergent validity and reliability

Table 1 presents the results of the measurement model assessment. Convergent validity was established, as indicator loadings ranged from 0.717 to 0.853, exceeding the recommended threshold of 0.70. Negatively worded work-environment items were reverse-coded so that higher scores consistently represented a more supportive work environment. The response anchors were checked to ensure consistent coding across all items. WEV4 and WEV5 were removed during measurement assessment because they showed the lowest outer loadings (0.536 and 0.651, respectively). After deletion, the remaining WEV indicators showed improved outer loadings ranging from 0.717 to 0.843. EJP3 and EJP6 were also removed because their loadings were below 0.70. The deleted indicators were reviewed for content coverage, and their removal was based on both low outer loadings and measurement consistency; the remaining indicators retained the core content of each construct. The deleted indicators and their original loadings, deletion decisions, and substantive justifications are reported in Table S1 Indicator Deletion Decisions. In addition, the average variance extracted (AVE) values ranged from 0.580 to 0.687, surpassing the recommended minimum value of 0.50. Reliability was also supported, with Cronbach's alpha values ranging from 0.848 to 0.928 and composite reliability values ranging from 0.898 to 0.941, all exceeding the recommended thresholds (Hair et al., 2022).

Discriminant validity was assessed using the Heterotrait–Monotrait (HTMT) ratio and the Fornell–Larcker criterion. All HTMT values were below the recommended threshold of 0.90, supporting discriminant validity (Fornell & Larcker, 1981; Hair et al., 2022). However, the HTMT values involving work environment were notably low (0.082 with employee innovation, 0.070 with employee job performance, and 0.082 with GHRM). These values suggest strong empirical distinctiveness of work environment from

Table 2. Discriminant validity assessment.

Constructs	EIN	GHRM	EJP	WEV
HTMT				
EIN	–			
GHRM	0.602	–		
EJP	0.412	0.511	–	
WEV	0.082	0.082	0.070	–
Fornell–Larcker				
EIN	0.829	–		
EJP	0.369	0.816	–	
GHRM	0.525	0.468	0.797	–
WEV	0.035	0.083	0.063	0.762

Abbreviations: EJP, employee job performance; WEV, work environment; EIN, employee innovation; GHRM, green human resource management.
Source: Developed by the authors.

the other constructs, although their magnitude warrants careful interpretation. The reliability, AVE, indicator loadings, and Fornell–Larcker results provide additional evidence that the work environment construct was adequately measured. Therefore, the low HTMT values are acknowledged as a measurement characteristic rather than interpreted solely as evidence of stronger discriminant validity. As shown in Table 2, all constructs met these criteria, providing evidence of adequate discriminant validity.

The coefficient of determination (R^2) values indicate moderate explanatory power, with employee innovation (EIN) and employee job performance (EJP) accounting for 27.6% and 26.9% of the variance, respectively (Hair et al., 2022). The R^2 values indicate that the model explains a moderate proportion of the variance in the endogenous constructs. Therefore, although the significant relationships are statistically meaningful, their practical effects should be interpreted as partial rather than comprehensive. The remaining variance indicates that other factors also contribute to employee job performance. These may include individual capabilities, organizational support, leadership, motivation, and job-related conditions that are not included in the present model. Furthermore, effect size (f^2) analysis was conducted to evaluate the relative contribution of each exogenous construct to the endogenous constructs. Following Cohen (1988), GHRM exhibited a large association with EIN ($f^2 = 0.381$), whereas GHRM ($f^2 = 0.130$) and EIN ($f^2 = 0.029$) showed small effect associations with EJP.

Model fit and predictive relevance were assessed using the standardized root mean square residual (SRMR) and Stone–Geisser's predictive relevance (Q^2). The SRMR value of 0.049 indicates an acceptable level of model fit for a complex PLS-SEM model (Hair et al., 2022). The Q^2 values for EIN and EJP were 0.185 and 0.174, respectively, indicating predictive relevance of the model. However, these values should not be interpreted as evidence of moderate out-of-sample predictive accuracy.

4.4. Hypothesis results

Figure 2 illustrates the hypothesized relationships among the study constructs. The structural model was assessed using a bootstrapping procedure with 5,000 resamples. A hypothesis was considered supported when the t-value exceeded 1.96 and the ρ-value was below 0.05. The results indicate that GHRM was positively associated with employee job performance ($\beta = 0.364$, $t = 6.321$, $\rho < 0.01$) and employee innovation ($\beta = 0.525$, $t = 11.495$, $\rho < 0.01$). Furthermore, employee innovation was positively related to employee job performance ($\beta = 0.172$, $t = 2.728$, $\rho < 0.01$). These findings support H1, H2a, and H2b. The mediation analysis showed a significant indirect association between GHRM and employee job performance through employee innovation ($\beta = 0.090$, $t = 2.576$, $\rho < 0.01$, 95% CI [0.025, 0.163]). The direct GHRM–employee job performance association remained significant ($\beta = 0.364$, $t = 6.321$, $\rho < 0.01$), indicating partial mediation. The direct effect of work environment and the interaction effect were assessed. The interaction term was created from employee innovation and work environment scores and evaluated using f^2, R^2 changes, and VIF. The interaction term had a VIF of 1.005, indicating no critical multicollinearity. The interaction effect was significant ($\beta = 0.169$, $t = 2.633$, $\rho < 0.01$, 95% CI [0.008, 0.251]; $f^2 = 0.037$), supporting H4. The detailed results are presented in Tables 3 and 4.

Figure 3 illustrates the interaction effect and shows that the positive relationship between employee innovation and employee job performance becomes stronger under a more supportive work




Figure 2. Measurement model.
Abbreviations: GHRM, green human resource management; EIN, employee innovation; WEV, work environment; EJP, employee job performance.

Table 3. Hypotheses results.

Hypotheses	Relationship	β	t-value	ρ-value	VIF	R^2	f^2	Decision
H1	GHRM → EJP	0.364	6.321	0.001			0.029	Supported
H2a	GHRM → EIN	0.525	11.495	0.001			0.381	Supported
H2b	EIN → EJP	0.172	2.728	0.006			0.130	Supported
H3	GHRM → EIN → EJP	0.090	2.576	0.010			0.037	Partial mediation
H4	EIN×WEV → EJP	0.169	2.633	0.008	1.005			Supported
	EIN					0.276		
	EJP					0.269		

Abbreviations: EJP, employee job performance; WEV, work environment; EIN, employee innovation; GHRM, green human resource management.
Source: Developed by the authors.

Table 4. Bootstrapped confidence intervals for mediation and moderation effects.

Effect	B	t-value	ρ-value	95% CI	Results
Total effect GHRM → EJP	0.454	9.948	0.001	[0.364, 0.543]	Significant
Direct effect GHRM → EJP	0.364	6.321	0.001	[0.251, 0.477]	Significant
GHRM → EIN → EJP	0.090	2.576	0.010	[0.025, 0.163]	Significant
EIN×WEV → EJP	0.169	2.633	0.008	[0.008, 0.251]	Significant

Note: Bootstrap confidence intervals excluding zero indicate a significant effect.

environment. Specifically, the slope under high work environment conditions is steeper than under low work environment conditions, indicating that supportive work environments strengthen the positive contribution of employee innovation toward employee job performance.

5. Discussion

Therefore, the findings suggest that GHRM contributes to employee job performance not only directly but also by developing employee innovation. From an AMO perspective, GHRM provides conditions that encourage employees to engage in innovative behavior. From an RBV perspective, employee innovation represents a valuable employee capability that can generate performance value. Thus, employee innovation provides a mechanism through which GHRM-related capabilities are translated into employee job




Figure 3. Moderating effect of work environment on the relationship between employee innovation and employee job performance.

performance. The moderating effect further indicates that this capability is more effectively translated into performance when the work environment provides sufficient support and opportunities for implementation. Ren et al. (2018) found a positive relationship between GHRM practices and employee job performance. The present findings are consistent with this relationship but extend previous evidence by showing that employee innovation provides a mechanism linking GHRM with employee job performance. This suggests that the effect of GHRM depends not only on the practices themselves but also on how employees are enabled to apply innovative behaviors. Because the study used cross-sectional data, these relationships should be interpreted as associations rather than causal effects. Reverse causality is also possible, as higher-performing or more innovative employees may evaluate their organizational HR practices more favorably.

GHRM practices can promote environmentally responsible behaviors by integrating environmental criteria into recruitment, selection, and incentive systems, which in turn contribute to improved employee job performance (Ghouri et al., 2020; Saeed et al., 2019; Tanova & Bayighomog, 2022). By embedding sustainability-oriented practices in human resource management, organizations can encourage employees to engage in innovative and green-oriented behaviors that enhance organizational effectiveness. The integration of GHRM with green creativity further enables organizations to gain competitive advantages through improved employee innovation (Joshi et al., 2023). In this regard, evidence from the banking sector in Indonesia also confirms that GHRM enhances employee innovation (Abbas & Khan, 2023).

Additional evidence supports the positive relationship between employee innovation and employee job performance. Employee innovation may contribute to improved job performance through initiatives that reduce energy use, air emissions, and material consumption. Such efforts help minimize the environmental footprint of business activities while supporting performance across social, financial, and environmental dimensions (Badir et al., 2020; Jiang et al., 2012). Additionally, GHRM is associated with employee job performance indirectly through employee innovation, which serves as a mediator in this relationship. GHRM provides employees with the knowledge, motivation, and opportunities needed to generate and implement new ideas. Thus, employee innovation represents the mechanism through which GHRM practices are translated into improved employee job performance.

The role of work environment in the relationship between employee innovation and employee job performance was examined. The results indicate that work environment strengthens this relationship. This finding suggests that employee innovation is not automatically converted into higher performance;

its performance value depends on whether employees have sufficient support and opportunities to implement innovative ideas (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). Thus, the findings extend the GHRM–performance explanation by identifying a conditional mechanism in which GHRM develops employee innovation, while the work environment determines how effectively this capability is translated into job performance. This mechanism is particularly relevant in banking, where sustainability-oriented outcomes depend strongly on employee behavior and service processes.

6. Implications

6.1. Theoretical implications

The findings extend RBV by showing that employee innovation can function as a valuable employee capability through which GHRM-related resources are converted into employee job performance. Thus, the contribution of GHRM is not limited to developing green-oriented human resources but also to enabling employees to create and implement innovative work practices. The findings also refine the application of AMO Theory by linking its three elements to the GHRM process. GHRM develops employees' ability through environmental knowledge and skills, motivation through supportive HR practices, and opportunity through conditions that enable innovative behavior. Employee innovation therefore represents an important mechanism through which these AMO conditions are translated into performance outcomes.

GHRM had an indirect effect on employee job performance through employee innovation. (Gerhart, 2005) reported that GHRM practices including green recruitment, training and development programs, empowering employees, and incentive programs based on performance helped organization to attract, retain, and sustain environmental values. In this context, banks integrated GHRM practices into organizational structures, allowing human resources to focus on unique attributes that offered more significant advantages. Additionally, the organization implemented a well-planned GHRM framework focused on attracting, developing, and retaining employees with a strong environmental mindset. The method was essential for improving employee innovation and enhancing employee job performance to provide a competitive edge within the industry. Accordingly, employee innovation represents a mechanism through which GHRM-related capabilities are converted into employee job performance.

A positive relationship was found between employee innovation and employee job performance. Specifically, A work environment conducive to employee innovation can strengthen the relationship between employee innovation and job performance when organizations provide adequate support and opportunities. Rayner and Morgan (2018) stated that work environment with proactive strategies to develop green technologies enhances overall performance. Meanwhile, Bigliardi et al. (2020) and Collins (2021) suggested that a bad managerial environment increased a reactive work atmosphere to elevate disaster risk and reduce credibility. The results showed that organization could develop and initiatively follow work environment in strengthening the connection between employee innovation and employee job performance. This indicates that the performance value of employee innovation depends on whether the work environment provides sufficient support and opportunities for implementation.

6.2. Managerial implications

This study provides practical recommendations for banking organizations and managers on the integration of GHRM, employee innovation, and work environment to achieve high employee job performance and organizational goals (Bigliardi et al., 2020; Collins, 2021; Rayner & Morgan, 2018). The practical effect of employee innovation on employee job performance was small ($f^2 = 0.029$). Therefore, employee innovation should be viewed as a supportive performance mechanism rather than a dominant determinant of employee performance. First, GHRM practices were essential for attracting, developing, and retaining employees in line with green values and principles. Banks should integrate environmental criteria into recruitment and selection to attract employees with green knowledge and values. Green performance appraisal should also be used to assess employees' environmental and innovative contributions. Banks can provide rewards for employees who develop and implement innovative green practices. These

practices can play a significant role in supporting the strategy to stay competitive by improving employee innovation to secure an advantage and improve employee job performance. Employees in the banking sector viewed employee innovation as a valuable strategic resource in accomplishing environmental sustainability objectives.

Second, work environment played a positive role in the innovation and employee job performance relationship. This showed that this organizational construct achieved green environmental goals. The possession of a proactive work environment improved employee innovation practices and employee job performance. Supervisors should receive training to support employee innovation and encourage the application of new ideas. Banks should also create a supportive innovation climate by providing employees with sufficient resources, autonomy, and opportunities to implement innovative practices. In contrast, the lack of work environment support and limited employee participation reduced the ability to reach green environmental objectives. Therefore, Banks should establish a supportive work environment to minimize these negative effects and enhance employee job performance.

6.3. Limitations and future research directions

Although this analysis has valuable insights, there are still limitations. First, the cross-sectional design limits causal interpretation and does not establish temporal relationships. Non-response bias cannot be completely ruled out because information on the characteristics and reasons for non-participation of the 30 excluded banks was not systematically collected. Therefore, the participating banks may differ from non-participating banks, which may limit the generalizability of the findings. Management practices across organizations, industries, and countries vary significantly (Bloom & Reenen, 2010). Future studies could use longitudinal data to examine these relationships more dynamically. Second, the use of self-reported data may introduce response bias and common method variance because the constructs were measured from the same respondents using the same survey. Although procedural remedies were applied, common method variance cannot be completely ruled out. Future research could use multiple data sources and objective performance indicators. Third, the work-environment scale was contextually adapted to the banking setting; however, independent content validation by banking or HRM experts was not conducted before data collection. Its original development in another work context may also limit its contextual appropriateness. Future research should revalidate the adapted scale through expert assessment and additional empirical testing. Several indicators were deleted during measurement assessment based on low outer loadings and measurement consistency, which may have narrowed construct coverage. The deleted indicators and their original loadings and justifications are reported in Table S1. Indicator Deletion Decisions. Fourth, the study focused on the Indonesian banking sector, which limits generalizability across countries and industries. Future studies could conduct cross-country comparisons and examine other sectors. Fifth, respondents were nested within 25 banks, and the present analysis treated employees as the unit of analysis without explicitly modeling bank-level clustering. Future research should assess intraclass correlations and design effects and consider multilevel or cluster-robust analysis. The sample also included conventional, Shariah, and digital banks, which may differ in organizational and HR practices. These differences were described but not explicitly modeled. Future research should examine relevant individual- and bank-level characteristics as controls or conduct robustness analyses across bank types where sample sizes permit. Although the study examined several factors related to the constructs under investigation, other relevant factors identified in the existing literature were not included. Thus, future research could apply additional constructs to offer a broader range of insights and enrich the results.

7. Conclusion

This study examined how GHRM is associated with employee job performance in the Indonesian banking sector by positioning employee innovation as a mediating mechanism and the work environment as a boundary condition. Using PLS-SEM on data from 272 employees in 25 banks, the results indicate that GHRM is positively associated with both employee innovation and employee job performance, and that employee innovation partially mediates the GHRM–performance relationship. The work environment

strengthens the association between employee innovation and employee job performance, indicating that innovative behavior contributes to performance more effectively when employees have sufficient support and opportunities to implement new ideas.

Theoretically, the study extends AMO Theory and the RBV by specifying employee innovation as the capability through which GHRM-related ability, motivation, and opportunity conditions are converted into performance value, and by identifying the work environment as the condition under which this conversion occurs. Practically, banks are encouraged to embed environmental criteria into recruitment, appraisal, and reward systems, and to provide the resources, autonomy, and supervisory support that allow innovative ideas to be implemented. Because the effect of employee innovation on performance was small and the data were cross-sectional, these findings should be interpreted as associations and employee innovation regarded as a supportive rather than dominant performance mechanism.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank all participants who contributed their time and valuable responses to this study.

Ethics statement

Ethical approval for this study was obtained from the La Tansa Mashiro University Human Resources Research Ethics Commission UNILAM/REG/09/2024. Approved on 15 September 2024.

Author contributions

CRediT: **Juliansyah Noor**: Conceptualization, Data curation, Investigation, Methodology, Supervision, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing; **Soleh Soleh**: Formal analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Resources, Software, Validation, Writing – original draft; **Yumhi Yumhi**: Formal analysis, Funding acquisition, Investigation, Project administration, Resources, Software, Validation, Visualization, Writing – original draft.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

About the authors

Juliansyah Noor is an Associate Professor at La Tansa Mashiro University, Indonesia, specializing in business management, human resource management, and organizational studies. His research focuses on employee performance, organizational sustainability, green human resource management, leadership, and sustainable business practices.

Soleh Soleh is an Associate Professor at La Tansa Mashiro University, Banten, Indonesia, with a Doctoral degree in Islamic Finance from Trisakti University, Indonesia. His research interests include Banking and Finance, Islamic Finance, entrepreneurship, financial management, and the behavior of Islamic financial organizations.

Yumhi Yumhi is an Indonesian academic, author, and Chair of the Postgraduate Study Program, specializing in human resource management and management studies. His research interests include human resource management, research methodology, business management, research quality, and rigorous scientific inquiry in economics and management.

ORCID

Juliansyah Noor http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5110-3518
Soleh Soleh http://orcid.org/0009-0007-2624-3421
Yumhi Yumhi http://orcid.org/0000-0003-1213-8958

Data availability statement

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request. Due to confidentiality agreements with participating organizations and privacy considerations regarding individual respondents, the dataset is not publicly available.

References

Abbas, J., & Khan, S. M. (2023). Green knowledge management and organizational green culture: An interaction for organizational green innovation and green performance. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, *27*(7), 1852–1870. https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-03-2022-0156

Afsar, B., Shahjehan, A., & Shah, S. I. (2018). Frontline employees' high-performance work practices, trust in supervisor, job-embeddedness and turnover intentions in hospitality industry. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, *30*(3), 1436–1452. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-11-2016-0633

Aftab, J., Sarwar, H., Amin, A., & Kiran, A. (2022). Does CSR mediate the nexus of ethical leadership and employee's job performance? Evidence from North Italy SMEs. *Social Responsibility Journal*, *18*(1), 154–177. https://doi.org/10.1108/SRJ-09-2020-0393

Aftab, J., Abid, N., Cucari, N., & Savastano, M. (2023). Green human resource management and environmental performance: The role of green innovation and environmental strategy in a developing country. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, *32*(4), 1782–1798. https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.3219

Aggarwal, P., & Agarwala, T. (2023). Relationship of green human resource management with environmental performance: Mediating effect of green organizational culture. *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, *30*(7), 2351–2376. https://doi.org/10.1108/BIJ-08-2021-0474

Ahmad, S. (2015). Green Human Resource Management: Policies and practices. *Cogent Business & Management*, *2*(1), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2015.1030817

Ahsan, M. J. (2025). Green leadership and innovation: Catalysts for environmental performance in Italian manufacturing. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, *33*(7), 1646–1669. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-04-2024-4450

Albort-Morant, G., Leal-Millán, A., & Cepeda-Carrión, G. (2016). The antecedents of green innovation performance: A model of learning and capabilities. *Journal of Business Research*, *69*(11), 4912–4917. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2016.04.052

Alwali, J., & Alwali, W. (2026). Green human resource management, ethical leadership and CSR orientation in the UAE banking sector: Implications for employee-perceived sustainable performance outcomes. *Social Responsibility Journal*, 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1108/SRJ-05-2025-0439

Anderson, J. C., & Gerbing, D. W. (1988). Structural equation modeling in practice: A review and recommended two-step approach. *American Psychological Association*, *103*(3), 411–423. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.103.3.411

Ángeles López-Cabarcos, M., Vázquez-Rodríguez, P., & Quiñoá-Piñeiro, L. M. (2022). An approach to employees' job performance through work environmental constructs and leadership behaviours. *Journal of Business Research*, *140*, 361–369. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2021.11.006

Anjum, A., Ming, X., Siddiqi, A. F., & Rasool, S. F. (2018). An empirical study analyzing job productivity in toxic workplace environments. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *15*(5), 1035. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph15051035

Appelbaum, E., Bailey, T. R., Berg, P., & Kalleberg, A. L. (2000). *Manufacturing advantage: Why high-performance work systems pay off*. ILR Press.

Ávila-Robinson, A., Islam, N., & Sengoku, S. (2022). Exploring the knowledge base of innovation research: Towards an emerging innovation model. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, *182*, 121804. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2022.121804

Badir, Y. F., Frank, B., & Bogers, M. (2020). Employee-level open innovation in emerging markets: Linking internal, external, and managerial resources. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, *48*(5), 891–913. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-019-00674-6

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The Job Demands-Resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *22*(3), 309–328. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940710733115

Barney, J. B. (2001). Resource-based theories of competitive advantage: A ten-year retrospective on the resource-based view. *Journal of Management*, *27*(6), 643–650. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0149-2063(01)00115-5

Bigliardi, B., Ferraro, G., Filippelli, S., & Galati, F. (2020). The influence of open innovation on firm performance. *International Journal of Engineering Business Management*, *12*, 184797902096954. https://doi.org/10.1177/1847979020969545

Bloom, N., & Reenen, J. V. (2010). Why do management practices differ across firms and countries? *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, *24*(1), 203–224. https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.24.1.203

Buallay, A. (2019). Is sustainability reporting (ESG) associated with performance? Evidence from the European banking sector. *Management of Environmental Quality: An International Journal*, *30*(1), 98–115. https://doi.org/10.1108/MEQ-12-2017-0149

Chaiyapruksayanonde, C., & Ponchaitiwat, K. (2025). Supportive work environments, innovative work behavior, and job performance in the hospitality industry: Empirical evidence from Thailand. *Tourism and Hospitality*, *6*(1), 20. https://doi.org/10.3390/tourhosp6010020

Cohen, J. (1988). Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Collins, C. J. (2021). Expanding the resource based view model of strategic human resource management. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *32*(2), 331–358. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2019.1711442

Darnall, N., Henriques, I., & Sadorsky, P. (2008). Do environmental management systems improve business performance in an international setting? *Journal of International Management*, *14*(4), 364–376. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intman.2007.09.006

Do, H., & Shipton, H. (2019). High-performance work systems and innovation in Vietnamese small firms. *International Small Business Journal: Researching Entrepreneurship*, *37*(7), 732–753. https://doi.org/10.1177/0266242619863572

Doghan, M. A. A., Abdelhamid, N., Abdelwahed, A., Soomro, B. A., Mohamed, M., & Ali, H. (2022). Organizational environmental culture, environmental sustainability and performance: The mediating role of green HRM and green innovation. *Sustainability*, *14*, 3–20.

Dubey, R., Gunasekaran, A., & Samar Ali, S. (2015). Exploring the relationship between leadership, operational practices, institutional pressures and environmental performance: A framework for the green supply chain. *International Journal of Production Economics*, *160*, 120–132. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2014.10.001

Dumont, J., Shen, 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. https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm

Elidemir, S. N., Ozturen, A., & Bayighomog, S. W. (2020). Innovative behaviors, employee creativity, and sustainable competitive advantage: A moderated mediation. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, *12*(8), 3295. https://doi.org/10.3390/SU12083295

Engen, M., Fuglsang, L., Tuominen, T., Sundbo, J., Møller, J. K., Scupola, A., & Sørensen, F. (2021). Conceptualising employee involvement in service innovation: An integrative review. *Journal of Service Management*, *32*(5), 702–751. https://doi.org/10.1108/JOSM-11-2019-0348

Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Unobservable constructs and measurement error: Algebra and statistics. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *18*(3), 382–388.

Gerhart, B. (2005). Human resources and business performance: Findings, unanswered questions, and an alternative approach. *Management Revu*, *16*(2), 174–185. https://doi.org/10.5771/0935-9915-2005-2-174

Ghobakhloo, M., Iranmanesh, M., Grybauskas, A., Vilkas, M., & Petraitė, M. (2021). Industry 4.0, innovation, and sustainable development: A systematic review and a roadmap to sustainable innovation. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, *30*(8), 4237–4257. https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.2867

Ghouri, A. M., Mani, V., Khan, M. R., Khan, N. R., & Srivastava, A. P. (2020). Enhancing business performance through green human resource management practices: An empirical evidence from Malaysian manufacturing industry. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, *69*(8), 1585–1607. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPPM-11-2019-0520

Gravina, N., Nastasi, J., & Austin, J. (2021). Assessment of employee performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior Management*, *41*(2), 124–149. https://doi.org/10.1080/01608061.2020.1869136

Hair, F. H., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2018). *Multivariate Data Analysis*. 7th ed., UK Cengage Learning. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119409137.ch4

Hair, J. F., Howard, M. C., & Nitzl, C. (2020). Assessing measurement model quality in PLS-SEM using confirmatory composite analysis. *Journal of Business Research*, *109*, 101–110. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.11.069

Hair, J. F., Jr., M. Hult, G. T., M. Ringle, C., & Sarstedt, M. (2022). *A Primer on Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM)*. (Vol. 3, 3rd ed.), Sage Publishing.

Hermundsdottir, F., & Aspelund, A. (2021). Sustainability innovations and firm competitiveness: A review. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *280*(1), 124715. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.124715

Jabbour, C. J., & Jabbour, D. S. (2016). Green human resource management and green supply chain management: Linking two emerging agendas. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *112*, 1824–1833. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.01.052

Javed, M., Mohd Mustamil, N., Sadiq, U., Najam, U., & Nasir, N. (2026). Investigating the impact of green HRM practices on bank sustainability performance through parallel mediation of FinTech and green banking practices. *Discover Sustainability*, *7*(1), 1129. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43621-026-03397-1

Jiang, J., Wang, S., & Zhao, S. (2012). Does HRM facilitate employee creativity and organizational innovation? A study of Chinese firms. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *23*(19), 4025–4047. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2012.690567

Joshi, A., Kataria, A., Rastogi, M., Beutell, N. J., Ahmad, S., & Yusliza, M. Y. (2023). Green human resource management in the context of organizational sustainability: A systematic review and research agenda. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *430*(12), 139713. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2023.139713

Kabir, I., Gunu, U., & Gwadabe, Z. L. (2023). Decent work environment and work-life balance: Empirical analysis of banking sector of hostile environments. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, *44*(2), 297–312. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10834-022-09843-2

Khanra, S., Kaur, P., Joseph, R. P., Malik, A., & Dhir, A. (2022). A resource-based view of green innovation as a strategic firm resource: Present status and future directions. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, *31*(4), 1395–1413. https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.2961

Kim, S., Tam, L., Kim, J.-N., & Rhee, Y. (2017). Determinants of employee turnover intention: Understanding the roles of organizational justice, supervisory justice, authoritarian organizational culture and organization-employee relationship quality. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, *22*(3), 308–328. https://doi.org/10.1108/CCIJ-11-2016-0074

Kim, T. T., Kim, W. G., Majeed, S., & Haldorai, K. (2023). Does green human resource management lead to a green competitive advantage? A sequential mediation model with three mediators. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, *111*, 103486. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2023.103486

Kock, N., & Lynn, G. S. (2012). Lateral collinearity and misleading results in variance-based SEM: An illustration and recommendations. *Journal of the Association for Information Systems*, *13*(7), 546–580. https://doi.org/10.17705/1jais.00302

Le, T. T., Vo, X. V., & Venkatesh, V. G. (2022). Role of green innovation and supply chain management in driving sustainable corporate performance. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *374*, 133875. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2022.133875

Mensah, L. E., Shukla, S., & Iqbal, H. F. (2023). Green human resource management practices and employee innovative behaviour: Reflection from Ghana. *IIMBG Journal of Sustainable Business and Innovation*, *1*(1), 58–74. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSBI-02-2023-0002

Na-Nan, K., Chaiprasit, K., & Pukkeeree, P. (2018). Factor analysis-validated comprehensive employee job performance scale. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, *35*(10), 2436–2449. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJQRM-06-2017-0117

Ng, C., Wider, W., Yang, C., Jiang, L., Vasudevan, A., Bhandari, P., & Lee, H. P. T. (2024). Keys factor affecting employee performance in the banking sector: A Delphi study. *Cogent Business & Management*, *11*(1), 2409942. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2024.2409942

Ogiemwonyi, O., Alam, M. N., & Alotaibi, H. S. (2023). Pathways toward environmental performance: Link between green human resource management, green innovation, and green behavior at work in manufacturing companies. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *425*(11), 138949. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2023.138949

Ouakouak, M. L., & Ouedraogo, N. (2017). Antecedents of Employee Creativity and Organisational Innovation: An Empirical Study. *International Journal of Innovation Management*, *21*(07), 1750060. https://doi.org/10.1142/S1363919617500608

Oubrich, M., Hakmaoui, A., Benhayoun, L., Solberg Söilen, K., & Abdulkader, B. (2021). Impacts of leadership style, organizational design and HRM practices on knowledge hiding: The indirect roles of organizational justice and competitive work environment. *Journal of Business Research*, *137*, 488–499. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2021.08.045

Patwary, A. K., Yusof, M. F. M., Simpong, D. B., Ghaffar, S. F. A., & Rahman, M. K. (2023). Examining proactive pro-environmental behaviour through green inclusive leadership and green human resource management: An empirical investigation among Malaysian hotel employees. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Insights*, *6*(5), 2012–2029. https://doi.org/10.1108/JHTI-06-2022-0213

Pham, N. T., Hoang, H. T., & Phan, Q. P. T. (2019). Green human resource management: A comprehensive review and future research agenda. *International Journal of Manpower*, *41*(7), 845–878. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJM-07-2019-0350

Preacher, K. J., Rucker, D. D., & Hayes, A. F. (2007). Addressing moderated mediation hypotheses: Theory, methods, and prescriptions. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, *42*(1), 185–227. https://doi.org/10.1080/00273170701341316

Ragas, S. F. P., Tantay, F. M. A., Chua, L. J. C., & Sunio, C. M. C. (2017). Green lifestyle moderates GHRM's impact on job performance. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, *66*(7), 857–872. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPPM-04-2016-0076

Rayner, J., & Morgan, D. (2018). An empirical study of 'green ' workplace behaviours: Ability, motivation and opportunity. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, *56*(1), 56–78. https://doi.org/10.1111/1744-7941.12151

Raza, S. A., & Khan, K. A. (2022). Impact of green human resource practices on hotel environmental performance: The moderating effect of environmental knowledge and individual green values. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, *34*(6), 2154–2175. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-05-2021-0553

Ren, S., Tang, G., & E. Jackson, S. (2018). Green human resource management research in emergence: A review and future directions. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, *35*(3), 769–803. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10490-017-9532-1

Renwick, D. W. S., Redman, T., & Maguire, S. (2013). Green human resource management: A review and research agenda*. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, *15*(1), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2370.2011.00328.x

Røssberg, J. I., Eiring, Ø., & Friis, S. (2004). Work environment and job satisfaction - A psychometric evaluation of the Working Environment Scale-10. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, *39*(7), 576–580. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00127-004-0791-z

Saeed, B. B., Afsar, B., Hafeez, S., Khan, I., Tahir, M., & Afridi, M. A. (2019). Promoting employee's proenvironmental behavior through green human resource management practices. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, *26*(2), 424–438. https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.1694

Sarıköse, S., & Göktepe, N. (2022). Effects of nurses' individual, professional and work environment characteristics on job performance. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, *31*(5-6), 633–641. https://doi.org/10.1111/jocn.15921

Scott, S. G., & Bruce, R. A. (1994). Determinants of innovative behavior: A path model of individual innovation in the workplace. *Academy of Management Journal*, *37*(3), 580–607. https://doi.org/10.2307/256701

Shanker, R., Bhanugopan, R., van der Heijden, B. I. J. M., & Farrell, M. (2017). Organizational climate for innovation and organizational performance: The mediating effect of innovative work behavior. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *100*, 67–77. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2017.02.004

Soleh, S., & Noor, J. (2021). Islamic rural bank performance model in Indonesia. *Jurnal Keuangan Dan Perbankan*, *25*(2), 367–378. https://doi.org/10.26905/jkdp.v25i2.5281

Tang, G., Chen, Y., Jiang, Y., Paillé, P., & Jia, J. (2018). Green human resource management practices: Scale development and validity. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, *56*(1), 31–55. https://doi.org/10.1111/1744-7941.12147

Tanova, C., & Bayighomog, S. W. (2022). Green human resource management in service industries: The construct, antecedents, consequences, and outlook. *The Service Industries Journal*, *42*(5-6), 412–452. https://doi.org/10.1080/02642069.2022.2045279

Verburg, R. M., Hartog, D. N. D., & Koopman, P. L. (2007). Configurations of human resource management practices: A model and test of internal fit. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *18*(2), 184–208. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585190601102349

Vuong, B. N., Tushar, H., & Hossain, S. F. A. (2023). The effect of social support on job performance through organizational commitment and innovative work behavior: Does innovative climate matter? *Asia-Pacific Journal of Business Administration*, *15*(5), 832–854. https://doi.org/10.1108/APJBA-06-2021-0256

Wei, H., Sewell, K. A., Woody, G., & Rose, M. A. (2018). The state of the science of nurse work environments in the United States: A systematic review. *International Journal of Nursing Sciences*, *5*(3), 287–300. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnss.2018.04.010

Welbourne, T. M., Johnson, D. E., & Erez, A. (1998). The role-based performance scale: Validity analysis of a theory-based measure. *Academy of Management Journal*, *41*(5), 540–555. https://doi.org/10.5465/256941

Yasir, M., Majid, A., Yasir, M., & Qudratullah, H. (2020). Promoting environmental performance in manufacturing industry of developing countries through environmental orientation and green business strategies. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *275*, 123003. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.123003

Zhou, Y., Shu, C., Jiang, W., & Gao, S. (2019). Green management, firm innovations, and environmental turbulence. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, *28*(4), 567–581. https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.2265