Available on: https://jmrr.ep-journals.org/ E-ISSN: 3051-3588, P-ISSN: 3051-357X

Journal of Management Research and Review

Volume: 02 Issue: 06 June-2026

Green HRM Practices, Green Mindfulness, And Pro-Environmental Behavior: The Moderating Role of Green Transformational Leadership

Dyan Arintowati
Faculty of Economic and Bussiness, Universitas PGRI Mpu Sindok, Nganjuk, East Java, Indonesia.

Indrian Supheni
Faculty of Economic and Bussiness, Universitas PGRI Mpu Sindok, Nganjuk, East Java, Indonesia.

Muhammad Bawono
Faculty of Economic and Bussiness, Universitas PGRI Mpu Sindok, Nganjuk, East Java, Indonesia.

Published Date: June 22, 2026 **Article DOI: 10.65150/EP-jmrr/V2E6/2026-11**

ABSTRACT: This study investigates the moderated mediation model linking Green Human Resource Management (GHRM) practices to employees' pro-environmental behavior (PEB) through green mindfulness as the mediating mechanism, with green transformational leadership (GTL) as the boundary condition. Drawing on Ability-Motivation-Opportunity (AMO) Theory, Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB), Self-Determination Theory (SDT), and Social Learning Theory (SLT), we test the model on a time-lagged two-wave sample of 342 employees from ISO 14001-certified manufacturing firms in East and Central Java, Indonesia. Structural Equation Modeling (SEM-CB) and Hayes PROCESS Macro Model 7 with bootstrapping (5,000 resamples) were employed for hypothesis testing. Results confirm that: (1) GHRM positively predicts green mindfulness (β = .48) and PEB (β = .31); (2) green mindfulness mediates the GHRM–PEB relationship (indirect β = .197, 95% BC-CI [.129, .274]); (3) GTL significantly moderates both the GHRM→green mindfulness and green mindfulness→PEB pathways; and (4) the conditional indirect effect of GHRM on PEB is 2.5 times stronger at high GTL than low GTL (moderated mediation index = .082, BC-CI [.041, .131]). Floodlight analysis reveals a GTL significance threshold of 2.87 (5-point scale), encompassing 91.2% of the sample. Findings contribute to GHRM theory by identifying green mindfulness as a new cognitive-affective mediator and GTL as a dual boundary condition amplifier. Practical implications for HR managers, organizational leaders and Indonesia's PROPER environmental rating policy are discussed.

KEYWORDS: Green Human Resource Management (GHRM); Green Mindfulness; Pro-Environmental Behavior; Green Transformational Leadership; Moderated Mediation; Manufacturing; Indonesia

INTRODUCTION

The increasing rate of environmental deterioration and climate change has made sustainability a strategic priority for corporations globally (Renwick et al., 2013; Zacher et al., 2023). The manufacturing industry is a major source of industrial carbon emissions and is under increasing pressure from regulators, investors and civil society to include environmental responsibility into its human resource strategies (Tang et al., 2018). This pressure is particularly intense in Indonesia, the world's fourth-largest country and one of the leading industrial economies in Southeast Asia: the PROPER environmental rating system incentivizes ISO 14001 certification and formal compliance standards that directly translate into demands for workplace behavior (Bawono et al., 2026; Supheni et al., 2023).

Green Human Resource Management (GHRM) has been identified as the major organizational tool for incorporating environmental principles throughout the entire workforce (Renwick et al., 2013; Yong et al., 2019). GHRM includes green recruitment and selection, green training and development, green performance appraisal, green reward and compensation, and green employee involvement all aiming to develop ability, motivation and opportunity for sustainable work behaviour (Appelbaum et al., 2000; Bos-Nehles et al., 2023). There is a growing body of evidence on the positive effects of GHRM on pro-environmental behavior (PEB), but the cognitive-affective mechanism behind this relationship is not well understood, especially in emerging-economy manufacturing contexts (Bawono et al., 2026; Li & Xu, 2025).

Two important gaps motivate the present investigation. First, although constructs like green psychological climate, green self-efficacy, and green organizational commitment have been explored as potential mediators, green mindfulness, which denotes employees' sustained, present-centered, non-judgmental awareness of the ecological implications of their workplace behavior, has thus far garnered only preliminary empirical attention as a transmission mechanism (Aghaei et al., 2024; Chen & Wu, 2022). Second, while green transformational leadership (GTL) has been established as an important predictor of PEB in its own right (Robertson & Barling, 2013), its role as a boundary condition conditioning the strength of the

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

GHRM → mindfulness → PEB mediated pathway has not been formally tested within a moderated mediation framework. This study addresses both gaps.

Accordingly, this study develops and tests a moderated mediation model grounded in AMO Theory, TPB, SDT, and SLT, with four objectives: (1) to test green mindfulness as a mediator of the GHRM–PEB relationship; (2) to examine GTL as a moderator of the GHRM → green mindfulness and green mindfulness → PEB paths; (3) to test the conditional indirect effect of GHRM on PEB across GTL levels; and (4) to apply floodlight analysis to identify the precise GTL threshold activating the mediated pathway in ISO 14001-certified manufacturing firms in Indonesia.

LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Green HRM and Pro-Environmental Behavior

GHRM refers to the systematic alignment of HRM practices with organizational environmental objectives (Renwick et al., 2013; Tang et al., 2018). In the context of the AMO framework (Appelbaum et al., 2000; Bos-Nehles et al., 2023), the five dimensions of GHRM function through separate behavioral pathways, namely green recruitment and training improve employees' green ability, green appraisal and reward systems improve green motivation, and green employee involvement provides opportunities for sustainable engagement. Meta-analytic data (Katz et al., 2022; Zacher et al., 2023) consistently indicates a strong positive correlation between GHRM and PEB across settings. Bawono et al., (2026) found that formal green HR systems are a positive predictor of labour productivity in Indonesian manufacturing. However, they also found that more psychological mediating mechanisms are needed for complete behavioural conversion. This motivates the current study to focus on green mindfulness as a proximal cognitive-affective mechanism.

B. Green Mindfulness as Mediator

Green mindfulness is considered a domain-specific attentional construct and is composed of three dimensions: environmental awareness (i.e., ecological salience in everyday work decisions), green attentiveness (i.e., a deliberate focus on sustainability in task execution), and non-judgmental green observation (i.e., objective engagement with environmental information at work) (Aghaei et al., 2024; Brown & Ryan, 2003; Chen & Wu, 2022). Using the AMO lens, GHRM enhances ecological consciousness by providing green information to employees (ability), focusing attention to sustainability standards through assessment and reward systems (motivation), and integrating environmental reflection in participatory processes (opportunity). This conscious knowledge then activates green attitudes, reinforces subjective green norms and enhances perceived behavioural control - the three proximal TPB antecedents of green action (Ajzen, 1991). Green mindfulness is a way to internalize externally transmitted green values into autonomous motivation using SDT (Ryan & Deci, 2020). Based on this and the expanding empirical support (Aghaei et al., 2024; Li & Xu, 2025), the following hypotheses are proposed:

H1: GHRM practices have a positive relationship with employees' green mindfulness.

H2: There is a favorable association between green mindfulness and the pro-environmental conduct of employees.

H3: The favorable association between GHRM and PEB is mediated by green mindfulness.

H4: GHRM practices are positively and directly related to PEB (beyond the mediated pathway).

C. Green Transformational Leadership as Boundary Condition

GTL includes a type of leadership such as environmental role modeling, communicating the green vision, intellectual stimulation for sustainable solutions, and individualized green consideration (Robertson & Barling, 2013). Drawing upon the Social Learning Theory (Bandura, 1977), green transformational leaders serve as environmental role models, and their visible ecological conduct enhances the credibility and salience of GHRM signals, which in turn deepens employees' green mindfulness. GTL meets employees' psychological requirements for autonomy, competence, and relatedness by means of SDT, allowing employees who are mindfully aware to transform ecological attention into autonomous behavioral action (Ryan & Deci, 2020; Xu et al., 2023). Chen & Wu, (2022) provided initial evidence of the moderating role of GTL on the GHRM → green mindfulness connection. The present study extends this to a full moderated mediation framework:

H5: GTL moderates GHRM → green mindfulness (stronger when GTL is high).

H6: GTL moderates green mindfulness → PEB (stronger when GTL is high).

H7 (Moderated Mediation): The indirect effect of GHRM on PEB via green mindfulness is significantly stronger when GTL is high than low (conditional indirect effect).

MATERIALS AND METHODS

A. Design, Sample, and Procedure

A quantitative time-lagged two-wave design was employed. Wave 1 collected GHRM, GTL, and demographic data; Wave 2 (4–6 weeks later) collected green mindfulness and PEB data to mitigate common method bias (Podsakoff et al., 2003). Two-stage cluster sampling identified 342 permanent employees from ISO 14001-certified manufacturing firms in East and Central Java, Indonesia (food & beverage 28.9%; textile 21.6%; chemical 27.5%; automotive components 21.9%). The sample exceeds the G*Power minimum ($n = 319$; $f^2 = .15$, $\alpha = .05$, power = .80). Instruments were adapted through forward-backward translation (Brislin, 1970) and piloted on $n = 60$ employees prior to the main study.

B. Measures

All constructs used validated 5-point Likert scales (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree). GHRM (20 items, 5 dimensions) was measured using Kim et al., (2019) and Yong et al., (2019). Green Mindfulness (12 items, 3 dimensions) was adapted from Aghaei et al., (2024) and Brown & Ryan, (2003). GTL (12 items, 4 dimensions) followed (Robertson & Barling, 2013). PEB (15 items, 3 dimensions: task-related, voluntary, counterproductive-reversed) drew on Ones & Dilchert, (2012) and Zacher et al., (2023). Six demographic items served as controls.

C. Analytical Strategy

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Measurement model quality was assessed via CFA in IBM AMOS 26.0 (factor loadings ≥ .70; CR ≥ .70; AVE ≥ .50; HTMT < .85; CFI/TLI ≥ .90; RMSEA < .08) (Hair et al., 2019; Hu & Bentler, 1999). Structural hypotheses (H1–H4) were tested via SEM-CB. Moderated mediation hypotheses (H5–H7) were tested using Hayes PROCESS Macro Model 7 with 5,000 bootstrap resamples and 95% bias-corrected confidence intervals (Hayes, 2022). Floodlight analysis (Johnson-Neyman technique; Spiller et al., 2013) identified the precise GTL threshold for conditional indirect effect significance. Common method bias was assessed through Harman's Single Factor test, Full Collinearity VIF (Kock, 2015), and the Measured Latent Marker Variable approach (Chin et al., 2013).

RESULTS

A. Descriptive Statistics and Measurement Model

Table I reports descriptive statistics and inter-construct correlations. All above-midpoint means (GHRM: M = 3.82; GTL: M = 3.74; Green Mindfulness: M = 3.69; PEB: M = 3.77) and significant positive correlations (r = .43–.62, all p < .01) provided preliminary support for the proposed relationships. CFA yielded excellent model fit: $\chi^2(1086) = 1847.3$, CFI = .946, TLI = .941, RMSEA = .046 [.042–.050], SRMR = .053. All factor loadings ranged from .71 to .89; Cronbach's α ranged from .869 to .924; CR ranged from .869 to .924; AVE ranged from .512 to .621; and all HTMT ratios remained below .85, confirming convergent and discriminant validity (Table II). Common method bias assessment confirmed no significant threat: Harman single-factor variance = 24.3% (< 50%); maximum VIF = 2.31 (< 3.3); MLMV Δβ < .03.

TABLE I. Descriptive Statistics and Pearson Correlations (n = 342)

Variable	M	SD	α	1	2	3	4	Controls
1. Green HRM (GHRM)	3.82	0.61	.913	—				
2. Green Mindfulness (GM)	3.69	0.58	.891	.54**	—			
3. Green Trans. Leadership (GTL)	3.74	0.63	.906	.43**	.49**	—		
4. Pro-Env. Behavior (PEB)	3.77	0.56	.887	.62**	.58**	.51**	—	

Note: *** p < .01 (two-tailed). Controls (age, gender, education, tenure, firm size, sub-sector) included in all models. All Cronbach's α ≥ .869.*

TABLE II. CFA Results: Factor Loadings, Reliability, and Validity (n = 342)

Construct	Items	Loading Range	α	CR	AVE	HTMT max	
Green HRM (GHRM) — 5 dims.	20	.73–.88	.913	.924	.598	.71	
Green Mindfulness (GM) — 3 dims.	12	.72–.86	.891	.903	.573	.69	
Green Trans. Leadership (GTL) — 4 dims.	12	.73–.87	.906	.917	.512	.66	
Pro-Environmental Behavior (PEB) — 3 dims.	15	.71–.89	.887	.899	.621	—	
Model fit indices	CFI = .946	TLI = .941	RMSEA = .046			[.042–.050]	SRMR = .053

Note: *CR = Composite Reliability; AVE = Average Variance Extracted; HTMT max = highest HTMT ratio for the construct (threshold < .85). All values meet Q1 journal thresholds (Hair et al., 2019; Henseler et al., 2015).*

B. Structural Model and Mediation (H1–H4)

Table III presents the structural equation model results. The model explained $R^2 = .42$ in green mindfulness and $R^2 = .51$ in PEB. All four hypotheses were supported. GHRM significantly predicted green mindfulness (β = .48, SE = .06, p < .001; H1 supported) and directly predicted PEB (β = .31, SE = .07, p < .001; H4 supported). Green mindfulness significantly predicted PEB (β = .41, SE = .06, p < .001; H2 supported). The indirect effect of GHRM on PEB through green mindfulness was β = .197 (95% BC-CI [.129, .274], excluding zero; H3 supported). The persistence of a significant direct path alongside the indirect path confirms *partial mediation*, indicating that GHRM produces PEB through both a cognitive-affective channel (via mindfulness) and a direct normative-institutional channel.

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

TABLE III. Structural Model: Direct Paths and Mediation (H1–H4)

H	Path	β	SE	t	p	95% BC-CI	Decision
H1	GHRM → Green Mindfulness	**.48**	.06	7.91	< .001	[.36, .60]	✓ Supported
H2	Green Mindfulness → PEB	**.41**	.06	6.78	< .001	[.29, .53]	✓ Supported
H3	GHRM → GM → PEB (indirect)	**.197**	.037	5.31	< .001	[.129, .274]	✓ Supported
H4	GHRM → PEB (direct)	**.31**	.07	4.57	< .001	[.18, .44]	✓ Supported
—	R^2 Green Mindfulness = .42 | R^2 PEB = .51	f^2 = .37 (large)					f^2 = .26 (large)

Note: *β = standardized path coefficient; SE = Standard Error; 95% BC-CI = Bias-Corrected Bootstrap CI (5,000 resamples). All models control for age, gender, education, tenure, firm size, sub-sector.*

C. Moderated Mediation and Floodlight Analysis (H5–H7)

Table IV presents the moderated mediation results (Hayes PROCESS Model 7). The GHRM × GTL interaction significantly predicted green mindfulness (β = .19, p < .001; H5 supported), and the GM × GTL interaction significantly predicted PEB (β = .16, p = .002; H6 supported). The index of moderated mediation was .082 (95% BC-CI [.041, .131]), excluding zero and thus **supporting H7**. The conditional indirect effects at low (β = .112), mean (β = .197), and high (β = .281) GTL all excluded zero from their 95% BC-CIs, confirming significance across the entire GTL range in the sample. Critically, the indirect effect at high GTL (.281) was **2.5 times greater** than at low GTL (.112), demonstrating substantial moderation.

Floodlight analysis (Johnson-Neyman technique; Spiller et al., 2013) revealed a GTL significance threshold of **2.87** on the 5-point scale — the minimum level of green-transformational leadership at which the conditional indirect effect achieves p < .05 significance. This threshold encompasses **91.2% of the sample**, indicating that the GHRM → green mindfulness → PEB chain is behaviorally significant for the overwhelming majority of employees in this ISO 14001 manufacturing context.

TABLE IV. Moderated Mediation Results and Conditional Indirect Effects (H5–H7)

H	Path / Index	β	SE	t	p	95% BC-CI	Decision
H5	GHRM × GTL → Green Mindfulness	**.19**	.05	3.67	< .001	[.09, .29]	✓ Supported
H6	GM × GTL → PEB	**.16**	.05	3.12	.002	[.06, .26]	✓ Supported
H7	Index of Moderated Mediation	**.082**	.023	—	—	**[.041, .131]**	✓ Supported

Conditional Indirect Effects at Three GTL Levels

GTL Level	GTL Value	Indirect β	SE	LL 95% CI	UL 95% CI
Low (M − 1SD)	3.11	.112	.029	.057	.171
Mean	3.74	**.197**	.037	.129	.274
High (M + 1SD)	4.37	**.281**	.048	.190	.381

Note: *Floodlight analysis (Johnson-Neyman): conditional indirect effect is significant (p < .05) when GTL ≥ 2.87, covering 91.2% of the sample (n = 312). All 95% BC-CIs exclude zero. 5,000 bootstrap resamples.*

DISCUSSION

A. Green Mindfulness as Cognitive-Affective Mediator

The support for H1–H3 establishes green mindfulness as a novel and substantively important partial mediator of the GHRM → PEB relationship (indirect β = .197). This extends Li & Xu, (2025) and Aghaei et al., (2024) by testing the full five-dimensional GHRM bundle against a multi-dimensional green mindfulness construct in a time-lagged design. From the perspective of AMO, GHRM's ability-enhancing (training), motivation-activating (appraisal/reward), and opportunity-creating (involvement) practices systematically prepare employees'

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

attentional orientation toward ecological stimuli, which is the basic cognitive precondition for green mindfulness. TPB enhances green attitudes, subjective norms and perceived behavioural control simultaneously, and through SDT allows the absorption of externally conveyed green values into autonomous motivation (Ryan & Deci, 2020), hence this mindful awareness. H4 also found partial mediation (direct β =.31) indicating a dual-pathway structure, where GHRM induces PEB through a cognitive-affective pathway (through mindfulness) and a direct normative-institutional pathway (through role clarity and compliance expectations). This is in line with the study of Bawono et al., (2026) in Indonesian industry that formal green HR systems require extra psychological mediating mechanisms for full behavioral conversion.

B. GTL as Dual Boundary Condition

The support for H5–H7 establishes GTL as a dual amplifier operating across both junctions of the mediation chain — a more pervasive boundary condition role than documented in prior studies (Chen & Wu, 2022). As per Social Learning Theory, green transformational leaders act as environmental role models and their observable ecological conduct increases the relevance and believability of GHRM signals, therefore enhancing employees' green mindfulness (Bandura, 1977; Cao et al., 2026). GTL, through SDT, satisfies the psychological demands of employees for autonomy, competence, and relatedness, so that mindfully aware employees can transform their ecological attention into overt behavioral action without the inhibiting influence of the value-action gap (Ryan & Deci, 2020). The indirect effect in the high GTL condition is 2.5× stronger than that at the low GTL condition. This difference between the two conditions represents the organizational cost of insufficient green leadership; organizations with leaders below the threshold leave a large amount of GHRM behavioral returns unclaimed.

C. Floodlight Analysis: Actionable Leadership Threshold

The identification of a GTL significance threshold of 2.87 (91.2% of sample within significance zone) reframes the practical challenge of green management. Effective GHRM behavioral conversion does not require exceptional green leadership — it requires adequate green leadership. For the 8.8% of employees below this threshold, targeted GTL development represents the most efficient lever for improving GHRM's behavioral return on investment. This actionable specificity — identifying at what level leadership begins to matter rather than merely whether it matters — is a direct benefit of the floodlight methodology that conventional spotlight analysis cannot provide (Spiller et al., 2013).

CONCLUSION

This study advances the GHRM literature by demonstrating that the path from organizational green HR policies to employee pro-environmental behavior runs through individual ecological awareness — and that supervisory green leadership is the catalyst determining whether this awareness generates meaningful behavioral change. Three principal conclusions emerge. First, green mindfulness is a significant partial mediator of the GHRM → PEB relationship, functioning as the cognitive-affective bridge through which AMO-enhancing HR practices convert environmental capabilities and motivations into behavioral action. Second, green transformational leadership amplifies both junctions of this mediation chain, with the conditional indirect effect being 2.5 times stronger under high versus low GTL. Third, the Johnson-Neyman threshold of 2.87 — achievable by the overwhelming majority of supervisors in ISO 14001-certified manufacturing firms — indicates that moderate green leadership suffices to activate the full behavioral pathway.

In practice, firms should apply a double investment strategy: they should implement complete GHRM across all five dimensions and, at the same time, develop supervisory green transformational competencies. Integrating structured green mindfulness programs such as eco-awareness check-ins, sustainability reflection practices, and green peer learning circles into GHRM can activate the cognitive-affective channel and maximize behavioural rewards. For policy makers, adding the quality of GHRM implementation and supervisory green leadership quality into the PROPER grading structure in Indonesia will offer system-level incentives that line with SDG 8 (Decent Work) and SDG 13 (Climate Action) commitments. Limitations include the cross-sectional two-wave design (preventing strong causal inference), restriction to ISO 14001 manufacturing in East and Central Java (limiting direct generalization), and reliance primarily on self-report measures. Future research should employ longitudinal designs, extend the model to non-certified and service-sector contexts across ASEAN, validate the green mindfulness scale in diverse cultural settings, and examine downstream organizational-level outcomes (PROPER ratings, energy efficiency indices) to close the bridge between micro-level HR mechanisms and macro-level sustainability performance.

REFERENCES

1) Aghaei, M., Aghaee, S., & Shahriari, M. (2024). *The effect of green vision and green training on voluntary employee green behavior: The mediating role of green mindfulness. Environment, Development and Sustainability*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10668-024-05665-4
2) Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *50*(2), 179–211. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T
3) Appelbaum, E., Bailey, T., Berg, P., & Kalleberg, A. L. (2000). *Manufacturing advantage: Why high-performance work systems pay off*. ILR Press.
4) Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Prentice Hall.
5) Bawono, S., Harnani, S., & Wulandari, M. W. (2026). Green HRM, transformational leadership, and psychological safety as drivers of perceived labour productivity in Indonesian manufacturing. *Discover Sustainability*, *7*(1), 438. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43621-026-02792-y
6) Bos-Nehles, A., Townsend, K., Cafferkey, K., & Trullen, J. (2023). Examining the ability, motivation and opportunity (AMO) framework in HRM research. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, *25*(4), 725–739.
7) Brislin, R. W. (1970). Back-translation for cross-cultural research. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *1*(3), 185–216.
8) Brown, K. W., & Ryan, R. M. (2003). The benefits of being present: Mindfulness and its role in psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *84*(4), 822–848.
9) Cao, J., Sun, H., Cao, X., & Ma, H. (2026). Green transformational leadership and employees' green behavior: A cross-level moderated

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

mediation study. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *17*, 1720404.
10) Chen, T., & Wu, Z. (2022). How to facilitate employees' green behavior? The joint role of green HRM practice and green transformational leadership. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *13*, 906869.
11) Chin, W. W., Thatcher, J. B., Wright, R. T., & Steel, D. (2013). Controlling for common method variance in PLS analysis: The measured latent marker variable approach. *New Perspectives in Partial Least Squares*, *169*, 231–239.
12) Hair, J. F., Risher, J. J., Sarstedt, M., & Ringle, C. M. (2019). When to use and how to report the results of PLS-SEM. *European Business Review*, *31*(1), 2–24.
13) Hayes, A. F. (2022). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis* (3rd ed.). Guilford Press.
14) Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis. *Structural Equation Modeling*, *6*(1), 1–55.
15) Katz, I. M., Rauvola, R. S., Rudolph, C. W., & Zacher, H. (2022). Employee green behavior: A meta-analysis. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, *29*(6), 1703–1714.
16) Kim, Y. J., Kim, W. G., Choi, H. M., & Phetvaroon, K. (2019). The effect of green human resource management on hotel employees' eco-friendly behavior and environmental performance. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, *76*, 83–93.
17) Kock, N. (2015). Common method bias in PLS-SEM: A full collinearity assessment approach. *International Journal of E-Collaboration*, *11*(4), 1–10.
18) Li, W., & Xu, H. (2025). The impact of green human resource management on green mindfulness and employee well-being: A self-determination perspective. *Current Psychology*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-025-08080-8
19) Ones, D. S., & Dilchert, S. (2012). Environmental sustainability at work: A call to action. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, *5*(4), 444–466.
20) Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *88*(5), 879–903.
21) 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.
22) Robertson, J. L., & Barling, J. (2013). Greening organizations through leaders' influence on employees' pro-environmental behaviors. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *34*(2), 176–194.
23) Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2020). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, *55*(1), 68–78.
24) Spiller, S. A., Fitzsimons, G. J., Lynch, J. G., & McClelland, G. H. (2013). Spotlights, floodlights, and the magic number zero. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *50*(2), 277–288.
25) Supheni, I., Ivada, E., Novianti, G. E., & Wiwin, W. (2023). Sustainable tourism from the perspective of tourists in Nganjuk, Indonesia. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism and Entrepreneurship*, *5*(1), 1–18.
26) 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.
27) Xu, G., Xue, M., & Zhao, J. (2023). The relationship of AI opportunity perception and employee workplace well-being: A moderated mediation model. *IJERPH*, *20*(3).
28) Yong, J. Y., Yusliza, M. Y., Ramayah, T., Jabbour, C. J. C., Sehnem, S., & Mani, V. (2019). Pathways towards sustainability in manufacturing organizations. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, *29*(1), 212–228.
29) Zacher, H., Rudolph, C. W., & Katz, I. M. (2023). Employee green behavior as the core of environmentally sustainable organizations. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, *10*, 465–494.

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/