EPH-International Journal of Business & Management Science

GREEN HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AND WORKPLACE ATTRACTIVENESS: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF SERVICE AND MANUFACTURING SECTOR EMPLOYEES

Dr. Kiransinh Natwarsinh Rajput

Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology
Government Arts College Shahera, Panchmahal, Gujarat (India)
E-mail Id: kiran.rajput2902@gmail.com
ORCID- https://orcid.org/0009-0009-2158-4707

Received : 2026-04-17
Revised : 2026-05-28
Accepted : 2026-05-07
Published : 2026-06-17

Abstract
Environmental sustainability has appeared as a strategic organizational priority, leading firms to increasingly integrate Green Human Resource Management practices into their human resource systems. The present study focused on the effect of Green Human Resource Management on the attractiveness of the workplace among employees from manufacturing and service industries, as well as the mediation of perceived organizational support for the environment. A cross-sectional quantitative research design was used and data was gathered with 240 full-time employees of whom 120 were from manufacturing and 120 were from service organizations from India. This study used hierarchical regression analysis, Structural Equation Modeling and Multi-Group Analysis on SPSS 28 and SmartPLS 4. The results showed that the Green Human Resource Management has a significant indirect effect on workplace attractiveness through the partial mediation by perceived organizational support for the environment ($\beta = 0.29$, $p < 0.001$), and an important direct effect ($\beta = 0.51$, $p < 0.01$). Furthermore, sectoral comparison indicated that the total effect of Green Human Resource Management on workplace attractiveness was stronger in manufacturing ($\beta = 0.53$) than in services ($\beta = 0.38$). The study concludes that sector-sensitive implementation of GHRM practices is essential for strengthening workplace attractiveness and sustainability-oriented employer branding.

Keywords: *Green Human Resource Management; Workplace Attractiveness; Perceived Organizational Support for the Environment; Sustainability; Employer Branding*

Vol. 12 Issue 3s (June, 2026)
ISSN: 2208-2190 Pages- 21-30
DOI: https://doi.org/10.69980/xqdxqh05

1. Introduction

Organizations around the globe are prioritizing environmental sustainability as the growing ecological issues, stakeholder demands, and sustainability regulations continue to influence organizational behaviors. To address these trends, companies are adopting environmental goals within their management and operations to improve sustainability outcomes and the reputation of the company. Human resource management, as one of the organizational functions which can facilitate sustainability transformation, is a significant mechanism as employees are at the core of implementing sustainability practices. Therefore, Green Human Resource Management (GHRM) has fascinated a lot of research and management interest recently. The term GHRM means that Environmental Management is incorporated into the HRM activities of recruitment, training, performance management, reward and employee engagement. Research has revealed that firms implementing GHRM practices see a positive impact on their employees' environmental behavior, sustainability orientation, and organizational image (Ansari et al., 2021). In the same way, Darvishmotevali and Altinay (2022) found that green HR practices lead to improved environmental awareness and green behaviours of employees.

The strategic importance of GHRM is growing, and is closely related to the modern employer branding and talent attraction approaches. Today's workers are more inclined to work for companies that are actively engaged in environmental protection and social responsibility. Organizations that are environmentally responsible are seen as being ethical, progressive and socially conscious, which helps make the workplace more attractive to current and prospective employees. According to Bustamante et al. (2021), organizational values related to environmental responsibility have a positive impact on employer attractiveness, especially among younger job seekers who are more interested in working in companies with an environmental approach. Similarly, Guillot-Soulez et al. (2022) discovered that the responsible image of their organization is often seen as a more attractive feature for an organization to have, making organizations with environmentally certified status more attractive employers. According to this report, environmental stewardship is now a strategic tool to improve an organization's appeal and employee involvement in addition to being an operational concern.

In this context, green hiring, green training, green rewards, and green performance management have become important GHRM strategies that can be applied to create a sustainable company culture. Green recruitment is a way of attracting applicants who are eco-minded and green training is training employees to develop competencies in sustainable working practices. Furthermore, green rewards and environmental performance evaluation systems encourage employees to be actively involved in sustainability initiatives. This is because the practices are known to lead to improved environmental performance, along with organizational reputation and employee attraction (Merlin & Chen, 2022). Haldorai et al., (2022) also noted that when top management shows commitment to environmental sustainability, it improves the effectiveness of GHRM practices in improving the performance outcomes of the organization.

Employee perceptions of company support for environmental sustainability are another crucial aspect of GHRM. Employee perceptions of the organization's importance and support for environmental responsibility are known as perceived organizational support for the environment. When workers feel that the company is truly supporting sustainability initiatives, they are more likely to develop a positive attitude and reciprocal actions. Green organizational support has been shown to have a positive effect on employee behavioral outcomes in hospital industry by Aboramadan and Karatepe (2021). Likewise, Karatepe et al. (2022) found that perceived organizational support for the environment also positively influences green and non-green employee outcomes, which means that environmental programs are more likely to positively affect employees when they are part of organizational support systems.

Another factor is that the connection between GHRM and the attractiveness of the workplace can also differ within industrial sectors, as environmental practices vary greatly between manufacturing and service companies. Typical features of manufacturing companies are the direct use of materials, energy intensive processes, waste production and apparent environmental effects. Consequently, manufacturing environments may be operationally embedded and highly visible with regard to how they practice the environment.Therefore, manufacturing environments may be operationally embedded and highly visible in how they practice the environment. On the other hand, environmental causes in service businesses can seem less concrete as service activities expose employees to lower levels of physical environments. Ojo et al. (2022) pointed out that environmental management practices in the information technology industry are frequently not directly related to environmental activities but are implemented through behavioral and/or policy-based approaches. Likewise, Umrani et al. (2022) found that organizational culture and environmental commitment are important factors that attract employees in the service industry. The sectoral differences suggest that the

Vol. 12 Issue 3s (June, 2026)
ISSN: 2208-2190 Pages- 21-30
DOI: https://doi.org/10.69980/xqdxqh05
level of employees' satisfaction with the effectiveness of GHRM could vary depending on the operational context and the visibility of sustainability practices.
Though the number of publications in GHRM has been increasing, there are still some research gaps that have not been sufficiently addressed. First, the significance of workplace beauty as an organizational outcome has received little attention in the research, which has mostly focused on environmental performance and employee green behavior. Second, there has been comparatively little research that compares the service sector with the manufacturing sector. Third, not enough research has been done on how perceived organizational support of the environment mediates the association between GHRM and workplace attractiveness. Additionally, employee perceptions of organizational identity and value alignment (Younis & Hammad, 2021) is another factor that affects organizational attractiveness besides corporate image. The restrictions suggest the need for a more extensive analysis of the psychological and contextual factors associated between GHRM and the attractiveness of the workplace.
By examining the relationship between GHRM and workplace attractiveness, examining the mediating function of perceived organizational support for the environment, and contrasting the variations between the two sectors (manufacturing vs. service), the current study seeks to close these gaps. GHRM is a positive organizational signal that will raise employees' perceptions of environmental commitment and organizational attractiveness, according to the study's signaling theory and social exchange theory.

The objectives of the study are:
1. To examine how Green HRM affects the workplace's appeal to employees in the manufacturing and service industries
2. To investigate how PORS mediates the association between workplace attractiveness and GHRM

1.1 Hypotheses Development
Based on the theoretical framework of social exchange theory, signaling theory, a review of the literature on green human resource management, and workplace sustainability, the following hypotheses were created for the study:
H1: Green Human Resource Management positively influences workplace attractiveness.
H2: Green HRM positively affects perceived environmental support of the organization (POSE).
H3: Perceived organizational support of the environment positively affects the attractiveness of the place of work.
H4: Green human resource management and workplace appeal are mediated by perceived organizational environmental support.
H5: Green HRM has a more positive impact on workplace attractiveness in the manufacturing industry than in the service industry.

2.Methodology
2.1 Research Design
The present study used a cross-sectional, quantitative design to examine the connection between GHRM and workplace attractiveness among workers in the manufacturing and service industries. Along with examining the variations in the relationships between each variable and the other variables across the sectors, the study also investigated the mediating role of POSE. Survey-based approach was chosen as it was suitable for the study objective of obtaining uniform responses on employees' perception of green practices, environmental supports and workplace attractiveness. The data were collected in India from January to March 2025. The study was conducted with employees from both service and manufacturing based organizations so that a comparison could be made between the two.

2.2 Sample and Data Collection
Responses were obtained using purposive sampling technique from the full time employees of service and manufacturing organizations. To ensure that the respondents had sufficient knowledge of the HR practices and environmental initiatives within their organizations, they had to have at least one year of work experience. The initial sample of 280 responses was gathered by sending the questionnaires online via professional networks and HR contacts. The responses were screened for incomplete and inconsistent responses and 240 usable responses were retained for final analysis. The final sample comprised 120 employees from service sectors (such as information technology, banking and hospitality) and 120 employees from manufacturing sectors such as automotive, textile, electronics, etc.).

Vol. 12 Issue 3s (June, 2026)
ISSN: 2208-2190 Pages- 21-30
DOI: https://doi.org/10.69980/xqdxqh05
The mean age was 33.8 years (range 22-57 years). The male respondents made up 56% of the sample and 44% were female respondents. The average time spent in the organization was 4.7 years.

2.3 Measurement Instruments
Scales that have been previously validated in the literature were used to measure all research variables. A 5-point Likert scale, with 1 denoting strongly disagree and 5 denoting strongly agree, was used to code each measurement item.

Green Human Resource Management (GHRM)
The GHRM was assessed with a 12-item scale that was adapted from Dumont et al. (2017). The scale measured employees' perceptions of the integration of environmental sustainability into the HR functions of their respective organizations, including recruiting, training, performance management, and rewards. One of the sample items included: “My organization takes environmental knowledge into account when hiring. The scale's internal consistency reliability was demonstrated by its Cronbach's alpha of 0.88.

Perceived Organizational Support for the Environment (POSE)
The perceived organizational support for the environment was assessed by a 5-item scale adapted from Lamm et al. (2015). The instrument assessed the employees' perception of the support and commitment of the organization towards the environmental protection and sustainability initiatives. Sample item added: "My organization really appreciates my work on protecting the environment. The Cronbach's alpha for the scale was 0.86.

Workplace Attractiveness
The attractiveness of the workplace was measured on a 6-item scale adapted from Berthon et al., (2005). The scale examined how much workers thought the workplace was respectable and the company had a good reputation. One sample item was: “I would like to work here as it has a good reputation with environmental issues on my CV.” The Cronbach’s alpha value for the scale was 0.90.

Control Variables
The age, gender and organizational tenure were involved as control variables in the study. The variables were controlled as prior studies have suggested that these variables can affect employee perceptions, attitudes at work and sustainability-related behaviors.

2.4 Analytical Strategy
The study tested the hypotheses under discussion using a two-stage analytical approach. Initially, descriptive statistics, reliability analysis, correlation analysis, and hierarchical regression analysis were analyzed using SPSS version 28. The study variables' mean values and standard deviations were calculated using descriptive statistics, and the link between constructs was investigated using correlation analysis.
The direct effect of GHRM on workplace attractiveness and the incremental explanatory power of the environment by perceived organizational support were analyzed using the hierarchical regression model.
Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) was carried out in the second step using SmartPLS 4 software. SEM was used to assess the mediation of perceived organizational support for the environment and to investigate both direct and indirect connections simultaneously. Factor loading, composite reliability, average variance extracted (AVE), and discriminant validity were evaluated for the measurement model.
In addition, a Multi-Group Analysis (MGA) was completed to identify the differences in structure between service sector employees and manufacturing sector employees. The MGA procedure allowed for the study to find out if there were significant variations in the relationships between GHRM, POSE, and workplace attractiveness based on the sectoral context.

3. Results
3.1 Descriptive Statistics and Correlations
The association between GHRM, POSE, and Workplace Attractiveness (WPA) was examined using correlation analysis and descriptive statistics. Table 1 displays each study variable's mean, standard deviation, and correlation coefficient. Strong positive connections between the three constructs were found in the results, which offered initial support for the suggested relationships.
The overall mean score for GHRM was 3.51 (SD = 0.76) which is considered moderate level of agreement

Vol. 12 Issue 3s (June, 2026)
ISSN: 2208-2190 Pages- 21-30
DOI: https://doi.org/10.69980/xqdxqh05
between employees about the implementation of environmentally responsible HR practices in their organizations. Employees' general perception of organizational support toward environmental sustainability was positively stated as the mean score of 3.58 (SD = 0.80) was reported by POSE. The mean value for the workplace attractiveness was 3.46 (SD = 0.83). Strong positive connection between the variables was indicated by the correlation coefficients, which ranged from 0.58 to 0.62 and were statistically significant at the 0.01 level.

Table 1. Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations Among Study Variables (N = 240)

Variable	Mean	SD	1	2	3
1. Green HRM	3.51	0.76	(0.88)		
2. Perceived Organizational Support for the Environment	3.58	0.80	.61**	(0.86)	
3. Workplace Attractiveness	3.46	0.83	.58**	.62**	(0.90)

Note: Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients are presented in parentheses along the diagonal. $p < .01$ (two-tailed).

According to the correlation research, employees' perceptions of the workplace's attractiveness and environmental support are positively correlated with the degree of GHRM activities. In addition, the reliability coefficients were above the recommended 0.70 indicating satisfactory internal consistency for all constructs.

3.2 Hierarchical Regression Analysis

The predictive link between GHRM and workplace attractiveness was tested using a hierarchical regression analysis, and the mediating effect of the environment considered as supportive of the workplace was assessed. Three models were used for analysis in which workplace attractiveness was the dependent variable.

Control variables were added to model 1, which included age, gender, and tenure. These demographic variables accounted for 1% of the variance in the workplace attractiveness ($R^2 = 0.01$) and none of the variables were statistically significant. For model 2, green HRM was added in the regression equation. The addition of GHRM raised the explained variance to 32% ($R^2 = 0.32$), and the GHRM showed an important positive relationship with the workplace attractiveness ($\beta = 0.51$, $p < 0.01$). This finding was in line with Hypothesis 1.

POSE was added as another predictor to model 3. The explained variance increased further to 47% ($R^2 = 0.47$). The regression coefficient for GHRM was reduced from 0.51 to 0.29, but was still statistically significant, and POSE had an important positive relationship with workplace attractiveness ($\beta = 0.44$, $p < 0.01$). Partial mediation was suggested by the reduction in the direct effect of GHRM when POSE was included.

The results shown in Table 2 suggest that the three regression models added significantly to the explanatory power of the models, with the GHRM and POSE being important predictors of workplace attractiveness.

Table 2. Hierarchical Regression Results for Workplace Attractiveness (N = 240)

Predictor	Model 1 (β)	Model 2 (β)	Model 3 (β)	VIF
Age	0.06	0.04	0.03	1.15
Gender	0.03	0.02	0.02	1.08
Tenure	0.05	0.04	0.03	1.20
Green HRM		0.51**	0.29**	1.62
Perceived Organizational Support for the Environment			0.44**	1.65
R^2	0.01	0.32	0.47	
ΔR^2		0.31**	0.15**	

Note: Standardized regression coefficients (β) are reported. $p < .01$.

Variance inflation factor (VIF) values were found between 1.08 and 1.65, which is still below the VIF limit of 5.0. So, there was no consideration of multicollinearity in the regression models.

3.3 Measurement Model Assessment

The measurement model was evaluated using factor loadings, composite reliability (CR), average variance extracted (AVE), and discriminant validity metrics. All of the indicator loading values were higher than the

Vol. 12 Issue 3s (June, 2026)
ISSN: 2208-2190 Pages- 21-30
DOI: https://doi.org/10.69980/xqdxqh05
suggested value of 0.70, indicating the reliability of the indicators. Good build reliability was indicated by composite reliability ratings between 0.87 and 0.93.
The AVE values for every construct were higher than the 0.50 minimum acceptable criteria, indicating strong convergent validity. Specifically, the GHRM, POSE, and workplace attractiveness AVE scores were 0.61, 0.67, and 0.70, respectively. The discriminant validity was assessed using the Heterotrait–Monotrait (HTMT) ratio criterion; all HTMT values below 0.85 indicated good discriminant validity among constructs.



HTMT Ratio (Heterotrait–Monotrait)

	GHRM	POSE	Workplace Attractiveness (WPA)
Green HRM (GHRM)	–	0.72	0.76
Perceived Organizational Support for the Environment (POSE)	0.72	–	0.74
Workplace Attractiveness (WPA)	0.76	0.74	–

Note: All HTMT values are below the threshold of 0.85, indicating adequate discriminant validity.

Figure 1. Measurement Model Assessment Framework

The assessment of the measurement model of the study is shown in Figure 1. The results showed that the items had satisfactory reliability and validity because all factor loadings, composite reliabilities, AVE values and HTMT ratios were within the recommended values.

3.4 Structural Equation Modelling Results

To investigate the direct and indirect correlations between the study variables, SEM was carried out with the aid of SmartPLS 4. The structural model's results are displayed in Table 3. According to the findings, POSE was strongly predicted by GHRM ($\beta = 0.61$, $t = 15.87$, $p < 0.001$), supporting Hypothesis 2. Similarly, the results confirmed Hypothesis 3 by demonstrating a substantial positive connection between POSE and workplace attractiveness ($\beta = 0.47$, $t = 10.92$, $p < 0.001$).

GHRM continued to have a statistically significant direct impact on workplace attractiveness ($\beta = 0.25$, $t = 5.31$, $p < 0.001$). Furthermore, the relationship between GHRM and workplace attractiveness was mediated by POSE, as evidenced by the statistically significant indirect effect of GHRM on workplace attractiveness through POSE ($\beta = 0.29$, $t = 7.25$, $p < 0.001$).

Table 3. Structural Equation Model Path Coefficients (N = 240)

Path	β	SE	t-value	p-value	95% CI
GHRM → POSE	0.61	0.04	15.87	< 0.001	[0.53, 0.69]
POSE → WPA	0.47	0.04	10.92	< 0.001	[0.39, 0.55]
GHRM → WPA (direct)	0.25	0.05	5.31	< 0.001	[0.15, 0.35]
GHRM → WPA (indirect via POSE)	0.29	0.04	7.25	< 0.001	[0.22, 0.36]

Note: β = standardized path coefficient; SE = standard error; CI = bias-corrected confidence interval.

The structural model explained 37% of the variance in POSE and 49% of the variance in workplace attractiveness, indicating satisfactory explanatory power for the proposed model.

Vol. 12 Issue 3s (June, 2026)
ISSN: 2208-2190 Pages- 21-30
DOI: https://doi.org/10.69980/xqdxqh05



Figure 2. Structural Model Results

Figure 2 shows the structural correlations between the variables of workplace attractiveness, perceived organizational support for the environment, and green human resource management. The findings indicate that GHRM significantly affects both POSE and workplace attractiveness, and that GHRM significantly benefits from workplace attractiveness. Through a considerable mediation effect of POSE, the figure also confirms the indirect influence of GHRM on workplace attractiveness.

3.5 Multi-Group Sectoral Comparison

The structure of links between workers in the manufacturing and service sectors was compared using a Multi-Group Analysis (MGA). The findings showed that the strength of the relationships between GHRM, POSE, and workplace attractiveness varied significantly among sectors.

The overall impact of GHRM on workplace attractiveness was greater in manufacturing than in services (β = 0.53 vs. 0.38, respectively, as shown in Table 4). The difference between the two sectors was statistically significant ($p<0.05$), thus supporting Hypothesis 5. Likewise, GHRM positively affected the attractiveness of the workplace more with manufacturing employees (β = 0.30) than with service employees (β = 0.18).

Table 4. Multi-Group Analysis: Service (n = 120) versus Manufacturing (n = 120)

Path	Service (β)	Manufacturing (β)	Difference	p-value (MGA)
GHRM → POSE	0.57	0.65	0.08	0.14
POSE → WPA	0.42	0.50	0.08	0.16
GHRM → WPA (direct)	0.18	0.30	0.12	0.04*
GHRM → WPA (total)	0.38	0.53	0.15	0.03*

Note: MGA = Multi-Group Analysis. $p < .05$ for differences between sectors.

The results indicate that GHRM practices are more effective in enhancing the attractiveness of a workplace for manufacturing organizations compared to the service organizations. This disparity could be due to the fact that environmental practices are visible and tangible in manufacturing operations.

4. Discussion

The results obtained from the present study revealed that there is an important influence of GHRM on workplace attractiveness of the employees of manufacturing and service sectors. An organization's culture that is eco-friendly is more likely to be appreciated by employees, making it a desirable environment to work. This finding is evidence for the signalling theory that says green organizational efforts communicate positive organizational values and ethics to the members of the organization. Shah et al. (2024) made similar observations, highlighting the growing relevance of GHRM in the modern business landscape. Likewise, Yong et al. (2022) claimed that GHRM is a crucial aspect in attaining the sustainability and competitiveness

Vol. 12 Issue 3s (June, 2026)
ISSN: 2208-2190 Pages- 21-30
DOI: https://doi.org/10.69980/xqdxqh05
of an organisation in the future.

The study also revealed that there exists a partial mediation between the POSE and the workplace attractiveness for the GHRM. This indicates that employees who have positive attitudes towards their workplaces feel that their organisations are truly contributing to environmental sustainability. Social exchange theory, which holds that employees repay organizational assistance by exhibiting positive attitudes and organizational attachment, could be used to explain POSE's mediating role. The results are in line with Bhatti et al. (2022), who found that P.O.S. was an important mechanism that connects GHRM with environmental outcomes. Similarly, Rashid et al. (2023) concluded that the proactiveness of the organization in implementing green measures and sustainable practices has a positive effect on employees' attitudes toward green behavior.

A key aspect of this study is the separation of differences between manufacturing and service firms. The results showed that the relationship between GHRM and workplace attractiveness is greater in manufacturing organisations than in service organisations. The likelihood is that the environmental practices in manufacturing are more visible and tangible, and that workers in such settings can easily observe the waste reduction systems and energy management practices as well as the environmentally responsible production activities. In the same way, Austen and Piwowar-Sulej (2024) claimed that GHRM practices and production processes are highly connected in a manufacturing system with regard to environmental compliance. Likewise, Piwowar-Sulej (2022) pointed out that consistency of environmental strategies and HR development, especially in manufacturing sectors, is particularly important.

The results are also consistent with earlier research that highlights the distinction in effectiveness of GHRM in different industries. The influence of GHRM practices on sustainability outcomes has been found to vary across industries by Jamal et al. (2021), and the intangible nature of service operations has been reported to cause different GHRM dynamics in service organizations by Tanova and Bayighomog (2022). Moreover, Aftab et al. (2023) established that environmental strategies and green innovation are beneficial for improving the environmental performance of organizations; which further adds to the role of strategic importance of GHRM. In the same vein, Shahzad et al. (2023) showed that green culture and employee green behavior have a significant impact on sustainable organizational performance.

The present study also adds to the ongoing debates about employee well-being and employer branding in sustainability-oriented organizations. Gyensare et al. (2024) highlighted that committing to resources further enhances the positive impacts of GHRM on employee well-being and sustainable actions. In a similar fashion, Khan et al. (2025) found that green HRM practices have a positive effect on green innovative work behavior in hospitality organizations. The results also validate the resource-based view suggested by Rodrigues et al. (2026) that GHRM increases the employer branding and sustainable competitive advantage.

Although these contributions have been made, there are some limitations in the study. Self-reported responses may contain common method bias and social desirability effects, and the cross-sectional design precludes drawing hasty conclusions. Moreover, the sample was drawn from India which can restrict the generalizability in other cultural settings. Longitudinal and cross-country comparative designs should be used in future studies, and the potential impact of greenwashing, employee cynicism, and GHRM practices across sectors on organizational attractiveness and sustainability outcomes should be explored.

5. Conclusion

The present study focused on the relationship between GHRM and workplace attractiveness in the manufacturing and service sector employees. The results showed that GHRM has a significant impact on the attractiveness of the workplace, in which positive employee perceptions about the sustainability of the workplace and environmental responsibility are created. Organizations with higher green HR practices were more likely to be rated as attractive, ethical, and supportive by employees. This study also revealed that the relationship between the environment and the employees' attitudes is partially explained by POSE, suggesting that employees' attitudes are more positive when the organization actively supports and values environmental sustainability initiatives. The study's contribution is that it identifies the difference in the effectiveness of Green Human Resource Management practices between the sectors. Results indicated that the impact of GHRM on workplace attractiveness is greater in manufacturing organizations than in service organizations. This distinction could be attributed to the higher level of environmental visibility and tangibility in manufacturing contexts because the employees have a more direct involvement with sustainability-related activities on a daily basis. The results thus indicate that it is significant to implement green HR practices at a sector level, instead of a uniform approach to sustainability practice across sectors. In order to show how green HR practices affect employee and organizational attractiveness perceptions, the study contributes to the

Vol. 12 Issue 3s (June, 2026)
ISSN: 2208-2190 Pages- 21-30
DOI: https://doi.org/10.69980/xqdxqh05
body of research on human resource management for sustainability by building on the theories of social exchange and signalling. The findings from a practical perspective suggest that environmental sustainability can be integrated into HR activities in recruitment, training, rewards, and performance management to enhance the employer brand and attract employees. Finally, the study highlights the importance of sustainability-related HR practices not just in the environment, but also as part of an organization's strategy to boost its competitiveness over time and workplace attractiveness.

References

1. Aboramadan, M., & Karatepe, O. M. (2021). Green human resource management, perceived green organizational support and their effects on hotel employees' behavioral outcomes. International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 33(10), 3199-3222.
2. 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.
3. Ansari, N. Y., Farrukh, M., & Raza, A. (2021). Green human resource management and employees pro-environmental behaviours: Examining the underlying mechanism. Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management, 28(1), 229-238.
4. Austen, A., & Piwowar-Sulej, K. (2024). Green Human Resource Management in the manufacturing sector: a bibliometric literature review. Engineering Management in Production and Services, 16(4), 34-47.
5. Bhatti, S. H., Saleem, F., Murtaza, G., & Haq, T. U. (2022). Exploring the impact of green human resource management on environmental performance: the roles of perceived organizational support and innovative environmental behavior. International Journal of Manpower, 43(3), 742-762.
6. Bustamante, S., Ehlscheidt, R., Pelzeter, A., Deckmann, A., & Freudenberger, F. (2021). The effect of values on the attractiveness of responsible employers for young job seekers. Journal of Human Values, 27(1), 27-48.
7. Darvishmotevali, M., & Altinay, L. (2022). Green HRM, environmental awareness and green behaviors: The moderating role of servant leadership. Tourism Management, 88, 104401.
8. Guillot-Soulez, C., Saint-Onge, S., & Soulez, S. (2022). Green certification and organizational attractiveness: The moderating role of firm ownership. Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management, 29(1), 189-199.
9. Gyensare, M. A., Adomako, S., & Amankwah-Amoah, J. (2024). Green HRM practices, employee well-being, and sustainable work behavior: Examining the moderating role of resource commitment. Business Strategy and the Environment, 33(4), 3129-3141.
10. Haldorai, K., Kim, W. G., & Garcia, R. F. (2022). Top management green commitment and green intellectual capital as enablers of hotel environmental performance: The mediating role of green human resource management. Tourism Management, 88, 104431.
11. Jamal, T., Zahid, M., Martins, J. M., Mata, M. N., Rahman, H. U., & Mata, P. N. (2021). Perceived green human resource management practices and corporate sustainability: Multigroup analysis and major industries perspectives. Sustainability, 13(6), 3045.
12. Karatepe, O. M., Hsieh, H., & Aboramadan, M. (2022). The effects of green human resource management and perceived organizational support for the environment on green and non-green hotel employee outcomes. International Journal of Hospitality Management, 103, 103202.
13. Khan, K., Gogia, E. H., Shao, Z., Rehman, M. Z., & Ullah, A. (2025). The impact of green HRM practices on green innovative work behaviour: empirical evidence from the hospitality sector of China and Pakistan. BMC psychology, 13(1), 96.
14. Lamm, E., Tosti-Kharas, J., & King, C. E. (2015). Empowering employee sustainability: Perceived organizational support toward the environment. Journal of Business Ethics, 128(1), 207-220.
15. Merlin, M. L., & Chen, Y. (2022). Impact of green human resource management on organizational reputation and attractiveness: The mediated-moderated model. Frontiers in Environmental Science, 10, 962531.
16. Ojo, A. O., Tan, C. N. L., & Alias, M. (2022). Linking green HRM practices to environmental performance through pro-environment behaviour in the information technology sector. Social Responsibility Journal, 18(1), 1-18.
17. Piwowar-Sulej, K. (2022). Environmental strategies and human resource development consistency: Research in the manufacturing industry. Journal of Cleaner Production, 330, 129538.

Vol. 12 Issue 3s (June, 2026)
ISSN: 2208-2190 Pages- 21-30
DOI: https://doi.org/10.69980/xqdxqh05
18. Rashid, W., Ghani, U., Khan, K., & Usman, M. (2023). If you care I care: role of Green Human Resource Management in employees green behaviors. Cogent Business & Management, 10(1), 2189768.
19. Rodrigues, C., Martins, H., Pitacho, L., Carvalho, L. C., Xara-Brasil, D., Pardal, P., & Cordeiro, J. P. (2026). Green Human Resource Management and Employer Branding: A Resource-Based Perspective for Sustainable Competitive Advantage. In Smart Business Models for Sustainability in Circular and Climate Neutral Economy: Volume 1: Creating Opportunities for Smart and Sustainable Regions (pp. 227-251). Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland.
20. Shah, P., Singh Dubey, R., Rai, S., Renwick, D. W., & Misra, S. (2024). Green human resource management: A comprehensive investigation using bibliometric analysis. Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management, 31(1), 31-53.
21. Shahzad, M. A., Jianguo, D., & Junaid, M. (2023). Impact of green HRM practices on sustainable performance: mediating role of green innovation, green culture, and green employees' behavior. Environmental Science and Pollution Research, 30(38), 88524-88547.
22. 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.
23. Umrani, W. A., Channa, N. A., Ahmed, U., Syed, J., Pahi, M. H., & Ramayah, T. (2022). The laws of attraction: Role of green human resources, culture and environmental performance in the hospitality sector. International Journal of Hospitality Management, 103, 103222.
24. Yong, J. Y., Yusliza, M. Y., Ramayah, T., Farooq, K., & Tanveer, M. I. (2022). Accentuating the interconnection between green intellectual capital, green human resource management and sustainability. Benchmarking: An International Journal, 30(8), 2783-2808.
25. Younis, R. A. A., & Hammad, R. (2021). Employer image, corporate image and organizational attractiveness: the moderating role of social identity consciousness. Personnel Review, 50(1), 244-263.
26. 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.
27. Berthon, P., Ewing, M., & Hah, L. L. (2005). Captivating company: dimensions of attractiveness in employer branding. International journal of advertising, 24(2), 151-172.