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Abstract

This article tested a structural model that investigates the relationship between Green Human Resource Management (GHRM) and Organizational Sustainability (OS), Green HRM and employee’s attitude during COVID-19 (CO), and CO and OS, further, the focus is on mediating role of CO in the link of GHRM and OS. Using a random sampling method, a survey was conducted on Jordanian commercial banks. In this study, the sample included 245 staff members working in Jordanian Commercial Banking. Analysis of the data involved the use of Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) by using SPSS AMOS tool. The results pointed out that GHRM was positively related to OS, GHRM exerted a significant positive effect on CO, and CO had a significant positive effect on OS. In regard to the CO role mediation on GHRM and OS relationship has equally been evaluated. Based on the theoretical and practical relevance, they entail highlighting the likelihood for future research direction building an evidence-based practice is the area of focus in the evidence-based aspects focused in this study.
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1. Introduction

In the current business environment characterised by intense globalisation and industrialization, environment and natural resources conservation in the process of profit maximisation and market dominance is critical. As noted in Das and Singh (2016), this is, however, not the case as most organisations are limitedly concerned with embracing best practice in achieving environmental sustainability. One of the strategies which can be embraced by modern organisations is the Green Human Resource Management (GHRM). Adopting the definition of Al-Swidi et al. (2021), GHRM is a process which entails integrating organisational environmental management objectives to the HRM practices of recruitment and selection, capacity development, performance management and reward for environmental sustainability. Further, Zhao et al. (2021) note that GHRM is a considerably new concept in the field of human capital in which priority is on employees attitude development on the environmentally conscious organisation. Further, a different study by Aust et al. (2020) generated an explanation of the different categories of sustainable HR, responsible socially, Triple-Bottom-line, mutual goodness and GHRM. Hence, it can be argued that through GHRM, it is possible to identify it as initiating, implementing and consistently maintaining sustenance of green concepts among an organisation’s staff. To achieve this, Langat (2017) identified best practices as including motivation of employees, empowerment and ensuring they are ecologically conscious in their pursued green projects. The impact of this is increasing entire capability of the employees in terms of knowledge and awareness on environment and as such translation to long-term viability of practices in distinct entities. The outcome of this, as identified in Vijai and Joyce (2021), is achievement of minimum or zero destruction of the environment in its production and service activities. The scope of sustainability is evidenced on the organisation embracing technical and managerial competencies for the employees as their organisation creates innovative environmental initiatives and functions. In particular, Sharma and Vashistha (2019) note that the environmentally friendly practices are embraced by HR ranging from resourcing approaches to capacity development and performance appraisals and long-term career growth. This is achieved with innovative technology applicable in different approaches for lowering the carbon footprints for employees and recruiters. It is in this regard that Longoni et al. (2018) recommended the application of an
environmental management system. This is a system inclusive of the commitment, policies, plans, implementing, measuring and evaluating, reviewing and improving various HR systems. These systems are fitting of organisation culture and their long-term set goals by being responsible to themselves, organisation and environment.

In reviewed studies, there is evidence towards the existence of a direct link on the GHRM, organisation sustainability and employees attitude during the COVID-19 pandemic. For instance, Rawashdeh’s (2018) study focused on Jordanian Health Service organisation and pointed to the existence of a direct correlation of the GHRM to the environmental performance in Jordanian health service organisation. Nevertheless, there exists limited research which has focused on evaluation of the Jordanian banking sector. It is in this regard that this sector has been selected for bridging the existing literature gap. From an indirect context, the Ali et al. (2019) study had noted the best practice for achieving a sustainability strategy as entailing an increase in awareness and commitment of the sector, creating a sector-wide strategy for sustainable development while harnessing transparency and reporting of non-financial performance. In regard to the employees’ attitudes during COVID-19 pandemic, Manuti et al. (2020) evidenced that it influences the scope in which the employees alter their working modalities. The study found that it is these attitudes which play a core role in sustainable HRM practices or GHRM from capitalising their human resources and organisation performance. The rationale of this is that as a consequence of COVID-19 pandemic which is a great uncertainty and global crisis, GHRM and sustainable HR practices influence human resources capitalization and organisation performance. This link is evidenced by Alqudah et al. (2021) as contributing to the employers putting immense efforts on achievement thus taxing high-level employees’ health and wellbeing. The best practice would entail implementing robust policies and strategies for integrating GHRM in strategic plans in integrating the process with sufficient management-employee involvement and commitment levels. Further, regarding the attitudes, Islam et al. (2021) note that as a consequence of the COVID-19 pandemic prevalence, the attitude of the employees is influenced by the monetary involvement and infrastructural requirements. The outcome of this is embracing organisational sustainability for organisation success.

The contribution of this paper can be highlighted for both its theoretical and practical aspects. For its theoretical contribution, for this study, it would increase to available studies which evaluate the GHRM impact on organisational sustainability strategies. In recent past, GHRM has increased in its popularity amongst various scholars and research works (Yong et al., 2019), despite different research works attempting in examining GHRM in distinct context inclusive of multinationals (Haddock-Millar et al., 2016), area of healthcare (PinZone et al., 2019), sporting sector (Gholami et al., 2016), and manufacturing industry (Nejati et al., 2017; Yong et al., 2019; Yusliza et al., 2017). Hence, there prevail necessity for pursuing further learning to appreciate GRHM in diverse contexts of entity operations including banking industry. Currently, GHRM is identified as a critical area of focus for majority of academicians, management and policy developers. As aforementioned, currently, there is a lack of studies which have focused on the Jordanian banking sector. This study will add to this content by generating rich outcomes in this regard. In terms of practice, by embracing the recommendations of this study, it would be possible to implement appropriate strategies for GHRM and organisational sustainability. Considering the Jordanian Banking Sector, owing to its complexity in integrating best practice in leverage on competitive advantage and market dominance, organisations end up achieving their intended goals. This is achieved by embracing appropriate systems of GHRM and recognizing the importance of employee’s attitudes during COVID-19, while ensuring such a player in the banking sector invokes relevant strategies for harnessing success in gaining positive attitudes.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Green HRM

As evidenced in the reviewed literature, it is evident that the concept of GHRM has attracted an increased prominence and focus in different corporate organisations. This popularity is linked by Rawashdeh (2018) as the approach being adopted by modern organisations in establishing greening of their organisational culture by establishing green offices and practices. Hence, for accomplishment of the organisation’s environmental goals of going green, a set of approaches are applicable in ensuring success of the process. Despite the evidenced importance, Sinaga and Nawangsari (2019) note that there lacks elaborate literature and academic work which have evaluated the sustainability and environmental affairs of human resources. This is particularly in regard to evaluating the scope in which organisations enjoying environment sustainable practice and best performance if HRM are interconnected with environment and sustainable aspects. The various practices which can be adopted by modern organisations include, but are not limited to, resourcing by embracing green approaches, performance management, capacity development and rewarding and compensating employees.
Due to the relevance of GHRM, scholars and academics have focused on evaluating the best practice of stimulating positive employee attitudes towards the process (Cooke, 2018). The approaches which include training, performance management and resourcing which successfully influence organisational GHRM strategies is influenced by the employee’s attitude. For instance, Opatha (2021) identified this as the green attitude among the employees, a phenomenon where the employees gain positive attitudes on the process, hence holistically embracing its implementation and taking an active role in it. In a different context, Ifitkhar et al. (2021) observed that the attitudes of the employees are informed by the capacity of employees clarifying on their responsibilities and engaging in GHRM behaviour. To support this, Chen et al. (2021) adopted the cognitive-affective system theory informed by the assumption that the individuals levels of GHRM behaviour is impacted by interactive implication among the cognitive, and motivational factors.

GHRM integrate a set of merits for an organisation inclusive of new talents attraction and employees retention (Muster & Schrader, 2011), lowering costs and leverage on competitive advantage (Carmona-Moreno et al., 2012), harnessing organisation entire productivity environment (Kim et al., 2019), harnessing entire efficiencies, improved business sustainable practice and entire employee well-being and productive nature (Gholami et al., 2016). Further, Cheema et al. (2017) hypothesized majority of organisations as incorporating HRM strategies with an intention to promote environment sustainable best practice with core priority being reduction of pollution of environment and degradation forms. Greening as part of HRM strategy could be identified as a process for promoting competencies of staff, motivated and committing themselves in their roles (Elrehail et al., 2019). For the organisation commitment, this entail the scope of identifying employees, loyalty scope and inclusion (Singh & Onahring, 2019). The HRM strategies are normally intended to modify the attitudes of staff and harnessing entire employees performance scope (Kim et al., 2019). In line with Jawaasd et al. (2019) findings, entities ought to pursue approaches intended to motivate employees to harness their commitment.

2.2 Organizational Sustainability

In the overall sustainability debates, Tourais and Videira (2019) identify organisational sustainability as a core research area. The strategies set in organisations for supporting pathways for societal sustainability inclusive of managing environment and social responsibility approaches used in broad. Nevertheless, there still exists a significant gap in terms of appreciating the best practice of organisations designing these strategies, assessing available alternatives and implementing sustainability transitions. As a best practice in organisational sustainability, the majority of the available studies, such as Horak et al. (2018), Braccini and Margherita (2019), Jamali (2006), and Alhaddi (2015) identify it as the achievement of triple bottom line as part of the organisation’s operations in the social, environmental and financial outcomes. Hence, by adoption of sustainability initiatives, they have the potential of offering organisations varying forms of benefits such as a positive image, improved trust from different stakeholders, efficiency in resources management, leverage on competitive advantage, gaining more superior returns on investment and profitability. The rationale of focusing on the other factors in the triple bottom line model is informed by Ramaswami et al. (2019) who note the maximisation of financial performance as having been the traditional orientation and focus of the majority of organisations. When profit maximisation is institutionalized and without regulatory obligations less organisations could leverage on the motivation of adopting sustainability initiatives and practices voluntarily as they entail ambiguity, challenges and potentially negative short-term financial impacts. Aside from profit maximisation, Garza’s (2013) study which focuses on establishing a framework for strategic sustainability in organisations, evidences sustainability as being a strategic aspect of contemporary entities in 21st century with significant evolving becoming a simple and core market force of competitiveness. The force exerted has short-term and sustainable financial viabilities and scope successful approach.

Apart from the triple bottom-line model, studies have similarly utilised the institutional theory in appreciating reasons and how organisational sustainability initiatives are implemented (Grob & Benn, 2014; Escobar & Vredenburg, 2011; Maletić et al. 2016; Fernando & Lawrence, 2014). The rationale behind using the institutional theory is informed by the view that organisation’s operations are influenced by an invisible institutional environment and ought to be conforming with the collective norms and beliefs of the environment. Simply put, Ainin et al. (2016) links the process with adoption of green IT practices and organisational performance and identifies it as a strategy for organisations imitating environmental factors in their structure. Hence, organisations need to fit in their institutional image for gaining legitimacy and as such accessing resources. The outcome of this is survival of the organisation which is dependent on adherence to institutionally defined rules and norms.

2.3 Employees’ Attitudes during COVID-19

Since COVID-19 is a new phenomenon in the labour market, there are few studies which have focused on
evaluating the employee’s attitude. According to Gopinath (2020), the rationale of evaluating the employee’s attitude is informed by the fact that employees represent the most valuable asset in organisations. The satisfaction and motivation of employees are core for organisations and a key factor influencing success of the organisations. In this regard, Sapta et al. (2021) identify the employee’s attitude as inclusive of the aspects of job involvement, job satisfaction involvement and commitment, which is imperative for productivity and achievement of organisational goals. In the current COVID-19 pandemic, Song et al. (2020) evaluated the employee’s work attitude among individuals resuming work in the current COVID-19 pandemic. The study found that employees’ attitudes in the current COVID-19 pandemic varies based on the type of the organisation and job status. Nevertheless, irrespective of the determinants, they are core antecedents of work and organisational behaviours which further establish job performance and organisational effective functioning. Further, despite being in a distinct context, AL‐Abrrow et al.’s (2021) study, which focused on understanding employees responses to the COVID-19 pandemic, evidenced employees attitudes as influencing the decisions of their retention in an organisation. The employees attitudes are hence impacted by the resources available and capacity to balance the physical and psychological needs of the employees.

3. Hypothesis Development

3.1 Green HRM, Employees’ attitudes during COVID-19 and Organizational Sustainability

According to Hussain et al. (2020), there is a need for more research to shed light on sustainability and competitiveness in service and non-service operating organisation. There exist detailed evidence existing for certifying varying gains attained in GRM integration initiatives. For instance, the consideration could include Wal-Mart which highlight cost-saving of upto $12,000 due to the lowered use of paper work. Additionally, EON entity evidence cost saving of approximately £107,000 due to workforce learning process. The consistently changing relevance of environment awareness lead to HR adopting GHRM initiatives including low usage of paper and reducing carbon footprint and different wastes (Ahmad, 2015). Alkhateeb (2018) insisted on the aspect of finances and economic development importantly increasing CO2 emissions scope and GHRM playing a significant constructive function to reverse impacts of degrading the environment. This is an attribute of the view that GHRM provides a critical prioritisation of environment and resources conserved (Jain & D’lima, 2018).

As evidenced in the Zhu et al. (2021) study, GHRM has a positive implication on voluntary green behaviour and task-related green behaviour. The rationale of this is identified by Alqudah et al. (2021) as being an attribute of the GHRM strategies during the current COVID-19 pandemic which has contributed to balancing of the economic, social, and environmental goals of the organisations, thus having a direct contribution on improvement of global recovery from the pandemic. Further, Kaukab et al. (2021) noted that in the current COVID-19 pandemic, GHRM is logical and harnesses strong implications on the employees’ behaviour and attitudes when employees view them as being consensual, distinctive and consistent. Despite this, it is evident that GHRM is significantly a new concept in modern organisations owing to the limited documented evidence which support their functions and practices.

Introducing the concept of GHRM practices link with organisational sustainability (OS), Dubey and Gupta (2018) used the triple bottom line theory. By focusing on the aspects of social, economic and environmental sustainability, the study noted GHRM practices as a critical HR strategy for harnessing organisational sustainability. The study nevertheless noted that this is dependent on the scope of leaders and top management harnessing awareness on the individuals and embracing change of their mindset for ensuring they are ready to embrace and adopt change. These findings are supported by Jyoti’s (2019) study which evidenced that GHRM practices ensures that environmentally-friendly HR practices are implemented with the knowledge capital appropriately preserved. In particular, the study found that in the green world, GHRM ensures that as part of people management function, they integrate sustainability as its core to people management and talent management focus and organisations engaging with society through alignment of their agendas with it. This is done with the communities, clients and contractors. Also, Rani and Mishra (2014) observed that GHRM means that all the employees interface is used in a way that harnesses and maintains sustainable business practices while creating awareness. Such awareness contributes to organisations operating in an environmentally sustainable manner. Hence, the hypotheses can be identified as;

H1: Green HRM practices positively influence organisational sustainability.
H2: Green HRM practices positively influence employees’ attitudes - COVID-19.
3.2 The Mediating Effect of Employees’ Attitudes during COVID-19 on Green HRM & Organisational Sustainability

Manuti et al. (2020) evaluated employees’ attitudes of sustainable HRM practices and positive organisational behaviour in the current COVID-19 pandemic. The study findings had evidenced the existence of a causal path linking employees’ attitudes during the COVID-19 pandemic and OS. Additionally, Al-dalahmeh et al. (2018) study also found that there is a significant and positive relationship between employees’ attitudes towards the implementation and expansion of sustainability policy, through a prioritisation of the triple bottom lines of sustainability performance. Hence, the study found that through an embrace of employees’ attitudes, sustainability performance is achieved as a prioritisation in their operations. People’s attitudes, beliefs and behaviours have an implication on the expected organisational change within organisations’ objectives and their development in varying scales established. The findings in the Khan et al. (2021) study point to the mediating effect of employees’ attitudes during the COVID-19 pandemic on GHRM and OS. Further, the O’Connor and Crowley-Henry (2019) study found that the employee’s attitude on their organisational approach to talent management and organisational engagement has an impact on their readiness in embracing GHRM and OS. In particular, the study noted that employees’ attitudes mediating role influences the best practice in corporate entrepreneurship within the business model and is inclusive of responsible environmental management, social accountability and economic performance. It is in this regard that Kurdi and Alshurideh (2020) observed that the roles of the employees ought not to be neglected in support of the business efforts for improving sustainability performance. Employees being the core resources in an organisation particularly in the current COVID-19 pandemic, are directly affected by GHRM practices and this influences how OS is achieved. Therefore, based on this background information, the following hypotheses can be developed:

H3: Employees’ attitudes -COVID-19 positively influences organisational sustainability.

H4: Employees’ attitudes -COVID-19 is found mediating relationship of GHRM initiatives and organisational sustainability.

To evaluate relationship of GHRM, EA-COVID-19 and OS by mediation of the effects of EA, the researchers focused on reviewing appropriate literature to develop proposal of conceptual model (as illustrated in figure 1);

![Figure 1. Conceptual Model](image)

4. Methodology & Measures

The focus of this article is to evaluate the relationship of GHRM approaches and OS and identifying the mediating impact on employee attitudes. This is in the current COVID-19 pandemic in Jordanian Commercial Banking sector as the case study. Overall number of 280 of questionnaires are distributed by use of random sampling method to staff members at Jordanian Commercial Banking, (245) valid surveys were obtained and analyzed with Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) through the descriptive statistical methods with Common method bias (CMB), Multicollinearity, Validity and reliability, and Correlation matrix and model fit. The researcher measured GHRM with an established 17 items scale (Tang et al.,2018). These include green recruitment and selection (items GRS1 - GRS4), green performance management (items GPR5 to GPR9), green training and development (items GTD10 0 GTD13), and green rewarding and compensation (items GRC14 - GRC17). This is similarly informed by (Farooqa et al. 2020; Tang et al. 2018;) which notes the scope in which the GHRM dimensions contribute to an increased consideration and prioritization of the factors of environmental management. In this study, the organisational sustainability construct was measured on a scale developed by (Cella-De-Oliveira, 2013). This scale, identified as TBL representing a hierarchy model which segment constructs of Economy, Environment and Social Pillars. To affirm this view, Munck et al. (2011) note that the TBL identifies organisational sustainability as a phenomenon which exists in levels, advocating that an entity
ought not to be viewed as sustainable or not, but rather as holding a certain organisation sustainability level. Overall, there were a total of 9 items (OS18 - OS26) for measurement and evidencing the organisation's success. The study by AL‐Abrrow et al. (2021) can be applied in identifying the measurement scale for the employees attitude during COVID-19 pandemic. The scale had highlighted on the aspects of social value, interest value, application value, development value and economic value. In overall, there were a total of 6 items (CO27 - CO32) for measurement and evidencing the organisation success. The importance of this would entail a focus on COVID-19 pandemic individual mental health condition, health system in the country of focus, governance and political issues, socioeconomic issues, endurance of emergent issues, attitude of employees social value, interest value, application value, development value, economic value and attractiveness of the jobs in the current COVID-19 pandemic.

5. Data Analysis and Results

5.1 Common Method Bias (CMB)

CMB is related to respondents’ low motivation to provide accurate answers due to numerous factors such as item ambiguity, respondents’ low self-efficacy, scale length, or forced participation (MacKenzie & Podsakoff, 2012). Such a problem results in biased results concerning the effects between research variables (Jakobsen & Jensen, 2015). Hence, researchers are required to check CMB as an initial step prior to performing any statistical tests. For the current study, CMB is conducted using Harman's single-factor test (Sembada & Kalantari, 2020; Van Assen, 2021; Rawashdeh et al., 2021). The main idea behind CMB is to test if there is a single factor that accounts for the majority of covariance between research variables (Jakobsen & Jensen, 2015). According to Riley et al. (2018), the shared variance between questionnaire items should be lower than 50%. Using IBM SPSS 24.0 to extract one factor, the results show that the total variance explained was 24.07%, which means that the current data is free of CMB.

5.2 Multicollinearity

Multicollinearity evidence on a significant intercorrelation amongst the independent variable in multiple regression models, which in turn leads to increased standard errors. Three methods are suggested to detect multicollinearity: correlation coefficients between independent variables, eigenvalue values, and variance inflation factor (VIF) were used. The results indicate that the correlation coefficients between independent variables ranged between 0.282 and 0.473, which were less than 0.80 (Shrestha, 2020). Moreover, the results of collinearity statistics (VIF and tolerance) show that all VIF values were greater than 1 and less than 5 (i.e., 1.257, 1.314, 1.398, 1.429) and tolerance values were less than 0.20 (Sui et al., 2021).

5.3 Validity and Reliability

Both validity and reliability were investigated informed on the outcomes of exploratory factor analysis (EFA). Validity was measured by convergence validity which could be assessing in terms of average assessed by the average extracted variance (AVE) of all indicators of each construct (Purwanto & Sudargini, 2021) and discriminant validity that can be evaluated by the square root of AVE values, which should be higher that the correlation coefficients between any pair of the independent variables (Butt et al., 2021). Measuring reliability by use of Cronbach Alpha (α) and composite reliability (CR) with a cut-off value of 0.70 (Rawashdeh et al., 2021). Results of validity and reliability can be seen in Table 1.
Table 1. Results of validity and reliability

| Components | Items | Factor Loadings | Mean | Std. | Validity | Reliability |
|------------|-------|-----------------|------|------|----------|-------------|
|            |       |                 |      |      | AVE √AVE * CR α |              |
| GHRM       | GRS   |                 |      |      |          |             |
|            | GR1   | 0.545           | 4.27 | 0.636 | 0.571    | 0.755       | 0.957       | 0.877       |
|            | GR2   | 0.762           |      |      |          |             |
|            | GR3   | 0.798           |      |      |          |             |
|            | GR4   | 0.818           |      |      |          |             |
| GPM        | GP5   | 0.525           | 4.21 | 0.675 |          |             |
|            | GP6   | 0.593           |      |      |          |             |
|            | GP7   | 0.776           |      |      |          |             |
|            | GP8   | 0.845           |      |      |          |             |
|            | GP9   | 0.825           |      |      |          |             |
| GTD        | GT10  | 0.585           | 4.23 | 0.681 |          |             |
|            | GT11  | 0.828           |      |      |          |             |
|            | GT12  | 0.837           |      |      |          |             |
|            | GT13  | 0.849           |      |      |          |             |
| GRC        | GR14  | 0.677           | 4.21 | 0.673 |          |             |
|            | GR15  | 0.820           |      |      |          |             |
|            | GR16  | 0.822           |      |      |          |             |
|            | GR17  | 0.798           |      |      |          |             |
| OS         | OS1   | 0.711           | 3.85 | 0.661 | 0.556    | 0.746       | 0.918       | 0.907       |
|            | OS2   | 0.795           |      |      |          |             |
|            | OS3   | 0.721           |      |      |          |             |
|            | OS4   | 0.783           |      |      |          |             |
|            | OS5   | 0.807           |      |      |          |             |
|            | OS6   | 0.761           |      |      |          |             |
|            | OS7   | 0.767           |      |      |          |             |
|            | OS8   | 0.734           |      |      |          |             |
|            | OS9   | 0.612           |      |      |          |             |
| CO         | CO1   | 0.773           | 3.79 | 0.718 | 0.639    | 0.800       | 0.914       | 0.901       |
|            | CO2   | 0.814           |      |      |          |             |
|            | CO3   | 0.823           |      |      |          |             |
|            | CO4   | 0.814           |      |      |          |             |
|            | CO5   | 0.802           |      |      |          |             |
|            | CO6   | 0.770           |      |      |          |             |

*Correlations between independent variables ranged between 0.282 and 0.473 at a significance level of 0.01.*

On the basis of the results in Table 1, both validity and reliability were assured. All the values of AVE are significantly higher more than 0.50 of AVE values of square root, which should be higher that the correlation coefficients between independent variables, and values of composite reliability as well as alpha coefficients were greater than 0.70.

5.4 Correlation Matrix and Model Fit

Results of Pearson correlation confections between the variables as evidenced in table 2. The table evidence GHRM as positively correlated to employee attitudes (r = 0.209) and organizational sustainability (0.246), and that employee attitudes is positively correlated to organizational sustainability (r = 0.327). Fit of measurement and structural models was computed using four indices: CMIN/DF (Chi-square-to-degree of freedom ratio), GFI (the Goodness of Fit Index), CFI (the Comparative Fit Index), and RMSEA (the Root Mean Squared Approximation of Error). The value of CMIN/DF should be lower than 3 (Porcel-Gálvez et al., 2018), GFI and CFI should be higher than 0.90 (Haney et al., 2019), and RMSEA should be less than 0.08 (Soto & Rojas, 2019). Based on the results in Table 2, the current data fit both measurement and structural models.
Table 2. Correlation matrix and model fit indices

| PC      | (1) | (2) | (3) | Index    | MM  | SM  | Criteria   | Result |
|---------|-----|-----|-----|----------|-----|-----|------------|--------|
| (1) GHRM | 1   |  |   | CMIN/DF  | 1.773 | 1.773 | Less than 3.00 | Accepted |
| (2) CO    | 0.209 | 1 |  | GFI      | 0.899 | 0.899 | Close to 0.90  | Accepted |
| (3) OS    | 0.246 | 0.327 | 1 | CFI      | 0.947 | 0.947 | Close to 0.90  | Accepted |

Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level. RMSEA 0.056 0.056 Less than 0.08 Accepted

Note. PC: Pearson Correlation Coefficients, MM: Measurement model, SM: Structural model.

5.5 Hypotheses Testing

Four hypotheses were proposed in this study: GHRM was assumed to show a positive effect on both CO and OS, CO was presumed to exert a positive significant effect on OS, and CO was postulated to play a significant role as a mediating variable in the effect of GHRM on OS. The results as shown in Table 3 and Figure 1 confirm that H1, H2, H3, and H4 were accepted.

Table 3. Results of hypotheses testing

| H      | Structural paths | Total effects | Direct effects | Indirect effects |
|--------|------------------|---------------|---------------|-----------------|
|        | β                | P             | β             | P               | β               | P               |
| H1     | GHRM → OS        | 0.299         | 0.001         | 0.218           | 0.009           | 0.082           | 0.005           |
| H4     |                  |               |               |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| H2     | GHRM → CO        | 0.258         | 0.005         | 0.258           | 0.005           | -               | -               |
| H3     | CO → OS          | 0.317         | 0.000         | 0.317           | 0.000           | -               | -               |

According to the results, GHRM is positively related to OS (βTotal effect = 0.299, P = 0.001, βDirect effect = 0.218, P = 0.009). These results indicate that H1 was supported. Furthermore, the results pointed out that GHRM exerted a significant positive effect on CO (βTotal effect = 0.258, P = 0.005), and CO had a significant positive effect on OS (βTotal effect = 0.317, P = 0.000). Therefore, H2 and H3 were accepted (see figure 2).

In terms of the mediating role of CO in the relationship between GHRM and OS, the results revealed that there is a significant mediating effect of CO on the effect of GHRM on OS (βTotal effect = 0.299, P = 0.001, βDirect effect = 0.218, P = 0.009, βIndirect effect = 0.082, P = 0.005).

6. Discussion, Conclusions and Recommendations

For this paper, the core area of interest is evaluating GHRM and organisational sustainability. This was achieved
by evaluating the mediating effect of staff attitude owing to COVID-19 pandemic in Jordanian banking sector. In tandem with projection of the current study, the outcomes highlight GHRM is positively related to organisational sustainability. The study findings are in tandem with past research works evidencing that an embrace of GHRM contributes positively to the scope of organisational sustainability (Das & Singh, 2016; Zhao et al., 2021 and Longoni et al., 2018). Further, the findings of the study show that GHRM exerts a significant positively impact on employees’ attitudes during the COVID-19 pandemic. This scope of influence was identified in Islam et al. (2021) as being a result of the prevalence of COVID-19 influencing the monetary impact and involvement and overall infrastructural requirements. It is this influence that was further noted as having a significant positive effect on organisational sustainability. Hence, it can be concluded that employees’ attitudes during the COVID-19 pandemic has a direct implication on GHRM and on organisational sustainability. This relationship has been identified by Ali et al. (2019) as influencing the achievement of sustainability practice which includes increasing awareness and sector commitment. This creates a sector-wide approach for sustainable development with transparency harnessed and reports on non-financial performance. Apart from the employees experiencing positive emotions harnessed by the GHRM, the likelihood of gaining more passion on an aspect of organisational and social importance (Green creativity), achievement of environmental sustainability is possible. This is the reason this study concludes that employees’ attitudes during the COVID-19 pandemic has significant implications.

The findings of this study offer core literature contributions in two dimensions. First, the past research work has evidenced GHRM as positively related to organisational sustainability and positive effecting employees’ attitudes during COVID-19. Albeit of a sufficient volume of literature being anchored on the effects of GHRM on employees’ performance and productivity, no literature has focused on the current COVID-19 pandemic in this regard. Hence, the current study contributes to the various research streams while enriching the literature on GHRM during the current COVID-19 pandemic. Secondly, this study contributes to the available literature in the area of environmental management through evaluating and mediating the implications of employees’ attitudes in the current COVID-19 pandemic on GHRM effects on organisational sustainability. A core practical impact of this study is that employees attitude on GMR in current COVID-19 pandemic impact the organisations capacity to harness proactive environmental behaviour. Also, by achieving GHRM successfully in an organisation, this directly impact achievement of proactiveness in environmentally appropriate behaviours. For organisations, part of their resourcing approaches would be the employees with preference on GHRM practices. In terms of recommendations, in the current COVID-19 pandemic, organisations preferences would be on setting strategies for fostering and developing employees positive emotions. This is inclusive of harnessing a broad scope of harmonious environmental passion. Another recommendation is for organisations to strengthen the overall passion of psychological ownership including green empowerment and autonomous practice. The rationale of this is to offer guidance on areas of creativity for improving employees attitude on GHRM in the current COVID-19 pandemic.

7. Limitations and Future Research

A set of limitations in this report can be applied for guiding future research. Firstly, the focus on the Jordanian Banking Sector indicates a lowered representativeness. Hence, it would be essential to explore the extent in which GHRM is successfully integrated in different sectors in Jordan and globally. Also, this study has focused on the general GHRM literature and employees’s attitudes in the current COVID-19 pandemic. Future research may need to focus more on other variables which similarly impact GHRM.
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