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ABSTRACT

Purpose: Drawing on stakeholder theory (Freeman, 1984) and TBL theory (Elkington, 1994), this study aims to propose a consolidated model of GHRMPs – SDGs linkages, shedding light on the underlying process through which the corporate-sector can attain SDGs.

Design/methodology: A detailed review of extant literature by strategically choosing articles on the topics of GHRMPs and sustainable-development from different databases published from 2015 to 2022 was performed.

Key finding(s): This study identified 8 SDGs potentially attainable by corporate-sector. Through GHRMPs corporate-sector can attain three pillars of sustainability i.e., environmental, social, and economic, effectively execute green SCM practices, undertake green–innovation, and eventually accomplish SDGs.

Practical implication(s): This study guides business policymakers and civil society actors seeking to widen the range of sustainable corporate actors.
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Introduction
Internationally, business patterns have been changed, as for the businesses merely profit augmentation and accomplishing upper hand in market isn't sufficient, tending to the ecological impressions of business activities is additionally vital (Channa et al., 2021). Objections coming from assorted stakeholders put the corporate-sector under colossal strain to integrate sustainability interventions to minimalize the ecological impressions of their organizations (Saeed & Kersten, 2020). The results that happened because of ecological degradation and environmental change have put compulsions on enterprises to carry out and adopt initiatives and practices that are ecologically economical (Khatter et al., 2019). Corporations as major contributors of environmental crises on planet earth face pressures by regulators, activists, costumes and competitors to cultivate green-practices (Dechant et al., 1993). To safeguards stakeholders concerns,
the UN’s Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) intended to shield the planet and guarantee prosperity for everyone by 2030, emerged in 2015. The program for Sustainable Development 2030, adopted by all member states of United Nations in 2015, offers a collective blueprint for prosperity and peace for people and the planet, for current and future generations (United Nations, 2018). SDGs replaced eight Millennium Development Goals intended to eradicate extreme poverty by 2015. Sustainable Development 2030 constitutes 17 Goals (SDGs) (executed in Figure 1) which are an earnest call for sustainable activities by all nations - developed and developing - in a worldwide partnership. SDGs acknowledge that eradicating poverty and different hardships should go connected at the hip with strategies that further develop wellbeing and education, diminish inequality, and spike economic development – all while handling environmental change and attempting to safeguard forests and oceans. “Sustainable development is the kind of development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs” (Hinrichsen, 1987). “The sustainable development agenda, for example, typically aims to reduce, reuse and recycle, creating more goods and services while using ever-less resources and producing less waste and pollution” (McDonough & Braungart, 2002). Sustainability is a three-pillar conception (environmental, social and economic) (Purvis et al., 2019).

Sustainability has become a major emphasis for many organizations (Yong, 2019). Sustainability-aimed companies, simultaneously committed to environmental and social well-being protection of stakeholders, and value-addition to shareholders, outperform players even across diverse industries in economic-slowdown (Kearney, 2009). Sustainability initiatives can constructively contribute to the overall success of organizations, the most sustainable businesses are also the most worthwhile (Chladek, 2019). Sustainability doesn’t mean sacrificing success or success on the backburner, instead, it has become a critical consequence to any organization’s prosperous strategy (Chladek, 2019). Sustainability is progressively turning into an obligation for corporations due to altering viewpoints around the world, It is becoming even more crucial for companies to deal with the gap between knowing and doing by implementing business practices that are sustainable (Rafi, 2021). Sustainability is integral for all businesses, across all industries or sectors in order to foster their own longevity, it is really a megatrend, a major challenge that rests upon recognizing and incorporating such practices renowned for impacting sustainable development.

Scharlemann et al. (2020) found environment–human relations in 13 out of 17 (SDGs). These environment–humans relations comprise both nature’s contributions to humans (e.g. provisioning of food,
fuel, etc.) and the adverse disservices it delivers (e.g., floods, earthquakes, disease, etc.). On the other side, these relations also comprise the impressions humans have on the environment, both constructive (e.g., restoring and protecting ecosystems, preserving species, etc.) and destructive (e.g., pollution, degradation of soils, ozone-depletion, etc.). The SDGs 2030 agenda voices itself as “an Agenda of the people, by the people, and for the people – and this will ensure its success” (United Nations, General Assembly, 2015, p. 12). Congruently, the twofold role of the human-element is clearly identified, as both the originator and the beneficiary of the executed SDGs (Chams & García-Blandónb, 2019). Chams and García-Blandónb (2019, p. 2) argued that Human Resource Management (HRM) is one of the areas that can contribute most to the fulfillment of SDGs at corporate and institutional levels, coherently, Cahan and Schweiger (1993) had argued that organizations must be get aligned with environmental-goals, organizations must alter its HRM practices in line with system-approach. The developing role of sustainable-development in the advancement of a cutting edge organization's upper hand prompts the advocacy of the topic of how to integrate environmental practices into the space of HRM strategy – which is frequently alluded to as green HRM. HRM is crucial for sustainability (Cohen et al., 2012). When HRM was linked with environmental-management and it was termed as ‘green’ or ‘environmental human resource management’ (Renwick et al., 2013). “GHRM is a phenomenon related to considerate connections between organizational deeds that influence the natural-environment and the implementation, evolution, design, and impact of HRM-systems” (Ren et al., 2017). Most organizations have modified HRM that inspire an ecological environment with the thoughtfulness of least ecological pollution and environment destruction, as a conservation motive HRM has contributed a crucial role in environmental conversation (Cheema & Javed, 2017). Sustainability strategies are developing quickly inside thousands of organizations these days as a response to the catastrophes and disasters that climate change has brought. GHRMPs expand their contribution to the preferment and attainment of sustainable objectives within an organization (Deka, 2021).

Addressing the knowledge gaps in this area, how corporate-sector can contribute to the attainment of SDGs is uncertain. On one side, the corporate or business sector is blamed to be major culprit toward environmental degradation that occurred due to its unsustainable activities (Bukhari et al., 2020; Dechant & Altman, 1994; Talukdar & Meisner, 2001; Fiksel, 1993), but on the other side, the role which the new-age corporate-sector (transitioning into sustainable business models) could have played in attaining SDGs has not been studied in extant literature. Although, Chams and García-Blandónb (2019) came with a qualitative review where the role of sustainable HRM (SHRM) in facilitating the accomplishment of just four SDGs (i.e., 8, 10, 12 &17) was proposed, although the study was novel in its own kind, but the potential of HRM was not fully explored, even conceptually. Although, SHRM – SDGs linkages were proposed, but the underlying mechanism bridging SHRM – SDGs linkages remained unexplored. Furthermore, Chams and García-Blandónb (2019) confessed that integrating statistical data and empirical studies could have provided further evidence on how sustainable HRM contributes to the formation of environmental organizations. Therefore, there is a lack of research elaborating the long-term potential of GHRMPs in attaining SDGs through the business or corporate sector; and studies depicting the GHRMPs – SDGs linkages, as argued by Chams and García-Blandónb (2019, p. 2), reminded unattempted. Unlike the previous take on this area, guided by stakeholder theory and TBL theory, this conceptual study (i.e., model paper) develops a consolidated conceptual framework to shed light on underlying process explaining ‘how’ sustainability millstones can be attained by integrated or joint impact of GHRMPs in diverse business settings while acknowledging stakeholders perspectives, and thus provides a comprehensive understanding of ‘how’ incorporating GHRMPs corporate sector can attain SGDs. Correspondingly, this study outlines its objectives.

**Objectives**

The core purpose of this study is to:

- To explore the underlying mechanism through which GHRMPs – SDGs linkages are formulated.
• To identify the links of GHRMPs with three pillars of sustainability (i.e., environmental, social, and economic).
• To identify the links of GHRMPs with others green practices or interventions in attaining SDGs
• To derive an integrated model offering an understanding of ‘how’ incorporating GHRMPs corporate sector can attain multiple SGDs, in line with stakeholder and triple bottom lines approaches.

The main debate in the literature concerns the establishment of a clear understanding of ‘how’ GHRMPs can enable the corporate sector towards the ultimate shared goal of sustainability-development. Hence, by attaining its research objectives this study contributes to the knowledge. This study sheds light on GHRMPs – SDGs linkages and advances the existing knowledge related to sustainability phenomena, which have not been discovered yet, and reveals the hidden truths about the enduring influence of GHRMPs that originates from an organization and lasts around planet earth. As Jaakkola (2020, p. 7) argued that a model paper contributes to the knowledge by explaining an entity, its objective is to depict, describe or detail an entity and its association to other entities (MacInnis, 2011), and hence provides a roadmap for understanding the entity by exploring the previously unexplored networks between constructs. Furthermore, the practical unity of this study is also considerable, as it offers clarity on which environmental interventions must be undertaken in organization for their potential transitioning into to sustainable organizations, as Chams and García-Blandón (2019, p. 2) argued that there is a lack of clarity in the developmental processes implemented in sustainable firms. Furthermore, the proposed framework in this study is guided by stakeholder theory, as argued by Freeman et al. (2021) that stakeholder theory is an effective framework for addressing management concerns, so this study holds its applied relevance.

Following the ‘Model’ approach to conceptual study (Jaakkola, 2020), the remainder of this paper is structured as follows. First, the theoretical perspectives (i.e., stakeholder and TBL theories) binding the proposed framework of the study are discussed. How stakeholder-perspective outperforms the shareholder-perspective is elaborated. How TBL captures the three-pillar conception of sustainability is discussed. Then linkages among GHRM – SDGs are explored, propositions are derived, and a consolidated model (theoretical-framework revealing antecedents, outcomes, and contingencies associated with the focal-construct) is presented. Finally, the paper concludes its work, outlines theoretical-contributions, derives implications, and suggests future opportunities in research.

Methodology
The study is primarily based upon secondary data. An in-depth review of extant literature by strategically choosing articles on the topics of GHRM and sustainable-development from different databases, websites, and other sources published from 2015 to 2022 was performed. Particularly review approach followed by Ahmad (2015) was applied with reference to ‘model paper’ designs to conceptual articles as defined by Jaakkola (2020).

Literature Review
Stakeholder Theory
Stakeholder theory is a promising track in advancing our understanding of management and addressing its stakeholders’ concerns (Freeman et al., 2021). Businesses hold goals, priorities, and liabilities towards diverse constituencies, and hence are accountable for their impacts, values, well-being, and consequences; the extended lines of accountability, executing business sustainability, prevalent today have their historic origin from stakeholder-theory. In 1963, the word ‘stakeholder’ was first seemed in management literature at SRI(Stanford Research Institute) at an internal memorandum, asserting management was supposed to be responsive to this group comprising: shareholders, customers, employees, lenders, suppliers, society, stakeholder, stakeholder originally meant "those groups without whose support the organization would cease to exist", researchers at SRI argued that without incorporating stakeholders’ concerns and needs
management can’t devise corporate-objectives mandatory for firm survival (Freeman, 2010). A stakeholder is “any group or individual who can affect or is affected by the achievement of the organization’s objectives” (Freeman, 1984).

Organizations are motivated for stakeholders ‘engagement in order to generate positive bottom-line figures (Berman et al., 1999). Despite of criticism on stakeholder-theory, that it’s a research-tradition rather than theory (Trevino and Weaver, 1999), or why it has been outlined as approach rather than theory, stakeholder-theory has managed to attain a priority form society and business sector as a robust, an appropriate and alternative model to project corporate behavior, rather than conventional economic-model. Understanding a business is simple, groups have stakes in business activities, understanding the linkages (integration) and value-creation among these group can explain a business; how these relationship are managed, is a product of, how these relations are tackled and shaped by executives (Freeman et al., 2010). The broader categories of stakeholders (as executed in Figure 2), which call for diverse stakes in value-creation process, are primary and secondary. Creating value for definitional primary-stakeholders is binding, because they make business viable, instrumental or secondary-stakeholders may affect the primary circle of stakeholders. Primary-stakeholders are: Financers (hold financial-stake in terms of bonds, or stocks, and demand stakeholder-value), Employees (hold jobs, put livelihood at stake, and demand remuneration, e.g., wage, benefits, and security), Customers (pay for products, or services and expect utility/benefit as promised by company). Suppliers (exchange resources and expect benefits in return, in an ethical, fair and transparent way), Local community (grant rights to construct facilities and demand taxes, social and economic contributions in return); and secondary-stakeholders are governments, competitors, media, special-interest and customers-advocacy groups (Freeman, et al., 2010).

Companies do impact upon communities, companies are required to be good-citizens in return to local services availed, fulfill all commitments, operate in transparent mode, not to be the reason of hazardous consequences (e.g., toxic-waste, pollution) for the communities, and mitigate catastrophic incidences arriving form business operations, in a collaborative way (Freeman et al., 2010). Stakeholders approach to conversation demands all stakeholders to participate in the conversation, a detailed “stakeholder management framework” (analysis, mapping, development, presentation, and implementation of stakeholders - work plan) approach can be applied in order to attain conversation (environment) projects through creating conflict-resolution (De Lopez, 2001). Bringing general-public and ecology for negotiation, meaningfully, is challenging; as a stakeholder, or nature representatives, identities and roles of environmental-groups do conflict (Jamal and Eyre, 2003). In contrast, shareholder-perspective stimulates thinking which is short-lived but at the cost of organizational-health, a long-lived perspective (Freeman et al., 2018). The perspective behind shareholder value-maximization is its core concern of the management to maximize profitability in order to deliver maximum return to shareholders; whereas, stakeholder-theory recognizes that businesses operate in an intricate world, therefore value-creation should be extended to diverse stakeholders, not only confined to financial gains (Freeman et al., 2010), so this theory sets the concrete foundation that bottom-lines are multiple.
Triple Bottom Line

The TBL framework is well-suited in underscoring both the tripartite and quantifiable facets of the sustainability conception (Shouheng & Myriam, 2021). TBL refers to “programs, policies, or activities designed to create or retain jobs and wealth in ways that contribute to environmental, social, and economic well-being over time” (Hammer & Pivo, 2016); which is congruent to the definition of sustainable development “development that meets the needs of the present generation without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs” (World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987). “The TBL is a philosophical orientation whereby organizations develop and implement not just a traditional economically sustainable strategy, but also explicitly include environmental and social sustainability strategies” (Stoddard et al., 2012). The concept of TBL (“triple bottom line”) was coined in 1994, which asserts that along with economical-value, social and environmental values are also bottom-line for corporations; in 1995 the concept 3Ps (“profit, people & planet”) was developed encompassing the scope of sustainability (Elkington, 2004) (executed in Figure 3). TBL takes into accounts the whole cost of conducting business operations; three bottom-lines, three impacts, and three critical responsibilities are forefront to businesses.
Elkington (1997) eloquently and appropriately positioned TBL as global agenda, in perfect timing and term: global awareness constituted due to market deregulations, pension-investing, privatization, boomed stocks-market and extraordinary profits, affected businesses; in the 1990s, technology, particularly internet, exploded information to social and environmental activists, investors, and corporations. TBL made the concept of sustainability understandable to the population merely focusing on the economic bottom-line, “the events of the 1990s legitimized the sustainability proposition, and the TBL concept articulated it”; TBL is a far-reaching and brilliant metaphor that stimulated corporations to generate a qualified expression of performance on three pillars of sustainability (Adams et al., 2014). In addition to conventional financial-statements, merely presenting profitability and other financial indicators, the economic dimension of TBL accounts for the comprehensive scope of business interactions with its stakeholders (Ho & Taylor, 2007). Through TBL reporting sustainability managers to communicate and generate an interpretation of “corporate sustainability” to satisfy stakeholders and external pressures (Sridhar, 2012). TBL (economic, environmental and social) disclosures improve accountability-levels, transparency, employee-motivation, market-share, and reduce employee-turnovers; TBL disclosures shield corporations from legal obstacles and overcome stakeholders stresses (Ekwueme et al., 2013). TBL reporting is driven by internal (e.g., HSE department) and external (e.g., local community) stakeholders (MacDermott, 2003).

The concept of TBL is congruent to “sustainable economic development” (Barbier, 1987) which argues that genuine improvements cannot be made unless strategies, that are ecologically sustainable and consistent with societal values are not devised and implemented, this process can be seen as the integration of three systems: (1) biological, or natural,(2) economical, and (3) social. TBL provides an intertwined-view of the business-society-nature interface, three-domain are brought together in an integrated manner (Marcus et al., 2010). Rather than isolated examination, sustainability is well understood with the interaction among three systems (economy, ecology, and society) (Seager, 2008). Success must incorporate solution which innovatively promotes both industrial-competitiveness and environmentalism (Porter & Linde, 1995). These three dimensions or pillars of sustainability are interlocked in concentric, or overlapping-circles to better integrate three objectives in the right balance (Adams, 2006). The broader range of entrepreneurial practice and research must integrate TBL in multifaceted value-creation (Cohen et al., 2008). TBL offers paradigms shift from short-lived to long-lived priorities and results in “competitive synergy” (a phenomenon in which anticipated-benefits e.g., reduced costs, coalesce with unanticipated-benefits e.g., employee-satisfaction, in a synergic mechanism) along with other tangential benefits for firms, ultimately sustainability enhance firm’s competitiveness (Boley & Uysal, 2013). TBL is management, planning, decision-making instrument, internal, and external reporting outline (Dwyer, 2005). TBL along with state-owned reforms, incorporated in a balanced approach, determines the state’s prosperity (Moore & Wen, 2006). Hence, TBL theory not only provides the theoretical foundation of multidisciplinary researches but also offers sustainability logic in applied business settings.

**Role of GHRMPs in Attaining Environmental-Sustainability and SDGs 12 and 13.**
Environmental-sustainability is a type of sustainability development that establishes a protected and decent climate and tries to lessen ecological effects and restores ecological harm (Tooranloo et al., 2017). It's a progress that is agreeable with the support of the eco-system, which orders the human activities to be observed that started in the climate change (Cabello et al., 2020). Environmental-sustainability rehearses are the reception of activities and strategies that emphatically affect the indigenous habitat (Alhaddi, 2015). There is an association between human activities and regular ecological systems, Environmental-sustainability is tied in with adjusting human requirements (present and future) without hurting the environment (Morelli, 2011). This ecological part of sustainable development involves an enduring centered battle to limit the ecological burden of firm/business' development and progression (Hart, 1995). Corporate environmental-performance denotes to “a firm’s effectiveness in meeting and
exceeding society’s expectations with respect to concerns for the natural environment” (Judge & Douglas, 1998) or “managing natural resources and the natural environment in the process of conducting business” (Ones & Dilchert, 2012). In an organizational or business context, various as environmental-sustainability practices e.g., energy-efficiency, water-conservation, waste-management, green technologies, recycle/reuse, ecofriendly packaging, etc., have been studied by authors (Jang, 2020; Sendawula et al., 2020; Yacob et al., 2018). Multiple studies have established that GHRMPs have facilitated the accomplishment of environmental-performance or environmental-sustainability across the diverse wings of the corporate sector around the globe including: the Pakistani textile sector (Amjad et al., 2021), Palestinian healthcare organizations (Mousa & Othman, 2020), Malaysian research universities (Anwar et al., 2020), Pakistani manufacturing firms (Malik et al., 2020; Mansoor et al., 2021), Pakistani healthcare organizations (Martins et al., 2021), Chinese manufacturing firms (Naz et al., 2021; Roscoe et al., 2018), Brazilian chemical-sector companies (Silva et al., 2019), Qatari oil and gas industry (Obeidat et al., 2018), Malaysian IT companies (Ojo et al., 2020), Malaysian hotels industry (Nisar et al., 2021; Shafaei et al., 2020; Yusoff et al., 2018), Egyptian tourist agencies (Elshaer et al., 2021), Malaysian manufacturing firms (Khan et al., 2021; Yong et al., 2019), and Manila hospitality-industry (Haldorai et al., 2022), and thus played a pivotal role in enabling the corporate sector to contribute its share in attaining SDGs 12 and 13. SDG 12 “sustainable production and consumption” intends to detach environmental deprivation with economic evolution, which is possible through a transition towards more sustainable outlines, such switch involves national public policies that produce favorable infrastructures and markets, and a modification of business operations along with the value-chains worldwide (United Nations, 2018), relatedly, SDG 13 intends to “take urgent action to combat climate change and its impact” e.g., reducing carbon dioxide (CO₂) and greenhouse gases emissions, building education and capacity for SGD adoption, adopting mitigation actions, etc. Organizations incorporate sustainability practices in order to actualize intent of SGDs. Hence, it is argued that by incorporating GHRMPs corporate sector not only ensures: (1) sustainable production and consumption i.e., producing and changing consumption of products and services in a way that is environmentally benevolent, socially constructive, and economically feasible over their entire life-cycle, (2) the reduction of its ecological footprints toward climate-change, but also can majorly facilitate the attainment of SDG 12 and 13, nationally and globally. Accordingly, the following proposition is derived:

**Proposition 1: The implementation of GHRMPs facilitate corporate sector to achieve environmental-sustainability and SDGs 12 & 13.**

**Role of GHRMPs in Attaining Social-Sustainability and SDGs 3,5,10 and 16.**

Social-Supportability is distinct as a degree of human’s welfare (Mohamed & Paleologos, 2021), it evaluates the influences of the value chain on society (Fernando et al., 2018). Social-sustainability can be elaborated as stipulating and handling both constructive and destructive influences of systems, processes, activities, and organizations on people and social life (Balaman, 2019). Social-sustainability holds the core objective of securing people’s spiritual needs and socio-cultural and in an equitable way (Popovic et al., 2013). Companies influence what occurs to employees, workers, clients and local societies, directly or indirectly, and it is imperative to manage such impacts proactively. From a business perspective, social-sustainability is about being empathetic to the impressions of corporations on the people and societies. In recent studies (Acquah et al., 2021; Malik et al., 2020; Martins et al., 2021; Yong et al., 2019) it have been empirically verified that GHRMPs provided a pathway towards attaining social-sustainability in Pakistani manufacturing SMEs and healthcare organizations, Malaysian large manufacturing firms, and Ghanaian hospitality and manufacturing firms, GHRMPs facilitated towards social-sustainability performance by: (1) improving stakeholder’ welfare, (2) upgrading health and safety in the community,(3) reducing ecological impacts and threats to the general public, (5) enhancing of employees’ occupational health and safety, (5) improving protection and awareness of the rights and claims of the communal people being served, and (6) dropping the adverse impression processes and products on the local community. Relatedly, SDG 3 aims to “ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages”, SDG 5 intends
to attain gender-equality, SDG 10 intends to lessen inequality, and SGD 16 intends to “promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels” (United Nations, 2018). That’s how the corporate sector approaches for social-sustainability overalls the essence of SDGs 3,5,10 and 16. Hence, it is argued that by integrating GHRMPs corporate sector not only ensures equal employment, income equality, human rights, the rule of law and access to justice, freedom-of-information for policies and laws, healthier lives, health facilities, and funding, hygiene conditions, but also safeguards against discrimination, sexual exploitation, forced labor, psychological violence, physical punishment, ill-health challenges, unsafe sanitation, global mortality, outdoor air pollution and unsustainable societies in general, and hence also can majorly facilitate the attainment of SDGs 3,5,10 and 16, nationally and globally. Accordingly, the following proposition is derived:

Proposition 2: The implementation of GHRMPs facilitate corporate sector to achieve social-sustainability and SDGs 3, 5, 10 & 16.

Role of GHRMPs in Attaining Economic-Sustainability and SDG 8.
Economic-sustainability denotes practices that upkeep the longstanding economic-development of a business or nation while also shielding ecological, social, and cultural components (Bish, 2021). This sustainability is achieved by conserving valued resources for comming generations i.e., implementing the principle of equal and fair distribution of resources between generations (Munasinghe, 1993). Economic-sustainability is an economic-development that does not have destructive repercussions on environmental or social-sustainability (Courtnell, 2019). Economic-sustainability entails an efficient and responsible utilization of resources by a business or state so that it can function in a sustainable manner to yield an operational profit. Several studies (Acquah et al., 2021; Malik et al., 2020; Martins et al., 2021; Yong et al., 2019; Zaid et al., 2018) have empirically confirmed that GHRMPs contributed towards the attainment of economic-sustainability in Pakistani manufacturing SMEs (i.e., furniture, agriculture, fruit processing, plastic, leather, textile, construction, dairy, food, and beverages), Malaysian large manufacturing firms, Pakistani healthcare organizations, Ghanaian hospitality and manufacturing firms, and Palestinian manufacturing sectors (i.e., pharmaceutical, food and chemical sectors). GHRMPs facilitated the economic pillar of sustainability performance, for instance, by decreasing material purchasing and energy consumption costs, and falling waste treatment and discharge fees; as economic-sustainability comprises monetary costs and benefits (Popovicab et al., 2013). Congruently, SDG 8 intends to “promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all”. That’s how the implementation of GHRMPs aids the corporate sector in achieving sustainable economic growth materializing the aim of SDGs 8. Hence, it is argued that by implementing GHRMPs corporate sector not only ensures sustainable economic prosperity, labor-productivity, employment opportunities, and secured working environments, but also fights against the prevailing profitability-first-approach and unemployment-rate, and hence also can primarily enable the attainment of SDGs 10, nationally and globally. Therefore, the following proposition is derived:

Proposition 3: The implementation of GHRMPs facilitate corporate sector to achieve economic-sustainability and SDG 8.

Role of GHRMPs in Attaining Green Supply Chain, Green Innovation and SDG 9.
Green supply chains (GSC) can be understood as logistic-structures that assure the manufacturing and distribution of products in an eco-friendly manner (Barbosa-Póvoa, 2009), it is about integrating the sustainable-environmental processes into the conventional supply-chain. GSC management encompasses driving value-creation of the entire supply-chain to reduce total ecological impacts. On the other hand, green innovation “is an innovation that involves creation, implementation and adoption of sustainable technology, green ideas and practices” (Hashim, Bock & Cooper, 2015), it is defined as “the hardware or
software innovation related to green products or processes” (Song & Yu, 2018). Multiple studies (Acquah et al., 2021; Khan et al., 2020; Longoni et al., 2016; Nejati et al., 2017; Teixeira et al., 2016; Zaid et al., 2018) have empirically established that GHRMPs constructively affected GSCMPs in Ghanaian, Chinese, Brazilian, Palestinian and Iranian manufacturing firms, Ghanaian hospitality firms, and across multiple Italian industries, GHRMPs facilitated the effective execution of green SCM practices, e.g., greenwashed purchasing, TQM, distribution, packaging, compliance, and auditing programs, etc., and hence supported resilient infrastructure and sustainable industrialization. Furthermore, studies (Ali et al., 2019; Singh et al., 2020; Yahya et al., 2021) have provided empirically to establish the deterministic potential of GHRMPs towards green innovation in the UAE manufacturing sector SMEs, Pakistani pharmaceutical industry and small manufacturing firms, GHRMPs facilitated: the usage of such materials that generated the least pollution and utilized least resources and energy, the production of products that are eco-friendly, easy to reuse, recycle and dispose of, and adoption of such manufacturing process that effectively reduced hazardous waste, consumption of fuel (i.e., oil, coal, electricity or water) and usage of raw-material and resultantly supported business to achieve green-innovation. Congruently, SDG 9 intends to “build resilient infrastructure, promote inclusive and sustainable industrialization and foster innovation”. That’s how the implementation of GHRMPs benefits the corporate sector in building resilient and sustainable industrialization, installing sustainable innovation, and contributing towards the aim of SDGs 9. Hence, it is argued that by integrating GHRMPs corporate sector not only ensures responsible and efficient resources utilization, implementation of clean and ecologically sound industrial and technologies processes, retrofit and upgrade industries to turn them sustainable, and thus can primarily enable the attainment of SDGs 9, nationally and globally. Accordingly, the following proposition is derived:

**Proposition 4:** The implementation of GHRMPs facilitate corporate sector in the implementation of green SCM practices, green-innovation and SDG 9.

![Figure 4: The consolidated model of GHRMPs – SDGs linkages](image)

**Conclusion**

This study intended to provide a comprehensive understanding of how incorporating GHRMPs corporate sector can attain SGDs. It explored the underlying mechanism through which GHRMPs – SDGs linkages are formulated. Stakeholder theory (Freeman, 1984) offers a distinctive twist on management strategy.
emphasizing the forming and maintenance of sustainable stakeholder relations as integral to corporate sector performance, the theory argues that a business should generate value for all stakeholders, not solely shareholders. Stakeholder theory is a pragmatic-approach that considers how the interests (counting well-being) of a broad group impact, or should impact leaders’ decisions. Guided by Stakeholder theory, this study attempted to comprehend how GHRMPs can facilitate the corporate sector to actualize sustainable-development and materially contribute toward SDGs. Likewise, the TBL framework (Elkington, 1994) is also well-suited in highlighting both the tripartite and quantifiable facets of the sustainability conception. It asserts that along with economical-value, social and environmental values are also bottom-line for corporations. The concept of TBL is congruent to the concept of sustainable-development which argues that genuine improvements cannot be made unless strategies that are ecologically sustainable and consistent with societal values are not devised and implemented. Relatively, guided by TBL theory, this study attempted to understand how GHRMPs can facilitate the corporate sector to accomplish three-pillar of sustainability (i.e., environmental, social, and economic) to materialize SDGs. The main output of this model paper is the generation of an integrative or consolidated model of GHRMPs linking with SDGs (executed in Figure 4). The study proposes that through GHRMPs corporate sector can attain three pillars of sustainability i.e., environmental, social, and economic, effectively execute GSCMPs, undertake green-innovation, and eventually accomplish SDGs. The overall thoughts behind the derived model are consistent with what Chams and García-Blandónb (2019) argued that HRM is one of the areas that can contribute most to the fulfillment of SDGs at corporate and institutional levels. The reasoning backing the proposed model also complies with Cohen et al. (2012) argument that human resource management is critical for sustainability. The study clearly elaborated the long-term potential of GHRMPs in attaining SDGs through the business or corporate sector. In an attempt to answer the research questions, this study managed to drive an integrated map offering a comprehensive understanding of how incorporating GHRMPs corporate sector can attain multiple SGDs, as an ideal approach to manage stakeholders concerns and triple lines of accountabilities.

Theoretical Implications
The theoretical contributions of this study are also notable. This study explored the organizational antecedents for achieving SGDs through corporate-sector. Unlike previous work, this study explored the mid-mechanism comprehending the GHRMPs – SDGs linkages and identified the role of GHRMPs towards SDGs, instead of sustainable HRM. This study managed to identify 8 SDGs potentially attainable by corporate-sector through GHRMPs intervention. Drawing on stakeholder theory (Freeman, 1984) and TBL theory (Elkington, 1994) as theoretical foundations, this study proposed a consolidated model of GHRMPs – SDGs linkages, with its implications taken in four propositions, in advancing the existing knowledge related to sustainability phenomena, which was not discovered yet. This study responded to the main debate in the literature concerning the establishment of a clear understanding of ‘how’ GHRMPs can enable the corporate sector towards the ultimate shared goal of sustainability-development. Complying with Jaakkola (2020) and MacInnis (2011) assumptions, this paper contributed to the knowledge by providing a roadmap for understanding sustainability by exploring the previously unexplored networks between constructs. Furthermore, the practical utility of this study is also substantial, as it offered clarity that GHRMPs must be undertaken in organization for their potential transitioning into sustainable ones, as Chams and García-Blandónb (2019, p. 2) argued that there is a lack of clarity in the developmental processes implemented in sustainable firms. Lastly, the proposed model facilitates organizations in the sustainable management of stakeholder concerns. Hence, this study fulfilled the ‘novelty’ and ‘utility’ dimensions of theoretical-contribution (Corley & Gioia, 2011).

Managerial Implications
Sustainability is progressively turning into an obligation for the corporate sector, it is becoming even more crucial for companies to deal with the gap between knowing and implementing business practices that are sustainable. It can be recommended for the corporate sector to be sustainable and meet the expectations of its stakeholders, it should adopt GHRM to ensure a suitable balance among its environmental, social,
and economic performance. Thus, companies must be transiting from strategic HRM to green HRM. For this, conscious planning for organizational sustainable-development will help the companies to improve, while meeting the expectation of diverse stakeholders by contributing toward the attainment of SDGs nationally and globally. Applying the proposed consolidated model from this study will provide valuable insight to organizational policymakers to achieve sustainable development changes that ensure responsible production and consumption, organizational health, well-being, justice, equality, sustainable communities, economic prosperity, labor-productivity, employment opportunities, secured working environments, resilient infrastructure, sustainable-industrialization, and innovation, that resultantly favor the accomplishment of SDGs i.e., 3,5,8,9,10,12,13 and 16.

**Future Directions**

Further conceptual and empirical researches are essential to make further progress in the field of GHRMPs in attaining sustainable-development. This study had explored GHRMPs – SDGs linkages in corporate-sector, the same direction of review can be diverted to other sectors i.e., governmental organizations. The unaddressed role of financial institutions i.e., banking organizations in developing sustainability due to the intervention of GHRMPs can be examined in forthcoming studies. Upcoming studies can contribute toward the prevailing scarcity of studies bridging GHRMPs with environmental-performance in banking-sector. Prospect studies can explore how SDGs are linked with other organization practices i.e., green-marketing, green-entrepreneurship, and green-financing, etc. The model proposed in this study is drawn upon macro level interactions among organizational-variables, future studies are called to explore micro variables bridging these macro organizational-variables in order to present macro-micro-macro frameworks. In future studies, the currently under-estimated role of environmental-leadership in moderating the link between pro-environmental behaviors (PEBs) and environmental-performance (EP) can be investigated for further comprehending the existing models (Elshaer et al., 2021; Naz et al., 2021; Nisar et al., 2021) linking GHRMPs with EP through PEBs. This study managed to explore links among GHRMPs and 8 SDGs, further studies are called to explore the associations of GHRMPs with remaining SDGs (e.g., 11 and 17). Lastly, this study derived four GHRMPs – SDGs linkages propositions, future studies are called to test these propositions empirically.
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