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Abstract

As the world is trying to curb CO₂ emission, mainly from the industries, various organizations’ employees are crucial in mitigating carbon monoxide emissions. The employee reaction based on their perception of human resources management practices shapes their commitment to the workplace environment. According to relevant environment literature, emphasizing effective environmental management improves employees’ green attitudes dedicated to natural purposes. This study explores how to enhance hotels’ environmental performance (EP) by adopting green human resource management (HRM) practices. The current study developed and investigated a moderation model which examined the green process innovation (GPI) as a moderator onto the relationship between green HRM and environmental process through the lens of Ability-Motivation-Opportunity theory (AMO). SmartPLS software was used to analyze the data from 220 full-time employees of 3-, 4-, and 5-stars green hotels in Turkey. The findings demonstrate the importance of adopting green practices in advancing organizational performance, especially the environmental aspect. The novel findings of this study enrich the moderation effect of GPI in hospitality literature.
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Introduction

The exponential development of the industry is contingent on natural resources, which causes environmental destruction (Bhatti et al., 2020; Irani et al., 2021; Rusinko, 2007; Ozdemir et al., 2021). Several countries have introduced environmental legislation to conserve and minimize greenhouse emissions by limiting energy usage; for example, the chlorofluorocarbon, the Johannesburg World Summit Sustainable Development Notices, and prohibitions on other dangerous substances (e.g., ban on electric and electrical devices, EU limitation on hazardous substances). This sort of legislation not only increased environmental conservation awareness, but it also enhanced corporate management practices and competitiveness. To conform with existing environmental regulations, organizations were required to adopt environmentally sustainable activities. That is to say; they can follow initiatives and policies that enable them to paradoxically boost their brand identities while still supporting sustainable growth to thrive in the competencies. (Athari et al., 2020; Irani & Rahimizhian, 2021; Panwaret, 2011; Qi et al., 2010). Going green was one of the primary ways in which organizations discussed environmental issues. Over the past
decades, methods for improving green technologies and sustainability policies have piqued the public’s imagination and stimulated debate (Davis, 1995; Schiederig et al., 2012). To promote green technologies, organizations must recognize the essential factors and antecedents of their industries (Hadi et al., 2020; Routroy, 2009). They involve customer demands, organization owners’ interests, producer capacities, government policy, and the fiscal, organizational, and antecedents that improve the atmosphere by pro-environmental measures. The impacts of different determinants on green actions have received attention in the relevant literature. However, the antecedents of implementing GPI have received less attention in a relevant context (Weng et al., 2015). Furthermore, it is essential to pay closer attention to the effect of each stakeholder in an organization on developing green innovation capacities and activities.

Top hierarchy management is involved in recognizing what the critical factors in developing innovative green activities are. In contrast, much of the prior research has concentrated on the manufacturing field or a single business area (Park & Park, 2020). It would be helpful if a general blueprint were included to tackle concerns relevant to innovation in green activities for the sector. Organizational environmental management strategies depend on the development and maintenance of internal competencies and capacities (Mercan et al., 2020; Yin & Schmeidler, 2009; Yong et al., 2019), whereby small and medium-sized companies were found to be significant defaulters due to a lack of employee expertise and enthusiasm combined with the organizational resources needed to tackle complex sustainability toward environmental challenges (Ali et al., 2020; Biscotti et al., 2018; Boiral et al., 2014; Russo, 2009).

This study contends that green HRM practices are focused on improving the business’s internal competencies and skills, which are essential for managing people in small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) with specific points of view (Leroy et al., 2018). Simultaneously, previous research indicates that employees’ role in corporate culture and the psychological characteristic of employees determines the success of SMEs (Brettel et al., 2015; Elsetouhi et al., 2018; Palmer et al., 2019). Nonetheless, we prescribe green HRM practices which help during the procedures, impact employee on a larger scale in an organized manner would be the manner for enhancing GPI and EP in SMEs, especially in a relatively power-distance society like Turkey (AlMazrouei et al., 2016; Lievens, 2015).

Predominantly, the current research primarily intended to address this gap by exploring how green HRM practices result in decisive consequences, such as green hotel environmental success. The green HRM practices examined in this study at the individual level. This empirical study’s main objective is to understand better how to enhance EP by investigating the role of green HRM practices. To address this objective, the study examines the association between green HRM practices and EP and the moderating role of GPI towards the effects of green HRM practices on EP. Instead, this study analyzes the process that green HRM practices contribute to significant results, specifically EP, at green hotels. The findings of this study analysis confirmed the hypotheses. By undertaking a structural equation modeling using the partial least squares path modeling method research approach, this study contributes to the existing relevant context in three ways. First, by creating a positive association between green HRM practices and EP, this study tries to demonstrate a situation that can contribute to the appropriation of green HRM practices beyond harsh administration discipline. Second, focusing on the AMO, the study advances current literature on green HRM activities at the individual level. Third, the study sheds light on the
framework by which green HRM practices affect employee outcomes by taking into account the crucial role of GPI as a moderator in the intended model.

Literature Review

Theoretical Framework

The AMO theory is widely applied in diverse disciplines, particularly in the HRM context (Boselie et al., 2005). The AMO theory’s potential is identified to enhance organizational employees’ behavior, contributing to the organization’s performance (Appelbaum et al., 2000). Based on the literature review results, the AMO comprises collective interests and willingness to research an individual’s actions in the light of sustainability toward organizational development (Marin-Garcia & Tomas, 2016). A variety of studies have examined green HRM practices in different sectors (i.e., Pham et al., 2019; Pinzone et al., 2016; Singh et al., 2020; Yu et al., 2020). The AMO theory has been used in various studies to explain the contributions of green HRM practices on EP, but there is a lack of adequate studies that employed the AMO framework in their studies (Anwar et al., 2020; Ragas et al., 2017).

The integration of green HRM practices and environmental protection systematically shapes a new avenue to implement remunerative management options that benefit managers, workers, customers and businesses, and other stakeholders in the organization (Jackson et al., 2011). When stakeholders coordinate their efforts to promote environmental sustainability, and the process is built on partnerships focused on equal sharing, a win-win system occurs (Gursoy & Kendall, 2006; Mitchell & Jolley, 2012). According to a recent finding derived from a related environmental literature analysis, individuals who see a boost from environmental conservation are more inclined to contribute back by seizing chances to improve organizational EP (Temminck et al., 2015). The position of green HRM practices received less recognition. In contrast, previous studies in broader management literature have demonstrated, by adopting AMO theory, that green HRM behaviors, combined with support from organizations, put up personal motivation to compensate for the admiring interest of the managers of organizations in the sense of environmental growth (Cheema & Javed, 2017; Tremblay et al., 2010).

Green Human Resource Management (HRM) Practices

The green HRM initiatives are described as innovations, policies, and the procedures in which organizations imply to reduce the negative impacts and simultaneously increase the positive impacts on the environment (Arulrajah et al., 2016; Kim et al., 2019). That is to say; green HRM practices is to train employees who are capable of adopting pro-environmental behaviors toward the environmentally sustainable development of their organizations. Therefore, various actions form an organization’s human capital, such as recruiting applicants with green attitudes, training, green empowerment, and reward (Arulrajah et al., 2016; Irani et al., 2020). Green HRM practices are among the most critical determinants in an organization striving toward environmentally sustainable practices that motivate employees (Ren et al., 2018).

Recently, the work process of the HRM system made headway to new forms in which the employee’s involvement level increased in more participation and support approaches (Lengnick-Hall et al., 2009; Masri & Jaaron, 2017), which result in opportunities to adopt skills, knowledge,
and attitudes by the employees (Singh et al., 2019). In a period of risen understanding of environmental sustainability and natural resource development, green human resources management corresponds to HRM activities aiming at the environment and economic implications of organizations (Roos & O’Connor, 2015) and is related to a coherent environmental approach and green behavior of employees (Cavicchi, 2017; Renwick et al., 2013; Yusoff et al., 2020). The study contends that green HRM practices are crucial for HRM literature centers on efficient natural administration applications (Dumont et al., 2017). Wherever green HRM attends as a tool to correlate human resource practices to the organizational environment’s administration actions.

**Green Process Innovation (GPI)**

Green innovation is defined as a procedure to develop environmentally sustainable products and services by conducting actions that help conserve the environment the adverse effects through replacing greener raw materials and renewable energies with conventional procedures (Agyabeng-Mensah et al., 2020; Albort-Morant et al., 2018). Different research emphasized that organizations with a higher level of innovation in green activities obtain better overall performances than other competitors, leading them to achieve competitive advantages (Albort-Morant et al., 2016; Allameh & Khalilakbar, 2018; Rahimizhian & Irani, 2020). Green innovation is related to the organization’s strategy for environmental sustainability. Green innovation improves EP in turn, greener product and process advancement not only decrease the organization’s adverse environmental effects and also enhance the social and economic aspects of the organization by minimizing waste and costs (Agyabeng-Mensah et al., 2020; Luu, 2019; Weng et al., 2015).

**Environmental Performance (EP)**

The EP involves organizational programs intended to fulfill and surpass public standards of the natural world in a way that goes beyond pure compliance with laws and regulations (Arda et al., 2019). It includes the impacts of the environment according to environmental requirements legislation (Dubey et al., 2015). Prior research indicates EP would rely on the quality of green goods, green technologies, and technological developments, and merging into company activities and product growth of sustainability toward environmental development (Darnall et al., 2008; Pham et al., 2020). EP is defined as protecting the environment (Paillé et al., 2014; Roscoe et al., 2019) through an organizational commitment by illustrating the importance of conserving the natural resources (Dubey et al., 2015).

**Green HRM Practices and EP**

The human resource department of organizations is critical to raise the benefits of the organization (Arulrajah et al., 2016), so it is apparent from previous studies that corporations are fostering effective environmental management policies, with the reduction in expenses and increase in profit channels, to achieve core environmental business objectives (Arda et al., 2019; Ogbeibu et al., 2020). Information suggests that green HRM activities are among the most potent approaches to enhancing organizations’ environmental efficiency. They provide an essential framework to effectively minimize corporations’ environmental footprint (Sudin et al., 2020). Green HRM practices, like environmentally sustainable HR operations, also contribute to enhanced efficiencies, reduced expenses, and strengthened employee participation and retention. This would help organizations reduce the carbon footprint of workers (Arda et al., 2019; Sheopuri & Sheopuri,
The green HRM activities also help organizations develop their EP by the awareness of environmental issues among employees (Fayyazi et al., 2015). One of the appropriate approaches to promoting EP is adopting green HRM practices (Dutta & Lanvin, 2012). The green HRM initiatives lead the organizations to have employees who are embodied in green thinking and attitudes. Employees are the foundations of their organizations so that their roles in conserving the environment are well known (Daily et al., 2009; Dutta & Lanvin, 2012; Kim et al., 2019; Teixeira et al., 2016). The previous study supports developing a green HRM environment where employees view green projects and practices as expected values. This can point out the empowerment based on green attitudes aiding organizational EP results, enhancing employee engagement, and sustaining the green initiatives (Gholami et al., 2016; Nejati et al., 2017).

Jabbour and Santos (2008) exerted that green HRM practices have been shown to add substantially to organizations’ sustainable success. Similarly, organizations that conducted green HRM activities and employed various employee layers in the program had good environmental results (Nejati et al., 2017; Paillé et al., 2014). The green HRM practices are seen as effective methods to boost human resources of the organizations that can potentially drive to improved EP through developing the green behaviors of the employees and promoting green organizational culture (Álvarez Jaramillo et al., 2019; Kim et al., 2019; Roscoe et al., 2019). The majority of the relevant context studies demonstrate the prominent role green HRM practices play in promoting environmental sustainability (Arda et al., 2019; Kim et al., 2019; O’Donohue & Torugsa, 2016; Paillé et al., 2014). Daily et al (2009) exerted those green actions should be considered among various employees (i.e., personal, team, and organizational) at the workplace. Vidal-Salazar et al. (2012) focused on the importance of having a positive linkage between environmental training and organizational learning. Employees of environmental ideals are considered to have a vital role in promoting organizations proactively embrace and enforce concepts of environmental protection and improve the EP of an organization (Daily et al., 2009; Dutta & Lanvin, 2012; Kim et al., 2019; Paillé et al., 2014; Teixeira et al., 2016). Therefore, the following hypothesis formed:

- **H1:** Green HRM practices positively influence the EP.

**Moderation of GPI**

Previous findings have shown that green HRM practices positively affect GPI (Jimenez-Jimenez & Sanz-Valle, 2008; Wei et al., 2011). Green HRM practices targeted at improving an atmosphere of engagement rather than compliance positively impact the organization’s creative direction (Das et al., 2018). Likewise, strategic green HRM practices enhance the GPI of the organizations, which develops the organizational structure (Wei et al., 2011). Meanwhile, previous studies relevant to HRM innovation have received less attention among scholars and practitioners (Bos-Nehles & Veenendaal, 2019). Furthermore, integrated findings on the association between green HRM and innovation in green processes at organizations are scarce. By utilizing AMO, this study intercepts that to provide and enhance the determinant that fosters the opportunities to green human resources are required to imply the green innovations into the entire organizational sectors.

- **H2:** GPI moderates the association between green HRM practices and EP.
The proposed hypothesis was developed based on extant literature and tested based on data gathered from Turkey’s green hotel employees. Turkey stands among the top ten tourist countries with different attractions (UNWTO, 2020). The list of Turkey’s green hotels was extracted from the green globe institution (www.greenglobe.com). The green members are committed to applying organizational management to foster sustainability development, replacing the conventional fossil fuels with renewable energies, financial investment regarding environmental conservation activities, and proactive employees’ involvement and motivating them to be engaged in pro-environmental initiatives. The green globe received UNWTO affiliation, and the sustainable tourism standards are based on the global sustainable tourism council. There are seven green hotels in Turkey, according to the green globe institution. There are four 5-stars green hotels, two 4-stars green hotels, and one 3-stars green hotel. The research team approached the aforementioned green hotels’ HRM with a letter, including the aim and permission request for data collection. As such, the seven green hotels’ HRM agreed to contribute to this empirical study.

Furthermore, phase distinction was used in this empirical study by collecting data in two different periods with the interval of 14 days between the measurement scales to minimize the potential common method bias, which can devalue the correlations between the study variables (Podsakoff et al., 2003). Thus, two detached questionnaires were used for this survey study (e.g., phase I and II). The independent and moderator variables formed phase I and phase II was included by the dependent variable and the demographic variables. The purpose of the research was clarified to the participants after permission was granted. The participants were invited to participate as volunteers, and the study team ensured their anonymity (Hair et al., 2014). The questionnaires were filled out using a self-administrated technique and were collected sealed in separate envelopes. Those questionnaires in unsealed envelopes were discarded, and only the sealed envelopes were considered in this study (Cobanoglu et al., 2021).

Two hundred thirty-six questionnaires were distributed to employees of green hotels and resorts in Turkey. The green hotels of Turkey have been selected as the intended sample due to the high contribution of Turkey as it ranked among the first high ten countries of tourist arrivals according to UNWTO from 2020 report. A total of 236 questionnaires was distributed, the collected copies were 223, and 220 of the questionnaires were usable. The majority of the participants were male by one hundred and fourteen (51.8%), and the rest were female. The majority of the participants,
with one hundred and twenty-four (56.4%) aged between 28 and 37. Approximately half of the respondents (48.9%) had a bachelor’s degree. The organizational tenure of 31.5% of the respondents was between 1 to 5 years.

Measures

The 5-points Likert scale ranging from 1 strongly disagree to 5 strongly agree were used to measure the variables. To ensure reliability and validity, the measuring items were adapted from existing literature. The green HRM practices were measured by slightly adapting eight items (Shafaei et al., 2020). These items measured the extent of employees’ actions regarding environmental issues. GPI was measured by three items slightly adapted from existing literature (Singh et al., 2020). These items measured the extent of the hotel’s policy by reducing energy usage. The EP was measured by five items slightly adapted from previous studies (Singh et al., 2020). These items assessed decreases in hazardous waste and pollution, concentrations of scrap, and improved awareness about legislation. The original version of the items (e.g., phase I and II) was in English. Since the aim was to collect data from employees of green hotels located in Turkey, the original version translated to the Turkish language as it is the official language of Turkey. The questionnaire’s back-translation has been done using two independent multilingual experts who are fluent in English and Turkish languages (Parameswaran & Yaprak, 1987; Schaufeli et al., 2006).

Results

Validity and Reliability of the Data

The constructs’ internal consistency and reliability are illustrated in Table 1; the Cronbach’s alpha and composite reliability threshold must be over .70 (Hair et al., 2014; Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). Thus, the measure items of this study meet the criteria of being reliable. The average variance extracted (AVEs) and outer loadings measured by using Smart PLS.

Table 1. Results of Confirmatory Factor Analysis

| Items                  | Outer Loadings | Cronbach Alpha | CR   | AVEs |
|------------------------|----------------|----------------|------|------|
| Green HRM Practices    |                |                |      |      |
| Green HRM1             | .67            | .91            | .92  | .61  |
| Green HRM2             | .84            |                |      |      |
| Green HRM3             | .86            |                |      |      |
| Green HRM4             | .83            |                |      |      |
| Green HRM5             | .79            |                |      |      |
| Green HRM6             | .74            |                |      |      |
| Green HRM7             | .72            |                |      |      |
| Green HRM8             | .77            | .84            | .90  | .75  |
| GPI                    |                |                |      |      |
| GPI1                   | .80            |                |      |      |
| GPI2                   | .88            |                |      |      |
| GPI3                   | .90            |                |      |      |
| EP                     |                | .87            | .90  | .65  |
| EP1                    | .77            |                |      |      |
| EP2                    | .73            |                |      |      |
| EP3                    | .81            |                |      |      |
| EP4                    | .88            |                |      |      |
| EP5                    | .81            |                |      |      |

Note. HRM = Human Resource Management, GPI = Green Process Innovation, EP = Environmental Performance, CR: Composite Reliability, AVEs: Average Variance Extracted
The convergent validity of this study’s data was confirmed since the AVEs, and outer loading was above .50 (Hair et al., 2014). Therefore, as shown in Table 2, the Heterotrait-Monotrait (HTMT) values of the constructs were measured and obtained less than .90 (Henseler et al., 2016). Therefore, discriminant validity seems to be in the required criteria.

**Table 2. Result of Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio (HTMT)**

| Constructs                  | Environmental Performance (EP) | Green HRM Practices | Green Process Innovation (GPI) |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------|
| Green Human Resource        | 0.4042                         |                     |                               |
| Management Practices        |                                |                     |                               |
| GPI                         | 0.2042                         | 0.6087              |                               |
| EP                          | 0.1123                         | 0.3102              | 0.4556                        |

**Assessment of the Structural Model**

The moderation that is to measure and assess the differential effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable based on Baron and Kenny (1986) approach was applied. The Smart PLS tests the direct relationship between green HRM practices as an independent variable and EP as a dependent variable and the moderation effect of GPI on the association between the direct relationship between green HRM practices and EP. Table 3 represents the results of the hypothesis testing of this study model. To examine and compare the importance of path values, this research employed the Smart PLS technique with standard bootstrapping of 5000 samples and 220 cases (Hair et al., 2014).

**Table 3. Structural Model Assessment With Moderation**

| Hypotheses                  | B     | M     | SD    | T-Value | P-Value | Status   |
|-----------------------------|-------|-------|-------|---------|---------|----------|
| Green HRM Practices -> EP   | 0.44  | 0.44  | 0.05  | 7.44    | .0000   | Supported|
| Moderating Effects -> EP    | 0.27  | 0.27  | 0.07  | 3.99    | .0001   | Supported|

*Note. HRM = Human Resource Management, EP = Environmental Performance*

**Moderating Effect of GPI**

The GPI is a moderator variable in this study. The GPI is expected to have a positive influence on the association between green HRM practices and EP. Therefore, the findings revealed that GPI strengthens the link between green HRM practices and EP. By using Smart PLS at 5000 samples, and the bootstrapping approach, the moderating effect of GPI was assessed (Hair et al., 2019). As shown in Table 3, the interaction positively influences EP (0.27) while the green HRM practices’ simple effect on EP is (0.44). The findings showed that the average level of green HRM practices toward the dependent variable is 0.44. The size of the interaction term adds or distracts the link between green HRM practices and EP. For the more eminent levels of GPI, the one standard deviation unit adds to interaction term size (i.e., 0.44 + 0.27 = 0.71). By distracting the one standard deviation unit from interaction term size (i.e., 0.44 - 0.27 = 0.17), the bond between green HRM practices and EP becomes more inadequate.

By using Smart PLS, for interpreting the moderation finding, the simple slope analysis was used. The simple slope plot is illustrated in Figure 2 for more details regards moderation analysis. The positive slope for all three lines indicates the positive significance of green HRM practices on EP. Additionally, higher levels of green HRM practices increase the level of EP positively. All three lines (green, blue, and red) represent the GPI as a moderator that a higher level of moderator increases the level of green HRM practices and EP. In case of a decrease in GPI level as a moderator, the level of green HRM practices and EP decreases, respectively.
This study addresses the main challenge in green innovation from the individual level, namely employees. This study aimed to explore the impact of GPI as a moderator on the association with green HRM practices and environmental processes. Green hotels, an emerging global challenge, has pushed hotels to constantly develop their sustainability capacity and adopt innovative green practices to protect the environment and enhance business results (Longoni & Cagliano, 2018). The collective green HRM practices variable gives a comprehensive recognition of how green HRM practices and business impacts are interrelated (Anwar, 2018). The findings revealed a strong and positive influence of the green HRM practices on EP and a moderation effect of GPI on the relationship between the green HRM practices and EP.

**Discussion and Conclusions**

This study addresses the main challenge in green innovation from the individual level, namely employees. This study aimed to explore the impact of GPI as a moderator on the association with green HRM practices and environmental processes. Green hotels, an emerging global challenge, has pushed hotels to constantly develop their sustainability capacity and adopt innovative green practices to protect the environment and enhance business results (Longoni & Cagliano, 2018). The collective green HRM practices variable gives a comprehensive recognition of how green HRM practices and business impacts are interrelated (Anwar, 2018). The findings revealed a strong and positive influence of the green HRM practices on EP and a moderation effect of GPI on the relationship between the green HRM practices and EP.

**Theoretical Contributions**

There are several theoretical contributions as a result of this study. Firstly, this study findings strengthen AMO’s perspective on the link between green HRM practices and the organization’s EP (e.g., Anwar et al., 2020; Teece, 2014). Therefore, due to the growth of environmental awareness among the variety of stakeholders, this study findings explore the necessities of organization’s key competencies, namely, green HRM practices and its implementation through employee’s GPI (i.e., skills, knowledge, and attitudes) enhance the EP (Anwar et al., 2020; Chang, 2011; El-Kassar & Singh, 2019; Teece, 2014). This study contributes to broadening the AMO framework concept and suggests that hotels can improve their EP by adopting green HRM practices. Previous studies confirmed the findings of this study as implementing the AMO framework is required to shape the association throughout the organizations by enacting the employee’s abilities to be involved in seizing opportunities to enhance the EP (e.g., Anwar et al., 2020; Bhatti et al., 2020; El-Kassar & Singh, 2019; Jabbour et al., 2019; Pham et al., 2020; Umran et al., 2020). Thus, the findings confirmed that green HRM practices promote the EP through GPI (e.g., Chang, 2011; Jabbour et al., 2019; Luu, 2019). Thereby, the organization’s green HRM practices are the backbone for intensified environmental management at the workplace.
Finally, the purpose of adopting green HRM practices toward environmental activities is theoretically promoted, which is in line with former studies (e.g., El-Kassar & Singh, 2019; Jabbour et al., 2019). Besides, in comparison with the study of Singh et al (2020), which suggests that GPI acts as a mediator between green HRM practices and EP, this study concentrated on GPI by hypothesizing it as a moderator. The findings support the claims that support the H2. Green thinking is a trend endeavor to straighten different organizations’ HRM practices (Jabbour et al., 2019; Renwick et al., 2013; Singh & El-Kassar, 2019). This study advises that green HRM practices play a notable task in reducing pollution reduction, product/service quality improvement, and enhancing the organizations’ brand images. That is to say; this study implies that green HRM practices intensify the environmental management goals of the organizations by applying the GPI. The results also represent that GPI can strengthen the positive impacts of green HRM practices on EP, shedding light on the contingent approach that GPI improves EP.

**Practical Implications**

This research has some significant strategic consequences for tackling heightened environmental tensions, as they cannot continue to disregard core stakeholders’ environmental concerns. Firstly, the organizations pursued approaches that enhance sustainable environmental development to reduce adverse effects (Haddad & Irani, 2020; Longoni & Cagliano, 2018; Yu et al., 2017). Thus, organizations should prioritize GPI to improve their EP, mainly when there are resource constraints. Secondly, organizations should invest in green HRM practices and establish new strategic assets compatible with environmental management initiatives. The findings pointed out that green HRM practices reflect the organizations’ strategic orientations toward environmental protection and motivate them to exhibit eco-friendly activities.

Furthermore, we believe that green HRM practices need a developmental culture and a flat organizational environment to foster and boost green innovation and gain a long-term competitive advantage. Finally, the findings intimate that organizations should recruit employees who meet the organizations’ criteria toward sustained proactive environmental management practices which result in environmental protection. Moreover, this study suggests that higher-level executives should affirm a system assessment to evaluate the employee’s pro-environmental behaviors at workplaces and recognize and value the employees who are embedded in conserving the environment. That is to say; the green HRM practices should be inspired by the employees who are well-known as agents to implement the organizations’ strategies.

**Limitations and Further Research**

This study is not without limitations as well as other studies. Firstly, the perceptual measures based on the extant literature were used in this study. In further studies, the objective measure can complement the perceptual measures simultaneously to advance the results. Secondly, GPI was used as a moderator to examine the influence of green HRM practices on EP. Future research should use other determinants such as capability, incentive, and contingency-based human resource practices to check whether they moderate the influence of green HRM practices on EP. Finally, the proposed model aimed the green hotels in Turkey. However, future research should test the proposed model in an expanded context to promote the theory and its implications.
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