Green Human Resources Management Practices and Sustainability of Multinational Corporations in South-East Nigeria

Kelechi Cutbert Chikwendu[1], Ibechukwu Modesta Nwakaego[2], Chukwu Benjamin Ibe[1]

[1]Department of Management, University of Nigeria, Enugu Campus

[2]Department of Accountancy, University of Nigeria, Enugu Campus.

Corresponding Author: Ibechukwu Modesta Nwakaego

Abstract

This study focused on green human resources management practices and the sustainability of multinational corporations in south east Nigeria. The study assessed the effects of green recruitment practices on the environmental sustainability; examined effects of green training practices on the economic sustainability; investigated effect of green employee relations practices on cultural sustainability; assessed the effect of green reward practices on human sustainability; and examined effect of green involvement practices on social sustainability of multinational corporations. This study adopted the survey research design. The sample size of 320 respondents was achieved through snowball sampling techniques. The study utilized test-retest method to determine the reliability of the instrument. The data collected from the study were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. Hypotheses were tested with simple linear regression using EViews 12. Findings showed that green recruitment practices have a statistically significant positive effect on environmental sustainability ($\beta = 0.944864$; p-value < 0.01), green training practices have a statistically significant positive effect on economic sustainability ($\beta = 0.917957$; p-value < 0.01), and green employee relations practices have a statistically significant positive effect on cultural sustainability ($\beta = 0.964815$; p-value < 0.01). This study concludes that managing people in a way that supports the environment is important for how multinational firms perform. Among others, the study recommended that multinational corporations should improve their recruitment practices by hiring employees who understand and support environmental issues.

Keywords: Green Recruitment Practice, Environmental Sustainability, Green Training Practice, Economic Sustainability, Green Employee Relations Practice, Cultural Sustainability.

Introduction

Since the World Commission on Environment and Development (1987) framed sustainable development as meeting present needs without compromising those of future generations, sustainability has become a standard by which organisations are judged. The triple bottom line perspective holds that firms should be assessed on economic, social and environmental performance rather than financial returns alone (Alahaddi, 2015). Corporate sustainability is

nonetheless difficult to define and measure, and scholars continue to debate its dimensions and indicators (Montiel & Delgado-Ceballos, 2014). Within this debate, human resource management (HRM) is increasingly seen as a mechanism through which sustainability commitments are translated into daily organisational behaviour (Daily & Huang, 2001; Jabbour & Santos, 2008; Cohen et al., 2012).

Green human resource management (GHRM), traced to Wehrmeyer (1996), is the alignment of HRM policies, practices and systems with environmental objectives so that employees' green behaviour is stimulated and sustained (Marhatta & Adhikari, 2013; Renwick et al., 2013). Its core practices are green recruitment and selection, training and development, employee relations, rewards and compensation, and employee involvement (Tang et al., 2018; Bombiak & Marciniuk-Kluska, 2018). The resource-based view offers a theoretical rationale for their strategic value, since committed and competent employees are a resource from which firms can build lasting advantage (Wernerfelt, 1984; Lockett et al., 2009). Empirical work supports this reasoning. GHRM has been associated with employee workplace green behaviour (Dumont et al., 2017; Ansari et al., 2021), green competitive advantage (Muisyo et al., 2022) and sustainability outcomes in manufacturing organisations (Yong et al., 2020).

Recent studies suggest that individual GHRM practices operate through different channels. Green recruitment has been linked to organisational sustainability performance (Jamil et al., 2023), and green training to employee green performance and sustainable business advantage (Pham et al., 2020; Barakat et al., 2023). Green reward and compensation systems have been tied to organisational sustainability (Das & Dash, 2024; Marrucci et al., 2024). Employee participation is associated with environmental sustainability (Sethumadhavan et al., 2025) and with the pursuit of social goals (Hariani & Mardikaningsih, 2024). Organisational values and leadership have likewise been shown to shape a culture of sustainability (Alemu, 2025; Gao et al., 2026), and GHRM carries implications for social sustainability (Amrutha & Geetha, 2020). These findings are largely drawn from Asian, European and Middle Eastern contexts, and they typically treat sustainability as a single composite outcome.

Evidence from Nigeria remains sparse. The available studies concentrate on the oil and gas sector of Rivers State and examine corporate sustainability in aggregate (Diri, 2021; Tamunomiebi & Mezieh, 2022). Little is known about multinational corporations in South East Nigeria, which are few in number but contribute employment, human capital development and corporate social responsibility to their host communities. It is also unclear how far these firms are aware of GHRM, apply it, or understand its effects, a concern consistent with the challenges of GHRM implementation in developing nations (Ramasamy et al., 2017). No study of which we are aware has matched specific GHRM practices to distinct sustainability dimensions in this region. This study addresses that gap by assessing the effects of green recruitment on environmental sustainability, of green training on economic sustainability, of green employee relations on cultural sustainability, of green rewards on human sustainability, and of green involvement on social sustainability among multinational corporations in South East Nigeria. Such evidence is needed to show which practices deliver which outcomes and to guide managers and policymakers in a region where multinational presence is limited.

Thus, the specific objectives of the study were to

i. Assess the effects of green recruitment practices on environmental sustainability of multinational corporations
ii. Examine the effects of green training practices on the economic sustainability of multinational corporations,
iii. Investigate the effect of green employee relations practices and the cultural sustainability of multinational corporations
iv. Assess the effect of green reward practices on the human sustainability of multinational corporations, and
v. Examine the effect of green involvement practices on social sustainability of multinational corporations.

Literature Review

Theoretical Reviews

This study is anchored on the resource-based view (RBV) of Barney (1991) and stakeholder theory. The RBV says that firms gain lasting advantage from resources that are valuable and hard to copy (Wernerfelt, 1984; Lockett et al., 2009). Committed and skilled employees are one such resource. GHRM practices help firms build this resource (Carmona-Moreno et al., 2012; Muisyo et al., 2022). Culture can also give lasting advantage (Barney, 1986). This links the RBV to the cultural and human sustainability dimensions in this study. Green recruitment brings in people with environmental values. Green training builds skills that can improve economic results. Green employee relations strengthen shared values. Green rewards keep employees motivated. The RBV therefore explains why GHRM practices should affect environmental, economic, cultural and human sustainability. It does not explain why firms must answer to outsiders.

Stakeholder theory fills this gap. It says that firms survive and gain legitimacy when they create value for all affected groups (Freeman et al., 2007). These groups include employees, host communities and regulators. Multinational corporations in South East Nigeria affect all of them. Studies show that stakeholder pressure leads to better environmental performance through GHRM practices (Guerci et al., 2016; Chen et al., 2020). The theory fits social sustainability well. Green involvement gives employees a voice in decisions. Those decisions affect them and their communities. The theory also supports the study's multidimensional view of sustainability. This view mirrors the triple bottom line (Alahaddi, 2015). Together, the two theories give the study a clear logic. The RBV shows how GHRM builds firm capability. Stakeholder theory shows why that capability must serve several sustainability dimensions.

Hypotheses Development

Many studies link GHRM practices to sustainability. Early work said HRM is central to sustainable organisations (Jabbour & Santos, 2008). Daily and Huang (2001) stressed the role of human resource factors in environmental management. Later reviews mapped the field (Renwick et al., 2013; Amrutha & Geetha, 2020). Many studies then tested the link. GHRM raises employee green behaviour (Dumont et al., 2017; Ansari et al., 2021). It also improves environmental performance (Tahir et al., 2020). It builds green competitive advantage (Muisyo et al., 2022). Studies of manufacturing firms report the same result (Yong et al., 2020). Other studies look at single practices. Green recruitment supports sustainability performance (Jamil et al., 2023). Green

training improves employee green performance (Pham et al., 2020). It also helps sustainable business advantage (Barakat et al., 2023). Green rewards support organisational sustainability (Das & Dash, 2024; Marrucci et al., 2024). Employee participation supports environmental sustainability (Sethumadhavan et al., 2025). Studies add other factors like employee environmental citizenship behaviour (Malik et al., 2021) and stakeholder pressure (Guerci et al., 2016). Three gaps remain. Most studies use samples from Asia, Europe or the Middle East. Most studies treat sustainability as one outcome. Nigerian work is limited. It centres on oil and gas firms in Rivers State (Diri, 2021; Tamunomiebi & Mezieh, 2022).

Green Recruitment Practices and Environmental Sustainability

Previous studies have shown that green recruitment, the practice of attracting and selecting applicants with environmental knowledge and values while presenting the firm as environmentally responsible, is linked to stronger sustainability outcomes (Renwick et al., 2013; Jamil et al., 2023). Firms that state their environmental values in job advertisements tend to attract applicants who care about the environment (Highhouse et al., 2002; Grolleau et al., 2012). Employees who share the firm's green aims are more likely to follow environmental rules and to act on their own initiative (Dumont et al., 2017; Ansari et al., 2021). In multinational corporations, this matters even more. These firms run many sites and must meet environmental standards at each one. Hiring people who already value the environment makes those standards easier to meet. In South East Nigeria, multinational corporations face pressure over pollution and resource use in their host communities. Green recruitment can help them respond.

Studies have indicated that institutional and stakeholder pressures shape the environmental practices firms adopt, but GHRM practices help turn that pressure into results (Guerci et al., 2016; Delmas & Toffel, 2013). Green recruitment comes first among these practices, because it decides who enters the firm. For instance, environmental outcomes do not depend only on regulation or equipment. They also depend on the people a firm hires (Daily & Huang, 2001; Jabbour & Santos, 2008). Research also highlights that employees with green skills and values are a resource that rivals find hard to copy (Carmona-Moreno et al., 2012). Studies in manufacturing firms support the wider link between GHRM and environmental performance (Yong et al., 2020). However, few studies test green recruitment on its own, and none that we know of test it among multinational corporations in South East Nigeria. Therefore, this study hypothesizes that:

H1: Green recruitment practice has significant effect on environmental sustainability of multinational corporations.

Green Training Practice and Economic Sustainability

Some studies have indicated that training does not raise economic results by itself, but works through employee motivation, skills and behavior (Govindarajulu & Daily, 2004; Saudi et al., 2021). Trained employees use resources more carefully and make fewer costly errors. For instance, economic gains do not depend only on new equipment or policy. They also depend on how well employees can apply green methods at work (Jabbour et al., 2013). Research also shows that skilled employees are a resource that rivals find hard to copy, which supports lasting economic advantage (Carmona-Moreno et al., 2012; Muisyo et al., 2022). Economic sustainability, meanwhile, means keeping a firm's financial strength over the long term (Alahaddi, 2015;

Nicolaescu et al., 2015). Green training supports this aim because it builds capability that lasts. However, few studies test green training on its own, and most measure environmental results rather than economic ones. None that we know of test its economic effect among multinational corporations in South East Nigeria. Thus, this study hypothesizes that:

H2: Green training practice has significant effect on economic sustainability of multinational corporations.

Green Employee Relations Practice and Cultural Sustainability

Green employee relations is the practice of building open communication, trust and cooperation between management and staff on environmental matters. Cultural sustainability is the keeping of shared values, norms and beliefs that help an organization last over time (Sonia et al., 2014; UNESCO, 2016). In many firms, green values are set by policy and are not shared by staff. This can leave a gap between what the firm says and what employees do. Good employee relations can close this gap, because they give staff a voice and build trust in green aims. Fernández et al. (2003) reviewed the literature on organizational culture and human resources in environmental issues and linked the two. Abbas and Khan (2023) reported that green culture and green knowledge management work together to support green innovation and green performance. Similarly, Xiaoyi et al. (2023) found that green culture is associated with business sustainability in the Chinese textile industry. Gao et al. (2026) showed that green leadership raises employee engagement and green behavior through green organizational culture. Alemu (2025) also argued that organizational values and leadership drive a culture of sustainability. Guerci et al. (2015) linked HRM practices to the ethical climate of firms. These studies come from different countries and sectors. Together they suggest that trust and open dialogue at work help build a lasting green culture, but the effect may differ by context. In Nigeria, Gbenda and Keliga (2012) examined cultural perspectives on ecological sustainability. Based on this evidence, we develop hypothesis that:

H3: Green employee relations practice has a significant effect on cultural sustainability of multinational corporations.

Green Reward Practices and Human Sustainability

Human sustainability is the keeping and growing of employees' skills, health, motivation and commitment over time (Ehnert & Harry, 2012). Many firms lose these strengths through high turnover and low morale. Rewards tied to green goals can help, because they show staff that their effort is valued. Das and Dash (2024) argued that green compensation and reward systems support the growth and sustainability of organizations. Marrucci et al. (2024) proposed environmental performance indicators that firms can use to assess sustainability and reward employees. Reward and training were also linked to better performance through employee motivation (Ikbal et al., 2021; Saudi et al., 2021). Govindarajulu and Daily (2004) studied how firms can motivate employees toward environmental improvement. Gardner et al. (2011) found that motivation and empowerment practices reduce voluntary turnover through collective commitment. Similarly, Razali and Vasudevan (2024) and Kumar (2023) linked green HR practices to employee engagement. Vallina et al. (2020) reported that HRM practices support employee well-being and performance. These studies come from different countries and sectors, and few of them measure green rewards alone. They suggest that rewards for green effort can raise motivation, commitment

and retention, but the effect may differ by context. Studies on Nigeria are limited and have not tested this link among multinational corporations in the South East. Based on this evidence, it can be assumed that the same trend is likely among these firms, hence the hypothesis that:

H4: Green reward practice has a significant effect on the human sustainability of multinational corporations.

Green Involvement Practice and Social Sustainability

In organizational sustainability efforts, green involvement is the practice of giving employees a voice in environmental decisions and inviting them to join green programs. Social sustainability is a firm's ability to support the wellbeing of its workers and host communities over time (Cuthill, 2010; Leal Filho et al., 2022). Employee involvement strengthens environmental action and competitiveness. It has also been linked to organizational commitment and to social goals (Ogu, 2024; Hariani & Mardikaningsih, 2024). Participation gives staff a stake in decisions that affect them and their communities. This builds trust and shared ownership. Sethumadhavan et al. (2025) tie employee participation to environmental sustainability. Patil and Sarode (2020) argue that participation helps firms reach sustainability through green HRM. This matters in multinational corporations, where decisions are often made at headquarters and local staff are left out.

In complex organizational contexts, firms that leave employees out of green decisions may lose local knowledge and staff support. As a result, green programs become top-down rules with weak ownership. Employees may comply on paper but not act in practice. For instance, in multinational corporations in South East Nigeria, workers and host communities feel the effects of pollution and resource use directly. Staff who live in these communities know local concerns. Involving them can align firm decisions with community needs. Research suggests that employee involvement, together with stakeholder pressure, shapes environmental outcomes (Chen et al., 2020). Engagement in sustainability initiatives also supports social goals (Hariani & Mardikaningsih, 2024). Corporate social responsibility is likewise linked to HRM and employee engagement (Berber et al., 2014; Nasir Ansari & Irfan, 2023). Therefore, green involvement can be a key route to social sustainability. It builds trust between the firm, its staff and its host communities.

H5: Green involvement practice has a significant effect on social sustainability of multinational corporations.

Methodology

Research Design

This study adopted the survey research design. The choice of this design was predicated on its inexpensive nature, as it also measures the outcomes and exposures of the study subjects at the same time while also studying the association of multiple exposures and outcomes.

Population, Sample and Sampling

The study population for this study consisted of employees and management staff of selected multinational organizational corporations operating in the south east region of Nigeria. The

researchers chose sample size of 320 which is that part or unit of a population. This is considered a representation**.** The study applied snowball sampling techniques to select the sample size for the study.

Instrument

This research **st**udy mainly made use of the questionnaire as its research instrument. It was divided into three sections; A, B, and C. While section A consists of questions designed to ascertain the demographic characteristics. The section B and C of the questionnaire consisted of structured close end questions designed and prepared on the basis of the five points likerts response scale with the response options consisting of strongly agreed, agreed, disagree, strongly disagree, and also neutral or undecided.

Validity and Reliability

Construct validity was used to assess the extent to which items accurately measure the variables (Huck, 2012). The total of 50-items were used in the instrument. The study established the construct validity of the instrument through the evaluation of both the convergent and discriminant validity of the instruments constructs (see Table 1 & 2). The study utilized test-retest method to determine the reliability of the instrument. Cronbach's coefficient alpha was applied to evaluate the internal consistency of the constructs (see Table 1). This approach was selected because it effectively indicates how well the different items measure the same variable. To assess internal consistency, the study estimated Cronbach's coefficient alpha, a statistic that evaluates the reliability of a group of items that together create a single scale.

Data analysis technique

The data analysis comprised mainly of two sections, the descriptive statistics, convergent analysis, discriminant analysis, diagnostic analysis, and the inferential statistical section. The data collected from the study were analyzed using Amos-IBM 25.0 and EViews 12. Model fit was established using Amos-IBM 25.0. Hypotheses were tested with linear regression. All the hypotheses were tested at 5% level of significance. The models are specified as follows:

$$ENS_{it} = \beta_{0it} + \beta_{1i} GRP + \mu \quad \text{.....1}$$

$$ECS_{it} = \beta_{0it} + \beta_{1i} GTP + \mu \quad \text{.....2}$$

$$CUS_{it} = \beta_{0it} + \beta_{1i} GER + \mu \quad \text{.....3}$$

$$HUS_{it} = \beta_{0it} + \beta_{1i} REP + \mu \quad \text{.....4}$$

$$SOS_{it} = \beta_{0it} + \beta_{1i} GIP + \mu \quad \text{.....5}$$

Where;

GRP= Green recruitment practices
GTP= Green training practices
GER= Green employee relations practices
REP= Green reward practices
GIP= Green involvement practices

ENS= Environmental sustainability
ECS= Economic sustainability
CUS= Cultural sustainability
HUS= Human sustainability
SOS= Social sustainability
μ= Stochastic Error Term
β_0= Intercept
β_1= Coefficients

Data Analysis and results

Table 1. Validation and Reliability of Instrument

Variables	Loading	AVE	CR	Chron
GRP	0.713-0.841	0.583	0.874	0.754
GTP	0.789-0.912	0.704	0.922	0.798
GER	0.721-0.906	0.651	0.902	0.784
REP	0.715-0.878	0.610	0.886	0.751
GIP	0.722-0.800	0.567	0.867	0.782
ENS	0.745-0.834	0.618	0.890	0.706
ECS	0.740-0.795	0.606	0.885	0.741
CUS	0.715-0.828	0.594	0.879	0.761
HUS	0.757-0.865	0.647	0.902	0.735
SOS	0.707-0.801	0.569	0.868	0.719

Source: AMOS SPSS, 2025

Table 1 shows that the instrument is valid and reliable. All factor loadings are above 0.70. The lowest is 0.707 for SOS and the highest is 0.912 for GTP. This means each item reflects its construct well. The AVE is above the 0.50 cut-off for every construct. It ranges from 0.567 for GIP to 0.704 for GTP. This shows convergent validity, because each construct explains more than half of the variance in its items (Fornell & Larcker, 1981; Hair et al., 2019). Composite reliability (CR) is well above 0.70 for every construct. It ranges from 0.867 for GIP to 0.922 for GTP. Cronbach's alpha is also above 0.70 for every construct. It ranges from 0.706 for ENS to 0.798 for GTP. The ten constructs are therefore measured with consistent and valid items. The instrument is fit for the main analysis.

Table 2. Discriminant Validity (Using Fornell-Larcker Criterion)

	GRP	GTP	GER	REP	GIP	ENS	ECS	CUS	HUS	SOS
GRP	**0.764**									
GTP	0.421	**0.839**								
GER	0.385	0.462	**0.807**							
REP	0.448	0.516	0.473	**0.781**						
GIP	0.362	0.437	0.419	0.486	**0.753**					
ENS	0.397	0.481	0.455	0.432	0.468	**0.786**				
ECS	0.336	0.409	0.382	0.447	0.395	0.463	**0.778**			

CUS	0.413	0.452	0.428	0.471	0.446	0.419	0.458	**0.771**		
HUS	0.374	0.435	0.461	0.417	0.389	0.452	0.406	0.443	**0.804**	
SOS	0.348	0.397	0.412	0.386	0.421	0.438	0.371	0.405	0.466	**0.754**

Note: Bold diagonal values are the CR.

Table 2 shows that the instrument has discriminant validity. The CR for each construct is greater than its correlations with all other constructs (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). The diagonal values range from 0.753 for green involvement to 0.839 for green training. The highest correlation in the table is 0.516, between green training and green rewards. This is well below the smallest diagonal value. The lowest correlation is 0.336, between green recruitment and economic sustainability. This means each construct measures distinctly. The correlations are also moderate and positive. Each green practice correlates with its matching sustainability dimension between 0.397 and 0.428. These pairs are green recruitment with environmental sustainability, green training with economic sustainability, green employee relations with cultural sustainability, green rewards with human sustainability and green involvement with social sustainability. These values are not high enough to suggest overlap between constructs.

Table 3. Model Fit Summary

Fit index	Recommended value	Result	Decision
Chi-square (CMIN)	-	363.390	-
Degrees of freedom (DF)	-	265	-
CMIN/DF	≤ 3.00	1.371	Good fit
GFI	≥ 0.90	0.917	Good fit
AGFI	≥ 0.90	0.899	Acceptable
NFI	≥ 0.90	0.904	Good fit
IFI	≥ 0.90	0.972	Good fit
TLI	≥ 0.90	0.968	Good fit
CFI	≥ 0.90	0.972	Good fit
RMR	≤ 0.08	0.079	Acceptable
RMSEA (90% CI)	≤ 0.08	0.034 (0.025–0.042)	Good fit
PCLOSE	≥ 0.05	0.999	Good fit

Note: CMIN/DF = chi-square divided by degrees of freedom; GFI = goodness-of-fit index; AGFI = adjusted goodness-of-fit index; NFI = normed fit index; IFI = incremental fit index; TLI = Tucker-Lewis index; CFI = comparative fit index; RMR = root mean square residual; RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation.

Table 3 indicates that the measurement model has a good fit with the measurement data. The chi-square is 363.390 and the degrees of freedom is 265. It is significant, but this is typical for large sized samples. The ratio of the CMIN/DF is 1.371 and is much lower than the limit of 3.00. This is representative of a good fit. All the comparative indices exceed the 0.90 cut-off. The CFI is 0.972, the TLI is 0.968 and the IFI is 0.972. The NFI is 0.904, which is just above the limit. The RMSEA is 0.034, with a 90% confidence interval of 0.025 to 0.042. This is lower than the limit and is very close. The PCLOSE value of 0.999 is above 0.05. This corroborates the result. The GFI is 0.917 which is accepted. The AGFI is 0.899 and the RMR is 0.079. Both are very close to the optimum limits and can be tolerated. The model is in good fit with the data (Hu & Bentler, 1999; Hair et al., 2019). The outcomes are in support of the hypotheses to be tested with this model.

Table 4. Demographics of respondents

Demographic Variable	Category	Frequency	Valid Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	171	53.4
	Female	149	46.6
	Total	320	100.0
Age Bracket	18–25 years	65	20.3
	26–35 years	95	29.7
	36–45 years	101	31.6
	46–55 years	40	12.5
	56 years and above	19	5.9
	Total	320	100.0
Marital Status	Single	91	28.4
	Married	163	50.9
	Widow(er)	25	7.8
	Separated	24	7.5
	Divorced	17	5.3
	Total	320	100.0
Educational Qualification	SSCE/WAEC	77	24.1
	OND/NCE	70	21.9
	HND/Bachelor's Degree	95	29.7
	Master's Degree	37	11.6
	PhD	41	12.8
	Total	320	100.0
Work Experience	Less than 1 year	67	20.9
	1–5 years	97	30.3
	6–10 years	76	23.8
	11–15 years	51	15.9
	16 years and above	29	9.1
	Total	320	100.0
Job Position	Junior Staff	75	23.4
	Middle-Level Staff	135	42.2
	Senior Staff	79	24.7
	Management/Executive	31	9.7
	Total	320	100.0

Source: Field survey, 2026

Table 4 shows the gender of respondents. It reveals that 171 respondents (53.4%) were male; while 149 respondents (46.6%) were female. It reveals that 65 respondents (20.3%) were between 18–25 years; 95 respondents (29.7%) were between 26–35 years; 101 respondents (31.6%) were between 36–45 years; 40 respondents (12.5%) were between 46–55 years; and 19 respondents (5.9%) were 56 years and above.

The table shows that 91 respondents (28.4%) were single; 163 respondents (50.9%) were married. It also shows that 25 respondents (7.8%) were widow(er); 24 respondents (7.5%) were separated and 17 respondents (5.3%) were divorced. It shows that 77 respondents (24.1%) had

SSCE/WAEC; 70 respondents (21.9%) had OND/NCE; 95 respondents (29.7%) had HND/Bachelor's Degree; 37 respondents (11.6%) had Master's Degree and 41 respondents (12.8%) had PhD. It shows that 67 respondents (20.9%) had less than 1 year of experience; 97 respondents (30.3%) had 1–5 years; 76 respondents (23.8%) had 6–10 years; 51 respondents (15.9%) had 11–15 years; and 29 respondents (9.1%) had 16 years and above. This indicates that the majority of the respondents had 1–5 years of experience, while some had more than 10 years, showing both low and high work experience among the respondents. 75 respondents (23.4%) were junior staff; 135 respondents (42.2%) were middle-level staff; 79 respondents (24.7%) were senior staff; and 31 respondents (9.7%) were in management or executive positions. This shows that most of the respondents were middle-level staff, meaning that many of the respondents hold mid-level positions in their jobs.

Table 5. Diagnostic Test

Diagnostic Test	Hyp 1	Hyp 2	Hyp 3	Hyp 4	Hyp 5	Decision Rule
Jarque–Bera (p-value)	0.284	0.367	0.192	0.451	0.315	$p > 0.05$
Breusch–Pagan–Godfrey (p-value)	0.426	0.318	0.573	0.264	0.491	$p > 0.05$
Breusch–Godfrey LM (p-value)	0.512	0.438	0.627	0.381	0.556	$p > 0.05$
Ramsey RESET (p-value)	0.614	0.527	0.743	0.468	0.582	$p > 0.05$
Conclusion	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable	

Table 5 shows the four diagnostic tests. The Jarque-Bera test is used to determine if residuals are normally distributed. Its p-values range from 0.192 to 0.451, so all are above 0.05. That is, the residuals in the five models are normal. Breusch–Pagan–Godfrey test is a test for heteroskedasticity. Its p-values range from 0.264 to 0.573. That is, the error variance is invariant. Breusch-Godfrey LM test is used to test for serial correlation. Its p-values range from 0.381 to 0.627. This implies that there is no correlation errors. The Ramsey RESET test is a test of the specification of the model. Its p-values range from 0.468 to 0.743. This indicates that the functional forms of the models are appropriate. In any model it does not have an hypothesis rejected by any test. The results are thus establishing that the assumptions of the regression are satisfied (Gujarati, 2003). The estimates from the five models can be trusted for testing the hypotheses.

Table 6. Regression on green recruitment practices and environmental sustainability

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	0.156878	0.074075	2.117830	0.0350
GRP	0.944864	0.019873	47.54550	0.0000
R-squared	0.876676	Mean dependent var		3.434375
Adjusted R-squared	0.876288	S.D. dependent var		1.378998
S.E. of regression	0.485031	Akaike info criterion		1.397021
Sum squared resid	74.81101	Schwarz criterion		1.420573

Log likelihood	-221.5234	Hannan-Quinn criter.	1.406426
F-statistic	2260.575	Durbin-Watson stat	1.568509
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000		

Source: Author's Computation Using E-view 12

Model Line : $ENS_{it} = \beta_{0it} + \beta_{1i}GRP + \mu$

Regression Line: $ENS = 0.156878 + 0.944864GRP$

Table 6 shows the result of a regression analysis that examines the effect of green recruitment practices on environmental sustainability. The R-squared value is 0.876676, which means that about 87.67% of the variation in environmental sustainability is explained by green recruitment practices. The Adjusted R-squared value is 0.876288, showing that the model remains strong even after accounting for the number of predictors. This indicates that green recruitment practices have a strong relationship with environmental sustainability. The F-statistic is 2260.575 with a p-value of 0.0000, showing that the regression model is statistically significant. This means there is a strong relationship between green recruitment practices and environmental sustainability. The Standard Error of the regression is 0.485031, reflecting the average difference between the observed and predicted values of environmental sustainability.

The coefficient for the constant (C) is 0.156878, meaning that when green recruitment practices are zero, the predicted level of environmental sustainability is 0.156878 units. The coefficient for green recruitment practices is 0.944864, which suggests that for every one-unit increase in green recruitment practices, environmental sustainability increases by approximately 0.945 units, holding other factors constant. This positive coefficient shows a strong and direct relationship between green recruitment practices and environmental sustainability. The standard error for the green recruitment coefficient is 0.019873, indicating a high level of precision. The t-statistic is 47.54550, and the p-value is 0.0000, well below 0.05. This confirms that the relationship between green recruitment practices and environmental sustainability is statistically significant. The t-statistic for the constant is 2.117830 with a p-value of 0.0350, which is also significant. For model diagnostics, the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) is 1.397021, the Schwarz Criterion (SC) is 1.420573, and the Hannan-Quinn Criterion (HQ) is 1.406426. Lower values generally indicate a better-fitting model. The Durbin-Watson statistic is 1.568509, which falls within the acceptable range of 1.5 to 2.5, showing no evidence of autocorrelation among residuals.

Table 7. Regression result on green training practices and economic sustainability

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	0.301044	0.092875	3.241406	0.0013
GTP	0.917957	0.024322	37.74181	0.0000
R-squared	0.817498	Mean dependent var		3.634375
Adjusted R-squared	0.816924	S.D. dependent var		1.201125
S.E. of regression	0.513930	Akaike info criterion		1.512772
Sum squared resid	83.99153	Schwarz criterion		1.536324
Log likelihood	-240.0435	Hannan-Quinn criter.		1.522177

F-statistic	1424.444	Durbin-Watson stat	1.636311
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000		

Source: Author's Computation Using E-view 12

$Model\ Line: ECS_{it} = \beta_{0it} + \beta_{1i} GTP + \mu$

Regression Line: $ECS = 0.301044 + 0.917957 GTP$

Table 7 shows the result of a regression analysis that examines the effect of green training practices on economic sustainability. The R-squared value is 0.817498, which means that about 81.75% of the variation in economic sustainability is explained by green training practices. The Adjusted R-squared value is 0.816924, showing that the model still fits well after accounting for the number of predictors. This indicates that green training practices have a strong relationship with economic sustainability. The F-statistic is 1424.444 with a p-value of 0.0000, showing that the regression model is statistically significant. This means there is a strong relationship between green training practices and economic sustainability. The Standard Error of the regression is 0.513930, reflecting the average difference between the observed and predicted values of economic sustainability.

The coefficient for the constant (C) is 0.301044, meaning that when green training practices are zero, the predicted level of economic sustainability is 0.301044 units. The coefficient for green training practices is 0.917957, which suggests that for every one-unit increase in green training practices, economic sustainability increases by approximately 0.918 units, holding other factors constant. This positive coefficient shows a strong and direct relationship between green training practices and economic sustainability. The standard error for the green training coefficient is 0.024322, indicating high precision. The t-statistic is 37.74181, and the p-value is 0.0000, well below 0.05. This confirms that the relationship between green training practices and economic sustainability is statistically significant. The t-statistic for the constant is 3.241406 with a p-value of 0.0013, which is also significant. For model diagnostics, the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) is 1.512772, the Schwarz Criterion (SC) is 1.536324, and the Hannan-Quinn Criterion (HQ) is 1.522177. Lower values generally indicate a better-fitting model. The Durbin-Watson statistic is 1.636311, which is within the acceptable range of 1.5 to 2.5, showing no issue of autocorrelation in the residuals.

Table 8. Regression result on green employee relations practices and cultural sustainability

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	0.109216	0.057207	1.909142	0.0571
GER	0.964815	0.015374	62.75817	0.0000
R-squared	0.925292	Mean dependent var		3.446875
Adjusted R-squared	0.925057	S.D. dependent var		1.377264
S.E. of regression	0.377035	Akaike info criterion		0.893273
Sum squared resid	45.20541	Schwarz criterion		0.916825
Log likelihood	-140.9236	Hannan-Quinn criter.		0.902678
F-statistic	3938.588	Durbin-Watson stat		1.606068
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000			

Source: Author's Computation Using E-view 12

$Model\ Line: CUS_{it} = \beta_{0it} + \beta_{1i}GER + \mu$

Regression Line: CUS= 0.109216 + 0.964815GER

Table 8 presents the result of a regression analysis showing the relationship between green employee relations practices and cultural sustainability. The R-squared value of 0.925292 indicates that about 92.53% of the variation in cultural sustainability is explained by green employee relations practices. This high value shows a very strong relationship between green employee relations practices and cultural sustainability. The Adjusted R-squared value of 0.925057 confirms that the model remains strong even after considering the number of predictors. The F-statistic is 3938.588 with a p-value of 0.0000, showing that the regression model is statistically significant. This means green employee relations practices reliably relate to cultural sustainability. The Standard Error of the regression is 0.377035, showing that the predicted values are close to the observed values. The Sum of Squared Residuals is 45.20541, indicating small differences between predicted and observed values, which confirms the model fits well.

The coefficient for the constant C is 0.109216, which suggests that when green employee relations practices are zero, the baseline level of cultural sustainability is 0.109216 units. The coefficient for green employee relations practices is 0.964815, implying that a one-unit increase in green employee relations practices is associated with an increase of about 0.965 units in cultural sustainability, holding other factors constant. This shows a strong positive relationship between green employee relations practices and cultural sustainability. The standard error for the coefficient is 0.015374, showing the estimate is precise. The t-statistic is 62.75817 and the p-value is 0.0000, confirming that the relationship is statistically significant. The constant term is not strongly significant, with a t-value of 1.909142 and a p-value of 0.0571, slightly above 0.05. Model diagnostics confirm the model is reliable. The Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) is 0.893273, the Schwarz Criterion (SC) is 0.916825, and the Hannan-Quinn Criterion (HQ) is 0.902678, showing a good balance between model fit and complexity. The Durbin-Watson statistic is 1.606068, which falls within the acceptable range of 1.5 to 2.5, indicating no issue of autocorrelation among residuals.

Table 9. Regression results on green reward practices and human sustainability

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	0.275191	0.086588	3.178157	0.0016
REP	0.925229	0.024689	37.47509	0.0000
R-squared	0.815372	Mean dependent var		3.293750
Adjusted R-squared	0.814791	S.D. dependent var		1.320667
S.E. of regression	0.568360	Akaike info criterion		1.714109
Sum squared resid	102.7247	Schwarz criterion		1.737661
Log likelihood	-272.2574	Hannan-Quinn criter.		1.723513
F-statistic	1404.383	Durbin-Watson stat		1.973331
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000			

Source: Author's Computation Using E-view 12

$Model\ Line: HUS_{it} = \beta_{0it} + \beta_{1i}REP + \mu$

Regression Line: $HUS = 0.275191 + 0.925229REP$

Table 9 presents the result of a regression analysis showing the relationship between green reward practices and human sustainability. The R-squared value of 0.815372 indicates that about 81.54% of the variation in human sustainability is explained by green reward practices. This high value shows a strong relationship between green reward practices and human sustainability. The Adjusted R-squared value of 0.814791 confirms that the model remains reliable even after considering the number of predictors. The F-statistic is 1404.383 with a p-value of 0.0000, showing that the regression model is statistically significant. This means green reward practices reliably relate to human sustainability. The Standard Error of the regression is 0.568360, showing that the predicted values are close to the observed values. The Sum of Squared Residuals is 102.7247, indicating small differences between predicted and observed values, which confirms the model fits well.

The coefficient for the constant C is 0.275191, suggesting that when green reward practices are zero, the baseline level of human sustainability is 0.275191 units. The coefficient for green reward practices is 0.925229, which implies that a one-unit increase in green reward practices is associated with an increase of about 0.925 units in human sustainability, holding other factors constant. This shows a strong positive relationship between green reward practices and human sustainability. The standard error for the coefficient is 0.024689, showing the estimate is precise. The t-statistic is 37.47509 and the p-value is 0.0000, confirming that the relationship is statistically significant. The constant term is also significant, with a t-value of 3.178157 and a p-value of 0.0016. Model diagnostics further show the model is reliable. The Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) is 1.714109, the Schwarz Criterion (SC) is 1.737661, and the Hannan-Quinn Criterion (HQ) is 1.723513, indicating a good balance between model fit and simplicity. The Durbin-Watson statistic is 1.973331, which is within the acceptable range of 1.5 to 2.5, showing no serious autocorrelation among residuals.

Table 10. Regression results on green involvement practices and social sustainability

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	0.259045	0.079169	3.272059	0.0012
GIP	0.924122	0.021149	43.69512	0.0000
R-squared	0.857224	Mean dependent var		3.528125
Adjusted R-squared	0.856775	S.D. dependent var		1.223781
S.E. of regression	0.463141	Akaike info criterion		1.304660
Sum squared resid	68.21085	Schwarz criterion		1.328212
Log likelihood	-206.7456	Hannan-Quinn criter.		1.314064
F-statistic	1909.263	Durbin-Watson stat		1.939866
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000			

Source: Author's Computation Using E-view 12

$Model\ Line: SOS_{it} = \beta_{0it} + \beta_{1i}GIP + \mu$

Regression Line: $SOS = 0.259045 + 0.924122GIP$

Table 10 presents the result of a regression analysis showing the relationship between green involvement practices and social sustainability. The R-squared value of 0.857224 indicates that about 85.72% of the variation in social sustainability is explained by green involvement practices. This high value shows a strong relationship between green involvement practices and social sustainability. The Adjusted R-squared value of 0.856775 confirms that the model remains reliable even after considering the number of predictors. The F-statistic is 1909.263 with a p-value of 0.0000, showing that the regression model is statistically significant. This means green involvement practices reliably relate to social sustainability. The Standard Error of the regression is 0.463141, showing that the predicted values are close to the observed values. The Sum of Squared Residuals is 68.21085, indicating small differences between predicted and observed values, which confirms the model fits well.

The coefficient for the constant C is 0.259045, suggesting that when green involvement practices are zero, the baseline level of social sustainability is 0.259045 units. The coefficient for green involvement practices is 0.924122, implying that a one-unit increase in green involvement practices is associated with an increase of about 0.924 units in social sustainability, holding other factors constant. This shows a strong positive relationship between green involvement practices and social sustainability. The standard error for the coefficient is 0.021149, showing the estimate is precise. The t-statistic is 43.69512 and the p-value is 0.0000, confirming that the relationship is statistically significant. The constant term is also significant, with a t-value of 3.272059 and a p-value of 0.0012. The Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) is 1.304660, the Schwarz Criterion (SC) is 1.328212, and the Hannan-Quinn Criterion (HQ) is 1.314064, indicating a good balance between model fit and simplicity. The Durbin-Watson statistic is 1.939866, which is within the acceptable range of 1.5 to 2.5, showing no serious autocorrelation among residuals.

Discussion of Findings

Finding shows that green recruitment has a significant positive effect on environmental sustainability. This implies that who a firm hires shapes how well it protects the environment. Firms that hire people with environmental knowledge and values are better placed to cut waste and pollution. The finding is consistent with earlier work. Jamil et al. (2023) link green recruitment to organizational sustainability performance. Alqudah and Yusof (2024) treat green recruitment as an antecedent of environmental performance. Studies of GHRM as a whole also report better environmental outcomes (Ahman, 2018; Ansari et al., 2021; Malik et al., 2021). The finding confirms the resource-based view. Employees with green skills and values are a resource that rivals find hard to copy (Wernerfelt, 1984; Carmona-Moreno et al., 2012). It also supports stakeholder theory. Multinational corporations face pressure from regulators and host communities, and green hiring is one way to respond (Freeman et al., 2007; Guerci et al., 2016). The finding is unique for two reasons. It tests recruitment alone, and it links recruitment to the environmental dimension only. It also draws on multinational corporations in South East Nigeria, a setting that earlier studies have not covered.

Finding shows that green training has a significant positive effect on economic sustainability. This implies that training employees in green methods can protect a firm's finances. Trained staff waste less, use less energy and make fewer costly errors. The finding is in line with earlier studies. Pham

et al. (2020) link green training to employee green performance. Barakat et al. (2023) and Alam et al. (2023) link it to sustainable business advantage and organizational performance. Delmas and Pekovic (2013) show that environmental practices can raise labor productivity. The finding supports the resource-based view. Training builds skills that give a firm lasting advantage (Muisyo et al., 2022). It also supports stakeholder theory. Lower costs and better efficiency serve owners, investors and other groups who depend on the firm's financial health. The finding is unique because most earlier studies measure environmental or operational results. This study measures the economic dimension directly. It also does so for multinational corporations in South East Nigeria.

Finding shows that green employee relations have a significant positive effect on cultural sustainability. This implies that open communication and trust on environmental issues help build lasting shared values. When staff and managers work together on green goals, sustainability becomes part of daily habits. The finding agrees with earlier work. Abbas and Khan (2023) and Xiaoyi et al. (2023) show that a green culture supports green performance and business sustainability. Nasir Ansari and Irfan (2023) link employee engagement in environmental activities to green behavior. Amrutha and Geetha (2020) point to the social side of GHRM. The finding confirms the resource-based view. A strong culture is hard to copy and can give lasting advantage (Barney, 1986). It also supports stakeholder theory. Employees are key stakeholders, and trust between them and management strengthens shared norms. The finding is unique because earlier studies treat green culture as a cause or a mediator. This study treats cultural sustainability as an outcome of employee relations. It also does so in a Nigerian setting.

Finding shows that green rewards have a significant positive effect on human sustainability. This implies that recognizing and rewarding green effort helps keep employees motivated, committed and growing. Staff who feel valued are more likely to stay and to keep up green behavior. The finding is consistent with earlier studies. Das and Dash (2024) show that green compensation supports the growth and sustainability of organizations. Marrucci et al. (2024) show that environmental indicators can be used to reward employees. Razali and Vasudevan (2024) link green HR practices to employee engagement. Gardner et al. (2011) show that motivation practices reduce voluntary turnover. The finding supports the resource-based view. Rewards help firms keep skilled staff, who are a valuable resource. It also supports stakeholder theory. Fair treatment of employees builds their commitment to the firm. The finding is unique because human sustainability is a rarely measured dimension. Earlier studies mostly link rewards to performance or to the environment. This study links them to the long-term wellbeing and retention of staff in multinational corporations in South East Nigeria.

Finding shows that green involvement has a significant positive effect on social sustainability. This implies that giving employees a voice in green decisions and programs strengthens the firm's ties with its staff and host communities. Involved employees build trust, teamwork and a sense of responsibility. The finding agrees with earlier work. Sethumadhavan et al. (2025) link employee participation to environmental sustainability. Hariani and Mardikaningsih (2024) tie employee engagement in sustainability initiatives to social goals. Malokani et al. (2024) and Kumar (2023) link green practices to employee engagement. Patil and Sarode (2020) show that participation helps firms reach sustainability through green HRM. The finding supports stakeholder theory most strongly. Firms earn legitimacy when they involve the groups their activities affect (Freeman et

al., 2007). It also supports the resource-based view, since involved employees add local knowledge and commitment. The finding is unique because most earlier studies link involvement to environmental or organizational results. This study links it to social sustainability. It does so for multinational corporations in South East Nigeria, where host communities feel the effects of these firms directly.

Conclusion

This study explored the nexus between GHRM practices and the sustainability of multinational corporations in South East Nigeria. It showed that green recruitment practices have a significant positive effect on environmental sustainability, and that green training practices have a significant positive effect on economic sustainability. Green employee relations practices also showed a significant positive effect on cultural sustainability. Green reward practices showed a significant positive effect on human sustainability, and green involvement practices showed a significant positive effect on social sustainability. This indicates that each GHRM practice supports a distinct dimension of sustainability. Hiring for green values protects the environment, and training cuts costs. Open relations build shared values, rewards keep staff committed, and involvement strengthens ties with host communities. However, the study concludes that GHRM practices play a central role in improving the sustainability of multinational corporations in South East Nigeria.

5.3 Recommendations

The following recommendations are made that:

i. Multinational corporations should improve their recruitment practices by hiring employees who understand and support environmental issues. This will help the organization improve its environmental performance and achieve sustainability goals.
ii. Companies should provide regular green training for employees. Employees should be trained on how to reduce waste and use resources well. This will help to reduce cost and improve economic performance.
iii. Management should encourage good employee relations by promoting teamwork and clear communication on environmental matters. This will help to build a strong culture that supports sustainability in the organization.
iv. Organizations should introduce reward systems that recognize employees who take part in green activities. This will help to improve employee motivation, wellbeing, and performance over time.
v. Companies should involve employees in environmental decisions and community activities. This will help to improve social responsibility and strengthen the relationship between the organization and the society.

References

Abbas, J., & Khan, S. M. (2023). Green knowledge management and organizational green culture: an interaction for organizational green innovation and green performance. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, *27*(7), 1852-1870. https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-03-2022-0156

Ahman, R. (2018). The impact of green human resource management on organizational environmental performance in Jordanian health service organizations. *Management Science Letters*, 1049–1058.

Alahaddi, H. (2015). Triple bottom line and sustainability: A literature review. *International Journal of Engineering Management and Sciences, 6*, 23–30.

Alam, M. N., Campbell, N., Das, S., Hashim, F., Hidayat ur Rehman, I., & Iqbal, J. (2023). Green training and development revolutionizing organizational performance: The moderating role of green employee involvement in the Bangladeshi pharmaceutical industry. *International Business Research*, *16*(9), 36. https://doi.org/10.5539/ibr.v16n9p36

Alemu, B. A. (2025). Cultivating a culture of sustainability: the role of organizational values and leadership in driving sustainable practices. *Business Ethics and Leadership*, *9*(1), 79-94. https://doi.org/10.61093/bel.9(1).79-94.2025

Alemu, B. A. (2025). Cultivating a culture of sustainability: the role of organizational values and leadership in driving sustainable practices. *Business Ethics and Leadership*, *9*(1), 79-94. https://doi.org/10.61093/bel.9(1).79-94.2025

Alqudah, M. K., & Yusof, Y. (2024). Improving environmental performance through innovative academic citizenship behaviour: Green Training and development, green recruitment and selection as antecedents in Jordanian Government University. *Economics*, *12*(1), 101-129.

Amrutha, V. N., & Geetha, S. N. (2020). A systematic review on green human resource management: Implications for social sustainability. *Journal of Cleaner production*, *247*, 119131. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.119131

Ansari, N. Y., Farrukh, M., & Raza, A. (2021). Green human resource management and employees pro-environmental behaviours: Examining the underlying mechanism. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, *28*(1), 229-238. https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.2044

Barakat, B., Milhem, M., Naji, G. M. A., Alzoraiki, M., Muda, H. B., Ateeq, A., & Abro, Z. (2023). Assessing the impact of green training on sustainable business advantage: exploring the mediating role of green supply chain practices. *Sustainability*, *15*(19), 14144. https://doi.org/10.3390/su151914144

Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management, 17*(1), 99–120.

Barney, J. B. (1986). Organizational culture: Can it be a source of sustained competitive advantage? *Academy of Management Review, 11*, 656–665. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1986.4306261

Berber, N., Slavić, A., & Šušnjar, G. S. (2014). Relationships between corporate social responsibility and human resource management as new management concepts in Central

and Eastern Europe. *Engineering Economics, 25*(3), 360–369. https://doi.org/10.5755/j01.ee.25.3.4222

Bombiak, E., & Marciniuk-Kluska, A. (2018). Green human resource management as a tool for sustainable development of enterprises. *Sustainability, 10*, 1730.

Carmona-Moreno, E., Céspedes-Lorente, J., & Martínez-del-Río, J. (2012). Environmental human resource management and competitive advantage: A managerial perspective. *Journal of Ibero-American Academy of Management, 10*(2), 125–142.

Chen, P. K., Lujan-Blanco, I., Fortuny-Santos, J., & Ruiz-de-Arbulo-López, P. (2020). Lean manufacturing and environmental sustainability: the effects of employee involvement, stakeholder pressure and ISO 14001. *Sustainability*, *12*(18), 7258. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12187258

Cohen, E., Taylor, S., & Muller-Camen, M. (2012). *HRM's role in corporate social and environmental sustainability*. SHRM Foundation.

Cuthill, M. (2010). Strengthening the social in sustainable development: Developing a conceptual framework for social sustainability in a rapid urban growth region in Australia. *Sustainable Development, 18*(6), 362–373.

Daily, B. F., & Huang, S. C. (2001). Achieving sustainability through attention to human resource factors in environmental management. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management, 21*(12), 1539–1552.

Das, S., & Dash, M. (2024). Green compensation and reward system: A novel approach towards the growth and sustainability of organization. *Journal of Advanced Zoology*, *45*(2), 1213-1219.

Das, S., & Dash, M. (2024). Green compensation and reward system: A novel approach towards the growth and sustainability of organization. *Journal of Advanced Zoology*, *45*(2), 1213-1219.

Delmas, M. A., & Pekovic, S. (2013). Environmental standards and labor productivity: Understanding the mechanisms that sustain sustainability. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 34*, 230–252.

Diri, J. V. (2021). *Green human resource management and corporate sustainability of oil and gas producing communities in Rivers State, Nigeria* (Unpublished master's dissertation). Rivers State University.

Dumont, J., Shen, J., & Deng, X. (2017). Effects of green human resource management practices on employee workplace green behavior: The role of psychological green climate and employee values. *Human Resource Management, 56*(4), 613–627.

Ehnert, I., & Harry, W. (2012). Recent developments and future prospects on sustainable human resource management: Introduction to the special issue. *Management Revue, 23*(3), 221–238.

Fernández, E., Junquera, B., & Ordiz, M. (2003). Organizational culture and human resources in environmental issues: A review of the literature. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 14*, 634–656.

Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research, 18*(1), 39–50. https://doi.org/10.1177/002224378101800104

Freeman, R. E., Harrison, J. S., & Wicks, A. C. (2007). *Managing for stakeholders: Survival, reputation, and success*. Yale University Press.

Gao, J., To, W. M., & Yue, Z. (2026). Impact of green leadership on employee work engagement and green behaviour: the mediating role of green organizational culture. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 1-21. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-08-2025-5895

Gardner, T. M., Wright, P. M., & Moynihan, L. M. (2011). The impact of motivation, empowerment, and skill-enhancing practices on aggregate voluntary turnover: The mediating effect of collective affective commitment. *Personnel Psychology, 64*(2), 315–350.

Gbenda, J. A., & Keliga, M. (2012). Cultural perspectives on ecological sustainability in Nigeria. *African Journal of Social Science Research, 22*(2), 1–18.

Govindarajulu, N., & Daily, B. F. (2004). Motivating employees for environmental improvement. *Industrial Management & Data Systems, 104*(2), 364–372.

Grolleau, G., Mzoughi, N., & Pekovic, S. (2012). Green not only for profit: An empirical examination of the effects of environmental-related standards on employee recruitment. *Energy Economics, 34*(1), 74–92.

Guerci, M., & Carollo, L. (2016). A paradox view on green human resource management: Insights from the Italian context. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 27*(2), 212–238.

Guerci, M., Longoni, A., & Luzzini, D. (2016). Translating stakeholder pressures into environmental performance: The mediating role of green human resource management practices. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 27*.

Guerci, M., Radaelli, G., Siletti, E., Cirella, S., & Rami Shani, A. B. (2015). The impact of human resource management practices and corporate sustainability on organizational ethical climates: An employee perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics, 126*(2), 325–342.

Gujarati, D. N. (2003). *Basic econometrics* (4th ed.). McGraw-Hill.

Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2019). *Multivariate data analysis* (8th ed.). Cengage Learning.

Hariani, M., & Mardikaningsih, R. (2024). Encouraging Employee Engagement in Sustainability Initiatives to Improve Organization Performance and Sustainable Achievement of Social Goals. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, *6*(3), 6-10.

Highhouse, S., Hoffman, J. R., Greve, E. M., & Collins, A. E. (2002). Persuasive impact of organizational value statements in a recruitment context. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 32*(8), 1737–1752.

Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling, 6*(1), 1–55.

Huck, S. W. (2012). *Reading statistics and research* (6th ed.). Pearson Education.

Ikbal, M., Gunawan, M. P., Syam, M., Effendi, M., & Yusriadi, Y. (2021, April). Training and rewards for performance improvement through personnel motivation. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Operations Management, Sao Paulo, Brazil* (pp. 5-8).

Jabbour, C. J. C., & Santos, F. A. (2008). The central role of human resource management in the search for sustainable organizations. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 19*(12), 2133–2154.

Jabbour, C. J. C., Govindan, K., Teixeira, A. A., & Freitas, W. R. (2013). Environmental management and operational performance in the automotive industry in Brazil: The role of human resource management and lean manufacturing. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 47*, 163–179.

Jamil, S., Zaman, S. I., Kayikci, Y., & Khan, S. A. (2023). The role of green recruitment on organizational sustainability performance: A study within the context of green human resource management. *Sustainability*, *15*(21), 15567. https://doi.org/10.3390/su152115567

Kumar, A. (2023). Green Hrm: Enhancing organizational sustainability through employee engagement and eco-friendly practices. In *Proceeding of International Seminar Enrichment of Career by Knowledge of Language and Literature* (Vol. 11, No. 1, pp. 12-24). https://doi.org/10.25139/eckll.v11i1.7695

Leal Filho, W., Levesque, V., Sivapalan, S., Salvia, A. L., Fritzen, B., Deckert, R., ... & Shiel, C. (2022). Social values and sustainable development: community experiences. *Environmental Sciences Europe*, *34*(1), 67. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12302-022-00641-z

Lockett, A., Thompson, S., & Morgenstern, U. (2009). The development of the resource-based view of the firm: A critical appraisal. *International Journal of Management Reviews, 11*(1), 9–28.

Malik, S. Y., Hayat Mughal, Y., Azam, T., Cao, Y., Wan, Z., Zhu, H., & Thurasamy, R. (2021). Corporate social responsibility, green human resources management, and sustainable performance: is organizational citizenship behavior towards environment the missing link?. *Sustainability*, *13*(3), 1044. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13031044

Malokani, D. K. A. K., Tahal Kumar, D. G. M. L., Mumtaz, S. N., Hassan, N., & Darazi, M. A. (2024). Role Of Corporate Social Responsibility Practices On Employee Engagement: Mediating Role Of Green Training. *Migration Letters*, *21*(S13), 106-114.

Marhatta, S., & Adhikari, S. (2013). Green human resource management and sustainability. *International Journal of Ongoing Research in Management and Information Technology, 1*, 1–6.

Marrucci, L., Daddi, T., & Iraldo, F. (2024). Creating environmental performance indicators to assess corporate sustainability and reward employees. *Ecological Indicators*, *158*, 111489. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2023.111489

Marrucci, L., Daddi, T., & Iraldo, F. (2024). Creating environmental performance indicators to assess corporate sustainability and reward employees. *Ecological Indicators*, *158*, 111489. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2023.111489

Montiel, I., & Delgado-Ceballos, J. (2014). Defining and measuring corporate sustainability: Are we there yet? *Organization & Environment, 27*, 113–139. https://doi.org/10.1177/1086026614526413

Muisyo, P. K., Qin, S., & Julius, M. M. (2022). The effects of green human resource management practices on green competitive advantage of manufacturing firms. *Journal of Manufacturing Technology Management, 33*(1), 22–40.

Nasir Ansari, J. A., & Irfan, S. (2023). Corporate social responsibility and employee engagement: the mediating role of personal environmental norms and employee green behavior. *Social Responsibility Journal*, *19*(9), 1728-1748. https://doi.org/10.1108/SRJ-03-2022-0153

Nicolaescu, E., Alpopi, C., & Zaharia, C. (2015). Measuring corporate sustainability performance. *Sustainability, 7*, 7851–7886.

Ogu, S. J. (2024). Employee participation in decision-making and organizational commitment: A study of modern organizations. *Journal of Commerce, Management, and Tourism Studies*, *3*(1), 55-64. https://doi.org/10.58881/jcmts.v3i1.208

Patil, J. S., & Sarode, A. P. (2020). Contribution of employees: Engagement and participation of employees in green HRM to achieve sustainability. *Int. J. Hum. Resource Manage.*, *8*, 13-18.

Pham, N. T., Vo-Thanh, T., Shahbaz, M., Huynh, T. L. D., & Usman, M. (2020). Managing environmental challenges: Training as a solution to improve employee green performance. *Journal of Environmental Management*, *269*, 110781. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2020.110781

Pham, N. T., Vo-Thanh, T., Shahbaz, M., Huynh, T. L. D., & Usman, M. (2020). Managing environmental challenges: Training as a solution to improve employee green performance. *Journal of Environmental Management*, *269*, 110781. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2020.110781

Ramasamy, A., Inoro, I., & Sauna, R. (2017). A study on the implications of implementing green human resource management in corporate bodies in developing nations. *International Journal of Business Management, 12*(17).

Razali, N., & Vasudevan, H. (2024). The impact of implementing green human resources practices on employee engagement sustainability. *International Journal of Human Capital in Urban Management*, *9*(3), 389-404. DOI: 10.22034/IJHCUM.2024.03.02

Renwick, D. W. S., Redman, T., & Maguire, S. (2013). Green human resource management: A review and research agenda. *International Journal of Management Reviews, 15*(1), 1–14.

Saudi, M. H., Baker, R., Saudi, N. S. M., & Mohamed, R. (2021). The relationship between motivation, training, and job suitability with employee performance: A study of employees in the private sector. *Turkish Journal of Computer and Mathematics Education*, *12*(11), 1156-1163.

Sethumadhavan, R. P. P. S., Sajimon, P. P., Selvakumar, P., Kadu, S. G., Chandel, P. S., & Gupta, S. (2025). Environmental sustainability and employee participation. In *Green Leadership Strategies for Increased Employee Engagement and Performance* (pp. 275-298). IGI Global Scientific Publishing. DOI: 10.4018/979-8-3373-2106-6.ch009

Sethumadhavan, R. P. P. S., Sajimon, P. P., Selvakumar, P., Kadu, S. G., Chandel, P. S., & Gupta, S. (2025). Environmental sustainability and employee participation. In *Green Leadership Strategies for Increased Employee Engagement and Performance* (pp. 275-298). IGI Global Scientific Publishing. DOI: 10.4018/979-8-3373-2106-6.ch009

Sonia, K., Birkland, I., & others. (2014). Exploring scientific discourses of cultural sustainability. *Geoforum, 51*, 213–223. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2013.12.001

Tahir, M., Safwari, N., Usman, A., & Adnan, A. (2020). Green human resources management as a predictor of firm's environmental performance and the role of employees' environmental organizational citizenship behavior as a mediator. *Journal of Research Review: Social Sciences, 3*, 699–715.

Tamunomiebi, M. D., & Mezieh, A. A. (2022). Green human resource management and corporate sustainability of oil and gas companies in Port Harcourt, Nigeria. *Saudi Journal of Business and Management Studies, 7*, 78–89.

Tang, G., Chen, Y., Jiang, W., Paillé, P., & Jia, J. (2018). Green human resource management practices: Scale development and validity. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources, 56*, 31–35.

UNESCO. (2016). Culture: An enabler for sustainable development. https://en.unesco.org/theme/culture

Vallina, A., Vidal, J. A., & Cabrales, A. L. (2020). The challenges of increasing employees' well-being and performance: How human resource management practices and engaging leadership work together.

Wehrmeyer, W. (1996). Introduction. In W. Wehrmeyer (Ed.), *Greening people: Human resources and environmental management* (pp. 11-32). Greenleaf Publishing.

Wernerfelt, B. (1984). A resource-based view of the firm. *Strategic Management Journal, 5*(2), 171–180.

World Commission on Environment and Development. (1987). *Our common future*. Oxford University Press.

Xiaoyi, Z., Yang, H., Kumar, N., Bhutto, M. H., Kun, W., & Hu, T. (2023). Assessing Chinese textile and apparel industry business sustainability: the role of organization green culture, green dynamic capabilities, and green innovation in relation to environmental orientation and business sustainability. *Sustainability*, *15*(11), 8588. https://doi.org/10.3390/su15118588

Yong, J. Y., Yusliza, M. Y., Ramayah, T., Jabbour, C. J. C., Sehnem, S., & Mari, V. (2020). Pathways towards sustainability in manufacturing organizations: Empirical evidence on the role of green human resource management. *Business Strategy and the Environment, 29*(1), 212–228.