

Being sustainable: The three-way interactive effects of CSR, green human resource management, and responsible leadership on employee green behavior and task performance

Abstract

The main goal of this research was to analyze the three-way interactive effects of corporate social responsibility (CSR), green human resource management (GHRM), and responsible leadership on employee green behavior and task performance. Social cognition theory was adopted to explore the context-behavior-performance framework. The research hypotheses were tested using data from a survey of 261 Millennial employees in five-star hotels in China. The results indicated that the three-way interactive effect of CSR, GHRM, and responsible leadership on employee green behavior and performance was significant and positive. In addition, green behavior played a mediation role in this relationship after controlling the effect of organizational identity. This suggests that behavioral improvements are a better predictor of performance than perceptions of organizational identity. The analysis enriches the context-behavior-performance framework literature and highlights that organizations can enhance sustainability by implementing CSR, GHRM, and responsible leadership.

KEYWORDS: Corporate social responsibility (CSR); green human resource management (GHRM); responsible leadership; employee green behavior; employee task performance; three-way interactive effects; sustainable development; hotels; China

1 INTRODUCTION

Employee green behavior is being encouraged in more organizations as a result of today's increasing environmental and resource use concerns, and the implementation of more

stringent environmental policies in many nations (Dumont et al., 2017; Cheema et al., 2020). This is especially so in hotels (Ahmed et al., 2020; Kim et al., 2017; Robertson & Barling, 2013; Su & Swanson, 2019; Tian & Robertson, 2019) since the hospitality industry depends on natural resources, energy, and human talent to conserve resources and protect the environment in supporting sustainable development goals (Chaudhary, 2020; Hategan et al., 2018; Luu, 2019; Serra-Cantalops et al., 2018; Su & Swanson, 2019). Accordingly, many leading hotel groups including Hilton, Marriott, Four Seasons, Banyan Tree, and Six Senses support and encourage resource recycling, conservation, and waste reduction, and are committed to sustainability and its obligations to the environment and community in conserving energy, reusing water for secondary applications, and recycling waste materials¹.

How to promote employee green behavior in service industries is attracting greater attention in academic research and industry practice. Employee green behavior within hotels differs from actions in workplaces where such behavior is based on people's ages, environmental awareness, knowledge, values, concerns, beliefs, and life satisfaction (Chan et al., 2014; Huang, 2016; Norton et al., 2015; Wang, 2016; Wang & Kang, 2019; Wells et al., 2016). To date, the dominant perspective for understanding employee green behavior has been a focus on individual differences. Researchers have found that corporate social responsibility (CSR) plays an important role in motivating green behavior in workplaces (Cheema et al., 2020; Manika et al., 2015; Su & Swanson, 2019; Su et al., 2017; Tian & Robertson, 2019). However, CSR does not operate in a vacuum in affecting employee green behavior; rather, its effects are influenced by other organizational practices including green

¹ <https://www.sixsenses.com/about-us/about-us>

human resource management (GHRM) and responsible leadership (Aguinis & Glavas, 2019).

Surprisingly, the current literature focuses on the independent effect of CSR on green behavior (Su & Swanson, 2019; Shen & Benson, 2016; Tian & Robertson, 2019). However, the implementation of CSR policies and strategies are impacted by HRM and leadership actions (Aguinis & Glavas, 2019). CSR reflects policies to promote environmental protection and resource conservation (Su & Swanson, 2019), while GHRM represents formal HR practices, and responsible leadership represents informal personal power to influence employee green behavior (Leroy et al., 2018). CSR comprises organizational policies; GHRM and responsible leadership represent practices and actions providing organizational contexts for staff behavior (Chan et al., 2014; Kim et al., 2019). These contexts need to be examined more broadly to detect potential synergies as envisaged in this research (Hu et al., 2011).

HRM and leadership may strengthen the effects of CSR in organizations (Aguinis & Glavas, 2019; Farrington et al., 2017; Norton et al., 2015). The effectiveness of CSR policies is influenced by managerial practices and actions. This research highlights the effects of GHRM and responsible leadership because they value environmental protection and support pre-environment actions through systematic programming and personnel coaching and training. GHRM and responsible leadership are among the practices that affect employee green behavior through formal organizational systems and informal personal relationships (Leroy et al., 2018). Therefore, it is worthwhile and necessary to examine the interactive effect of these three important aspects of organizations.

In addition, the mediating effect of employee green behavior was explored in this

analysis. It is not yet completely known how CSR impacts employee performance. Most previous research has examined the positive relationships between CSR and employee performance based on social identification perspectives (Kim et al., 2019; Martínez et al., 2014; Raub & Blunschi, 2014). However, organizational identification emphasizes employee perceptions of organizational images based upon company policies and actions (Cheema et al., 2020; Norton et al., 2015). Further research efforts are needed to determine the effects of CSR, GHRM, and responsible leadership in improving and motivating green behavior leading to performance according to social cognition theory (Bandura, 1986; Chen et al., 2015). To bridge this literature gap, this research explored the three-way interactive effect of CSR, GHRM, and responsible leadership on individual performance through green behavior. With a focus on antecedents of green behavior (Ahmed et al., 2020; Dumont et al., 2017; Kim et al., 2019; Renwich et al., 2013; Shen & Benson, 2016; Su & Swanson, 2019; Tian & Robertson, 2019), the effects of employee green behavior in the hospitality industry require greater attention (Chen et al., 2015; Kim et al., 2019).

It is believed that this investigation has several potential contributions to the related research literature and practice. First, it analyzed the three-way interactive influence of CSR, GHRM, and responsible leadership on employee green behavior and performance. It recognized the complexity of organizational settings aimed at improving employee performance and can enrich the boundary condition research on CSR. Second, this work investigated the interactive influences of CSR, GHRM, and responsible leadership on employee task performance via green behavior through the lens of social cognition theory. This research tested the context-behavior-performance model in the hospitality industry.

Third, it extends the hospitality CSR research at the micro-level. The proposed theoretical model that was tested (Figure 1) was as follows:

[Insert Figure 1 about here]

2 LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT

The Three-way Interactive Effects of CSR, Green HRM, and Responsible Leadership

Employee green behavior refers to resource recycling, conservation, and waste reduction behaviors in organizations (Ahmed et al., 2020; Chaudhary, 2020; Dumont et al., 2017).

Employee green behavior is potentially impacted by significant organizational contexts, including CSR (Su & Swanson, 2019), GHRM (Dumont et al., 2017), and responsible leadership (Luu, 2019). CSR in hotels reflects the beliefs that organizational policies will achieve financial, social, and environmentally-sustainable development targets, including concerns about communities and the natural environment (Afsar et al., 2020; Calveras, 2015; Cheema et al., 2020).

CSR as a resource conservation policy and ethic creates a green context that fosters employee green behavior (Boan & Dedeolu, 2020; Su & Swanson, 2019). It is acknowledged that organizations that highly value corporate social and environmental responsibility make strong efforts to protect the environment, reduce resource waste and pollution, and care about customer and community benefits (Levy & Park, 2011; Kim et al., 2017). This, in turn, encourages employees to conserve resources and protect the environment (Asfer et al., 2020; Chaudhary, 2020; Tian & Robertson, 2019).

GHRM refers to a bundle of HR practices that encourages and supports pro-

environmental actions through positive effects on employee green behavior (Coan, 2015; Chaudhary, 2020; Dumont et al., 2017; Kramar, 2014; Kim et al., 2017, Kim et al., 2019; Renwich et al., 2013). GHRM valuing sustainable development usually represents formal organizational systems of environmental actions, including sustainability value-based recruitment, pro-environmental behavior training, and performance, and rewards (Ahmed et al., 2020; Chaudhary, 2020; Dumont et al., 2017; Kramar, 2014; Renwich et al., 2013). GHRM promotes green behavior by enhancing employees' pro-environmental capabilities, knowledge, and skills (Guerci et al., 2016), strengthening employee motivation to engage in green behavior (Dumont et al., 2017), and providing opportunities for employee green behavior (Pham et al., 2019).

Responsible leadership emphasizes that supervisors value companies' sustainable development goals, which include taking social responsibility for the increasing challenges of pollution, resource waste, and food safety (Afsar et al., 2016; Liao & Zhang, 2020).

Responsible leadership affects employee green behavior through informal personal relationships between supervisors and employees (Székely & Knirsch, 2005; Waldman & Balven, 2015). Responsible leaders have the supervisory power to encourage and support employees to engage in pro-environmental activities, including recycling and reducing pollution (Afsar et al., 2016; Robertson & Barling, 2013). In addition, responsible leaders value organizational sustainability, indicating they are not only concerned about financial performance but also consider the sustainability of the environment and help to deliver on these values (Doh & Quigley, 2014; Miska et al., 2014; Wang et al., 2015). They set an example to be followed by employees in the workplace (Kim et al., 2017; Xing &

Starik,2017; Waldman & Balven, 2015).

Furthermore, it is critical to consider the interactive effects among CSR, GHRM, and responsible leadership on employee behavior. CSR is the driver of organizational policies that demonstrate the value attached to social and environmental responsibility. It articulates the norms for protecting the environment, reducing resource waste and pollution, and caring about customer and community benefits (Su & Swanson, 2019). GHRM and responsible leadership are the practices that support corporate social and environmental responsibility policies, and encourage the appropriate staff behaviors (Dumont et al., 2017; Waldman & Balven, 2015). The interaction of CSR, GHRM, and responsible leadership potentially may further the effective attainment of corporate policies. Many previous studies focus on just a single factor; however, this research investigated the three-way interactive effects to expand upon these single antecedent models (Duffy et al.2006; Haar & Roche, 2013).

First, the effects of CSR may be augmented by GHRM practices in organizations (Aguinis & Glavas, 2019; Farrington et al., 2017). Organizations emphasizing sustainability need their employees to be engaged in pro-environmental behaviors (Su & Swanson, 2019). This not only necessitates formal policies and procedures but also requires cooperation and coordination between staff and employers. In this respect, GHRM can be the foundation that connects the two parties (Jiang et al., 2012). In addition, GHRM is comprised of critical employee management practices (recruiting, training, performance appraisal, and compensation) that may enhance the effects of CSR on this behavior (Norton et al., 2015; Lombardi et al., 2020). Moreover, without the support from GHRM, there might be negative effects of CSR on employee green behavior. CSR emphasizes advocacy and values that

enhance employee identity with engaging in green behavior; however, CSR may introduce more workload, stress, and emotional exhaustion and have a negative influence on employee green behavior (Aguinis & Glavas, 2019).

Responsible leadership may augment the interactive effects of CSR and GHRM on employee green behavior. Responsible leadership impacts employee behavior through informal leader-member relationships, and constitutes another organizational action that impacts workplaces (De Roeck & Farooq, 2018; Leroy et al., 2018). Also, responsible leadership can make a difference in employee motivation and green behavior through informal personal relationships (Inceoglu et al., 2018; Kara et al., 2013; Luo et al., 2014; Robertson & Carleton, 2018).

Responsible leadership may strengthen the moderating effect of GHRM. GHRM highlights the management systems and processes that motivate employee green behavior (Dumont et al., 2017). However, GHRM may be insufficient in promoting employee green behavior. Responsible leadership may increase the beneficial effects of GHRM through individual employee impacts, including leaders providing resources and support (Afsar et al., 2016), and can play a key role in planning and executing CSR policies in organizations (Javed et al., 2020). If leadership is indifferent, it signals that supervisors do not value environmental protection and do not support employee green behavior through personal example, and this can cause diminished employee green behavior (Graves & Sarkis, 2018). Therefore, it was proposed that responsible leadership strengthens the interactive effects of CSR and GHRM on green behavior.

CSR represents the guidelines on how an organization will achieve economic, social, and

environmental sustainability (Akremi et al., 2018; Kim et al., 2017; Shen & Benson, 2016).

The effects of CSR are strengthened by GHRM and responsible leadership to signal the message about the pro-environmental values, attitudes, and behaviors that the organization supports and expects, and the appropriate employee green behaviors will receive social approval (Norton et al., 2015). Thus, the first hypothesis was proposed as:

H1. There is a three-way interactive effect among CSR, GRHM, and responsible leadership, the effects of CSR are strengthened by the interactive effects of GHRM and responsible leadership on green behavior.

Employee Green Behavior and Task Performance

Green behavior is characterized as responsible or pro-environmental actions that demonstrate a valuing of environmental sustainability, including reducing resource waste and the recycling of resources. Employee performance is defined as the quantity and quality of task accomplishment. According to the context-behavior-performance framework, employee green behavior reflects the knowledge, skills, and capabilities in the workplace (Chan et al., 2014), and employee green behavior leads to positive outcomes (Norton et al., 2015; Kim et al., 2019). Green behaviors improve employee performance for two reasons: first, they enhance and add to employee knowledge, skills, and values. Green behavior means that employees care about the sustainability of the organization and absorb pro-environmental knowledge and values at work which facilitates their efficiency and effectiveness in task accomplishment (Shen et al., 2016). Second, new skills are learned, and knowledge acquired in the service environment, with employees reducing waste and recycling resources, which reduces costs

while also attaining environmental goals (Kim et al., 2019). Therefore, it was proposed that green behavior has a positive impact on employee task performance.

H2. Green behavior is positively related to employee task performance.

Mediation Effects of Employee Green Behavior

CSR articulates policies associated with sustainable development and exhibits care for the interests of employees, customers, communities, and governments, and it indirectly impacts employee performance (Tian & Robertson, 2019). Social identity could potentially be a means for explaining the effects of CSR on individuals (Cheema et al., 2020; Tian & Robertson, 2019). However, social identity has tended to focus on perceptions of individual images and identities, and a significant link between individual behavior and performance has been neglected (Fu, Ye, & Law, 2014; Kim, et al., 2019).

According to social cognition theory, the context can be an important antecedent of individual behavior and lead to consequent performance (Bandura, 1991). Based on the context-behavior-performance framework, the foregoing discussion rests on an underlying assumption that organizational contexts (CSR, GHRM, and responsible leadership) affect individual task performance through green behavior. CSR, GHRM, and responsible leadership may directly improve employee green behaviors in organizations (Aguinis & Glavas, 2019; Leroy et al., 2018). CSR is organizational policy and GHRM is formal HRM practice, while responsible leaders demonstrate concern and actions to protect the environment. Organizations and leaders set examples and provide role models to motivate employee green behavior (Kim et al., 2019).

These organizational contexts are believed to significantly influence green behavior and, in turn, enhance employee task performance. CSR provides employees with organizational norms and may encourage individuals to commit to their employers, positively influencing performance (Raub & Blunschi, 2014; Shen et al., 2016). Moreover, GHRM augments work knowledge, skills, motivations, and opportunities, thereby also improving performance (Kim et al., 2019). Responsible leadership provides a pro-environmental model of care and support for green behavior and performance (Afsar et al. 2016). In addition, the effects of CSR are strengthened by GHRM and responsible leadership leading to improved employee performance via green behavior. Green behaviors in hotels conserve natural resources and energy, reduce non-durable product usage, and increase effectiveness and efficiency (Chen & Lin, 2015; Chen et al., 2015; Kim et al., 2019). Therefore, the hypothesis was that green behavior plays a mediating role between the antecedents and employee task performance, as follows:

H3. There is an interactive effect of CSR, GHRM, and responsible leadership on employee task performance through green behavior.

METHODS

Sample and Procedures

A survey was conducted, and linear regression analysis was applied thereafter to examine the proposed theoretical model. The questionnaires were sent to 300 Millennial employees in five-star certified hotels in Hangzhou, Shanghai, Wuhan, Changsha, Shenzhen, and Chengdu from January to March, 2018. WeChat, email, and QQ were used for questionnaire

distribution. Snowball (Sun et al., 2007) and convenience sampling (Ahmed et al., 2020) were applied in this research. Some 280 responses were received and there were 261 valid questionnaires after excluding 19 due to missing key variables or obvious tendencies for repetitive answers. Millennial employees of five-star hotels in China were selected for three reasons. First, the hospitality industry is quickly developing and making a positive contribution to better lives and economic transformation. Millennial employees (born after the 1980s) are the mainstream in hotels nowadays, and most of them are educated to protect the environment in response to sustainable development policies. Second, the attention attached to CSR in the hospitality industry is increasing (Boan & Dedeolu, 2020), especially because resource waste and pollution are becoming increasingly serious issues in China. It is essential that green practices are implemented in hotels, and that green behaviors are encouraged. Third, as industry leaders five-star hotels typically assume the responsibility to be pioneers and role models for sustainable development policies and practices, including groups such as Banyan Tree, Six Senses, and Hilton.

The respondents included 28% males and 72% females. On average, they were approximately 25 years old, had 2.7 years of job tenure, and 255 (94.3%) had a college degree or higher. There were 158 frontline employees, accounting for 60.5% of the total sample, and 103 employees were managers in hotels (39.5%).

Measures

Scales using five-point Likert measures were used for GHRM, responsible leadership, CSR, green behavior, and task performance, ranging from “strongly disagree” (1) to “strongly agree” (5). The variables were defined as follows.

CSR. The 17-item scale for CSR from Wu et al.'s (2015) research was used. Items included concerns about the environment, government, customers, society, and employees. They included, "Our company implements special programs to minimize negative impacts on the natural environment," "Our company complies with legal regulations completely and promptly," "Our company provides full and accurate information about products or services to customers," and "The management of our company is greatly concerned with employees' needs and wants." The scale showed good reliability, with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.94.

GHRM. GHRM was measured with a scale adapted from Dumont et al. (2017). The items included, "My company sets green goals for its employees", "My company relates employees' workplace green behaviors to rewards and compensation." and "My company considers employees' workplace green behavior in performance appraisals." The Cronbach's alpha statistic was 0.95.

Responsible leadership. The scale for responsible leadership from Voegtlin (2011) was applied. Representative items were, "Our leader is aware of and considers the consequences of our actions for all stakeholders"; "Our leader tries to achieve a consensus by weighing the arguments and balancing the interests of stakeholders." The scale showed good reliability with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.82.

Employee green behavior. Green behavior was measured with a seven-item scale adapted from Robertson and Barling (2013). Items included "I print double sided whenever possible," "I bring reusable eating utensils to work (e.g., travel coffee mug, water bottle, reusable containers, reusable cutlery)," and "I take part in environmentally friendly programs (e.g., bike/walk to work every day, bring my own lunch)." The Cronbach's alpha was 0.81.

Employee task performance. The measures of task performance focused on quality, efficiency, and quantity with a three-item scale adapted from Farh et al. (2010). The items included "High quality, low errors, and high accuracy in main job responsibilities," "High

efficiency, fast execution, and high quantity in main responsibilities,” and “Achieve high goals and in key job responsibilities” . The Cronbach’s alpha was 0.81.

Control variables. Demographic factors (age, gender, education level, position and tenure, and company ownership) related to employees’ task performance were controlled in this research (Su & Swanson, 2019). To test the mediation effects of employee green behavior in this model, organizational identification was controlled. Organizational identification was measured by Mael and Ashforth’s (1992) six-item scale. The Cronbach’s alpha was 0.89.

Herman single factor was used test to examine common method bias. The largest variance explained by a single factor was 40.4%, and the result showed that the common method bias was acceptable.

RESULTS

Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA)

CFA results with LISREL 8.80 showed that the five-factor model (i.e., CSR, GHRM, responsible leadership, green behavior, and task performance) fit the data better than alternative models (Table 1). For instance, the five-factor model ($\chi^2/df = 2.65 < 3$; NFI = 0.96; NNFI = 0.98; CFI = 0.98; IFI = 0.98; RMSEA = 0.075) yielded a better fit than a four-factor model formed by combining CSR and GHRM into one factor. The CFA results also indicated that the common method bias was acceptable.

[Insert Table 1 about here]

Descriptive Statistics

The means, standard deviations, correlations, and reliability statistics for the five key variables are presented in Table 2. The results revealed that CSR, GHRM, and responsible leadership were correlated with green behavior. Also, there was a positive correlation

between green behavior and task performance.

[Insert Table 2 about here]

Hypothesis Testing

The three-way interactive effects of CSR, GHRM, and responsible leadership on green behavior and task performance were tested following Haar and Roche (2013) and Zhou and George (2001). The traditional indirect effects analysis and bootstrap standard error-based tests were used (Messersmith, Patel, Lepak, & Gould-Williams 2011).

Step 1 examined the effects of GHRM, responsible leadership, and CSR on employee green behavior. The results showed that GHRM was positively related to green behavior (M2: $\beta = 0.271$, $p < 0.001$) (Table 3). Responsible leadership and CSR were also positively related to green behavior (M2: $\beta = 0.232$, $p < 0.001$; $\beta = 0.391$, $p < 0.001$). The results indicated that GHRM, responsible leadership, and CSR had positive effects on green behavior and that the effect of CSR on green behavior was strengthened by GHRM and responsible leadership. The results confirmed that the three-way interactive effect among CSR, GHRM, responsible leadership was positively associated with green behavior (M4: $\beta = 0.107$, $p < 0.05$) and H1 was supported. The three-way interactive effect on green behavior is shown in Figure 2.

[Insert Table 3 about here]

[Insert Figure 2 about here]

For Hypotheses 2 and controlling for the demographic variables, the relationship between green behavior and task performance was tested. As shown in Model 6 (Table 4), the positive relationship between green behavior and performance was significant (M6: $\beta = 0.665$, $p < 0.001$); therefore, H2 was supported.

Models 7 to 9 (Table 4) tested the mediating role of green behavior between the interactive effect and task performance. The results showed that GHRM and CSR were positively associated with task performance (M7: $\beta = 0.299$, $p < 0.001$; M7: $\beta = 0.374$, $p <$

0.001). In addition, the three-way interactive effect of CSR, GHRM, and responsible leadership was positively related to employee performance (M9: $\beta = 0.152$, $p < 0.05$). The three-way interactive effect on employee performance is shown in Figure 3.

[Insert Figure 3 about here]

After entering the mediator (green behavior), the influence of the three-way interactive effect on employee task performance decreased (M9: $\beta = 0.115$, $p < 0.10$) when compared to model 9 (M8: $\beta = 0.152$, $p < 0.02$). In model 10, after entering the controlled mediator, organizational identity, the mediation effect of employee green behavior was significant (M10: $\beta = 0.337$, $p < 0.01$). Additionally, the bootstrap result showed that the mediating effect of green behavior between the interactive effect and task performance was significant (M9: (0.123, 0.529), $p < 0.05$). H3 was supported.

[Insert Table 4 about here]

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

This research explored the effects of important organizational contexts (CSR, GHRM, and responsible leadership) on green behaviors and consequently task performance based on social cognition theory. The context-behavior-performance framework was tested.

CSR, GHRM, and responsible leadership had combined and synergistic effects on green behavior and task performance. CSR does not work in a vacuum, and the effects of CSR policies need the support of management practices, including GRHM and responsible leadership.

Employee green behavior played a mediating role between the interactive effects of CSR, GHRM, and responsible leadership and task performance after organizational identity was controlled as the mediator. When compared with organizational identification, CSR,

GRHM, and responsible leadership are intended to enhance individual performance through green behavior. In this respect, green behavior is more significant than identification in predicting performance in the hospitality industry.

GHRM is essential in pro-environment organizational context building. In addition, the results showed that the interactive effects of CSR and responsible leadership have negative effects on employee performance. This result is different from De Roeck & Farooq (2018), who found a positive interactive effect of CSR and leadership. The possible reason is that CSR and responsible leadership may bring additional workload, stress, and conflict to employees without GRHM support. This negative effect of CSR needs more attention in future research (Aguinis & Glavas, 2019). Therefore, GHRM plays an essential role in supporting and implementing CSR policies in hotels, and this is consistent with the perspectives of Luu (2018) and Kim et al (2019).

Theoretical Implications

First, this research explored the boundary conditions of CSR in organizations. The interactive effect of CSR, GHRM, and responsible leadership was tested, and this analysis explored the combined impact of important organizational factors (CSR, GHRM, and responsible leadership) in workplaces. The effects of CSR on employee green behavior and performance were impacted by GHRM and responsible leadership. The findings provide a comprehensive understanding of how complex organizational contexts promote employee green behavior and task performance. This supports previous studies revealing the positive effects of CSR (Ahmed et al., 2020; Su & Swanson, 2019; Tian & Robertson, 2019), GHRM

(Chaudhary, 2020) and responsible leadership (Afsar et al., 2016; Robertson & Barling, 2013). In addition, CSR does not operate alone; the effects of CSR are impacted by GHRM and responsible leadership. CSR, GHRM, and responsible leadership have synergistic effects on employee green behavior. These findings are a positive response to the call for greater boundary research on CSR by exploring the impacts of GHRM and responsible leadership on CSR's effects (Aguinis & Glavas, 2019).

Second, this research explored the underlying psychological mechanisms of organizational contexts on green behavior based on social cognition theory, and these results enrich the context-behavior-performance framework. It was proposed that the effects of complex organizational contexts including CSR, GHRM, and responsible leadership on employee performance were mediated by employee green behavior, and this better explains the underlying processes of how CSR impacts employee performance. In addition, green behavior had greater mediation effects between organizational contexts and task performance. A significant amount of past research has explored the effects of organizational factors on performance based on social identification theory (Cheema, et al., 2020; Su & Swanson, 2019). The results supported the perspective that behavioral improvements are a critical predictor of performance (Kim et al., 2019).

Third, this work may contribute at the micro level of CSR research. The past literature has an emphasis on the implementation of CSR (Osagie et al., 2020), and impacts of CSR on organizational performance in response to the call for more caring about stakeholder benefits and sustainability (Farrington, 2017; Gu et al., 2013; Javed et al., 2020; Kim et al., 2017; Liao & Zhang, 2020; Serra-Cantalops et al., 2018). These findings offer robust evidence on

the impacts of CSR on employee green behavior and task performance, as well as enriching CSR research at a micro level (Aguinis & Glavas, 2019; Ahmed et al., 2020; Boan & Dedeolu, 2020; Cheema et al., 2020). CSR and individual outcomes are emphasized in this research as green behavior is important in hospitality and should be the subject of greater research in the future. This analysis offers an illustration of the relationship among CSR, individual behavior, and consequently task performance.

Managerial Implications

Organizations should simultaneously invest in CSR, GHRM, and responsible leadership to fire more employee passion for green behavior for sustainable development. CSR represents corporate policies to promote environmental protection and resource conservation. GHRM constitutes formal organizational practices, while responsible supervisory leadership is based on informal personal relationships that positively influence staff behavior in support of the environment. The planning and practicing of CSR depend on support from GHRM and responsible leadership. Therefore, GHRM should be applied in organizations, including recruitment, performance appraisal, and promotion. Also, organization should train responsible leadership for sustainable development.

It is highly desirable for managers to promote employee green behaviors. Pro-environmental actions are important for organizational development and society. Green management could be characterized as being at an early stage, particularly in China where many properties and companies have neglected these concerns. Several world-renowned hotel groups have exemplary pro-environmental practices and should be a beacon for others

highlighting what is needed. Six Senses and Banyan Tree, for instance, emphasize CSR and employee green behavior and thereby have improved their competitive advantages. Many hotels in China need to follow these examples and do much more to conserve resources and protect the environment, especially because of their dependency on natural resources and energy. Being so labor-intensive, enhancing employee green behavior could be a major resource- and cost-saving strategy. Also, this investigation suggests that green behavior has positive impacts on workplace task performance.

CSR can be used as an informal HRM strategy in organizations, as it has positive impacts on green behavior and task performance. CSR delivers messages that organizations care about their employees, society, and sustainable development. It elevates the norms and values that can transform organizations and their people (Cheema et al., 2020). When successfully implemented, CSR encourages staff to absorb the norms and values and to mirror their organizations in pro-environmental behavior. Therefore, it is essential for organizations to fully embrace their social responsibilities and to encourage higher levels of green behavior.

Limitations and Future Research Directions

It is acknowledged that there are several shortcomings in this work. First, the research focused on employee perceived CSR, GHRM, and responsible leadership at one point in time and in certain Chinese cities, and consequently it was a cross-sectional design, which is limited in explaining causality relationships between antecedents and individual outcomes. Longitudinal research is needed to explore in greater depth the cause-and-effect relationships between organizational contextual factors, green behaviors, and task performance.

Second, the data were from hotel employees, and this single source inevitably leads to common variance. Common variance bias was controlled by randomizing items in the questionnaire and examining whether the common variance bias was acceptable. Future research should collect data from multiple sources including managers, corporate executives, and employees.

Third, this analysis focused on the effects of GHRM and CSR at an individual employee level. Although this micro-level view of CSR research has value, developing a multi-level model involving organizational and individual outcomes to bridge the gap between macro and micro research of GHRM and CSR will be an important direction in the future. Greater investigation of these mediation effects is required.

CONCLUSION

The main goal of this research was to explore the three-way interactive effect of organizational contexts (CSR, GHRM, and responsible leadership) on green behaviors and task performance in the hospitality industry. It was proposed, based upon social cognition theory, that CSR, GHRM, and responsible leadership exert a combined and synergistic influence on employee green behavior. GHRM and responsible leadership play important roles in the implementation of CSR policies.

The context-behavior-performance mechanism was explored focusing on the interactive impact of these three contextual factors. In addition, green behaviors mediated the effects of organizational factors and employee task performance. The expanded model illustrates the valuable contribution of CSR as an influencing mechanism for transforming organizational

policies into employee behavior and performance, especially when combined with GHRM and responsible leadership. CSR, GHRM, and responsible leadership can be a source of competitive advantage in hospitality, especially when the emphasis increases on economic, social, and environmental sustainability. Moreover, organizational contexts and personal factors are essential antecedents of employee green behavior and more future in-depth research is needed in this field.

REFERENCES

- Afsar, B., Badir, Y., & Kiani, U. S. (2016). Linking spiritual leadership and employee pro-environmental behavior: the influence of workplace spirituality, intrinsic motivation, and environmental passion. *Journal of Environmental Psychology, 45*, 79-88.
- Afsar, B., Al-Ghazali, B. M., Rehman, Z. U., & Umrani, W. A. (2020). The moderating effects of employee corporate social responsibility motive attributions (substantive and symbolic) between corporate social responsibility perceptions and voluntary pro-environmental behavior. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management, 27*(2), 769-785.
- Aguinis, H., & Glavas, A. (2012). What we know and don't know about corporate social responsibility a review and research agenda. *Journal of Management, 38*(4), 932-968.
- Aguinis, H., & Glavas, A. (2019). On corporate social responsibility, sensemaking, and the search for meaningfulness through work. *Journal of Management, 45*(3), 1057-1086.
- Ahmed, M., Zehou, S., Raza, S. A., Qureshi, M. A., & Yousufi, S. Q. (2020). Impact of CSR and environmental triggers on employee green behavior: the mediating effect of employee well-being. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management, 27*, 2225-2239.
- Akreml, A. E., Gond, J. P., Swaen, V., Roeck, K. D., & Igalens, J. (2018). How do employees perceive corporate responsibility? development and validation of a multidimensional corporate stakeholder responsibility scale. *Journal of Management, 44*(2), 619-657.
- Bandura, A. . (1986). Social foundations of thought and action: a social cognitive theory. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 12*(1), 169.
- Bandura, A. . (1991). Social cognitive theory of self-regulation. *Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes, 50*(2), 248-287.
- Boan, E., & Dedeolu, B. B. (2020). Hotel employees' corporate social responsibility perception and organizational citizenship behavior: perceived external prestige and pride in organization as serial mediators. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management, 27*, 2342-2353.
- Calveras, A. (2015). Corporate social responsibility strategy in the hotel industry: evidence from the Balearic Islands. *International Journal of Tourism Research, 17*(4), 399-408.

- Chan, E. S. W., Hon, A. H. Y., Okumus, F., & Chan, W. (2014). An empirical study of environmental practices and employee ecological behavior in the hotel industry. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 41(5), 585-608.
- Chaudhary, R. (2020). Green human resource management and employee green behavior: an empirical analysis. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 27, 630-641.
- Cheema, S., Afsar, B., Basheer M. Al-Ghazali, & Maqsoom, A. (2020). How employee's perceived corporate social responsibility affects employee's pro-environmental behaviour? the influence of organizational identification, corporate entrepreneurship, and environmental consciousness. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 27, 616-629.
- Chen, M. H., & Lin, C. P. (2015). The impact of corporate charitable giving on hospitality firm performance: doing well by doing good? *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 47, 25-34.
- Chen, Y., Tang, G., Jin, J., Li, J., & Paillé, P. (2015). Linking market orientation and environmental performance: The influence of environmental strategy, employee's environmental involvement, and environmental product quality. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 127(2), 479-500.
- Coan, P. (2015). HRM practices used to promote pro-environmental behavior: a UK survey. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 26(16), 1-22.
- De Roeck, K., & Farooq, O. (2018). Corporate social responsibility and ethical leadership: Investigating their interactive effect on employees' socially responsible behaviors. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 151(4), 923-939.
- Doh, J. P., & Quigley, N. R. (2014). Responsible leadership and stakeholder management: : influence pathways and organizational outcomes. *Academy of Management Executive*, 28(3), 255-274.
- Duffy, M. K., Shaw, J. D., Scott, K. L., & Tepper, B. J. (2006). The moderating roles of self-esteem and neuroticism in the relationship between group and individual undermining behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(5), 1066-1077.
- Dumont, J., Shen, J., & Deng, X. (2017). Effects of green HRM practices on employee workplace green behavior: the role of psychological green climate and employee green values. *Human Resource Management*, 56(4).
- Farh, J., Dobbins, G. H., & Cheng, B. (2010). Cultural relativity in action: A comparison of self-rating made by Chinese and U.S. workers. *Personnel Psychology*, 44(1), 129-147.
- Farrington, T., Curran, R., Gori, K., O'Gorman, K. D., & Queenan, C. J. (2017). Corporate social responsibility: reviewed, rated, revised. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 29(1), 30-47.
- Flammer, C., & Luo, J. (2016). Corporate social responsibility as an employee governance tool: evidence from a quasi-experiment. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18, 163-183.
- Font, X., Walmsley, A., Cogotti, S., McCombes, L., & Häusler, N. (2012). Corporate social responsibility: the disclosure–performance gap. *Tourism Management*, 33(6), 1544-1553.
- Fu, H., Ye, H. B. B. Y., & Law, R. (2014). You do well and i do well? the behavioral consequences of corporate social responsibility. *International Journal of Hospitality*

- Management*, 40, 62-70.
- Graves, L. M., & Sarkis, J. (2018). The role of employees' leadership perceptions, values, and motivation in employees' pro-environmental behaviors. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 196, 576-587.
- Gu, H., Ryan, C., Li, B., & Wei, G. (2013). Political connections, guanxi, and adoption of CSR policies in the Chinese hotel industry: is there a link? *Tourism Management*, 34(2), 231-235.
- Guerci, M., Longoni, A., & Luzzini, D. (2016). Translating stakeholder pressures into environmental performance – the mediating role of green HRM practices. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 27(2), 1-28.
- Haar, J., & Roche, M. (2013). Three-way interaction effects of workaholism on employee well-being: evidence from blue-collar workers in New Zealand. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 19(2), 134-149.
- Hategan, C. D., Sirghi, N., Curea-Pitorac, R. I., & Hategan, V. P. (2018). Doing well or doing good: The relationship between corporate social responsibility and profit in Romanian companies. *Sustainability*, 10(4), 1041.
- Hu, Q., Schaufeli, W. B., & Taris, T. W. (2011). The job demands–resources model: An analysis of additive and joint effects of demands and resources. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 79(1), 181-190.
- Huang, H. (2016). Media use, environmental beliefs, self-efficacy, and pro-environmental behavior. *Journal of Business Research*, 69(6), 2206-2212.
- Inceoglu, I., Thomas, G., Chu, C., Plans, D., & Gerbasi, A. (2018). Leadership behavior and employee well-being: an integrated review and a future research agenda. *Leadership Quarterly*, 29(1), 179-202.
- Javed, M., Rashid, M. A., Hussain, G., & Ali, H. Y. (2020). The effects of corporate social responsibility on corporate reputation and firm financial performance: moderating role of responsible leadership. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 27, 1395-1409.
- Jiang, K., Lepak, D. P., Hu, J., & Baer, J. C. (2012). How does human resource management influence organizational outcomes? a meta-analytic investigation of mediating mechanisms. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(6), 1264-1294.
- Kara, D., Uysal, M., Sirgy, M. J., & Lee, G. (2013). The effects of leadership style on employee well-being in hospitality. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 34(6), 9-18.
- Kim, H. L., Rhou, Y., Uysal, M., & Kwon, N. (2017). An examination of the links between corporate social responsibility (CSR) and its internal consequences. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 61, 26-34.
- Kim, A., Kim, Y., Han, K., Jackson, S. E., & Ployhart, R. E. (2017). Multilevel influences on voluntary workplace green behavior: individual differences, leader behavior, and coworker advocacy. *Journal of Management*, 43(5), 1335-1358.
- Kim, Y. J. , Kim, W. G. , Choi, H. M. , & Phetvaroon, K. . (2019). The effect of green human resource management on hotel employees' eco-friendly behavior and environmental performance. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 76, 83-93.
- Kramar, R. (2014). Beyond strategic human resource management: is sustainable human

- resource management the next approach? *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 25(8), 1069-1089.
- Leroy, H., Segers, J., Dierendonck, D. V., & Hartog, D. D. (2018). Managing people in organizations: integrating the study of HRM and leadership. *Human Resource Management Review*, 28(3), 249-257.
- Levy, S. E., & Park, S. Y. (2011). An analysis of CSR activities in the lodging industry. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Management*, 18(1), 147–154.
- Liao, Z., & Zhang, M. (2020). The influence of responsible leadership on environmental innovation and environmental performance: the moderating role of managerial discretion. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 27, 2016-2027.
- Lombardi, R., Manfredi, S., Cuzzo, B., & Palmaccio, M. (2020). The profitable relationship among corporate social responsibility and human resource management: a new sustainable key factor. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 1, 1-11.
- Luo, Z. P., Song, H. Y., Marnburg, E., & Øgaard, T. (2014). The impact of relational identity on the relationship between LMX, interpersonal justice, and employees' group commitment. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 41, 21-27.
- Luu, T. T. (2017). CSR and organizational citizenship behavior for the environment in hotel industry: the moderating roles of corporate entrepreneurship and employee attachment style. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 29(3), 2867-2900.
- Luu, T. T. (2019). Building employees' organizational citizenship behavior for the environment. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 31(1): 406-426.
- Mael, F., & Ashforth, B. E. (1992). Alumni and their alma mater: a partial test of the reformulated model of organizational identification. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13(2), 103-123.
- Manika, D., Wells, V. K., Gregory-Smith, D., & Gentry, M. (2015). The impact of individual attitudinal and organisational variables on workplace environmentally friendly behaviours. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 126(4), 663-684.
- Martínez, P., Pérez, A., & Bosque, I. R. D. (2014). Exploring the role of CSR in the organizational identity of hospitality companies: a case from the Spanish tourism industry. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 124(1), 47-66.
- Messersmith, J. G., Patel, P. C., Lepak, D. P., & Gould-Williams, J. (2011). Unlocking the black box: exploring the link between high-performance work systems and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(6), 1105-1118.
- Miska, C., Hilbe, C., & Mayer, S. (2014). Reconciling different views on responsible leadership: a rationality-based approach. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 125(2), 349-360.
- Morgeson, F. P., Aguinis, H., Waldman, D. A., & Siegel, D. S. (2013). Extending corporate social responsibility research to the human resource management and organizational behavior domains: a look to the future. *Personnel Psychology*, 66(4), 805–824.
- Norton, T. A., Parker, S. L., Zacher, H., & Ashkanasy, N. M. (2015). Employee green behavior: a theoretical framework, multilevel review, and future research agenda

- (supplementary material). *Organization & Environment*, 28(1), 103-125.
- Osagie, E., Wesselink, R., Blok, V., & Mulder, M. (2020). Learning Organization for Corporate Social Responsibility Implementation; Unravelling the Intricate Relationship Between Organizational and Operational Learning Organization Characteristics. *Organization & Environment*, 1-24, 1086026620933915.
- Park, S. Y., Lee, C. K., & Kim, H. (2018). The influence of corporate social responsibility on travel company employees. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 30(1), 178-196.
- Park, S. Y., & Levy, S. E. (2014). Corporate social responsibility: perspectives of hotel frontline employees. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 26(3), 2-2.
- Pham, N. T., Tučková, Z., & Jabbour, C. J. C. (2019). Greening the hospitality industry: How do green human resource management practices influence organizational citizenship behavior in hotels? A mixed-methods study. *Tourism Management*, 72, 386-399.
- Raub, S., & Blunschi, S. (2014). The power of meaningful work: how awareness of CSR initiatives fosters task significance and positive work outcomes in service employees. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, 55(1), 10-18.
- 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.
- Robertson, J. L., & Barling, J. (2013). Greening organizations through leaders' influence on employees' pro-environmental behaviors. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 34(2), 176-194.
- Robertson, J. L., & Carleton, E. (2018). Uncovering how and when environmental leadership affects employees' voluntary pro-environmental behavior. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 25(2), 197-210.
- Serra-Cantalops, A., Peña-Miranda, D. D., Ramón-Cardona, J., & Martorell-Cunill, O. (2018). Progress in Research on CSR and the Hotel Industry (2006-2015). *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, 59(1), 15-38.
- Shen, J., & Benson, J. (2016). When CSR is a social norm: how socially responsible human resource management affects employee work behavior. *Journal of Management*, 20(6), 1723-1746.
- Shen, J., Dumont, J., & Deng, X. (2016). Employees perceptions of green HRM and non-green employee work outcomes: the social identity and stakeholder perspectives. *Group & Organization Management*, 43(4), 594-622.
- Su, L., Swanson, S. R., Hsu, M., & Chen, X. (2017). How does perceived corporate social responsibility contribute to green consumer behavior of Chinese tourists: A hotel context. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 29(12), 3157-3176.
- Su, L., & Swanson, S. R. (2019). Perceived corporate social responsibility's impact on the well-being and supportive green behaviors of hotel employees: The mediating role of the employee-corporate relationship. *Tourism Management*, 72, 437-450.
- Sun, L. Y., Aryee, S. and Law, K. S. (2007). High-performance human resource practices, citizenship behavior, and organizational performance: A relational perspective.

- Academy of Management Journal*, 50(3), 558-577.
- Székely, F., & Knirsch, M. (2005). Responsible leadership and corporate social responsibility: metrics for sustainable performance. *European Management Journal*, 23(6), 628-647.
- Tian, Q., & Robertson, J. L. (2019). How and when does perceived CSR affect employees' engagement in voluntary pro-environmental behavior? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 155(4), 399-412.
- Unsworth, K. L., & McNeil, I. M. (2017). Increasing pro-environmental behaviors by increasing self-concordance: testing an intervention. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(1), 88-103.
- Voegtlin, C. (2011). Development of a scale measuring discursive responsible leadership. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 98(1), 57-73.
- Waldman, D. A., & Balven, R. M. (2015). Responsible leadership: theoretical issues and research directions. *Academy of Management Executive*, 28(3), 224-234.
- Wang, E., & Kang, N. (2019). Does life satisfaction matter for pro-environmental behavior? empirical evidence from china general social survey. *Quality & Quantity*, 53(1), 449-469.
- Wang, Y. F. (2016). Modeling predictors of restaurant employees' green behavior: comparison of six attitude-behavior models. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 58, 66-81.
- Wang, S., Huang, W., Gao, Y., Ansett, S., & Xu, S. (2015). Can socially responsible leaders drive Chinese firm performance? *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 36(4), 435-450.
- Wells, V. K., Taheri, B., Gregory-Smith, D., & Manika, D. (2016). The role of generativity and attitudes on employees home and workplace water and energy saving behaviours. *Tourism Management*, 56, 63-74.
- Wu L Z, Kwan H K, Yim H K, Randy K. Chiu, R. K., & He. X. (2015). CEO Ethical Leadership and Corporate Social Responsibility: A Moderated Mediation Model. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 130(4), 819-831.
- Xing, Y., & Starik, M. (2017). Taoist leadership and employee green behavior: A cultural and philosophical micro-foundation of sustainability. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 38(9), 1302-1319.
- Zhou, J., & George, J. M. (2001). When job dissatisfaction leads to creativity: encouraging the expression of voice. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(4), 682-696.