

The Impact of Green Human Resource Management (GHRM) on Work Productivity Mediated by Environmental Performance

Evin Nabilla¹, Ahmad Mardalis¹(^{ICI}), Nur Achmad¹, and Minhayati Saleh²

¹ Management Department, Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta, Surakarta, Indonesia am180@ums.ac.id

² Mathematic Department, UIN Walisongo, Semarang, Indonesia

Abstract. This study examines the effect of green human resource management on work productivity with environmental performance as a moderating variable. PT. Apsara Tiyasa Sambada, Klaten Regency. This study involved 42 employees of the company's office to be used as respondents using a saturated sample, which involved the entire population as a sample. The data collection tool in this study uses a Google form using a Likert scale as a measure. The data analysis technique used in this study uses the SEM model with the partial least squares (PLS) approach. The results of this study show that green human resource management has a positive and significant effect on work productivity. Still, environmental performance does not moderate or does not affect green human resource management and work productivity.

Keywords: Green human resource management, · Employee work productivity, · Environmental performance

1 Introduction

Humans are the most critical factor in every activity in organizational life and companies due to the line of offense or the interaction of individuals in it. It causes dynamics in an organization/company. To carry out operational tasks, the company must have employees to carry out these activities. Activities carried out by employees within the company can show their existence in favorable terms, meaning they can deliver good performance in the eyes of outsiders, especially the community. Improved individual employee performance will drive overall performance, which is reflected in increased productivity [1].

Work productivity allows a significant influence on their work activities. A conducive environment will support the work productivity of its employees. Productivity is a measure of production in the form of services or commodities against inputs in the form of labor, capital, modules, or raw materials and equipment. The critical factors for the success of work productivity for the company's employees are good work and high morale skills so that they can expect a job with promising results [2]. One factor that affects work productivity is the atmosphere factor because the atmosphere factor can affect the level of performance achieved by a person, a supportive atmosphere, for example, the existence of good business facilities, a quiet room, and recognition of the comments of other colleagues. These leaders understand the needs of employees and are not authoritarian but democratic. A supportive work system will encourage more outstanding performance achievement than unsupportive working conditions where there are authoritarian leaders, unsatisfactory service, and role pressure, which will result in low employee performance [3].

Recently in the field of HR, the issue of green human resource management, commonly interpreted as green human resource management, has emerged, which has identified itself as a new research path and a new competitive measure [4].

In today's business world, companies are experiencing new challenges related to their business continuity. Companies must protect the environment and improve environmental-based human resource management strategies to survive in the business world. For organizations, green human resource management is a crucial business strategy [5].

The interviews provide a picture almost the same as the questionnaire results conducted on 42 companies that understand the concept of GHRM. They believe implementing GHRM can increase company productivity, especially for companies oriented toward developing products for international markets [6].

Environmental performance reflects results that show how well the company's commitment to protection. Environmental performance can be assessed by various indicators such as low ecological emissions, pollution control, waste minimization, and recycling activities and can be improved by environmentally friendly human resource management [7]. The quality of the work environment that is good and following the human condition as a worker will support the performance and productivity of the work produced [8].

Given the research gap discussed in this study [9], considering the different roles that GHRM practices play in developing environmental performance, the gap in relevance has been widely recognized by the literature. Latest. They acknowledge that most of the existing research on GHRM is focused on the impact of specific GHRM practices on environmental performance. Consequently, they explicitly call for studies that simultaneously consider the different effects of different GHRM methods on environmental performance.

Based on previous research, there is a gap between this study and previous research. This study explores the relationship between GHRM on work productivity and moderated environmental performance.

2 Literature Review and Hypothesis

2.1 Work Productivity

The implementation of the policy has to do with efforts to achieve the objectives of the stipulation of a particular policy (Hamdi, 2014). Policy implementation was influenced by the content and context of the procedure (Grindle, 1997), while Hamdi (2014) said

the success of policy implementation was influenced by several factors, namely: the substance of the policy, the behavior of the implementer, the interaction of work networks, the participation of target groups, and resources.

2.2 Green Human Resource Management

Green Human Resources Green Human Resource Management is an eco-friendly initiative towards more effective jobs, lower pay, and greater levels of employee engagement [12]. GHRM plays an essential role in the organization to support playing vital position in the organization to support the resolution of problems related to the environment by mastering management perspectives, HR policies, and applications, training people, and practicing provisions related to social protection [13].

Based on the statement [6] that GHRM increases productivity positively and significantly, the authors propose the first hypothesis:

H1: Green human resource management affects work productivity.

2.3 Environmental Performance

Work environment Organizational environment refers to the organization's functions in a way that positively affects the environment. The environment has two main objectives: controlling the pollution level in the background and increasing the quality of the domain from accepted standards [13]. Increased concern for environmental safety forces organizations to get ecological management practices [14].

H2: Will environmental performance moderate between GHRM and work productivity?

3 Research Method

In this study, the authors used the associative method using a quantitative approach. This study tried to test 42 employees in the company's office. Determination of the sample in this study was carried out with the type of Non-Probability Sampling, and the sampling technique used was a saturated sample. The data was obtained through a questionnaire by Google form. The measurement of these variables was carried out using a Likert scale with 5 variants. This study uses the Partial Least Square (PLS) technique with the calculation process using the SmartPLS 3.0 application program using the evaluation of the outer model and inner model.

4 Results and Discussion

4.1 Respondent Profile

We use the respondent profile to identify characteristics obtained from personal data on the first page of the questionnaire, such as gender, age, and division.

Gender	Number of Respondents	Percentage
Man	17	40%
Woman	25	60%

Table 1. Characteristics of respondents based on gender

4.1.1 Characteristics of Respondents Based on Gender

From the Table 1 results, we can conclude that women prioritize more than men. It can be proven that there are 25 respondents, or 60% of women, and 17 respondents, or 40% of men.

4.1.2 Characteristics of Respondents Based on Age

From these results, we can conclude that respondents aged 28 years and over dominated as much as 6 or 14%. Meanwhile, those aged 17 years were 1 or 2%, aged 19 1 year or 2%, 20 years 1 or 2%, aged 21 years were 3 or 8%, 22 years old 1 or 1%, 24 years 1 or 2%, 25 years 2 or 5%, 26 years 3 or 8%, 27 years old 4 or 10%, 29 years old 4 or 10%, age 30 is 3 or 8%, age 31 is 1 or 2%, age 32 is 1 or equal to 2%, age 33 is 1 or 2%, age 34 is 1 or 2%, age 37 is 3 or 8%, 38 years is 1 or 2%, 45 years is 1 or 2%, 52 years is 1 or 1% (Table. 2).

4.1.3 Characteristics of Respondents Based on Distribution

From these results, we can conclude that the division of respondents in the company that dominates more is Sales Support and IT Support, which is 19 or 45%, accounting is 9 or 21%, the warehouse is 2 or 5%, HRD is 2 or 5%, tax of 1 or 2%, production of 9 or 21% (Fig. 1).

Distribution	Number of Respondents	Percentage	
Accounting	9	21	
Warehouse	2	5	
HRD	2	5	
Sales & IT Support	19	46	
Tax	1	29	
Production	9	21	

Table 2. Characteristics Based on Distribution

Source: primary data 2022



Fig. 1. Outer Loading

4.2 Analysis Results

4.2.1 Convergent Validity

Convergent validity aims to determine the validity of each relationship between indicators and their constructs or latent variables. The reflective measure is said to be high if it correlates more than 0.70 with the construct you want to measure. The loading factor values are explained in Table 4.

Based on the extreme loading values, Table 3 shows that all loading factor values have values above 0.7. It shows that the indicator variables are collectively valid and meet the convergent validity criteria.

4.2.2 Discriminant Validity

The analysis results in Table 4 show that the 3 variables in this study are Green Human Resource Management, Work Productivity, and Environmental Performance on each question item that requires each variable to have a loading factor value > 0.7. So, each question representing the variable is valid.

To evaluate the descriptive validity can be seen with the AVE (Average Variance Extracted) method for each construct or latent variable. The model has better discriminant validity when the square root of AVE (Average Variance Extracted) for each construct is greater than the correlation between the two constructs in the model.

Based on Table 5, all variable indicators are valid for discriminant validity.

4.2.3 Reliability Test

Reliability The reliability test's measurement will reflect how accurately the coherence of respondents' answers with the variables used to determine whether respondents consistently answer research questions using Cronchbach Alpha and composite reliability.

Based on the test results in Table 6, the composite reliability value generated for each variable is a combined reliability value, and the Cronchbach alpha > 0.8 for each variable indicates that the three variables are reliable.

Variable	Indicator	Outer Loading	
GHRM (X)	X1	0,780	
	X2	0,794	
	X3	0,814	
	X4	0,886	
	X5	0,864	
	X6	0,934	
	X7	0,885	
	X8	0,910	
	X9	0,896	
	X10	0,904	
	X11	0,799	
	X12	9,841	
	X13	0,828	
(Z)	Z1	0,756	
	Z2	0.869	
	Z3	0.838	
	Z4	0.838	
	Z5	0.786	
Kerja	Y1	0.743	
(Y)	Y2	0.845	
	Y3	0.792	
	Y4	0.855	
	Y5	0.917	
	Y6	0.824	

Table 3. Loading Factor Values

4.2.4 Multicollinearity Test

A multicollinearity test is needed to determine whether there are independent variables that have similarities between independent variables in a regression model.

Based on the test results in Table 7, the Collinearity Statistics (VIFs) results < 10. It can be declared free from multicollinearity.

	GHRM	Work Productivity	Env Perfm	Moderating Effect
GHRM1	0.780			1.334
GHRM2	0.794			
GHRM3	0.814			
GHRM4	0.886			
GHRM5	0.864			
GHRM6	0.934			
GHRM7	0.885			
GHRM8	0.910			
GHRM9	0.896			
GHRM10	0.904			
GHRM11	0.799			
GHRM12	9.841			
GHRM13	0.828			
EP1			0.756	
EP2			0.869	
EP3			0.838	
EP4			0.838	
EP5			0.786	
WP1		0.743		
WP2		0.845		
WP3		0.792		
WP4		0.855		
WP5		0.824		
WP6		0.917		

Table 4. Cross Loading

Source: primary data 2022

4.2.5 Inner Model Evaluation

The specification of the relationship between latent variables (structural model) can also be called an inner relation, which shows the relationship between latent variables based on the substantive theory of the research.

Based on the results of Table 8 shows that the coefficient of determination (R2) on employee work productivity is 0.457 or 45.7%. It means that the effect of green human resource management on employee work productivity is 45.7%. The remaining 54.3% is influenced by factors not examined (Fig. 2).

Table 5.	Analysis AVE
----------	--------------

AVE	
0.670	
0.736	
0.691	

Table 6. Cronbach Alpha and Composite Reliability

Variable	Cronbach Alpha	Composite Reliability
Work Environment (Z)	0.877	0.902
GHRM (X)	0.970	0.975
Work (Y)	0.913	0.909

Source: primary data 2022

Table 7. Multicollinearity Test

Variable	Work Productivity
Environmental Performance (Z)	
GHRM (X)	1,521
Moderating Effect 1	1,039
Work Productivity (Y)	

Source: primary data 2022

Table 8. R Square Test

Variable	R2 Square
Work Productivity (Y)	0.457

Source: primary data 2022

4.2.6 Hypothesis Test

From the data collected, the results can be used to answer the hypothesis in this study by looking at the results of t Statistics and P Values. The results of processing the direct effect hypothesis can be seen in the Coefficient Path Table 9 in Bootstrapping.

The result of the first hypothesis, H1, is that the green human resource management variable has a positive and significant effect on work productivity. It is in line with



Fig. 2. Bootstrapping

Table 9. Path Coefficients

Variable	Original Sample	P Values	T Statistic	Description
$\mathrm{EP}\left(\mathrm{Z}\right) \text{-} > \mathrm{WP}\left(\mathrm{Y}\right)$	0,332	0,048	1,984	Positive, Significant
$GHRM(X) \rightarrow WP(Y)$	0,430	0,012	2,523	Positive, Significant
Moderation Effect -> WP(Y)	-0,022	0,838	0,205	No significant

research conducted by [6], which states that green human resource management has a positive and significant impact on work productivity in 69 companies in East Java, and research results [16] introduce the principles of green HRM, one of which is to increase sustainable productivity.

Research [8] also said that organizations should develop environmentally friendly capabilities, motivate employees through environmentally friendly rewards and provide opportunities for employees to improve performance which has an impact on increasing productivity.

The result of the second hypothesis, H2, is that environmental performance has no potential and does not mediate the relationship between GHRM and work productivity.

5 Conclusion

The results of the research above indicate that green human resource management has a positive and significant effect on work productivity. Still, environmental performance needs to moderate the impact between green human resource management and work productivity.

This research has limitations. Namely, only done on one company. Hopefully, in the future, it can be done in many companies so that we can maximize this research.

Acknowledgments. Thanks to the Head of the UMS Management Department, who contributed to the writing of this paper. Moreover, thanks to PT. Apsara Tiyasa Sambada, who has taken the time to fill out the questionnaire.

Authors' Contributions. Nabilla, Ahmad Mardalis, and Nur Ahmad did the data collection and discussion and then brought the research results. Minhayati Saleh contributed to the writing of the publication's manuscript.

References

- Hidayati, Reni; Yadi Purwanto, and Susatyo Yuwono. (2010). Korelasi Kecerdasan Emosi dan Stres Kerja dengan Kinerja. Indigenous, Jurnal Ilmiah Berkala Psikologi. 12(1): 81-87.
- N. Almigo, "Hubungan Antara Tujuan Kerja dengan Produktivitas Kerja Karyawan," J. Psyche, vol. 1, tidak. 1, pp. 50–60, 2004.
- D. Rahmawati, "Pengaruh Motivasi Terhadap Produktivitas Kerja Karyawan Pr Fajar Berlian Tulungagung," J. Univ. Tulungagung Bonorowo, vol. 1, tidak. 1, hlm. 1–16, 2013, [Online]. Tersedia: http://www.jurnalunita.org/index.php/bonorowo/article/view/6/6.
- C. Zurnali dan A. Sujanto, "Pentingnya Green Human Resource Management pada Perusahaan di Indonesia," J. Chem. Inf. Model., jilid. 56, tidak. 2, pp. 116–127, 2020.
- LC Nawangsari dan AH Sutawidjaya, "Bagaimana Proses Green Human Re-sources Management (GHRM) Dapat Diadopsi untuk Bisnis Organisasi?," Adv. Ekonomi Manajer Bisnis. Res., jilid. 65, tidak. Icebef 2018, hlm. 463–465, 2019, https://doi.org/10.2991/icebef-18.201 9.100.
- 6. M. Astuti, HC Wahyuni, dan D. Nastiti, "ANALISIS PERAN GREEN HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT (GHRM) PADA PROSES PENINGKATAN PRODUKTIVITASI USAHA Lingkungan hidup merupakan salah satu aspek penting bagi perkembangan usaha. Dewasa ini, isu tentang lingkungan hidup sedang hangat didiskusikan oleh pa," pp. 1–8, 2018.
- MI Hadjri, B. Perizade, Z. Zunaidah, and W. Farla WK, "Green Human Resource Management dan Kinerja : Studi Kasus pada Rumah Sakit di Kota Palembang," Inovbiz J. Inov. Bisnis, vol. 8, tidak. 2, hal. 182, 2020, https://doi.org/10.35314/inovbiz.v8i2.1627.
- Indah Pratiwi, (2013). Pengaruh Pencahayaan, Kebisingan, dan Temperatur Terhadap Performansi Kerja. Prosiding National Conference on Applied Ergo-nomics (CAE), Jurusan Teknik Mesin dan Industri, FT UGM. ISBN 978–602–14349–0–1.
- DWS Renwick, T. Redman, dan S. Maguire, "Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Hijau: Sebuah Tinjauan dan Agenda Penelitian*," Int. J.Manajer. Pdt., vol. 15, tidak. 1, hlm. 1–14, 2013, https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2370.2011.00328.x.
- AR Saleh and H. Utomo, "Pengaruh Disiplin Kerja, Motivasi Kerja, Etos Kerja Dan Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Produktivitas Kerja Karyawan Bagian Produksi Di Pt. Inko Java Semarang," Di Antara Makarti, vol. 11, tidak. 1, hlm. 28–50, 2018, https://doi.org/10.52353/ ama.v11i1.160.
- S. Wahyuningsih, "Pengaruh Pelatihan Dalam peningkatan Produktivitas Kerja Karyawan," J. War. Ed., jilid. 60, tidak. April, hlm. 91–96, 2019, [Online]. Terse-dia: http://jurnal.dharma wangsa.ac.id/index.php/juwarta/article/view/413.
- S. Rani dan K. Mishra, "HRM Hijau: Praktik dan Implementasi Strategis dalam Organisasi," Int. J. Inovasi Terbaru. Komputasi Tren. komuni., jilid. 2, tidak. 11, hlm. 3633–3639, 2014.

- AR Assyofa, AM Rani, dan T. Yuliawati, "Faktor Perilaku Hijau pada Praktik Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Hijau pada Karyawan 'The First Movers on Sustainable Banking' di Indonesia," jilid 409, tidak. SoRes 2019, hlm. 102–106, 2020, https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr. k.200225.022.
- FD Yasamis, "Instrumen ekonomi untuk pengelolaan lingkungan," Lingkungan. Kelola. Praktek. Lingkungan Instrumen. Kelola., jilid. 1, tidak. 38, hlm. 98–108, 2011, https://doi.org/10. 4324/9781315071657.
- J. González-Benito dan. González Benito, "Proaktivitas lingkungan dan kinerja bisnis: Analisis empiris," Omega, vol. 33, tidak. 1, hlm. 1–15, 2005, doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.omega. 2004.03.002.
- JP Cherian dan J. Jacob, "A Study of Green HR Practices and Its Effective Im-plementation in the Organization: A Review," Int. J. Bis. Kelola., jilid. 7, tidak. 21, hlm. 25–33, 2012, https:// doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v7n21p25.

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

