

GREEN LEADERSHIP AND SUSTAINABLE CORPORATE PERFORMANCE IN COASTAL TOURISM

Andi Sylvana¹, Murtiadi Awaluddin^{2*}, Muhammad Adam Sudariyanto¹

¹Universitas Terbuka, Indonesia

²Universitas Islam Negeri Alauddin Makassar, Indonesia

Citation (7th APA): Sylvana, A., Awaluddin, M., & Sudariyanto, M. A. (2026). Green Leadership and Sustainable Corporate Performance in Coastal Tourism. *Jurnal Minds: Manajemen Ide Dan Inspirasi*, 13(3), 641–650. <https://doi.org/10.24252/minds.v13i3.64786>

Submitted: 18 January 2026

Revised: 02 July 2026

Accepted: 02 October 2026

Published: 09 October 2026



Copyright: © 2026 by the author.

ABSTRACT: This study explains how green leadership becomes sustainable organizational practice in environmentally sensitive coastal tourism settings. It contributes a context-sensitive mechanism in which leadership translates ecological values, green organizational culture stabilizes them as routines, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior for the Environment enacts them through voluntary practice. A qualitative multiple-case study examined five destinations in Eastern Indonesia through focus group discussions, in-depth interviews, document analysis, and cross-case thematic comparison involving nine key informants. The findings show that resource availability, community participation, and environmental governance shape whether leadership values become durable organizational practices. Environmental actions provide the strongest evidence, while their economic and social performance implications remain perceived rather than objectively verified. The proposed Contextualized Green Leadership Ecosystem is therefore an interpretive framework, not a validated dynamic model. Coastal tourism managers should align leadership, cultural routines, and employee initiative with local ecological and institutional constraints.

Keywords: Halal Tourism; Muslim-Friendly Tourism Facilities; Tourism Service Quality; Government Support; Tourist Visit Intensity

*Corresponding Author: murtiadi.awaluddin@uin-alauddin.ac.id

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24252/minds.v13i3.64786>

ISSN-E: 2597-6990

ISSN-P: 2442-4951

<http://journal.uin-alauddin.ac.id/index.php/minds>

Publisher: Department of Management, Alauddin State Islamic University Makassar, Indonesia

INTRODUCTION

Coastal tourism supports employment, local enterprise, and regional income, yet its expansion also intensifies ecosystem pressure and resource consumption. Tourism's carbon footprint demonstrates that environmental costs extend across transport, accommodation, and supply chains (Lenzen et al., 2018). Climate vulnerability further shows that destination dependence on natural resources creates uneven exposure and adaptive capacity (Scott et al., 2019). Organizational sustainability in coastal settings therefore depends on how environmental commitments enter routine decisions and employee conduct, alongside infrastructure and regulatory compliance.

Eastern Indonesia provides a theoretically useful setting because coastal destinations differ in tourism maturity, institutional capacity, community participation, and access to environmental resources. Bali, Makassar, Gorontalo, Kupang, and Ambon represent distinct configurations of ecological pressure and organizational support. Sustainable tourism scholarship connects environmental responsibility with governance and social priorities (Bramwell et al., 2017), while hospitality research emphasizes stakeholder involvement in implementing corporate responsibility (Font & Lynes, 2018). These arguments make contextual variation analytically relevant to explaining why similar leadership intentions produce uneven sustainability practices.

Sustainable Corporate Performance combines environmental integrity, social responsibility, and economic viability. Research on green intellectual capital treats these dimensions as related but distinct outcomes (Yusliza et al., 2020), and tourism indicator research distinguishes subjective assessments from objective measures (Rasoolimanesh et al., 2023). Hotel evidence connects green human resource management with employee behavior and environmental performance (Kim et al., 2019), but these relationships do not establish broader financial or social benefits. Sustainability marketing also involves tensions between commercial goals and environmental commitments (Font & McCabe, 2017). Theoretical explanation must therefore specify how ecological practices may protect resources, strengthen stakeholder legitimacy, reduce waste, or support organizational continuity.

Green Transformational Leadership explains how leaders articulate an environmental vision, model ecological responsibility, and encourage voluntary environmental conduct (Robertson & Carleton, 2018). Its contribution also depends on organizational practices that enable environmental innovation (Singh et al., 2020). Green Organizational Culture captures the shared values and routines that make environmental responsibility collectively expected; research identifies cultural enablers as a link between green management practices and environmental performance (Roscoe et al., 2019). Evidence on the joint influence of leadership, human resource practices, and culture further supports treating these mechanisms as connected organizational processes (Al-Swidi et al., 2021). Organizational Citizenship Behavior for the Environment (OCBE) represents discretionary action beyond formal duties, including conservation, peer encouragement, and participation in environmental initiatives (Pham et al., 2019).

Existing studies connect green management practices with employee environmental behavior, yet the conversion of managerial commitment into durable practice remains a central explanatory issue. Ren et al. (2018) identify the need to connect organizational systems with employee responses, while Guo et al. (2025) synthesize evidence that green human resource management relates to both in-role and extra-role behavior through employee green values. Hospitality evidence also links organizational practices with OCBE (Pham et al., 2019). Norton et al. (2017) show that green psychological climate matters for converting intentions into behavior. These findings establish important organizational pathways, but they leave scope to examine how local ecological dependence, institutional support, and community relations shape their operation in coastal tourism.

This study addresses that explanatory limitation through a value-to-practice conversion mechanism. Green leadership initiates and legitimizes environmental values. Green Organizational Culture stabilizes those values in routines and shared expectations. OCBE expresses them through discretionary employee behavior. Local conditions shape each conversion point by supplying or withholding resources, community legitimacy, and environmental governance support. Stakeholder collaboration research shows why implementation depends on relationships beyond the focal tourism organization (Wondirad et al., 2020). Context is therefore

treated as an interpretive condition that facilitates or constrains the process, rather than a statistically tested moderator.

The proposed Contextualized Green Leadership Ecosystem does not claim that familiar constructs become novel merely through combination. Its contribution lies in explaining the mechanism that connects them and identifying where that mechanism becomes context-sensitive. The framework also distinguishes environmental practices from broader Sustainable Corporate Performance. The data directly support environmental enactment and perceived organizational benefits, while economic and social outcomes require cautious interpretation.

This study asks how Green Transformational Leadership, Green Organizational Culture, and OCBE interact in coastal tourism organizations and how local ecological and institutional conditions shape their translation into sustainability practice. The study uses a qualitative multiple-case design across five destinations in Eastern Indonesia. It contributes a provisional process framework that explains leadership as value translation, culture as institutionalization, OCBE as behavioral enactment, and local context as a set of enabling or constraining mechanisms.

THEORETICAL OVERVIEW

Green Transformational Leadership explains how leaders translate environmental responsibility into organizational priorities through vision, role modeling, intellectual stimulation, and employee encouragement. Robertson and Carleton (2018) connect environmentally specific transformational leadership with voluntary environmental behavior, which supports treating leadership as a source of behavioral influence. A resource-based perspective adds that environmental commitment requires organizational capabilities that enable implementation. Singh et al. (2020) link green leadership with human resource management and innovation, while Yong et al. (2019) connect environmental knowledge resources with green management practices. Leadership can therefore initiate environmental action, but its influence depends on employees' skills, resources, and opportunities to act. This reasoning positions green leadership as the starting point of a value-to-practice conversion process rather than a sufficient explanation of sustainable performance.

Green Organizational Culture explains how environmental values become shared expectations and recurring organizational practices. Roscoe et al. (2019) identify cultural enablers that connect green human resource management with environmental performance, while Al-Swidi et al. (2021) demonstrate the interconnected roles of leadership, management practices, and green culture. Culture provides continuity beyond individual leaders by embedding environmental responsibility in work routines and collective expectations. Green psychological climate offers a related explanation of how employees perceive organizational support for environmental action. Norton et al. (2017) show that this climate shapes the translation of environmental intentions into behavior. Culture concerns shared values and assumptions; climate concerns employees' perceptions of organizational practices. Together, these perspectives suggest that leadership messages gain practical force through credible and consistent organizational support.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior for the Environment represents discretionary employee action that extends beyond formal environmental duties. Employees enact such citizenship through voluntary conservation, peer encouragement, and participation in environmental initiatives. Pham et al. (2019) link green human resource practices with environmental citizenship in hotels, while Pham et al. (2020) identify OCBE as a pathway connecting management practices with environmental performance. Luu (2019) further explains the roles of collective green crafting and environmentally specific servant leadership. Recent evidence also connects colleague support and organizational climate with voluntary environmental behavior (Zafar et al., 2025). Guo et al. (2025) distinguish in-role and extra-role green behavior and identify employee green values as an explanatory mechanism. These findings position OCBE as the discretionary enactment of environmental commitments, while preserving its distinction from required compliance.

Coastal context shapes the conditions under which leadership, culture, and employee citizenship can support sustainable performance. Tourism's environmental footprint and climate vulnerability establish the importance of ecological dependence and uneven adaptive capacity (Lenzen et al., 2018; Scott et al., 2019). Stakeholder perspectives extend the explanation beyond internal organizational processes: collaboration supports sustainable ecotourism, and

coordinated stakeholder roles strengthen destination governance (Roxas et al., 2020; Wondirad et al., 2020). Sustainable performance also requires separate attention to environmental, social, and economic outcomes rather than treating environmental activity as evidence of all three dimensions (Rasoolimanesh et al., 2023; Yusliza et al., 2020). These arguments underpin the proposed Contextualized Green Leadership Ecosystem: leadership translates values, culture institutionalizes them, and OCBE enacts them, while resources, community participation, and governance enable or constrain each transition. The framework proposes an interpretive process for examination rather than an established causal sequence.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study employed a qualitative multiple-case design to examine how green leadership values become organizational routines and voluntary environmental practices across different coastal tourism contexts. The evidence comprised focus group discussions, in-depth interviews, documents, thematic coding, and cross-case comparison. Qualitative theory building requires alignment between the research question, analytical approach, and evidentiary claims (Gehman et al., 2018). The study therefore presents interpretive process patterns and does not claim a sequential explanatory mixed-methods design or quantitative validation.

Research Design

A multiple-case approach was appropriate because the study examined a common process across destinations with different ecological, organizational, and institutional conditions. Each destination served as a contextual case rather than a statistical comparison group. Cross-case analysis can clarify how a process operates under contrasting conditions, provided that the comparison remains connected to the evidence (Eisenhardt, 2021). The design supported within-case interpretation and cross-case comparison of leadership, culture, and employee initiative under different local constraints.

Research Sites

The cases comprised coastal tourism settings in Bali, Makassar, Gorontalo, Kupang, and Ambon. The sites were selected purposively to capture variation in tourism maturity, ecological sensitivity, organizational resources, community involvement, and institutional support. The comparison sought analytical variation rather than population representativeness.

Participants

Nine key informants were selected purposively because they had direct experience with tourism management, environmental practice, or community engagement. The participant group included managers, supervisors, frontline employees, community representatives, and tourism stakeholders. Sample adequacy depends on the study's objectives and participant heterogeneity, and saturation findings from narrowly focused homogeneous samples cannot serve as a universal threshold (Hennink & Kaiser, 2022). The small heterogeneous group supports exploratory process interpretation but limits the breadth of destination-level claims and does not establish saturation or statistical generalizability.

Data Collection

Data were collected through focus group discussions, in-depth interviews, and document analysis. The semi-structured protocol examined leadership practices, shared environmental norms, voluntary employee behavior, perceived sustainability outcomes, and contextual constraints. Discussions lasted between 60 and 90 minutes and were audio-recorded with informed consent. Focus groups enabled participants to compare shared and divergent interpretations, while interviews clarified role-specific experiences. Focus group research shows that the depth of meaning and the identification of recurring topics depend on different aspects of sample composition and discussion coverage (Hennink et al., 2019). The combined sources were therefore used for interpretive comparison rather than as proof of exhaustive coverage.

Data Analysis and Cross-Case Integration

Analysis proceeded through data condensation, display, and conclusion verification. The researchers coded evidence into four process categories: leadership value translation, cultural institutionalization, OCBE enactment, and perceived sustainability consequences. A second coding layer identified contextual mechanisms involving resource availability, community participation, and environmental governance. Within-case summaries preceded cross-case comparison. Qualitative rigor requires researchers to make category construction explicit rather than present themes as self-evident discoveries (Grodal et al., 2021). The interpretation also retained the distinction between the study's structured thematic coding and reflexive thematic analysis, for which quality criteria depend on methodological commitments (Braun & Clarke, 2021). This sequence linked empirical themes to the proposed framework without claiming statistically established mediation or moderation.

Trustworthiness

Credibility was supported through triangulation across discussions, interviews, and documents, followed by member checking. Cross-case comparison and attention to discrepant patterns reduced the risk of treating one destination as representative of all settings. Thick contextual description supported transferability, while coding records and an audit trail supported dependability and confirmability. Transparency in qualitative research concerns the trustworthiness of interpretation and the evidence supporting it, rather than exact replication of analytical judgments (Pratt et al., 2020). The manuscript provides coded summaries rather than full transcripts or extensive verbatim quotations; the findings therefore represent interpretive patterns rather than exhaustive accounts.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Leadership as Ecological Value Translation

Across the cases, leaders made environmental responsibility actionable by connecting organizational priorities with visible coastal problems. They linked waste reduction, resource conservation, coastal protection, and community relations to operational expectations. This process involved more than communicating an environmental vision. Leaders translated broad ecological values into decisions that employees could recognize in daily work.

The finding remains related to environmentally specific transformational leadership because leaders used role modeling, vision, and encouragement. Robertson and Carleton (2018) connect such influence with voluntary employee environmental behavior, but the coastal interpretation adds attention to the ecological problems that leaders make operationally relevant. Coastal leaders had to connect organizational conduct with visible ecological dependence, community expectations, and destination reputation. Climate vulnerability research supports the importance of this place-dependent exposure (Scott et al., 2019). The architect role is therefore interpreted as a contextual application of transformational influence rather than a new leadership dimension.

The evidence also showed that symbolic participation mattered when it was connected to routines. Leaders who joined environmental activities increased the credibility of sustainability messages, but visible participation alone did not ensure institutional change. Its influence depended on procedures, resources, and opportunities for employees to act. Singh et al. (2020) similarly connect green leadership with organizational human resource practices and innovation, while Guo et al. (2025) show that specific management practices differ in their relationships with employee green behavior. Leadership thus initiated the process, but organizational arrangements supported its enactment.

Culture as Institutionalization and OCBE as Enactment

Green Organizational Culture institutionalized leadership values through shared expectations, informal monitoring, and recurring routines. Participants described sustainability as more durable when it became part of work organization rather than an occasional campaign. This

interpretation accords with Roscoe et al. (2019), who identify cultural enablers linking green human resource management with environmental performance, and Al-Swidi et al. (2021), who connect leadership and management practices with green culture and employee behavior. Norton et al. (2017) offer a complementary climate-based explanation for the intention-to-behavior transition. Culture and climate remain conceptually distinct, but both accounts show why environmental intentions require collective organizational support.

OCBE represented the behavioral enactment of environmental expectations. Reported practices included voluntary waste sorting, energy conservation, peer reminders, and participation in environmental initiatives beyond formal duties. Hospitality research links green human resource practices with such discretionary environmental action (Pham et al., 2019), and hotel evidence associates OCBE with the translation of training and performance management into environmental performance (Pham et al., 2020). Luu (2019) further identifies collective green crafting and environmental servant leadership as supporting processes. More recent evidence connects colleague support, green crafting, and organizational climate with voluntary environmental behavior (Zafar et al., 2025). These studies help explain peer encouragement in the present accounts without turning those accounts into estimates of behavioral effects.

The findings support an interpretive sequence linking leadership values, cultural institutionalization, and voluntary enactment, but they do not establish statistical mediation. Green Organizational Culture and OCBE should not be described as competing or parallel mediators. Culture explains how values become collectively expected, while OCBE explains how employees enact those expectations. Qualitative theory-method fit requires the explanatory claim to match the analytical design (Gehman et al., 2018). The proposed ordering is therefore conceptual and process-based, rather than an estimated indirect-effect model.

Contextual Mechanisms Across Coastal Destinations

Cross-case comparison indicated that resource availability influenced whether environmental intentions could become stable routines. Organizations with stronger financial, technical, or human resources could support waste systems, conservation activities, and staff participation. Yong et al. (2019) connect green intellectual capital with green human resource management, which supports treating environmental knowledge and organizational capabilities as implementation resources. The present accounts show how resource limitations constrained implementation even when leaders expressed strong environmental commitment.

Community participation shaped the legitimacy and reach of organizational initiatives. Sustainability practices gained traction when local actors viewed them as relevant to livelihoods, cultural expectations, and shared coastal resources. Wondirad et al. (2020) identify stakeholder collaboration as central to sustainable ecotourism development, while Font and Lynes (2018) emphasize integrating stakeholder perspectives throughout corporate responsibility initiatives. The present cases extend this reasoning to the reach of internal environmental practices: weak participation restricted implementation to organizational activities and reduced opportunities for broader destination-level effects.

Environmental governance influenced coordination, continuity, and accountability. Clear institutional support, partnerships, and enforcement reinforced organizational practice, whereas fragmented responsibilities and weak support produced uneven implementation. Roxas et al. (2020) explain how stakeholder roles can support destination governance through coordinated regulation, conservation, and livelihoods. Sustainable tourism scholarship also cautions against narrowing sustainability to environmental management alone (Bramwell et al., 2017). These arguments support interpreting governance as an enabling or constraining mechanism; the cases do not estimate the magnitude of a statistical interaction effect.

From Environmental Practice to Sustainable Corporate Performance

The strongest empirical evidence concerns environmental practices, including conservation, waste management, and employee participation. Participants also associated these practices with efficiency, stakeholder trust, community relations, and organizational reputation. Tourism indicator research distinguishes subjective perceptions from objective sustainability measures (Rasoolimanesh et al., 2023). The perceived benefits therefore offer plausible

pathways to economic and social performance, but the study did not measure financial returns, social impact, or longitudinal organizational outcomes. Sustainable Corporate Performance is interpreted as an emerging multidimensional consequence rather than a fully demonstrated result.

Environmental engagement cannot be treated as equivalent to sustainable performance. Hotel research supports connections between green management, employee behavior, and environmental outcomes (Kim et al., 2019), while Luu (2020) links management strategy and environmental leadership with employee OCBE and organizational green performance. Broader research treats economic, environmental, and social performance as distinct outcomes of organizational green capabilities (Yusliza et al., 2020). Sustainability marketing also faces commercial and communication tensions that complicate assumptions about automatic reputational returns (Font & McCabe, 2017). Environmental routines may reduce waste, community participation may strengthen social legitimacy, and these improvements may support economic continuity; those links remain propositions rather than verified causal effects in the present study.

Toward a Provisional Contextualized Green Leadership Ecosystem

The findings support a provisional Contextualized Green Leadership Ecosystem. Green Transformational Leadership translates ecological values into organizational priorities. Green Organizational Culture stabilizes those priorities as routines and shared expectations. OCBE enacts them through voluntary employee practice. Resource availability, community participation, and environmental governance facilitate or constrain each transition. Perceived environmental, social, and economic consequences sit at the outcome boundary of the framework.

The ecosystem identifies conversion points and contextual constraints, but the present evidence does not demonstrate feedback, reciprocity, or temporal development. Cross-case theory building can generate testable explanations, yet the resulting claims must remain tied to the observed evidence (Eisenhardt, 2021). Improved performance may later reinforce leadership legitimacy or cultural strength, but that possibility requires longitudinal observation. The framework should therefore guide future testing rather than be presented as a validated dynamic model.

CONCLUSION AND FURTHER STUDY

This study explains how green leadership becomes sustainability practice through a context-sensitive process in coastal tourism organizations. Its contribution lies in identifying the organizational mechanisms that connect environmental commitment with everyday action. Leaders translate ecological values into operational priorities, green organizational culture embeds those priorities in shared expectations and recurring routines, and OCBE expresses them through voluntary employee conduct. Resource availability, community participation, and environmental governance shape the conditions under which these transitions gain continuity. The proposed Contextualized Green Leadership Ecosystem therefore extends leadership-centered explanations by connecting managerial influence with organizational support and destination-level conditions. The findings suggest that sustainability practices become more durable when leadership messages receive consistent operational support and local legitimacy. Environmental conservation, waste management, and employee participation provide the strongest evidence for this interpretation. Their contributions to efficiency, community relations, and organizational reputation remain perceived benefits that require independent verification. The framework offers a foundation for further theoretical development, but the available evidence does not establish causal ordering, statistical mediation, or improvements across all dimensions of sustainable corporate performance.

Several limitations define the scope of these conclusions. The small, heterogeneous informant group provides varied perspectives but limits the depth of evidence available for each destination and stakeholder category. Reliance on coded accounts, with limited verbatim material, also restricts readers' ability to assess how participant experiences support the proposed mechanisms. The cross-sectional design cannot determine whether leadership precedes cultural change and voluntary behavior or whether these processes develop reciprocally. The absence of

objective economic and social indicators further limits claims about broader organizational performance. Future studies should combine longitudinal interviews, employee assessments, organizational records, and direct observation to examine the proposed transitions and competing explanations. Comparative research should investigate how differences in governance capacity, resource access, and community involvement shape implementation across coastal destinations. Researchers should also examine unsuccessful initiatives and discrepant cases to identify where the conversion process weakens or breaks down. Environmental, social, and economic outcomes should be assessed separately before researchers model an overall performance construct. The practical implication is that managers must support environmental vision with clear responsibilities, staff development, adequate resources, and opportunities for employee initiative. Community representatives should help define ecological priorities and evaluate initiatives, while destination authorities should strengthen coordination and continuity across organizations. Coastal tourism managers should institutionalize funded environmental routines, meaningful community partnerships, and supported employee discretion that address local ecological pressures and produce outcomes that can be monitored over time.

ETHICAL DISCLOSURE

This study was conducted in accordance with the ethical principles for research involving human participants. Responses were collected and stored anonymously, with no identifying information linked to individual questionnaires, and data were used solely for the aggregate statistical purposes reported in this study. Informed consent was obtained from all participants involved in the study. Participants were fully informed about the purpose of the research, the data collection procedures, and their rights to withdraw at any stage without any consequences.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

This research was funded by a research grant from Universitas Terbuka, Indonesia. The funders are not related to research independence, data collection and presentation.

REFERENCES

- Al-Swidi, A. K., Gelaidan, H. M., & Saleh, R. M. (2021). The joint impact of green human resource management, leadership and organizational culture on employees' green behaviour and organisational environmental performance. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 316, Article 128112. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2021.128112>
- Bramwell, B., Higham, J., Lane, B., & Miller, G. (2017). Twenty-five years of sustainable tourism and the Journal of Sustainable Tourism: Looking back and moving forward. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 25(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2017.1251689>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021). One size fits all? What counts as quality practice in (reflexive) thematic analysis? *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 18(3), 328–352. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2020.1769238>
- Eisenhardt, K. M. (2021). What is the Eisenhardt Method, really? *Strategic Organization*, 19(1), 147–160. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1476127020982866>
- Font, X., & Lynes, J. (2018). Corporate social responsibility in tourism and hospitality. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 26(7), 1027–1042. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2018.1488856>
- Font, X., & McCabe, S. (2017). Sustainability and marketing in tourism: Its contexts, paradoxes, approaches, challenges and potential. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 25(7), 869–883. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2017.1301721>
- Gehman, J., Glaser, V. L., Eisenhardt, K. M., Gioia, D., Langley, A., & Corley, K. G. (2018). Finding theory–method fit: A comparison of three qualitative approaches to theory building. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 27(3), 284–300. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1056492617706029>
- Grodal, S., Anteby, M., & Holm, A. L. (2021). Achieving rigor in qualitative analysis: The role of active categorization in theory building. *Academy of Management Review*, 46(3), 591–612. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2018.0482>

- Guo, Y., Wang, S., & Yang, Q. (2025). Green human resource management: Synthesising outcomes and identifying effective practices. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 63(4), Article e70033. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1744-7941.70033>
- Hennink, M., & Kaiser, B. N. (2022). Sample sizes for saturation in qualitative research: A systematic review of empirical tests. *Social Science & Medicine*, 292, Article 114523. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2021.114523>
- Hennink, M. M., Kaiser, B. N., & Weber, M. B. (2019). What influences saturation? Estimating sample sizes in focus group research. *Qualitative Health Research*, 29(10), 1483–1496. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732318821692>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2018.04.007>
- Lenzen, M., Sun, Y.-Y., Faturay, F., Ting, Y.-P., Geschke, A., & Malik, A. (2018). The carbon footprint of global tourism. *Nature Climate Change*, 8(6), 522–528. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-018-0141-x>
- Luu, T. T. (2019). Green human resource practices and organizational citizenship behavior for the environment: The roles of collective green crafting and environmentally specific servant leadership. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 27(8), 1167–1196. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2019.1601731>
- Luu, T. T. (2020). Integrating green strategy and green human resource practices to trigger individual and organizational green performance: The role of environmentally-specific servant leadership. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 28(8), 1193–1222. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2020.1729165>
- Norton, T. A., Zacher, H., Parker, S. L., & Ashkanasy, N. M. (2017). Bridging the gap between green behavioral intentions and employee green behavior: The role of green psychological climate. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 38(7), 996–1015. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2178>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2018.12.008>
- Pham, N. T., Vo-Thanh, T., Tučková, Z., & Thuy, V. T. N. (2020). The role of green human resource management in driving hotel's environmental performance: Interaction and mediation analysis. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 88, Article 102392. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2019.102392>
- Pratt, M. G., Kaplan, S., & Whittington, R. (2020). Editorial essay: The tumult over transparency: Decoupling transparency from replication in establishing trustworthy qualitative research. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 65(1), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0001839219887663>
- Rasoolimanesh, S. M., Ramakrishna, S., Hall, C. M., Esfandiar, K., & Seyfi, S. (2023). A systematic scoping review of sustainable tourism indicators in relation to the sustainable development goals. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 31(7), 1497–1517. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2020.1775621>
- Ren, S., Tang, G., & Jackson, S. E. (2018). Green human resource management research in emergence: A review and future directions. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 35(3), 769–803. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10490-017-9532-1>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051817738940>
- Roscoe, S., Subramanian, N., Jabbour, C. J. C., & Chong, T. (2019). Green human resource management and the enablers of green organisational culture: Enhancing a firm's environmental performance for sustainable development. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 28(5), 737–749. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.2277>
- Roxas, F. M. Y., Rivera, J. P. R., & Gutierrez, E. L. M. (2020). Mapping stakeholders' roles in governing sustainable tourism destinations. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 45, 387–398. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2020.09.005>
- Scott, D., Hall, C. M., & Gössling, S. (2019). Global tourism vulnerability to climate change. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 77, 49–61. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2019.05.007>

- Singh, S. K., Del Giudice, M., Chierici, R., & Graziano, D. (2020). Green innovation and environmental performance: The role of green transformational leadership and green human resource management. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 150, Article 119762. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2019.119762>
- Wondirad, A., Tolkach, D., & King, B. (2020). Stakeholder collaboration as a major factor for sustainable ecotourism development in developing countries. *Tourism Management*, 78, Article 104024. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2019.104024>
- Yong, J. Y., Yusliza, M.-Y., Ramayah, T., & Fawehinmi, O. (2019). Nexus between green intellectual capital and green human resource management. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 215, 364–374. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.12.306>
- Yusliza, M.-Y., Yong, J. Y., Tanveer, M. I., Ramayah, T., Noor Faezah, J., & Muhammad, Z. (2020). A structural model of the impact of green intellectual capital on sustainable performance. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 249, Article 119334. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.119334>
- Zafar, H., Tian, F., Ho, J. A., Roh, T., & Latif, B. (2025). Understanding voluntary pro-environmental behavior among colleagues: Roles of green crafting, psychological empowerment, and green organizational climate. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 34(1), 468–482. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.4001>