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ABSTRACT

The focus on achieving environmental sustainability has led to the implementation of green human resource management (GHRM) practices in various organizations. Many studies have investigated the effect of GHRM practices on existing employees in developed countries. However, limited studies have examined how prospective job seekers perceive GHRM practices in an organization before entering the workplace in developing countries, especially in the Egyptian context. Drawing upon signalling theory, social identity theory and person-environment fit theory, this study aims to bridge this gap by examining the effect of perceived green human resource management (GHRM) practices on the job pursuit intention (JPI) of prospective job seekers in Egypt. A moderated mediation model was proposed, with organizational attractiveness (OA) as a mediator and individual green values (IGV) as a moderator. The sample consisted of 219 final-year undergraduate business students registered in the College of Management and Technology in the Arab Academy for Science, Technology, and Maritime Transport, Alexandria, Egypt. The study used an experimental scenario-based approach where perceptions of individuals were examined toward a hypothetical company using self-administered questionnaires. Direct, mediation, moderation, and moderated mediation models were analysed using linear, multiple regression analysis, and bootstrapping procedures (PROCESS macro extension to SPSS) with the help of SPSS version 26. Results supported the significant positive influence of GHRM on JPI and OA mediated the GHRM-JPI relationship. In addition, IGV moderated the GHRM-OA-JPI relationship. The study provided various theoretical and practical implications for scholars and practitioners. Study limitations and suggestions for future research are also discussed.
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1. Introduction

The global community is dealing with various environmental challenges, including climate change and warming, deforestation, air and water pollution, and waste from industrial operations (Nik Abdul Rashid & Mohammad, 2011). Due to the growing environmental awareness and demands of today’s society, many organizations are working to lessen the negative impact on the environment resulting from their business processes (Gilal et al., 2019; Freitas et al., 2020). As environmental sustainability has become more widely recognized, the field of green human resource management (GHRM) has emerged by adopting effective environmental management (EM) within organizations (Ren et al., 2018). GHRM reflects that the company holds environmental values (Chaudhary, 2019a) and indicates its strategic approach towards enhancing ecological performance (Ren et al., 2018). Therefore, to attain organizational environmental performance and ecological sustainability, the GHRM model has been designed by integrating traditional human resource management (HRM) practices with...
environmental management processes (Siyambalapitiya et al., 2018; Chaudhary, 2021; Mensah et al., 2021).

Scholars have suggested various definitions for GHRM; however, all of them are within the same scope. As an example, Chaudhary (2018, p. 306) states that GHRM is “the use of HRM policies to encourage the sustainable use of resources and promote the cause of environmentalism”. Also, Ari et al. (2020, p. 5) define GHRM as “the result of an injection of environmental/green management to human resource management”. Implementing a whole set of GHRM practices can assist companies in creating an ‘eco-advantage’ culture that extends beyond merely resource efficiency and waste management and reduction to include environmental consideration in various aspects of employees’ behaviour through establishing green policies and initiatives as well as fostering green values (Masri & Jaaron, 2017). In this paper, the author acknowledges GHRM as the implementation of HR practices while taking into consideration the principles of environmental sustainability, where every enterprise can do its own way according to its business operations and activities.

The literature on GHRM has primarily focused on organizational-related rather than individual-related outcomes (Chaudhary, 2021). In addition, on an individual basis, the GHRM research has emphasized existing employees’ outcomes (Chaudhary, 2018); however, studying the effect of GHRM on prospective employees’ attitudes and behaviours received less attention from scholars (Chaudhary, 2019a, 2021).

Examining how the implementation of green practices in organizations influences the intentions of job seekers to pursue employment in such firms remains mostly unexplained (Hanson-Rasmussen & Lauver, 2017). Little research has examined how job seekers perceive GHRM practices in organizations. For instance, it has been indicated that potential candidates perceive companies adopting GHRM practices as attractive and demonstrate intention to work for them (Chaudhary, 2019a; Khan & Muktar, 2020). Such companies are expected to well treat their employees (i.e., primary stakeholders) as they care for the natural environment (i.e., secondary stakeholder) (Chaudhary, 2018). Also, environmentally responsible and eco-friendly organizations have a good reputation over their peers (Tarigan et al., 2021). Thus, prospective job seekers view these companies as their employer of choice.

Since job seekers are still outsiders and not acting as actual employees inside the company, scholars have investigated their perceptions toward the implementation of organizational green practices by analysing their organizational attractiveness (OA) and job pursuit intention (JPI) (Rupp et al., 2013; Duarte et al., 2014; Sohn et al., 2015; Guerci et al., 2016; Chaudhary 2018; DeGrassi, 2019; Chaudhary, 2021; Choi et al., 2021).

Due to the possible variations in individuals’ beliefs and values regarding their perceptions toward green practices in organizations, Jones et al. (2016) suggested that individuals may differ in their responses toward such practices. Therefore, it is also crucial to identify the type of individuals who are more likely to be attracted to organizations applying GHRM practices (Chaudhary, 2021). In this regard, Gully et al. (2013) proposed that further research is needed to address the individual differences that affect OA and JPI of job seekers toward the implementation of GHRM practices. Previous studies established that people with green values are more likely to be attracted to companies implementing green practices (Hanson-Rasmussen and Lauver, 2017; Chaudhary, 2018, 2021).

Studying how and when job applicants are attracted to organizations is imperative because, if they are not, this may lead to leaving the applicants’ pool, negative effect on the selection and hiring process, and limited positive outcomes on recruiting talented individuals (Turban et al., 1998; Firfiray & Mayo, 2017). Previous studies exploring the intention of job seekers to pursue
employment in green companies have been conducted in various developed countries, such as the USA (Rupp et al., 2013), Germany (Sohn et al., 2015), Spain (Carballo-Penela et al., 2020), Portugal (Story et al., 2016), and Norway (Xie et al., 2015). Also, several studies have taken place in various Asian countries, such as Malaysia (Khan & Muktar, 2020), South Korea (Choi et al., 2021), Taiwan (Tsai et al., 2015), India (Kumari & Saini, 2018; Chaudhary, 2021). However, little research has tested how prospective applicants perceive GHRM practices and whether such practices influence their intentions to pursue job opportunities in these organizations in developing countries (Gilal et al., 2019), particularly in African nations (Pham et al., 2020).

Therefore, to bridge this gap in the literature and expand the knowledge in this area, the current paper aims to study the impact of perceived GHRM practices on prospective candidates’ intention to pursue employment in such companies in Egypt, as an example of a developing country in Africa. Furthermore, the paper seeks to examine the underlying mechanism in the GHRM-JPI relationship by exploring the role of organizational attractiveness (OA) as a mediator. Also, as mentioned earlier, it is necessary to identify the role of individual differences in the proposed relationship. Therefore, to provide additional insights into the boundary conditions influencing the GHRM-OA-JPI relationship, the study examines the moderating role of individual green values (IGV). The theoretical framework of this paper is built upon the foundations of signalling theory, social identity theory, and person-environment fit theory.

This paper contributes to the existing literature in various ways. First, it extends the knowledge about the GHRM and its influence on the job pursuit intention (JPI) of prospective employees. Second, it examines this relationship in a developing country where research is still scarce. Third, the paper examines the underlying process in the GHRM-JPI relationship by testing the mediating mechanism of organizational attractiveness (OA). Fourth, the study explores the moderating role of individual green values (IGV) as a boundary condition in the GHRM-OA-JPI association.

The paper is structured as follows: the next section presents the literature review and hypotheses development. Then, the research methodology is illustrated in section three. Section four demonstrates empirical results and findings. Section five indicates the discussion of results, practical and theoretical implications, limitations, suggestions for future research, and conclusion.

2. Theoretical Background and Hypotheses Development

The conceptual framework of the paper is drawn from the theoretical underpinnings of signalling theory, social identity theory, and person-environment fit theory. According to the signalling theory, job seekers take advantage of the little information they have while searching for the companies they desire to apply for (Rynes, 1991). The amount and type of information applicants obtain about an organization throughout the recruitment phase determines their perceptions of the organizational attributes and characteristics (Turban et al., 1998). With relation to GHRM, it is one of the most prominent practices through which prospective applicants, during the initial recruitment process, can portray the organizational ecological orientation and green values (Ghouri et al., 2020). Investing in green practices, such as GHRM, enhances the company’s reputation and shows potential candidates that it is a responsible employer caring for the environment and the society in which it operates (Story et al., 2016).

Organizational attractiveness (OA) refers to the degree to which prospective employees believe an organization to be a desirable place to work (Bednarska, 2016). When applicants are attracted to a company, they are more likely to apply for job employment with it (Presley et al., 2018). Signalling-based mechanisms are best suited to understand how candidates interpret
signals sent out by companies and form their perceptions of OA so that they can shape their minds about working for a particular company (Pham & Paille, 2020).

Social identity theory (SIT) states that “attraction to an organization allows individuals to gain social approval and establish an identity” (Highhouse et al., 2007, p. 143). Individuals are seen to be strongly identified with an organization when they define themselves with the same characteristics and attributes they use when defining their employer (Dutton et al., 1994). Lievens and Highhouse (2003, p. 96) stated that “the organization in which people work is one of the important determinants of their self-concept and social identity”. This means that the more applicants’ organizational identification, the more organizational attractiveness and job pursuit intention.

Hoang et al. (2020, p. 282) define JPI as “the intention of the applicant to pursue a job opportunity with a possible future organization”. Job pursuit intention indicates the applicants’ readiness to join or remain in the applicant pool (Bednarska, 2016). Based on the understanding of SIT, it can be suggested that perceived GHRM practices might have a positive impact on JPI (Choi et al., 2021). Prospective employees perceive organizations implementing GHRM practices as more attractive, leading to higher JPI (Chaudhary, 2018).

GHRM represents the environmental component of corporate social responsibility (CSR) (Chaudhary, 2019b, 2021). Given that existing research on GHRM is limited, more specifically its linkage with potential candidates’ outcomes and perceptions, various related evidence can be borrowed from the field of CSR (Chaudhary, 2018, 2019a, 2021). Numerous research has illustrated the role of CSR in attracting quality applicants; however, the environmental component of CSR has received little attention in this area (Chaudhary, 2018). According to Moorthy et al.’s (2017) study among business students attending Malaysian universities, the environmental dimension of CSR has a significant positive linkage with JPI. Similarly, Tarigan et al. (2021) found that the ecological component of CSR significantly relates to JPI. Also, Kumari and Saini (2018) concluded that perceived organizational CSR reputation significantly affects OA and JPI among final-year business and engineering university students in India.

Among the scant studies conducted on GHRM is the work done by Chaudhary (2019a), which indicated that GHRM-JPI association is sequentially mediated by organizational prestige (OP) and OA. Also, the study by Chaudhary (2021) demonstrated that OA acts as a mediator in the GHRM-JPI linkage. In addition, Khan and Muktar (2020) supported the mediating role of OA in the association between green recruitment and JPI.

Given the results of previous studies, several remarks can be noted. First, studies have indicated that job seekers perceive companies implementing green practices as socially and environmentally responsible. Also, they expect to be well-treated in such companies; thus, they are attracted to them. In other words, it can be illustrated that the implementation of GHRM practices (or the environmental dimension of CSR) attracts job applicants, leading to their intention to seek employment in these companies.

Therefore, the following hypotheses can be developed:

**H1:** Perceived GHRM practices influence the job pursuit intention (JPI) of prospective job seekers.

**H2:** Perceived GHRM practices influence organizational attractiveness (OA).

**H3:** Organizational attractiveness (OA) mediates the relationship between perceived GHRM practices and the job pursuit intention (JPI) of prospective job seekers.

As discussed earlier, individual differences can play a role in shaping job seekers’ attitudes and behaviours toward choosing their future employers. Therefore, the following part demonstrates
the moderating role of individual green values (IGV) in the association between GHRM, OA, and JPI.

2.1. Individual Green Values (IGV) as a Moderator

Person-environment fit theory is best suited to lay the foundation of individual green values (IGV) in the GHRM-OA-JPI relationship. According to person-environment fit theory, individuals working in jobs aligning with their interests outperform those in mismatched occupations (Muchinsky & Monahan, 1987). When prospective applicants perceive a shared set of values with an organization, this could play a significant factor in their choice to pursue employment opportunities in this company (Choi et al., 2021). Value congruence and similarity between job seekers and an organization leads to improved performance and lower turnover rates (Gully et al., 2013).

Green values and environmental values are used interchangeably in previous studies. Hanson-Rasmussen and Lauver (2017) viewed IGV as the reflection of one’s beliefs about the importance of treating the environment with respect. According to Hameed et al. (2020), IGV are associated with people’s care for the environment, which increases their dedication and commitment to ecological protection and conservation.

Earlier discussions indicate that GHRM practices reflect the organizational green values, initiatives, and activities (Chaudhary, 2020) and IGV reflect personal environmental orientation, consideration, and beliefs (Hanson-Rasmussen & Lauver, 2017). When individuals hold shared green values with an organization, they become motivated to achieve their organizational green/environmental goals (Kim et al., 2019) by demonstrating green attitudes and behaviours (Chaudhary, 2021). When ecologically conscious individuals recognize that companies adopt green practices, they perceive a fit between their values and that of the organization, leading to higher levels of intention to seek employment in this company (i.e., JPI) (Bogan et al., 2020). These benefit both the organization and employees in that the organization achieve its ecological goals, and it represents a way for individuals to express their green values by demonstrating behaviours related to environmental protection (Chaudhary, 2020; Zhang et al., 2021).

Empirical studies in this area include the study conducted by Hanson-Rasmussen and Lauver (2017). The authors found that undergraduates and graduates holding green values are more likely to perceive environmentally responsible organizations as attractive and desirable places to work. Islam et al. (2020) identified the moderating mechanism of IGV as it strengthens the relationship between GHRM and green behaviour. Additionally, Gilal et al. (2019) explored that IGV moderates the indirect influence of GHRM on environmental performance through employees’ environmental passion. Furthermore, Chaudhary’s (2021) study, among final-year engineering students in India, indicated that the GHRM-OA-JPI linkage is stronger for environmentally responsible individuals who feel committed to ecological protection.

Reviewing these studies indicates that individual green values can play a moderating role in the GHRM-OA-JPI relationship. When job applicants perceive a fit between their values and organizational values, they become more likely to be attracted to these companies. Thus, individuals with green values are more attracted to organizations implementing GHRM practices, leading to enhanced job pursuit intention. Therefore, the following hypotheses can be developed:

**H5:** Individual green values (IGV) moderate the effect of perceived GHRM practices on organizational attractiveness (OA).
H6: Individual green values (IGV) moderate the indirect influence of perceived GHRM practices on the job pursuit intention (JPI) of prospective job seekers through organizational attractiveness (OA) (i.e., Moderated mediation model).

2.2. The Proposed Model
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Figure 1. The Proposed Model

3. Research Methodology

3.1. Participants

Final-year undergraduate business students registered in a private university in Alexandria, Egypt were the subjects of the study. Given the purpose of this paper, final-year university students are suitable for examining the proposed hypotheses for various reasons: (1) they comprise a large pool of job applicants joining the labour force every year (Jones et al., 2016; Chaudhary, 2018; Presley et al., 2018), (2) organizations direct many recruitment messages toward them as being the prospective employees (Renaud et al., 2016; Story et al., 2016), and (3) they constitute the target group to accommodate entry-level positions in companies (Presley et al., 2018; Carballo-Penela et al., 2020).

3.2. Design and Procedure

The current study adopted a scenario-based, experimental design approach involving two scenarios about a hypothetical company in line with the research conducted by previous studies examining the perceptions of prospective candidates toward organizations implementing green or environmental practices (e.g., Bauer & Aimsmith, 1996; Behrend et al. 2009; Gully et al., 2013; Rupp et al., 2013; Duarte et al., 2014; Guerici et al., 2016; Jones et al., 2016; Story et al., 2016; Presley et al., 2018; DeGrassi, 2019; Carballo-Penela et al., 2020; Choi et al., 2021; Chaudhary, 2018, 2019a, 2021). The first scenario described a company implementing GHRM practices (green recruitment and selection, green training and development, green reward and compensation, green performance management, and green involvement), was allocated to the experimental group, and coded as “1”. The second scenario presented the same company without any information about GHRM practices, was assigned to the control group, and coded as “0”. Participants were assigned randomly to both groups. All other factors, such as salaries, benefits, working environment, and organizational culture remained the same for the two scenarios.
The pen-and-paper questionnaire was developed to collect the data. First, participants were instructed to assume themselves as actual job seekers and read the information about the hypothetical organization. Next, participants were asked to respond to the questionnaire scale items about organizational attractiveness (OA), job pursuit intention (JPI), and individual green values (IGV). Questionnaires were administered and collected in March 2022. A total of 260 questionnaires were distributed, and 219 valid questionnaires were returned after eliminating the invalid ones with missing values or incomplete information (n = 112 for the experimental group, n = 107 for the control group). The total response rate was 84.23%.

3.3. Measures

The scales of the study were measured using a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*. The scale of organizational attractiveness (OA) consists of five statements and was developed by Highhouse et al. (2003). A sample statement includes “For me, this company would be a good place to work”. The scale of job pursuit intention (JPI) consists of five statements and was developed by Highhouse et al. (2003). A sample statement is “I would exert a great deal of effort to work for this company”. Both measures of OA and JPI were used in studies by Rupp et al. (2013), Chaudhary (2018), Chaudhary (2019), Bogan et al. (2020), Carballo-Penela et al. (2020), Khan and Muktar (2020), Chaudhary (2021), and Choi et al. (2021). The scale of individual green values (IGV) consists of seven statements and was developed by Chou (2014). A sample scale item includes “I feel a personal obligation to do whatever I can to prevent environmental degradation”. The scale was used in the studies by Dumont et al. (2017), Chaudhary (2020), Hameed et al. (2020), Hooi et al. (2021), Liu et al. (2021), and Zhang et al. (2021). The questionnaire was tested for the internal consistency of its underlying constructs. Cronbach’s alpha for all measures is illustrated in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>No. of Items</th>
<th>Cronbach α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Attractiveness (OA)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Pursuit Intention (JPI)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Green Values (IGV)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.704</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4. Control Variables

Demographic information was collected to use as control variables. Age and gender of participants were included as control variables as done by previous studies (Rupp et al., 2013; Story et al., 2016; Chaudhary, 2019a, 2021; Hameed et al., 2020; Liu et al., 2021) because they have been indicated to influence organizational attractiveness (OA) and job pursuit intention (JPI).

4. Data Analysis and Results

Data were analysed using SPSS version 26. Descriptive statistics, correlation, and regression analysis (linear regression and hierarchal multiple regression) were performed. The moderated mediation model was analysed using PROCESS macro version 4 for SPSS, devised by Hayes (2013).

4.1. Manipulation Check

The manipulation check is done to check that the participants assigned to the two scenarios differ in their perceptions regarding OA and JPI. In other words, the role of the manipulation
check is used to ensure that there is a significant difference between the experimental group and control group concerning their perceptions toward OA and JPI. Thus, to determine the appropriate test to check the differences between the two groups, the test of normality is conducted. As shown in Table 2, both Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests indicate that data are not normally distributed \((P < 0.05)\). Therefore, the two independent samples Mann-Whitney U test is conducted.

Table 2. Test of Normality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Kolmogorov-Smirnov</th>
<th>Shapiro-Wilk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OA</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPI</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As illustrated in Table 3, the results report a significant difference between the two groups of participants assigned to the different scenarios regarding their responses to OA and JPI. The values of the mean rank indicated that the group assigned to the GHRM scenario showed higher OA (mean rank = 147.09) and JPI (mean rank = 138.69) compared with the control group (mean rank = 71.18 for OA and 79.97 for JPI).

Table 3. Mann-Whitney Test Ranks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Sum of Ranks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO GHRM</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>71.18</td>
<td>7616.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHRM</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>147.09</td>
<td>16474.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>219</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO GHRM</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>79.97</td>
<td>8557.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHRM</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>138.69</td>
<td>15533.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>219</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be concluded that OA \((U = 1838.00, Z = -8.91, P < 0.05)\) and JPI \((U = 2779.00, Z = -6.88, P < 0.05)\) in the experimental group (i.e., with GHRM) were statistically significantly higher than the control group (i.e., no GHRM) (see Table 4).

Table 4. Test Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OA</th>
<th>JPI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mann-Whitney U</td>
<td>1838.00</td>
<td>2779.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>-8.91</td>
<td>-6.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also, as shown by the visual representation of the histogram (Figure 2), the distributions of OA and JPI were not similar across the two groups.
4.2. Sample Characteristics

The sample consists of 219 participants. Females accounted for 61.6%, while males were 38.4%. Regarding the age of participants, 62.6% of them were aged 20-22 years old, and those aged above 22 years old were around 37%.

Table 5.
Gender and Age Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>61.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-22 years old</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>62.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 22 years old</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3. Descriptive Statistics

The descriptive analysis (mean and standard deviations) is shown in Table 6. As GHRM is a categorical variable (with two groups), its mean is 0.50, and the standard deviation is 0.50. The mean score for OA, JPI, and IGV is found to be above average.

Table 6.
Descriptive Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GHRM</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OA</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPI</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGV</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4. Correlation Analysis

The correlation matrix reports that all the study variables were statistically and significantly correlated (Table 7). There is a significant positive correlation between GHRM and both organizational attractiveness ($r = 0.604, P < 0.05$) and job pursuit intention ($r = 0.466, P <$
0.05). Also, there was a statistically significant positive correlation between organizational attractiveness and job pursuit intention ($r = 0.814, P < 0.05$).

Table 7.
*Correlation Matrix*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>GHRM</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>OA</td>
<td>.604**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>JPI</td>
<td>.466**</td>
<td>.814**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

### 4.5. Hypotheses Testing

**Mediation Analysis.** First, to test the influence of GHRM (independent variable) on JPI (dependent variable), a linear regression analysis is conducted, where JPI is regressed on GHRM. The results indicate that GHRM significantly influences JPI ($P < 0.05, R^2 = 0.215$). This means that 21.5% of the variance in JPI was explained by GHRM (see Table 8). It can be noticed that the value of the $R$ square indicates that another variable may influence or intervene in the relationship between GHRM and JPI. Therefore, $H1$ is supported.

Table 8.
*Linear Regression Analysis of GHRM and JPI*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.464a</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>.59448</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), GHRM, Age, Gender

b. Dependent variable: JPI

$GHRM \rightarrow JPI$

t = 7.465, $P = 0.000$

$R^2 = 0.215$

Also, when OA is regressed on GHRM, the results indicate that GHRM has a significant positive influence on OA ($P < 0.05, R^2 = 0.379$). It means that 37.9% of the variance in OA was explained by GHRM (see Table 9). Therefore, $H2$ is supported.

Table 9.
*Linear Regression Analysis of GHRM and OA*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.616a</td>
<td>.379</td>
<td>.371</td>
<td>.58401</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Age, GHRM, Gender

b. Dependent variable: OA

To test the influence of both GHRM and OA on JPI, a hierarchical multiple regression analysis is undertaken. In step 1, JPI is regressed on GHRM as conducted before in the linear regression analysis. Then, in step 2, OA is added as a predictor to the model, where JPI is regressed on both GHRM and OA. As indicated in Table 10, the results reveal that when OA is added to the model, the results are statistically significant, ($P < 0.05, R^2 = 0.672$). This means that 67.2% of the variance in JPI was explained by both GHRM and OA. It explains that when OA is added to the model, the value of $R^2$ increases from .215 (i.e., with GHRM alone) to .672 (i.e., with GHRM and OA). In other words, $R^2$ increased by 45.7% when OA was included in the model. Therefore, $H3$ is supported.
Table 10.
Multiple Regression Analysis of GHRM, OA, and JPI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.464a</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>.59448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.820b</td>
<td>.672</td>
<td>.666</td>
<td>.38488</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Age, GHRM, Gender
b. Predictors: (Constant), Age, GHRM, Gender, OA
c. Dependent variable: JPI

Furthermore, the coefficients of hierarchical regression reported that when GHRM and OA are added as predictors of JPI, the effect of GHRM on JPI (i.e., direct effect) was not statistically significant ($P > 0.05$). However, the effect of OA on JPI was significant ($P < 0.05$). It implies that there might be a full mediation effect of OA in the GHRM-JPI relationship, which will be tested using PROCESS macro for SPSS devised by Hayes et al. (2013).

To authenticate the (full) mediation effect of OA on the GHRM-JPI association, PROCESS Macro Model 4 was used to calculate the direct and indirect effects using the least square procedure (Hayes, 2013; Hayes, 2018). It utilizes bootstrapping, a robust non-parametric technique, which estimates the effect size and tests the statistical hypotheses without making assumptions of normal distribution. Effect size estimates of indirect effects were drawn using bootstrap confidence intervals (CI). When the 95% CI range does not include zero, a statistically significant relationship is concluded. However, if the 95% CI range contains zero, the relationship becomes not statistically significant (Hayes, 2013; Hayes, 2018).

Figure 3 indicates the paths of the mediation model (a, b, and c'). The results revealed that GHRM positively influenced OA ($B = .88$, $SE = .079$, $P < 0.05$). The goodness of fit of the linear model was established, $R^2 = .38$, $F$-value = 43.79, $P < 0.05$. The results reported that 38% of the variance in OA was explained by GHRM. Also, the significant GHRM-OA relationship can be confirmed by observing the bootstrap confidence interval (CI) range, where zero did not lie in the 95% bootstrap confidence interval range (CI = .73, 1.039).

Model : 4
Y : JPI
X : GHRM
M : OA

Covariates:
Age    Gender

Sample Size: 219

Outcome Variable:
OA

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>R-sq</th>
<th>MSE</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.6158</td>
<td>.3793</td>
<td>.3411</td>
<td>43.7867</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>215.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>constant</th>
<th>coeff</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.7387</td>
<td>.1541</td>
<td>24.2650</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>3.4350</td>
<td>4.0424</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHRM</td>
<td>.8827</td>
<td>.0791</td>
<td>11.1598</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.7268</td>
<td>1.0386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.0152</td>
<td>.0838</td>
<td>.1815</td>
<td>.8562</td>
<td>-.1499</td>
<td>.1803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.1736</td>
<td>.0834</td>
<td>-.20829</td>
<td>.0384</td>
<td>-.3380</td>
<td>-.0093</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3. PROCESS Macro Model 4
The relationship between GHRM and JPI (c’-path) represents the direct path of the mediation (i.e. when OA is included in the model). The results indicated that c’-path was not significant ($P > 0.05$) and zero lied in the 95% bootstrap confidence interval range (CI = -.21, .04). However, the positive influence of OA on JPI (represented by the b-path) was significant ($B = .78, SE = .045, P < 0.05, CI = .69, .87$). Also, the full model fitness (Figure 4) was established, $R^2 = .67, F-value = 109.85, P < 0.05$.

Outcome Variable:
JPI
Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>R-sq</th>
<th>MSE</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.8200</td>
<td>.6725</td>
<td>.1481</td>
<td>109.8454</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>214.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model

coeff | se | t  | p    | LLCI | ULCI |
------|----|----|------|------|------|
constant | .8910 | .1963 | 4.5380 | .0000 | .5040 | 1.2780 |
GHRM | -.0849 | .0655 | -1.2958 | .1964 | -.2140 | .0442 |
OA | .7771 | .0449 | 17.2897 | .0000 | .6885 | .8657 |
Age | -.1054 | .0552 | -1.9088 | .0576 | -.2142 | .0034 |
Gender | .0454 | .0555 | .8176 | .4145 | -.0640 | .1548 |

Figure 4. Full Model Analysis

The total effect model (Figure 5) indicates the sum of the direct effect of GHRM on JPI (c’-path) and the indirect effect (a × b). The total effect model was significant, $B = .60, SE = .08, P < 0.05, CI = .44, .76, R^2 = .215, F-value = 19.62$.

Total effect (c) = c’ + ab

Outcome Variable:
JPI
Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>R-sq</th>
<th>MSE</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.4636</td>
<td>.2150</td>
<td>.3534</td>
<td>19.6233</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>215.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model

coeff | se | t  | p    | LLCI | ULCI |
------|----|----|------|------|------|
constant | 3.7963 | .1568 | 24.2048 | .0000 | 3.4871 | 4.1054 |
Scenario | .6010 | .0805 | 7.4652 | .0000 | .4423 | .7597 |
Age | -.0936 | .0853 | -1.0973 | .2737 | -.2616 | .0745 |
Gender | -.0896 | .0849 | -1.0555 | .2924 | -.2568 | .0777 |

Figure 5. Total Effect Model

The indirect effect of X on Y represents the influence of GHRM on JPI through the mediating role of OA (i.e., the mediation analysis) (see Figure 6). The results revealed that the mediation analysis was significant as zero did not lie in the 95% bootstrap confidence interval range (CI = .55, .82). Therefore, $H4$ is supported. Also, the results confirmed the full mediation effect of OA on the GHRM-JPI relationship because the c’-path of the mediation (GHRM-JPI relationship) was not significant, whereas the GHRM-OA-JPI relationship was statistically significant.
Indirect effect(s) of X on Y:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>BootSE</th>
<th>BootLLCI</th>
<th>BootULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OA</td>
<td>.6859</td>
<td>.0692</td>
<td>.5487</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( a \times b \) (indirect effect)

Figure 6. Indirect Effect of GHRM on JPI via OA

**Moderation Analysis.** To test the moderating role of individual green values (IGV) on the relationship between GHRM and OA, both GHRM and IGV were included in step 1 of hierarchical multiple regression analysis as the independent variables and OA as the dependent variable. Then, in step 2, an interaction term (GHRM x IGV) was entered. The interaction term is found to predict OA significantly \( (R^2 = .51, P < 0.05) \) and accounted for 2.4% of the variance in OA \( (R^2 \text{ change value} = .024, P < 0.05) \). Therefore, H5 is supported.

To test H6, model 7 of PROCESS macro for SPSS (Hayes, 2015; Hayes, 2018; Igartua and Hayes, 2021) was used to test the moderating effect of IGV in the GHRM-OA-JPI relationship (Figure 7). The results report that GHRM \( (B = -1.81, SE = .83, P < 0.05) \) and IGV \( (B = .33, SE = .13, P < 0.05) \) were both associated with increasing OA. The interaction between GHRM and IGV was also significant \( (B = .61, SE = .17, P < 0.05) \), suggesting that the influence of GHRM on OA is dependent on the level of IGV. Therefore, H6 is supported.

Model : 7
Y : JPI
X : GHRM
M : OA
W : IGV
Covariates:
Age, Gender
Sample Size: 219

Outcome Variable:
OA
Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>R-sq</th>
<th>MSE</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.7127</td>
<td>.5080</td>
<td>.2729</td>
<td>43.9775</td>
<td>5.0000</td>
<td>213.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>coeff</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>constant</td>
<td>2.3433</td>
<td>.6072</td>
<td>3.8595</td>
<td>.0002</td>
<td>1.1465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario</td>
<td>-1.8094</td>
<td>.8303</td>
<td>-2.1791</td>
<td>.0304</td>
<td>-3.4461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGV</td>
<td>.3283</td>
<td>.1346</td>
<td>2.4392</td>
<td>.0155</td>
<td>.0630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>.6067</td>
<td>.1885</td>
<td>3.2193</td>
<td>.0015</td>
<td>.2352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.0488</td>
<td>.0754</td>
<td>-.6472</td>
<td>.5182</td>
<td>-.1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.1389</td>
<td>.0748</td>
<td>-1.8575</td>
<td>.0646</td>
<td>-.2863</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7. PROCESS Macro Model 7
Also, the results reveal that GHRM, IGV, and the interaction between them (i.e., GHRM × IGV) accounted for approximately 51% of the variance in OA, \( R^2 = .51 \), \( F\text{-value} = 43.98 \), \( P < 0.05 \). The full model revealed that a moderated mediation relationship is significant where zero did not lie in the 95% bootstrap confidence interval range of IGV (CI = .17, .77). This means that the indirect influence of GHRM on JPI through the mediating role of OA was conditional on the level of IGV, where it is stronger at high values of IGV compared to moderate or low values as indicated in Figure 8 and Table 11.

Indirect Effect:
GHRM \(-\) OA \(-\) JPI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IGV</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>BootSE</th>
<th>BootLLCI</th>
<th>BootULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.0141</td>
<td>.4866</td>
<td>.0839</td>
<td>.3329</td>
<td>.6586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3914</td>
<td>.6645</td>
<td>.0633</td>
<td>.5416</td>
<td>.7945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7686</td>
<td>.8424</td>
<td>.0878</td>
<td>.6676</td>
<td>1.0110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Index of moderated mediation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IGV</th>
<th>BootSE</th>
<th>BootLLCI</th>
<th>BootULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.4715</td>
<td>.1538</td>
<td>.1720</td>
<td>.7726</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8. Conditional Indirect Effects of GHRM on JPI

Figure 9 indicates the slopes for the positive effect of GHRM on OA at different levels of IGV. Simple slopes for the GHRM-OA relationship were tested at three levels of IGV; low (-1 SD below the mean), moderate (mean), and high (+1 SD above the mean). The slopes of the graph showed that the relationship was stronger for high levels of IGV (\( B = .84 \), \( SE = .087 \), \( P < 0.05 \)) than average (\( B = .66 \), \( SE = .062 \), \( P < 0.05 \)) and low levels (\( B = .49 \), \( SE = .083 \), \( P < 0.05 \)).

Figure 9. Visual representation of GHRM-OA relationship at different levels of IGV
Table 11.
Moderated Mediation Index and Conditional Indirect Influence of GHRM on JPI through OA at Different Values of IGV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IGV</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conditional indirect effect at IGV = mean and +/- 1 SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0141 (-1SD)</td>
<td>.4866</td>
<td>.0829</td>
<td>.3280</td>
<td>.6552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3914 (M)</td>
<td>.6645</td>
<td>.0616</td>
<td>.5469</td>
<td>.7893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7686 (+1SD)</td>
<td>.8424</td>
<td>.0865</td>
<td>.6739</td>
<td>1.0135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderated mediation index</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OA</td>
<td>.4715</td>
<td>.1542</td>
<td>.1659</td>
<td>.7732</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Discussion of the Results

This paper aims to explore the impact of perceived GHRM practices on the job pursuit intention (JPI) of prospective employees within the Egyptian context. An integrative moderated mediation model was proposed linking GHRM (independent variable), JPI (dependent variable), organizational attractiveness (OA) (mediator), and individual green values (IGV) (moderator). The subjects of the study were final-year business students attending a private university in Alexandria Governorate, Egypt.

The findings supported the significant influence of perceived GHRM practices on the JPI of prospective job seekers, which is consistent with previous studies (e.g., Chaudhary, 2018, 2021; Khan & Muktar, 2020). Furthermore, because GHRM is regarded as the environmental aspect of CSR, several studies (Rupp et al., 2013; Sohn et al., 2015; Moorthy et al., 2017; Carballo-Penela et al., 2020; Choi et al., 2021; Tarigan et al., 2021) found that the environmental dimension of CSR is positively related to JPI, which is in line with the results of the present study. This finding can be interpreted as follows: job seekers are more likely to apply for employment in companies when they perceive the organization to be committed to preserving the environment by adopting GHRM practices, policies, and initiatives, which in turn enhances the organizational reputation among others. Companies implementing GHRM practices convey positive messages to potential applicants that they are accountable for maintaining a sustainable environment and being ecologically responsible. Consequently, prospective employees interpret these messages or signals favourably, considering that companies caring for and appreciating the environment reflect their caring for their employees. This generates an intention to seek employment in such organizations, enhancing applicants' JPI.

Also, the current study confirmed the mediating role of OA in the GHRM-JPI relationship, which is in line with the results of earlier research (Duarte et al., 2014; Jones et al., 2016; Presley et al., 2018; Chaudhary, 2019a, 2021; DeGrassi, 2019; Khan & Muktar, 2020). Potential candidates are attracted to companies implementing GHRM practices, exhibiting their intention to seek employment in them. These findings indicate that organizations sharing information about integrating pro-environmental activities with traditional HRM functions attract applicants to work for them rather than other companies that do not possess these characteristics.

These findings, however, contrast with the findings of Lis (2012), who reported no relationship between the environmental component of CSR and JPI. A possible interpretation is that Lis (2012) performed the study among undergraduate students in Germany, where environmental rules and regulations are already in place in German companies. Prospective employees in Germany prioritize factors other than green practices when deciding about their future employers because environmental procedures are already established in German organizations.
On the other hand, the implementation of ecological policies, rules and regulations in Egyptian firms is still not well developed and established.

Furthermore, this study provided evidence that individual green values (IGV) moderated the indirect influence of GHRM on JPI via OA. These results are congruent with research conducted by Tsai et al. (2014), Dumont et al. (2017), Chaudhary (2018, 2021), and DeGrassi (2019), which showed that personal values, such as environmental orientation, green values, moral identity, and socio-environmental consciousness determine job seekers’ attitudes and behaviours toward their prospective employers. In addition, environmentally responsible individuals are more likely to be attracted to companies communicating green activities in their job adverts than those that are non-green (Coelho et al., 2022). This finding can be justified by the fact that those individuals are still outsiders and not true or actual employees inside the organization; thus, they determine and evaluate the matching and alignment between their personal values and those of the organization. Based on their perceptions of initial fit, they decide their attractiveness and intention to pursue employment in such companies.

6. Theoretical and Practical Implications

The relationship between GHRM and JPI via the mediating mechanism of OA supports the theoretical underpinning of signalling theory. During the job search phase, prospective candidates can shape their opinions and perceptions about an organization from the ‘signals’ or ‘cues’ they discover from the recruitment adverts or the company’s website. Job applicants are more likely to be attracted to companies that are committed to mitigating the negative consequences of their operations on the environment. Also, the association between perceived GHRM practices, OA, and JPI supports the theoretical foundation of social identity theory. People are attracted to companies possessing certain characteristics and attributes where they can define themselves according to such qualities. For example, some individuals who perceive themselves as tech-savvy are attracted to and pursue employment in technology-oriented companies. Similarly, individuals who identify themselves as environmentalists are more likely to join companies applying GHRM practices. The results of the current study indicate that potential employees are attracted to and seek employment opportunities in organizations implementing GHRM practices so that they can define themselves as being environmentally responsible and caring for ecological protection.

Furthermore, the study reveals that the GHRM-OA-JPI relationship was contingent on the moderating mechanism of individual green values (IGV). Based on person-environment fit theory, individuals possessing green values are attracted to companies adopting GHRM practices because their values are aligned with that of the organization. This finding explains the role of individual differences in shaping and influencing attitudinal and behavioural reactions of prospective candidates toward their future employers.

The study findings provide practical implications to be considered by organizations. First, being an environmentally responsible company can be regarded as a value-added privilege for attracting job seekers, distinguishing them from non-green competitors. Organizations adopting GHRM practices provide them with a competitive advantage over their rivals, making them more appealing and attractive to job seekers when they seek employment opportunities. Consequently, HR managers and recruiters need to emphasize such green practices in their recruitment messages and communications to attract potential candidates via various media channels, such as the company’s website, job fairs, and job advertisements. Second, to ensure that employees engage in organizational green activities and achieve environmental performance, companies employing GHRM policies need to select and hire individuals with green values. People holding green values can respect and appreciate the company’s green
practices, demonstrating green behaviour at the workplace, leading to achieving the organizational green goals.

Furthermore, the findings can provide practical implications for universities. First, the significance of environmental sustainability and related topics should be actively covered and incorporated into the academic curriculum. Second, it would be beneficial to provide seminars and hands-on workshops to students on campus to educate them and enhance their awareness about recycling, decreasing energy consumption, and minimizing air and water pollution. Students should understand that even small positive acts can help environmental protection for the current and future generations. Third, educational institutions need to encourage, recognize, and promote students’ projects addressing and acting toward ecological sustainability. Doing so will help individuals understand the significance of environmental preservation and become an important aspect of their mindsets before joining the actual labour market.

7. Limitations and Future Research Suggestions

The current study has some limitations, providing avenues for further research. Initially, the research design used is cross-sectional, which restricts the examination of cause-and-effect relationships between the variables under inquiry. Thus, to have a deeper understanding of the potential causal link between the predictor and outcome variables, future researchers are encouraged to carry out longitudinal studies to explore causality between variables. Secondly, a sample of final-year Egyptian undergraduate students from a single higher education institution is used in the research. Therefore, examining a sample of students from different universities might offer a more thorough perspective and enable a better generalization of the results to the Egyptian setting. Also, it is suggested to replicate the model using a larger sample size to provide better generalization of the study results. Additionally, it can be beneficial to examine and compare the perceptions of potential candidates from green and non-green universities. This can provide additional insights into the role of environmental knowledge and awareness in shaping the attitudes and behaviours of individuals toward pursuing employment in organizations implementing GHRM practices. Future studies can replicate the research model on other developing countries and compare the findings to gain a better understanding and extend the knowledge on the dynamics of the implementation of GHRM practices in various countries.

Furthermore, the study employed an experimental research approach, in which the reactions of potential employees toward a fictional organization were analysed. Subsequent research efforts might examine the proposed model among the real labour force in the marketplace and explore their reactions toward actual companies adopting green practices. Additionally, the present study examined the moderating mechanism of individual green values. To provide further insights, future scholars could examine other moderators, such as personality types, educational backgrounds, and type and years of professional experience, which may exert an influence on the effect of GHRM practices on the attitude and behaviour of prospective employees. Besides, exploring the gender differences in the proposed model might extend our knowledge regarding the possible discrepancies between males and females about their perceptions toward green organizations.

8. Conclusion

To sum up, this research adds to the body of knowledge about the impact of implementing GHRM practices on potential candidates’ intentions to pursue employment in these organizations. The findings contribute to our limited understanding of GHRM practices in Egypt. It also broadens our knowledge of the underlying mechanisms influencing the
association between GHRM and JPI by exploring the mediating effect of organizational attractiveness (OA) and the boundary condition of individual green values (IGV). Furthermore, the research contributes to advancing our understanding of the theoretical underpinnings of signalling theory, social identity theory, and person-environment fit theory within the context of GHRM. Besides, it offers practical implications for Egyptian higher education institutions, businesses, and practitioners.
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