https://doi.org/10.63985/ttbr.v2i2.145

Aligning Organizational Behavior with Green Marketing Initiatives for Sustainable Product Innovation

Hengki Mangiring Parulian Simarmata

Politeknik Bisnis Indonesia, Indonesia.
*Corresponding author email address: hengkisimarmata.mm@gmail.com

Abstract: The contemporary integration of environmental imperatives into corporate strategy has elevated Sustainable Product Innovation (SPI) from a peripheral corporate social responsibility concern to a core determinant of competitive advantage. However, organizations frequently experience a profound strategy-execution gap, where high-level green marketing directives fail to translate into tangible product innovations due to internal behavioral misalignment. This study develops an integrative theoretical and empirical synthesis examining how Organizational Behavior (OB) specifically Green Transformational Leadership (GTL), Green Organizational Climate (GOC), Green Human Resource Management (GHRM) framed through the Ability-Motivation-Opportunity (AMO) model, Green Knowledge, and Organizational Citiszenship Behavior towards the Environment (OCBE) must be strategically aligned with Green Marketing Initiatives (encompassing Strategic, Internal, and Tactical Green Marketing Orientations) to foster Sustainable Product Innovation. Synthesizing global empirical evidence from structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM and AMOS) across manufacturing enterprises and B2B sectors under PRISMA 2020 systematic review principles, this paper explicates the sequential mechanisms and boundary conditions governing green strategy execution. The results demonstrate that while Strategic Green Marketing Orientation (SGMO) and Green Transformational Leadership exert direct positive effects on product innovation, their impact is heavily mediated by Internal Green Marketing Orientation (IGMO) and employee OCBE. Furthermore, Green Organizational Climate and Green Knowledge serve as critical moderating enablers that amplify the behavioral conversion of green leadership into voluntary eco-innovative workplace behaviors. By bridging the Natural-Resource-Based View (NRBV) with Tripartite Green Marketing Orientation theory and Social Learning Theory, this article provides a multi-level conceptual model, illuminates governance paradoxes such as greenwashing and greenhushing, and offers a four-phase managerial roadmap for authentic organizational transformation.

Keywords: Green Marketing Orientation, Organizational Behavior, Green Transformational Leadership, Organizational Citizenship Behavior towards the Environment, Sustainable Product Innovation, Natural-Resource-Based View.

Copyright © TechTalent & Business Review
All rights reserved

1. Introduction

In an era defined by accelerating ecological degradation, resource scarcity, and severe climate vulnerabilities, modern industrial enterprises face unprecedented pressure to reconcile economic performance with environmental stewardship (Hart & Dowell, 2011; Popović et al., 2023). Global regulatory bodies have responded by enacting stringent sustainability mandates, such

as the European Union's Regulation EC No 1223/2009 for industrial products and ISO 14001 environmental management benchmarks, which compel firms to take full life-cycle accountability for their operational footprints (Damarani et al., 2025; Union, 2019). Concurrently, consumer markets are undergoing a structural shift toward ecological consciousness, with a substantial majority of buyers demonstrating a willingness to transition toward eco-friendly offerings and pay premiums for verified green attributes (JDMHI, 2024; Ottman et al., 2006; Zainuddin et al., 2025). In response, corporate strategists have recognized that traditional, end-of-pipe compliance measures are insufficient. Sustained market leadership increasingly depends on Sustainable Product Innovation (SPI) the development of novel or modified products that minimize environmental damage throughout their life cycles while delivering superior functional and economic value (Chang, 2016; Ge et al., 2018).

Despite widespread formal commitments to environmental sustainability, many enterprises encounter a persistent "strategy-execution gap" (Papadas et al., 2017, 2019). High-level green marketing strategies designed by executive leadership frequently fail to yield substantive green product breakthroughs, resulting in operational friction, market skepticism, or severe accusations of greenwashing (Badhwar et al., 2024; Daou et al., 2025a; Mishra et al., 2019). Strategic management literature indicates that this implementation breakdown stems primarily from a fundamental theoretical and operational disconnect: the decoupling of external green marketing initiatives from internal organizational behavior (Casidy & Papadas, 2026; Liu et al., 2022; Papadas et al., 2017). While green marketing initiatives establish market positioning, stakeholder communication, and strategic direction, the actual capability to innovate rests within the human element t he organizational behavior, leadership dynamics, workplace climate, and voluntary employee discretions that dictate daily operational execution (Amrutha & Geetha, 2020; Boiral, 2009; Daily et al., 2009).

To address this critical gap, two dominant theoretical frameworks provide foundational insights. Stuart L. Hart's (1995) Natural-Resource-Based View (NRBV) posits that sustained competitive advantage in environmentally constrained markets relies upon three interconnected, path-dependent capabilities: pollution prevention, product stewardship, and clean technology (Hart & Dowell, 2011). Crucially, NRBV underscores that product stewardship integrating environmental considerations into product design cannot be credibly achieved without an established internal baseline of pollution prevention and employee involvement (Hart, 1995; Sharma & Vredenburg, 1998). Complementing this internal resource perspective, Papadas et al. (2017, 2019) conceptualized the Tripartite Green Marketing Orientation (GMO) framework, establishing that a truly green-oriented firm must achieve alignment across three distinct operational dimensions: Strategic Green Marketing Orientation (SGMO), Internal Green Marketing Orientation (IGMO), and Tactical Green Marketing Orientation (TGMO). While SGMO reflects long-term executive commitments and TGMO encompasses short-term 4P marketing mix adaptations, IGMO represents the internal dissemination of environmental values, employee training, and cultural alignment across functional departments (Papadas et al., 2017, 2019).

Despite these conceptual advancements, existing literature remains fragmented. Prior studies have predominantly examined organizational behavior constructs such as Green Transformational Leadership (GTL) or Green Human Resource Management (GHRM) in isolation from market-facing green marketing strategies (Liu et al., 2022; Pinzone et al., 2016; RSIS, 2024). Conversely, marketing scholars have frequently evaluated green marketing orientations without dissecting the micro-foundational employee behaviors and climate conditions necessary to execute eco-design

(Mishra et al., 2019; Papadas et al., 2019). Consequently, there is an urgent theoretical and practical imperative to synthesize these streams into an integrated structural framework.

This study aims to address this gap by systematically investigating the alignment between Organizational Behavior and Green Marketing Initiatives as a dual engine for Sustainable Product Innovation. Specifically, this research pursues three primary objectives:

1. To articulate the multi-level structural mechanisms through which Organizational Behavior antecedents (GTL, GHRM via the Ability-Motivation-Opportunity model, Green Knowledge, and GOC) interact with Green Marketing Orientations (SGMO, IGMO, TGMO).

2. To synthesize empirical evidence regarding the mediating role of discretionary employee behavior specifically Organizational Citizenship Behavior towards the Environment (OCBE) and the moderating boundary conditions imposed by organizational climate and knowledge management.

3. To construct an integrative conceptual framework that explicates how authentic alignment mitigates governance paradoxes such as greenwashing and greenhushing, offering actionable strategic guidance for industrial enterprises.

2. Method

To build a rigorous, comprehensive, and objective analysis set at the standard of high-impact international journals, this study adopted a dual methodological design: a Systematic Literature Review (SLR) guided by the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA 2020) principles (Page et al., 2021), combined with a critical empirical synthesis of quantitative structural equation models (PLS-SEM and CB-SEM/AMOS) and qualitative case studies available within the domain literature (Ge et al., 2018; Laurin & Fantazy, 2017; Liu et al., 2022; Papadas et al., 2019; RSIS, 2024).

Literature Identification and Selection Strategy

The literature identification protocol targeted high-quality, peer-reviewed journals indexed in Scopus and Web of Science (with SJR > 1.0) published across the foundational and contemporary eras of green marketing and organizational strategy (1995–2026). Key search strings combined primary domain terms: `("Green Marketing Orientation" OR "Strategic Green Marketing" OR "Internal Green Marketing") AND ("Organizational Behavior" OR "Green Transformational Leadership" OR "OCBE" OR "Green HRM") AND ("Sustainable Product Innovation" OR "Green Product Innovation" OR "Eco-Design")`.

The screening process evaluated records against specific inclusion criteria:

1. Empirical or conceptual focus on firm-level or multi-level green marketing strategies, organizational behavior, leadership, or sustainable product innovation.

2. Methodological rigor, requiring explicit reporting of structural equation modeling fit indices (χ^2/df, CFI, TLI, RMSEA, SRMR), path coefficients (eta), mediation confidence intervals (Bootstrap 95% CI), or validated qualitative case evidence.

3. Theoretical grounding in NRBV, Resource-Based View, Tripartite GMO, Social Learning Theory, or the Ability-Motivation-Opportunity (AMO) framework.

Out of the initial database identification, 30 primary empirical studies and comprehensive systematic reviews were selected for detailed data extraction and thematic synthesis.

Construct Operationalization

To establish analytical clarity, the core theoretical constructs examined across the literature were operationalized into distinct behavioral, strategic, and performance dimensions, as detailed in Table 1.

Table 1.

Construct	Operational Definition	Primary Measurement Indicators	Theoretical Foundation
Strategic Green Marketing Orientation (SGMO)	The extent to which an organization integrates environmental imperatives into long-term strategic marketing decisions and corporate vision (Papadas et al., 2017).	Executive environmental commitment, long-term green vision, strategic eco-alliances, low-carbon technology investments.	Natural-Resource-Based View (Hart, 1995; Hart & Dowell, 2011).
Internal Green Marketing Orientation (IGMO)	The internal dissemination and assimilation of environmental values across organizational culture and cross-functional teams (Papadas et al., 2017).	Internal green workshops, cross-departmental environmental communication, recognition of green behavior, shared green values.	Tripartite GMO Theory (Papadas et al., 2017, 2019).
Tactical Green Marketing Orientation (TGMO)	The operational adaptation of the traditional marketing mix (4Ps) to deliver environmentally responsible value propositions (Papadas et al., 2017; Mishra et al., 2019).	Recyclable packaging, eco-labeling, green pricing adjustments, paperless distribution, green promotional transparency.	Marketing Mix Adaptation Theory (Leonidou et al., 2013; Mishra et al., 2019).
Green Transformational Leadership (GTL)	Leadership behavior that inspires, motivates, and intellectually stimulates subordinates to achieve environmental goals (Robertson & Barling, 2013, 2017).	Environmental idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration.	Social Learning Theory (Bandura, 1977; Robertson & Barling, 2013).
Green Organizational Climate (GOC)	Shared employee perceptions regarding the organization's pro-environmental policies, procedures, and behavioral expectations (Norton et al., 2014; Liu et al., 2022).	Perception of management support for ecology, clarity of environmental norms, psychological safety for eco-initiatives.	Organizational Climate Theory (Schneider et al., 1998; Norton et al., 2014).
Green HRM (AMO Framework)	Human resource architectures structured around Ability, Motivation, and Opportunity to build	Green recruitment criteria, environmental training programs, green performance	Ability-Motivation-Opportunity Model (Renwick et al., 2016; RSIS, 2024).

	environmental capabilities (Renwick et al., 2016; RSIS, 2024).	KPIs/rewards, employee green involvement.	
Organizational Citizenship Behavior towards the Environment (OCBE)	Voluntary, extra-role employee actions that fall outside formal job duties but contribute to organizational environmental management (Boiral, 2009; Daily et al., 2009).	Sharing tacit green ideas, voluntary waste reduction, encouraging peer eco-awareness, questioning unsustainable practices.	Extra-Role Behavior Theory (Organ, 1988; Boiral, 2009).
Sustainable Product Innovation (SPI)	Product improvements or novel designs that reduce environmental impacts across the full life cycle while fulfilling consumer needs (Chang, 2016; Ge et al., 2018).	Use of eco-friendly/recycled materials, energy efficiency in use, design for disassembly/circularity, reduced post-consumer waste.	Innovation & Product Stewardship (Hart, 1995; Pujari et al., 2003).

3. Results and Discussion

Direct Structural Relationships: Strategy, Leadership, and Product Innovation

Empirical findings across the reviewed literature consistently demonstrate that both strategic green marketing orientation and environmentally specific leadership serve as primary direct antecedents of Sustainable Product Innovation. In a quantitative study of manufacturing enterprises, Liu et al. (2022) established a significant direct positive path between Green Transformational Leadership (GTL) and Green Product Innovation (GPI) ($eta = 0.226, p < 0.001$), with a total effect of $eta = 0.598 (p < 0.001)$. Leaders who actively model environmental values, articulate an inspiring ecological vision, and intellectually stimulate employees to challenge resource-intensive paradigms directly catalyze eco-design ideas (Chen & Chang, 2013; Robertson & Barling, 2017).

Similarly, studies examining Green Marketing Orientation confirm that Strategic Green Marketing Orientation (SGMO) exerts a powerful direct impact on sustainable innovation and firm performance (Casidy & Papadas, 2026; Mishra et al., 2019; Papadas et al., 2019). Analyzing B2B manufacturing firms, Casidy and Papadas (2026) revealed that Perceived Strategic Green Marketing Orientation (PSGMO) directly enhances buyer trust, commitment, and willingness to pay premiums ($eta = 0.780 ext{ to } 0.891, p < 0.001$). Furthermore, Wang (2020) and Negi et al. (2023) demonstrated that SGMO directly drives green product innovation, establishing that top-management integration of environmental goals provides necessary capital, technology allocation, and strategic prioritization for eco-design projects.

Mediating Mechanisms: The Internal Behavioral Bridge

A central empirical discovery emerging from structural equation analyses is that direct strategic directives alone account for only a fraction of variance in sustainable product innovation. The conversion of strategic intent into physical product innovation relies on sequential mediation through internal organizational behavior and internal green marketing orientation.

1. The Mediating Role of OCBE: Liu et al. (2022) conducted deviation-corrected Bootstrap mediation analysis (5,000 resamples) examining Chinese manufacturing firms ($N = 312$). Their structural model confirmed that Organizational Citizenship Behavior towards the Environment (OCBE) significantly mediates the relationship between Green Transformational Leadership and Green Product Innovation (indirect effect $= 0.372, 95\% ext{ CI } [0.283, 0.466]$). While GTL provides the inspirational catalyst, the actual day-to-day identification of eco-friendly materials, energy-saving design tweaks, and cross-departmental problem-solving depends on voluntary, extra-role behaviors exhibited by frontline employees (Boiral, 2009; Daily et al., 2009).

2. The Mediating Role of IGMO: Papadas et al. (2019) and Casidy and Papadas (2026) demonstrated that Internal Green Marketing Orientation (IGMO) operates as a indispensable structural mediator connecting Strategic Green Marketing Orientation (SGMO) to Tactical Green Marketing Orientation (TGMO) and innovation outcomes. Without IGMO manifested in employee green training, internal sustainability awards, and cross-functional environmental committees SGMO directives remain isolated at the executive suite, producing operational friction and failing to generate the internal collaboration required for product stewardship (Papadas et al., 2017, 2019).

3. The Mediating Role of Job Satisfaction and GHRM: In a cross-sectional empirical study of manufacturing enterprises, the RSIS/ABC study (2024) ($N = 327$) confirmed that Green Human Resource Management (GHRM) practices positively impact OCBE ($eta = 0.621, R^2 = 0.385, p < 0.001$), with employee job satisfaction operating as a significant partial mediator (Sobel test $p < 0.05$; correlation $r = 0.711$). GHRM practices built upon the AMO framework—such as green recruitment, eco-training, and green rewards—enhance employee job satisfaction by aligning corporate values with personal environmental ethics, thereby driving discretionary workplace green initiatives (Freire & Pieta, 2022; Renwick et al., 2016).

Moderating Boundary Conditions: Climate and Knowledge Management

The structural conversion of leadership and green strategy into innovative outcomes is bounded by contextual organizational conditions. Structural regression models highlight two dominant moderating variables:

1. Green Organizational Climate (GOC) as a Behavioral Amplifier: Liu et al. (2022) tested the moderating effect of perceived Green Organizational Climate on the path between GTL and employee OCBE. Hierarchical regression confirmed a statistically significant positive interaction term ($eta = 0.126, p < 0.01$), with the model explanatory power increasing from $R^2 = 0.518$ to $R^2 = 0.529$. Simple slope analysis revealed that under conditions of a strong GOC where employees perceive consistent organizational support, clear environmental policies, and psychological safety for sustainability initiatives the positive impact of GTL on employee OCBE is significantly pronounced. Conversely, in a weak GOC, where environmental goals conflict with short-term cost-cutting demands, the capacity of GTL to stimulate voluntary green behavior is severely muted (Norton et al., 2014; Schneider et al., 1998).

2. Green Knowledge Management and Absorptive Capacity: Empirical syntheses by Ge et al. (2018) and Martinez-Falco et al. (2026) demonstrated that Green Knowledge Management (GKM) acts as a critical moderating and mediating mechanism. Accumulating tacit environmental knowledge such as expertise in life-cycle assessment (LCA), bio-based material capabilities, and circular economy design principles strengthens the firm's green absorptive

capacity, allowing frontline teams to translate strategic goals into technically viable, high-quality product innovations (Damarani et al., 2025; Riva et al., 2021).

A synthesis of core empirical path models from key studies across reviewed manufacturing contexts is summarized in Table 2.

Source Study & Context	Structural Path Evaluated	Direct / Indirect Effect (eta)	Fit Indices & Statistical Metrics	Core Empirical Finding
Liu et al. (2022) China Manufacturing ($N = 312$)				

Discussion

Theoretical Integration: NRBV, GMO, and Social Learning Synthesis

The empirical findings synthesized in this study provide compelling support for an integrated theoretical paradigm combining the Natural-Resource-Based View (Hart, 1995; Hart & Dowell, 2011), Tripartite Green Marketing Orientation theory (Papadas et al., 2017, 2019), and Social Learning Theory (Bandura, 1977; Robertson & Barling, 2013).

From an NRBV perspective, Sustainable Product Innovation represents the operational manifestation of product stewardship (Hart, 1995). However, a critical structural principle within NRBV is path dependence: an enterprise cannot credibly execute product stewardship or capture market premiums without first establishing an internal capability baseline of pollution prevention and employee engagement (Hart & Dowell, 2011; Sharma & Vredenburg, 1998). When executive management attempts to deploy external Tactical Green Marketing Orientation (TGMO)—such as eco-labeling or green promotional campaigns—without cultivating Internal Green Marketing Orientation (IGMO) and employee OCBE, the firm violates NRBV path dependence. This structural misalignment creates cognitive dissonance among internal employees and exposes the enterprise to severe reputational damage from external stakeholders (Daou et al., 2025a; Papadas et al., 2019).

Furthermore, Social Learning Theory (Bandura, 1977) elucidates the precise behavioral mechanism governing this internal transformation. Green Transformational Leaders function as social role models who demonstrate environmental commitment through daily managerial actions (Robertson & Barling, 2017). When employees observe supervisors prioritizing ecological criteria over short-term expediency, they internalize pro-environmental subjective norms (Ajzen, 1991; JDMHI, 2024). Structured through GHRM architectures under the Ability-Motivation-Opportunity (AMO) model, employees acquire tacit green knowledge (Ability), receive psychological reinforcement and job satisfaction through aligned corporate values (Motivation), and are granted autonomy through environmental committees and suggestion channels (Opportunity) (Renwick et al., 2016; RSIS, 2024). Consequently, voluntary OCBE emerges as an organic, self-sustaining organizational capability that directly feeds product stewardship and green product design (Boiral, 2009; Daily et al., 2009; Liu et al., 2022).

Organizational Behavior as the Internal Engine

The synthesis of empirical data establishes that Organizational Behavior is not merely a supportive background factor, but the core internal engine that operationalizes green marketing initiatives. As illustrated by real-world industrial case evidence such as IKEA's global "People & Planet Positive" strategy achieving ambitious sustainable innovation goals (e.g., circular product design, 100% renewable/recycled material utilization, and climate positivity) requires deep multi-level organizational integration (Korez Vide et al., 2024; Laurin & Fantazy, 2017; Play It Green, 2023).

IKEA operationalizes its strategic vision through a dedicated corporate Sustainability Group, enforcing the binding IWAY Standard across tier-1, tier-2, and tier-3 global suppliers, while fostering a flat, democratic design culture that empowers cross-functional teams to innovate flat-pack circular furniture architectures (Korez Vide et al., 2024; Laurin & Fantazy, 2017). Similarly, in B2B manufacturing contexts such as cosmetic packaging production, Damarani and Raharjo (2023) and Damarani et al. (2025) demonstrated that shifting from conventional plastic packaging to biodegradable, Life Cycle Assessment (LCA)-verified materials requires structured management planning, employee eco-skills training, and ISO 14001 compliance governance to satisfy global regulatory demands (EU Regulation EC No 1223/2009).

Mitigating Governance Paradoxes: Greenwashing versus Greenhushing

When organizational behavior is misaligned with green marketing initiatives, enterprises inevitably succumb to one of two destructive governance paradoxes:

1. Greenwashing: Occurs when executive leadership deploys aggressive external Tactical Green Marketing Orientation (TGMO) such as promotional campaigns, eco-labels, or bold carbon-neutral claims without establishing corresponding internal capabilities, GHRM systems, or an NRBV operational baseline of pollution prevention (Badhwar et al., 2024; Daou et al., 2025a; Mishra et al., 2019). Exposure of greenwashing triggers severe consumer expectation disconfirmation, destroys brand trust, invites regulatory penalties, and demotivates internal employees who perceive executive hypocrisy (Daou et al., 2025a; Forliano et al., 2025).

2. Greenhushing: Represents the deliberate under-communication or suppression of legitimate sustainability achievements by corporate leadership, driven by extreme risk aversion to public scrutiny, legal liability, or regulatory backlash (Forliano et al., 2025; Papadas et al., 2019). While avoiding external controversy, greenhushing starves the organization of Internal Green Marketing Orientation (IGMO). When leadership fails to communicate green milestones, internal employees remain unaware of corporate progress, which severely suppresses organizational pride, diminishes OCBE, and halts the cross-functional knowledge sharing necessary for continuous eco-innovation (Boiral, 2009; Renwick et al., 2016).

Authentic alignment solves both paradoxes by establishing a transparent, bi-directional flow where internal operational capabilities (NRBV baseline, GHRM, OCBE) strictly validate external marketing claims (TGMO), while internal marketing initiatives (IGMO) actively celebrate and reinforce employee green achievements. A comparative analysis of these organizational archetypes is presented in Table 3.

Table 3.

Governance Archetype	Structural Configuration	Primary Organizational Mechanism	Impact on Innovation & Brand Equity
Greenwashing	High TGMO, Low SGMO, Low IGMO, Low OCBE.	External marketing mix decoupled from internal capabilities; lack of baseline pollution prevention (Badhwar et al., 2024).	Transient public interest followed by catastrophic loss of trust, brand erosion, regulatory fines, and employee cynicism (Daou et al., 2025a).
Greenhushing	Moderate SGMO, High Operational Compliance, Low IGMO, Zero TGMO.	Deliberate suppression of environmental wins due to executive risk aversion (Forliano et al., 2025).	Suppresses employee OCBE, halts cross-functional green learning, forfeits green price premiums, degrades brand differentiation.
Authentic Strategic Alignment	High SGMO, High IGMO, High TGMO, High GTL, High OCBE.	Multi-level integration; NRBV path dependence; GHRM/AMO activation; verified EMA governance (Papadas et al., 2019).	Sustained competitive advantage, continuous eco-product innovation, resilient brand loyalty, verified ESG performance.

Strategic Roadmap for Managerial Implementation

To achieve authentic strategic alignment, corporate executives and HR directors must implement a structured, four-phase operational roadmap:

1. Phase 1: Baseline Governance and Operational Readiness: Leadership must implement Environmental Management Accounting (EMA) systems to establish transparent data tracking of physical material flows and carbon footprints (Zainuddin et al., 2025). Concurrently, manufacturing operations must eliminate basic waste inefficiencies, establishing the NRBV baseline of pollution prevention before initiating external green claims (Hart, 1995).

2. Phase 2: Internal Activation and Behavioral Capability Building: Executive management must undergo GTL coaching to learn environmental role-modeling techniques (Robertson & Barling, 2017). HR divisions must reconfigure talent architectures around the AMO model—integrating ecological criteria into recruitment, delivering specialized eco-design training, and tying management bonuses to verified sustainability KPIs (Renwick et al., 2016; RSIS, 2024).

3. Phase 3: Internal Green Marketing Orientation (IGMO): Organizations must build internal communication channels, cross-functional green innovation teams, and recognition platforms to celebrate employee OCBE (Papadas et al., 2017, 2019). Disseminating green knowledge internally builds psychological safety, eliminates departmental silos, and aligns employee personal values with corporate strategic goals (Liu et al., 2022).

4. Phase 4: Tactical Execution and Market Differentiation (TGMO): Once internal behavioral readiness is secured, product development teams execute Sustainable Product Innovations utilizing circular materials, design-for-disassembly, and energy-efficient architectures (Damarani et al., 2025; Korez Vide et al., 2024). Marketing teams then deploy

transparent, LCA-verified promotional mix strategies, eco-labeling, and green pricing models to capture market share and establish eco-brand engagement without greenwashing risks (Casidy & Papadas, 2026; Zainuddin et al., 2025).

Conclusion

This research demonstrates that Sustainable Product Innovation is fundamentally an emergent outcome of aligning internal Organizational Behavior with external Green Marketing Initiatives. Drawing upon the Natural-Resource-Based View, Tripartite Green Marketing Orientation theory, and Social Learning Theory, this study breaks down traditional disciplinary silos between organizational management and strategic marketing. The empirical synthesis confirms that while executive leadership (GTL) and strategic vision (SGMO) provide indispensable direction, their ultimate conversion into innovative eco-products is mediated by internal green culture (IGMO) and voluntary frontline employee actions (OCBE), bounded by a supportive organizational climate (GOC) and green human resource architectures (GHRM/AMO).

By adhering to NRBV path dependence and embedding environmental values throughout the internal organizational fabric, industrial enterprises can successfully bridge the strategy-execution gap, eliminate the destructive risks of greenwashing and greenhushing, and achieve

References

Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 50*(2), 179–211. https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T

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

Badhwar, A., Islam, S., Tan, C. L., Panwar, T., Wigley, S., & Nayak, R. (2024). Unraveling green marketing and greenwashing: A systematic review in the context of the fashion and textiles industry. *Sustainability, 16*(7), 2738. https://doi.org/10.3390/su16072738

Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Prentice-Hall.

Boiral, O. (2009). Greening the corporation through organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Business Ethics, 87*(2), 221–236. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-008-9882-z

Casidy, R., & Papadas, K. (2026). Perceived strategic green marketing orientation and buyer–supplier relational outcomes: Evidence from small- and medium-sized enterprises. *Business Strategy and the Environment, 35*(1), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.71464

Chang, C. H. (2016). The determinants of green product innovation performance. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management, 23*(2), 65–76. https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.1361

Chen, Y. S., & Chang, C. H. (2013). The determinants of green product development performance: Green dynamic capabilities, green transformational leadership, and green creativity. *Journal of Business Ethics, 116*(1), 107–119. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-012-1452-x

Daily, B. F., Bishop, J. W., & Govindarajulu, N. (2009). A conceptual model for organizational citizenship behavior directed toward the environment. *Business & Society, 48*(2), 243–256. https://doi.org/10.1177/0007650308315439

Damarani, Z. N., Nurdianasari, R., & Maharani, S. (2025). Sustainable innovation in marketing: A literature review on green products and design for sustainability in a manufacturing cosmetic company. *International Research Journal of Economics and Management Studies, 4*(5), 148–154. https://doi.org/10.56472/25835238/IRJEMS-V4I5P120

Damarani, Z. N., & Raharjo, S. T. (2023). Analisis kinerja pemasaran dari perspektif produk ramah lingkungan (green product) dan desain untuk keberlanjutan (design for sustainability). *Jurnal Akuntansi dan Pajak, 23*(2), 1–12.

Daou, L., Sayegh, E., Atallah, E., Jabbour Al Maalouf, N., & Sarkis, N. (2025). Greenwashing as a barrier to sustainable marketing: Expectation disconfirmation, confusion, and brand–consumer relationships. *Sustainability, 17*(22), 9979. https://doi.org/10.3390/su17229979

Eneizan, B. (2019). Green marketing strategies: Theoretical approach. *American Journal of Economics and Business Management, 2*(2), 80–94.

Forliano, C., Battisti, E., De Bernardi, P., & Kliestik, T. (2025). Mapping the greenwashing research landscape: A theoretical and field analysis. *Review of Managerial Science, 19*(3), 1–50. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11846-024-00780-1

Freire, C., & Pieta, P. (2022). The impact of green human resource management on organizational citizenship behaviors: The mediating role of organizational identification and job satisfaction. *Sustainability, 14*(13), 7557. https://doi.org/10.3390/su14137557

Ge, B., Yang, Y., Jiang, D., Gao, Y., Du, X., & Zhou, T. (2018). An empirical study on green innovation strategy and sustainable competitive advantages: Path and boundaries. *Sustainability, 10*(10), 3631. https://doi.org/10.3390/su10103631

Hart, S. L. (1995). A natural-resource-based view of the firm. *Academy of Management Review, 20*(4), 986–1014. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1995.9512280033

Hart, S. L., & Dowell, G. (2011). Invited editorial: A natural-resource-based view of the firm: Fifteen years after. *Journal of Management, 37*(5), 1464–1479. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206310390219

JDMHI. (2024). Theory of planned behavior on green marketing influence to green purchase decision. *Journal of Digital Marketing and Halal Industry, 6*(1), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.21580/jdmhi.2024.6.1.20694

Korez Vide, R., Hunjet, A., & Sesar, V. (2024). Sustainable global value chain: The case of IKEA. In *FEB case studies: Development, sustainability, and innovation in business practice* (pp. 211–230). https://doi.org/10.18690/um.epf.8.2024.8

Laurin, F., & Fantazy, K. (2017). Sustainable supply chain management: A case study at IKEA. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management, 45*(12), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1080/19186444.2017.1401208

Leonidou, C. N., Katsikeas, C. S., & Morgan, N. A. (2013). "Greening" the marketing mix: Do firms do it and does it pay off? *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 41*(2), 151–170. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-012-0317-2

Liu, X., Yu, X., & Xing, W. (2022). Green product innovation via green transformational leadership and employees' OCBE: The moderating role of green organizational climate:

Empirical evidence from China's manufacturing enterprises. *Polish Journal of Environmental Studies, 31*(5), 4487–4498. https://doi.org/10.15244/pjoes/150015

Martinez-Falco, J., Sanchez-Garcia, E., Marco-Lajara, B., & Carneiro-Zen, A. (2026). Green organizational antecedents of managerially perceived green brand image in wineries: A dual-path mediation analysis through green knowledge management. *British Food Journal, 128*(2), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1108/BFJ-05-2025-0412

Mishra, M., Choudhury, D., & Rao, K. (2019). Impact of strategic and tactical green marketing orientation on SMEs performance. *Theoretical Economics Letters, 9*(5), 1633–1650. https://doi.org/10.4236/tel.2019.95104

Negi, R., Gupta, A. K., & Gaur, V. (2023). Effect of green marketing orientation dimensions on green innovation and organizational performance: A mediation-moderation analysis. *Business Strategy and the Environment, 32*(8), 5435–5458. https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.3456

Norton, T. A., Zacher, H., & Ashkanasy, N. M. (2014). Organisational sustainability policies and employee green behaviour: The mediating role of work climate perceptions. *Journal of Environmental Psychology, 38*, 49–57. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2013.12.008

Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington Books.

Ottman, J. A., Stafford, E. R., & Hartman, C. L. (2006). Avoiding green marketing myopia: Ways to improve consumer appeal for environmentally preferable products. *Environment: Science and Policy for Sustainable Development, 48*(5), 22–36. https://doi.org/10.3200/ENVT.48.5.22-36

Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., & Moher, D. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ, 372*, n71. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71

Papadas, K. K., Avlonitis, G. J., & Carrigan, M. (2017). Green marketing orientation: Conceptualization, scale development and validation. *Journal of Business Research, 80*, 236–246. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2017.05.024

Papadas, K. K., Avlonitis, G. J., Carrigan, M., & Piha, L. (2019). The interplay of strategic and internal green marketing orientation on competitive advantage. *Journal of Business Research, 104*, 632–643. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2018.07.009

Pinzone, M., Guerci, M., Lettieri, E., & Redman, T. (2016). Progressing in the change journey towards sustainability in healthcare: The role of "Green" HRM. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 122*, 201–211. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.02.031

Play It Green. (2023). *The sustainability success of IKEA: A case study*. Play It Green Publications.

Popović, S., Cvetković, M., & Avramović, M. (2023). Green marketing in the function of sustainable development. *Economics, 69*(2), 61–73. https://doi.org/10.5937/economica2302061P

Pujari, D., Wright, G., & Peattie, K. (2003). Green and competitive: Influences on environmental new product development performance. *Journal of Business Research, 56*(8), 657–671. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963(01)00310-1

Renwick, D. W., Jabbour, C. J., Muller-Camen, M., Redman, T., & Wilkinson, A. (2016). Contemporary developments in green (environmental) HRM scholarship. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 27*(2), 114–128. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2015.1105844

Riva, F., Magrizos, S., & Rubel, M. R. B. (2021). Investigating the link between managers' green knowledge and leadership style, and their firms' environmental performance: The mediation role of green creativity. *Business Strategy and the Environment, 30*(8), 3228–3240. https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.2799

Robertson, J. L., & Barling, J. (2013). Greening organizations through leaders' influence on employees' proenvironmental behaviors. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 34*(2), 176–194. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1820

Robertson, J. L., & Barling, J. (2017). Contrasting the nature and effects of environmentally specific and general transformational leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 38*(1), 22–41. https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-05-2015-0100

RSIS. (2024). Impact of green human resource management practices on organizational citizenship behavior: Job satisfaction: The study of ABC manufacturing company in Sri Lanka. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science, 8*(9), 207–227. https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2024.8090207

Schneider, B., White, S. S., & Paul, M. C. (1998). Linking service climate and customer perceptions of service quality: Test of a causal model. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83*(2), 150–163. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.83.2.150

Sharma, S., & Vredenburg, H. (1998). Proactive corporate environmental strategy and the development of competitively valuable organizational capabilities. *Strategic Management Journal, 19*(8), 729–753. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-0266(199808)19:8<729::AID-SMJ967>3.0.CO;2-4

Union, E. (2019). Regulation (EC) No 1223/2009 on cosmetic products. *Official Journal of the European Union, L 342*, 59–209.

Wang, C. H. (2020). An environmental perspective extends market orientation: Green innovation sustainability. *Business Strategy and the Environment, 29*(8), 3123–3134. https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.2562

Zainuddin, M. Z., Tamburaka, S., & Dali, N. (2025). Consumer green behavior and sustainability accounting-based marketing innovation: A systematic framework for eco-brand engagement. *Ilomata International Journal of Tax and Accounting, 6*(4), 2188. https://doi.org/10.61194/ijtc.v6i4.2188