



## Examining Green Transformational Leadership, Group Cohesiveness and Organizational Justice in Reducing Turnover Intention and Enhancing Sustainable Employee Performance

Lisa Septiani<sup>1</sup>, Anik Herminingsih<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Universitas Mercu Buana, Jakarta, Indonesia, [55122110057@student.mercubuana.ac.id](mailto:55122110057@student.mercubuana.ac.id)

<sup>2</sup>Universitas Mercu Buana, Jakarta, Indonesia, [anik\\_herminingsih@mercubuana.ac.id](mailto:anik_herminingsih@mercubuana.ac.id)

Corresponding Author: [55122110057@student.mercubuana.ac.id](mailto:55122110057@student.mercubuana.ac.id)<sup>1</sup>

**Abstract:** This research investigates how green transformational leadership (GTL), group cohesiveness (GC), and organizational justice (OJ) affect employee sustainable performance (ESP), with turnover intention (TOI) acting as an intermediary. The study, conducted at PT Puyo Indonesia Kreasi, emphasizes the significance of sustainable leadership, teamwork, and fairness in boosting employee performance that aligns with environmental, social, and economic objectives. Utilizing Structural Equation Modeling (SEM), the results indicate notable positive correlations between green transformational leadership, group cohesiveness, organizational justice, and employee sustainable performance, while turnover intention negatively mediates these connections. The study emphasizes an integrated approach that combines eco-friendly leadership, cohesive teamwork, and justice driven policies to enhance ESP and minimize TOI. GTL fosters an environmentally conscious workplace by embedding sustainability values into corporate culture, inspiring employees toward sustainable behaviors. GC strengthens collaboration, trust, and shared commitment, creating a foundation for long-term performance. OJ enhances employee motivation and loyalty by ensuring fairness in decision-making and resource allocation. However, high TOI disrupts ESP by reducing engagement and workforce stability. The findings offer managerial insights, advocating for sustainability focused leadership programs, structured team building, and fairness audits. Future research should explore these relationships across diverse contexts using longitudinal methods to capture dynamic changes in sustainable performance.

**Keyword:** Green Transformational Leadership, Group Cohesiveness, Organizational Justice, Turnover Intention, Employee Sustainable Performance

### INTRODUCTION

Recognizing its critical importance, sustainable development is now a key area of study in universities and a guiding principle for businesses. Reflecting this, the United Nations' Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) highlight the need for economic growth that is both inclusive and environmentally sound. Goal 8 specifically addresses this by advocating for productive employment and fair labor practices for everyone (United Nations, 2015).

Organizations play a pivotal role in ensuring economic stability by providing quality employment, implementing ethical business practices, and minimizing negative environmental impacts (Hamid & Hosna, 2021). Employee sustainable performance, defined as the ability to maintain high productivity and well-being over time is a crucial component of long term organizational success (Ji et al., 2021). This is particularly relevant in industries relying on daily workers, who often experience job insecurity, irregular work hours and limited social protection. Ensuring sustainable employee performance requires impactful leadership, cohesive teamwork and fair organizational policies.

Green transformational leadership has been recognized as a key driver in fostering sustainable work behaviors. This leadership approach encourages employees to adopt eco-friendly practices, instills a culture of environmental responsibility and enhances overall commitment (Saleem et al., 2024). Studies have shown that green transformational leadership positively influences employee retention by reducing turnover intention (Kim et al., 2021). Another critical factor is group cohesiveness, which fosters collaboration, trust and shared objectives among employees (Ispiryan et al., 2024). High levels of group cohesion have been linked to greater job satisfaction and lower turnover intention, ultimately enhancing workforce stability and performance (Chuang et al., 2022).

Organizational justice, which includes procedural, distributive, and interactional fairness, significantly influences employee attitudes and behaviors. When employees perceive fairness in decisions, resource distribution, and interactions, they tend to be more committed to the organization and less likely to leave (Farooq et al., 2022; Ahmed et al., 2021). Ensuring fairness within an organization strengthens employee trust and motivation, leading to improved longterm performance. Turnover intention serves as a mediating variable in the correlation from leadership, team cohesiveness and organizational justice with sustainable performance. High turnover rates disrupt team dynamics, reduce efficiency, and escalate operational costs (Hom et al., 2017). Mitigating turnover intention through strategic leadership, cohesive teams, and equitable organizational policies is therefore essential for sustaining employee performance.

Aiming to understand how to improve employee sustainable performance, this research delves into the roles of green transformational leadership, group cohesiveness, and organizational justice. It also investigates whether turnover intention acts as a mediating factor, potentially hindering or enhancing these effects. Using structural equation modeling (SEM), data collected from employees at PT Puyo Indonesia Kreasi will be analyzed to understand these interactions and their implications for organizational success. The findings will provide valuable insights for business leaders and policymakers in designing sustainability driven workforce strategies. By integrating sustainable leadership, fostering cohesive teams and ensuring organizational justice, businesses can cultivate a more engaged and resilient workforce. This research underscores the importance of a comprehensive approach to workforce sustainability, aligning employee well being with organizational objectives and environmental stewardship.

## **METHOD**

Focusing on the operational division of PT. Puyo Indonesia Kreasi, this research uses a quantitative methodology to explore the influence of Green Transformational Leadership, Group Cohesiveness, and Organizational Justice on Employee Sustainable Performance. The study also examines the mediating role of Turnover Intention. Causal relationships were analyzed using a structured questionnaire, with employee responses measured on a Likert scale ranging from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree.

The sample size is determined using Slovin's formula, resulting in 181 respondents selected through simple random sampling. This method ensures equal representation of

employees, minimizing bias in the research findings. Primary data is collected through surveys, while additional qualitative insights are gathered through direct observations and interviews. Descriptive statistical analysis is employed to summarize the data, while inferential statistics, particularly PLS-SEM, is utilized to test the hypotheses and assess the correlations from variables.

The study's measurement model (outer model) was evaluated for reliability and validity using tests for convergent validity, discriminant validity, and Cronbach's Alpha to assess internal consistency. Structural model assessment (inner model) examines path coefficients, R-square values, and predictive relevance ( $Q^2$ ) to determine the significance of the relationships. Bootstrapping is used to validate the robustness of statistical results, ensuring the research's findings are both reliable and generalizable.

By integrating quantitative analysis with rigorous statistical evaluation, this methodology ensures the accuracy and validity of the study's conclusions. The use of advanced statistical tools enhances the reliability of the research findings, providing valuable insights into the impacts of leadership, group dynamics, and organizational fairness on employee turnover intention and sustainable performance. By considering these factors, this research offers a more complete picture of what drives employee retention and promotes long-term organizational success.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Results

Green Transformational Leadership (GTL) integrates transformational leadership principles with environmental sustainability to inspire eco-friendly behaviors and improve organizational performance. GTL emphasizes vision, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration, enhancing employee engagement, reducing turnover intention, and promoting long-term environmental responsibility (Ding, Su, & Hahn, 2023). Leaders practicing GTL promote green HR practices and align individual goals with organizational sustainability, creating a culture of ecological consciousness (Weber & Kasab, 2024).

The impact of GTL on employee performance is further reinforced by group cohesiveness, which refers to team members' connection and commitment to group goals. Group cohesiveness enhances collaboration, communication, and mutual support, leading to improved productivity and reduced turnover intention (Forsyth, 2010). Cohesive teams demonstrate higher resilience, motivation, and job satisfaction, which are essential for maintaining high levels of performance under pressure (Chuang, Chen, & Lin, 2022). Organizations that foster cohesiveness benefit from knowledge sharing and innovative problem solving, further supporting long-term sustainable performance.

Beyond the impact of leadership and group cohesion, organizational justice is a critical factor in influencing employee attitudes and actions. Organizational justice, in this context, refers to employees' perceptions of fairness across multiple dimensions: the fairness of outcomes (distributive justice), the fairness of the processes used to make decisions (procedural justice), and the fairness of the way they are treated by others (interactional justice) (Colquitt et al., 2001). Fair practices enhance employee satisfaction, job performance, and organizational commitment, while perceived injustice can lead to dissatisfaction and higher turnover (Farooq et al., 2022). Transparent policies and equitable treatment are essential for fostering positive work environments and promoting sustainable employee performance.

The link between organizational justice and turnover intention underscores the need for supportive practices within the workplace. Turnover intention reflects employees' deliberate consideration of leaving their organization due to dissatisfaction, perceived unfairness, or a lack of growth opportunities (Hom et al., 2017). High turnover intention raises recruitment costs, reduces morale, and diminishes productivity. However, supportive leadership and fair

policies can mitigate turnover intention, enhancing employee retention and overall performance (Kim et al., 2021).

The combined effect of these factors is most evident in Employee Sustainable Performance (ESP), which refers to employees maintaining productivity, adaptability, and well-being over time while supporting organizational sustainability goals (Ji et al., 2021). Organizations promoting sustainable work environments and continuous learning see higher ESP and reduced turnover, strengthening long-term employee engagement (Docherty et al., 2022). Together, green leadership, group cohesiveness, and organizational justice create a foundation for ESP, ensuring that employees remain committed and productive in alignment with organizational goals. Given the above literature, the following hypotheses are proposed to examine the relationships among these key variables:

- 1) H1: Green transformational leadership positively predicts employee sustainable performance.
- 2) H2: Group cohesiveness positively predicts employee sustainable performance.
- 3) H3: Organizational justice positively predicts employee sustainable performance.
- 4) H4: Green transformational leadership negatively predicts turnover intention.
- 5) H5: Group cohesiveness negatively predicts turnover intention.
- 6) H6: Organizational justice negatively predicts turnover intention.
- 7) H7: Turnover intention negatively predicts employee sustainable performance.
- 8) H8: Green transformational leadership positively predicts employee sustainable performance, with turnover intention as a mediator.
- 9) H9: Group cohesiveness positively predicts employee sustainable performance, with turnover intention as a mediator.
- 10) H10: Organizational justice positively predicts employee sustainable performance, with turnover intention as a mediator.

An overview of the respondents' key demographic attributes, such as gender, age, and level of education is presented in this section. The analysis provides a comprehensive understanding of the sample composition, ensuring the representativeness and reliability of the study findings.

**Table 1. Description of Research Respondents**

Characteristics	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	78	43,09%
	Female	103	56,91%
Age	19-20 Years	25	13,81%
	21-25 Years	118	65,19%
	25-30 Years	38	20,99%
Last Education	High School	169	93,37%
	Associate Degree (D3)	11	6,08%
	Bachelor's Degree (S1)	1	0,55%

Source: Research data

### Outer Model Analysis

The validity and reliability of the relationships between observed indicators and their underlying latent constructs are evaluated through testing the measurement model (outer model) in Partial Least Squares-Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM). This evaluation process includes assessing convergent validity, discriminant validity, and construct reliability:

1. **Convergent Validity** is tested through outer loadings and Average Variance Extracted (AVE). Outer loadings should be greater than 0.7 to indicate a strong correlation between indicators and their respective constructs. AVE values must exceed 0.5 to ensure that the majority of the variance in the indicators is captured by the latent construct.

**Table 2. Outer Loading Value**

Variable	Indicator	Loading Factor	Cut Off	Result
Green transformational leadership	GTL 1	0,833	0,7	Valid
	GTL 2	0,843	0,7	Valid
	GTL 3	0,889	0,7	Valid
	GTL 4	0,864	0,7	Valid
	GTL 5	0,855	0,7	Valid
	GTL 6	0,865	0,7	Valid
Green transformational leadership	GTL 7	0,792	0,7	Valid
	GTL 8	0,847	0,7	Valid
	GTL 9	0,894	0,7	Valid
	GTL 10	0,803	0,7	Valid
Group cohesiveness	GC 1	0,822	0,7	Valid
	GC 2	0,892	0,7	Valid
	GC 3	0,908	0,7	Valid
	GC 4	0,894	0,7	Valid
	GC 5	0,848	0,7	Valid
	GC 6	0,843	0,7	Valid
	GC 7	0,890	0,7	Valid
	GC 8	0,861	0,7	Valid
	GC 9	0,868	0,7	Valid
	GC 10	0,707	0,7	Valid
	GC 11	0,880	0,7	Valid
	GC 12	0,835	0,7	Valid
	GC 13	0,846	0,7	Valid
Organizational Justice	KO 1	0,843	0,7	Valid
	KO 2	0,873	0,7	Valid
	KO 3	0,859	0,7	Valid
	KO 4	0,814	0,7	Valid
	KO 5	0,890	0,7	Valid
	KO 6	0,806	0,7	Valid
	KO 7	0,831	0,7	Valid
	KO 8	0,829	0,7	Valid
	KO 9	0,833	0,7	Valid
	KO 10	0,871	0,7	Valid
Employee sustainable performance	ESP 1	0,829	0,7	Valid
	ESP 2	0,788	0,7	Valid
	ESP 3	0,806	0,7	Valid
	ESP 4	0,877	0,7	Valid
	ESP 5	0,833	0,7	Valid
	ESP 6	0,786	0,7	Valid
	ESP 7	0,747	0,7	Valid
	ESP 8	0,865	0,7	Valid
	ESP 9	0,799	0,7	Valid
	ESP 10	0,862	0,7	Valid
	ESP 11	0,810	0,7	Valid
	ESP 12	0,806	0,7	Valid
	ESP 13	0,798	0,7	Valid

Source: Research data

**Table 3. Outer Loading Value**

Variable	Indicator	Loading Factor	Cut Off	Result
<i>Turnover intention</i>	TO 1	0,817	0,7	Valid

TO 2	0,890	0,7	Valid
TO 3	0,897	0,7	Valid
TO 4	0,894	0,7	Valid
TO 5	0,796	0,7	Valid
TO 6	0,774	0,7	Valid
TO 7	0,794	0,7	Valid
TO 8	0,746	0,7	Valid

Source: Research data

**2. Discriminant validity** ensuring that constructs are truly distinct, is evaluated using the Fornell-Larcker criterion and an examination of cross-loadings. According to the Fornell-Larcker criterion, a construct demonstrates uniqueness when the square root of its Average Variance Extracted (AVE) is greater than its correlations with all other constructs. Similarly, cross loadings should indicate that each indicator loads higher on its respective construct than on others.

**Table 4. Average Variance Extract (AVE) Value**

Variable	Average Variance Extracted (AVE)	Cut Off	Result
Green transformational leadership (X1)	0,721	0,5	Valid
Group cohesiveness (X2)	0,731	0,5	Valid
Organizational Justice (X3)	0,715	0,5	Valid

Source: Research data

**Table 5. Average Variance Extract (AVE) Value**

Variable	Average Variance Extracted (AVE)	Cut Off	Result
Turnover intention (Z)	0,685	0,5	Valid
Employee sustainable performance (Y)	0,667	0,5	Valid

Source: Research data

**Table 6. Cross Loading Results**

Construct	Employee Sustainable Performance	Group Cohesiveness	Green Transformational Leadership	Organizational Justice	Turnover Intention
ESP1	0,829	0,665	0,737	0,691	-0,638
ESP2	0,788	0,589	0,597	0,562	-0,551
ESP3	0,806	0,626	0,633	0,582	-0,628
ESP4	0,877	0,644	0,685	0,694	-0,681
ESP5	0,833	0,650	0,663	0,628	-0,557
ESP6	0,786	0,596	0,589	0,580	-0,588
ESP7	0,747	0,512	0,533	0,569	-0,630
ESP8	0,865	0,667	0,652	0,651	-0,642
ESP9	0,799	0,581	0,593	0,580	-0,536
ESP10	0,862	0,661	0,677	0,694	-0,690
ESP11	0,810	0,638	0,648	0,669	-0,625
ESP12	0,806	0,671	0,633	0,635	-0,663
ESP13	0,798	0,636	0,599	0,543	-0,571
GC1	0,651	0,822	0,661	0,657	-0,586
GC2	0,724	0,892	0,712	0,680	-0,631
GC3	0,689	0,908	0,703	0,622	-0,641

GC4	0,703	0,894	0,720	0,646	-0,676
GC5	0,627	0,848	0,672	0,580	-0,590
GC6	0,594	0,843	0,648	0,624	-0,560
GC7	0,652	0,890	0,657	0,616	-0,576
GC8	0,591	0,861	0,636	0,601	-0,569
GC9	0,613	0,868	0,637	0,631	-0,587
GC10	0,575	0,707	0,531	0,569	-0,488
GC11	0,712	0,880	0,661	0,625	-0,611
GC12	0,693	0,835	0,660	0,623	-0,545
GC13	0,684	0,846	0,632	0,571	-0,552
GTL1	0,632	0,554	0,833	0,633	-0,609
GTL2	0,647	0,670	0,843	0,668	-0,595
GTL3	0,636	0,631	0,889	0,690	-0,684
GTL4	0,635	0,665	0,864	0,697	-0,671
GTL5	0,644	0,705	0,855	0,677	-0,646
GTL6	0,708	0,670	0,865	0,702	-0,604
GTL7	0,620	0,632	0,792	0,627	-0,559
GTL8	0,616	0,671	0,847	0,695	-0,634
GTL9	0,753	0,689	0,894	0,757	-0,698
GTL10	0,708	0,646	0,803	0,699	-0,599

Source: Research data

**Table 7. Cross Loading Results**

<b>Construct</b>	<b>Employee Sustainable Performance</b>	<b>Group Cohesiveness</b>	<b>Green Transformational Leadership</b>	<b>Organizational Justice</b>	<b>Turnover Intention</b>
KO1	0,637	0,617	0,664	0,843	-0,660
KO2	0,686	0,651	0,715	0,873	-0,705
KO3	0,669	0,625	0,695	0,859	-0,666
KO4	0,619	0,584	0,657	0,814	-0,556
KO5	0,699	0,670	0,754	0,890	-0,673
KO6	0,580	0,590	0,667	0,806	-0,555
KO7	0,595	0,605	0,645	0,831	-0,618
KO8	0,634	0,564	0,621	0,829	-0,588
KO9	0,647	0,575	0,660	0,833	-0,576
KO10	0,680	0,633	0,741	0,871	-0,613
TOI1	-0,626	-0,545	-0,630	-0,591	0,817
TOI2	-0,710	-0,649	-0,692	-0,663	0,890
TOI3	-0,718	-0,619	-0,689	-0,651	0,897
TOI4	-0,722	-0,654	-0,751	-0,729	0,894
TOI5	-0,524	-0,540	-0,505	-0,515	0,796
TOI6	-0,618	-0,558	-0,613	-0,642	0,774
TOI7	-0,559	-0,503	-0,502	-0,548	0,794
TOI8	-0,454	-0,440	-0,461	-0,489	0,746

Source: Research data

**Table 8. Fornell-Lecker Criterion Results**

Variable	Employee Sustainable Performance	Group Cohesiveness	Green Transformational Leadership	Organizational Justice	Turnover Intention
ESP	0,817				
GC	0,768	0,855			
GTL	0,779	0,770	0,849		
KO	0,764	0,724	0,808	0,845	
TOI	-0,756	-0,687	-0,743	-0,737	0,828

Source: Research data

**3. Construct reliability** is assessed by calculating both Composite Reliability (CR) and Cronbach's Alpha. Values above 0.7 for both measures are generally accepted as evidence of good internal consistency, with CR reflecting the overall reliability of the construct and Cronbach's Alpha indicating the consistency among its indicators.

**Table 9. Composite Reliability and Cronbach's Alpha**

Variable	Cronbach's Alpha	Composite Reliability	Result
Employee Sustainable Performance	0,958	0,963	Reliable
Green Cohesiveness	0,969	0,972	Reliable
Green Transformational Leadership	0,957	0,963	Reliable
Organizational Justice	0,956	0,962	Reliable
Turnover Intention	0,934	0,946	Reliable

Source: Research data

By fulfilling all the criteria for validity and reliability, the outer model is deemed suitable for further analysis in the structural model (inner model) to examine the correlations from latent constructs.

**Inner Model Analysis**

The inner model analysis in PLS-SEM evaluates the structural correlations from latent variables, assessing the model's predictive power and hypothesis testing. This analysis includes path coefficient evaluation, coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ), predictive relevance ( $Q^2$ ) and the Goodness of Fit Index (GoF).

**1. Coefficient of Determination ( $R^2$ )**

The  $R^2$  value measures the proportion of variance in the dependent variable explained by the independent variables. A higher  $R^2$  indicates a stronger explanatory power of the model. According to Ghazali & Latan (2021), an  $R^2$  value above 0.75 is considered strong, between 0.50 and 0.75 is moderate, and below 0.25 is weak.

**Table 10. R-Square Results**

Variable	R-square	Criteria
<i>Employee Sustainable Performance</i>	0,728	Strong
<i>Turnover Intention</i>	0,621	Moderate

Source: Research data

The results indicate that **72.8%** of the variance in Employee Sustainable Performance is explained by Green Transformational Leadership, Group Cohesiveness, Organizational Justice, and Turnover Intention. Meanwhile, **62.1%** of the variance in Turnover Intention is explained by Green Transformational Leadership, Group Cohesiveness, and Organizational Justice.



## 2. Predictive Relevance (Q<sup>2</sup>)

The predictive relevance of the model for endogenous constructs was evaluated using the Q<sup>2</sup> statistic, derived through the blindfolding procedure. A value of Q<sup>2</sup> greater than zero supports the model’s predictive validity (Ghozali & Latan, 2021).

**Table 11: Q<sup>2</sup> Values**

Construct	Q-Square (Q <sup>2</sup> )
Employee Sustainable Performance (Y)	0,466
Turnover Intention (Z)	0,414

Source: Research data

Since both Q<sup>2</sup> values are above 0, the model exhibits strong predictive relevance.

## 3. Goodness of Fit Index (GoF)

GoF index evaluates the overall model fit by combining measurement model validity (AVE) and structural model strength (R<sup>2</sup>). The GoF value is calculated using the following formula. Since the GoF value (**0.688**) exceeds 0.36, the model has a **high level of goodness of fit**, indicating a strong model.

## Hypotesis Test

Hypothesis testing evaluates the impact of exogenous variables on endogenous variables using bootstrapping, a statistical resampling method that provides robust inferences without strict distributional assumptions. Bootstrapping enables repeated resampling to estimate statistical distributions when traditional assumptions are difficult to meet. The analysis assesses the impact of exogenous variables through path coefficients, significance levels via p-values, and impact strength using original sample values. Statistical hypothesis testing is conducted using SmartPLS 4, comparing t-statistics against a critical t-table value. In this research, with DF = 176, the t-table value at a 0.05 significance level ( $\alpha$ ) is 1.653. Decision-making follows these criteria: If p-value > 0.05 or t-statistic < t-table, the null hypothesis (H<sub>0</sub>) is accepted, and the alternative hypothesis (H<sub>a</sub>) is rejected. If p-value < 0.05 or t-statistic > t-table, the null hypothesis (H<sub>0</sub>) is rejected, and the alternative hypothesis (H<sub>a</sub>) is accepted.

**Table 12. Path Coefficients and Hypothesis Testing**

Intercorrelations from Constructs	Original Sample (O)	T Statistics ((O/STDEV))	T Table	P Values	Result
GTL → ESP	0,201	2,443	1,653	0,015	Positively and significantly influence
GC → ESP	0,291	2,719	1,653	0,007	Positively and significantly influence
KO →ESP	0,200	2,183	1,653	0,029	Positively and significantly influence
GTL → TOI	-0,320	3,276	1,653	0,001	Negatively and significantly influences
GC → TOI	-0,198	2,348	1,653	0,019	Negatively and significantly influences
KO → TOI	-0,335	3,848	1,653	0,000	Negatively and significantly influences
TOI → ESP	-0,259	4,033	1,653	0,000	Negatively and significantly influences

Source: Research data

**Table 13. Hypothesis Testing for Indirect Impacts**

Intercorrelations from Constructs	Original Sample (O)	T Statistics ((O/STDEV))	T Table	P Values	Result
GTL → TOI → ESP	0,083	2,342	1,653	0,019	Positively and significantly influence
GC → TOI → ESP	0,051	2,101	1,653	0,036	Positively and significantly influence
KO → TOI → ESP	0,087	2,728	1,653	0,006	Positively and significantly influence

Source: Research data

The results confirm that all hypothesized relationships are significant at  $p < 0.05$ . The findings suggest that Green Transformational Leadership, Group Cohesiveness, and Organizational Justice significantly enhance Employee Sustainable Performance, while also reducing Turnover Intention. Additionally, lower Turnover Intention positively contributes to Employee Sustainable Performance. By fulfilling all structural model evaluation criteria, the inner model is validated, supporting the research hypotheses and indicating a strong theoretical framework.

This study's findings offer valuable insights into how leadership, group cohesiveness, and organizational justice shape employee outcomes. Specifically, green transformational leadership was found to significantly and positively influence employee sustainable performance ( $T = 2.443$ ,  $P = 0.015$ ). Similarly, group cohesiveness and organizational justice also had significant positive effects on employee sustainable performance ( $T = 2.719$ ,  $P = 0.007$  and  $T = 2.183$ ,  $P = 0.029$ , respectively).

The research also explored the drivers of employee turnover intention, revealing that green transformational leadership, group cohesiveness, and organizational justice all had significant negative impacts ( $T = 3.276$ ,  $P = 0.001$ ;  $T = 3.276$ ,  $P = 0.001$ ; and  $T = 3.848$ ,  $P < 0.001$ , respectively). These results suggest that promoting transformational leadership, team cohesion, and a fair work environment can effectively reduce employee turnover.

Further analysis confirmed that turnover intention significantly and negatively impacts employee sustainable performance ( $T = 4.033$ , coefficient =  $-0.259$ ), highlighting the importance of retention efforts. Moreover, turnover intention was found to mediate the relationships between green transformational leadership, group cohesiveness, organizational justice and employee sustainable performance ( $T = 2.342$ ,  $T = 2.101$ , and  $T = 2.728$ , respectively), indicating that these factors influence performance, in part, by reducing employees' intentions to leave.

Overall, these findings contribute to the existing body of knowledge by reinforcing the importance of leadership, team cohesion, and fairness in sustaining employee performance while highlighting turnover intention as a critical mediating factor. Organizations seeking to enhance employee performance and retention should prioritize fostering transformational leadership, strengthening group cohesiveness, and ensuring organizational justice to mitigate turnover and promote long term sustainability.

## CONCLUSION

This research examines the interrelationships between Green Transformational Leadership, Group Cohesiveness, Organizational Justice, Turnover Intention, and Employee Sustainable Performance at PT Puyo Indonesia Kreasi. The findings from hypothesis testing reveal several key insights that contribute to a deeper understanding of these variables. First, Green Transformational Leadership has a significant positive impact on Employee Sustainable Performance with Green Individualized Consideration emerging as the most dominant dimension. This aspect fosters a pro environmental work culture, which not only motivates

employees to engage in sustainable practices but also enhances productivity and strengthens their commitment to long term sustainability.

Similarly, Group Cohesiveness also plays a crucial role in improving Employee Sustainable Performance. Among its dimensions, social cohesion is the most influential, as it promotes effective communication among employees, encourages teamwork, and ultimately enhances sustainable performance. Furthermore, Organizational Justice significantly contributes to Employee Sustainable Performance, with procedural justice especially structured and frequent feedback being the most dominant factor in increasing employee motivation and engagement in sustainability initiatives.

In addition to influencing performance, these organizational factors also impact turnover intention. Green Transformational Leadership demonstrates a significant negative effect on Turnover Intention with Green Individualized Consideration again being the dominant dimension. By cultivating a pro environmental work atmosphere, this leadership approach increases employee loyalty and reduces the likelihood of turnover. Likewise, Group Cohesiveness negatively affects Turnover Intention with social cohesion fostering a comfortable and supportive work environment that strengthens employees emotional attachment to the organization. Similarly, Organizational Justice plays a crucial role in lowering Turnover Intention, where procedural justice especially through fair and frequent feedback proves to be the most significant factor in reducing employees' inclination to leave.

In addition to its direct negative impact on employee sustainable performance, turnover intention serves as a critical mediating factor between organizational influences and employee outcomes. The study found that employees' contemplation of leaving, frequently fueled by job dissatisfaction, hinders their sustainable performance. Moreover, the positive influence of green transformational leadership on employee sustainable performance is partially explained by its ability to reduce turnover intention. Within green transformational leadership, individualized consideration appears to be particularly effective in creating a supportive environment that encourages both sustainable performance and employee retention. Similarly, Group Cohesiveness positively affects Employee Sustainable Performance through Turnover Intention, where social cohesion strengthens team collaboration and reduces turnover intention. Lastly, Organizational Justice significantly enhances Employee Sustainable Performance through Turnover Intention, with procedural justice particularly fair and consistent feedback serving as the key factor in minimizing turnover and improving long term performance.

## REFERENCE

- Ahmed, W., Umrani, W. A., Pahi, M. H., & Ahmed, S. (2021). Green Transformational Leadership And Employee Green Behavior: A Meta-analysis. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 28(4), 1041–1056. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.2131>
- Chuang, S.P., Chen, P.Y., & Lin, Y.L. (2022). The Impact of Green Transformational Leadership, Green HRM, Green Innovation, And Green Culture On Sustainable Business Performance. *Economic Research-Ekonomska Istraživanja*, 35(1), 5760–5775. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/1331677X.2022.2047086>.
- Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice At The Millennium: A Meta-Analytic Review Of 25 Years of Organizational Justice Research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 425–445. DOI : <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.425>
- Dewantoro. (2022). Organizational Justice: A Literature Review. *International Journal of Science and Management Studies (IJSMS)*, 5(2), 66-73. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.51386/25815946/ij sms-v5i2p108>

- Ding, H., Su, W., & Hahn, J. (2023). How Green transformational leadership Affects Employee Individual Green Performance A Multilevel Moderated Mediation Model. *Behavioral Sciences*, 13(11), 1-22. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs13110887>
- Farooq, H., Janjua, U. I., Madni, M., & Waheed, A. (2022). Identification and analysis of factors influencing turnover intention of Pakistan IT professionals: An empirical study. *IEEE Access*, 10(4), 1-23. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2022.3181753>
- Forsyth, D. R. (2010). *Group Dinamic (Edision Fifth)*. Belmont : Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Ghozali, Imam & Latan, Hengky. (2017). *Partial Least Square: Konsep, Metode, dan Aplikasi menggunakan program WarpPLS 5.0, Edisi ke-3*. Semarang: Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.
- Hamid, M., & Ul Hosna, A. (2021). Employee's Sustainable Performance Process: Developing a Model For Sustaining Employees Performance by Managing Age Diversity. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Research*, 4(2), 42-47. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31580/ijer.v4i2.2071>
- Hom, P. W., Lee, T. W., Shaw, J. D., & Hausknecht, J. P. (2017). One Hundred Years Of Employee Turnover Theory And Research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(3), 530–545. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000103>
- Ispiryan, A., Pakeltiene, R., Ispiryan, O., & Giedraitis, A. (2024). Fostering Organizational Sustainability Through Employee Collaboration: An Integrative Approach to Environmental, Social, and Economic Dimensions. *Encyclopedia*, 4(4), 1806-1826. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3390/encyclopedia4040119>
- Ji, T. (2021). *Employee sustainable performance (E-SuPer): Theoretical Conceptualization, Scale Development, and Psychometric Properties*. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(19), 1-18. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph181910497>
- Kim, Y., Lee, S., & Lee, H. (2021). Green transformational leadership And Environmental Performance In Small And Medium Enterprises. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 28(1), 1–12. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-020-10556-0>
- Laura, N. (2021). Pengaruh Keadilan Organisasi Dan Employer Branding Terhadap Turnover intention Dengan Employee Engagement Sebagai Variabel Mediasi. *Media Studi Ekonomi*, 16(1), 1-14. DOI: <https://journal.uta45jakarta.ac.id/index.php/MSE>
- Lee, S., & Kim, Y. (2020). Green transformational leadership and Employee Organizational Citizenship Behavior For The Environment: The Mediating Role Of Green Organizational Climate. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 1-13. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1097655>
- Li, L., Zhu, B., Che, X., Sun, H., & Tan, M. (2021). Examining Impact of Green transformational leadership and Environmental Regulation Through Emission Reduction Policy On Energy-Intensive Industry's Employee Turnover intention in China. *Journal Sustainability*, 13(12), 1-21. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13126530>
- Mathieu, J. E., Kukenberger, M. R., D'Innocenzo, L., & Reilly, G. (2015). Modeling Reciprocal Team Cohesion–Performance Relationships, As Impacted by Shared Leadership And Members Competence. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100(3), 713–734. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038898>
- Park, S., Lee, S., & Lee, H. (2017). Group cohesiveness on Performance: Mediating Impact Of Collective Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *European Journal of Management and Business Economics*, 26(3), 122–130. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJMBE-03-2017-003>
- Prayogi, B. Yusrizal. (2023). The Influence of Group cohesiveness, Personality Job Fit, andwork stress on Turnover intention (Bank Sumut Syariah KCP Simpang Kayu Besar

- Tanjung Morawa. *International Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting Research (IJEBAR)*, 7(4), 1-10.
- Rio Syukron Jamal, Sandy Firdaus , Yusuf Bakhtiar & Vicky F Sanjaya (2022). Pengaruh Komitmen dan *Turnover intention* Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan (Study Kasus Perusahaan Yang Berada Di Lampung). *Srikandi: Journal of Islamic Economic and Banking*, 1(1), 38–44. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.25217/srikandiv1i1.1335>
- Robertson, J. L., & Barling, J. (2017). Toward a new measure of organizational environmental citizenship behavior. *Journal of Business Research*, 75, 57–66. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2017.02.010>
- Saleem, F., Mateou, S., & Malik, M. I. (2024). How Green Transformational Leaders Trigger Environmental Performance? Unleashing the Missing Links Through Green Self-Efficacy, Green Empowerment, and Green Training of Employees. *Sustainability*, 16(22), 1-21. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16229982>
- Weber, P., & Kassab, E. A. (2024). The Employee green behavior of Green transformational leadership, green human resource management on the Sustainable Performance. *Journal of Industrial Engineering and Management Development*, 8(8), 1-21. DOI : <https://doi.org/10.24294/jipd.v8i8.4630>