

Opportunities & Challenges of Common Good Human Resource Management in Achieving Sustainability: A Scoping Review

Dr. Samuel Bangura, Department of Human Resource Management, Faculty of Management Science, Mangosuthu University of Technology, Umlazi 4031, Republic of South Africa.

Abstract: In response to increasing economic, social, and environmental challenges, the United Nations' 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development has emphasized the need for more responsible and human-centered business practices. Consequently, human resource management (HRM) scholarship has increasingly incorporated sustainability frameworks, leading to the development of common good human resource management (CGHRM). This study offers a comprehensive scoping review that explores the conceptual foundations of sustainability, traces the evolution of human resource management (HRM) toward a common good orientation, and assesses the opportunities, challenges, and implementation strategies associated with CGHRM in advancing sustainable development. Grounded in sustainability theory, the tradition of the common good, the Ability–Motivation–Opportunity (AMO) framework, and Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) theory, the review synthesizes interdisciplinary literature on sustainable HRM, green HRM, and socially responsible HRM. Employing established scoping review methodologies, the study systematically identifies, selects, and analyses relevant peer-reviewed research to map the current state of knowledge. Findings indicate that common good (CGHRM) signifies a notable shift from traditional, efficiency-focused HRM models toward an “outside-in” approach that emphasizes societal well-being, human dignity, solidarity, and alignment with the sustainable development goals. Evidence suggests that common good (CGHRM) can enhance employee resilience, ethical conduct, engagement, and meaningful work, thereby contributing to both organizational and societal sustainability. Nonetheless, challenges such as resistance to change, resource limitations, conceptual ambiguity, and measurement difficulties present barriers to widespread implementation. The review concludes that common good (CGHRM) has significant potential as a transformative, sustainability-oriented HRM paradigm. Achieving its full impact will require further theoretical development, the establishment of robust metrics, and extensive empirical validation across diverse organizational contexts.

Keywords: Corporate Social Responsibility, SDG's, Sustainability, Green Human Resource Management, And Organisational Culture

Introduction

Given the ongoing challenges and uncertainties associated with addressing major economic, social, and environmental issues today, the United Nations' "2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development" has emerged as a key framework for guiding business practices and human resource management. This agenda encompasses 17 Sustainable Development Goals (Boorman, Jackson, and Burkett, 2023). The International Labour Organization has further contributed to this effort by introducing the concept of "human-centered" HRM (Richards, 2022), which aims to support the achievement of these goals (Aust, Cooke, Muller-Camen, and Wood, 2022). Despite an increasing need for management research to focus on sustainability-related topics, Aguinis, Jensen, and Kraus (2022) have noted that less than 3% of publications in leading management journals address critical issues such as inequality, climate change, and job insecurity.

Common Good in Economics and Management

The concept of the common good has its origins in Aristotle's early perspectives on politics. Over time, this idea has been developed and refined by scholars in business ethics, leading to the establishment of the theory of the common good. It provides a comprehensive framework for societal well-being, encompassing all aspects of human development. The principle of the common good has two primary dimensions: first, it acknowledges the ethical and social nature of human beings, emphasizing human dignity as central to community life and various social structures; second, it recognizes that the common good is shaped through the collective efforts of individuals within these

communities, as they collaborate to establish their shared way of life (Albareda and Sison, 2019).

Both private and public organizations frequently engage in initiatives aimed at enhancing public welfare. Such efforts may serve to strengthen their reputation and increase recognition, as well as to improve their economic performance. Numerous studies indicate that adopting practices aligned with the common good benefits not only the organizations' stakeholders but also external parties, including customers, investors, and governmental entities (Meynhardt, Brieger, and Hermann, 2020). As Aust et al. (2020) observe, shifting organizational focus from purely economic objectives toward broader, more inclusive goals poses significant challenges within current institutional frameworks. Nevertheless, over the past decade, there has been a notable movement towards concepts such as the common good economy, conscious capitalism, and the economy for the common good (ECG).

In line with ongoing discussion, conscious capitalism emphasizes the importance of awareness and mindfulness in business actions. This approach is guided by four core principles aimed at providing employees with a greater sense of purpose in their work: fostering personal spiritual growth and humble servant leadership, cultivating a conscious organizational culture, prioritizing stakeholder needs, and pursuing objectives that transcend profit maximization (Frémeaux and Michelson, 2017). The primary aim of the economy for the common good (ECG) is to establish a new economic paradigm in which the common good becomes the central purpose of all economic activities. In this view, money and profits are considered means rather than ends. The well-being of all members of society is regarded as essential. Since its inception in 2010, the economy for the common good (ECG) movement has attracted over 10,000 participants, including companies, associations, universities, municipalities, and individuals from around the world. Some critics argue that the economy for the common good (ECG) bears similarities to socialist principles and express concerns that it may discourage entrepreneurship and new business development (Wiefek and Heinitz, 2018).

Literature Review

Definition of Sustainability

Sustainable development has emerged as an alternative means to address the damage caused to the environment by the overexploitation of resources; environmental degradation, climate change, and population increase (WCED,1987). According to the United Nations by 2050, world population growth will increase by 26%, to a total of 9.7 billion people. This growth will affect the quality of life of future generations. Thus, the need arises for a “development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs” (United Nations,2019), which can be applied as a concept in almost all disciplines.

The term “sustainability” refers to the way of defending, applying, or arguing in favor of sustainable development. According to the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA,2022) sustainability is a concept that can be defined in different ways, but its principles remain constant: balancing a growing economy, protection of the environment, and social responsibility (Zwickle, Koontz, Slagle, and Bruskotter,2014).

Dixit and Chaudhary (2020) affirmed that the term sustainable development is firstly coined in 1987 by Brundtland Report presented by United Nation. According to this the Sustainable Development can be expressed as, “Evolution that meet with the present generations without affecting the needs of the future generation”. It basically addresses the interlinked feature of environment, economy and social well-being.

Today, sustainability has become a popular term (Msengi, Doe, Wilson, Fowler, Wigginton, Olorunyomi, Banks, and Morel, 2019) but it is also a broad, complex, and multidisciplinary topic (Bollani, Bonadonna, and Peira, 2019; Hansmann, Mieg, Frischknecht, 2012) which includes different dimensions, such as the environmental, social, and economic dimensions mentioned in United Nations Resolution A/60/1 of 2005 (UN—United Nations,2005).

Pillars of Sustainability

Ghimire (2023) suggest that sustainable development is the systematic plan and process of achieving development goals for the present and future as in various dimensions, by considerable utilization of available resources in ecological system to address social well-being and economic growth. A long-term strategy with a particular structure that aims to maintain social cohesion, and economic growth

with viable and responsible utilization of environmental resources is sustainability. In 1987, Brundtland Commission; to balance economic development and environmental sustainability published its report *'Our Common Future'*. This report provided the definition which is often cited of sustainable development as "development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs" (Borowy, 2013).

The Three Pillars of Sustainable Development

As issues related to social, environmental, and economic sustainability become increasingly prominent globally, many organizations are integrating sustainability into their management strategies and communicating their progress to stakeholders. Human resource management (HRM) is a vital component of this initiative, as the human resource (HR) department can significantly contribute to the realization of sustainability objectives within organizations (Stahl et al., 2020). In line with the prior assertion, sustainable development is fundamentally grounded in three interconnected pillars: economic growth, social equity, and environmental stewardship. These elements are vital for fostering a balanced approach to development that fulfils present needs without compromising the well-being of future generations. Each pillar plays a critical role in creating a sustainable future, and their interrelationships can either complement or conflict with one another.

Economic Sustainability

It focuses on promoting economic growth through efficient resource utilization and encourages practices such as the circular economy, which aims to minimize waste and optimize resource use. In addition, it acknowledges that economic policies should incorporate environmental and social considerations to prevent adverse impacts on communities (Kosmopoulos, 2024).

Social Sustainability

This pillar of sustainability development highlights the importance of social equity, community well-being, and active citizen participation in societal decision-making processes (Kosmopoulos, 2024). It also addresses critical issues such as poverty alleviation and access to essential services, which are essential for long-term societal stability (Ghimire, 2023). Furthermore, it involves engaging local stakeholders to ensure development aligns with community needs and priorities (Ragulina, 2023).

Environmental Sustainability

In line with ongoing discussion, Ghimire, 2023) the environment sustainability pillar is aimed at preserving natural ecosystems and biodiversity through responsible resource management, Whilst Kosmopoulos, (2024) suggest that emphasizes the adoption of renewable energy and sustainable practices to reduce environmental degradation, At the same time, Recognizes the interconnectedness of environmental health with economic and social factors, underscoring the importance of a holistic approach to sustainability (Umurzoqova, & Kaplan, 2023).

While these three pillars are essential for achieving a balanced approach to development, challenges persist in harmonizing them. Conflicts may arise when economic growth exerts pressure that leads to environmental harm or social inequalities. Therefore, integrated strategies that simultaneously address economic, social, and environmental objectives are necessary to advance sustainable development (Ragulina, 2023; Clune & Zehnder, 2020).

Developmental Trajectory of Human Resource Management (HRM) Research Towards the Domain of Common Good Human Resource Management (CGHRM)

Initially, human resource management (HRM) primarily focused on enhancing organizational efficiency and achieving economic objectives. Managing employees was regarded to improve productivity and maintain competitive advantage (Richards, 2022). Toward the end of the 20th century, HRM began incorporating principles of corporate social responsibility (CSR), emphasizing ethical conduct, fair treatment of employees, and societal responsibility (Bansal and Song, 2017). This evolution led to the development of socially responsible HRM (SR-HRM), which prioritizes employee well-being, diversity, and fairness as integral to the organization's ethical commitments (Pimenta, Duarte, and Simões, 2024). As environmental considerations gained prominence, green human resource management (GHRM) emerged as a specialized approach integrating ecological

concerns into HR practices. Green human resource management (GHRM) aims to reduce the environmental footprint of work processes through initiatives such as energy conservation, eco-friendly recruitment, and environmental training (Piwowar-Sulej, Austen, and Iqbal, 2023). Subsequently, sustainable human resource management (S-HRM) was conceived as a comprehensive framework that balances economic, social, and environmental factors within human resource (HR) strategies. However, the predominant focus of organizations implementing these human resource management (HRM) approaches remains primarily internal, reflecting an "inside-out" orientation where social and environmental efforts align mainly with internal stakeholder interests while prioritizing long-term economic sustainability (Järlström, Saru, and Pekkarinen, 2023). More recently, the concept of common good (CGHRM) has been introduced as a more holistic and transformative model. It extends beyond the traditional triple bottom line by emphasizing the role of human resource (HR) in advancing broader societal objectives, such as addressing climate change, alleviating poverty, and reducing inequality. Common good (CGHRM) emphasizes embedding values such as dignity, solidarity, and mutual support into organizational policies and practices, shifting the focus from an "inside-out" to an "outside-in" perspective that centers on collective societal well-being (Aust et al., 2024; Aust et al., 2020).

Drawing on the ongoing discussion, Organizations should address global issues that affect everyone, in alignment with the common good approach (Albareda and Sison, 2020). The theory of the common good (Melé, 2009; Sison and Fontrodona, 2013) examines how organizations contribute to the well-being of communities and individuals, with the aim of supporting societal improvement and enhancing quality of life for all stakeholders (Sison and Fontrodona, 2013). The concept of the common good emphasizes the importance of teamwork and shared knowledge among employees (Pham et al., 2023). Common good (HRM) is an emerging perspective that considers not only organizational outcomes but also the purpose and ethical motivations of a company's actions (Aust et al., 2020). Illustrated on the classical teleological philosophies, this approach suggests that a company's purpose is to foster conditions that enable both individuals and groups to flourish achieving eudaimonia through collaborative engagement within a community (Melé, 2009).

Theoretical Basis of Common Good Human Resource Management (CGHRM).

Ability-Motivation-Opportunity (AMO) Theory

There are various perspectives on human resource management (HRM) practices. Building upon the complexity of the AMO model, Lin and Tang (2016) emphasize the importance of distinguishing between high performance work systems (HPWS) and high commitment work systems (HCWS) to understand how human resource management (HRM) practices influence organizational performance. HPWS refers to management approaches that directly impact performance by shaping employee attitudes through initiatives such as skill development, quality control, and performance management. Conversely, HCWS focuses on fostering employee commitment and engagement through practices like employee welfare programs and long-term employment strategies.

The Ability – Motivation – Opportunity (AMO) framework, introduced by Applebaum et al. (2000), provides guidance for selecting human resource management (HRM) practices aligned with organizational performance objectives. Gerhart (2005) asserts that effective human resource management (HRM) practices are essential for enhancing employee capabilities through recruitment, selection, and training; motivating employees via performance-based incentives; and providing opportunities for participation, such as teamwork or suggestion schemes. Building on this, Katou and Budhwar (2010) categorized human resource management (HRM) practices into three groups corresponding to ability, motivation, and opportunity to perform. Similarly, Rauch and Hatak (2016) classified HRM practices into three distinct categories: skill-enhancing, motivation-enhancing, and empowerment-enhancing practices. Skill-enhancing HR practices, as discussed by Subramoney (2009), aim to improve employees' knowledge, skills, and competencies, thereby enabling better job performance. This category includes two subtypes: practices designed to develop abilities, such as effective recruitment and selection, and practices focused on facilitating knowledge and skill development through training and coaching, as outlined by Schmitt (2014). Motivation-enhancing practices are designed to influence employee behaviour in alignment with organizational goals by utilizing an appropriate combination of incentives. These practices encompass activities such as performance management, compensation structures, incentives, and reward systems, as noted by

Jiang et al. (2012). It is important to distinguish these practices from the organizational behaviour literature, such as the work by Deci and Ryan (1985), which primarily emphasizes extrinsic motivation through rewards and incentives. Conversely, empowerment-enhancing practices focus on granting employees greater autonomy, involving them in decision-making processes, increasing their responsibilities, and establishing effective feedback mechanisms, as discussed by (Mathieu, Gilson, and Ruddy, 2006; Wood and Wall, 2007).

In line with the ongoing discussion, surrounding the AMO theory offers several key insights. First, according to AMO theory, human resource management (HRM) practices influence organizational performance indirectly by enhancing individual skills, motivation, and the organizational environment that fosters creativity, accountability, and active participation. Second, different human resource management (HRM) practices impact various components of the AMO framework some aim to develop skills, others to boost motivation, and still others to shape the organizational context. Third, research on human resource (HR) practices associated with AMO spans multiple disciplines, including management, psychology, sociology, and organizational behaviour. Fourth, the AMO framework encompasses a broad range of elements such as skills, abilities, knowledge, commitment, job satisfaction, decision-making, empowerment, responsibility, creativity, and innovation. Due to this diversity, it is common for researchers to focus on specific aspects like satisfaction, commitment, knowledge, decision-making, or creativity in individual studies. Finally, certain elements within the AMO framework are considered important organizational objectives. One such element is organizational commitment.

Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) Theory

The concept of corporate social responsibility (CSR) is founded on the understanding that organizations have moral obligations and should respond appropriately to societal concerns. Over recent decades, the range of possible responses by companies has significantly expanded. Although discussions regarding the relationship between businesses and society, as well as their responsibilities, have been ongoing for many years, there remains no universally accepted definition of CSR (Carroll, 1999; McWilliams and Siegel, 2001). The lack of a standardized definition hinders the establishment of credibility and consistency in research related to corporate social and environmental responsibilities (Lantos, 2001; Ougaard and Nielsen, 2002). The consensus among researchers and scholars is that businesses bear obligations to a broader stakeholder group beyond just their shareholders. However, achieving a universally accepted description of CSR has proven challenging. In 1960, Keith Davis proposed that corporate social responsibility involves making decisions and taking actions that extend beyond a company's immediate economic or technical interests. This perspective assumes that corporations are accountable not only for economic and legal considerations but also for duties owed to society that surpass these obligations (McGuire, 1963). Carroll (1979) further emphasized that CSR encompasses more than legal compliance, asserting that an appropriate definition should include economic, legal, ethical, and discretionary dimensions of corporate conduct.

Opportunities of Common Good Human Resource Management (CGHRM) in Achieving Sustainability

Common good (CGHRM) represents a strategic shift from a primary focus on profit generation and short-term objectives toward a long-term perspective that emphasizes the well-being of people and environmental sustainability. This approach underscores a company's social responsibilities and supports its efforts to uphold and enhance its reputation as an ethical organization (Dyllick and Muff, 2016). Organizations are increasingly recognized not only as contributors to economic growth but also as integral players in addressing global challenges and advancing the Sustainable Development Goals (Aust et al., 2024; Kolk and Van Tulder, 2010; Sama et al., 2022). Rooted in values such as respect for individuals, collaboration, and social responsibility (Aust et al., 2020), the aim of common good (CGHRM) is to improve organizational effectiveness while contributing positively to society's long-term sustainability (Aust et al., 2024; Lu et al., 2023; Pham et al., 2023). It prioritizes community needs alongside organizational interests and promotes broader societal goals, including equitable employment practices, democratic workplaces, social fairness, and environmental protection (Frémeaux and Michelson, 2017). This approach encourages organizations to re-examine traditional human resource management (HRM) practices by leveraging resources and skills to address environmental and social challenges for the collective benefit (Dyllick and Muff, 2016). Additionally,

it advocates for viewing HRM from a broader external perspective, moving beyond internal metrics typical of strategic human resource management (SHRM) (Aust et al., 2020). Ultimately, Common Good HRM emphasizes collaboration, relationship-building, and a focus on addressing long-term societal issues such as sustainability.

Premised on the ongoing discussion, common good human resource management practices contribute to organizational sustainability by fostering holistic, employee-centered approaches that align organizational objectives with broader social and environmental goals. Therefore, Research indicates several avenues through which common good (CGHRM) supports sustainability. For instance, studies by Järlström et al. (2023) demonstrate that human resource management (HRM) strategies focused on employee development, engagement, diversity, and well-being can positively influence sustainable outcomes. Additionally, Ying Lu et al. (2022) found that common good (CGHRM) practices enhance employee resilience and engagement, which in turn can lead to improved performance. Furthermore, Strobel et al. (2024) highlight that common good (CGHRM) practices grounded in humanistic values can generate shared value by prioritizing the well-being of individuals. Aust et al. (2024) emphasize the potential for common good (CGHRM) to contribute to sustainable development goals through initiatives that address collective social and environmental responsibilities.

Challenges of Common Good Human Resource Management (CGHRM) in Achieving Sustainability

The challenges of common good (CGHRM) in achieving sustainability are multifaceted, stemming from both internal organizational dynamics and external pressures. These challenges hinder the effective implementation of common good (CGHRM) practices, which are essential for aligning business operations with broader social and environmental goals. The following sections outline key challenges associated with common good (CGHRM) in achieving sustainability.

Traditional Organizational Structures

- **Resistance to Change:** Established hierarchies often resist the shift towards sustainable practices, leading to inertia in adopting common good (CGHRM) principles (Adhikari & Shrestha, 2024).
- **Role Ambiguity:** Employees may face confusion regarding their roles in sustainability initiatives, resulting in ineffective implementation (Adhikari & Shrestha, 2024).

Lack of Resources and Support

- **Financial Constraints:** Organizations frequently encounter budget limitations that restrict investment in sustainable human resource management (HRM) practices. Furthermore, **Inadequate Training:** A lack of training and expertise in sustainability concepts among human resource (HR) professionals can impede the integration of these practices (Abd Rahman et al., 2025).

Measurement and Evaluation Challenges

- **Lack of Metrics:** Organizations often struggle to establish reliable metrics to assess the effectiveness of sustainable human resource management (SHRM) initiatives, complicating efforts to demonstrate their value (Abd Rahman et al., 2025).
- **Confusion Over Definitions:** The evolving nature of sustainable human resource management (SHRM) leads to ambiguity in its definition and scope, making it difficult for organizations to implement coherent strategies (Cooke, 2025).

While these challenges are significant, they also present opportunities for organizations to innovate and redefine their HRM practices. By addressing these barriers, firms can enhance their contributions to sustainability and the common good, ultimately benefiting both their operations and society at large.

Effective Implementation Strategies of Common Good Human Resource Management (CGHRM) in Achieving Sustainability

The effective implementation of common good (CGHRM) is essential for promoting organizational sustainability. This approach integrates social, economic, and environmental considerations, creating

a comprehensive framework that supports long-term value generation. Key factors influencing its success include:

Institutional Pressures

Organizations often adopt common good (CGHRM) practices in response to perceived institutional pressures for sustainability, which encourage employee participation in sustainable behaviours (Li et al., 2023). These pressures may originate from regulatory mandates, market expectations, and societal demands, shaping human resource management (HRM) strategies accordingly.

Employee Engagement and Development

Effective common good (CGHRM) emphasizes employee development, engagement, diversity, and well-being, aligning with broader sustainability objectives (Järlström et al., 2023). Providing training and fostering participatory practices empower employees and enhance their commitment to sustainability initiatives (Daily & Huang, 2001).

Supportive Organizational Culture

A culture that promotes teamwork, receives support from top management, and recognizes employee contributions is vital for cultivating an environment conducive to sustainability (Daily & Huang, 2001). Additionally, psychological and social factors such as employer branding and community engagement play important roles in sustaining HRM practices (Mohiuddin et al., 2022). It is important to note that while common good HRM practices offer numerous benefits, some organizations may face challenges in implementation due to resource limitations or misalignment with core business strategies, which can hinder their sustainability efforts.

Methods

According to Levac, Colquhoun, and O'Brien (2010), a scoping review typically involves broad research questions, as the primary objective is to summarize a wide range of available evidence. Arksey and O'Malley (2005) concur that research questions should remain broad; however, it is observed that research questions lacked sufficient direction, clarity, and focus to effectively guide subsequent stages of the research process, such as identifying relevant studies and determining inclusion criteria. To improve this aspect, it is recommended that researchers formulate a broad research question complemented by a clearly defined scope. This approach entails identifying relevant studies, selecting appropriate data, organizing the information, and ultimately presenting the findings in a coherent manner.

1: Identifying the research question	The scoping review was guided by the following research questions i) what is sustainability ii) what is common good (CGHRM) iii) what opportunities can be linked to common good (CGHRM) iv) what challenges are linked to common good (CGHRM)
2: Identifying relevant studies	The relevant studies selected pertain to sustainability, green human resources, and corporate social responsibility.
3: Study selection	The studies were selected based on their ability to provide insights into the concepts of the common good (CGHRM) and sustainability. Additionally, selection criteria included the academic rigor of the research, such as the robustness of the research methodology and evidence of peer review.
4: Charting the data	The data were thoroughly reviewed and examined to prevent redundancy and bias, as well as to ensure adherence to ethical standards. The author confirmed that only data directly related to the research topic were utilized.
5: Collating, summarizing, and reporting results	In the scoping reviews, results were presented in narrative summaries linking to objectives.

Findings

The findings from the scoping review revealed that common good (CGHRM) is an emerging approach within sustainable human resource management (HRM), introduced by Aust, Matthews, and Muller-Camen in 2020. It represents a potential shift away from traditional, firm-centered models toward prioritizing societal well-being, human dignity, solidarity, and contributions to the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Unlike earlier frameworks such as socially responsible HRM, green HRM, or triple bottom line HRM, CGHRM adopts an "outside-in" perspective, using HR practices to address broader societal challenges such as inequality, climate change, and poverty. It views profit as a tool for collective well-being rather than an end.

Recent developments, including Aust et al.'s (2024) work linking common good (CGHRM) to the SDGs through moral obligations and multi-stakeholder collaboration, as well as its connections to the Economy for the common good movement, highlight its growing scholarly interest. Empirical research by Pham et al., 2023; Lu et al., 2023 and 2025) has shown that common good (CGHRM) can promote positive outcomes such as increased ethical behaviours, organizational citizenship, resilience, meaningful work, innovation, and organizational thriving. These findings align with theoretical frameworks like Ability-Motivation-Opportunity (AMO) and corporate social responsibility (CSR), while addressing limitations of traditional human resource management (HRM) related to sustainability. The findings from the scoping review suggest that while common good (CGHRM) offers opportunities for long-term societal benefits through participatory practices, employee development, and supportive institutional pressures, challenges remain. These include resistance to change, resource limitations, difficulties in measurement, conceptual ambiguity, and the risk that it may become a temporary trend rather than a sustained paradigm especially given the limited empirical validation and diverse contextual applications. As of late 2025, Common good (CGHRM) is still in its early stages but is developing rapidly, with ongoing discussions about its distinctiveness and calls for comprehensive, multi-level, international research to establish its practical viability and effectiveness in balancing societal good with organizational performance.

Conclusion

This scoping review is aimed to examine the concept of sustainability and investigate the role of Common Good (CGHRM) in promoting sustainable development through an extensive scoping review. Utilizing frameworks rooted in sustainability theory, the tradition of the common good, and key human resource management models such as the Ability–Motivation–Opportunity (AMO) framework and Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) theory, the review identifies a notable shift in HRM research—from efficiency-focused, organization-centered approaches to more humanistic, value-driven, and society-focused models.

The findings indicate that common good (CGHRM) represents a significant conceptual advancement in sustainable (SHRM) by adopting an "outside-in" perspective that emphasizes societal well-being, human dignity, solidarity, and alignment with the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals. Unlike prior approaches such as socially responsible HRM or green HRM, Common good (GHRM) broadens the scope of HR practices to address wider social and environmental issues, positioning organizations as active contributors to the common good. Empirical evidence suggests that implementing common good (CGHRM) practices can improve employee resilience, ethical conduct, engagement, meaningful work experiences, and overall organizational well-being, thereby supporting long-term sustainability objectives.

Nevertheless, the review also highlights ongoing challenges that may hinder the effective adoption of common good (CGHRM). These include organizational resistance to change within traditional structures, limited financial and human resources, conceptual ambiguities, and difficulties in measuring social and environmental impact. Such barriers suggest that common good (CGHRM) may remain an aspirational ideal unless further efforts are made to establish it as a fully integrated human resource management (HRM) paradigm. In conclusion, common good (CGHRM) shows significant potential as a transformative approach to sustainable human resource management. Its success depends on strengthening theoretical foundations, developing reliable measurement tools, and expanding empirical research across diverse contexts. Future studies should explore multi-level and cross-national perspectives to better understand how common good (CGHRM) can effectively balance organizational ambitions with the pursuit of long-term societal and environmental sustainability.

REFERENCE

- Abd Rahman, N. H., Saad, A., & Ismail, S. (2025). Green human resource management (ghrm): a review of implementation challenges. *ADVANCED INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF BUSINESS, ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND SME'S*, 7(24), 315–324. <https://doi.org/10.35631/aijbes.724021>
- Adhikari, D. R., & Shrestha, P. (2024). Transforming Human Resource Management for Common Good Agenda: An Outside-in Approach. *International Research Journal of Management Science*, 9(1), 233–246. <https://doi.org/10.3126/irjms.v9i1.72709>
- Aguinis H., Jensen S. H., Kraus, S. (2022), Policy implications of organizational behavior and human resource management research, *Academy of Management Perspectives* 36 (3): 857–878, <https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2020.0093>
- Albareda L., Sison A. J. G. (2019), Commons paradigm: Embedding common good and collective action, *Academy of Management Proceedings* (1): 12067, <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMBPP.2019.46>
- Arksey, H., & O'Malley, L. (2005). Scoping studies: towards a methodological framework. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 8(1), 19–32. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1364557032000119616>
- Aust I., Cooke F. L., Muller-Camen M., Wood G. (2024), Achieving sustainable development goals through common-good HRM: Context, approach and practice, *German Journal of Human Resource Management-Zeitschrift für Personalforschung* 38 (2): 93–110, <https://doi.org/10.1177/23970022241240890>
- Aust I., Cooke F. L., Muller-Camen M., Wood G. (2022), Special issue: achieving sustainable development goals through a common-good HRM: Context, approach and practice, *German Journal of Human Resource Management: Zeitschrift Für Personalforschung* 36 (2): 197–201, <https://doi.org/10.1177/23970022221089117>
- Aust I., Matthews B., Muller-Camen M. (2020), Common Good HRM: a paradigm shift in sustainable HRM?, *Human Resource Management Review* 30 (3): 100705, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2019.100705>
- Bansal P., Song H.-C. [2017], Similar but not the same: Differentiating corporate sustainability from corporate responsibility, *Academy of Management Annals* 11 (1): 105–149, <https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2015.0095>
- Bollani, L., Bonadonna, A., & Peira, G. (2019). The Millennials' Concept of Sustainability in the Food Sector. *Sustainability*, 11(10), 2984.
- Boorman, C., Jackson, B., & Burkett, I. (2023). SDG localization: Mobilizing the Potential of Place Leadership Through Collective Impact and Mission-Oriented Innovation Methodologies. *Journal of Change Management*, 23(1), 53–71. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14697017.2023.2167226>
- Borowy, I. (2013). *Defining Sustainable Development for Our Common Future: A History of the World Commission on Environment and Development (Brundtland Commission)* (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203383797>
- Carroll, A. B. (1999). Corporate social responsibility: Evolution of a definitional construct. *Business & Society*, 38(3), 268–295. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000765039903800303>
- Clune, W. H., & Zehnder, A. J. B. (2020). The evolution of sustainability models, from descriptive, to strategic, to the three pillars framework for applied solutions. *Sustainability Science*, 15(3), 1001–1006. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S11625-019-00776-8>
- Cooke, F. L. (2025). From Strategic HRM to Sustainable HRM? Exploring a Common Good Approach Through a Critical Reflection on Existing Literature. *Human Resource Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.22318>
- Daily, B. F., & Huang, S. (2001). Achieving sustainability through attention to human resource factors in environmental management. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 21(12), 1539–1552. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01443570110410892>
- Davis, K. (1960). Can business afford to ignore social responsibilities? *California*

Management Review, 2, 70-76.

Deci, E., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic Motivation and Self-determination in Human behaviour*. Springer Science & Business Media. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4899-2271-7>

Dixit, S., Chaudhary, M., & Sahni, N. (2020). *Network Learning Approaches to Study World happiness*. arXiv. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2007.09181>

Frémeaux S., & Michelson G. (2017), *The Common Good of the Firm and Humanistic management: Conscious capitalism and economy of communion*, *Journal of Business Ethics* 145 (4): 701–709, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-016-3118-6>

Gerhart, B. (2005). *Human Resources and Business Performance: findings, unanswered questions, and an alternative approach*. *Management Revue*, 174-185. <https://doi.org/10.5771/0935-9915-2005-2-174>

Ghimire, B. (2023). *Three Pillars of Sustainable Development: Challenges versus Achievements*. *Journey for Sustainable Development and Peace*, 1(02), 132–146. <https://doi.org/10.3126/jsdpj.v1i02.58266>

Hansmann, R., Mieg, H. A., & Frischknecht, P. (2012). *Principal Sustainability Components: empirical analysis of synergies between the three pillars of sustainability*. *International Journal of Sustainable Development & World Ecology*, 19(5), 451–459. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13504509.2012.696220>

Järnlström M., Saru E., Pekkarinen A. (2023), *Practices of Sustainable Human Resource Management in Three Finnish Companies: Comparative case study*, *South Asian Journal of Business and Management Cases* 12 (1): 31–51, <https://doi.org/10.1177/22779779231154656>

Järnlström, M., Saru, E., Viitasaari, M., & Akrivou, K. (2023). *Toward the Common Good HRM*. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 2023(1). <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMPROC.2023.14940>

Jiang, K., Lepak, D. P., Hu, J., & Baer, J. C. (2012). *How Does Human Resource management influence Organizational Outcomes? A meta-analytic investigation of mediating mechanisms*. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(6), 1264-1294. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2011.0088>

Katou, A. A., & Budhwar, P. S. (2010). *Causal Relationship between HRM Policies and Organisational Performance: Evidence from the Greek manufacturing sector*. *European Management Journal*, 28(1), 25-39. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2009.06.001>

Kolk, A., & van Tulder, R. (2010). *International business, corporate social responsibility and sustainable development*. *International Business Review*, 19(2), 119-125. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ibusrev.2009.12.003>

Kosmopoulos, P. (2024). *The way forward for sustainable development* (pp. 173–189). Elsevier BV. <https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-12-823390-0.00001-6>

Lantos, G. P. (2001). *The Boundaries of Strategic Corporate Social Responsibility*. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 18(7), 595–630. <https://doi.org/10.1108/07363760110410281>

Levac, D., Colquhoun, H., & O'Brien, K. K. (2010). *Scoping Studies: advancing the methodology*. *Implementation science: IS*, 5, 69. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1748-5908-5-69>

Li, T., Zhang, M. M., Lu, Y., Yang, M. M., Wang, Y., & Yi, L. (2023). *Common Good HRM Practices and Employee Involvement in Sustainability: a social exchange perspective*. *Proceedings - Academy of Management*, 2023(1). <https://doi.org/10.5465/amproc.2023.64bp>

Lin, X., & Tang, H. (2016). *A Framework for Human Resource Configurations in Knowledge-intensive Organizations*. *International Journal of Business Administration*, 7(1), 1. <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijba.v7n1p1>

Lu, Y., Zhang, M. M., Yang, M. M., & Wang, Y. (2022). *Sustainable Human Resource Management Practices, Employee Resilience, and Employee Outcomes: toward common good values*. *Human Resource Management*, Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.22153>

- Lu, Y., M. M. Zhang, M. M. Yang, and Y. Wang. (2023). "Sustainable Human Resource Management Practices, Employee Resilience, and Employee Outcomes: Toward Common Good Values." *Human Resource Management* 62, (3): 331–353
- Mathieu, J. E., Gilson, L. L., & Ruddy, T. M. (2006). Empowerment and Team Effectiveness: an empirical test of an integrated model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(1), 97. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.1.97>
- McGuire, J. W. (1963). *Business and society*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- McWilliams, A., & Siegel, D. (2001). Corporate Social Responsibility: a theory of the firm perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 26(1), 117–127.
- Melé, D. (2009). Integrating Personalism into Virtue-based Business Ethics: The personalist and the common good principles. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 88(1), 227–244. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-009-0108-y>
- Meynhardt T., Brieger S. A., Hermann C. [2020], Organizational Public Value and Employee life satisfaction: the mediating roles of work engagement and organizational citizenship behavior, *The International Journal of Human Resource Management* 31 (12): 1560–1593, <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2017.1416653>
- Mohiuddin, M., Hosseini, E., Faradonbeh, S. B., & Sabokro, M. (2022). Achieving Human Resource Management Sustainability in Universities. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(2), 928. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19020928>
- Msengi, I., Doe, R., Wilson, T., Fowler, D., Wigginton, C., Olorunyomi, S., Banks, I., & Morel, R. (2019). Assessment of Knowledge and Awareness of Sustainability Initiatives Among College Students. *Renewable Energy and Environmental Sustainability*, 4, 6. <https://ui.adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2019REES....4....6M>
- Ougaard, M. and Nielsen, M.E. (2002) Beyond Moralizing: Agendas and Inquiries in Corporate Social Responsibility, available at http://www.cbs.dk/centres/cvr/pdf/morten_ougaard_beyound_moralizing.pdf
- Pham, N. T., Jabbour, C. J. C., Pereira, V., Usman, M., Ali, M., & Vo-Thanh, T. (2023). Common Good Human Resource Management, Ethical Employee Behaviours, and Organizational Citizenship Behaviours toward the Individual. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 33 (4), 977–1000. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12493>
- Pimenta S., Duarte A. P., Simões E. [2024], How Socially Responsible Human Resource Management Fosters Work Engagement: the role of perceived organizational support and affective organizational commitment, *Social Responsibility Journal* 20 (2): 326–343, <https://doi.org/10.1108/SRJ-10-2022-0442>
- Piwowar-Sulej K., Austen A., Iqbal Q. [2023], Fostering Three Types of Green Behaviours through green HRM in the Energy Sector: The conditional role of environmental managerial support, *Baltic Journal of Management* 18 (4): 509–524, <https://doi.org/10.1108/BJM-03-2023-0089>
- Ragulina, Y. V. (2023). Basic Principles of Sustainable Development. *Èkonomika i Upravljenje: Problemy, Rešeniâ*, 1/4(133), 132–136. <https://doi.org/10.36871/ek.up.p.r.2023.01.04.017>
- Rauch, A., & Hatak, I. (2016). A Meta-analysis of Different HR-enhancing Practices and Performance of Small and Medium sized firms. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 31(5), 485–504. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2016.05.005>
- Richards J (2022), Putting Employees at the Centre of Sustainable HRM: a review, map and research agenda". *Employee Relations: The International Journal*, 44 (3), 533–554, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1108/ER-01-2019-0037>
- Sama, L. M., Stefanidis, A and Casselman. R.M. (2022). Rethinking Corporate Governance in the Digital Economy: The Role of Stewardship. *Business Horizons* 65: 535–546
- Schmitt, N. (2014). Personality and Cognitive ability as Predictors of Effective Performance at Work. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behaviour* 1(1), 45–65. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091255>

- Sison, A. J., & Fontrodona, J. (2013). Participating in the Common Good of the Firm. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 113(4), 611–625. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1684-4>
- Stahl, G. K., Brewster, C. J., Collings, D. G., & Hajro, A. (2020). Enhancing the Role of Human Resource Management in Corporate Sustainability and Social Responsibility: a multi-stakeholder, multidimensional approach to HRM. *Human Resource Management Review*, 30(3), Article 100708. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2019.100708>
- Strobel, M., Taylor, K., Bals, L., & Rosca, E. (2024). Creating Shared Value through Meta-Organizational Common Good Human Resource Management. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 2024(1). <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMPROC.2024.13745>
- Subramony, M. (2009). A meta-analytic investigation of the relationship between HRM bundles and firm performance. *Human Resource Management*, 48(5), 745-768. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.20315>
- Umurzoqova, N. A., & Kaplan, E. L. (2023). Sustainability and sustainable development concepts: Defining the perspectives and pillars. Elsevier eBooks. <https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-44-313776-1.00030-1>
- United Nations General Assembly. (2005). 2005 World Summit Outcome (Resolution A/RES/60/1). U.S. Environmental Protection Agency | US EPA
- WCED—World Commission on Environment and Development. Report: Our Common Future; UN: New York, NY, USA, 1987; Available online: <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/139811?ln=es>
- Wiefek J., Heinitz K. [2018], Common good-oriented companies: Exploring corporate values, characteristics and practices that could support a development towards degrowth, *Management Revue* 29 (3): 311–331, <https://doi.org/10.5771/0935-9915-2018-3-311>
- Wood, S. J., & Wall, T. D. (2007). Work enrichment and employee voice in human resource management-performance studies. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 18(7), 1335-1372. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585190701394150>
- Zwickle, A., Koontz, T. M., Slagle, K. M., & Bruskotter, J. T. (2014). Assessing sustainability knowledge of a student population. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, 15(4), 375–389. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSHE-01-2013-0008>