

ADDRESSING BIG SOCIETAL CHALLENGES: TOWARDS COMMON GOOD HRM AS AN EMERGING RESEARCH FIELD

Introduction

In response to the ongoing challenges and uncertainties in effectively tackling the economic, social, and ecological “Grand Challenges” of our time, the United Nations’ “2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development”, with its 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) [Boorman, Jackson, Burkett, 2023], has become a crucial reference point for both the business world and HRM. The International Labour Organization has enriched this narrative by introducing the ‘human-centered’ HRM concept [Richards, 2022], which is designed to help achieve the SDGs [Aust, Cooke, Muller-Camen, Wood, 2022]. Although there is a need for noticeable shift in management literature towards sustainability, Aguinis, Jensen and Kraus [2022] identified that to date, there has been little research published in leading management journals (less than 3%) that focuses on the identified “major challenges” such as inequalities, climate change, or precarious employment. Cited authors also state that a negligible percentage of articles in the field of HRM considered so-called implications for policymakers. Moreover, due to the growing wave of criticism over the inefficiency of current business models in addressing the issues of sustainable development, there is increasing interest among both scholars and practitioners in alternative models of the so-called “outside-in” approach. This perspective seeks to answer the question: how

* Agata Austen, Associate Profesor – University of Economics in Katowice. ORCID: 0000-0002-1362-2736.

** Katarzyna Piwowar-Sulej, Full Professor – University of Economics in Wrocław. ORCID: 0000-0002-4627-4344.

can business leverage its resources, competencies, and experiences in such a way that they are useful in addressing the major economic, social, or environmental challenges, such as those associated with artificial intelligence, digital technologies, environmental pollution, climate change, demographic shifts, or globalization? [Dyllick, Muff, 2016; Ren et al., 2023]. These models respond to the need for a new paradigm that redefines the purpose of business in context of the value of the common good [Frémeaux, Michelson, 2017]. The equivalent in the field of Human Resource Management (HRM) is Human Resources Management in the Context of the Common Good (Common Good HRM–CGHRM), which inputs refer to using HRM competencies, skills, knowledge, and attitudes to address the common good and contribute to solving the “Grand Challenges” of our time [Aust, Matthews, Muller-Camen, 2020]. As Aust, Cooke, Muller-Camen and Wood (2024) claim, the field of CGHRM is relatively new and underdeveloped. None of the previous studies synthesized the existing knowledge about CGHRM in a systematic manner. Furthermore, the cited authors call for further studies to understand this phenomenon.

The aim of the article is to present the concept of CGHRM based on a systematic literature review. The authors analyzed all articles that include the name of this concept in titles, abstract or keywords, and are indexed in the Web of Science and Scopus database (accessed on 31st August 2024). A total, 10 articles were identified in the WoS database and 11 in the Scopus database, with is a notable overlap between the two sets of articles. In total, 11 articles were selected and analyzed (see: Table 1 in Appendix). The focus of the analysis was to establish the current state of art in the field, identify gaps in the literature and propose future research directions, which constitutes the authors’ contribution to the field of HRM. Thus, the first part of the paper presents the origins and the essence of common good in economy and management, the second discusses origins of CGHRM and its relationships with other concepts. The next part presents the results of analysis of empirical studies on CGHRM. In the conclusions section, the authors presented implications, limitations and directions for future research. The findings suggest that the field of CGHRM is in the conceptual and exploratory phase with some promising theoretical developments but limited empirical data and few validated scales. This means there is significant room for further research to deepen our understanding and application of CGHRM.

1. Common good in economy and management

The origins of the common good can be traced back to Aristotle’s original approach to politics. This concept has been adapted by Business Ethics scholars, leading to the development of the theory of the common good. It embodies a holistic ‘vision of societal well-being, encompassing all facets of human development’. The principle

of the common good encompasses two primary dimensions. First, it acknowledges the ethical and social aspects of human beings, placing human dignity at the forefront of their community and across various social organizations. Second, the common good is collaboratively created within these communities by their members, who collectively constitute the community [Albareda, Sison, 2019].

Private and public organizations often engage in efforts to enhance public welfare, not only to establish and maintain legitimacy but also to increase their economic success. Numerous studies have highlighted the positive impacts of common good practices for both owners and external stakeholders, including customers, investors, and governments [Meynhardt, Brieger, Hermann, 2020]. As Aust et al. [2020] notice, changing the prevailing focus from economic objectives to broader goals presents a significant challenge within the existing framework of institutions and organizations. Over the last ten years, however, there has been a rise in movements such as common good economy or conscious Capitalism and the Economy for the Common Good (ECG). Conscious Capitalism operates on the principle of increased individual consciousness. This approach is characterized by four main tenets that motivate employees to find deeper significance in their work. These include the development of spirituality and humble servant leadership, the cultivation of a conscious culture within organizations, an orientation towards stakeholders' interests, and the pursuit of a higher purpose that goes beyond mere profit maximization [Frémeaux, Michelson, 2017]. The core idea of the ECG is to promote an alternative economic model that identifies the common good as the main purpose of all economic activity. Monetary profits are seen as a mere means; common good requires that everyone's welfare is addressed. Since the ECG's foundation in 2010, over 10,000 entities including companies, associations, universities, municipalities and individuals all over the world have affiliated themselves with the movement (Economy For The Common Good). Some critics reject the ECG as socialist and believe that the ECG would create no incentives for entrepreneurship [Wiefek, Heinitz, 2018]. Moreover, the growing desire among millennials for socially meaningful work, increased consumer expectations for corporate social responsibility and mounting pressure from governments and investors on firms to contribute to the common good might inspire some companies to adopt this new perspective [Aust et al., 2020].

2. Evolution of the HRM research field towards Common Good HRM

Initially, HRM was focused primarily on maximizing organizational efficiency and achieving economic goals. Employee management was seen as a means to drive productivity and competitiveness [Richards, 2022]. In the late 20th century, HRM

began to integrate Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) principles, which emphasized ethical conduct, fair treatment of employees, and responsible practices toward society [Bansal, Song, 2017]. This led to the development of Socially Responsible HRM (SR-HRM), which focuses on promoting employee well-being, diversity, and fairness as part of the organization's ethical responsibilities [Pimenta, Duarte, Simões, 2024]. As environmental sustainability became more important, Green HRM (GHRM), another sustainability-oriented HRM concept, emerged as a specialized approach to incorporate environmental concerns into HR practices. GHRM focuses on reducing the environmental impact of organizational activities through sustainable workplace behaviors, such as energy-saving initiatives, green recruitment, and environmental training [Piwowar-Sulej, Austen, Iqbal, 2023]. Sustainable HRM (S-HRM) emerged as a broader framework that balances economic, social, and environmental dimensions within HR practices. Yet, the company's orientation in the above-presented HRM concepts is "inside-out". This means that although companies may integrate social and environmental considerations into their HR practices, the primary goal remains achieving long-term economic sustainability. "Inside-out" – oriented organizations also often prioritize internal stakeholders [Maria Järlström, Saru, Pekkarinen, 2023]. Recently, Common Good HRM (CGHRM) has been proposed as a more comprehensive and transformative approach that goes beyond the triple bottom line. CGHRM emphasises the role of HR in contributing to broader societal goals, such as solving global challenges like climate change, poverty, and inequality. It focuses on embedding values such as dignity, solidarity, and reciprocity in organizational policies and practices. This approach contrasts with traditional HRM models by placing collective well-being at the center, moving from an "inside-out" to an "outside-in" perspective [Aust et al., 2024; Aust et al., 2020].

Analyzing the conceptual articles on CGHRM (see: Table 1 in Appendix), it can be noticed that CGHRM differs from SR-HRM, GHRM, and S-HRM in its broader societal focus. While SR-HRM concentrates on ethical treatment within the organization, and GHRM addresses environmental sustainability, CGHRM prioritizes the well-being of all societal stakeholders and aims to solve grand societal challenges. It extends the purpose of HRM beyond organizational and employee well-being to address global issues such as climate change and social justice. CGHRM differs from other emerging types of sustainability-oriented HRM, which typically emphasize aligning organizational goals with external pressures for greater social and environmental responsibility [Ehnert et al., 2016]. Instead of focusing on the economic objective, the main goal of CGHRM is to support business leaders and employees in their contribution to ecological and social progress worldwide. This contribution constitutes a fundamental difference compared to other types of HRM oriented towards sustainable development, which are motivated (in the worst case) by the aim to limit negative external impacts and (in the best case) to extract win-win

opportunities [Aust et al., 2020]. CGHRM also represents a fundamental shift in the purpose of HRM. It challenges the traditional organizational objectives of profit maximization by placing the common good at the center of HR practices. This is distinct from S-HRM, which seeks to balance economic, social, and environmental goals, and GHRM that focuses exclusively on environmental concerns. By adopting the CGHRM approach, an organization must place collective interests at the same level or higher than the individual level (including company one), by encouraging employees to resolve any differences, improve the conditions and status of their environment and local communities, and also promote social progress worldwide [Aust et al., 2020]. Finally, CGHRM emphasizes multi-stakeholder engagement, considering the interests of employees, society, and the environment in equal measure.

3. Results of the in-depth analyses of empirical research on CGHRM

Academic articles presenting theoretical or empirical considerations in the field of CGHRM are extremely rare, which causes limitations in the conceptualization of this construct. As stated in the introduction, the authors identified 11 articles about CGHRM. All of them are presented in Table 1 (Appendix). Only 7 out of 11 articles are empirical, including 4 that used quantitative research.

At the beginning, it is worth discussing measurements scales used in quantitative research to determine the extent of CGHRM in companies. In their study among policemen in the UK, [Brunetto et al., 2023] assumed that CGHRM is based on four principles: HRM practices should be SDG (s) oriented, employees should be equally and fairly treated, work democracy should be used, and psychological contract should be maintained. Moreover, they focused on Aust's et. al. [2020] statement that CGHRM reflects "security, safety, and meaningful work". Considering the above-presented arguments they decided that organizational psychological support addresses common good and examined the support as a CGHRM practice. They found that the lack of support leads to stress and demotivation towards work.

Li et al. [2023] did not present the scale used. However, based on a multilevel research conducted in China, they found that CGHRM both directly and indirectly (through perceived organizational support) stimulates employee involvement in sustainability. They also identified the antecedent of CGHRM in the form of institutional pressures. At this point it is worth indicating that company support is treated here as an outcome of CGHRM, which stays in contradiction to Brunetto et al. [2023] who treated it as CGHRM practice. The above highlights inconsistencies in approaching CGHRM. Furthermore, the above-presented two articles – although

mentioning CGHRM – are rather focused on SR-HRM which puts emphasis on the needs of internal company stakeholders (employees) rather than the good of the society.

Pham et al. [2023] developed and validated a CGHRM scale which consists of only four items. The items refer to HRM policies and practices such as equality and security in employment, employee participation and meaningful work, safety at work, and fair salaries. One can state that the items do not significantly differ from items used for measurement of socially-responsible HRM (SR-HRM) which is one of many sub-concepts of S-HRM. For example, in their SR-HRM scale, [Maignan, Ferrell, 2004] emphasized employee participation and provision of fair salaries, whereas [Barrena-Martínez, López-Fernández, Romero-Fernández, 2017] used items related to health and security at work. Furthermore, each individual item of the analyzed scale includes several HRM practices (e.g., security, safety and meaningful work are included in one item), which may be questionable. Leaving aside the above considerations about CGHRM scale, it is worth indicating that [Pham et al., 2023] also provided evidence for the positive impact of CGHRM practices on employee ethical behaviours and voluntary helping behaviors towards coworkers in Vietnamese companies.

Considering qualitative empirical research, Järlström et al. [2024] analyzed HRM practices demonstrated by companies in the sustainability reports. They identified that practices such as HR development, diversity and inclusion, employee participation, and care for employees' well-being contribute the most to organizational sustainable performance. Furthermore, they emphasized that these practices reflect S-HRM rather than CGHRM. One can state that these practices are mainly related to SR-HRM because of their focus on the employees' needs. Finally, in their qualitative research, [Dobbins, Prowse, 2024] and [Geradine, McWha-Hermann, 2024] focused on the employees' decent working conditions. Although decent work is placed among the SDGs, the examined organizational practices – similarly to those presented in the above-analyzed paper – reflect SR-HRM.

Discussion and conclusions

Implications for theory

As this study shows, the field of CGHRM is still in its early stages of development. There are only a limited number of studies addressing this concept directly. While there are several theoretical discussions around CGHRM, especially linking it to frameworks like Social Exchange Theory and Institutional Theory, the field is still primarily conceptual. CGHRM is often discussed in the context of broader sustainability and HRM frameworks, rather than as a fully developed independent concept. Most studies

are conceptual or qualitative, with few quantitative analyses or large-scale empirical data to support CGHRM's impact on organizational performance.

CGHRM relies mostly on the theoretical works by Aust. Empirical research on CGHRM is scarce and the research approaches are inconsistent. Despite growing academic interest and the suggested benefits of orientation towards various objectives, little is known about whether and how CGHRM benefits both employees and employers, and whether HRM promotes other social and environmental objectives [Poon, Law, 2022; Richards, 2022]. The reliance of HRM on an individualist, strategic, performance-centric (and ultimately decontextualized) approach has left the discipline isolated and disconnected from wider societal and ecological concerns and, therefore, ineffective in driving forward a challenging sustainable agenda. As a result, there is a need for a heightened awareness within the discipline of HRM that a paradigm change is both urgently needed and achievable within the current institutional contexts [Aust et al., 2022].

While there has been some initial work in developing CGHRM measurement scales, these are not yet widely validated across different contexts. More research on standardized scales is required. Researchers should aim to test these scales across diverse industries and global contexts. Also, the long-term impact of CGHRM on organizational performance, employee behavior and societal outcomes has not been extensively studied. Longitudinal research is needed to assess its real-world applicability and impact over time. Finally, there is a fragmented understanding of how CGHRM integrates into existing HR practices. While some studies propose integrating CGHRM with S-HRM or CSR, these frameworks are still not fully aligned or well-differentiated in the literature.

We are aware that despite its potential advantages implementation of CGHRM may be challenging. Companies may fear that adopting appropriate CGHRM practices ultimately leads to reduced efficiency and decreased employee performance. Additionally, the very idea of the common good may be negatively perceived by some employees, as focusing on various objectives requires members of staff to take on greater responsibility while simultaneously fulfilling different roles that require incompatible behavior [Lu et al., 2023]. Additionally, it should be noted that organizational managers may fear that adopting an "outside-in" orientation will ultimately lead to reduced efficiency and decreased employee performance, and employees may fear that this will require them to take on greater responsibility and fulfil various roles that may be conflicting [Lu, Zhang, Yang, Wang, 2023]. Therefore, it is important to seek answers to the question "how can business leverage its resources, competencies, and experiences in such a way that they are useful in addressing the major challenges of our times" [Aust et al., 2020], while managing tensions related to the realization of different objectives from the perspective of various stakeholders [Richards, 2022]. Future research should address these concerns.

The concept of sustainable development is still relatively new in Poland, which makes S-HRM increasingly popular [Piwowar-Sulej et al., 2023]. For this reason, we propose conducting exploratory-explanatory research using mainly qualitative methods that align with methodological recommendations for study in this area [Ren et al., 2023]. We believe that answering below questions can serve as a starting point for further research on CGGRM in the Polish context:

- How is the concept of HRM in the Context of the Common Good understood?
- What conditions would need to exist on the organization's side for there to be an interest in CGHRM?
- How can employees influence the implementation of CGHRM?
- How can managers influence the implementation of CGHRM?
- How can the external environment influence the implementation of CGHRM?
- What is the role of HR departments in building CGHRM?

As the concept of CGHRM evolves and its implementation in companies progresses, more advanced research can be proposed.

Implications for practice

The value of a literature review is mostly theoretical, however they can serve as valuable educational material for practitioners and thus have practical implications [Piwowar-Sulej, Iqbal, 2023]. They mostly help managers to understand the topic. This study increases the understanding of the emerging HRM concept (CGHRM) among practitioners. Thanks to this research, practitioners may easily find sources used in this article to further increase their knowledge. This study also presents authors who specialize in CGHRM and who may be employed as business consultants. Finally, practitioners may also contribute to the development of CGHRM research field by collaborating with academic in the empirical study that aims to answer the above-presented questions.

Given the above, we recommend undertaking considerations on the issue of CGHRM in line with the Society-Actors-Processes-Policy (SAPP) approach, linking policy, actors, and processes at multiple levels (micro, meso, macro). The SAPP framework facilitates a holistic approach to policy-making at the organizational or community level and research on management, recognizing the interconnectedness of society's elements and the multifaceted nature of addressing the major challenges of our times. By fostering dialogue among scholars, policymakers, and organizations, SAPP aims to support more effective and equitable policy-making and human resource practices that tackle these critical global challenges [Hughes, Dundon, 2023]. It can be used as a tool within CGHRM to address societal challenges by identifying policy, actors, and processes necessary for addressing issues such as climate change, inclusion, and employment precarity and offer a practical pathway for implementing

CGHRM goals, by structuring how organisations can manage societal challenges through stakeholder engagement and policy enactment, making it compatible with the broader goals of CGHRM.

Limitations

This study – being systematic in its nature – provides transparency and replicability of research process. However, it has some limitations, which also suggest directions for future research. It is worth emphasizing that the conducted analyses are valid for a given moment. The number of publications increases, which requires an update to the article database. Furthermore, the applied search methodology could have excluded some valuable works from the sample if their authors did not include the search terms in the abstract, title, or keywords and did not write their papers in English. Future literature reviews are recommended to overcome these limitations.

References

- [1] 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>.
- [2] Albareda L., Sison A.J.G. [2019], Commons paradigm: Embedding common good and collective action, *Academy of Management Proceedings* 2019(1): 12067, <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMBPP.2019.46>.
- [3] 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>.
- [4] 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>.
- [5] 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>.
- [6] 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>.

- [7] Barrena-Martínez J., López-Fernández M., Romero-Fernández P.M. [2017], Socially responsible human resource policies and practices: Academic and professional validation, *European Research on Management and Business Economics* 23(1): 55–61, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iedeen.2016.05.001>.
- [8] 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>.
- [9] Brunetto Y., Farr-Wharton B., Wankhade P., Saccon C., Xerri M. [2023], Managing emotional labour: the importance of organisational support for managing police officers in England and Italy, *The International Journal of Human Resource Management* 34(4): 832–854, <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2022.2047755>.
- [10] Dobbins T., Prowse P. [2024], Moral economy and the ethics of the real living wage in UK football clubs, *Journal of Business Ethics*, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-024-05645-8>.
- [11] Dyllick T., Muff K. [2016], Clarifying the meaning of sustainable business, *Organization & Environment* 29(2): 156–174, <https://doi.org/10.1177/1086026615575176>.
- [12] Economy For the Common Good [2022], <https://www.ecogood.org/> (accessed: 12.01.2024).
- [13] Ehnert I., Parsa S., Roper I., Wagner M., Muller-Camen M. [2016], Reporting on sustainability and HRM: A comparative study of sustainability reporting practices by the world's largest companies, *International Journal of Human Resource Management* 27(1): 88–108, <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2015.1024157>.
- [14] 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>.
- [15] Geradine K., McWha-Hermann I. [2024], In search of decent work: Human resource managers as custodians of fair reward in international NGOs, *German Journal of Human Resource Management-Zeitschrift Fur Personalforschung* 38(2): 202–230, <https://doi.org/10.1177/23970022241231838>.
- [16] Järnlström M., Saru E., Viitasaari M., Akrivou K. [2024], Integrating “common good” authenticity for sustainable human resource management reporting, *German Journal of Human Resource Management-Zeitschrift Fur Personalforschung* 38(2): 159–182, <https://doi.org/10.1177/23970022241229035>.
- [17] 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>.
- [18] Kruse P., Wegge J. [2024], A constructive error management culture promotes innovation and corporate social responsibility: A multi-level analysis in 10 countries, *German Journal of Human Resource Management-Zeitschrift Fur Personalforschung* 38(2): 111–139, <https://doi.org/10.1177/23970022231226318>.

- [19] 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, *Academy of Management Proceedings* 2023(1), <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMPROC.2023.64bp>.
- [20] Lu Y., Zhang M.M., Yang M.M., Wang Y. [2023], Sustainable human resource management practices, employee resilience, and employee outcomes: Toward common good values, *Human Resource Management* 62(3): 331–353, <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.22153>.
- [21] Maignan I., Ferrell O.C. [2004], Corporate social responsibility and marketing: An integrative framework, *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* 32(1): 3–19, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0092070303258971>.
- [22] 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>.
- [23] Pham N.T., Jabbour C.J.C., Pereira V., Usman M., Ali M., Vo-Thanh T. [2023], Common good human resource management, ethical employee behaviors, and organizational citizenship behaviors toward the individual, *Human Resource Management Journal* 33(4): 977–1000, <https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12493>.
- [24] 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>.
- [25] Piowar-Sulej K. [2021], Core functions of sustainable human resource management. A hybrid literature review with the use of <sc>H-Classics</sc> methodology, *Sustainable Development* 29(4): 671–693, <https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.2166>.
- [26] Piowar-Sulej K., Austen A., Iqbal Q. [2023], Fostering three types of green behavior 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>.
- [27] Piowar-Sulej K., Iqbal Q. [2023], Leadership styles and sustainable performance: A systematic literature review, *Journal of Cleaner Production* 382: 134600, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2022.134600>.
- [28] Piowar-Sulej K., Malik S., Shobande O.A., Singh S., Dagar V. [2023], A contribution to sustainable human resource development in the era of the COVID-19 pandemic, *Journal of Business Ethics*, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-023-05456-3>.
- [29] Poon T.S.C., Law K.K. [2022], Sustainable HRM: An extension of the paradox perspective, *Human Resource Management Review* 32(2), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2020.100818>.
- [30] Ren S., Cooke F.L., Stahl G.K., Fan D., Timming A.R. [2023], Advancing the sustainability agenda through strategic human resource management: Insights and suggestions for future research, *Human Resource Management* 62(3): 251–265, <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.22169>.

- [31] Richards J. [2022], Putting employees at the centre of sustainable HRM: A review, map and research agenda, *Employee Relations* 44(3): 533–554, <https://doi.org/10.1108/ER-01-2019-0037>.
- [32] Taylor P., Earl C. [2023], Age management for the common good, *Economic and Labour Relations Review* 34(1): 179–188, <https://doi.org/10.1017/elr.2023.2>.
- [33] 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>.

Appendix

Table 1. Synthesis of previous studies devoted to CGHRM

Authors	Aim of the study	Methodology	Key findings
Aust, Cooke, Muller-Camen, Wood [2024]	Discussion on how Common Good HRM can contribute to achieving Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).	Conceptual article with literature review and theoretical discussion on SDGs and HRM.	CGHRM can drive meaningful contributions to SDGs by prioritizing societal and ecological outcomes over purely financial goals.
Järlström et al., [2024]	Explore how common good values can be integrated into sustainable HRM reporting.	Qualitative analysis of sustainability reports from 40 most sustainable companies.	Common good values are present in S-HRM reporting but in a fragmented way; the study suggests integrating humanistic-ethical orientations.
Dobbins, Prowse, [2024]	Explore the ethics and moral economy of the Real Living Wage (RLW) in UK football clubs using a case study of Luton Town FC.	Qualitative case study with semi-structured interviews.	The RLW at LTFC provided economic distributive justice and contributive justice, positively impacting employee dignity, participation, and retention.
Geradine, McWha-Hermann, [2024]	Explore the role of HR managers in promoting fair reward system in international NGOs to support SDG8 and decent work.	In-depth semi-structured interviews with HR and reward managers from NGOs.	HR managers adopt different roles to promote fair reward system and leverage contextual factors like anti-discrimination campaign and COVID-19 to push for fairer reward practices.
Kruse, Wegge, [2024]	Investigate the impact of error management culture (EMC) on employee innovativeness and internal CSR.	Multi-level analysis of survey data from 82,927 employees across 10 countries.	Constructive EMC positively impacts employee innovativeness and internal CSR, with team diversity and national culture influencing these effects.
Li et al., [2023]	Examine the influence of institutional pressures on employee involvement in sustainability through CGHRM and POS.	Multi-wave, multisource survey of 96 firms using multilevel structural equation modelling (MSEM).	Institutional pressures positively affect CGHRM, which enhances POS, leading to increased employee involvement in sustainability.

Authors	Aim of the study	Methodology	Key findings
Pham et al., [2023]	Develop and validate a CGHRM scale and investigate its impact on ethical employee behaviors and OCBI.	Mixed-methods, scale development, and multi-wave survey	CGHRM positively influences ethical employee behaviors and OCBI via value commitment, with stronger effects when spiritual leadership is high.
Brunetto et al., [2023]	Examine the impact of Perceived Organizational Support (POS) on stress, resilience, and engagement in police officers.	Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) analysis of survey data from 220 Italian and 228 English police officers.	Low POS (acting as a 'Common Good HRM' factor) leads to high stress, reducing resilience and engagement, with stress mediating the relationship between POS and engagement.
Taylor, Earl, [2023]	Propose a framework for workforce ageing and employment of older workers using Common Good HRM principles.	Conceptual framework with references to empirical research on workforce ageing.	Proposes four principles of Common Good HRM for age management: outward orientation, equality, fairness, multi-stakeholder involvement.
Piwowar-Sulej, [2021]	Analyze core functions of Sustainable HRM using the H-Classics methodology.	Hybrid literature review using H-Classics methodology and manual content analysis.	HR training was the most discussed function, with HR flow least examined; gaps in Sustainable HRM functions were identified.
Aust et al., [2020]	Extend CGHRM further for HRM with the intention of stimulating future Sustainable HRM research.	Conceptual article with typology development and literature review.	Identifies four types of Sustainable HRM, including Common Good HRM, which shifts focus from economic to societal purposes.

Source: own study.

ADDRESSING BIG SOCIETAL CHALLENGES: TOWARDS COMMON GOOD HRM AS AN EMERGING RESEARCH FIELD

Abstract

This article explores the emerging concept of Human Resources Management in the Context of the Common Good (CGHRM), an approach that integrates the principles of sustainable development and common good into HRM practices. CGHRM stands as a pivotal concept for aligning organizational goals with broader societal and ecological objectives. The authors analyzed all articles that include the name of this concept in titles, abstract or keywords, and are indexed in the Web of Science and Scopus database. In total, 11 articles were found and analyzed. The presented analysis reveals that empirical research is sparse. The paper highlights the challenges and potential conflicts organizations face when implementing

CGHRM, such as balancing collective interests with organizational efficiency and employee performance. It also discusses various theoretical and empirical considerations in the field, including measurement scales and the impact of CGHRM practices on employee behavior and organizational sustainability.

In addressing these issues, the study underscores the need for a paradigm shift in HRM, from an individualistic, profit-driven focus to one that encompasses societal well-being and environmental stewardship. The authors suggest employing the Society-Actors-Processes-Policy (SAPP) approach for a more holistic understanding of policy-making in HRM. Additionally, they recommend exploratory-explanatory research using qualitative methods and case studies, particularly in the Polish context, due to the low level of awareness and implementation of sustainable development ideas. The article concludes with a proposal of research questions that could guide future studies on CGHRM, contributing to development of a more sustainable and socially responsible HRM paradigm.

KEYWORDS: COMMON GOOD HRM (CGHRM); SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS (SDGs); ECONOMIC, SOCIAL, AND ECOLOGICAL CHALLENGES; SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

JEL CLASSIFICATION CODES: M12, M14, Q01

RADZENIE SOBIE Z WIELKIMI WYZWANIAMi SPOŁECZNYMI: W KIERUNKU HRM DLA DOBRA WSPÓLNEGO JAKO WYŁANIAJĄCEGO SIĘ OBSZARU BADAŃ

Streszczenie

Artykuł przedstawia nowo powstającą koncepcję Zarządzania Zasobami Ludzkimi w Kontekście Wspólnego Dobra (CGHRM), podejście, które integruje zasady zrównoważonego rozwoju i dobra wspólnego z praktykami HRM. CGHRM staje się kluczowym pojęciem w kwestii dopasowywania celów organizacyjnych do szerszych społecznych i ekologicznych wyzwań. Prezentowana analiza ujawnia niewielką liczbę badań empirycznych w tym zakresie. Artykuł podkreśla wyzwania i potencjalne konflikty, przed którymi stoją organizacje wdrażające CGHRM, takie jak równoważenie interesów zbiorowych z efektywnością organizacyjną i wydajnością pracowników. Omawia także różne teoretyczne i empiryczne rozważania w tej dziedzinie, w tym skale pomiarowe oraz wpływ praktyk CGHRM na zachowanie pracowników i zrównoważony rozwój organizacji.

W odpowiedzi na te kwestie podkreślono potrzebę zmiany paradygmatu w HRM, od podejścia indywidualistycznego, opartego jedynie na zysku, do takiego, które obejmuje dobrobyt

społeczny i zarządzanie środowiskowe. Autorzy sugerują zastosowanie podejścia Społeczeństwo – Aktorzy – Procesy – Polityka (SAPP) dla bardziej holistycznego zrozumienia tworzenia polityki w HRM. Ponadto rekomendują badania eksploracyjno-eksplanacyjne, przy wykorzystaniu metod jakościowych oraz studium przypadku, szczególnie w warunkach polskich, ze względu na niski poziom świadomości i wdrożenia idei zrównoważonego rozwoju w tym kraju. Artykuł kończy się propozycją pytań badawczych, które mogą zostać zaadresowane w ramach przyszłych badań nad CGHRM, przyczyniając się do bardziej zrównoważonego i społecznie odpowiedzialnego paradygmatu HRM.

SŁOWA KLUCZOWE: ZARZĄDZANIE ZASOBAMI LUDZKIMI DLA WSPÓLNEGO DOBRA (CGHRM), CELE ZRÓWNOWAŻONEGO ROZWOJU (SDGs), WYZWANIA EKONOMICZNE, SPOŁECZNE I EKOLOGICZNE, ZRÓWNOWAŻONY ROZWÓJ

KODY KLASYFIKACJI JEL: M12, M14, Q01

