



Advance Journal of Econometrics and Finance

Online ISSN

2959-8990

Print ISSN

2959-8982

<https://ajeaf.com/index.php/Journal/About>

Name of Publisher: SCHOLAR CRAFT EDUCATION & RESEARCH HUB

Review Type: Double Blind Peer Review

Journal Frequency: Quarterly Research Journal (4- Issue)

Common Good HRM and Employee Well-Being: An Integrative Literature Review and Future Research Agenda

¹Saira Kanwal, ²Ume Hani Rahat, ³Asad Javed

	Abstract
Saira Kanwal PhD Scholar, GCUF. sairakanwal686@gmail.com Ume Hani Rahat PhD Scholar, GCUF. Umehanirahat786@gmail.com Asad Javed* PhD Scholar,GCUF. asadjaved657@gmail.com	The growing concern with social sustainability, decent work, employee dignity, and the wider societal responsibilities of organizations has encouraged human resource management (HRM) to reconsider the dominant assumption that employees should primarily be managed as resources for organizational performance. Common Good Human Resource Management (CGHRM) represents an emerging response to this concern by positioning human, social, and ecological well-being as legitimate organizational ends rather than merely instruments for economic performance. Despite increasing interest in CGHRM, understanding of its relationship with employee well-being remains fragmented. This study provides an integrative review of open-access peer-reviewed literature published between 2021 and 2025 concerning CGHRM, sustainable HRM, and employee well-being. The review synthesizes direct CGHRM studies with closely related sustainable-HRM research explicitly oriented toward common-good values. Five interconnected mechanisms are identified: resource protection and resilience; meaningful work and thriving; relational support and social well-being; dignity, fairness, and inclusion; and employee voice and participation. The review further demonstrates that employee well-being should be conceptualized as multidimensional, incorporating psychological, social, physical, and eudaimonic dimensions rather than being reduced to job satisfaction or engagement. A multilevel conceptual framework is proposed in which CGHRM practices influence multidimensional employee well-being through resource-based, relational, and meaning-based mechanisms, subject to individual, organizational, institutional, and occupational boundary conditions. The review identifies major limitations in the current literature, including conceptual ambiguity, geographic concentration, cross-sectional designs, limited attention to vulnerable workers, insufficient examination of negative or paradoxical effects, and the absence of validated multidimensional CGHRM measures. A research agenda is developed to advance employee-centered and societally embedded HRM scholarship
Keywords:	Common Good HRM; employee well-being; sustainable HRM; meaningful work; thriving; resilience; social sustainability; human dignity; decent work

1. Introduction

Human resource management has traditionally been evaluated largely according to its contribution to organizational effectiveness, employee performance, productivity, and competitive advantage. Although this perspective has generated substantial theoretical and empirical development, it also creates an important normative question: **for whose** benefit should human resources be managed? Recent sustainability-oriented HRM has increasingly challenged the assumption that improvements in employee welfare are primarily valuable because they enhance organizational performance. Instead, employees' well-being, dignity, development, and capacity to live meaningful working lives are increasingly treated as legitimate outcomes in their own right.

This development has contributed to the emergence of Common Good Human Resource Management (CGHRM). CGHRM is conceptualized as an expansive form of sustainable HRM that moves beyond organizationally centered sustainability and incorporates the interests of employees, communities, society, and the natural environment. Aust et al. (2024), for example, connect CGHRM explicitly with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and argue that HRM has a role in addressing collective social and environmental challenges inside and beyond organizational boundaries. Cooke (2025) similarly characterizes common-good HRM as an important recent development within sustainable HRM and calls for a broader understanding of stakeholders, institutions, cultures, and HR ecosystems.

Employee well-being occupies a particularly important position in this emerging perspective. Whereas conventional HRM may consider well-being because healthy and satisfied workers are more productive, a common-good perspective creates a stronger normative proposition. Organizations have responsibilities for creating employment systems that protect and enhance human well-being irrespective of whether every such investment produces an immediate financial return. This employee-centered orientation is consistent with recent research arguing that well-being should constitute an organizational responsibility rather than merely an intermediate mechanism connecting HR practices with performance. Bhoir and Sinha's (2024) systematic review, for example, concludes that employee well-being-oriented HR practices should be considered organizational objectives in themselves and identifies fair pay, employment security, development, flexibility, voice, supportive relationships, and health and safety among relevant practices.

Empirical evidence directly connecting CGHRM and employee outcomes is beginning to emerge. Pham et al. (2023) demonstrated that CGHRM was associated with employee ethical behavior and organizational citizenship behavior through value commitment. Lu et al. (2025) subsequently showed that organizational CGHRM practices can enhance employees' perceived meaningfulness of work, which contributes to thriving and innovative behavior. Related sustainable-HRM research demonstrates that employee resilience and work engagement constitute additional mechanisms through which sustainability-oriented HR systems affect employee outcomes.

Despite these advances, the relationship between CGHRM and employee well-being remains theoretically fragmented. First, CGHRM is an emerging construct, and relatively few studies directly operationalize it. Second, employee well-being itself is conceptualized inconsistently across HRM research. Third, existing research often continues to justify well-being through its subsequent contribution to performance, potentially reproducing the instrumental logic that CGHRM is intended to transcend. Fourth, employee experiences across occupational, institutional, and socioeconomic contexts remain insufficiently understood. Recent research on marginalized home healthcare workers, for instance, demonstrates that HRM and well-being can overlook gender, precarious working conditions, external social structures, and outcomes extending beyond organizational boundaries.

Accordingly, this review addresses three research questions:

RQ1: How does recent literature conceptualize the relationship between Common Good HRM and employee well-being?

RQ2: Through what mechanisms and HR practices can CGHRM contribute to different dimensions of employee well-being?

RQ3: What theoretical, methodological, and contextual gaps should future research address to advance knowledge of CGHRM and employee well-being?

By answering these questions, the paper makes three contributions. First, it integrates the emerging CGHRM literature with relevant sustainable-HRM and employee-well-being research. Second, it shifts attention from whether CGHRM influences well-being toward **how, why, when, and for whom** such effects may occur. Third, it develops a multilevel conceptual framework and research agenda that positions employee well-being as an intrinsic common-good outcome rather than simply a mechanism for increasing performance.

2. Conceptual Foundations

2.1 From Sustainable HRM to Common Good HRM

Sustainable HRM encompasses a heterogeneous collection of perspectives concerning the long-term social, human, economic, and environmental implications of employment practices. This diversity has produced conceptual richness but also ambiguity concerning what exactly should be sustained and whose interests should receive priority. Cooke (2025) notes continuing uncertainty concerning the definition, measurement, and beneficiaries of sustainable HRM and presents the common-good approach as an opportunity to expand HRM beyond narrowly organizational beneficiaries.

CGHRM provides a distinctive answer to the beneficiary question. Rather than assuming that social and environmental outcomes require justification through organizational financial returns, CGHRM recognizes employees, communities, society, future generations, and ecological systems as legitimate stakeholders.

This distinction has substantial implications for employee well-being. Employee health, dignity, security, development, meaningful work, and participation become desirable outcomes because they contribute to human flourishing and societal sustainability, not simply because they generate higher productivity.

Aust et al. (2024) reinforce this broader perspective by connecting CGHRM with the SDGs and emphasizing HRM's potential contribution to social and environmental outcomes extending beyond workplace boundaries. Järlström et al. (2024), studying sustainability reports from 40 highly sustainable corporations, likewise identify HR practices related to common-good values and demonstrate the importance of authenticity when organizations claim that their HR systems contribute to sustainability.

CGHRM therefore represents more than the addition of employee wellness programs to traditional HRM. It potentially involves reconsidering the **purpose, beneficiaries, processes, and outcomes of HRM itself**.

2.2 Employee Well-Being as a Multidimensional Construct

A central problem within the literature concerns what researchers mean by employee well-being. Well-being cannot adequately be represented by a single measure such as job satisfaction. Recent HRM supports multidimensional conceptualizations incorporating psychological, physical, and social dimensions. Bhoir and Sinha (2024), for example, emphasize all three dimensions when developing their employee well-being HR practices framework.

A further distinction exists between hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. Hedonic well-being concerns positive affect, satisfaction, comfort, and the avoidance of distress. Eudaimonic well-being concerns functioning and flourishing through meaning, personal development, accomplishment, positive relationships, and realization of human potential. This distinction is particularly relevant to CGHRM because common-good employment should arguably involve more than making employees comfortable. It should create conditions under which people can develop and experience meaningful participation in work.

Bai (2025) connects sustainable HRM with the PERMA framework, encompassing positive emotion, engagement, relationships, meaning, and accomplishment. This approach highlights the possibility that HR systems can influence different elements of well-being through different mechanisms rather than generating a single undifferentiated well-being outcome.

For the purposes of the present review, employee well-being is therefore conceptualized as:

A multidimensional state of positive physical, psychological, social, and eudaimonic functioning through which employees are able to experience health, security, supportive relationships, dignity, meaning, development, and sustainable participation in working life.

This definition is particularly compatible with CGHRM because it recognizes employees as persons whose welfare extends beyond their immediate productive contribution.

3. Review Methodology

3.1 Review Design

Because direct empirical CGHRM research remains comparatively limited, this study adopts a **structured integrative literature review** rather than restricting the analysis to studies carrying the exact CGHRM label. An integrative approach is appropriate for emerging research domains in which constructs and theoretical boundaries are still developing.

The review uses two layers of evidence.

The **core literature** comprises studies that explicitly examine Common Good HRM or common-good values in HRM.

The **adjacent literature** comprises sustainable-HRM and employee-well-being research that directly informs the mechanisms, practices, or employee outcomes central to the CGHRM perspective.

This approach prevents conceptual overextension while avoiding an excessively narrow evidence base.

3.2 Eligibility Criteria

Studies were considered relevant when they met the following criteria:

1. Publication between 2021 and 2025, inclusive;
2. Peer-reviewed scholarly publication;
3. Availability through an open-access source;
4. Substantive focus on CGHRM, sustainable HRM, employee-oriented sustainability, or HRM and employee well-being relationships;
5. Relevance to employee well-being, meaningful work, thriving, resilience, dignity, inclusion, participation, social relationships, health, or closely related employee outcomes; and
6. Publication in English.

Studies whose primary focus was unrelated to HRM or employee well-being were excluded from the conceptual synthesis.

Because the purpose of the present article is theory development rather than effect-size estimation, evidence was synthesized thematically.

4. Findings

4.1 CGHRM as a Shift from Instrumental to Intrinsic Employee Well-Being

The most fundamental theme emerging from the literature is a change in the status of employee well-being.

Traditional mutual-gains arguments frequently suggest that organizations should invest in employees because well-being increases commitment, engagement, productivity, or performance. The common-good perspective does not necessarily reject organizational performance instead, it rejects the assumption that employee welfare becomes legitimate only when accompanied by organizational economic benefits.

Bhoir and Sinha (2024) make a related argument by positioning employee well-being as an organizational responsibility and warning against treating employee outcomes merely as instruments for organizational performance. CGHRM strengthens this position by embedding employee well-being within broader societal sustainability.

This suggests a fundamental theoretical distinction:

Performance-oriented logic:

HR practices → employee well-being → organizational performance.

Common-good logic:

CGHRM → employee well-being **as a legitimate end**, while potentially also generating organizational and societal outcomes.

The distinction is important because the same HR practice can have different normative foundations depending on its purpose and implementation.

4.2 Resource Protection, Resilience, and Sustainable Functioning

The first major mechanism connecting common-good-oriented HRM with employee well-being concerns the creation and protection of resources.

Employees possess finite psychological, social, cognitive, and physical resources. Excessive workload, insecurity, poor supervision, work-family conflict, and unsafe working conditions can deplete these resources. Conversely, developmental opportunities, supportive management, security, autonomy, and adequate recovery can create or protect them.

Lu et al. (2023), drawing on the Job Demands Resources perspective, found that sustainable HRM practices positively affected employee resilience and work engagement. Their multilevel and multisource findings suggest that resilience constitutes an important pathway connecting sustainability-oriented HR practices with positive employee outcomes.

Research on sustainable leadership similarly identifies resilience as an explanatory mechanism connecting sustainability-oriented management with employee well-being. Evidence from SMEs indicates that sustainable leadership can contribute to employee well-being partly by strengthening employee resilience.

From a CGHRM perspective, however, resilience requires careful interpretation. Organizations should not use resilience discourse to transfer responsibility for harmful working conditions onto individual employees. A common-good approach should prioritize the removal of unnecessary demands and protection of human resources before expecting employees to become more resilient.

Thus:

CGHRM practices → resource protection/resource generation → resilience and sustainable functioning → employee well-being.

4.3 Meaningful Work and Thriving

The second pathway concerns meaningfulness.

Meaningful work is particularly important to CGHRM because the common-good perspective connects employment with purposes extending beyond individual financial gain or organizational profitability.

Lu et al. (2025) provide direct empirical evidence for this mechanism. Using a multi-wave, multisource design involving 45 Chinese firms, 82 executives, and 206 employees, they found that organizational CGHRM practices contributed to perceived meaningfulness of work, which subsequently promoted employee thriving and innovative behavior. This finding is theoretically important because thriving combines experiences of **vitality and learning**. It therefore represents a form of eudaimonic well-being rather than simple satisfaction.

CGHRM may increase meaningfulness when employees perceive that their work contributes to legitimate social, environmental, or human purposes. However, future research should distinguish genuine meaningfulness from organizational rhetoric. Employees may react negatively where organizations publicly promote sustainability or social responsibility while employment practices contradict these values.

The mechanism can therefore be expressed as:

Authentic CGHRM → perceived meaningfulness → thriving → eudaimonic well-being.

4.4 Relational Support and Social Well-Being

Employee well-being also has an inherently relational dimension.

Supportive supervisors, coworker relationships, teamwork, communication, organizational care, compassion, and inclusion can provide employees with social resources and belonging. Bhoir and Sinha's (2024) review identifies workgroup interaction and supportive practices among important components of employee-oriented well-being HR systems. Evidence from healthcare research also indicates that sustainable leadership can support employee well-being through procedural knowledge and compassion, highlighting the relational and social mechanisms underlying sustainable management.

This relational pathway is especially consistent with common-good philosophy because individuals do not experience well-being independently from their communities. Workplace relationships constitute part of the social environment through which employees experience recognition, belonging, respect, and mutual support.

Consequently:

CGHRM → organizational support/compassion/positive relationships → belonging and social resources → social and psychological well-being.

4.5 Dignity, Fairness, Security, and Inclusion

A fourth theme concerns basic employment conditions.

Well-being interventions can become superficial when organizations offer wellness initiatives while employees simultaneously experience insecure employment, unfair compensation, discrimination, excessive workloads, or unsafe working conditions.

Bhoir and Sinha (2024) identify fair pay, employment security, development, health and safety, flexibility, employee voice, and mental-health support among relevant employee-well-being HR practices. Research connecting CGHRM with the SDGs similarly emphasizes the importance of social sustainability and decent employment rather than restricting sustainability to environmental outcomes.

Recent work on marginalized home healthcare employees provides a particularly important warning. This research shows that well-being scholarship can neglect gendered structures, socioeconomic conditions, precarious employment, and external influences on worker welfare.

Thus, CGHRM requires a distinction between **wellness practices** and **well-being-supportive employment systems**.

The former may include counselling, mindfulness, or wellness programs. The latter address structural employment conditions including fair treatment, security, workload, safety, inclusion, compensation, development, and voice.

A common-good approach arguably requires both but gives priority to eliminating structural sources of harm.

4.6 Employee Voice, Participation, and Agency

The fifth mechanism concerns employee agency.

Employees cannot easily be treated as beneficiaries of the common good while being excluded from decisions determining their working conditions. Employee voice, participation, and workplace democracy therefore represent potentially central components of CGHRM.

Well-being-oriented HR research identifies voice as an important component of employee-centered HR bundles. CGHRM scholarship further expands this logic because participation helps transform employees from passive recipients of HR practices into stakeholders capable of influencing what constitutes the common good.

Employee participation may influence well-being through several pathways: increasing perceived control, strengthening procedural justice, improving job design, enabling employees to identify harmful conditions, and increasing organizational belonging.

Accordingly:

CGHRM → employee voice and participation → autonomy/control and perceived justice → employee well-being.

5. Integrative Conceptual Framework

Based on the reviewed literature, this paper proposes a **Common Good HRM and Employee Well-Being Framework**.

CGHRM practices

The first layer consists of HR practices reflecting common-good principles:

fair and secure employment; health and safety protection; employee development; meaningful job design; flexible work arrangements; employee voice and participation; diversity and inclusion; supportive leadership; work-life support; socially and environmentally responsible participation.

These practices generate three broad classes of mechanisms.

Resource-based mechanisms

These include resource preservation, resilience, manageable demands, autonomy, security, development, and opportunities for recovery.

Relational mechanisms

These include perceived organizational support, trust, fairness, compassion, inclusion, belonging, and positive workplace relationships.

Meaning-based mechanisms

These include meaningful work, value congruence, contribution to society, ethical identification, purpose, learning, and thriving.

Together, these mechanisms contribute to four interconnected well-being dimensions:

Psychological well-being — positive affect, reduced strain, satisfaction, mental health.

Physical well-being — health, safety, sustainable workload, recovery.

Social well-being — belonging, positive relationships, inclusion, interpersonal support.

Eudaimonic well-being — meaning, thriving, learning, accomplishment, dignity, and human development.

The framework further proposes that these relationships depend on contextual conditions.

At the **individual level**, employment status, career stage, gender, family responsibilities, personal resources, and employee interpretations may affect responses.

At the **organizational level**, leadership, HR implementation quality, organizational culture, workload, organizational authenticity, and employment systems may strengthen or weaken outcomes.

At the **institutional level**, labor regulation, national culture, welfare institutions, economic conditions, and stakeholder pressure may determine what CGHRM practices are possible and how employees experience them.

At the **societal level**, inequality, environmental conditions, community relationships, gender norms, and labor-market structures can shape employee well-being beyond organizational boundaries.

The proposed model therefore rejects a universal assumption that CGHRM automatically generates well-being. Instead, it proposes a **multilevel, contingent relationship**.

6. Discussion

6.1 Theoretical Contribution

The first contribution of this review is the repositioning of employee well-being from an instrumental mediator to a **substantive common-good outcome**.

Existing HRM research frequently examines whether employee well-being ultimately improves performance. CGHRM provides a normative basis for reversing the question: HRM systems should also be evaluated according to whether organizational performance is achieved without undermining employees' dignity, health, development, relationships, and sustainable working lives.

Second, this review extends CGHRM by distinguishing three mechanisms—**resource-based, relational, and meaning-based mechanisms**. Existing studies frequently examine these mechanisms separately. Their integration provides a clearer theoretical explanation of how CGHRM may produce different dimensions of well-being.

Third, the review integrates hedonic and eudaimonic perspectives. Meaningfulness and thriving identified in direct CGHRM research demonstrate that the concept should extend beyond satisfaction and absence of stress. Bai's (2025) PERMA-oriented analysis similarly demonstrates the value of conceptualizing well-being through positive emotion, engagement, relationships, meaning, and accomplishment.

Fourth, the framework expands analysis beyond organizational boundaries. Recent CGHRM scholarship emphasizes broader stakeholder systems, while research involving marginalized workers demonstrates that social and structural conditions external to organizations can fundamentally affect employee welfare.

7. Future Research Agenda

7.1 Develop and Validate CGHRM Measurement

A major limitation is the absence of a universally established multidimensional CGHRM measurement framework.

Pham et al. (2023) made an important contribution by developing and validating items for CGHRM in their empirical study. Nevertheless, the conceptual domain continues to develop.

Future research should establish whether CGHRM should be modeled as a unidimensional construct, multidimensional construct, formative index, or higher-order HR system.

Particular attention should be given to dimensions such as:

- human dignity and decent work;
- employee well-being;
- participation and workplace democracy;
- diversity and inclusion;
- meaningful work;
- societal contribution; and
- environmental responsibility.

7.2 Move Beyond Cross-Sectional Research

CGHRM concerns sustainability over time, yet much HRM research captures employees' perceptions at a single point.

Future studies should employ longitudinal, multi-wave, experimental, and quasi-experimental designs. Researchers could examine employee well-being before and after organizations implement common-good-oriented HR interventions.

Such designs would improve causal inference and allow examination of whether CGHRM effects persist over time.

7.3 Investigate the Dark Side and Paradoxes of CGHRM

CGHRM should not be assumed to produce universally positive outcomes.

Socially and environmentally responsible initiatives may create additional work. Sustainability participation may generate role overload. Employee volunteering programs can create implicit pressure. Meaningful work can encourage employees to tolerate excessive demands because they perceive their work as socially important.

Future research should therefore investigate:

When can common-good initiatives reduce rather than improve employee well-being?

This question would move CGHRM beyond normative optimism toward theoretically mature analysis.

7.4 Examine Vulnerable and Marginalized Workers

Much sustainability-oriented HR research remains concentrated in formal organizational settings and relatively secure employee populations.

The review of home healthcare workers illustrates the importance of gender, precarious work, socioeconomic conditions, and occupational marginalization.

Future CGHRM research should examine migrant workers, platform workers, gig workers, temporary employees, low-wage workers, informal-sector workers, persons with disabilities, and other groups whose employment experiences may differ substantially from professional employees.

A common-good theory that explains only relatively privileged employees would be theoretically incomplete.

7.5 Expand Research Beyond Limited Geographic Contexts

Several important empirical studies have been conducted in Asian contexts, including China and Vietnam. These studies provide valuable evidence but also create opportunities for comparative research.

CGHRM may operate differently across liberal market economies, coordinated market economies, emerging economies, and institutionally fragile environments.

Cross-country research should investigate whether labor regulation, cultural values, welfare institutions, union representation, economic development, and institutional enforcement modify CGHRM and well-being relationships.

7.6 Study Well-Being as a Multidimensional Outcome

Future research should avoid treating employee well-being as a single variable.

CGHRM practices may simultaneously improve one dimension while damaging another. For example, participation in socially meaningful projects may increase meaningfulness but also increase workload.

Researchers should therefore simultaneously assess:

psychological well-being, physical well-being, social well-being, and eudaimonic well-being.

This would reveal potential trade-offs hidden by aggregate well-being scores.

7.7 Investigate Employee Perceptions and Implementation

Formal HR policies do not guarantee employee well-being.

Employees experience HRM primarily through implementation by managers and through their interpretations of organizational motives. A policy described as common-good-oriented by senior management may be perceived by employees as symbolic or instrumental.

Future studies should therefore distinguish:

Intended CGHRM → implemented CGHRM → perceived CGHRM → employee well-being.

This distinction may explain inconsistent findings across organizations.

7.8 Examine Common-Good Authenticity

The literature on common-good sustainability reporting raises another important question: whether organizations genuinely integrate common-good principles or primarily communicate them symbolically. Järlström et al. (2024) highlight the importance of authenticity in sustainable HRM reporting.

Future research should investigate the consequences of inconsistency between external sustainability claims and employees' internal employment experiences.

A particularly promising proposition is:

Perceived CGHRM authenticity strengthens the positive relationship between CGHRM practices and employee well-being, whereas perceived hypocrisy weakens or reverses it.

8. Practical Implications

The findings have several implications for HR professionals.

First, organizations seeking to implement CGHRM should avoid reducing employee well-being to isolated wellness initiatives. Counselling programs and wellness activities cannot compensate for persistent insecurity, excessive workloads, discrimination, unfair compensation, or unsafe work.

Second, HR professionals should assess well-being across multiple dimensions. Psychological health is important, but sustainable employment also requires physical safety, positive social relationships, meaningful work, development, and dignity.

Third, employee voice should become part of the design of CGHRM systems. Employees should participate in identifying what constitutes well-being and the common good rather than having these concepts defined exclusively by senior management.

Fourth, organizations should evaluate possible trade-offs associated with sustainability initiatives. An environmental or social initiative cannot automatically be classified as common-good HRM if achieving it systematically damages employee welfare.

Finally, organizations should examine whether sustainability communication matches employment reality. Authenticity requires alignment between external commitments and employees' lived experience.

9. Limitations

This review has several limitations.

First, CGHRM remains an emerging research domain, resulting in a relatively limited body of studies directly operationalizing the construct. The review therefore incorporated closely aligned sustainable-HRM literature where it explicitly informed common-good values or employee well-being.

Second, the review was restricted to open-access scholarship published from 2021 through 2025. This decision increases transparency and reproducibility for readers without subscription access but excludes potentially relevant subscription-based research and foundational literature published before 2021.

Third, because the review integrates conceptual, empirical, and review-based scholarship, findings should not be interpreted as a meta-analytic estimate of the magnitude of CGHRM effects.

Finally, conceptual boundaries among sustainable HRM, well-being-oriented HRM, socially responsible HRM, and CGHRM remain contested. Rather than eliminating this ambiguity, the review identifies conceptual clarification as an important direction for future research.

10. Conclusion

Common Good HRM represents an important shift in thinking about the purpose of human resource management. Instead of asking exclusively how HR practices can make employees more productive, CGHRM raises a broader question: how can employment systems contribute to human flourishing, societal sustainability, and organizational viability simultaneously?

The literature reviewed in this paper indicates that employee well-being occupies a central position in answering this question. CGHRM and closely related sustainable-HRM practices can potentially influence well-being through resource protection and resilience, meaningful work and thriving, supportive relationships, dignity and fairness, and employee voice and participation. Recent empirical research provides particularly promising evidence concerning meaningfulness, thriving, resilience, engagement, ethical behavior, and employee participation.

However, the evidence base remains emergent. Existing research is characterized by conceptual ambiguity, restricted geographic coverage, limited longitudinal evidence, insufficient examination of vulnerable workers, and inadequate attention to potential trade-offs and unintended consequences.

The principal theoretical argument developed in this review is therefore that employee well-being should not be positioned merely as a mechanism through which CGHRM generates organizational performance. Within a genuine common-good framework, employee well-being constitutes an outcome worthy of organizational attention in its own right.

Future CGHRM scholarship should consequently evaluate HR systems according to a broader criterion whether organizations enable employees to remain healthy, secure, respected, included, socially connected, capable of development, and able to experience meaningful and sustainable working lives while simultaneously contributing to organizations, communities, society, and the natural environment.

References

- Abid, G., Contreras, F., Rank, S., & Ilyas, S. (2023). Sustainable leadership and wellbeing of healthcare personnel: A sequential mediation model of procedural knowledge and compassion. *Frontiers in Psychology, 13*, 1039456. DOI: 10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1039456.
- 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, 38*(2), 93–110. DOI: 10.1177/23970022241240890.
- Bai, B. (2025). Exploring sustainable HRM through the lens of employee wellbeing. *Sustainability, 17*(12), 5646. DOI: 10.3390/su17125646.
- Bhoir, M., & Sinha, V. (2024). Employee well-being human resource practices: A systematic literature review and directions for future research. *Future Business Journal, 10*, 95. DOI: 10.1186/s43093-024-00382-w.
- 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, 64*(5), 1381–1399. DOI: 10.1002/hrm.22318.
- Järlström, M., Saru, E., Viitasaari, M., & Akrivou, K. (2024). Integrating ‘common good’ authenticity for sustainable human resource management reporting. *German Journal of Human Resource Management, 38*(2), 159–182. DOI: 10.1177/23970022241229035.
- Jaskeviciute, V., Stankeviciene, A., Diskiene, D., & Savicke, J. (2021). The relationship between employee well-being and organizational trust in the context of sustainable human resource management. *Problems and Perspectives in Management, 19*(2), 118–131. DOI: 10.21511/ppm.19(2).2021.10.
- Lu, Y., Zhang, M. M., Yang, M. M., & Li, T. (2025). Enhancing employee outcomes through Common Good Human Resource Management: Exploring the role of meaningfulness and thriving. *Human Resource Management, 64*(2), 485–502. DOI: 10.1002/hrm.22270.
- 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. DOI: 10.1002/hrm.22153.
- 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. DOI: 10.1111/1748-8583.12493.