International Journal of Applied and Advanced Multidisciplinary Research (IJAAMR)
Vol. 4, No. 10, 2026: 993-1008

Sustainable Human Resource Management: A Strategic Approach to Achieving Organizational Sustainability

IWK Teja Sukmana[1*], I Made Dwi Adnyana[2], Putu Steven Eka Putra[3]
Universitas Dhyana Pura
Corresponding Author: IWK Teja Sukmana tejasukmana@undhirabali.ac.id

A R T I C L E I N F O

Keywords: Sustainable Human Resource Management, Organizational Sustainability, Employee Well-Being, Social Responsibility, Green HRM

Received: 5 August
Revised: 22 September
Accepted: 25 October

©2026 Sukmana, Adnyana, Putra: This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Atribusi 4.0 Internasional.

A B S T R A C T

Sustainable Human Resource Management (Sustainable HRM) integrates economic, social, and environmental sustainability into human resource policies and practices. This article examines its concepts, theoretical foundations, implementation across HR functions, potential benefits, and organizational challenges. A qualitative theoretical literature review was conducted using relevant scholarly publications from 2021–2025, selected for their relevance and traceable bibliographic information

DOI: https://doi.org/10.59890/ijaamr.v4i10.3
ISSN-E: 3026-2437
https://journalijaamr.my.id/index.php/ijaamr

INTRODUCTION

Organizations operate in an environment in which financial performance remains essential but is no longer a sufficient description of organizational success. Employers are increasingly expected to consider how their operations affect employees, communities, and the natural environment, while maintaining the economic capacity required for continued operation.

Human resource management (HRM) has a central role in translating organizational priorities into everyday work. Decisions concerning workforce planning, recruitment, selection, training, performance appraisal, compensation, promotion, work design, and employment relations shape the conditions under which employees contribute to organizational objectives.

An organization may achieve short-term output targets while creating conditions that weaken its long-term capacity. For example, targets that disregard staffing levels or work complexity may increase pressure and fatigue. Incentives that reward only immediate output can encourage employees to overlook safety, quality, collaboration, or resource use.

A sustainable approach does not imply that productivity, cost control, or financial performance should be abandoned. Organizations need sufficient economic resources to pay employees, maintain facilities, invest in training, and adapt to changing markets.

The importance of this perspective is visible in the development of scholarship on Sustainable HRM, Green HRM, and socially responsible HRM. Piwowar-Sulej (2021) examines the core HR functions addressed in Sustainable HRM research and notes the importance of considering several HR activities rather than a single practice. Kainzbauer et al.

These studies provide a foundation for a broader conceptual question: how can organizations distinguish isolated sustainability initiatives from a genuinely integrated HRM approach? Environmental training, energy-saving campaigns, or waste-reduction programs may be useful, but they do not necessarily demonstrate that the overall HR system is sustainable. A comprehensive approach must also consider employee treatment, fairness, development, economic continuity, and the consistency of management decisions.

Research Objectives and Questions

This article aims to synthesize relevant literature on Sustainable HRM and clarify its implications for organizational practice. It has five objectives: to explain the concept and theoretical foundations of Sustainable HRM; to analyze the economic, social, and environmental dimensions of sustainability in HR practices; to identify the ways Sustainable HRM may contribute to employee well-being and organizational sustainability; to discuss barriers to implementation; and to derive implications for HR practitioners and future research.

The review is guided by five questions. First, how is Sustainable HRM conceptualized and theoretically grounded in contemporary HRM scholarship? Second, how can the three dimensions of sustainability be integrated into HR policies and practices? Third, through what potential mechanisms may

Sustainable HRM contribute to employee well-being and organizational sustainability?

Contribution and Scope

The article contributes a structured conceptual synthesis rather than new empirical findings. It brings together literature on Sustainable HRM, Green HRM, and socially responsible HRM to explain their relationship and distinguish their scope.

THEORETICAL REVIEW

1. Conceptualizing Sustainable Human Resource Management

Sustainable HRM can be understood as the integration of sustainability principles into the design, implementation, and evaluation of HR policies and practices. It broadens the purpose of HRM beyond the immediate alignment of employee capabilities and organizational objectives by considering the long-term availability of skills, the quality of employment relationships, employee well-being, social responsibility, and environmental consequences.

A key implication is that sustainability should be considered throughout the employment relationship. Recruitment decisions influence the competencies and expectations employees bring into the organization. Training affects whether employees can adapt to changing work requirements.

Sustainable HRM also introduces a temporal perspective. A policy may appear efficient in the short term but create future costs if it leads to avoidable turnover, loss of knowledge, preventable injuries, skill shortages, or environmental waste.

Piwowar-Sulej (2021) identifies several approaches related to Sustainable HRM, including Green HRM, socially responsible HRM, Triple Bottom Line HRM, and Common Good HRM. These perspectives differ in their primary emphasis, but each highlights some aspect of the relationship between people management and broader responsibilities.

2. Development of Sustainability within HRM

The development of sustainability within HRM reflects an expansion in the way the role of HR systems is understood. Strategic HRM traditionally emphasizes the alignment of people, competencies, and organizational strategy.

Kainzbauer et al. (2021) map connected streams of research that include Green HRM, corporate social responsibility, and Sustainable HRM. These streams overlap, but they are not interchangeable. Green HRM emphasizes the environmental dimension of people management.

This distinction matters for organizational diagnosis. An organization may have effective environmental initiatives but still maintain inequitable reward systems or insufficient support for employee development. Another organization may offer strong employee benefits while failing to address wasteful resource use. In both cases, a single positive initiative is not enough to establish comprehensive sustainability.

The literature reviewed by Omidi and Dal Zotto (2022) reinforces the relevance of employee experience and ethical responsibility. Ren et al. (2023) further argue for a strategic connection between HRM and sustainability.

THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS

Stakeholder Theory

Stakeholder theory emphasizes that organizations affect and depend on multiple parties, including employees, owners, customers, suppliers, communities, governments, and the natural environment. The theory provides a basis for evaluating organizational decisions beyond their direct effects on shareholders or short-term financial outcomes.

The stakeholder perspective also draws attention to the distribution of benefits and costs. A decision that improves financial performance may still be problematic if it shifts excessive risk or workload to employees or creates avoidable harm for communities.

Resource-Based View

The resource-based view explains how internal resources and capabilities can support organizational advantage. Human resources may contribute through expertise, experience, knowledge, cooperation, and the capacity to learn. Sustainable HRM is consistent with this perspective when it invests in capabilities that remain relevant as technology, markets, and sustainability expectations change. Training, knowledge transfer, leadership development, and succession planning can help preserve organizational knowledge and improve adaptation.

However, a purely instrumental reading of human resources would be incomplete. Employees are not only resources to be utilized; they are people whose health, dignity, and future opportunities matter in their own right.

Ability–Motivation–Opportunity Framework

The Ability–Motivation–Opportunity (AMO) framework offers a practical lens for examining how HR practices may influence employee contributions. Ability is supported by recruitment, selection, education, and training. Motivation can be influenced by fair compensation, recognition, meaningful feedback, and transparent performance management.

The three elements need to be considered together. Employees may have the ability to identify environmental waste but lack the opportunity to change an inefficient process. They may be motivated to improve safety but face production targets that penalize time spent following safety procedures.

AMO is an analytical framework rather than a complete definition of Sustainable HRM. It can help explain how selected HR practices become employee capabilities and behavior, but it does not independently encompass all questions about environmental impact, social responsibility, or long-term economic viability. Its value lies in showing that sustainability-related behavior requires more than awareness or formal policy.

Dimensions of Sustainable HRM

Economic Sustainability

Economic sustainability concerns the organization's ability to remain viable, maintain productive capacity, and create value over time. HRM

contributes through workforce planning, appropriate staffing, skills development, succession planning, and the improvement of work processes.

Efficiency should not be reduced to labor-cost minimization. Better training can reduce errors; effective onboarding can improve role clarity; knowledge sharing can prevent the loss of expertise; and improved work design can reduce unnecessary effort. These practices may support productivity while also improving the quality and reliability of work.

Economic goals can conflict with social and environmental priorities when managers rely on short-term savings. Cutting training, reducing staffing below operational needs, or postponing safety improvements may reduce immediate expenditure while increasing risk.

Social Sustainability

Social sustainability concerns the quality and fairness of employment relationships. It includes employee well-being, occupational health and safety, equitable treatment, inclusion, reasonable workloads, opportunities for development, and the ability to raise concerns without fear of retaliation. These issues are not peripheral to HRM; they are directly shaped by policies and managerial behavior.

Well-being should be considered in work design rather than only through separate wellness programs. An organization may offer health activities but fail to address persistent understaffing or unrealistic deadlines.

Social sustainability does not mean eliminating all work demands. Jobs inevitably involve responsibilities, deadlines, and performance expectations. The relevant question is whether those demands are reasonable, whether employees have adequate resources and support, and whether the organization responds when risks become apparent. Omidi and Dal Zotto (2022) position ethical and socially responsible treatment as important concerns within HRM.

Environmental Sustainability

Environmental sustainability concerns the reduction of negative environmental impacts associated with organizational activity. HR-related practices can include environmental awareness training, resource-efficiency procedures, reduced paper use, energy conservation, waste management, and performance indicators related to the environmental responsibilities of particular roles.

Environmental initiatives are unlikely to be effective when organizational systems contradict the requested behavior. Employees cannot reliably reduce paper use if processes require multiple printed copies. Energy-saving behavior may be difficult when equipment or facilities do not support it.

Piwowar-Sulej (2021) notes that environmental issues have received substantial attention in the literature examined. This is a reason to maintain a balanced view: environmental HR practices are important, but they should not displace attention to employee well-being, fair treatment, and economic continuity. The three dimensions should be considered together when decisions are designed and evaluated.

Sustainable HRM and Green HRM

Green HRM and Sustainable HRM are closely related but have different scopes. Green HRM focuses primarily on how HR policies and employee behavior can support environmental objectives. Examples include environmental training, recruiting for relevant environmental competencies, including environmental criteria in performance appraisal, and encouraging employee participation in waste reduction.

This distinction helps prevent an overly narrow assessment of sustainability. A company that introduces energy-saving training may be implementing a meaningful Green HRM practice. However, a comprehensive Sustainable HRM assessment would also consider whether the company offers fair compensation, maintains safe conditions, develops employee capabilities, and manages its resources in ways that support long-term viability. Environmental achievements should not be used to obscure weaknesses in employment practices.

Paulet et al. (2021), Xie and Lau (2023), Mahdy et al. (2023), and Joshi et al. (2023) examine Green HRM and its development, including questions about conceptual clarity, research methods, and organizational sustainability.

Contemporary Research and Identified Gaps

The contemporary literature suggests a growing but diverse research field. Studies differ in definitions, theoretical perspectives, research contexts, methods, and the HR practices they examine. This diversity enables multiple aspects of sustainability to be investigated, but it can also make findings difficult to compare when constructs and indicators are not clearly defined.

Piwowar-Sulej (2021) examines the core HR functions included in Sustainable HRM research. Kainzbauer et al. (2021) map research streams through document co-citation analysis. Omidi and Dal Zotto (2022) review socially responsible HRM, while Ren et al. (2023) connect strategic HRM with the sustainability agenda.

More recent reviews point to continuing implementation questions. Banga and Gobind (2025) review the implementation of sustainability in HRM, while Purgał-Popiela (2025) examines sustainability-related HR practices in small and medium-sized enterprises. Naqshbandi et al. (2025) review the development of Sustainable HRM research across a broad publication period.

A central research gap is the need to distinguish formal sustainability commitments from actual HR practices and employee experiences. Another is the need for measures that represent economic, social, and environmental dimensions without reducing the construct to environmental activity alone. Further research can also examine whether relationships differ by sector, organizational size, institutional setting, or workforce characteristics.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This article adopts a qualitative theoretical literature review. The design is appropriate for an article whose purpose is to interpret and synthesize concepts, theoretical perspectives, and arguments from existing scholarship rather than collect primary data or test hypotheses statistically.

Sources and Selection Approach

The article draws on relevant scholarly publications from 2021–2025. Sources were selected according to their relevance to the research questions and the traceability of their bibliographic information through publisher pages and DOI records.

The source set includes conceptual and review-oriented work relevant to the article's themes. It was not assembled through a fully documented systematic search protocol. The article does not report an exhaustive database search, a reproducible search string, a formal screening flow, or a complete inclusion–exclusion procedure.

Analytical Procedure

The literature was examined descriptively and thematically. First, recurring concepts and the stated scope of each research stream were identified. Second, the concepts were organized around the economic, social, and environmental dimensions of sustainability.

The analysis focuses on conceptual patterns and plausible mechanisms described in the literature. It does not calculate effect sizes, estimate causal relationships, or claim that the practices discussed will produce identical outcomes across organizations.

Methodological Limitations

The review is limited by the absence of a fully documented systematic search and screening process. Selection may not include all relevant publications, and the conclusions depend on the scope and quality of the studies considered. The literature also varies in terminology and emphasis, especially between Green HRM and broader Sustainable HRM.

RESULTS

1. Sustainable HRM as an Integrated System

The first result of the synthesis is that Sustainable HRM is most coherently understood as an integrated system rather than a collection of separate programs. Recruitment, training, performance management, compensation, work design, and employment relations influence one another.

Systemic alignment means that organizational goals, HR policies, performance indicators, managerial behavior, and employee expectations should reinforce one another. Sustainability cannot be assessed solely by counting programs or reviewing official statements.

2. Integration Across Core HR Functions

Recruitment and Selection

Recruitment and selection can support Sustainable HRM by identifying job-relevant capabilities and communicating realistic expectations about work.

Where environmental responsibilities are relevant to a role, selection may assess the candidate's knowledge of resource efficiency or waste management. For other roles, relevant criteria may include safety competence, collaboration, ethical judgment, or adaptability.

Recruitment is also a point at which the organization communicates its own responsibilities. Candidates should receive realistic information about working conditions, expected responsibilities, available support, and development opportunities.

Training and Development

Training and development build the capabilities needed to respond to changing technology, operational requirements, and sustainability expectations. Relevant areas may include occupational safety, efficient processes, environmental management, inclusive communication, technical skills, and leadership.

Training should not be treated as an administrative activity whose success is measured only by attendance. Organizations can assess whether employees understand the content, whether procedures change, and whether employees have the resources to apply new skills.

Performance Management

Performance management should evaluate both the results achieved and the manner in which they are achieved. If employees are judged exclusively on volume, revenue, or speed, they may have incentives to overlook safety, quality, cooperation, or resource use. Sustainable HRM therefore supports the use of balanced, role-relevant indicators that reflect the responsibilities of the position.

Operational indicators may include work quality, compliance with safety procedures, reduction of avoidable waste, and contributions to process improvement. Managerial indicators may include employee development, fairness in the allocation of work, the quality of the team environment, and implementation of relevant sustainability policies.

Compensation and Recognition

Compensation is important because it recognizes employee contribution and affects employees' ability to meet their needs. Sustainable HRM emphasizes fairness, transparency, and consistency in pay and reward systems.

Rewards can recognize measurable improvements in resource use, collaboration, quality, or responsible work practices. However, incentives must be designed carefully. If a bonus rewards only short-term output, employees may be encouraged to sacrifice longer-term quality or take unsafe shortcuts. Compensation should support responsible performance rather than simply maximize immediate productivity.

Employee Well-Being and Employment Relations

Employee well-being is a substantive part of social sustainability. Organizations can support it through safe work environments, reasonable workload distribution, open communication, supportive supervision, fair treatment, and policies that help employees manage work and personal responsibilities.

A sustainable employment relationship also requires credible mechanisms for reporting concerns, preventing discrimination, and addressing grievances

without retaliation. Employees need to be able to communicate problems before they become serious risks.

Potential Pathways to Organizational Sustainability

The literature synthesis identifies several potential pathways through which Sustainable HRM may contribute to organizational sustainability. First, competency development may improve work quality and adaptability. Employees with relevant knowledge and skills may be better prepared to reduce errors, adopt improved procedures, and respond to change. The size and durability of these benefits depend on training quality, job context, and opportunities to apply new competencies.

Second, fair treatment and attention to working conditions may support healthier employment relationships. When employees experience policies as consistent and fair, the organization has a stronger basis for trust.

Third, employee participation may reveal operational problems that are not fully visible to senior management. Employees who work directly with processes may identify waste, unsafe practices, unnecessary administrative steps, or opportunities to improve service quality.

Fourth, integrating social and environmental indicators into performance management can make consequences visible that are missed by financial metrics alone. A decision that reduces immediate cost may have wider implications for injury risk, employee turnover, material use, or environmental impact. Balanced evaluation does not remove trade-offs, but it gives managers a broader basis for making and explaining decisions.

Fifth, consistency between sustainability commitments and daily practice may strengthen organizational credibility among employees and other stakeholders. Conversely, a gap between official statements and actual working conditions may undermine trust. This means that communication should follow, not substitute for, substantive changes in policy, resource allocation, and managerial behavior.

Main Implementation Challenges

Short-Term Orientation

Sustainable HRM may require investment before benefits become visible. Training, safer facilities, improved technology, and more reliable measurement systems may create immediate costs. Organizations that prioritize short-term financial results can therefore delay or reduce such investments.

Resource Constraints

Organizations differ in their budgets, technical capacity, expertise, and ability to devote staff time to sustainability initiatives. Smaller organizations may be unable to implement complex systems immediately. Resource limitations do not necessarily prevent action, however.

Measurement Difficulties

Some indicators, such as training hours or energy consumption, are relatively straightforward to record, although their interpretation still requires

care. Other concepts, including fairness, work quality, employee experience, and long-term competency sustainability, are multidimensional.

A useful evaluation approach combines quantitative and qualitative information. Quantitative indicators may include turnover, occupational incidents, training participation, or resource use. Qualitative evidence may come from interviews, focus groups, employee feedback, and process reviews. Measurement should reflect the organizational context and should not claim causality without adequate evidence.

Gaps Between Policy and Practice

An organization may publish sustainability commitments while continuing to use practices that contradict them. For example, a stated commitment to employee well-being may coexist with unrealistic workloads, or an environmental campaign may be introduced without providing the facilities needed to reduce waste. Such gaps can make policies appear symbolic and reduce employee confidence.

Reducing this gap requires consistency between senior-management commitment, operational procedures, resource allocation, supervisory behavior, and evaluation. Employees should be able to see how sustainability expectations affect actual decisions.

Organizational Culture and Resistance

Resistance can emerge when managers and employees do not understand the purpose of changes or believe that sustainability requirements will create extra work without meaningful benefit. Managers may fear that well-being measures reduce productivity, while employees may see environmental initiatives as additional tasks. Clear communication, participation, training, and visible leadership support can help address these concerns.

Organizations should avoid blaming individuals for outcomes that are primarily shaped by system design. Employees cannot consistently follow procedures that conflict with their targets or operate without required equipment.

Synthesis of the Results

The review supports four overarching propositions. First, Sustainable HRM requires a long-term orientation that considers the consequences of current decisions for future organizational and employee capability. Second, sustainability principles should be integrated across HR functions so that recruitment, development, performance, rewards, and employment relations do not send conflicting signals.

These propositions synthesize themes from the reviewed literature and provide a conceptual framework for practice. They are not hypotheses tested with primary data in this article. The relationships among Sustainable HRM practices, employee experience, and organizational outcomes require further empirical examination across different contexts.

DISCUSSION

Why a Systemic Approach Matters

The central implication of the review is that Sustainable HRM should be assessed at the level of the HR system rather than through isolated initiatives. Individual programs can be valuable, but their contribution depends on the surrounding policies and conditions.

This systemic interpretation is consistent with the emphasis on core HR functions in Piwowar-Sulej (2021) and the broader strategic perspective discussed by Ren et al. (2023). It also reflects the socially responsible orientation examined by Omidi and Dal Zotto (2022).

Balancing Economic, Social, and Environmental Goals

The three sustainability dimensions can complement one another, but they can also create tensions. Investments in employee development may raise current costs while building future capability. Reducing staffing may improve short-term expenditure but increase workload and operational risk. Environmental changes may require new procedures or equipment before resource savings are realized.

A balanced approach does not require equal spending on every dimension in every period. Priorities should reflect organizational risks, obligations, strategy, and resources. The important requirement is that one dimension is not routinely treated as irrelevant. A cost-saving decision should be examined for its implications for safety and workload.

The Role of Managers and HR Practitioners

HR practitioners can coordinate the translation of sustainability priorities into workforce planning, job design, capability development, performance criteria, and employment policies. Their role includes ensuring that policies are mutually consistent and that managers understand how sustainability applies to their decisions.

Senior leadership is responsible for aligning sustainability commitments with strategic priorities and resource allocation. If leaders communicate sustainability as a priority but reward only short-term financial outcomes, employees receive conflicting signals.

Implications for Evaluation and Accountability

Evaluation should combine indicators that are meaningful for the organization and within its capacity to collect. Possible indicators include workforce stability, safety incidents, access to development, employee feedback, fairness in HR processes, resource consumption, and relevant productivity measures.

Measurement also requires careful interpretation. A reduction in turnover, for example, may be associated with improved working conditions, but it may also reflect labor-market constraints or other factors.

Conceptual Contribution and Research Agenda

The conceptual contribution of this article is to position Sustainable HRM as an integrative approach that connects HR policy coherence with economic,

social, and environmental responsibility. The framework emphasizes that the presence of sustainability programs is insufficient unless employees have the ability, motivation, and opportunity to act responsibly and unless the organization's incentives support the same priorities.

Future research can test whether particular Sustainable HRM practices are associated with employee well-being, engagement, retention, organizational resilience, and environmental outcomes. Studies should specify which dimensions are measured and how the practices are experienced by employees.

Contextual comparison is equally important. A large manufacturing company, a small hospitality business, a university, and a public organization face different operational risks, labor requirements, and environmental impacts.

Interpretation Boundaries

The findings presented here should be interpreted within the limits of a theoretical review. They identify recurring arguments, conceptual relationships, and implementation issues in the literature, but they do not establish causal effects or estimate the magnitude of any organizational benefit. The article does not include interviews, surveys, observations, or administrative data.

This distinction is important for responsible academic writing. Statements that Sustainable HRM may support well-being or resilience should not be read as proof that every program produces those outcomes. Implementation quality, leadership, organizational resources, labor-market conditions, and employee experience may influence results.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

Sustainable Human Resource Management is an approach that integrates economic, social, and environmental considerations into HR policies and practices. It extends beyond environmental initiatives to include employee well-being, fairness, responsible employment relationships, competency development, and long-term organizational capability. Its scope is broader than Green HRM, although environmental practices remain an important component.

The review indicates that Sustainable HRM should be implemented across the employee-management cycle, including recruitment and selection, training and development, performance management, compensation, employee well-being, and employment relations.

Sustainable HRM may contribute to organizational sustainability through competency development, healthier employment relationships, employee participation, more balanced performance evaluation, and greater consistency between commitments and practice. These are potential pathways identified through literature synthesis, not causal effects demonstrated by the present article. Actual outcomes are likely to depend on organizational context and the quality of implementation.

The main challenges include short-term financial orientation, resource limitations, difficulties in selecting meaningful indicators, inconsistencies between policy and practice, and resistance to change. Addressing these challenges requires management commitment, coherent HR policies, employee

involvement, adequate resources, and continuous evaluation of economic, social, and environmental consequences.

Recommendations for Practitioners

First, organizations should incorporate sustainability into HR strategy and routine decision-making rather than treating it as a separate campaign. Workforce planning, recruitment, development, performance management, compensation, and employee relations should reflect the organization's sustainability priorities.

Second, performance evaluation should include relevant economic, social, and environmental indicators. Indicators should be limited to those that can inform decisions and that employees or managers can reasonably influence.

Third, employee development should be based on actual capability needs and linked to opportunities to apply learning. Training should be evaluated through changes in knowledge, work procedures, or relevant behavior rather than attendance alone. Development plans should also consider future skill requirements and knowledge transfer.

Fourth, organizations should support safe, fair, and workable employment conditions. This includes reasonable workload allocation, transparent compensation, open communication, reliable grievance mechanisms, and protection against discrimination or retaliation. Employee well-being should be addressed through job design and management practices, not only through supplementary wellness activities.

Fifth, managers should involve employees in identifying process improvements and sustainability risks. Participation is meaningful when employees can raise concerns, receive responses, and see how suggestions influence decisions. Managers should also ensure that employees have the equipment, authority, and time required to follow sustainability procedures.

Sixth, organizations should adapt implementation to their size, resources, and operational context. Where resources are limited, they can begin with high-priority areas such as safety, workload, fairness, and resource efficiency, then expand the system as capability grows. Prioritization should be explicit and periodically reviewed.

Recommendations for Future Research

Future studies should empirically examine relationships between Sustainable HRM and employee performance, psychological well-being, work engagement, retention, organizational resilience, and environmental outcomes. Research should distinguish between policy adoption, implementation quality, employee experience, and final outcomes. These are different stages and should not be treated as interchangeable measures.

Further work should develop and validate measures that capture economic, social, and environmental dimensions in a balanced manner. Researchers should clarify whether a construct represents Green HRM, socially responsible HRM, or broader Sustainable HRM, and should explain how indicators relate to the underlying definition. This would improve comparability across studies.

Research comparing sectors and organizational sizes can clarify how context shapes implementation. Longitudinal studies can examine whether

outcomes persist over time, while qualitative case studies can explain how employees and managers interpret sustainability policies. Mixed-method designs may combine outcome measures with evidence about implementation processes and unintended consequences.

Research in Indonesia can contribute evidence about how Sustainable HRM is practiced under different institutional, cultural, and resource conditions. Such studies should avoid assuming that approaches developed in other settings transfer without adaptation.

FURTHER STUDY

This article has several limitations. It is based on a theoretical literature review rather than primary empirical data, and its source selection was not conducted through a fully documented systematic review protocol.

The article does not test hypotheses, estimate causal effects, or measure the impact of Sustainable HRM on employee or organizational outcomes. The mechanisms discussed should therefore be treated as conceptual propositions that require empirical validation.

Empirical research should examine whether integrated HR practices are associated with durable outcomes and under what conditions. Researchers should consider both expected benefits and unintended effects, such as additional administrative workload, inconsistent incentives, or sustainability targets that employees cannot realistically influence. Studies in varied organizational contexts, including Indonesian organizations, can help develop a more context-sensitive understanding of Sustainable HRM.

REFERENCES

Banga, C. M., & Gobind, J. (2025). Implementation of sustainability in human resource management: A literature review. SA Journal of Human Resource Management, 23, a2741. https://doi.org/10.4102/sajhrm.v23i0.2741

Joshi, A., Kataria, A., Rastogi, M., Beutell, N. J., Ahmad, S., & Yusliza, M. Y. (2023). Green human resource management in the context of organizational sustainability: A systematic review and research agenda. Journal of Cleaner Production, 430, 139713. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2023.139713

Kainzbauer, A., Rungruang, P., & Hallinger, P. (2021). How does research on sustainable human resource management contribute to corporate sustainability: A document co-citation analysis, 1982–2021. Sustainability, 13(21), 11745. https://doi.org/10.3390/su132111745

Mahdy, F., Alqahtani, M., & Binzafrah, F. (2023). Imperatives, benefits, and initiatives of green human resource management (GHRM): A systematic literature review. Sustainability, 15(6), 4866. https://doi.org/10.3390/su15064866

Naqshbandi, M. M., Ishak, N. A., & Islam, M. Z. (2025). Sustainable human resource management: What we know and still need to know. In Reviewing the Latest Trends in Management Literature (Vol. 4A). Emerald Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1108/S2754-58652025000004A007

Omidi, A., & Dal Zotto, C. (2022). Socially responsible human resource management: A systematic literature review and research agenda. Sustainability, 14(4), 2116. https://doi.org/10.3390/su14042116

Paulet, R., Holland, P., & Morgan, D. (2021). A meta-review of 10 years of green human resource management: Is Green HRM headed towards a roadblock or a revitalisation? Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources, 59(2), 159–183.

Piwowar-Sulej, K. (2021). Core functions of sustainable human resource management: A hybrid literature review with the use of H-Classics methodology. Sustainable Development, 29(4), 671–693. https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.2166

Purgał-Popiela, J. (2025). Sustainability in human resource management practices used by small and medium-sized enterprises: A systematic review. Central European Management Journal, 33(1), 87–106. https://doi.org/10.1108/CEMJ-03-2024-0097

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

Xie, H., & Lau, T. C. (2023). Evidence-based green human resource management: A systematic literature review. Sustainability, 15(14), 10941. https://doi.org/10.3390/su151410941