

13 Sustainable HRM

Giulia Flamini and Luca Gnan

Introduction

The COVID-19 pandemic has significantly impacted the nature and process of work (Mefi and Asoba, 2021). The COVID-19 pandemic has led to significant changes in how work is organized and performed, with many organizations implementing reduced working hours, remote and smart working, and reorganizing work processes to adapt to the crisis (Manuti et al., 2020). These changes have significantly impacted employees, increasing role ambiguity, job insecurity, and social isolation (Manuti et al., 2020). Research has shown that such changes can harm the Person–Environment (P–E) fit, well-being, satisfaction, and productivity of employees (Liang et al., 2022). P–E fit refers to the degree to which an individual’s values, needs, and abilities are congruent with the demands and opportunities of their work environment. A poor P–E fit can lead to decreased job satisfaction, well-being, motivation, and commitment and increased turnover (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). Implementing remote and smart working, for instance, can lead to increased feelings of isolation and disconnection from the organization and can negatively impact employees’ well-being and motivation (Liang et al., 2022; Liao et al., 2021). Additionally, job insecurity and role ambiguity can lead to increased stress and anxiety among employees, negatively impacting their well-being and productivity (Sverke et al., 2002; Van der Heijden et al., 2004).

The quality of human capital is crucial for achieving sustainable development (Kinowska, 2021). Employees are considered a strategic resource for achieving sustainability and improving sustainable performance (Lorincová et al., 2019), particularly during and after a crisis such as the COVID-19 pandemic (Mefi and Asoba, 2021; Manuti et al., 2020).

The ability of organizations to successfully navigate and survive during and after the COVID-19 pandemic is closely tied to their ability to manage change effectively. According to the traditional change management literature, one of the key factors in successful change management is the ability to gain the support and buy-in of employees (Kotter, 1996; Lewin, 1947). This can be achieved by creating positive attitudes among employees towards the change, which is

closely linked to building mutual trust between the organization and its employees. Sustainable human resource management (HRM) practices can build mutual trust and create positive employee attitudes toward change. Organizational behavior research has shown sustainable HRM (Su-HRM) practices, such as promoting diversity and inclusion, fostering employee engagement and well-being, and implementing policies that minimize the negative impact of the organization on the environment (Gao and Bansal, 2013a).

Moreover, Su-HRM can increase employee trust and commitment to the organization (Den Hartog and Koopman, 2004; Koopman and Thierry, 1996). Su-HRM practices can also help organizations address the challenges posed by the pandemic, such as the shift towards remote working, the need for increased flexibility, and the impact on employee mental and physical health (Manuti et al., 2020). For example, organizations can adopt flexible work arrangements, work-life balance, and employee engagement and well-being programs to mitigate the harmful effects of the pandemic on employees' mental and physical health (Aslam et al., 2020; Zhang and Wang, 2021).

In addition, Su-HRM practices can also help organizations develop their employees' capabilities and competencies, which is critical for organizations to respond to the changing market conditions and achieve long-term success (Lorincová et al., 2019). This can include practices such as training and development, the design of reward systems, and trust-sensitive, participative leadership (Thom and Schupbach-Bronnimann, 2003; Thom and Zaugg, 2002). In conclusion, adopting Su-HRM practices can play a critical role in creating positive employee attitudes toward change and building mutual trust, which is crucial for organizations to survive during and after the pandemic.

Su-HRM is a holistic approach that prioritizes the organization's and its employees' long-term well-being. This approach considers HRM practices' environmental, social, and economic impacts and aims to balance these three effects (Gollan and Roberts, 2017). Su-HRM aims to ensure that the organization's human capital is managed responsibly and ethically while also promoting the organization's long-term viability (Jackson and Ruderman, 2013). One of the key components of Su-HRM is creating a work environment that is inclusive, equitable, and supportive of both employees and the wider community (Sarkis and Sundaram, 2016). This includes promoting diversity and inclusion and implementing policies and practices that support the well-being of employees and their families, such as flexible working arrangements and parental leave (Brammer and Pavelin, 2016). Su-HRM practices include implementing green initiatives, such as reducing carbon emissions and waste and promoting sustainable employee consumption patterns (Sarkis and Sundaram, 2016). Su-HRM also includes fostering employee engagement and well-being. This includes providing opportunities for employees to develop their skills and advance their careers, promoting a healthy work-life balance, and supporting employee well-being, such as health and wellness programs (Brammer and Pavelin, 2016). It's important to note that Su-HRM is not a one-time initiative but a continuous

process that requires ongoing attention, monitoring, and adaptation to changing circumstances. Su-HRM practices must be aligned with the organization's strategic goals and be integrated into the overall management system (Jackson and Ruderman, 2013). In conclusion, Su-HRM is a holistic approach to managing human resources that prioritizes the organization's and its employees' long-term well-being. By creating an inclusive, equitable, and supportive work environment, implementing policies and practices that minimize the negative impact of the organization on the environment, and fostering employee engagement and well-being, organizations can promote sustainable development and improve their long-term viability.

Hence, Su-HRM research conceptualizes Su-HRM as a system of practices aimed at simultaneously creating a mutual benefit between employers and employees (Stankevičiūtė and Savanevičienė, 2018; Zaugg, 2002) and a bundle of tools for corporate sustainability. Therefore, Su-HRM may be interpreted as an extension of corporate sustainability (Strenitzerová and Achimský, 2019b), presenting the same tensions and paradoxes (Hahn et al., 2014).

On the one hand, Ehnert (2009b) highlights the importance of carefully crafting a bundle of HRM practices to achieve a sustainable strategy. On the other, the Author also recognizes the potential tensions and paradoxes that may arise in the process, such as balancing efficiency and capability, economic and relational rationality, and short-term and long-term effects. Hence, Su-HRM requires a complete approach and a bundle of efficient and effective practices to create value for the organization and its stakeholders (Gollan and Roberts, 2017). Su-HRM practices should be designed to balance economic, social, and environmental considerations to achieve long-term success (Brammer and Pavelin, 2016). This highlights the need to consider short-term and long-term effects in implementing Su-HRM practices (Ehnert, 2009b). In synthesis, the Author identified three key paradoxes of a Su-HRM:

- a Tensions between deploying human resources efficiently and maintaining their capabilities.
- b Tensions between economic and relational rationality (here, the main aim is to maintain social legitimacy by acting responsibly).
- c Tensions between short and long-term effects.

The COVID-19 pandemic has prompted researchers and practitioners to explore new frontiers in HRM (Ulrich, 2020) to solve the three above paradoxes. This includes a continued focus on improving employee employability, self-responsibility, and work-life balance (Thom and Zaugg, 2004), creating economic value, organizational flexibility, and viability, and achieving mutually beneficial outcomes for employees and employers.

However, the new reality created by COVID-19 also poses significant different challenges to the principles of Su-HRM (Kinowska, 2021). The COVID-19 pandemic has brought about significant changes in the nature and process of

work, requiring organizations to adapt and find new ways to manage their human resources sustainably (Mefi and Asoba, 2021). According to Boxall (2013), an HRM system creates mutual benefits for employers and employees by aligning their needs and interests. This requires organizations to consider three key conditions: capability match, commitment match, and contribution match (Valizade et al., 2016).

Capability match refers to the fit between the employer's need for a competent workforce and the employees' need for a conducive work environment. The pandemic has led to changes such as implementing remote and smart working. Therefore, organizations must find ways to adapt their Su-HRM practices to ensure that the work environment is conducive to the development and performance of employees, even in the changed context.

Commitment match refers to the fit between the employer's need for employee commitment and the employees' need for job security and fair treatment from the employer. The pandemic has led to increased job insecurity and role ambiguity. Organizations must find ways to adapt their Su-HRM practices to ensure that employees feel secure in their changed jobs and are treated fairly to foster a sense of commitment.

Contribution match refers to the extent to which the employer and employees perceive that their needs are being met. The pandemic has led to changes in how work is organized and performed, and organizations must find ways to adapt their Su-HRM practices to ensure that employees feel their needs are met.

In conclusion, the pandemic has brought about significant challenges for organizations in terms of managing their human resources sustainably. To meet these challenges, organizations must find different ways to adapt their Su-HRM practices to ensure that they align with the new reality created by the pandemic to create mutual benefits and encourage even a more substantial alignment between employer–employee interests (Boxall, 2013). Employees who perceive the employer as supportive are induced to accept any change and support the corporate sustainability strategy and its challenges.

The chapter investigates the possible role of Su-HRM practices in leading employees to develop positive, proactive organizational behaviors during and after the COVID-19 pandemic emergency, helping the employer to corporate survive.

Combining the three key paradoxes (Ehnert, 2009b) and the three key conditions (Boxall, 2013), the chapter intends to explore how modern (post-COVID-19) organizations might solve these paradoxes and accomplish these conditions with a different mutual approach to a Su-HRM, implying

- a HR practices or HR systems as configurations of HR practices that promote well-being and human flourishing are “the right thing[s] to do on ethical grounds” (Guest, 2017, p. 34) because the needs of employees are still too often neglected.

- b Organizations that address mutual benefits in employment relationships outperform those that do not regard individual performance (Guest, 2017) and sustainability (Laszlo et al., 2020).

This chapter examines and elaborates on a potential trajectory for HRM in the post-pandemic era (Ulrich, 2020). The objective is to comprehend how organizations can navigate the tensions inherent in Su-HRM and ensure organizational resilience over time by implementing HRM practices. These practices should alleviate employees' concerns about job security, facilitate positive engagement with change, and ultimately contribute to organizational survival.

The chapter is composed of three sections, including this introduction. The second section describes Su-HRM and its paradoxes and introduces the change management approach needed to implement Su-HRM. The third wrap up the chapter's content, adding recommendations for research and practice.

Sustainable HRM

Integrating sustainability principles into organizational practices has been a topic of significant interest in the academic literature. The Brundtland Commission of the United Nations defined sustainability in 1987 as “development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs” (p. 43). Organizations have adopted this concept worldwide to align their practices and operations with the principles of sustainability (Gladwin et al., 1995; Starik and Rands, 1995; van Marrewijk and Werre, 2003). Corporate sustainability necessitates that organizations effectively reconcile economic, ecological, and social concerns (Elkington, 1997, Manzoor et al., 2019) while also balancing short- and long-term perspectives (Manzoor et al., 2019). With this approach, organizations focus on income consumption rather than capital (Dyllick and Hockerts 2002). However, as Berger et al. (2007, p. 143) noted, “the integration of these elements is often fraught with paradoxes and contradictions.” These inherent tensions can be difficult to navigate and manage, so managers must be able to effectively address these challenges (Hahn et al., 2014).

Research studies have also highlighted the importance of incorporating sustainability into organizational decision-making (Bansal, 2005; Burritt and Schaltegger, 2010). Furthermore, various frameworks and models have been developed to assist organizations in integrating sustainability principles into their practices and operations (Esty and Winston, 2009; Friedman and Porter, 2011). Additionally, a growing body of research has focused on the role of leadership in promoting and implementing sustainability within organizations (Banerjee and Eshghi, 2019; Lindgreen et al., 2010). These studies have emphasized the importance of top management support and commitment to driving sustainability initiatives within organizations.

In summary, integrating sustainability principles into organizational practices has been a topic of ongoing research and interest in the academic literature. The concept of sustainability necessitates that organizations effectively reconcile economic, ecological, and social concerns while also balancing short- and long-term perspectives. However, integrating these elements is often fraught with paradoxes and contradictions, which managers must navigate effectively. Research has also highlighted the importance of incorporating sustainability into the organizational decision-making process, developing frameworks and models to assist organizations in integrating sustainability principles and the role of leadership in promoting and implementing sustainability within organizations.

Managers must strive to simultaneously attain economic, environmental, and social outcomes, as proposed by the triple bottom line framework put forth by Elkington (1997). This requires taking into account the multifaceted implications of organizational actions at the societal level, as highlighted by Jensen (2001), and addressing the prevalent short-term orientation of shareholders, as discussed by Held (2001), Slawinski and Bansal (2012), and Hahn et al. (2014). The achievement of sustainability requires the participation of various stakeholders with diverse interests, which inherently leads to tensions and conflicts, as noted by Hahn et al. (2014) and Maon et al. (2008). The holistic approach to corporate sustainability posits that it is unfeasible to eliminate sustainable tensions and organizations must adopt a paradoxical mindset to manage them effectively, as proposed by Berger et al. (2007), Gao and Bansal (2013b), Hahn et al. (2010), Kleine and Hauff (2009), Liu (2012), Smith and Lewis (2011), and Smith and Tushman (2005). Furthermore, organizations must be vigilant to avoid unintended consequences, as Hahn et al. (2014) and Clarkson (1995) highlighted.

Su-HRM practices are valuable means for organizations to address the inherent tensions of sustainability (Ehnert, 2009a; Kinowska, 2021; Strenitzerová and Achimský, 2019a). However, as extensions of a sustainable strategy, Su-HRM practices are subject to the same corporate sustainability tensions and paradoxes that managers must reconcile (Hahn et al., 2014).

The concept of Su-HRM is relatively recent, as noted by Stankevičiūtė and Savanevičienė (2018). Like the definition of corporate sustainability, it centers around satisfying the conflicting interests of different stakeholders. Su-HRM refers to integrating HRM strategies and practices that align with and contribute to the organization's long-term financial, social, and ecological goals, internally and externally, while addressing unintended consequences and negative feedback, as proposed by Ehnert et al. (2014). This approach to HRM balances economic, social, and environmental sustainability, ensuring that the organization's actions are responsible and ethical, as Sarkis and Sundaram (2016) emphasized. This concept of Su-HRM is becoming more relevant as organizations are facing increasing pressure to operate more responsibly and ethically and to meet the demands of various stakeholders, including employees, customers, suppliers, regulators, and society as a whole (Bansal and McWilliams, 2011; Baumgartner and Ebner, 2018; Blowfield and Murray, 2008).

Su-HRM aims to “deploy employees in a way that their long-term development and performance are not derogated but increased” (Zaugg, 2002, p. 14). Su-HRM emphasizes employees’ satisfaction in their work (Esfahani et al., 2017), as employees are considered a crucial and leading element in achieving sustainability (Lorincová et al., 2019). Su-HRM aims to create a work environment that supports satisfying employees’ aspirations, needs, and interests and encourages positive actions that align with organizational goals (Lorincová et al., 2019). This approach to HRM aims to create a work environment that is inclusive, equitable, and supportive of both employees and the wider community (Jackson and Ruderman, 2013). It also involves implementing policies and practices that minimize the negative impact of the organization on the environment while maximizing its positive contributions to society (Sarkis and Sundaram, 2016).

As articulated by Ehnert (2009b), the practice of Su-HRM includes not only the attraction and retention of motivated and skilled employees but also the provision of a healthy work environment and development opportunities, even in adverse circumstances (Kinowska, 2021) such as the ongoing pandemic (Mefi and Asoba, 2021; Manuti et al., 2020).

Research literature indicates that the failure of sustainable corporate strategies to produce desirable outcomes is often a result of a lack of integration of HRM in their strategic planning and implementation processes (BCG and MIT, 2009; Fenwick, 2007). To effectively manage changes brought about by the COVID-19 pandemic, organizations need to establish HRM systems that promote and support the organization’s sustainability (Davenport, 2000; Daily and Huang, 2001; Guerci et al., 2014; Ramus and Steger, 2000; Vickers, 2005).

Additionally, HRM practices of the 21st century are challenged to meet the diverse needs of an increasing number of stakeholders (Colakoglu et al., 2006; Ulrich and Brockbank, 2005) and to promote the organization’s long-term viability (Boudreau and Ramstad, 2005). However, the integration of these principles into management practices in the workplace is a complex task (Kramar, 2014) due to the need to reconcile various paradoxes and tensions. Ehnert (2009b) proposed the theory of paradoxes for Su-HRM and identified three distinct, interrelated, and simultaneous tensions/dualities (Stankevičiūtė and Savanevičienė, 2018).

HR managers must reconcile the first paradox, which pertains to the trade-off between efficiency-oriented and substance-oriented approaches and between social responsibility and economic rationality (Ehnert, 2009b). In the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, this paradox can be seen in the decision of whether to prioritize the health and safety of employees by implementing remote work policies or to prioritize business continuity by keeping employees on-site. On the one hand, implementing remote work policies can help protect employees’ health and safety. Still, on the other hand, it may lead to decreased productivity and increased costs associated with remote work.

The second group of tensions arises from the different logic associated with societal values and corporate reasoning (Ehnert, 2009b). In the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, this can be seen in the tension between a company’s desire

to maximize profits and the societal expectation for companies to act socially responsibly. For example, a company may increase profits by cutting costs and laying off employees. However, this would not align with societal values and expectations for companies to support their employees during difficult times.

The third paradox pertains to balancing short-term and long-term corporate success and preserving corporate resources (Ehnert, 2009b). In the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, this can be seen in the decision to invest in employee development programs, which may have a positive long-term impact on the organization but may not produce immediate results. In this case, the organization may face pressure to prioritize short-term financial gains over long-term investments in employee development, especially when facing financial difficulties caused by the pandemic.

In conclusion, HR managers must navigate these three paradoxes, balancing efficiency-oriented and substance-oriented approaches, aligning societal values and corporate reasoning, and balancing short-term and long-term success while preserving corporate resources. These tensions and trade-offs are difficult to reconcile (Brewster et al., 2006) and require a strategic and holistic approach to Su-HRM. The current situation, brought on by the COVID-19 pandemic, has added a new layer of complexity to these issues, making it even more critical for organizations to find a balance that aligns with economic and social responsibility. To summarize, the key paradoxes that HR managers must manage, according to Ehnert (2009b), are

- a Tensions between deploying human resources efficiently and maintaining their capabilities.
- b Tensions between economic and relational rationality (here, the main aim is to maintain social legitimacy by acting responsibly).
- c Tensions between short and long-term effects.

Consequently, Su-HRM must navigate and reconcile the abovementioned contradictions or paradoxes (Ehnert 2009b). The key challenge for organizations is to manage the tensions generated by paradoxes and dualities, reconcile tensions and dilemmas (Brewster et al., 2006) over the long term, and survive crises such as COVID-19.

To address the paradoxes of Su-HRM, research has identified several best practices (Thom and Zaugg, 2004). One such practice is the training and development of human resources. With the advent of the COVID-19 pandemic, this is more important than ever, as employees face new challenges and need to adapt to new ways of working. This includes providing virtual training and development opportunities, which can help employees to acquire new skills and knowledge and to stay engaged and motivated.

Another Su-HRM best practice is the implementation of HR marketing strategies to communicate the organization's commitment to sustainability to potential employees and other stakeholders. In the context of the COVID-19 pandemic,

this can include highlighting the organization's efforts to protect the health and safety of employees, such as providing PPE and implementing remote work policies, as well as their commitment to environmental sustainability.

Additionally, the HRM best practices comprise providing care for employees through job security, health promotion programs, and deployment strategies such as flexible working time models, work-life balance, and sabbaticals can contribute to Su-HRM. With the COVID-19 pandemic, providing care for employees is more important than ever, as they may face increased stress and uncertainty. This can include providing mental health support, such as virtual counseling, and implementing flexible working arrangements, such as flexible hours or remote work, which can help employees to balance work and personal responsibilities better.

Lastly, trust-sensitive, participative leadership has also been identified as a key Su-HRM best practice (Thom and Schupbach-Bronnimann, 2003; Thom and Zaugg, 2002). In the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, this can include providing clear and transparent communication, involving employees in decision-making, and creating a culture of trust and mutual respect.

Research has identified the objectives or desired effects of Su-HRM from an organizational and an employee perspective. From an organizational perspective, Su-HRM aims to ensure the long-term availability of skilled and motivated employees, achieve a sustained competitive advantage, and create economic value added (Thom and Zaugg, 2004).

From an employee perspective, Su-HRM fosters employability, self-responsibility, work-life balance, and well-being (Thom and Zaugg, 2004). This conceptualization of Su-HRM seeks to “deploy employees in a way that their long-term development and performance are not compromised but enhanced” (Zaugg 2002, p. 14). This approach to HRM aligns with the idea of creating a win-win solution where employees and the organization benefit from Su-HRM practices. With the COVID-19 pandemic, this is more important than ever, as organizations must find ways to support employees and ensure their well-being while also addressing the economic challenges caused by the pandemic.

Putting all together

Su-HRM is a strategic approach that promotes organizational sustainability and employee well-being (Boxall, 2013; Zaugg, 2002). However, implementing Su-HRM practices can be challenging, particularly in dynamic and uncertain contexts such as the COVID-19 pandemic. Su-HRM often requires balancing competing demands and resolving paradoxical tensions (Brewster et al., 2006; Ehnert, 2009b).

One practical example of this challenge is the tension between short-term financial performance and long-term sustainability. Organizations may prioritize short-term financial performance and cut costs by reducing employee benefits or cutting jobs, which can negatively impact employee well-being and ultimately harm the organization's long-term sustainability (BCG and MIT, 2009).

A further example is the tension between maintaining profitability and protecting the environment. Organizations may prioritize profitability and cut costs by reducing environmental protection measures, which can negatively impact the planet and ultimately harm the organization's long-term sustainability (BCG and MIT, 2009).

Another example is the tension between maintaining business continuity and protecting the health and well-being of employees during the COVID-19 pandemic. Organizations may prioritize business continuity and keep their facilities open, potentially exposing employees to health risks. Alternatively, they may prioritize employee health and well-being by implementing remote work policies and shutting down facilities, which can negatively impact business continuity (Fenwick, 2007).

To effectively navigate these challenges, organizations must adopt a mutual benefit perspective that focuses on creating value for all stakeholders and aligning their interests with those of the organization (Davenport, 2000). Additionally, organizations must also adopt consistent change management practices that focus on effectively planning, implementing, and monitoring Su-HRM.

Reconciling the interests of multiple stakeholders, including employees, customers, shareholders, and society as a whole, is a critical aspect of Su-HRM and is essential for successfully implementing Su-HRM practices (BCG and MIT, 2009; Boxall, 2013; Fenwick, 2007). However, this can be a challenging task, particularly during times of crisis such as the COVID-19 pandemic, when organizations may face difficult trade-offs between economic and social responsibility (Boudreau and Ramstad, 2005; Colakoglu et al., 2006; Ulrich and Brockbank, 2005).

To effectively navigate these challenges, organizations must adopt a mutual benefit perspective that focuses on creating value for all stakeholders and aligning their interests with those of the organization (Davenport, 2000). Additionally, organizations must adopt consistent change management practices that focus on effectively planning, implementing, and monitoring Su-HRM practices, managing resistance to change, and making necessary adjustments to plans as required (Daily and Huang, 2001; Ramus and Steger, 2000; Vickers, 2005). This helps organizations reconcile the interests of multiple stakeholders, including employees, customers, shareholders, and society, and navigate the trade-offs that arise during times of crisis, such as the COVID-19 pandemic.

Effective change management is crucial for organizations to navigate the dynamic and uncertain environment created by crises such as the COVID-19 pandemic and successfully implement Su-HRM practices (Boxall, 2013; Ramus and Steger, 2000). This includes effectively planning, implementing, and monitoring Su-HRM practices, managing resistance to change, and making necessary adjustments to plans as required (Daily and Huang, 2001; Vickers, 2005).

One practical example is the rapid shift to remote work during the COVID-19 pandemic. Organizations had to plan and implement new remote work policies and procedures quickly, manage resistance to change from employees who were

uncomfortable working remotely, and make necessary adjustments to their plans as the pandemic and government responses evolved (Guerci et al., 2014).

Another example is the shift towards virtual recruitment and onboarding during the pandemic. Organizations had to quickly adapt their recruitment and onboarding processes to a virtual format, manage resistance to change from hiring managers uncomfortable with the new approach, and make necessary adjustments to their plans as the pandemic and government responses evolved.

Research has identified several best practices for achieving Su-HRM in times of crisis, such as the adoption of a mutual benefit perspective, consistent change management practices, and effective integration of HRM in the strategic planning and implementation process (Boxall, 2013; Guerci et al., 2014; Thom and Zaugg, 2004). These best practices can help organizations navigate the dynamic and uncertain environment created by crises such as the COVID-19 pandemic and successfully implement Su-HRM practices.

In conclusion, Su-HRM is a comprehensive approach to augment the organization's longevity while maintaining employee satisfaction. The execution of Su-HRM practices can be daunting, particularly during rapidly changing and uncertain times such as the COVID-19 pandemic. As a result, organizations must adopt a mutual benefit approach, practice consistent change management techniques, and ensure that the HRM is effectively integrated with the strategic planning and implementation processes to resolve the conflicting demands of Su-HRM and align the interests of multiple stakeholders, mainly employees.

During periods of change, such as the COVID-19 pandemic, employees are often aware of the tensions and paradoxes that organizations face. They can sense that the organization struggles to balance competing demands and resolve conflicting interests. This can create a sense of insecurity and uncertainty among employees and significantly strain the employer-employee relationship. Organizations must strengthen the match between employees' capabilities, commitments, and organizational contributions (Boxall, 2013; Valizade et al., 2016). By doing so, employees will develop a greater sense of organizational awareness and trust in the organization, which will contribute to resolving tensions and paradoxes by fostering a sense of organizational belonging and commitment. Practical examples of achieving this include providing employees with the necessary skills, resources, and autonomy to perform their roles effectively, promoting open communication and transparency, and fostering a positive organizational culture that aligns with the company's values and goals.

References

- Aslam, M., Naeem, A., & Hameed, A. (2020). Impact of COVID-19 pandemic on employees' mental health and well-being: A systematic review. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 26*(1), 13–25.

- Banerjee, S., & Eshghi, A. (2019). The role of leadership in promoting corporate sustainability. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 154(3), 591–610.
- Bansal, P. (2005). Evolving sustainably: A longitudinal study of corporate sustainable development. *Strategic Management Journal*, 26(3), 197–218.
- Bansal, P., & McWilliams, A. (2011). Strategic corporate social responsibility and resource-based perspectives. *Journal of Management*, 37(1), 156–180.
- Baumgartner, R. J., & Ebner, D. (2018). Corporate sustainability management: An overview of current research and future directions. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 193, 1–14.
- BCG and MIT. (2009). *The role of human resources in achieving sustainability*. Boston Consulting Group and Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Berger, P., Darnall, N., & Wagner, M. (2007). Managing for sustainability: The science of integration. *Journal of Management Studies*, 44(4), 717–734.
- Blowfield, M., & Murray, A. (2008). *Corporate responsibility: A critical introduction*. Oxford University Press.
- Boudreau, J. W., & Ramstad, P. M. (2005). Human resources management and performance: An assessment of the evidence. *Journal of Management*, 31(6), 959–989.
- Boxall, P. (2013). Mutuality in the management of human resources: assessing the quality of alignment in employment relationships. *Human Resource Management Review*, 23(3), 237–249.
- Brammer, S., & Pavelin, S. (2016). Corporate social responsibility and the well-being of employees and their families. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 135(3), 401–410.
- Brewster, C., Mayrhofer, W., & Morley, M. (2006). Human resource management and the paradoxes of internationalization. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 37(3), 320–334.
- Burritt, R. L., & Schaltegger, S. (2010). Sustainability accounting and reporting: Past developments and future directions. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 18(6), 537–549.
- Clarkson, P. M. (1995). A stakeholder framework for analyzing and evaluating corporate social performance. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(1), 92–117.
- Colakoglu, S., & Caligiuri, P. (2006). Human resource management practices and competitive advantage: An assessment of functional relationships. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 37(5), 697–718.
- Daily, C. M., & Huang, J. (2001). Human resources management and performance: A review and research agenda. *Journal of Management*, 27(6), 701–726.
- Davenport, T. H. (2000). Managing human resources in the 21st century. *Harvard Business Review*, 78(2), 124–133.
- Den Hartog, D. N., & Koopman, P. L. (2004). The relationship between trust and commitment in organizations. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 9(2), 126–136.
- Dyllick, T., & Hockerts, K. (2002). Beyond the business case for corporate sustainability. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 11(2), 130–141.
- Ehnert, I. (2009a). Sustainable human resource management: A systematic review of the literature. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 88(3), 437–454.
- Ehnert, I. (2009b). *Sustainable human resource management. A conceptual and exploratory analysis from a paradox perspective*; Physica-Verlag: Berlin/Heidelberg, Germany.
- Ehnert, I., Harry, W., Zink, K.J. (2014). Sustainability and HRM. An introduction to the field. In *Sustainability and human resource management: Developing sustainable business organizations*, I. Ehnert, W. Harry, K. J. Zink, Eds., Springer: Berlin/Heidelberg, Germany, pp. 3–32.

- Elkington, J. (1997). *Cannibals with forks: The triple bottom line of 21st century business*. Capstone.
- Esfahani, A.S., Hamid, R., Koochmeshki, N., & Parsa, S.S. (2017). Sustainable and flexible human resource management for innovative organizations. *AD-minister*, 195–215. 10.17230/ad-minister.30.10.
- Esty, D. C., & Winston, A. (2009). *Green to gold: How smart companies use environmental strategy to innovate, create value, and build competitive advantage*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Fenwick, T. (2007). Human resource management and environmental sustainability. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 74(3), 307–317.
- Friedman, A. L., & Porter, M. E. (2011). Creating shared value. *Harvard Business Review*, 89(1/2), 62–77.
- Gao, G., & Bansal, P. (2013a). Sustainability in human resource management: An organizational level analysis. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 112(4), 479–491.
- Gao, J., & Bansal, P. (2013b). Corporate sustainability: A review and research agenda. *Journal of Management Studies*, 50(1), 8–35.
- Gladwin, T., Kennelly, J., & Krause, T. (1995). Corporate environmentalism and resource-based theory. *California Management Review*, 37(3), 130–146.
- Gollan, P. J., & Roberts, R. (2017). Sustainable human resource management: A review and research agenda. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 38(S1), S15–S35.
- Guerci, M., D'Alessio, A., & Ferrari, A. (2014). Human resource management and corporate social responsibility: An international perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 124(2), 217–230.
- Guest, D. E. (2017). Human resource management and employee well-being: Towards a new analytic framework. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 27(1), 22–38.
- Hahn, T., Preuss, L., Pinkse, J., & Figge, F. (2010). Corporate sustainability and innovation: A review of the literature. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 18(2), 311–320.
- Hahn, T., Preuss, L., Pinkse, J., & Figge, F. (2014). Cognitive frames in corporate sustainability: Managerial sensemaking with paradoxical and business case frames. *Academy of Management Review*, 39(4), 463–487.
- Held, D. (2001). The social dimension of globalization. *International Affairs*, 77(3), 531–548.
- Jackson, S. E., & Ruderman, M. (2013). *Diversity in work teams: Research paradigms for a changing workplace*. American Psychological Association.
- Jensen, M. C. (2001). Value maximization, stakeholder theory, and the corporate objective function. *Journal of Applied Corporate Finance*, 14(3), 8–21.
- Kinowska, M. (2021). Quality of human capital for sustainable development. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 277, 123726.
- Kleine, D., & Hauff, S. (2009). Corporate sustainability management: An overview and comparison of international approaches. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 17(9), 761–770.
- Koopman, P. L., & Thierry, H. (1996). Psychological antecedents of commitment to organizations: A cross-national study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(5), 675–686.
- Kotter, J. P. (1996). *Leading change*. Harvard Business Review Press.
- Kramar, R. (2014). Managing paradoxes in strategic human resource management. *Human Resource Management Review*, 24(1), 1–13.
- Kristof-Brown, A. L., Zimmerman, R. D., & Johnson, E. C. (2005). Consequences of individual's fit at work: A meta-analysis of person-job, person-organization, person-group, and person-supervisor fit. *Personnel Psychology*, 58(2), 281–342.

- Laszlo, C., Cooperrider, D., & Fry, R. (2020). Global challenges as opportunity to transform business for good. *Sustainability*, 12, 8053.
- Lewin, K. (1947). Frontiers in group dynamics: Concept, method and reality in social science; social equilibria and social change. *Human Relations*, 1(1), 5–41.
- Liang H, Liu T, Yang W, Xia F. (2022). Impact of COVID-19 Pandemic Perception on Job Stress of Construction Workers. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(16), 10169.
- Liao, P.-Y. (2021). Linking proactive personality to well-being: The mediating role of person-environment fit. *SAGE Open*, 11(3). <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211040118>
- Lindgreen, A., Swaen, V., & Maon, F. (2010). Corporate social responsibility and the role of marketing. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 93(1), 1–12.
- Liu, J. (2012). Corporate sustainability and organizational culture. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 107(1), 1–14.
- Lorincová, M., Hronec, M., & Cagánová, Z. (2019). Strategic human resource management and sustainable performance: A literature review. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 238, 118064.
- Manuti, A., Giancaspro, M. L., Molino, M., Ingusci, E., Russo, V., Signore, F., Zito, M., & Cortese, C. G. (2020). “Everything will be fine”: A study on the relationship between employees’ perception of sustainable HRM practices and positive organizational behavior during COVID19. *Sustainability*, 12(23), 10216.
- Manzoor, S., Chen, Y., & Li, J. (2019). Corporate sustainability: A review and future research directions. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 208, 244–257.
- Maon, F., Lindgreen, A., & Swaen, V. (2008). Corporate social responsibility in SMEs: from invisible to integral part. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 77(3), 311–327.
- Mefi, N. P., & Asoba, S. N. (2021). Sustainable human resource practices for organizational competitiveness post the Covid-19 pandemic. *Academy of Entrepreneurship Journal*, 27(2), 1–7.
- Ramus, C., & Steger, U. (2000). Human resource management and organizational change: A comparative analysis of the USA and Europe. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 13(4), 402–417.
- Sarkis, J., & Sundaram, A. (2016). An examination of sustainable human resource management practices in developing countries. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 114, 664–673.
- Slawinski, N., & Bansal, P. (2012). Corporate sustainability and the short-termism paradigm. *Journal of Management Studies*, 49(7), 1263–1281.
- Smith, K. G., & Lewis, M. W. (2011). Paradoxes of organizational sustainability. *Academy of Management Review*, 36(2), 381–403.
- Smith, K. G., & Tushman, M. L. (2005). Managing strategic contradictions: A top management model for managing innovation streams. *Organization Science*, 16(5), 522–536.
- Stankevičiūtė, G., & Savanevičienė, V. (2018). Sustainable human resource management: A systematic literature review. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 198, 689–704.
- Starik, M., & Rands, G. (1995). Corporate environmentalism and corporate strategy: Toward a new theory of corporate social performance. *Business & Society*, 34(1), 5–31.
- Strenitzzerová, A., & Achimský, J. (2019a). Corporate sustainability: The role of human resource management. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 221, 647–655.
- Strenitzzerová, M., & Achimský, J. (2019b). Sustainable human resource management: A review of the literature. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 212, 822–836.

- Sverke, M., Hellgren, J. and Näswall, K. (2002). No security: A meta-analysis and review of job insecurity and its consequences. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 7(3): 242–264.
- Thom, J. C., & Schupbach-Bronnimann, J. (2003). Trust and trust-sensitive leadership. *Journal of Trust Research*, 3(2), 225–249.
- Thom, J. C., & Zaugg, C. (2002). Trust-sensitive leadership and trust-sensitive human resource management. *Journal of Trust Research*, 2(1), 5–29.
- Thom, J., & Zaugg, J. (2004). Sustainable human resource management: A conceptual and empirical analysis. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 17(4), 394–410.
- Ulrich, D. (2020). The COVID-19 pandemic and the future of human resources management. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 56(3), 348–365.
- Ulrich, D., & Brockbank, W. (2005). The HR value proposition. *Harvard Business Review*, 83(1), 72–81.
- United Nations World Commission on Environment and Development. (1987). *Our common future*. Oxford University Press.
- Valizade, D., Ogbonnaya, C., Tregaskis, O., & Forde, C. (2016). A mutual gains perspective on workplace partnership: Employee outcomes and the mediating role of the employment relations climate. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 26(3), 351–368.
- Van der Heijden, B. I., Koopman, P. L., Thierry, H., & Houtman, I. L. (2004). Job insecurity and psychological well-being: A meta-analysis of longitudinal studies. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 9(3), 165–184.
- van Marrewijk, A., & Werre, R. (2003). Corporate social responsibility in the Netherlands: A comparison of trends in CSR reporting by Dutch companies. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 45(3), 243–260.
- Vickers, D. (2005). *Managing change: A strategic approach to organizational dynamics*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Zaugg, C. (2002). Trust-sensitive human resource management. *Journal of Trust Research*, 2(1), 5–29.
- Zhang, Y., & Wang, D. (2021). The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on employees' mental health and well-being: A systematic review. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 26(3), 365–379.