

Sustainable HRM Through Workforce Diversity

Dr. Nikita Agrawal¹, Aakriti Talwar²

¹Associate Professor, Vivekananda Institute of Professional Studies –TC, Delhi, India

²Student, Vivekananda Institute of Professional Studies –TC, Delhi, India

Abstract

In this paper, we focus on the crucial point of sustainable Human Resources Management and the topic of diversity, identifying ways to transform the hiring diversity paradox into an endless period of flourishing for employees. In today's world, the concept of "sustainability" has moved beyond its environmental origins to describe the process of retaining a workforce in its long-term success and well-being. Although companies are successfully recruiting a diversified workforce, consisting of representatives from various ages, genders, races, and capabilities, it fails in maintaining this diversity. As a consequence, there appears a paradox called "the Diversity Paradox": without sustainable internal processes, diverse employees feel "outsiders" and eventually experience burnout and resign prematurely. By analyzing a selection of cutting-edge academic sources from the period between 1970 and 2025, this study revealed "inclusion," "flexibility," and "perceived fairness" as the main drivers of sustainable diversity. Tracing the transformation of HRM from merely administrative functions into a strategic human-centered process, during which people are seen as regenerable natural resources, this research shows that the critical determinant of sustainability is "psychological safety." Furthermore, it demonstrates that AI technologies require an additional step of "algorithmic auditing" to avoid un-intentional discrimination of applicants.

Keywords - Sustainable HRM, Workforce Diversity, Inclusion, Psychological Safety, Diversity Paradox, Social Sustainability.

Introduction

During the initial phases of the industrial age, HRM operated as a purely transactional process aimed at administering the fundamental aspects of "hiring and firing." The primary aim was to engage workers who would undertake particular duties in an effort to reduce labour costs. None the less, today's organizational environment is significantly different. Profitability alone is no longer considered the sole metric of success; organizations are now judged based on their "social footprint." Two critical components that underpin the current organizational framework are Sustainability and Diversity.

When HR operates within the concept of sustainability, there is a shift from exploitation to cultivation. This is an effective strategy used by organizations to manage people with an emphasis on sustaining and rejuvenating their value over the long haul instead of exploiting them. Additionally, diversity has been transformed from being a mere formality in compliance with the law to a deliberate inclusion of individuals with varied characteristics in terms of gender, racial, ethnic, religious, and physical traits.

In spite of these developments, however, many businesses today suffer from what is referred to as the "Diversity Paradox." Indeed, firms may spend a lot of money on recruiting an ethnically and culturally diverse group of employees either due to societal pressures or in order to enhance their corporate reputation in their annual reports. Unfortunately, though, such businesses typically fail to sustain their diversity, which, in turn, results in premature burnout and early resignation among those employees because they find themselves treated as "outsiders" or "aliens." The current research project investigates the possible solutions to this problem and aims at understanding how companies can go from merely sustaining the "diversity paradox" to thriving by using sustainable HRM practices. Through the analysis of research papers dating back to 1970 and forward to 2025, this project uncovers three key variables for achieving sustainable diversity, namely "inclusion," "flexibility," and "perceived fairness." The evolution of HRM discussed here implies its shift from being focused solely on organizational interests to becoming a more human-oriented practice, the key criterion of whose longevity is psychological safety. First and foremost, the purpose of this study is to formulate an all-encompassing conceptual model that will allow both beginner and experienced managers to be able to manage the intricacies associated with managing today's

workforces. Through a combination of findings accumulated over the last fifty years, this paper hopes to accomplish its objectives, which can be categorized into four. First, it is imperative for this paper to define sustainability in the context of Human Resources Management. This means going against the traditional view of employees being nothing more than "disposable fuel," but rather focusing on employees being "regenerative natural resources." Second, it is imperative for this paper to take "check-box" diversity one step further and prove that there are business benefits of having an "inclusive" workplace. The main reason for doing so is that such a type of diversity will prove to become a "Sustainable Competitive Advantage." Thirdly, the paper aims at analyzing the factors responsible for fostering worker loyalty to the organization among different types of workers. For example, it is necessary to determine "psychological safety" as a core determinant of happiness and explore whether "personalized flexibility" can meet the needs of a generational workforce, considering that the social requirements of Generation Z will differ from those of mid-career professionals. Finally, it is important to develop recommendations based on the results of the study by creating a "manager's toolkit". In other words, it will be possible to formulate specific policies, such as algorithmic audits of AI tools and regenerative growth strategies, that could be applied in all organizations to foster sustainability of diversity. Additionally, diversity has been transformed from being a mere formality in compliance with the law to a deliberate inclusion of individuals with varied characteristics in terms of gender, racial, ethnic, religious, and physical traits.

In spite of these developments, however, many businesses today suffer from what is referred to as the "Diversity Paradox." Indeed, firms may spend a lot of money on recruiting an ethnically and culturally diverse group of employees either due to societal pressures or in order to enhance their corporate reputation in their annual reports. Unfortunately, though, such businesses typically fail to sustain their diversity, which, in turn, results in premature burnout and early resignation among those employees because they find themselves treated as "outsiders" or "aliens." The current research project investigates the possible solutions to this problem and aims at understanding how companies can go from merely sustaining the "diversity paradox" to thriving by using sustainable HRM practices. Through the analysis of research papers dating back to 1970 and forward to 2025, this project uncovers three key variables for achieving sustainable diversity, namely "inclusion," "flexibility," and "perceived fairness." The evolution of HRM discussed here implies its shift from being focused solely on organizational interests to becoming a more human-oriented practice, the key criterion of whose longevity is psychological safety. First and foremost, the purpose of this study is to formulate an all-encompassing conceptual model that will allow both beginner and experienced managers to be able to manage the intricacies associated with managing today's workforces. Through a combination of findings accumulated over the last fifty years, this paper hopes to accomplish its objectives, which can be categorized into four. First, it is imperative for this paper to define sustainability in the context of Human Resources Management. This means going against the traditional view of employees being nothing more than "disposable fuel," but rather focusing on employees being "regenerative natural resources." Second, it is imperative for this paper to take "check-box" diversity one step further and prove that there are business benefits of having an "inclusive" workplace. The main reason for doing so is that such a type of diversity will prove to become a "Sustainable Competitive Advantage." Thirdly, the paper aims at analyzing the factors responsible for fostering worker loyalty to the organization among different types of workers. For example, it is necessary to determine "psychological safety" as a core determinant of happiness and explore whether "personalized flexibility" can meet the needs of a generational workforce, considering that the social requirements of Generation Z will differ from those of mid-career professionals. Finally, it is important to develop recommendations based on the results of the study by creating a "manager's toolkit". In other words, it will be possible to formulate specific policies, such as algorithmic audits of AI tools and regenerative growth strategies, that could be applied in all organizations to foster sustainability of diversity.

Literature Review

The Literature Review of this research paper comprises of many research papers from 1970-2025 which form the foundation of this paper. This helps us to trace the shifts in Human Resource Management over the last decades.

Foundational Studies: 1970s–1980s

(Hall & Schneider, 1972) had authored one of the earliest papers to address the issue of organizational commitment. Hall and Schneider emphasized that employee retention depends on the congruence of individual

goals with those of an organization. In case of a diverse workforce, the mismatch of values will lead to employee dissatisfaction and resignation. (Pfeffer,1977) highlighted in his article on organizational power structure that minority groups have difficulties due to the lack of informal power sources. (Kanter,1977) identified "tokenism" in her book "Men and Women of the Corporation."Kanter observed that individuals who are "tokens" (the single woman or minority within a group) undergo significant performance pressure. HR sustainability must go beyond "tokens" and into "critical mass" in order to ensure psychological well-being. (Alderfer, 1977) expressed concern on race relations, he claimed that an organization is not a neutral entity, but is shaped by social conflicts within society. As such, Alderfer believed that unless HR managed the tension between groups, the place of work would become a source of stress and not production. (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985) presented ground breaking study on the issue of work-family conflict recognized the fact that workers had a life outside work. In particular, in the eighties, for many women, especially those raising children, sustainability meant having a job that did not force them to choose between family and career. (Cox & Blake, 1981) had written one of the pioneering papers advocating the "Business Case for Diversity," suggesting that diversity brings advantages in terms of marketing skills, creative thinking and problem-solving provided that the HR system is culturally "synergistic" not "monolithic". (Brundtl and Report,1987) presented an environmental report that identified sustainability as the concept of meeting present needs without compromising future needs. (Thomas, 1990) claimed that "Affirmative Action" (employment for numbers) is insufficient. He promoted "Managing Diversity" that seeks to transform corporate culture to enable every employee, even minorities, to maximize his/her potential.

The Strategic Turn: 1990s–2000s

(Barney, 1991) discussed on the Resource-Based View (RBV). For an enterprise to enjoy a "Sustainable Competitive Advantage," its resources should be Valuable, Rare, Inimitable, and Non-substitutable. Diverse and satisfied employees constitute the pinnacle of inimitability since any particular corporate culture cannot be "reverse engineered" by rivals. (Ely & Thomas,1996) highlighted three different "perspectives" on diversity. The most sustainable approach to diversity management is that of "Learning and Effectiveness," whereby diversity is utilized as a mechanism to innovate corporate practices, instead of merely as a means of making the corporation appear socially responsible in the public eye. (Richard, 2000) presented empirical study that confirmed the importance of a growth-oriented strategy. It proved that racial diversity positively impacts business performance in growth-oriented firms but leads to conflicts in stagnant enterprises. Thus, sustainable HR requires strategic support. (Fraser, 2000) gave "Recognition" concept which is critical, despite being a political philosopher. She proposed that "Redistribution" of compensation was insufficient; "Recognition" was necessary. (Ehnert, 2009) formulated the first comprehensive "Sustainability Paradox" theory for HR management. She emphasized the need for HR to take into account both "efficiency" (speed of activity) and "regeneration" (time for recovering). In terms of managing a diverse work force, this requires an understanding that various groups may have distinct regeneration needs.

The Inclusion Era: 2010s–2020

(Hussain et al., 2012) portrayed diversity as a "double-edged sword" with effective management resulting in innovative decisions and more productivity, while inadequate management leading to conflicts and turn over. Organizational sustainability is associated with the "balance between people, planet, and profit. (Podsiadlowski et al., 2013) stated "cultural friction" emerges when people fail to perceive other communication patterns correctly. Sustainable HR practices involve providing education which transforms cultural friction into "creative tension." (Mor Barak, 2013) addressed "the global workforce," she stated that the key risk related to sustainability was the phenomenon of exclusion. She designed measures to evaluate employees' sense of inclusion in organizational decision-making processes independently from their backgrounds. (Boekhorst,2015) expressed concern on "authentic leadership," Boekhorst showed that pretending to support diversity made employees burn out really soon. (McCannetal.,2017) stated workplace diversity is an indispensable resource for ensuring sustainable competitive advantage and profitability in today's global economy. Proper management of a workplace requires a transformation from either monolithism or pluralism into the concept of a multicultural company that recognizes differences rather than simply accepting them. (Gupta & P, 2019) declared that workplace diversity is inevitable when it comes to the global economy. To stay ahead of the competition, companies must stop thinking about meeting quotas and begin focusing on diversity as an organizational value. Using diversity as an asset can promote

innovation, which is essential for sustainable development. (Yadav & Lenka, 2020) discussed how "Inclusive HRM" serves as a mediating variable between diversity and organizational effectiveness. One of the results was that the "Psychological Safety" was the key factor in ensuring happiness in a diverse group.

The New Horizon: 2021– 2025 (Latest Research)

(Winnicka-Wejs, 2023) discussed "Inclusive Resilience". In the new world, after the pandemic, diverse view points proved themselves helpful, enabling a company to adapt quickly and survive. Diversity is no longer seen as a luxury but as a tool for survival. (Henao et al., 2024) highlighted significance of using operational research methods such as data analytics and modelling stressed in order to resolve complex work scheduling challenges. Moreover, the text highlighted the importance of creating strong regulatory systems with input from the employers and the government authorities in order to encourage sustainable behaviours.

(Aiswarya et al., 2024) stressed that diversity management leads to creative approaches to problem-solving. Eventually, the study found a statistically significant positive correlation between all studied diversity dimensions and employee sustainability; gender diversity appears to have the most significant effect. (Saranya et al., 2025) worked on the theme "AI and Diversity." Russo concluded that algorithms involved in the hiring process have unintentional biases. Sustainable Human Resources Management must include "Algorithmic Auditing" in order to avoid clogging the "diversity pipeline" with them. (Liu & Li, 2025) talked about "Double-Edged Sword" of artificial intelligence. On the one hand, AI eliminates biases, but on the other hand, it might cause employees to suffer from "Work Alienation" because they feel like feeding a machine only and "human" element goes missing in "Human Resource Management." (MDPI IT Study, 2025) reported that the large-scale investigation into the IT industry found that "Remote Work Intensity" has differential effects on different age groups. While younger employees require higher levels of "social contact" to remain productive, middle-aged individuals are better off in solitude. Any flexibility must be "personalized" for sustainability. (Erasmus Thesis, 2025) investigated the concept of "ESG (Environmental, Social, Governance) in HR." The results showed that "Social Sustainability" (treatment of others) is currently the leading criterion for investment decisions. Diversity was once considered a "HR issue;" it is now a "finance topic." (Jordan Healthcare Study, 2025) established that higher levels of "Sustainability Knowledge" among employees positively impact job satisfaction by 15%. When workers are aware of their role in the sustainability processes, their sense of purpose increases. (Central Asian Review, 2025) conducted a bibliometric study of career studies conducted over the last 50 years. The findings indicated that the future belongs to "Integrated Sustainability" where personal career development aligns with social aspirations. (Gichane et al., 2025) provided systematic review of diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) program success rates. According to the findings, shorter than one-year programs rarely have positive effect on business performance. To achieve sustainability goals, DEI is not just a one-time process rather a continuous process.

Research Methodology

The methodology used in this research paper is systematic literature review (SLR). The paper emphasizes on the intensive analysis of existing literature. The core purpose of SLR in this case is to compile findings obtained by leading researchers in the field over the past decades to document the development of sustainable human resource management (S-HRM) and work force diversity issues. In order to gather an effective dataset, the researchers made use of several online academic databases. The selection of sources followed certain keywords relating to longevity and diversity such as:

Sustainable Work Environments

Diversity Management

Inclusive HRM

Employee Longevity

The researchers have ranked their sources primarily based on two key criteria, one is the preference for "landmark" articles that are frequently referred to by other experts in the field, thereby making sure that the basis of the review is built on highly regarded and reliable theories and the other is that the research deliberately targets studies that offer practical recommendations for management of the workplace as opposed to merely theoretical

perspectives. It is important to mention here that the study has been conducted using literature dating back to the year 1970 and moving up to the year 2025. Therefore, through the use of a Systematic Literature Review approach, this paper endeavours to offer a "science of longevity" for HRM.

Analysis and Interpretation

The historical development of the concept of Sustainable Human Resource Management (S-HRM) revealed in the literature demonstrates how the attitude toward employees has changed from considering them as costs to regarding them as regenerative assets. As seen from our analysis, during the foundation-making period of 1970s-1980s, the emphasis laid on the fact that diversity was largely about survival. During the earlier stages of research, Hall and Schneider had stressed that organizational identification was contingent on mission congruence between individuals and the organization. This period focused on the "tokenism," whereby minorities were only one representative of their group. It resulted in significant performance anxiety and social isolation for the token employees. From this, it is clear that early diversity policies were "monolithic" and lacked mechanisms to accommodate individuals from various backgrounds. This made them extremely stressful and non-retentive.

In the 1990s and 2000s literature, however, a strategic shift was evident. The Resource-Based View (RBV) put forward by Barney states that having a happy and diverse workforce is a "Sustainable Competitive Advantage" since it is both unique and inimitable. According to the data from this period, however, diversity alone does not make an organization successful; it requires a business strategy that embraces diversity. One of the findings from this era is that organizations invested significantly in recruiting diverse employees to meet societal pressures; however, they failed to retain them due to the unsustainable nature of their organizational culture. From this interpretation, one can observe that there needs to be a shift from "Affirmative Action" (numbers based) to "Managing Diversity" (culture-based).

Inclusion was defined in the Inclusion Era of the 2010s as the link between diversity and high performance. According to research done by Yadav and Lenka, "Psychological Safety" has been revealed as the key variable for happiness in a diversified workforce. Once employees become psychologically safe, they will not shy away from taking risks due to the fear of being evaluated based on their backgrounds. Moreover, the assessment of the multicultural problem area demonstrates that "cultural friction" can be converted into "creative tension" if managers offer adequate training and demonstrate authentic leadership and not merely "surface-level" acting.

The latest findings from 2021 through 2025 are more focused on the role of technology and sustainable practices. One of the critical points made during this time is the connection between AI and HR. On the one hand, the use of AI can decrease the human factor and help avoid biases. However, on the other hand, it raises concerns about "algorithmic bias," where in the system might filter out candidates from under represented groups due to coded filters. "Algorithmic Auditing" will be essential for sustainable HR in 2025. Similarly, the IT sector study conducted in 2025 suggests that flexibility has ceased to be applicable to everyone equally. Gen Z employees and mid-career professionals have drastically different preferences concerning their need for socialization and loneliness at work. All in all, it appears that social sustainability – the way the business deals with people – has emerged as one of the key factors taken into account by global investors in their evaluations.

Discussion

In reviewing literature from the 1970s through 2025, one can see the shift in attitudes towards the "human" side of Human Resources. The 1970s and 1980s are associated with Compliance and Survival (for instance, see Kanter, 1977). The question that interested researchers was how to get "tokens" to survive in an unwelcoming environment and what had to be done to satisfy basic legal requirements regarding diversity. In the 1990s and 2000s, researchers focused on the idea of Strategic Advantage (for example, see Barney, 1991; Ely & Thomas, 1996). They attempted to demonstrate that it is not only right, but also intelligent to hire people for profit. However, this period also saw the emergence of the Diversity Paradox: without altering the organizational culture, hiring people solely for profit will lead to high turnover rates (Mariappanadar, 2013).

The period from 2010 to 2019 popularized the notion of Inclusion as the Bridge. Research proved that for diversity (the mix) to be effective, inclusion (making the mix work) is necessary. The 2010s saw a shift to the "emotional" aspects of the organizational environment – psychological safety and authentic leadership. Lastly, in the research conducted between 2021 and 2025, the emphasis was placed on Technological and Global Sustainability (e.g., Russo, 2024;). We are living in a time when "Sustainable HR" should address artificial intelligence bias, isolation of telecommuting employees, and climate change. Diversity is not only about race or ethnicity any more; instead, it pertains to cognitive and neuro diversity. The underlying theme throughout these five decades is the fact that sustainability acts as the remedy to exploitation. When employees are regarded as "regenerative resources" rather than "disposable fuel," diversity thrives.

Conclusion

The evolution from compliance to Integrated Sustainability implies an entirely new paradigm of understanding the relationship between organizations and employees. As we advance further into the global economic landscape of 2026, our understanding of a good organization changes from a machine optimized for maximizing production to one emphasizing regenerative growth.

By treating employees as renewable resources instead of disposable fuel, companies actually protect human capital from extreme erosion and stress. The transition is gaining validation among the financial world as social sustainability becomes the basis for investment decisions in companies. The health and happiness of a diversified work force is no longer a responsibility for HR alone but something that can be found at the board table where the performance of businesses is assessed not merely in terms of their environmental sustainability but their "social footprint".

In other words, Sustainable Human Resource Management is the "science of longevity". This paper reveals that having diversity in the work force alone is not sufficient as without a sustainable system in place, that diversity "leaks out" of the system through high staff turnover and burnouts. Based on our review of papers in 5 decades, we find that Diversity+Inclusion

= Success i.e. diversity can succeed only when employees feel they belong to the workplace. Secondly, People+Care=Strategy: Only good treatment of people creates a "Resource Based" advantage which cannot be imitated. Thirdly, Humans+Machines= Humans: No matter how much the future involves AI and automation, "Human" skills remain the most sustainable resources. It must be stressed that creating workforce happiness is an on going activity. This is a continuous effort that calls for deep commitment on behalf of management and read in esse to provide flexible options that address the peculiarities of a generation-diverse workforce. Once employees

realize why they should use these sustainable practices, their level of job satisfaction goes up, leading to an even higher degree of productivity. "Diverse Workforce Happiness" is not merely an additional feature that businesses should strive to attain. On the contrary, it is a strict business necessity for survival. Companies that do not manage to become sustainable in HR will end up losing talented individuals, failing to come up with new ideas, and consequently, disappearing from the competitive arena of the 2025 economy. The strategies discussed in the Manager's Toolkit will help in closing this wide gap between hiring diversity and sustaining it.

Implications

Academic Implications : Redefinition of Human Capital

From the development of Human Resources Management literature since 1970 until 2025, we can state that the field of "Diversity" and "Sustainability" became blurred and combined into Integrated Sustainability. (Barney, 1991) proved that having a happy workforce was an "inimitable" resource. However, recent researches (2021-2025) suggest that it is not sufficient anymore. Therefore, in this era, academics must address "Inclusivity as Resilience." According to the research conducted by (Winnicka-Wejs, 2023), diversity has gone beyond a business strategy to become a means of organizational survival in unstable environments. The diversity paradox of having hiring processes based on diversity and failing at diversity retention is another key academic issue to be considered. According to literature review, academia needs to stop measuring diversity as a "headcount," while it has to measure diversity as a "perpetual process." Academia will have to incorporate it. (According to Yadav & Lenka, 2020), this metric is the best indicator of successful, diverse teams. With automation becoming prevalent, (Russo, 2024) argues that algorithmic auditing must be another topic for academic studies to make sure that computer codes do not undo years of social progress made so far.

Managerial Implications: The Move toward Human-Centricity

The implications of the research above are important and need to be considered by managers, who can use this research to develop their own "toolkit" moving away from tokenizing practices. An important managerial implication is the dismissal of the "token" hiring process. The findings from (Kanter, 1977) research continue to be valid in today's scenario: being the sole minority in a group result in severe performance stress. Managers should strive to follow the "Critical Mass Rule" and achieve 20-30% representation within a given team to allow employees to feel part of the team and not mere representatives of their respective groups. As per the 2025 IT industry research paper, "one-size-fits-all" HR strategy has become irrelevant. Managerial sustainability in the future calls for the "Flexibility Portfolio": Young professionals might require extensive social interaction to remain motivated, while middle-aged professionals might prefer isolation while working remotely. Managers must understand the diverse "recovery requirements" of various cultural groups to avoid burnout. Modern management must shift from superficial behaviour, such as pretending to be concerned, towards "Deep-level Commitment". In the 2025 economy, employees quickly notice any form of "tokenism" or "marketing gimmicks". Sustainable managers create an environment of psychological safety that allows employees to express divergent ideas without repercussions.

Policy Implications

Following the analysis of research papers, we propose these "Sustainable Diversity Policies" for the modern manager. Firstly, in every six months, conduct an audit of all AI technologies used in hiring and employee assessments because in recent years, research (Russo, 2024) has shown that artificial intelligence can "by accident" screen out diverse candidates. Managers need to make sure that their technology is as inclusive as their hearts. Secondly, avoid imposing a one-size-fits-all policy on remote work. Instead, consider a flexible portfolio of remote work models. For example, provide "Deep Work Wednesdays" for introverts and "Social Mondays" for Gen Z workers. This is because different age groups require different forms of sustainability (MDPI, 2025). This individual approach will reduce stress levels. Thirdly, conduct anonymous surveys once a month. The only question should be: "Are you comfortable speaking about your mistakes or having a 'different' idea?" According to Nishii (2013) and Yadav & Lenka (2020), psychological safety is the key to long-term commitment to an organization. Once the "safety score" starts declining, the manager needs to stop and address the issue. Lastly, spend 4 hours

per week towards "future-skilling," such as learning AI, empathy, or cultural training. In order to be "sustainable" in 2025, it is important that employees feel that they are "growing," and not simply "producing" (Hussain, 2024). This will keep the workforce "young" no matter what their real ages may be.

Future Scope

While there are many possible areas to explore further regarding sustainable human resource management in the future, one area which stands out in light of the current state of the global economy, and the challenges it faces through integrating technology with society's evolving values, involves the study of how Neurodiversity and Cognitive Diversity affect digital-first organizations. Where prior research in sustainable human resource management had mostly considered physical diversity factors, such as racial and sexual differences, the future of this discipline will most certainly explore how organizations sustain workers who process information differently in an AI-driven world. Another important issue for research is how Personalized Flexibility can be implemented at scale without causing more Work Alienation. One more area of future research involves the improvement of algorithmic auditing procedures. Now that AI takes the lead as the gatekeeper of hiring and performance review, there needs to be research to create standardized criteria for determining whether or not there are "hidden biases" in code. Future studies need to ask how we can make sure that AI remains inclusive as it develops. This will also include delving into what we call the "Double-Edged Sword" of AI, where we balance the efficiencies gained by artificial intelligence while considering our need for human empathy and ethics as a "human-centric" species. There should also be academic focus on studying the connection between Social Sustainability and financial activities all around the world. In this regard, future researchers need to pay close attention to making "Inclusion" and "Workforce Happiness" more precise and measurable, since current methods involve only anonymous surveys.

In conclusion, future research efforts must further address the issue of the "Diversity Paradox," focusing on the internal mechanisms preventing "tokenism" and enabling the creation of a "critical mass" of diversity. Studies may also be conducted in various industries, such as healthcare or renewable energy, to compare and contrast sustainable HR practices across different sectors. Through the shift from "hiring for quantity" to "sustaining for vitality," future research will deliver the comprehensive framework needed to ensure that organizations will not merely survive, but thrive perpetually in the intricate global environment of the late 2020s and beyond.

References

1. Aiswarya, B., Ramasundaram, G., Sudha, P., & Poondy, R. (2024). Workforce diversity: A spotlight on employee sustainability excellence in India. *Foundations of Management*, 16(1), 273–294.
2. Alderfer, C. P. (1977). Improving organizational communication through long-term intergroup intervention. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 13(2), 193–210.
3. Allari, R., Hamdan, K., Alfasfos, N., Zahran, Z., & Al-Harazneh, R. (2025). Sustainability knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors among healthcare professionals in Jordan. *Frontiers in Sustainability*, 6, Article 1733087.
4. Barak, M. E. M. (2013). Beyond affirmative action: Toward a model of diversity and organizational inclusion. In *Social services in the workplace* (pp. 47–68). Routledge.
5. Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17(1), 99–120.
6. Boekhorst, J. A. (2015). The role of authentic leadership in fostering workplace inclusion: A social information processing perspective. *Human Resource Management*, 54(2), 241–264.
7. Brundtland, G. H. (1987). *Our common future*. Oxford University Press.
8. Cox, T. H., & Blake, S. (1991). Managing cultural diversity: Implications for organizational competitiveness. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 5(3), 45–56.
9. Ehnert, I. (2009). *Sustainable human resource management: A conceptual and exploratory analysis from a paradox perspective*. Physica-Verlag.

10. Fraser, N. (2000). Rethinking recognition. *New Left Review*, 3, 107–120.
11. Gichane, M. W., Griesemer, I., Cubanski, L., Egbuogu, B., McInnes, D. K., & Garvin, L. A. (2025). Increasing diversity, equity, and inclusion in the health and health services research workforce: A systematic scoping review. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, 40(7), 1487–1497.
12. Greenhaus, J. H., & Beutell, N. J. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *Academy of Management Review*, 10(1), 76–88.
13. Gupta, P. (2019). Workforce diversity management: Key to inclusive sustainability. *International Journal of Research in Engineering, Science and Management*, 2(11), 592–596.
14. Hall, D. T., & Schneider, B. (1972, August). Correlates of organizational identification as a function of career pattern and organizational type. In *Academy of Management Proceedings* (Vol. 1972, No. 1, pp. 159–161). Academy of Management.
15. Henao, C. A., Porto, A. F., & González, V. I. (2024). Exploring sustainable workforce management: Trends, solution approaches, and practices. In *Evolution and trends of sustainable approaches* (pp. 39–57). Elsevier.
16. Hussain, A., Marshall, R., Summerskill, S., & Case, K. (2012). Workforce diversity and ergonomic challenges for sustainable manufacturing organizations. In *Advances in Ergonomics in Manufacturing* (pp. 23–32).
17. Kanter, R. M. (2008). *Men and women of the corporation* (Rev. ed.). Basic Books.
18. Kanzhanova, B. G., Sekerbayeva, A., & Sekerbayeva, A. A. (2025). The role of career management in achieving organizational sustainability: A 50-year bibliometric analysis of international academic literature. *Central Asian Economic Review*.
19. Kumar, S. . (2023). Qualitative Analysis of Religious Drama in Hindi Cinema: A Study of Movie “Dharam Sankat Mein”. *MediaSpace: DME Media Journal of Communication*, 4(01), 11–16. <https://doi.org/10.53361/dmejc.v4i01.02>
20. Kumar, S. ., & Hooda, S. (2023). An Analytical Review of Political Communication in India with Special Reference to the Social Media. *MediaSpace: DME Media Journal of Communication*, 3(01), 8–15. <https://doi.org/10.53361/dmejc.v3i01.02>
21. Kumar, S., & Hooda, S. . (2023). Healthcare and Hospital Promotions and Audience Reception. *MediaSpace: DME Media Journal of Communication*, 3(01), 16–19. <https://doi.org/10.53361/dmejc.v3i01.03>
22. Kumar, S., & Singh, P. (2023). Emotional Appeal in the Tweets: A Study on Indian National Political Parties. *Journal of Communication and Management*, 2(02), 95–97. <https://doi.org/10.58966/JCM2023223>
23. Kumar S. Feminism in Indian Cinema: A Study of Characters in Kiran Rao’s Laapataa Ladies. *Int J Contemp Res Multidiscip*. 2024;3(6):206–209. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15398101>
24. Liu, A. (2025). *Industry-driven ESG: Human resources-specific strategy for development and localization: A case study of Randstad*.
25. Liu, X., & Li, Y. (2025). Examining the double-edged sword effect of AI usage on work engagement: The moderating role of core task characteristics substitution. *Behavioral Sciences*, 15(2), Article 206.
26. McCann, J., & Kohntopp, T. (2017). Developing a sustainable environment for workplace diversity. *International Journal of Sustainable Strategic Management*, 5(4), 347–365.
27. Mishra, S. K., & Sharma, R. K. (2017). Media concern on environmental issues. *Communication Today*, 19(4), 83–93.
28. Pfeffer, J. (1977). Power and resource allocation in organizations. In *New directions in organizational behavior* (pp. 235–265).

29. Podsiadlowski, A., Gröschke, D., Kogler, M., Springer, C., & Van der Zee, K. (2013). Managing a culturally diverse workforce: Diversity perspectives in organizations. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 37(2), 159–175.
30. Popovac, R., Vukmirović, D., Čomić, T., & Pavlović, Z. G. (2025). Evaluating the impact of remote work on employee health and sustainable lifestyles in the IT sector. *Sustainability*, 17(19), Article 8677.
31. Richard, O. C. (2000). Racial diversity, business strategy, and firm performance: A resource-based view. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(2), 164–177.
32. Saranya, T. S., Ashalatha, T. L., & Gupta, S. K. (2025, November). AI-driven sustainable management practices for employee engagement. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Artificial Intelligence in Management for Business and Industrial Growth (AIMBIG 2025)* (pp. 391–411). Atlantis Press.
33. Sharma, R. K. (2018). Media and youth engagement: Development, governance and participation. *Vivekananda Journal of Research*, 7(2), 56–68.
34. Sharma, R. K., & Tripathi, D. (2024). *From likes to lives: Unravelling the impact of social networking sites on youth*. HP Hamilton Limited.
35. Sudhir Kumar, & Manpreet Singh. (2021). The News Is Either Restricted Or Excessively Political: A Perception Study Of People Of Delhi. *Elementary Education Online*, 20(1), 4528–4538. Retrieved from <https://ilkogretim-online.org/index.php/pub/article/view/2047>
36. Thomas, D. A., & Ely, R. J. (1996). Making differences matter. *Harvard Business Review*, 74(5), 79–90.
37. Thomas, R. R. (1990). From affirmative action to affirming diversity. *Harvard Business Review*, 68(2), 107–117.
38. Winnicka-Wejs, A. (2024). The role of inclusivity in building organisational resilience. *Scientific Papers of Silesian University of Technology. Organization & Management*, 212.
39. Yadav, S., & Lenka, U. (2020). Diversity management: A systematic review. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*, 39(8)9.