Working Papers in Management Series:

The Working Paper Series in Management is published by the Business School of Bournemouth University, as part of a number of initiatives to encourage research and the dissemination of research-based knowledge about management. East issue consists of a single paper on some aspects of management, and forms part of a numbered series. The full list of papers comprising the series appears on the back page of each issue. Those interested in obtaining back issues should write directly to the Business School. Copies of each issue are distributed with in the University, with selected issues being sent to major academic libraries and companies in Britain.

Notes for Contributors:

In view of the generic nature of management, contributions are welcome from a wide variety of disciplines. Papers dealing with any aspect of management will be considered for publication, with only the most technical papers that would have limited appeal to our general readership being excluded on grounds of content. It is anticipated that most, but not all, of the contributions will be initial drafts of papers whose final versions are destined for publication in referred academic journals. Because they are not necessarily in the final form desired by authors, papers should not be directly quoted from without first securing the permission of the author.

Contributors are free to submit papers in the form and style (layout, referencing, subheadings) that they consider most appropriate for their paper. Whenever possible, they should send a copy of their paper on a computer diskette, (preferably an Apple Macintosh 3½") to make production of the series easier for the Business School. The final publication decision is that of the Editor, to whom all contributions should be sent.

Editor: Dr Christopher Orpen
The Business School
Bournemouth University
Bournemouth House
Christchurch Road
BOURNEMOUTH BH1 3LG
Dorset, UK

HRM is simply another management fad – an argument to test the validity of this criticism against the features of a fad.

Chris Shiel

The Business School

Bournemouth University

HRM is simply another management fad – an argument to evaluate the validity of this criticism against the features of a fad

The proliferation of new approaches to management has led some commentators to suggest that management theory has more in common with the fashion houses of Paris and Milan than the senior common rooms of our universities. The suggestion is that management theorists sit down each summer and design the new 'management look', often or not reworking old designs in an attempt to catch the attention of the increasing fashion conscious professionals and consultants (see Abrahamson 1996) to enable them to establish a new niche in the market. New developments in research and professional practice so the argument goes, owe more to the insatiable demands of the market for the new look than the principled pursuit of research grounded practice.

This article takes a serious look at this view in the context of the debate about HRM. It seeks to provide a response to a statement made by commentators that:
'HRM is simply another management fad'

The quote implies that HRM is but one in a long line of distinctive approaches to business practice such as MBO, Quality Circles, and Reengineering whose popularity waxes and wanes like styles in popular culture and fashion. [1]The mere fact that a ·particular management approach or cultural style loses its grip on popular consciousness doesn't necessarily entail however, that it was simply a fad, for it may continue to exercise influence, albeit with a more restricted group. In order·to do justice to the question we need first to develop a more robust understanding of the essential characteristics of a fad.

---

[1] Wickens 1998 traces a history of 'management fads' from Talyor's control strategy, through Japanese style management to commitment approaches.

A 'fad' fulfils a need in the market at a particular time and is adopted with 'exaggerated zeal' (Websters), is 'intense but short-lived' (Collins) and at some time will be discarded or replaced by another fad because its perceived importance is 'insignificant' (Chambers).

'Management fads' are techniques, practices and ideas or concepts that are adopted by managers and writers of management texts and popularised, with all the characteristics defined above. It is often suggested that fads are no more than a repackaging of earlier ideas and techniques. A feature of 'management fads' is that they are sometimes regarded as a panacea, thus they are treated in a superficial way (Shelley 1996) and because their significance is not always fully understood, they are indiscriminately applied and are therefore unlikely to take root.

Thus, if HRM is simply a management fad it will be necessary to show that:

a) it is a new, though fictionally differentiated 'package' of concepts, practice and techniques which;

b) fulfils a need in the market and therefore attracts intense, exaggerated and thus superficial, popular appeal but

c) is not fully understood, or applied and is of short-lived influence.

The definition of HRM is somewhat problematic as it buys into the debate. For those who regard it as a fad, HRM is a repackaging of personnel management; for those who regard HRM as something more substantial it is a distinctively new approach that is not wholly reducible to elements of traditional personnel policy and practice.

The first section of this paper will attempt to define HRM, explore its development and highlight the key features. The critical issue is to determine whether HRM is 'old wine in new bottles' (i.e. personnel management repackaged), or whether there is sufficient affinity and distinctiveness in the collection of initiatives which comprise HRM, such that they comprise a coherent and distinct corpus of knowledge and community of practice.

What comes to be regarded as a fad depends as much on the way initiatives are taken up and adopted, as on the cogency or distinctiveness of the ideas themselves. In the second section of this paper I shall investigate the adoption of HRM and the context in which HRM emerged. Reasons will be presented to show why line management, personnel managers and academics might have embraced HRM with zeal. I shall explore the extent to which this might reflect a vested interest in developing a more compelling professional rhetoric or a more genuine commitment to improving performance and understanding. Evidence of the take-up of the practice of HRM and its impact on performance will be reviewed.

Finally I shall consider whether HRM is likely to offer anything in the future or whether it will "wither along with many other fads" (Storey, p3, 1995).

The conclusion suggests that while HRM meets some of the criteria for a fad it does not do so entirely and the concept has much to offer.

HRM – the emergence and definitions

One of the problems in answering the question is that there is no shared definition of the term. Noon (1992) asks whether it is a 'map, a model or a theory?' This in part reflects the differences of view as to whether HRM is different from good personnel management. Legge (1989) exposes its contradictions and Storey (1989) suggests that the term is shrouded in managerial hype and is both 'elusive' and 'elastic'.

The term 'human resource management' moved to 'centre stage' of debate in the UK in the mid-eighties and was 'proclaimed as the new paradigm' (Guest and Hoque), although the term had been used much earlier in the States. Drucker (1954) first introduced the concept of the worker as the 'human resource' and Backe (1958) elaborated a more detailed discussion of the human resource function. It was not until Miles (1965) enjoined management to view employees as 'human resources' to raise performance that the term started to attract serious attention and become popularised in management circles in the USA. By the late 1970s the term was being 'purloined' by personnel professionals and the terms personnel management/HRM started to

become inter-changeable (Marciano 1995). The 1980s saw the emergence of American theories of HRM, first Tichy et al (1982), which formed the basis of a rapid succession of studies looking at strategic HRM (SHRM) (to distinguish it from the 'purloined HRM') which attempted to codify its distinguishing characteristics. The work of Beer et al (1984) was, as we shall see, particularly influential. HRM made a bold appearance in UK in the late 1980s, however unlike North America the introduction of HRM was management led (Marciano 1995).

I shall use Guest's (1990) influential review of the development of HRM to summarise the different perspectives on HRM. He draws out what he considers to be the features that distinguish it from personnel management, and thus indicates its potential for exercising a more substantial and lasting influence than a fad. He identifies three different perspectives, summarised below:

1 Descriptive Models

Guest includes the Harvard Business School model (Beer et al 1984) in this category. Beer argues that the focus for HRM should be the consideration of 'all management decisions and actions which affect the nature of the relationship between the organisation and employees.' HRM is deemed too important to be left to personnel and is the responsibility of all managers and particularly top management. Four broad areas of policy choice are identified within the HRM framework: employee influence; human resource flow; reward systems and work-system design.

Choices are to be determined in relation to situational factors such as business strategy, labour market and workforce characteristics and the interest of stakeholders including employee groups, government, community and unions. The policy choices, the model suggests, should be designed to secure four kinds of HR outcomes, commitment, competence, congruence and cost effectiveness and to lead to long term improvements in individual well-being, organisational effectiveness and societal well-being. Guest argues that this framework is in effect no more than an updated version of a Contingency Approach to personnel management with more emphasis on strategy and systems. Adopting the definition introduced earlier, this approach may be regarded as satisfying the criteria for a fad.

4   ©CL Shiel

2 HRM as Strategy

This perspective Guest suggests, firmly establishes HRM as part of the strategic development process, however he doubts whether this represents a radical departure from personnel management. It includes the competitive strategy approaches (Miles and Snow 1984; Hendry and Pettigrew 1986) and the life-cycle model developed by Tichy, Fombrun and Devanna. (1985). With the possible exception of Kochan and Borocci (1985) these approaches regard HRM as a 'servant' strategy to be determined in the light of the overall business objectives.

Guest argues that the overall emphasis on strategy is not new and indeed can be found in earlier approaches to personnel management such as Legge (1989). Thus, following my definition this perspective is a candidate for a fad.

3 HRM as Full Utilisation of Human Resources

This approach which draws extensively on Organisational Psychology, places itself in direct contrast to traditional personnel management as offering a different approach and as such, is a clear candidate in Guest's early intervention in this debate as representing something more substantial than a fad. A critical point of departure, stems from the work of Walton (1985) and his distinction between compliance and commitment strategies. For Walton, HRM is grounded in commitment and thus is radically different from personnel management in general, which reflects a compliance ideology. Guest draws on this distinction to develop a model and theory of HRM. Four key elements of the model are identified. The first is a set of policies and practices including recruitment and training but embracing also management of change and organisational design. The question of what set of practices are central to HRM, is of considerable debate. Pfeffer (1994) argues that the distinctive feature is the link with higher performance. Guest argues that whilst many of these practices are not in themselves new, what is new is that within HRM they are deployed to secure the explicit HRM outcomes of organisational commitment, flexibility and quality. Transcending this element is the goal of strategic integration. This embraces

©CL Shiel

integration between business and HR strategy and integration of HRM policies and integration of HRM with line management. These goals in turn, are linked to explicitly defined organisational level outcomes for HRM being high job performance; problem solving; change; innovation; and cost effectiveness, as well as more traditional outcomes such as labour turnover and absence. The final element of the model is 'Leadership' which provides the coherence and direction to shape the 'Culture' and the HRM 'Strategy'. This defines an explicit role for HRM in articulating and shaping the organisational culture.

Guest suggests that this version of HRM is 'deliberately ideological and prescriptive' and in contrast to the Descriptive Perspective does not take a contingent approach. This perspective reflects a strong American influence and as Guest notes may not travel well.

Guest argues that Descriptive Models such as Beer's are merely a fashionable reworking or reclassification of personnel management. He also contends that the Strategic Perspective offers little that is distinctively new for models of personnel management have, for a number of years, emphasised the importance of strategy. The 'Full-Utilisation' model of HRM however, provides a distinctively new approach in that it places HR at the core of business. It also provides a means through 'Strategic integration' for linking the internal focus on policy, practice and goals with external strategic issues and is based on a clear set of values.

Guest's model provides a valuable analytical framework and expresses a clearer set of propositions than the Harvard model but is not, without its critics. Some suggest it may be an 'ideal-type' (Keenoy 1990) which places conditions for HR practice, which need relaxing. Others (Legge 1989) comment on the tensions and contradictions implicit in the model and suggest that the concept of integration is ambiguous (Legge 1995). The model's strength however, is that it clearly maps the field of HRM and allows for empirical testing.

Later authors (e.g. Storey 1992) facilitate an operationalization of HRM outcomes but in setting up their own 'dimensions' do not contradict Guest's characterisation of HRM. Storey (1992) does however, provide a useful distinction between 'hard' and

©CL Shiel

'soft' HRM. 'Hard' HRM sees the human resource in a more calculative, asset counting manner while 'soft' HRM has its roots in the human relation's school and emphasises motivation, communication and leadership. But if you did not understand HRM in the first instance you might assume that this distinction is no different to Theory X and Theory Y, in which case it would hardly be surprising if HRM was dismissed as a fad.

In conclusion to the first section is HRM different to personnel management?

I disagree with Armstrong (1987) who suggests that HRM is nothing new and Torrington (1989) who argues that HRM is "no revolution but a further dimension to a 'multi-faceted role". I believe that Guest's model (1989; 1997) offers a particular approach to the management of people (the human resource) which is distinctive in that it provides a set of HR policies and practices that will produce outcomes that should increase organisational effectiveness. However, as some writers do consider HRM as just a 'new and consumer friendly repackaging' (Storey 1995) then for those who adopt such perspectives, part of the criteria for a fad is fulfilled.

Legge (1989) underscores the problems of comparing descriptive models of personnel management practice against normative models of HRM. However, her work supports the argument that HRM is different, albeit in terms of emphasis and style from personnel management. She provides perhaps the most cogent summary of distinguishing features suggesting that HRM is more concerned with managerial staff, a more integrated line management activity and emphasises the importance of senior management's involvement in culture. Legge (1995) suggests that differences are "more those of meaning and emphasis than substance – but 'real' for all that" (p74).

The next section will consider the adoption of HRM with a view to determining whether HRM has been adopted in a superficial way, like a fad. As the context has to be 'fertile' for a fad to emerge, and indeed for it to take root (become more than a fad), I shall first consider whether HRM was just the favoured solution to a certain context – a 'product of its times' (Guest 1998). I shall then suggest how HRM might meet the needs of different groups at a particular time and explore how the rhetoric, the title and the practices have been adopted.

The Adoption of HRM – the context

Increased competition; structural changes to industry; reorganisation and collaboration and ideological changes (Tyson 1985) created a propitious scenario for the emergence of HRM. A 'better educated work-force', 'Models of Excellence' (Peters and Waterman, 1982), 'Japanese companies' and the 'failure of personnel', set a scene which is ready for change (Guest 1987). In addition, the enterprise culture under the banner of Thatcherism (Legge 1995), weaker Trade Unions, individualism, the 'survival of the fittest', and the 'cult' of culture, seem compatible with HRM. A backcloth is thus created for a new ideal: HRM - a concept that encapsulates ideas for managing in the new arena and promises improved performance - a 'fad' to conquer the brave new world.

A critical consideration is that in a context of discontinuity and change, management becomes difficult. The concept of HRM therefore plays a part in helping managers to make sense of their role and their identity and it could be said that the Unitarist philosophy of HRM sits well in the context of Thatcherism. Indeed, Clarke and Salaman (1997) argue that part of the success of popular management ideas is that they provide managers with a rhetoric that justifies their actions. Legge (1995) comments on this change in the 'language of management'. She suggests that the early 'hyping' particularly of 'soft' HRM, is a result of the values it embodies which supported the American Dream, which Guest persuasively argues creates a myth which obscures "the less than pleasant reality"(Guest 1990b p393). The HRM rhetoric thus, for some, masks the negative side of the enterprise culture. (Keenoy and Anthony 1992)

But who exactly espouses HRM?

Storey (1995) suggests that the three major stakeholders of HRM are academics, line managers, and personnel managers and they act as 'buyers' and 'sellers' in a situation where the rhetoric of HRM becomes the reality of commerce. I shall address each of these groups to suggest why they may have been attracted to HRM and have a vested interest in talking it up. The nature of their take-up of the concept may support the claim that HRM is a fad.

©CL Shiel

'Human resource management represents the discovery of personnel management by chief executives' (Legge 1989) or as Storey (1992) suggests the rhetoric of HRM supports the line. Line managers get a broader remit and enhanced legitimacy where they are the designer and deliverer of HRM initiatives with responsibility for co-ordinating and directing the human resource in a way that contributes to the bottom line (Storey1995). Clarke (1996) shows that managers have achieved greater autonomy over employee relations and suggests that managers have sought to utilise a language that legitimises a 'new reality'. Purcell (1993) remarks that this is the rediscovery of the management prerogative. The rhetoric of 'tough love' (Legge 1995) allows managers to reconcile the hard/soft contradictions of HRM and justify tough decisions while purporting to practice soft HRM. The language of HRM reinforces a managerial agenda that is reason enough to talk it up with all the zeal of a fad without necessarily embracing the reality.

Academics too, have a vested interest in 'talking up' a new paradigm (Legge 1995; Blyton and Turnbull 1992) and it is suggested that it is academics who have theoretically constructed and popularised HRM, in an attempt to find a new cause on which to base career advancement through research publication. Storey (1995) provides a useful explanation of how HRM puts a 'commercial gloss' on discipline based research which attracts funding. He also suggests that HRM has allowed academics to repackage material, enhance their marketability and advance careers, even where they have sought to 'deconstruct' HRM. Mabey, Skinner and Clarke (1998) make similar comments suggesting that HRM has allowed some academic departments to gain a 'new lease of life'. However, while this is undoubtedly true the adoption of HRM by academics is not superficial and has inspired research leading to developments in theory and practice.

Finally, it is suggested that for some HRM is just 'a posh way of describing a personnel manager' (Legge 1998) which is cynical but not necessarily grounds to suggest that HRM is a fad. However, one might suggest that some personnel managers may have embraced HRM in a superficial way, in response to the 'dilemma' facing personnel and criticisms such as "are they managing or mediating?" (Legge 1989) and perhaps in response to their inability to become 'deviant innovators'. The criticism of the function has a long history (Watson 1977; Legge

1978; Thurley 1981; Storey 1995). The rhetoric of HRM provides, in theory, an opportunity to gain access to the Board, perhaps a move away from the 'trash can' view and an opportunity to be involved in strategy which was previously denied (see Marginson et al 1988). A new rhetoric provides a new role: specialists as internal consultants to the line. Giving power to line management can be accommodated because integration means HR staff are 'part of the team' (Storey 1995). Thus, personnel practitioners might have adopted HRM titles and articulated the language of HRM to avoid 'the Cinderella image' of personnel, and the weakening of their role as 'consensus negotiator' (Torrington 1989) without necessarily adopting the practice, in a way that is consistent with a fad.

But is there evidence to suggest that the title is adopted in such a superficial way? There is no doubt that HRM has been taken up in academic circles. Guest and Hoque (1993) however, reporting on the Workplace Industrial Relations Survey (Millward et al 1992), comment that HR managers are very 'thin on the ground' with little evidence to suggest that practitioners have changed their job titles to reflect the 'new reality'. Only 44 out off 2061 establishments used the HRM title with USA firms being more likely to do so. Where the title is used, it does not necessarily mean that the organisation has progressive policies, or if it has some, that they constitute a coherent approach. The Cranfield/Price Waterhouse survey (Brewster and Burnois, 1991) supports a conclusion that while the title is more evident in HO, overall personnel management is 'alive and well' in the UK, with HRM as a title being more evident in France and Spain.

The next section will review the evidence of the adoption of HRM practices.

Adoption of HRM practice
A feature of the early debates on HRM was a) a lack of data to show whether HRM existed in practice and b) empirical evidence to prove such practices resulted in increased performance. Detailed case studies and large-scale surveys have now provided some data.

The initial evidence on the practice of HRM might lead to a conclusion that the practice is 'superficial' and therefore fad-like. Commentators on the 'reality' of HRM imply that what is being practised is piecemeal or 'ad hoc' (Guest 1989; Sisson 1993, 1995; Storey 1992; Kochan and Dyer 1995) with evidence of general implementation of HR ideas but a 'pick and mix approach' (Sisson 1993). If one seeks evidence of Guest's (1989) HR outcomes then there is little evidence to suggest that organisations have sought to apply the model in an integrated way as part of a coherent strategy, with some exceptions (e.g. 'Greenfield' sites Guest and Hoque 1996). There is evidence of the take-up of employee involvement schemes (Millward et al 1992) but researchers are sceptical about the underlying motives (Marchington et al 1993) and suggest that such schemes are often applied like the latest fad rather than evidence that commitment is being pursued. Benkhoff (1997) provides support for the view that commitment makes a significant contribution to performance in study of bank employees but in the main there is no evidence to suggest that HR type interventions have had a level of impact on commitment in organisations. (Wood 1995; Guest and Peccei 1996)

A variety of initiatives have been taken up to secure quality improvements. There is evidence of investment in training (Fellstead and Green 1995) and use of quality circles and TQM (Wilkinson and Marchington 1994). Guest (1990) however, concludes that investment in development has not been great and again there is a suggestion that many such initiatives may end in the way that other fads do.

There is evidence of flexibility (Guest and Hoque 1994) but this appears to be as much a result of cost cutting, or a tendency to follow fads, rather than reflecting a coherent strategy (Guest 1998).

As for strategic integration Brewster and Smith (1990) reported that 70% of their sample had a strategy for HRM and 50% of the heads of the personnel function were contributing to corporate strategy. However, the coherence of such strategy is challenged and it is suggested that strategy may be 'vague' or formulated in a 'disjointed manner' (Hailey et al 1997). Later evidence (Sisson 1995) shows a lack of HRM specialist involvement at Board (HRM was absent in 66% of large organisations). There is however, some evidence to suggest that line management has

©CL Shiel

greater responsibility for HR practices (Poole & Jenkins, 1997) but with suggestions that devolution to the line has been problematic. The WIRS(1990) survey reports that personnel managers have increased their influence but in contradiction highlights that Board level representation is down.

In summary the bulk of the evidence implies 'more talk than action' (Guest 1998).

Does it improve performance? – if it can be shown that HRM improves performance then it must be more than a fad.

An implicit assumption in the HRM literature is that it contributes to business performance. The extent to which HRM impacts on performance is emerging as the dominant research theme. The suggestion is that if best practice HR policies are properly configured then they improve performance (Purcell 1996; Guest 1996).

Most of the studies are cross-sectional and vary in terms of what they measure and their samples. However the results, despite problems of methodology and controlling influencing variables are starting to attract attention. There is now support for linking HRM practice to strategy (Huselid 1995) and for ensuring the internal fit of HR practices (Huselid 1995; MacDuffie 1995). Arthur (1994) provides evidence of the importance of the type of HR system and shows how a commitment system can lower wastage and increase efficiency. Guest and Hoque (1994) show that using an above median number of HRM practices in greenfield sites, when combined with an HR strategy, appears to result in superior HRM outcomes but not to improvements in productivity or quality. The IPD survey by Patterson et al (1997) lends some support that attention to people management issues improves performance more than say, R&D but this is hardly a revelation.

MacDuffie (1995) provides more substantial evidence that an internally consistent 'bundle' of innovative HR practice contributes to productivity and quality when integrated with manufacturing policy but it is Huselid (1995) who provides the most exciting and exceptional evidence. He shows that 'high performance work practices' are associated with outcomes such as low employee turnover, productivity and short and long term measures of corporate financial performance. His study puts a price on good HRM and is a sophisticated attempt to overcome methodological criticisms of previous studies.

©CL Shiel

It would seem that there is evidence to suggest that some key dimensions of HRM have been taken up in mainstream British companies (Millward et al 1992; Storey 1992) and "increasing confidence that HRM works" (Guest 1997) but as Guest suggests it needs "a lot more flesh on the bones". But is that sufficient to write HRM off as a fad? I suggest that it is too early to reach a definitive conclusion and we need to await the results of longitudinal studies, a basis is now in place to develop further research.

The next section will consider the future of HRM with a view to determining whether its lifespan is consistent with that of a fad.

HRM has survived for more than 15 years which suggests a lifespan greater than a mere fad. Sparrow and Marchington (1998) suggest that HRM is no more 'in crisis' than it has been over the last decade and Guest (1998) suggests that the dangers lie in imposing 'a spurious uniformity of practice'. Guest also suggests that HR specialists will need to reconcile the different prescriptions for high performance systems with organisational contexts. The single market and increasing power of multi-nationals will direct attention to developing HRM models which acknowledge the influence of different national contexts (Poole 1990; Brewster 1994; Brewster and Hegewish 1994). However, the extent to which HRM is able to meet the challenge depends also on the extent to which contexts change.

If the context is favourable then opportunities to extend the influence of HRM and its remit lie in what Mabey et al (1998) identify as the 'Second Wave' of HRM, with four new distinctive strands for analysis and debate:

i) The emergence of social responsibility and ethical considerations in addressing broader social, environmental and economic dynamics and thus the need to address a broader range of stakeholders;
ii) The emerging emphasis on overall business performance and profitability and growth with the scrutiny for bottom-line results (witnessed already in Huselid's (1995) seminal work);

©CL Shiel

iii) The engagement with the development of new organisational structures such as network and virtual organisations;

iv) The importance of determining 'core competencies' and the linking of these to the management of knowledge and learning.

Legge (1995) suggests a more pessimistic view, that 'the widespread implementation of the 'soft' normative model of HRM appears as a mirage, retreating into a receding horizon.'' (P339) There is also increasing evidence of the cost-minimisation, low skill, low pay, corner- cutting approach (Storey 1995) where employment practices are ' more akin to Bleak House' (Sisson) than HRM. Guest (1995) draws attention to the 'black hole' employment category where both HRM and traditional industrial relations are sacrificed in favour of de-recognition and least-cost strategy.

Intensifying competition and technological change may mean that organisations cannot afford time or costs to adopt an integrated HR approach but pick out those principles relevant to the situation - a piecemeal approach. This will result in fragmentation but organisations will still need continuity – "personnel work doesn't go away". (Legge 1995).

Conclusion

I have reviewed the nature of HRM, examined the context of its emergence and the extent of its adoption. I shall now return to my original criteria for a management fad. It would seem that for some, HRM is simply repackaged personnel management and nothing new. However, I have shown, with particular reference to the 'Full-Utilisation model' that in theory, HRM encompasses more. It is 'new' and it represents a distinctly different approach to the management of the human resource that is not wholly reducible to elements of personnel practice.

In looking at the adoption of HRM I have suggested that HRM fulfilled a need in the market. It would seem that general managers, personnel managers and academics were keen to jump on the wave of HRM because as a product it appeared to meet the wider needs of the time, with each group having its own reason for embracing a new rhetoric. There is evidence that it has been 'hyped' up, that the title has been used without meaning, and that it has attracted the superficial appeal suggested by my

©CL Shiel

second criteria. I am sure for some it has been used as a panacea – the promise of increased performance is very attractive but others have taken HRM more seriously as a body of knowledge and a set of practices that define the nature of work and the employment relationship.

Has it been fully understood and applied? If HRM is conceptualised as different things to different people then it is not surprising that there is diversity in application and limited evidence that it exists and works. Evidence reveals that it has been 'indiscriminately applied'. But is that sufficient to write it off as 'simply a management fad'?

I would suggest that the concept is logical despite contradictions in models and evidence is only just emerging which shows in 'hard' terms that it can work. The development of theory and empirical testing will continue and the evidence to show that high quality HRM practice improves performance will be substantial. Whether organisations pursue such practices will depend on the costs and the context.

 I have also suggested that HRM is not short-lived and that there is potential for the future. Perhaps the context will constrain the opportunities for the future of HRM but I would concur with Storey (1995) 'The terminology is too widely entrenched in practitioner and academic circles for it to go away.'

Thus in conclusion while HRM might appear to have some of the characteristics of a fad I suggest that it cannot be simply dismissed as a management fad and that it has the potential to influence the work of academics and practitioners for the foreseeable future. Perhaps the secret in extending the life of HRM is to continue to evolve aspects of the total concept, which attract the attention of new fads – a call for more 'deviant innovation'.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abrahamson, A. (1996). Management Fashion. Academy of management Review,21, 254:85

Armstrong, M. (1987) Human Resource Management: a case of the emperor's new clothes? Personnel Management, 19 (8): 30-5.

Armstrong, M. & Long, P. (1994) The Reality of Strategic HRM. IPD.

Armstrong, D. (1995) HRM model is a flawed way to view people management. People Management; London; Feb 23.

Arthur, J. B. (1994) Effects of human resource systems on manufacturing performance and turnover. Academy of management Journal, 37, 670-687.

Bakke, E. W. (1958) The human resources function. New Haven ; Yale Labour Mgt Centre.reprinted in E W Baccke et al (eds) 1967. Unions, management and the public 197-201.

Beer, M., Spector, B., Lawrence, P., Quinn Mills, D. and Walton, R., (1985) Human Resource Management : A General Manager's Perspective, Glencoe,III.: Free Press.

Benkhoff, B. (1997) A test of the HRM model: Good for employers and employees. Human Resource Management Journal, London Vol 7.4 pp44-60.

Bratton, J. and Gold,J. (1999) Human Resource Management Theory and Practice (2nd Ed) Macmillan Business Press. London.

Brewster, C. and Burnois, F. (1991). Human resource management: a European perspective. Personnel Review, 20, 6, 4-13.

Brewster, C. and Smith, C. (1990) Corporate strategy: a no go area for personnel, Personnel Management, Vol 22, No 7.

Brewster, C. (1994) European human resource management versus the American concept in Kirkbride, PS (ed) Human Resource Management in Europe, Routledge, London and New York.

Blyton, P. & Turnbull, P. (1992) (eds) Reassessing Human Resource Management, London: Sage.

Clark, T. (1996) European Human Resource Management. Oxford: Blackwell.

Clark,T. & Salaman, G. (1997) Telling tales: the management gurus' narratives and the construction of managerial identity', Journal of Management Studies, 32 (2).

Drucker, P F. (1954) The practice of management. New York: Harper.

Felstead, A. and Green, F. (1993) Cylcles of Training? Evidence from the British recession of the 1990s, Discussion Papers in Economics, Leicester, University of Leicester.

Guest, D (1987) Human resource management and industrial relations. Journal of Management Studies, Vol. 14 No 5, pp503-21.

Guest, D. (1989a) Human resource management:its implication for industrial realtions and trade unions, In Storey, J (ed) New Perspectives in HRM.

Guest, D. (1989b) Personnel and HRM: can you tell the difference? Personnel Management, January, pp48-51

Guest, D. (1990). Human resource management and the American Dream. Journal of Management Studies, 27, 4, 378-97.

Guest, D. (1991) Personnel Management: The end of orthodoxy?. British Journal of Industrial Relations 29:2 June.

Guest, D. (1997) Human resource management and performance: a review and research agenda. IRJHRM: 8:3.

Guest, D. 1998. Beyond HRM: commitment and the contract culture. In Storey, J.

Guest, D & Conway, N. (to be published) Peering into the Black Hole: The Downside of the New Employment Relations.

Guest, D & Hoque, K (1993) The mystery of the missing human resource manager. Personnel Management; London;June

Guest, D. and Hoque, K. (1996) National ownership and HR practices in UK greenfield sites. Human Resource Management Journal; London.

Guest, D and Peccei, R. (1994) The nature and causes of effective human resource mangement. British Journal of Industrial Relations, London, June.

Guest, D. (1997) Human resource management and performance: a review and research agenda. The International Journal of Human Resource Management 8:3 June.

Hollinshead, G. and Leat, M. (1995) Human Resource Management: An International Perspective,Pitman:london.

Hope-Hailey, V., Graton, L., McGovern,P., Styles, P. & Truss, C. (1997). A chameleon function? HRM in the '90s. Human Resource Management Journal; London

Huselid, M A., (1995) The impact of human resource management practices on turnover, productivity, and corporate financial performance. Academy of Management Journal; Mississippi State; June Vol 38.

Keenoy, T. (1990) HRM: A case of the wolf in sheep's clothing. Personnel Review, Vol. 19, No 2, 1990.

Keenoy, T and Anthony, P. (1992). HRM: Metaphore, meaning and morality. In P. Blyton & P Turnbull (Eds)

Kochan, T. and Barocci, T. (1985) Human resource Management and Industrial Relations: text, Reading and cases, Boston: Little, Brown.

Legge, K. (1978) Power,Innovation and Problem solving in Personnel Mnagement, Maidenhead, Mcgraw Hill.

Legge, K. (1989) Human resource management : a critical analysis. In J. Storey (ed) New Perspectives in Human Resource Management, London, Routledge.

Legge, K. (1995) Human Resource Management: Rhetorics and Realities, MacMillan: London.

Mabey, C., Skinner, D. & Clarke, T. (1998) Experiencing Human Resource Management. Sage: London.

Mabey, C., Salaman, G., & Storey, J. (1998) Strategic Human Resource Management; a Reader, The Open University: London.

MacDuffie. J.P. (1995) Human resource bundles and manufacturing performance:organi Industrial & Labor Relations Review,Ithaca;Jan.

Marchington, M., Wilkinson, A., Ackers, P. and Goodman, J. (1994) Understanding the meaning of participation; views from the workplace, Human Relations, 47 (8); 867-94.

Marciano, V. M. (1995) The origins and development of human resource management. Academy of Management Journal, Best Papers Proceedings p223-231

Miles, R. (1965) Human relations or human resources? Harvard Business Review, 43: 148 – 163.

Miles, R. E. E. and Snow, C. C. (1984). Designing strategic human resource systems. Organizational Dynamics, Summer, 36-52.

Milward, N., Stevens, M.. Samrt, D. and Hawes ,W (1992). Workplace industrial relations in transition, Dartmouth.

Niehaus, R. & Swiercz, P. (1996) Do HR systems affect the bottom line? We have the answer.HR Human Resource Planning; Tempe Vol 19, 4 pp61-63.

Noon, M. (1992) HRM: a map, model or theory?, in P. Blyton and P. Turnbull (eds)

Patterson, M., West, M. Lawthorn, R. (1997) Impact of People Management Practices on Business Performance. IPD.

Peters, T. J. and Waterman, R. H. (1982). In Search of Excellence. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Pfeffer, J. (1994). Competitive Advantage Through People. Boston, Mass; Harvard Business School Press.

Poole, M. and Jenkins, G. (1997) Responsibilities for human resource management practices in the modern enterprise: evidence from Britain, Personnel Review, (UK), Vol 26, No. 5. 97.

Purcell, J. (1993) The challenge of human resource management for industrial relations research and practice, International Journal of Human Resource Management, 4 (3): 511-27.

Purcell, J. (1996) Human resource bundles of best practice; a utopian cul-de-sac? Paper presented to the ESRC Seminar Series on the Contribution of HR Strategy to Business Performance, Cranfield, 1 February.

Robinson, I. & Rowland, V. (1994) HRM – Rhetoric or reality? Employment Bulletin and IR Digest; Bradford Vol 10, 1.

Sisson, K. 1990. 'Introducing the Human Resource Management Journal'. HRMJ, Vol.1, No. 1

Sisson, K. (1993) 'In Search of HRM'. British Journal of Industrial Relations. Vol. 31,No 2, 227-34.

Sisson, K. (1995) 'Human Resource Management and the personnel function' in Storey, J. (ed). Human Resource managemment. London: Routledge, 87-109.

Shelley, G C.(1996) The search for the universal management elixir. Business Quarterly, Canada, Summer, pp 11-13.

Sparrow, P. & Marchington, M. (1998) Human Resource Management:The New Agenda (ed). Financial Times Pitman Publishing: London

Storey, J. (ed) (1989) New perspectives on human resourc management. London: Routledge.

Storey, J. (1992) Developments in the management of human resources. London: Blackwell,

Storey, J. (1995) Is HRM catching on? International Journal of Manpower, Bradford Vol 16, 4 pp3-11.

Storey, J. (1995) (Ed) Human Resource Management: A critical text.Routledge: London.

Tichy, n S., Fombrm, C. J & Devanna, m A (1982) Strategic human resource management. Sloan Management Review, 22 Winter 47-60.

Torrington, D. (1989) Human resource management and the personnel function. In J Storey (ed) New Perspectives on Human Resource Management.

Thurley, K. (1981) Personnel management in the UK: a case for urgent treatment, Personnel Management, 13 (8): 24-9.

Tyson, S. (1985). Is this the very model of a modern personnel manager? Personnel Management, 17, 5, 22-5.

Tyson, S. (ed) (1995) Strategic prospects for HRM. London: IPD.

Tyson, S. (ed) (1997) The Practice of Human Resource Strategy. Pitman: London.

Walton. R. E. (1985) Towards a strategy of eliciting employee commitment based on policies of mutuality in R E Walton & P R Lawrence (eds) Human Resource Management, Trednds and Challenges. Boston: Harvard Business School Presss,pp35-65.

Wickens, P. (1995) Getting the most out of your people. People management (uk), 9 Mar pp28-31.

Wilkinson, a. and Marchington, M. (1994) TQM: Instant pudding for the personnel function? Human Resource management Journal, 5 92): 33-49.

Wood (1995) The four pillars of HRM: Are they connected? Human Resource Management Journal; London; Autumn 5:5 p49.

Youndt, M., Snell, s. A., Dean, j. W. and Lepak, D. P. (19950. Human resource management , manufacturing strategy, and firm performance. Paper presented to the Academy of Management Conference, Vancouver, Aug, 6-9, 1995.