

THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF BUSINESS & MANAGEMENT

Has the Leopard Changed its Spots? Personnel Management versus Human Resource Management

Dr. Eno A. Maycock

Lecturer, Department of Organisation, Relationship and Behaviour, Faculty of Business,
Environment and Society, Coventry University, Coventry, UK

Nnenda F. Atata

MBA Research Candidate, Department of Organisation, Relationship and Behaviour,
Faculty of Business, Environment and Society, Coventry University, Coventry, UK

Angela K. Mwape

MBA Research Candidate, Department of Organisation, Relationship and Behaviour,
Faculty of Business, Environment and Society, Coventry University, Coventry, UK

Florence Nanthalo

MBA Research Candidate, Department of Organisation, Relationship and Behaviour,
Faculty of Business, Environment and Society, Coventry University, Coventry, UK

Richard Geraghty

MBA Research Candidate, Department of Organisation, Relationship and Behaviour,
Faculty of Business, Environment and Society, Coventry University, Coventry, UK

Abstract:

Purpose – The purpose of this paper is to review the existing literature and the empirical evidence linked to the debate between Personnel Management (PM) and Human Resource Management (HRM).

Design/methodology/approach – The approach taken entails reviewing books and academic journals from the area of human resource management and business management. The review shows that research and theory from a range of fields can help add to one's knowledge of personnel management and human resource management.

Research limitations/implications – The main limitation of the review is that, while different areas and fields of research are being drawn to help identify useful knowledge that can improve one's understands of the transition from PM to HRM, the literature and research in each area will be necessarily selective.

Practical implications – The review has a number of general practical implications; many of these are highlighted in the propositions set out within each section.

Originality/value – The originality of the review is that it is unique in showing how different areas of literature can be linked to the debate between HRM and PM. The review helps to integrate existing literature in a way which can help practitioners to immediately see the relevance of theory and research form a range of key academic fields.

Keywords: *Human resource management, personnel management*

1. Introduction

In support of the above quotation, innovative thinking in this day and age is the cure for poor performance of a company. In order, to gain competitive advantage in a fast paced changing environment due to macro environmental factors such as technological, political and economic, companies in the 1980s felt a need to transition how they worked by being innovative thinkers. One of these changes was from Personnel Management (PM) to Human Resource Management (HRM) (Storey 2007:5; Armstrong 2012). These are further defined in the literature review.

The analysis and evaluation of HRM has become a major theme of debates in academic, policy and practitioners literature (Holden and Beardwell 2001). This is probably because of the extent to which it has disturbed many formerly accepted concepts in the employment relationship. It is argued that there is difficulty distinguishing the differences between HRM, a term which only became popular in the mid1980s and personnel management(PM) which has been in existence before this time (Doaei and Najminia 2012). HRM has undoubtedly become prominent over the last forty years, both in terms of its practical contribution and its development as an

academic subject of enquiry (Marchington 2008). It is now seen by many as a major contributor to organisational strategy and performance (Marchington 2008).

PM emerged during the late 1800 and early 1900 in the US as a result of welfare departments that were created to establish a safe and comfortable working environment for employees (Stankeviciute and Savaneviciene 2014: 235). This function later merged with hiring/staffing and training to create employee management (EM). EM was then transformed into PM and another department was formed called Industrial Relations (IR). The latter looked at “the relationship between employers and employees” whereas the former, focused on functional activities such as hiring/staffing, compensation, training, benefits and similar employment areas (Stankeviciute and Savaneviciene 2014, Kaufmann 2014). Factors that have cultivated interest into this field can also be linked to the UK (Guest 1987: 504).

Some researchers have resisted this change while others have embraced it. In this transition HRM has been linked to eye catching idioms and phrases such as “Old wine in new bottles” (Guest 1989: 48), “A case of the emperor’s new clothes” (Armstrong 1987: 30), “A rhetoric vs reality split” (Legge 2005; Storey 2007: 3), “A Chameleon function” (Truss et al. 1990: 5) and “A sheep in wolfs clothing” (Keenoy 1990:1). As a result of this transition questions have arisen such as “How is it different from PM?” (Bratton & Gold 2003: 29), “Is one better than the other?” (Armstrong 2000: 576), “Are variances between HRM and PM not just a matter of semantic?” (Bratton & Gold 2003: 29) and “is it a relabelled or new approach?” (Stankeviciute and Savaneviciene 2014: 234).

During the era of PM, which Torrington et al (2014) describes as an evolved complex form of HRM, Organisations only required people to provide manual labour with no skill or experience. Hiring and firing employees was easy as a result of inexpensive training methods and “un-sophisticated payment methods”. However, this is still the case in some industries and various countries but a rarity in “industrialised countries” where the majority of jobs require expensive training, skills and competency. Therefore, methods of effective people management have evolved with a change in workforce leading to the evolution of HRM – “a distinctive approach to people management (Torrington et al 2014: 5). HRM stresses that “humans are key resource assets to an organization” (Dianna and Diana 2014: 194). Key differences between PM and HRM are summarised in Fig 1.

According to Armstrong (2012) HRM’s focus activities include “human capital and knowledge management”, “strategic HRM”, “corporate social responsibility”, “organisation development”, “resource (including recruitment and selection and talent management)”, “training and development” “performance and reward management”, “employee relations and wellbeing” and lastly, “the provision of employee services”.

The purpose of this article is to address the question of “what’s new” both in the overall concept of HRM and in the various policies and practice areas. Consideration is also giving to issues emerging from the analysis and possible direction in the future.

2. Literature Review

2.1. What is PM and HRM?

The shift from PM to HRM has gained so much attention (David 1987:48) and controversy (Storey 2007: 6) over the last 20 decades since its formalization in the 1980s. Before then, PM and HRM were regarded as equivalent (Straus 2001:879). Due to its diversified nature, it is no surprise that the term HRM has been defined from different perspectives causing a public disagreement on the right definition.

The background of Personnel Management comes due to the industrial revolutions which led to the massive growth of welfares, trade unions, the rise of scientific management and Taylorist theories (Tyson 1995:17). Moreover, in the Nineteenth century many employees had poor life styles and working conditions. Agreeably, the Northampton shire poet, John Clare wrote: “...the poor man’s lot seems to have been so long remembered as to be entirely forgotten” (Tyson and York 1989:47). PM has several definitions and the analysis of the definitions showed that some terms were common such as developing, rewarding, selecting and directing (Legge 1989:22). Nevertheless, Beach (1985:5) identified the following as challenges that were faced by PM in the past years: increased rate of unemployment, globalization, shift towards services industries, new technology, competition, increasing litigation in the employment relationship, career opportunities, insufficient Prospects for a better educated work force and many other factors. Consequently, loss of faith in PM mass production, Japanese organisation success and the recognition of the effects of technology on employment practices lead to HRM, the new thinking of managing people (Gallie *et al* 1998 cited in Henderson 2011:7).

HRM has roots in the following models: Michigan Model, Harvard Model (1984), Guest’s Model (1987), Storey’s Model (1992) and Warwick Model (Bratton and Gold 2012:18). In Michigan Model, Fombrun *et al.* emphasized the HR system and organisation structure to be congruent with organisation strategy while the Harvard framework recommended HRM to adopt long run perspectives in managing employees and to value them as assets not costs (Armstrong 2012:5). Furthermore, Beardwell *et al.* (2004:21) discussed Guest Model four suggestions namely: high quality, strategic integration, flexibility and high commitment and were further linked to HRM aims, Policies and outcomes. On the other hand, Storey Model highlighted the twenty-seven differences of PM/IR and HRM and the focus was on beliefs and assumption, strategic aspects, line management and key levers. In Warwick model, the Harvard model was extended and its analytical aspect was drawn by Hendry and Pettigrew (1990). Furthermore, the models consist of business strategy content, Human Resource practices and the internal and external environment (Bratton and Gold 2012:22). Beardwell *et al.* (2004:14) laid the four HRM theoretical perspectives and located key aspects within HRM framework.

HRM takes on two approaches (Storey 2007; Torrington et al. 2014), firstly, when used amongst academicians and scientific researchers it is just a “new fashion” with a modern name for PM (Guest 1989:48). However, when used amongst managers and practitioners in the field it “signifies more than an updating of the label” but is instead used to enable businesses function more

effectively in comparison to PM (Torrington et al. 2014). The latter approach encompasses managing people in line with company goals (Guest 1987). Guest (1987) summarises key HRM objectives as “strategic integration”, “high commitment”, “high quality” and “flexibility”.

Additionally, Torrington et al (2014) sums up four key objectives which are related to both HRM and PM as being, “staffing objectives which include finding the right people for the right jobs at the right time”, “performance objectives such as motivating people through training and development and reward and performance”, “change management objective - by recruiting and developing people with necessary leadership management” and “administration objectives - by maintenance of accurate employee data such as performance, training, attendance , contract”. However Henderson (2011) states that PM managers are more linked to administration objectives whereas the general managers perform all the rest.

2.2. What is Similar?

Regarding similarities, some scholars state that HRM has familiar concepts and key phrases as PM, therefore, nothing has changed except the context in which people are managed. This is because many companies want to achieve competitive advantage, by repositioning themselves in terms of how they work, as a result PM has become more strategic (Armstrong 2000). However, the extent and manner in which these terms are used is what makes the difference between modern day HRM and PM (Henderson 2011). To support his statement, Armstrong exemplifies this by stating that since the beginning of HRM in 1980, “competency –based personnel management”, “performance management”, “the learning organisation”, “knowledge management” and “emotional intelligence” have been identified as personnel practices which became apparent (Armstrong 2000). Therefore, the term “competency –based personnel management” became prominent in the early 1980s (Boyartzis 1982)¹.

However, Armstrong (2000: 583) has different views by mentioning that this was a term widely used in the 1960s by British Bakeries who set up well defined interview procedures accompanied by psychometric tests to identify a suitable range of workers who would not be over qualified for the job. These techniques increased employee retention and sales performance. Criticising the idea of psychometric tests been widely used in PM, Henderson (2011: 5) alludes that these tests were only given to top management or highly paid jobs, whereas, these days most firms that embrace HRM use these techniques not for retention purposes or determining the right candidates for the role, but to ensure that all employees welcome a “strong common culture”. It is suggested that personnel management and HRM have clear similarities and there seems to be no conflict of interest between them as they are both forms of practice which are responsive to circumstances (Haston n.d.), this probably points to the fact that it is absurd attempting to distinguish them.

2.3. What is different?

It is also mentioned that HRM unlike PM has more focus on organisation, observation and control rather than PMs way of reconciliation to satisfy employee work-related needs (Armstrong 2009). Supporting the “sterile debate” of HRM, Ulrich (1998)² has joined other critics in arguing that HRM is ineffective and costly, therefore, should be removed. Unless it is “restructured” to focus on results other than the usual staffing and compensation. In contrast to this statement, most managers and management theorists think HRM in the 21st century is important to the continuity and triumph of a company (Henderson 2011). Furthermore, with Prowse & Prowse (2010)³ argues that “HRM has inculcated new ideas on motivation of employees rather than control them”.

Legge (1989) cited in Doaei and Najminia (2012:163) concluded that PM is mainly concerned with non-managers activity whilst HRM focuses on managerial staff. Agreeably, strategy constitutes the unique feature of HRM to PM. Strategy has a useful fourfold namely: planning, employment policy underpinned by philosophy, HRM activities matched to the business strategy and seeing employees as a strategic resource for achieving competitive advantage (Hendry and Pettigrew 1986 cited in Guest 1991:152). Furthermore, PM and HRM differs because HRM has been developed from Harvard Model, Matching Model, Guest Model and Storey Model (Storey and Sisson 1993:5). Besides, PM is supply driven while HRM is demand driven. Thus, PM concerns start with the employee of an organisation while HRM concerns start from the organisation need for HR (Torrington 1989:42). In PM the organisation function is seen as of Personnel Specialist and in respect of handling employee issues is separate from line management, hence, large departments. On the other hand, in HRM the organisation Line Managers are the ones that implement policies and they involve HR in difficult issues. Moreover, the HR departments are small and highly specialized, their functions tend to be formulation of policies and act as internal consultants to line managers (Henderson 2011:18).

PM in system of control is associated with compliance where as HRM is associated with commitment (Starkey and McKinlay 1992:326). In employee relations PM is said to be pluralist, low trust and collective while HRM is unitarist, high trust and individual (Bratton and Gold 2012:20). The UK survey in 1999 with a sample size of 350 companies showed that Personnel Specialists tended to be older, male, long serving and less level of qualification. On the other hand, HR specialists tended to be young, both female and male, short serving and high level of qualification (Caldwell 2002:697).

PM has hierarchical organisation where as HRM has a flexible organisation (Cole 2002:3). HRM regard employees as valued assets in contrast PM regard employees as variable cost (Armstrong 1992:15). In PM training is inadequate and mostly controlled to train non-managerial employees while in HRM training is for all employees including those not on managerial post (Henderson 2011:18).

¹ cited in Armstrong 2000: 582

² as cited in (Armstrong 2009)

³ cited in Kaufmann 2014

HRM is goal oriented whereas PM is relationship-oriented (Guest 1991 cited in Turnbull *et al.* 1992:12). PM and HRM differs because HRM highlights managing culture as a central role of senior managers (Storey and Sisson 1993 cited in Haston n.d.:4).

Another avenue for discord in the PM vs. HRM debate is related to the notion of ‘Best Practice’ over ‘Best Fit’. The supporters of ‘Best Practice’ suggest that the most effective application of HRM is through a universally applied set of established practices that have been shown to improve business performance, and there is a volume of research that establishes the efficacy of this policy (Torrington *et al.* 2011). On the other hand, ‘Best Fit’ promoters believe that there is no universally correct method and that circumstances, industry sectors, economic condition will shape a tailored HRM policy (Armstrong 2008: 42).

Good managers have always acknowledged the fact that how people are managed has a major impact on the organisation’s performance and research has also shown this to be true (Psychpress 2008). This new concept of HRM which is a strategic approach to the management of people may have evolved due to a range of factors such as increased competitive pressure caused by globalization, government laws and policies, socio-cultural diversity, research works from notable academics in the United States and United Kingdom and to enforce its relevance in an organisation as compared to other department within the organisation (Marchington 2008) (Fleming 2000) (Psychpress 2008) (Haston n.d.) (Benjamin 2015) (Lucas *et al.* 2006).

The employment and taxation laws are measures adopted by the government to ensure the economic and social well-being of its citizens (Lucas *et al.* 2006: 14). These laws are important factors that are considered by human resource (HR) managers. Subsequently, this affects human resource strategies and policies as they tend to adopt a HRM approach rather than personnel management (Benjamin 2015) (Lucas *et al.* 2006: 14). The Civil right act which prohibits discrimination against employees on the basis of race, colour, sex, religion and national origin may have forced organisation to employ and retain employee (Benjamin 2015) which may not have occurred if these laws were absent. Furthermore, the amendment of ‘the Work and Families Act’ in the United Kingdom allowed all pregnant employees up to 52 weeks of maternity leave including ordinary and additional leave (Benjamin 2015) and this has to be fulfilled by the organisation demonstrating its concerns for employees wellbeing (soft HRM).

Gaining and retaining a competitive advantage is crucial for the growth and prosperity of an organisation and this has significantly influenced approaches to human resource management (Schuler and MacMillan 1984) (McGuire and Cross 2003) (Haston n.d.). Although many companies recognize the growing importance of their human resources, only a few are conceptualizing them in strategic way to gain a competitive advantage in the industry (Schuler and MacMillan 1984). The result of an effective human resource management is an enhanced ability to attract and retain qualified employees who are motivated to perform as this subsequently leads to greater profitability, low employee turnover, high product quality, lower production costs, and more rapid acceptance and implementation of the organisation strategy (Schuler and MacMillan 1984). The PM approach holds employees satisfaction as the key to keeping employees motivated, and institutes compensation, bonuses, rewards, and work simplification initiatives as possible motivators whereas human resource holds improved performance as the driver of employee satisfaction, and devises strategies such as work challenges, team work, and creativity to improve motivation (Nayab 2013). In summary, Guest (1987) highlights its revolutionary nature, Armstrong (2000) defines it as “high concept personnel management” and Hendry and Pettigrew (1990:25) argue that it is a “perspective on personnel management, not personnel management itself”.

3. Discussions

It may be theoretically possible to differentiate the application of soft and hard HRM but the boundaries between them may become blurred in practice as the HRM rhetoric of an organisation may be soft when in reality it is hard (Kidombo 2004). The benefits and ‘softer’ approach of human resource management may have been successful in most multinational companies (MNCs) with parent company in developed countries however this may prove challenging and probably detrimental for medium sized companies in a developing countries. HRM policies and practice are carried out within an economic, social, political and legal environment (Fajana *et al.* 2011), and so would be surprising if the local values, culture and custom of a country did not have an influence on HRM practices. A case study would be a medium sized company in Nigeria, a country characterized by socio-cultural diversity (Fajana *et al.* 2011). Factors such as religion, language, gender will determine if an average individual will be employed (Fajana *et al.* 2011). Unlike MNCs that may adopt the person- organisation match model (Dias n.d.) to improve job attraction, performance and most importantly retention satisfaction. If this is the case, how would a medium sized company in Nigeria survive with its recruitment and selection methods that are not in line with models of recruitment? This may be a HRM strategy aimed at developing a good relationship with the local authority. This is similar to the recruitment strategy used by Township and Village Enterprises (TVEs) in China where they recruited line workers locally (Ding *et al.* 2001) however this can be detrimental to the diversity and multiculturalism of the workplace.

Likewise in Ireland *Delivering Better Government* (DBG) was used as a reform to revamp the departmental functions. This was done by making changes in the way the departments were run. Departments were made to adopt more strategic approach of functioning; part of which was the stress on making line-managers accountable for handling the day to day issues related to HRM (Fleming 2000; 5). This clearly indicates that the reforms were undertaken to make a conscious effort to move from PM to HRM resulting in better governance.

To assess the best HRM practices in Jordan, a study was conducted by Muhammed (2011) on ZAIN – a mobile network in Jordan. Using a “Likert scale” employees rated four key - HRM practices adopted by ZAIN HR department. These key HRM practices being Training and development, performance appraisal, recruitment and selection and lastly, communication and information sharing. It was discovered that the first three key HRM practices as mentioned above were practised the most whereas recruitment and selection had a rather low practice level. A further survey showed that communication was vital and contributed to employee job involvement,

hence, being a crucial element in HR enactment (Longmore and Ronnie, 2014). Furthermore there is evidence of PM management to some extent because biases in recruitment and selection were observed. This evidence was linked to nepotism, interpersonal relations and education importance in that some employees had the education but lacked experience and still got the job. Results also showed that “employee participation” in ZAIN was not given much surveillance – another aspect of PM management. Zain has transitioned to HRM, however, practices of PM management in some functional areas is evident.

In another research conducted in China, HR practices were assessed with the construction industry in china (Zhai et al. 2014). The empirical evidence indicated that HR practices were the same as those employed by western countries as they were all wrapped in practices of “job description”, “participation”, “training”, “staffing”, and “rewards” (Zhai et al. 2014: 2001). From this perspective, this company seems to embrace HRM. However, it is unknown whether all companies have the same practice in China. Although personnel management has been applauded as one of the key factors to the success of a Japanese cooperation (Suzuki 1991), this is not the case with Japanese companies abroad. PM was noted as an obstacle to their globalisation process (Suzuki 1991) and was considered inappropriate in the changing environment. There was a need for a new way of management that will accommodate the ‘new-breed’ (young workers), ‘freeter’ (part-time worker) and the elderly workforce since they each had different values and level of commitment to the organisation (Suzuki 1991).

In the Middle East, according to a mini case study conducted at Fattal holding by Syed and Krammar (2012) - an organisation with operations in the Middle East and North African region. The HRM department in the last 23 years has evolved from focusing on PM related administrative tasks to incorporating functional groups like training, compensation and benefits, recruitment, and communication and employee involvement – these additional areas are referred to as the “five pillars of human resources”. With all pillars being dependant on each other and the company recognising people as valuable assets to the organisation. Using “strategic integration” in order to achieve competitive advantage, the company’s HR takes on a “proactive approach” by executing and acknowledging the company’s strategy. This has led the company to expand its workforce and attain more projects (Krammar and Syed 2012).

In the United Kingdom, flexibility is a key aspect of HRM (Guest 1987) one of the top 50 HR directors, Graham Poole, an employee of Camelot Global is able to work part time. He has also taken on broader roles with increased remit and accountability while the company maintains his part time work hours (CIPD 2015). This is another evidence of HRM which most companies seem to practice. Life style changes have led to a change in work patterns, HRM therefore also focuses on “flexibility”.

Deloitte, a multinational consulting professional service clearly distinguishes PM from HRM by focusing on “strategic integration” of HR goals with those of the company. Deloitte also emphasises how HRM is playing an important aspect in adding value to the business by the manner in which “human capital” affects customers, company success and shareholder value. Conversely, practices such as this would question the ethical aspect of HRM where emphasis seems to be more on “commercial outcomes” where people are treated as “mere factors of production” (Boxall et al 2007 as cited in Armstrong 2009: 12). Instead, such companies should also take on the “paternalistic” approach of PM by being concerned about the health and well-being of employees. To de-value the ethical aspect of HRM, Guest (2002), however, likens this approach to a “paternalistic or mutual gain system” where both employees personal and company goals are met to gain competitive advantage. In support of this approach, successful Companies like British Airways and Lloyds TSB bank have adopted employee well-being into their organisations (CIPD Nov 2014) with a view to promote employee retention and reduce absenteeism, increase productivity and employee engagement.

A major shift of low skilled, manufacturing based jobs towards developing countries has occurred, especially to those countries with cheap labour, such as China and India. In the UK alone, it is estimated that 4 million manufacturing jobs have been lost between 1978 and 2008 (Price Waterhouse Coopers 2010). But, importantly, manufacturing as a % of GDP has risen in relative terms, which suggests that manufacturing is now producing more value for any given output and this reflects the benefit of the more advanced manufacturing centred around the knowledge economy (Price Waterhouse Coopers 2010). PWC also go on to state that there exists a shortage of skilled manufacturing workers in the UK (Price Waterhouse Coopers 2010) and that this is affecting manufacturing growth and limiting economic benefit to the country. In order for these highly skilled workers to be recruited, it would be reasonable to conclude that HRM practices would play a key role, especially those related to performance related pay, corporate culture development and psychological contract fulfilment. Attracting these workers, and effectively utilizing their input within the business is the key to competitive advantage in the knowledge economy (Whicker & Andrews 2004). This suggests that HRM is an appropriate ideology for the knowledge-based economy.

In universities, HRM was introduced by Harvard Business School as a first compulsory course (Guest 1987:505). PM is out of syllabus and HRM is one of the compulsory social science courses among the module to be done in undertaking MBA (Kaufman 2004 cited in Heery 2008:358). Knowledgeably, all over the world HRM course is now one of the courses for those undertaking MBA in all the universities. In summary, as Armstrong (2009) stated that the internal environment of an organisation such as type of business – private, public or non-governmental, size, age, type of employees whether professional, academicians, sales or customer service staff will affect the HRM policy and practice of that the organisation. However, it is worth noting that HRM is still a new concept especially in developing countries which are still transitioning from PM to HRM.

4. Conclusion and Recommendations

In conclusion, HRM plays a key role in adding value and helping organisations deal with challenges arising from globalisation and other economic factors. “Human resources are the key assets that lead to success or failure of a company” (Maund 2001)⁴. However, it is just about the name, but how people are actually managed. What works best for one company may not necessarily be what works for another due to changing environments. Armstrong (2000) argues that it is a “different perspective on PM”. Similar to Apple, every company aims to be successful by gaining competitive advantage and to achieve this, they have to be innovative. Distinguishing HRM from PM is a difficult task because not much is known about PM (Guest and Harwood 1980)⁵. Most authors have highlighted PMs shortcomings and restrictions in practice; this puts them at risk of comparing an idealistic approach to HRM with a picturesque outlook on PM (Guest 1987).

Companies adopt various practices whether regarded as “PM” or “HRM” on how to manage their employees while continuing to be successful. HRM may not be a permanent status but may alternate according to the changing environment as it has become apparent that organisations will adopt either soft or hard HRM depending on the nature of the business strategy (Kidombo 2004). HRM may be the current term adopted in business to emphasize the “softer” aspect of managing employees. This term may be prone to change due to the dynamic nature of the business environment. There is now a shift to Strategic Human Resource Management (SHRM) and of recent within the literature Electronic Human Resource Management (e-HRM) (Marler and Fisher 2013: 19).

A unique set of staff management practices that can be applicable in any place may not exist. Examples of HRM for networked projects, Korean software developers, Ireland and Southern African counties suggest that staff management practices varies from culture to culture, and industry to industry. Horwitz (2012: 2953) suggests a ‘hybrid model’ as an effective one because the same HR practices that are effective in one culture may not in another. Important issue in attaining the objectives is not applying PM or HRM practices mechanically but selecting appropriate practices deliberately among diverse staff management practices and fitting them into actual workplace; having such flexibility may be crucial in this globally competitive business environment.

It can be concluded that there has been a change in the field of managing human resources; personnel management operates on operation level HRM in contrast to PM operates in proactive manner in which it links strategies with objectives of organization and long term investment on people which reaps profits hereafter. The literature review reveals that difference between PM and HRM are enormous. HRM is definitely an improvement over PM. One key difference is that HRM is strategic in nature which is pertinent in today’s hyper-turbulent and competitive environment. HRM can be seen as distinctive discipline which is different from PM. HRM manifests itself in practice of goal; commitment to objectives of organization. 21st century perspective of HRM has made it important that HRM becomes strategic partner of the business. Therefore SHRM has become an essential tool which helps organizations to keep HRM synchronized and harmonized with all the tasks within an organization and provide support to the strategies of business by employing and retaining the right employee.

5. References

- i. Abutayeh, B., and Al-Qatawneh, M (2012) ‘The Effect of Human Resource Management Practices on Job Involvement in selected Private Companies in Jordan’. Canadian Social Science 8 (2), 50-57. Available from < <http://dx.doi.org/10.3968/j.css.1923669720120802.2256>> [27 Feb 2015]
- ii. Armstrong, M. (1987) ‘Human Resource Management: a case of the emperor’s new clothes?’. Personnel Management 30-35
- iii. Armstrong, M. (2000) ‘The name has changed but has the game remained the same?’ Employee Relations 22 (6), 576-593. Available from < <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/01425450010379207>> [31 Jan 2015]
- iv. Armstrong, M. (2009) Armstrong’s Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice. 11th edn. London: Kogan Page.
- v. Armstrong, M. (2012) Armstrong’s Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice. 12th edn. London: Kogan Page
- vi. Beach, D. S., (1985) Personnel: The Management of People at Work. 5th ed. London: Collier Macmillan
- vii. Benjamin, T. (2015) Laws Affecting Human Resource Management [online] available from <<http://smallbusiness.chron.com/laws-affecting-human-resource-management-36304.html>> [4 March 2015]
- viii. Bratton, J., and Gold, J. (2007) Human Resource Management: Theory and Practice. 4th edn. Basingstoke: Palgrave
- ix. Bratton, J., and Gold, J., (2012) Human Resource Management: Theory & Practice. 5th ed. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan
- x. CIPD (05 Jan 2015) Q & A: HR director Graham Poole [Online]. Available at < <http://www.cipd.co.uk/pm/peoplemanagement/b/weblog/archive/2015/01/05/q-amp-a-hr-director-graham-poole.aspx>> [19 Feb 2015]
- xi. CIPD (02 DEC 2014) Employers ‘actively discourage’ whistle blowing, survey reveals [online]. Available at < <http://www.cipd.co.uk/pm/peoplemanagement/b/weblog/archive/2014/12/02/employers-actively-discourage-whistleblowing-survey-reveals.aspx>> [19 Feb 2015]
- xii. CIPD (24 Nov 2015) How well-being can help HR regain its influence [online]. Available at < <http://www.cipd.co.uk/pm/peoplemanagement/b/weblog/archive/2014/11/24/how-well-being-can-help-hr-regain-its-influence.aspx> > [19 Feb 2015]

⁴ cited in Bandar Abutayeh and Al-Qatawneh 2012: 50)

⁵cited in Guest 1987:507)

- xiii. Deloitte (2008) Taking HR to the Next Level [online] available from <http://public.deloitte.com/media/0524/us_bnet_takinghrnextlevel_Feb08.pdf> [27 Feb 2015]
- xiv. Dias, L. (n.d.) Human Resource Management.
- xv. Ding, D., Lan, G. and Warner, M. (2001) 'A New Form Of Chinese Human Resource Management? Personnel And Labour-Management Relations In Chinese Township And Village Enterprises: A Case-Study Approach'. *Industrial Relations Journal* 32 (4), 328-343
- xvi. Doaei, H. A. and Najminia, R. (2012) How Far does HRM Differ from PM, *European Scientific Journal*, 8 (13). 161-171
- xvii. Deadrick, D.L., and Stone, D.L (2014) 'Human Resource Management: Past, Present and Future'. *Human Resource Management Review* 24 (3), 193-195. available from <<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.HRMr.2014.03.002>> [31 Jan 2015]
- xviii. Fajana, S., Owoyemi, O., Elegbede, T., and Gbajumo-Sheriff, M. (2011) 'Human Resource Management Practices in Nigeria'. *Journal of Management and Strategy* 2 (2), p57
- xix. Fleming, S. (2000) 'From Personnel Management to HRM: Key Issues and Challenges'
- xx. Guest, D. (1987) 'Human Resource Management and Industrial Relations'. *Journal of Management Studies* 24 (5), 503-521. Available from <<http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=bth&AN=4555858&site=ehost-live>> [09 Feb 2015]
- xxi. Guest, D. (1989) 'Personnel and HRM: can you tell the difference?'. *Personnel Management* 48-51
- xxii. Guest, D. (2002) 'Human Resource Management, Corporate Performance and Employee Wellbeing: Building the Worker into HRM'. *The Journal of Industrial Relations* 44 (3), 335-338. Available from <<http://jir.sagepub.com/content/44/3/335.full.pdf+html>> [15 Feb 2015]
- xxiii. Haston, R. (n.d.) 'Are There Significant Differences In Approach Between Personnel Management And Human Resource Management To Be Found In The Literature On This Subject? A Review of Key Literature from A New Starter In The HR Profession'. *International Journal of Applied HRM* 3 (1)
- xxiv. Henderson, I. (2011) *Human Resource Management for MBA Students*. 2nd edn. London: CIPD
- xxv. Hendry, C. and Pettigrew, A.M. (1990) 'Human Resource Management: An agenda for the 1990s'. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 1(1), 17-43. Available from, <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=bth&AN=5802170&site=ehost-live>.
- xxvi. Heery, E. (2008) Runt Redux the Rise of Human Resource Management as a Field of Study, *Work and Occupations*, 35 (3). 351-357
- xxvii. Holden, L. and Beardwell, I. (2001) *Human Resource Management*. Harlow: Financial Times Prentice Hall
- xxviii. Hope-Hailey, V., Gratton, L., McGovern, P., Stiles, P. and Truss, C. (1997) 'A chameleon function?' *Human Resource Management Journal* 7 (3), 5-18. available from <<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.HRMr.2014.03.003>> [31 Jan 2015]
- xxix. HR Magazine (02 Dec 2014) HR Professionals most fearful of whistleblowing reprisals [Online]. Available at <<http://www.HRMagazine.co.uk/hro/news/1148484/hr-professionals-fearful-whistleblowing-reprisals>> [19 Feb 2015]
- xxx. Kaufman, B. E. (2014) 'The historical Development of American HRM broadly viewed'. *Human Resource Management Review* 24, 196-218. Available from <<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.HRMr.2014.03.003>> [07 Feb 2015]
- xxxi. Kidombo, H. (2004) *Human Resource Management Orientation and Strategic Responses To Environmental Change*. PhD. School of Continuing and Distance Education, University of Nairobi, Kenya
- xxxii. Kramar, R., and Syed, J. (2012) *Human Resource Management in a Global Context: a critical approach*. London: Palgrave, 42-43
- xxxiii. Legge, K., (1989) *Human Resource Management: a critical analysis*, in Storey, J. (Ed.) *New Perspectives on Human Resource Management*. London: Routledge 19-25
- xxxiv. Legge, K. (2005) *Human Resource Management: Rhetorics and Realities*. Basingstoke: Palgrave
- xxxv. Longmore, B., and Ronnie, L. (2014) 'Human Resource Management Practices in a Medical Complex in the Eastern Cape, South Africa: Assessing their impact on the retention of doctors'. *The South African Medical Journal* 104 (5) 368-371. Available from <<http://dx.doi.org/10.7196%2Fsamj.7751>> [19 Mar 2015]
- xxxvi. Lucas, R., Mathieson, H. and Lupton, B. (2006) *Human Resource Management in an International Context*. London: Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development.
- xxxvii. Marchington, M. (2008) 'Where Next for HRM?' CIPD.
- xxxviii. Marler, J.H., and Fisher, S.I (2013) 'An evidence-based review of e-HRM and Strategic Human Resource Management'. *Human Resource Management Review* 23 (1), 18-36. Available from <<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.HRMr.2012.06.002>> [02 Mar 2015]
- xxxix. Mohammad, S.I.S. (2011) 'Human Resource Management Practices in Zain Cellular Communications Company Operating in Jordan'. *Perspectives of innovations, Economics and Business* 8 (2), 26-34. Available from <<http://academicpublishingplatforms.com/article.php?journal=PIEB&number=8&article=434>> [18 Feb 2015]
- xl. Psychpress, (2008) *People Management and The Bottom Line*
- xli. Savaneviciene, A., and Staneviciute, Z. (2013) 'Relabeling or New Approach: Theoretical Insights Regarding Personnel Management and Human Resource Management'. *Inzinerine Ekonomika-Engineering Economics* 24 (3), 234-243. Available from <<http://dx.doi.org/10.5755/j01.ee.24.3.1618>> [31 Jan 2015]

- xlii. Schuler, R. and MacMillan, I. (1984) 'Gaining Competitive Advantage Through Human Resource Management Practices'. *Human Resource Management* 23 (3), 241-255
- xlili. Starkey, K. and McKinlay. (1992) *Human Resource Management and Personnel Management: the Case of Ford Motor Company*, in Towers, B. (Ed.) *The Handbook of Human Resource Management*. Oxford: Blackwell 322-339
- xliv. Storey, J. (2007) *Human Resource Management: A Critical Text*. 3rd edn. London: Thomson
- xlv. Straus, G. (2001) 'HRM in the USA: Correcting some British impressions'. *International Journal of Human Resource Management* 12 (6), 873-897. Available from <<http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=bth&AN=5180411&site=ehost-live>> [05 Mar 2015]
- xlvi. Suzuki, K. (1991) *Survival of Japanese Personnel Management in the 'New-Breed': Euro-Asia Centre, INSEAD*
- xlvii. The Telegraph and Argus (25 Feb 2015) Landmark legal win' for cardiologist Dr Kevin Beatt sacked by Croydon Hospital for whistleblowing on patient safety [online]. Available at <http://www.thetelegraphandargus.co.uk/news/11640263._Landmark_legal_win__for_cardiologist_sacked_by_Croydon_Hospital_for_whistleblowing_on_patient_safety/> [28 Feb 2015]
- xlviii. Torrington, D., Hall, L., Taylor, S., and Atkinson, C. (2014) *Human Resource Management*. 9th edn. Harlow: Pearson
- xlix. Tyson, S., (1995) *Human Resource Strategy: Towards a General Theory of Human Resource Management*. London: Pitman
 - 1. Tyson, S., and York, S., (1989) *Personnel Management made Simple*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Made Simple Books
 - li. Young, A. (2013) Amazon. Com's Workers Are Low-Paid, Overworked And Unhappy; Is this the New Employee Model For The Internet Age? [online] available from <<http://www.ibtimes.com/amazoncoms-workers-are-low-paid-overworked-unhappy-new-employee-model-internet-age-1514780>> [6 March 2015]