

Relabeling or New Approach: Theoretical Insights Regarding Personnel Management and Human Resource Management

Asta Savaneviciene, Zivile Stankeviciute

Kaunas University of Technology

K. Donelaicio st. 73, LT-44029, Kaunas, Lithuania

e-mail: asta.savaneviciene@ktu.lt, zivile.stankeviciute@ktu.lt

crossref <http://dx.doi.org/10.5755/j01.ee.24.3.1618>

The business challenges like globalization, profitability through growth, technology integration, intellectual capital management, continuous change influence not only the way the organizations are structured and managed, but also determine the language of management. As a result some terms emerge and other terms are rejected. However, to what extent the development of the language signify the difference between old and new terms? The question concerning just relabeling or repackaging of old things is relevant in the scientific literature.

A debate about changing the terminology from „personnel management“ to „human resource management“ attracted huge attention among scientists (Guest, 1987; Sisson, 1990; Clark, 1993; Legge, 1995; Henry & Pettigrew, 1990; Torrington, 1989; Armstrong, 2000; Cakar, Bititci & MacBryde, 2003; Boselie, Brewster & Paauwe, 2009; Freitas, Jabbour & Santos, 2011) underlying the “rhetoric” of human resource academics and the “reality” in the organizations.

The paper starts with the development of human resource management concept, emphasizing that the 1980s and 1990s are the time of the significant change in the context and content of the way in which people were managed. Drawing to the prior research, the paper identifies three main stages in the process of human resource management formation.

Acknowledging that human resource management concept is controversial (Storey, 1995), the paper presents two approaches as regards personnel management (PM) and human resource management (HRM): some scientists highlight the revolutionary nature of HRM (Legge, 1989, 1995; Keenoy, 1990; Storey, 1993; Guest, 1987, 1990; Hope-Hailey et al., 1997), meanwhile others (Torrington, 1989; Armstrong, 2000) deny the relevant difference in the concepts of PM and HRM.

Seeking to provide the answer to the question – does HRM differ from PM? – the paper attempts to provide the definitions of HRM, however states that a widely acknowledged definition of HRM does not exist, although the definitions of HRM disclose four HRM dimensions: high commitment, high quality, flexibility and strategic integration.

To reveal better the nature of HRM, the paper provides some insights on the similarities of PM and HRM highlighting that some of similarities are viewed in the literature as differences also.

Finally assessing that the differences between PM and HRM can be seen as a matter of emphasis (Armstrong, 2006), the main differences of the concepts are presented in this paper. This brings to conclusion that in the scientific literature the distinction was made between PM and HRM, and the term “human resource management” is now mainly used as synonyms for “personnel management”.

Keywords: *human resource management, personnel management, people management, human resource, models of human resource management.*

Introduction

Due to rapid environmental change, competition to provide innovative services and other business challenges the ideas and disciplines can not be static. This was particularly the case in the late twentieth century, when the social sciences were subject to continuing pressures for changes in emphasis or direction, or for even more radical structural shifts (Kelly, 2003).

The new language, some changes in the terminology when certain terms emerge and other terms are rejected can be stipulated not only by new economic circumstances, but by fashions also. The review of the scientific literature allows drawing the conclusions that the relabeling when the concepts are introduced as new ideas although they were used long time before just under the different names is not novel affair. For example, according to Larson and Halldorsson (2002), the relabelers simply change the name of purchasing to supply chain management, arguing that

purchasing has already evolved to supply management in many cases. Very similar view shares Martensson (2000) providing an example respecting knowledge management. Assuming that knowledge has always been a valuable asset Martensson (2000) brings a question - what is knowledge management – and proposes the discussion: is knowledge management a new way to understand organizing and organizations, or is it a tool for exploiting knowledge, or is it just another relabeling in the ceaseless flow of fashionable management concepts.

The shift in terminology does not miss the processes in employment area. In 1980s in the scientific literature there was argued that in response to new and qualitatively different competitive conditions the organizations need to alter the way in which they manage employees (Storey, 1995). The term which has been attached to „the new way“ is „human resource management“. The shift in language from „personnel management“ to „human resource management“ rises huge amount of questions: „How does

HRM differ from the deeply rooted personnel management?“ (Bratton & Gold, 2003); „Is one better than the other? (Armstrong, 2000) “; Are differences between HRM and PM „not just a matter of semantic“? (Bratton & Gold, 2003); „Whether HRM has anything to offer and whether it is not just another new-fangled management rhetoric“? (Kamoche, 1991).

In the scientific literature it is accepted that HRM is a term of ambiguous and controversial meaning (Storey, 1995). Much of the controversy stems from absence of precise formulation and agreement of it's significant (Bratton & Gold, 2003). Despite that fact for some scientists HRM reflects no more than a relabeling of personnel management or a catch-all term in which no particular approach to managing the workforce is favored or discernible (Hallier & Leopold, 1996). However, others highlight the essential features of HRM underlying a belief that people really make difference and that human skills and knowledge are a strategic resource, emphasizing HRM integration with organizational strategy and the responsibility of line managers in the process of delivery of HRM practices (Bratton & Gold, 2003; Clarke, 2011).

Whether, like Keenoy (1990), one views HRM as a phenomenon or whether like Strauss (2001) sees HRM as “a relabeled (or at most repackaged) version of the old feisty field of personnel”, it is indisputable that in the literature HRM has clearly overpowered personnel management as a desirable field of research and writing (Edgar & Geare, 2009; Freitas *et al.*, 2011).

The **problem** stated in the paper: is human resource management simply a relabeling and repackaging of personnel management or it represents a new approach to managing people. The research **aim** is theoretically to examine the concepts of PM and HRM by disclosing the nature, similarities and differences of both concepts.

Research object is the concepts of PM and HRM.

Research method. The paper is built on the analysis and synthesis of scientific literature.

The development of human resource management

It is generally accepted that the concept of HRM originated in North America in the late 1910s to early 1920s. At this period a plethora of names were used to describe processes in employment area: employment management, labour management, personnel management, personnel administration, labour relations, industrial relations, industrial relations management and employment relations. The term “human resource management” was not used, however the general term “human resources” was already employed to express the „idea that the nation's labour input is embodied in human beings and represents a form of capital good that can be augmented through various forms of private and public investment, such as education, training, and public health programs” (Commons, 1919; Kaufmann, 2001).

It is important to mention that over the period the changes in terminology of people management have occurred: some labels have taken new meanings, new labels have appeared and others disappeared. As stated

Kaufman (2001), one significant trend is the replacement of the old term “personnel management” with the new one “human resource management.” According to Strauss (2001), the human resource term was first used in this substitute sense in the mainstream literature in 1964. The background for using „human resource” term can be found in two sources: first, a published lecture given in 1958 by economist E. Wight Bakke titled “The Human Resources Function”; second, Myers, Frederick, Harbison, and other economists scholars research in the late 1950s on the role of labour as a factor in economic growth and in that context used the “human resource” term in various publications (Kaufman, 2001).

For some period the “personnel” and “human resources” terms were largely used interchangeably, however starting in the early 1980s, the term „human resource“ became the main and represented a break with traditional personnel administration, hereby PM gave way to HRM (Thorntwaite, 2012).

According to Bratton and Gold (2003), the 1980s and 1990s are the time of the relevant change in the context and content of the way in which people were managed. In this point the question concerning the radical change in the context field arises.

Concerning the context, Schuler and Jackson (2005) link the formation of HRM concept with a growing professionalism among HRM practitioners in USA and with a growing recognition of the significance of human resource management to organizational success. Guest (1987) identifies 6 factors behind the emergent interest in HRM: the search for competitive advantage; models of excellence; the failure of personnel management; the decline in trade union pressure; changes in the workforce and the nature of work; availability of new models. Gooderham and Nordhaug (2010) underline the end of the “Fordist” or “welfare capitalist” stage in labour management. According to Beaumont (1992) (as cited in Prowse & Prowse, 2010), a combination of increasing competitive markets, the introduction of Japanese work systems, declining unionization in the USA private sector determined the development of HRM in USA.

Very similar attitude shares Legge (1995) emphasizing the changes in product and labour market in USA and UK mediated by new technologies. Analyzing the genesis of HRM, it is essential to stress the duality of the concept, because the book *New Perspective on Human Resource Management* (1989), edited by John Storey, generated the first wave of debate on the nature of the normative HRM focusing on hard and soft versions of the construct. Either the second wave of debate on HRM plays crucial rule in literature and in practice highlighting the centrality of HRM to success of organizational performance (Bratton & Gold, 2003; Marescaux *et al.*, 2013).

Summing up, it could be stated that in the process of HRM formation three main stages exist: first, the initial thoughts originated in USA; second, the further development of these ideas by British scientists; thirdly, traditional personal management expansion to human resource management.

The attitude to personnel management and human resource management

Whereas over the last 30 years there has been an increased interest in HRM (Prowse & Prowse, 2010), so the question arises if HRM represents something different or it is just a continuation of previous management practices (Legge, 1995; Keenoy, 1990). Is HRM better than PM?; Does something really changed by replacing the name?; Is the change for better or for worse? – all these questions reflect the core of the discussion, acknowledging the confusion of the HRM practitioners when concepts or techniques are introduced as new ideas although they have been used all the time under different names (Armstrong, 2000). Guest (1987) stresses that term „human resource management“ is used in three approaches: first, HRM is simply a re-title to personnel management in order to hold the new fashion. Second, HRM is a way of re-conceptualizing

and re-organizing personnel roles and describing the work of personnel departments. It is worth to underline, that this second attitude is in part reflected in the Harvard model of HRM. Thirdly, HRM is distinctively different and offers a new approach for people management, whereas it integrates human resources into strategic management and emphasis on a full and positive utilization of these resources. The analysis of scientific literature allows stating, that some of scientists (Torrington, 1989; Armstrong, 2000) stick to the opinion that there is any significant difference in the concepts of PM and HRM and that this is more a matter of emphasis and approach than the essence. Other scientists (Legge, 1989, 1995; Keenoy, 1990; Storey, 1993; Guest, 1987, 1990; Hope-Hailey *et al.*, 1997), conversely, claim that HRM represents new philosophy and concept, which radically differs from PM. Based on these two approaches different authors describe the issue using appropriate statements (see Table 1).

Table 1

Approach to HRM and PM concepts

Author	Statements
The approach – there is no significant difference between HRM and PM	
Armstrong, 1987	HRM is just „old wine in new bottles“. HRM could be no more no less than another name for PM, however the advantage of HRM lies in the fact, that it emphasizes the treatment of people as key resources.
Torrington, 1989	PM has grown through assimilating a number of additional emphases to produce an even richer combination of experience. Due to this fact HRM is no revolution but a further dimension to a multi-faceted role of PM.
Lowry, 1990 (as cited in Armstrong, 2000)	Whereas personnel work has always included strategic matters and the emphasis on strategic issues, so HRM is just the continuing process of PM - it is not different.
Henry and Pettigrew, 1990	HRM can be perceived as perspective on PM and not PM itself.
Armstrong, 2000	The difference between PM and HRM appear to be substantial, notwithstanding they can be seen as a concern of emphasis rather than one of substance.
The approach – there is extreme difference between HRM and PM	
Guest, 1987	HRM emphasizes the importance of strategic integration, high commitment, high quality and flexibility.
Bratton and Gold, 2003	The essence of HRM as compared to PM constitutes the treatment of HRM as strategic part of organization management, which integrates factors, determining the behavior of the employees
Legge, 1995	The potential of PM has developed and became the worth of the organization, which is labeled as HRM

Summarizing it is valuable to admit two separate opinions: from one point of view HRM is just „a perspective on personnel management“ (Hendry & Pettigrew, 1990) and „high-concept personnel management“ (Armstrong, 1996, as cited in Armstrong, 2000) or „simply a case of the emperor’s new clothes“ (Armstrong, 1987), meanwhile from another point of view it is highlighted the revolutionary nature of HRM by estimating the relevance of strategic integration, high commitment, high quality and flexibility (Guest, 1987). Based on above mentioned two approaches the definition of HRM and PM will be later exploring.

The conceptions of personnel management and human resource management

Seeking to provide the answer to the questions – is PM equal to HRM? Does HRM as compared to PM represent new approach to managing people? - is it essential to define these two constructs, despite the fact that HRM is controversial (Kamoche, 1991) and Storey (1995)

underlines the dispute due to the definition. In the scientific discussion framework Noon (1992) asks whether HRM is a map, a model or a theory?; Legge (1995) exposes the contradictions of the concept; according to Keenoy and Anthony (1992), HRM is designed to inspire and therefore to explain the construct means to destroy it (Storey, 1995). Acknowledging that “the big ideas can lose something when translated into detail” (Storey, 1995), in the context of progress and deep understanding it is important to explain, as Bratton and Gold (2003) stated, the content of the way in which people were managed, it means to define PM and HRM. However, a widely accepted definition of HRM and PM does not exist: although different scientists do not provide cardinally opposite definitions, but stress particular aspects (see Table 2).

The definitions of HRM presented in Table 2 illustrate the diversity of the concept. According to Blyton and Morris (1992) (as cited in Prowse & Prowse, 2010), the linkage of HRM and flexibility is an evidence that HRM postulates a closer connection between business strategies, personnel policies and practices; Hartley and Stephenson

Definitions of HRM and PM concepts

<i>Author</i>	<i>Definitions</i>
Personal management is:	
Armstrong, 1977 (Armstrong, 2006)	concerned with obtaining, organizing and motivating the human resource required by the enterprise
Torrington & Hall, 1998 (Armstrong, 2006)	is concerned with practices, which allow employer and employee not only to make a contract, but also to assure that the contact is pursuing
Human resource management is:	
Beer <i>et al.</i> , 1984 (Prowse & Prowse, 2010)	all management decisions that affect the relationship between organizations and employees – its humans
Storey, 1995	a distinctive approach to employment management which seeks to achieve competitive advantage through the strategic deployment of a highly committed and capable workforce, using an integrated array of cultural, structural and personnel techniques
Guest, 1987	defined in terms of four key goals: high commitment, high quality, flexibility and strategic integration
Pool, 1990 (Prowse & Prowse, 2010)	viewed as strategic; it regards people as the most important single asset of the organization; it involves all managerial personnel; it is proactive in relationship with people; seeks to enhance organizational performance, employee “needs” and societal well being
Armstrong, 2009	defined as a strategic and coherent approach to the management of the most valued assets of organization – the people, who individually and collectively contribute to the achievement of organization’s objectives

(1992) (Prowse & Prowse, 2010) maintain that HRM has generated new ideas about how to motivate rather than control employees. Although the definitions of HRM disclose four HRM dimensions: high commitment, high quality, flexibility and strategic integration, however in 1997 Guest argues that „we still don’t know what HRM is”. The attempts to define PM and HRM does not provide clear answer to the question: is HRM the same as PM? Seeking to reveal if PM and HRM are different or the relabeling is just a matter of fashion the similarities and differences of PM and HRM will be later explored.

The similarities and differences of personnel management and human resource management

Notwithstanding the diverse approaches to the relation between HRM and PM, both concepts have similarities and, as Armstrong (2006) states, the differences can be viewed much more as a matter of focus.

According to Guest (1987), there are two main issues analyzing the differences between two constructs. First, it is not much known about personnel management. Second, there is a danger of comparing a normative/ideal view of HRM with a descriptive view of PM.

Armstrong (2006), upholding the view that HRM is no more and no less than PM, presents the catalogue of concepts similarities:

1. PM strategies, like HRM strategies, flow from the business strategy.
2. PM, like HRM, recognizes that line managers are responsible for people managing.
3. The values of PM and at least the “soft” version of HRM are identical due to the respect for the individual, developing people to achieve their maximum level of competence for their own satisfaction and to facilitate the achievement of organizational objectives.

4. PM and HRM recognize that it is significant to match people to ever-changing organizational requirements: placing and developing right people in and for the right jobs.

5. In PM and in HRM there are used the same range of selection, competence analysis, performance management, training, management development and reward management techniques.

6. PM, like “soft” version of HRM, stresses importance to the processes of communication and participation within an employee relation system.

It is worth to highlight that some of above mentioned similarities are viewed in the literature as differences also, emphasizing the bigger HRM focus on certain aspects (for example: strategic integration). As discussed earlier in the paper, there is no consensus in the scientific literature as to content of HRM, so, it means that scientists, like Guest (1997), Henry & Pettigrew (1990), Storey (1993), Legge (1995), Armstrong (2006) underline different HRM and PM aspects. These differences are our interest here.

Several schools have attempted to define HRM traits by producing polar models, which help to focus debate around the question: Is HRM simply personal management in a new wrapping? (Bratton & Gold, 2003). In the scientific literature (Bratton & Gold, 2003) five main HRM models that seek to show analytically the qualitative differences between traditional PM and HRM can be identified: The Harvard model (Fombrun *et al.*, 1984), The Michigan model (Beer *et al.*, 1984), Guest (1997) model, Warwick model (Henry & Pettigrew, 1990), Storey (1992) model. All these models provide an analytical framework for studying HRM, legitimate certain HRM practices, provide a characterization of HRM and serve as a heuristic device for explaining the nature and relevance of key human resource practices.

One of the first explicit statements of the HRM concept was made by Michigan school (1984), putting in the foreground the coherence of internal human resource

practices and the congruence between human resource management practices and organizational strategy.

Another analytical framework – the Harvard model (1984) - is based on the belief that the problems of historical PM can be solved only “when general managers develop a viewpoint of how they wish to see employees involved in and developed by the enterprise, and of what HRM policies and practices may achieve those goals” (Armstrong, 2006).

According to Guest (1987), HRM differ from PM due to four reasons: it integrates human resources into strategic management; the perspective in unitary with the focus on individual; it works better in such organizations which have an „organic“ structure; the emphasis is on a full and positive utilization of human resources (Bratton & Gold, 2003). By making an assumption, that HRM is “better”, Guest (1987) acknowledges, that all variations should be taken into account in the context, which might limit HRM effectiveness. Due to this fact Guest (1987) proposes to view HRM as an approach to manage the workforce.

The Warwick model extends the Harvard framework:

it includes business strategy, human resource practices, the internal and external context in which these practices take place and the processes by which such changes take place, including interaction between changes in content and context (Bratton & Gold, 2003). According to Storey (1995), HRM is an amalgam of description, prescription and logical deduction. He distinguishes four main dimensions in his model: 1. belief and assumptions - HRM attempts to enhance employee trust and commitment and aims to go beyond the work contract; 2. strategic aspects - HRM is a matter of strategic importance; 3. the role of the line managers - line managers are seen as crucial to the delivery of HRM practices – HRM specialists have a transformational leadership role in the organization; 4. key levers. Based on these four dimensions and their characteristics Storey (1995) identified 25 key HRM variables to measure the degree of movement from PM approach to HRM approach.

As it is seen from Table 3, differences between PM and HRM are supported by the review of five HRM models and by other researchers on HRM field.

Table 3

Differences between PM and HRM

<i>Author</i>	<i>Statements</i>
Bratton & Gold, 2003 (analyses based on review of five HRM models)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. HRM is, at least in theory, integrated into strategic planning. 2. HRM highlights the significance of the psychological contract. 3. HRM paradigm explicitly underlines the importance of learning in the workplace. 4. HRM has overall focused on the individual and the way how individuals can be managed in order to achieve both individual and organizational goals. 5. HRM is characterized by proactive nature. 6. Three of five HRM models make an explicit reference to performance outcomes and one conclusively claim for HRM is that if organization adopts HRM approach its financial results will improve.
Legge, 1995	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PM is the activity primary aimed at non-managers, meanwhile HRM is less clearly focused, but is certainly concerned more with managerial staff. 2. HRM is much more of an integrated line management activity, whereas PM seeks to make influence to line management. 3. HRM highlights the relevance of senior management’s management of culture, whereas PM has been rather suspicious of organizational development and related unitarist, social – psychologically oriented ideas.
Armstrong, 2006	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. HRM treats employees as assets and not costs. 2. HRM places more emphasis on strategic fit and integration. 3. HRM is based on management and business oriented philosophy. 4. HRM places more importance on the management of culture and the achievement of commitment. 5. HRM places more emphasis on the line managers. 6. HRM is a holistic approach concerned with the total interests of the business. 7. Human resource specialists are expected to be business partners rather than just personnel administrators.

Seeking to answer the research question if HRM is just “old wine in new bottles”, and based on the PM and HRM differences summarized by Armstrong (2006), further these differences are deeply explored.

HRM treats employees as assets and not costs. In scientific literature there is no consensus as to what in particular serves as a source of competitive advantage – some authors state that sustained competitive advantage lies in the human resources, other authors maintain that competitive advantage is created through HRM practices and not human resources, a third part of researches proposes a unifying attitude to the critical role of both human resources and HRM in the enhancement of organizational competitiveness (Kazlauskaite & Buciniene, 2008). However, the approach that people should be regarded as assets rather than costs is accepted underlying that „human resources are valuable” (Legge, 1995), that

“people and their collective skills, abilities and experience, coupled with their ability to deploy these in the interests of the employing organization, are now recognized as making a significant contribution to organizational success” (Armstrong, 2006) and that “human resources are key to the success” (Clarke, 2011).

HRM places more emphasis on strategic fit and integration. The strategic nature of HRM, as the distinctive dimension, denying PM link with strategic aspects is widely underlined in the scientific literature (Clarke, 2011; Thornthwaite, 2012). Armstrong (2006) treats the strategic nature of HRM as most relevant feature of HRM, which flows from top management vision and leadership and demands the commitment of people to it. Guest (1987) distinguishes four components of integration: the first component is concerned with integration to management strategy; the second component encompasses vertical

integration between strategic concerns, management concerns and operational concerns; the third aspect of integration concerns the attitudes and behavior of line managers; the fourth element of integration proposes that all employees should be integrated into the business as fully as possible. Guest (1987) underlying these four forms of integration proposes that „if human resources can be integrated into strategic plans, if human resource policies cohere, if line managers have internalized the importance of human resources and this is reflected in their behavior and if employees identify with the company, then the company's strategic plans are likely to be more successfully implemented.“ Girdauskiene and Savaneviciene (2004) highlight the importance of the interaction of the general strategies of the organization and the human resource management as well as the dependence of the reaction to the changes.

HRM is based on management and business oriented philosophy. According to Armstrong (2006), HRM is described as a central, senior-management driven strategic activity, whereas, as Guest (1991) states, „HRM is too important to be left to personnel managers“. Legge (1995) acknowledges that HRM policies are adapted to drive business values. However, as an outcome of the discussion concerning HRM as a management-driven activity, Purcell (1993) (as cited in Armstrong, 2006) envisages a danger that describing HRM as modern best-management practice we stereotype the past and idealize the future.

HRM places more importance on the management of culture and the achievement of commitment. The importance of mutuality was emphasized by Walton (1985a) (as cited in Armstrong, 2009) emphasizing that HRM encompasses policies that promote mutuality – mutual goals, mutual influence, mutual respect, mutual rewards, mutual responsibility. In that context arises the relevance of organizational commitment, which is treated as one of the most important factors, affecting organization competitiveness (Kumpikaite & Rupsiene, 2006). As Macky and Boxall (2007) stated, committed workers not only identify psychologically with the employer and feel stronger attachment to the organization, they also are more likely to expend discretionary effort towards achieving organizational results. Increased commitment means better communication between employees and managers (Karami, *et al.*, 2004) and employees who are committed to an organization exhibit a greater volume of positive extra-role behavior (Wright, Gardner & Moynihan, 2003). According to Bucuniene and Skudiene (2008), committed employees have strong belief in the organization's goals and values, possess a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization and feel a strong desire to remain with the organization. Notwithstanding the stress of commitment is highly criticized in the scientific literature, whereas in the practice the final decision is up to the employer (Noon, 1992; Armstrong, 2006). If HRM emphasizes the need of employee to be committed to do what the organizations wants them to do, the case of HRM as „a wolf in sheep's clothing“ (Keenoy, 1990) can be under consideration.

HRM places more emphasis on the line managers. As it was mention earlier, following an approach that HRM is

too important to be left just to personnel managers (Guest, 1991), the role of line managers is emphasized. However, in the scientific literature the distinction between intended HRM practices, actual HRM practices and HRM practices perceived by employees are underlined (Wright & Nishi, 2006; Purcell & Hutchinson, 2007). This appears due to the fact that the main role „bringing HR practices to life“ (Purcell *et al.*, 2003) is given to line managers, who, according to Marchington and Grugulis (2000) (Harney & Jordan, 2008), do not act as “robotic conformists”.

HRM is a holistic approach concerned with the total interests of the business. HRM concept is related to the total interests of the organization: the implications are that the interests of the members of the organization are recognized but subordinated to those of the enterprise. HRM is characterized by a unitarist rather than a pluralist view, which expresses the belief that people in organizations share the same goals and work as members of one team (Armstrong, 2009).

Human resource specialists are expected to be business partners rather than just personnel administrators. Due to the fact that human resource specialists assume and share the responsibility with line managers concerning business prospects, they need to be capable to identify business possibilities. According to Ulrich (1998) (as cited in Armstrong, 2000), human resource managers and line managers should be partners in strategy formulation process, encourage and manage the discussion how the organization can achieve better performance.

Summing up the review of the similarities and differences of PM and HRM, it could be stated that in the theory the distinction was made between PM and HRM and the term “human resource management” is now in general use both in it own right and as synonyms for “personnel management”. This conclusion still needs more research and answer concerning the “rhetoric” and “reality” of HRM in organizations. Due to that in the context of today's Lithuania the question arises – which approach follows the practitioners – do they use HRM as synonyms for PM or make difference between two constructs. Based on the literature review and underlying similarities and differences of PM and HRM a constructive empirical research could be arranged. The empirical research methodology and discussion on the findings are the topic for the next paper.

Conclusions

1. The relabeling when the concepts are introduced as new ideas although they were used long time before just under the different names is not a novel affair in the scientific literature. In the field of people management one significant trend is the replacement of the old term “personnel management” with the new one “human resource management.” Notwithstanding the development of HRM, which is treated as the end of “orthodoxy” in managing of people, is mediated by product and labour markets, social movements and public policies, however the process of HRM formation has three main stages existing: first, the initial thoughts originated in USA; second, the further development of these ideas by British

scientists; thirdly, traditional personal management expansion to human resource management.

2. The existence of two approaches: the first, there is any significant difference in the concepts of PM and HRM and the second, HRM represents new philosophy and concept, which radically differs from PM, allow stating that both concepts have the similarities, whereas the difference can be seen as a matter of emphasis and approach rather than the search for essential distinction. In that context it is relevant, that some similarities of two concepts are viewed in the literature as differences also, emphasizing the bigger HRM focus on certain aspects.

3. Underlying that HRM is controversial, it is acknowledged that widely accepted definitions of HRM

and PM do not exist. Treating employees as assets not costs, placing more emphasis on strategic fit and integration, placing more importance on the management of culture and the achievement of commitment; placing more emphasis on the line managers and expecting that human resource specialists will be business partners rather than just personnel administrators and upholding the holistic approach concerned with the total interests of the business are the main features which differ HRM from PM. This allows maintaining that in theory the distinction is made between PM and HRM and the term "human resource management" is now in general use both in its own right and as synonyms for "personnel management".

References

- Armstrong, M. (1987). Human Resource Management: a Case of Emperor's New Clothes? *Personnel management*, 19 (8), 30-35.
- Armstrong, M. (2000). The Name has Changed But Has the Game Remained the Same?. *Employee Relations*, 22 (6), 576-593. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/01425450010379207>
- Armstrong, M. (2006). *A Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice*. London: Kogan Page.
- Armstrong, M. (2009). *A Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice*. London: Kogan Page.
- Boselie, P., Brewster, C., & Paauwe, J. (2009). In Search of Balance – Managing the Dualities of HRM: an Overview of the Issues. *Personnel Review*, 38 (5), 461-471. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/00483480910977992>
- Bratton, J., & Gold, J. (2003). *Human Resource Management – Theory and Practice*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Buciuniene, I., & Skudiene, V. (2008). Impact of Leadership Styles on Employees Organizational Commitment in Lithuanian Manufacturing Companies. *SEE Journal of Economics and Business*, 3(2), 57-65.
- Cakar, F., Bititci, U. S., & MacBryde, J. (2003). A Business Process Approach to Human Resource Management. *Business Process Management Journal*, 9 (2), 190-207. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/14637150310468>
- Clark, I. (1993). HRM: Prescription, Description and Concept. *Personnel Review*, 22 (4), 17-25. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/00483489310042653>
- Clarke, M. (2011). Sustainable HRM: a New Approach to People Management, in Clarke, M. (Ed.), *Readings in HRM and Sustainability*, Tilde University Press.
- Edgar, F., & Geare, A. (2009). Inside the "black box" and "HRM". *International Journal of Manpower*, 30(3), 220-236. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/01437720910956736>
- Freitas, W., Jabbour, Ch., & Santos, F. (2011). Continuing the Evolution: Towards Sustainable HRM and Sustainable Organizations. *Business strategy series*, 12(5), 226-234. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/17515631111166861>
- Girdauskiene, L., & Savaneviciene, A. (2004). Relationship and Interaction of Human Resource Management and General Business Strategy. *Inžinerine Ekonomika-Engineering Economics*, 2(37), 69-78.
- Gooderham, P., & Nordhaug, O. (2010). One European Model of HRM? Cranet Empirical Contributions. *Human Resource Management Review*, 21, 27-36. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2010.09.009>
- Guest, E. D. (1987). Human Resource Management and Industrial Relations. *Journal of Management Studies*, 24 (5), 503-521. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.1987.tb00460.x>
- Guest, E. D. (1990). Human Resource Management and the American Dream. *Journal of Management Studies*, 27(4), 377-397. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.1990.tb00253.x>
- Guest, E. D. (1991). Personnel Management: the End of Orthodoxy? *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 29 (2), 149-175. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8543.1991.tb00235.x>
- Guest, D. E. (1997). Human Resource Management and Performance: a Review and Research Agenda. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 8 (3), 263-276. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/095851997341630>
- Hallier, J. & Leopold, J. (1996). Creating and Replicating HRM on Greenfield sites: Rhetoric or Reality? *Employee Relations*, 18 (5), 46-65. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/01425459610129380>
- Harney, B., & Jordan, C. (2008). Unlocking the Black box: Line Managers and HRM-Performance in a Call Centre Context. *International Journal of productivity and performance management*, 57 (4), 275-296. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/17410400810867508>
- Hendry, C., & Pettigrew, A. (1990). HRM as an Agenda for the 1990s. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 1, 17-25. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09585199000000038>

- Hope-Hailey, V., Gratton, L., McGovern, P., Stiles, P., & Truss, C. (1997). A Chameleon Function: HRM in the '90s", *Human Resource Management Journal*, 3 (3), 5-18. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-8583.1997.tb00421.x>
- Kamoche, K. (1991). Human Resource Management. *Personnel Review*, 20 (4), 3-14. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/EUM0000000000794>
- Karami, A., Analoui, F., & Cusworth, J. (2004). Strategic Human Resource Management and Resource-Based Approach: the Evidence From British Manufacturing Industry. *Management Research News*, 27 (6), 50-68. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/01409170410784202>
- Kaufmann, B. E. (2001). Human Resources and Industrial Relations Commonalities and Differences. *Human Resource Management Review*, 11, 339-374. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822\(01\)00045-6](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822(01)00045-6)
- Kazlauskaite, R., & Buciuniene, I. (2008). The Role of Human Resources and their Management in the Establishment of Sustainable Competitive Advantage. *Inzinerine Ekonomika-Engineering Economics*(5), 78-84.
- Keenoy, T. (1990). HRM: A Case of the Wolf in Sheep's Clothing?' *Personnel Review*, 19(2), 3-9. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/00483489010004306>
- Keenoy, T., & Anthony, P. (1992). HRM: Metaphor, Meaning and Morality, in Blyton, P. & Turnbull, P. (Ed.), *Reassessing Human Resource Management*, London: Sage.
- Kelly, D. (2003). A Shock to the System? The Impact of HRM on Academic IR in Australia in Comparison With USA and UK, 1980-95. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 41 (2), 149-171. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/10384111030412003>
- Kumpikaite, V., & Rupsiene, K. (2008). Darbuotoju isipareigojimu didinimas: teorinis ir praktinis aspektas (374-380). *Ekonomika ir vadyba: tarptautines konferencijos pranesimu medziaga*. 13.
- Larson, P. D., & Halldorsson, A. (2002). What is SCM? and, Where is It?. *The Journal of Supply Chain Management*, 36-43. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-493X.2002.tb00141.x>
- Legge, K. (1989). Human Resource Management: a Critical Analysis, in (ed) J Storey, *New Perspectives in Human Resource Management*, Routledge, London.
- Legge, K. (1995). HRM: Rhetorics, Realities and Hidden Agendas. in Storey J.(ed.) *Human Resource Management: A Critical Text*. London: Routledge.
- Macky, K., & Boxall, P. (2007). The Relationship between 'High Performance Work Practices' and Employee Attitudes: an Investigation of Additive and Interaction Effects. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 18 (4), 537-567. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09585190601178745>
- Marescaux, E., De Winne, S., & Sels, L. (2013). HR Practices and HRM Outcomes: the Role of Basic Need Satisfaction. *Personnel Review*, 42(1), 4-27. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/00483481311285200>
- Martensson, M. (2000). A Critical Review of Knowledge Management as a Management Tool. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 4(3), 204-216. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/13673270010350002>
- Noon, M. (1992). HRM: a Map, Model or Theory, in Blyton, P. & Turnbull, P. (Ed.), *Reassessing Human Resource Management*, London: Sage.
- Purcell, J., & Hutchinson S. (2007). Front-Line Managers as Agents in the HRM-Performance Causal Chain: Theory, Analysis and Evidence. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 17 (1), 3-20. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-8583.2007.00022.x>
- Purcell, J., Kinnie, N., Hutchinson, S., Rayton, B., & Swart J. (2003). *Understanding the People and Performance Link: Unlocking the Black Box*. London.
- Prowse, P., & Prowse, J. (2010). Whatever Happened to Human Resource Management Performance? *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 59 (2), 145-162. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/17410401011014230>
- Schuler, R. S., & Jackson, S. (2005). A Quarter-Century Review of Human Resource Management in the U.S.: the Growth in Importance of the International Perspective. *Management Revue*, 16(1), 11-35.
- Sisson, K. (1990). Introducing the Human Resource Management Journal, *Human Resource Management Journal*, 1(1), 1-11. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-8583.1990.tb00213.x>
- Strauss, G. (2001). HRM in the USA: Correcting Some British Impressions. *International Journal of Human resource management*, 12 (6), 873-897.
- Storey, J. (1993). The take-up of Human Resource Management by Mainstream Companies: Key Lessons From Research., *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 4 (3), 529-557. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09585199300000035>
- Storey J. (1995). HRM: Still Marching On, or Marching Out?, in Storey J.(ed.) *Human Resource Management: A Critical Text*. London: Routledge.

- Thorntwaite, L. (2012). The Origins of Personnel Management: Reasserting the Public Sector Experience. *Journal of Management History*, 18(3), 312-330. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/17511341211236264>
- Torrington, D. P. (1989). Human Resource Management and the Personnel Function, in Storey, J. (Ed.), *New Perspectives on Human Resource Management*, Routledge, London.
- Wright, P. M., Gardner, T. M., & Moynihan, L. M. (2003). The Impact of HR Practices on the Performance of Business units. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 13 (3), 21-36. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-8583.2003.tb00096.x>
- Wright, P. M., & Nishii, L. H. (2006). Strategic HRM and Organizational Behaviour: Integrating Multiple Levels of Analysis. CARHS Working Paper Series, 05. Retrieved 10th. September, 2011, Available from internet: <<http://ilr.cornell.edu/CAHRS>>.

Asta Savanevičienė, Živilė Stankevičiūtė

Pavadinimo pakeitimas ar naujas požiūris: teorinės įžvalgos dėl personalo vadybos ir žmogiškųjų išteklių vadybos

Santrauka

Greitai pokyčiai, globalizacija, konkuravimas inovatyviomis paslaugomis ir prekėmis lemia, jog įėjus bei disciplinos negali išlikti statiškomis. Tai ypač akivaizdu XX-ojo amžiaus pabaigoje, kai socialiniai mokslai tapo nuolatinio spaudimo objektu, siekiant pakeisti akcentus bei kryptį ar net inicijuoti radikalių struktūrinių pokyčių įgyvendinimą (Kelly, 2003).

Pokyčiai terminologijoje, kai atsiranda naujų terminų, o senųjų yra atsisakoma, sąlygojami ne tik ekonominių aplinkybių, bet ir mados tendencijų. Mokslinės literatūros analizė leidžia teigti, jog pavadinimo pakeitimas, kai koncepcijos yra pristatomos kaip naujos, nors jos jau ilgą laiką buvo vartotos tik kitu terminu, nėra naujas dalykas. Ši teiginį iliustruoja Larson ir Halldorsson (2002) akcentuodami, jog terminas „pirkimas“ (plg angl. *purchasing*) tiesiog pakeistas „tiekimu grandinės vadyba“ (plg. ang. *supply chain management*) sąvoka. Analogiškos pozicijos laikosi ir Martensson (2000), pateikdama pavyzdį, susijusį su „žinių vadybos“ (plg. angl. *knowledge management*) terminu.

Pokyčiai terminologijoje neaplekė ir organizacijos veiklos užimtumo valdymo srityje. XX-ojo amžiaus devintajame dešimtmetyje, mokslinėje literatūroje įrodinėjama, jog organizacijos, siekdamos sėkmingai konkuruoti naujomis ir kokybiškai skirtingomis sąlygomis, turi pakeisti darbuotojų valdymo būdą (Storey, 1995). Konceptas, kuris sietinas su „nauju būdu“, pavadintas „žmogiškųjų išteklių vadyba“, tačiau pokyčiai terminologijoje, atsisakant „personalo vadybos“, o „žmogiškųjų išteklių vadybai“ tampant dominuojančia definicija, iškėlė nemažai klausimų: „ar žmogiškųjų išteklių vadyba skiriasi nuo giliai išsiskyrusios personalo vadybos?“ (Bratton, Gold, 2003). „Ar vienas konstruktas yra geresnis nei kitas?“ (Armstrong, 2000). „Ar skirtumai nėra tik semantiniai?“ (Bratton, Gold, 2003).

Problema – ar žmogiškųjų išteklių vadyba yra tik personalo vadybos termino pakeitimas, ar atskleidžia naują požiūrį į žmonių vadybą.

Straipsnio tikslas – teoriškai išnagrinėti personalo vadybos ir žmogiškųjų išteklių vadybos konstruktus, kartu atskleidžiant jų pobūdį, panašumus ir skirtumus.

Tyrimo metodas – mokslinės literatūros analizė ir sintezė.

Analizuojant istorinę žmogiškųjų išteklių vadybos raidą akcentuotina, jog XX a. 9-10-asis dešimtmečiai, apibūdinami kaip radikalių pokyčių žmonių vadybos srityje, tiek konteksto, tiek ir turinio prasme, laikotarpis (Bratton, Gold, 2003). Žmogiškųjų išteklių vadybos konceptas, pradėjęs formuotis JAV, reiškė tradicinio personalo administravimo pabaigą (Kaufman, 2001). Schuler ir Jackson (2005) koncepto formavimąsi sieja su didėjančiu JAV praktikų profesionalumu ir žmogiškųjų išteklių vadybos svarbos organizacijos sėkmei pripažinimu, todėl žmogiškųjų išteklių vadybininkai pradėti traktuoti kaip partnerai, kurie turi būti įtraukti priimančiais strateginius sprendimus. Gooderham ir Nordhaug (2010) nuomone, koncepto atsiradimas siejamas su „fordizmo“ ir „gerovės kapitalizmo“ pabaiga JAV. Prowse (2010), cituodamas Beaumont (1992) teigia, kad auganti konkurencija, japonų darbo organizavimo metodai, mažėjantis profesinių sąjungų skaičius ir ribota personalo vadybininkų įtaka sąlygojo žmogiškųjų išteklių vadybos plėtrą JAV. Panašios sąlygos, įskaitant devintojo dešimtmečio recesiją, konkurencingumo praradimą ir naujas technologijas, tuo metu vyravo ir Didžiojoje Britanijoje. Pasak Legge (1995), XX amžiaus 9-ajame dešimtmetyje, termino „personalo vadyba“ pakeitimas terminu „žmogiškųjų išteklių vadyba“ JAV bei Didžiojoje Britanijoje buvo sąlygotas pokyčių, atsiradusių prekių ir darbo jėgos rinkose, kuriuos lėmė naujos technologijos bei politinių jėgų pasikeitimas. Apibendrinant galima teigti, kad žmogiškųjų išteklių vadybos koncepcijos formavimosi procese galima išskirti tris pagrindinius etapus: 1) pirminės idėjos, suformuluotos JAV autorių XX a. 9-ajame dešimtmetyje; 2) tolimesnė britų autorių šių idėjų plėtra 9-ojo dešimtmečio pabaigoje ir 10-ojo dešimtmečio pradžioje, kai požiūris į praktinį idėjų įgyvendinimą buvo skeptiškas; 3) tradicinės personalo valdymo sistemos išplėtimas iki žmogiškųjų išteklių vadybos.

Kadangi pastaruosius trisdešimt metų žmogiškųjų išteklių vadyba yra mokslininkų ir praktikų susidomėjimo sritis (Prowse ir Prowse, 2010), tai kyla klausimas: ar žmogiškųjų išteklių vadyba pateikia kažką naujo ar tai tik iki tol buvusių vadybos praktikų tęsinys (Legge, 1995; Kenney, 1990)? Ar žmogiškųjų išteklių vadyba yra geresnė nei personalo vadyba? Ar pasikeitė kažkas pakeitus pavadinimą? Ar tai gerai ar blogai? Visi šie klausimai atskleidžia diskusijų esmę, pripažįstant žmogiškųjų išteklių vadybos praktikų sutrikimą, kai koncepcijos yra pristatomos kaip naujos idėjos, nors jos iki tol jau buvo naudojamos, tačiau tik kitu pavadinimu (Armstrong, 2000).

Guest 1987 metais pabrėžė, kad terminas „žmogiškųjų išteklių vadyba“ vartojamas trimis prasmėmis: pirma, žmogiškųjų išteklių vadyba yra tiesiog kitoks personalo vadybos pavadinimas; antra: žmogiškųjų išteklių vadyba – tai būdas iš naujo suvokti ir pertvarkyti personalo vaidmenį ir personalo skyriaus darbą (iš dalies šis požiūris atspindi Harvardo modelyje, nors pastarasis žmogiškųjų išteklių vadybą vartoja ir kaip bendrą terminą); trečia: žmogiškųjų išteklių vadyba yra akivaizdžiai naujas ir skirtingas požiūris, nes žmogiškuosius išteklius integruoja priimančiais strateginius sprendimus bei pabrėžia visapusišką ir pozityvų šių išteklių panaudojimą.

Mokslinės literatūros analizė leidžia teigti, jog kai kurie mokslininkai (Armstrong, 2000; Torrington, 1989) laikosi nuomonės, kad tarp žmogiškųjų išteklių vadybos ir personalo vadybos koncepcijų nėra reikšmingų skirtumų ir kad tai daugiau požiūrio, o ne esmės dalykas. Kiti mokslininkai tvirtina priešingai: žmogiškųjų išteklių vadybos terminas atstovauja naujai koncepcijai ir filosofijai, kuri radikaliai skiriasi nuo personalo vadybos (Legge, 1989, 1995; Keenoy, 1990; Storey, 1993; Guest, 1987, 1990; Hope-Hailey ir kt., 1997).

Analizuojant ar tarp žmogiškųjų išteklių vadybos ir personalo vadybos galima dėti lygybės ženklą, būtina apibrėžti konstruktus. Nors žmogiškųjų išteklių vadyba ir yra kontraversiška (Kamoche, 1991), o Storey (1995) akcentuoja polemiką dėl minėto konstrukto definicijos, mokslinių diskusijų plotmėje, Noon (1992) klausia: ar žmogiškųjų išteklių vadyba yra tik planas, ar modelis, ar teorija. Legge (1989) iškelia sąvokos prieštaravimus, o Keenoy ir Anthony (1992) požiūriu, žmogiškųjų išteklių vadyba yra skirta „įkvėpti“ bei uždegti, todėl konstrukto paaiškinimas yra tolygus jo sugriovimui. Pripažįstant, kad „didelės idėjos gali kai ką prarasti jas transformuojant į detales“ (Storey, 1995), o vadybos teorijų įvairovė: mokslinio valdymo mokykla, klasikinė valdymo mokykla, žmogiškųjų santykių mokykla, daro įtaką pačiai sampratai ir jos turiniui, akcentuotina, jog mokslinėje literatūroje nėra konsensuso ne tik dėl žmogiškųjų išteklių vadybos, bet ir dėl personalo vadybos definicijų: skirtingi autoriai, nors ir nepateikia kardinaliai priešingų sampratų, tačiau pabrėžia skirtingus aspektus.

Nepaisant skirtingų požiūrių į santykį tarp personalo vadybos ir žmogiškųjų išteklių vadybos bei koncepcijų unifikuoatų apibrėžimų nebuvimo, abi šios koncepcijos turi bendrų bruožų, o skirtumai tarp personalo vadybos ir žmogiškųjų išteklių vadybos gali būti nagrinėjami daugiau kaip akcentų sudėjių ir požiūrių netapatumu, o ne kaip esminių skirtumų paieška. Armstrong (2006), laikydamasis nuomonės, jog žmogiškųjų išteklių vadyba yra

kaip ir personalo vadyba, pateikia personalo vadybos ir žmogiškųjų išteklių vadybos panašumų katalogą, teigdamas, jog kai kurie iš panašumų gali būti pateikiami ir kaip skirtumai, taip pabrėždamas žmogiškųjų išteklių vadybos didesnę akcentavimą bei dėmesio skyrimą tam tikriems aspektams (pvz. strateginei integracijai).

Kaip jau buvo minėta, mokslinėje literatūroje skirtumai tarp personalo vadybos ir žmogiškųjų išteklių vadybos yra nagrinėjami daugiau reikšmingumo ir požiūrio aspektais (Armstrong, 2006). Šiame darbe, siekiant atskleisti konstruktyvius skirtumus, aptariami penki žmogiškųjų išteklių vadybos modeliai ir Legge (1995) bei Armstrong (2006) pateikti skirtumai. Akcentuotina, jog esminiais konstruktyvūs skirtumais laikytini šie (Armstrong, 2006): 1. Žmogiškųjų išteklių vadyboje labiau akcentuojama strateginė integracija; 2. Žmogiškųjų išteklių vadyba yra į valdymą ir į verslą nukreipta filosofija; 3. Žmogiškųjų išteklių vadyba propaguoja bendrosios kultūros vertybes ir abipusių išipareigojimų vykdymą; 4. Žmogiškųjų išteklių vadyboje labiau pabrėžiamas tiesioginių vadovų vaidmuo įgyvendinant žmogiškųjų išteklių vadybos veiklas; 5. Žmogiškųjų išteklių vadyboje taikomas holistinis požiūris, susijęs su bendrais veiklos interesais – organizacijos narių interesai yra pripažįstami, tačiau vyrauja korporacijos tikslai; 6. Žmogiškųjų išteklių vadybininkai yra aktyvūs verslo partneriai, o ne personalo administratoriai; 7. Žmogiškųjų išteklių vadyba darbuotojus vertina kaip turtą, o ne kaip išlaidas.

Straipsnio pabaigoje daroma išvada, jog teorinėje literatūroje personalo vadybos ir žmogiškųjų išteklių vadybos skirtingumas yra atskleistas ir pagrįstas, tačiau terminas „žmogiškųjų išteklių vadyba“ yra vartojamas dvejopai: ir kaip „personalo vadybos“ sinonimas ir savo tiesiogine prasme. Tačiau iškeliamas klausimas dėl Lietuvos organizacijų požiūrių – ar jose praktikuojama žmogiškųjų išteklių vadyba ar personalo vadyba, akcentuojant, jog atsakymas į klausimą yra kito straipsnio objektas.

Raktažodžiai: *žmogiškųjų išteklių vadyba, personalo vadyba, žmonių valdymas, žmogiškieji ištekliai, žmogiškųjų išteklių vadybos modeliai.*

The article has been reviewed.

Received in April, 2012; accepted in June, 2013.