---

1. Introduction to the *Research Handbook on HRM in the Public Sector*

Eva Knies and Bram Steijn

WHY THIS BOOK?

Arguably, Human Resource Management (or HRM) is one of the most important management functions for every organisation, as without employees, organisations do not exist. How to attract able people, keep them motivated to do their job, and how to deal with unfit employees are classic challenges each organisation faces. Everyone even vaguely familiar with organisational practice knows that dealing with this kind of operational challenges is difficult and complex. However – although important – HRM is not only about dealing with these operational challenges. In recent decades, many HRM scholars have stressed the importance of *strategic* HRM. As such, HRM is understood as an important enabling factor for realising various strategic outcomes. Originally, these outcomes were mainly defined in financial terms, but Beer and colleagues (Beer et al., 1984; Beer et al., 2015) have made a plea for a balanced approach that does not only take into account cost effectiveness, but also the importance of employee well-being and social legitimacy.

For HRM to be strategic, it is important to specify the goals HRM should contribute to. Boxall and Purcell (2016) identified two main economic goals for strategic HRM: (1) viability with adequate returns for shareholders, and (2) sustained competitive advantage or consistent and superior profitability. These goals are certainly relevant for private organisations operating in a market context but require adaptation for public organisations that generally do not have shareholders and for which competitive advantage or superior profitability is not a main driver. Indeed, some scholars have recognised this difference; for instance, Paauwe (2004) has argued that organisations operate both in a market and institutional environment, with the latter being more important for public organisations. However, this is not extensively studied in the HRM literature. The fact that many HRM publications often do not address public/private differences explicitly forms the leitmotiv of this Research Handbook: we argue it is vital to pay specific attention to HRM in public organisations, simply because public organisations differ from their private counterparts. How and to what extent is discussed below.

The fact that public organisations differ from private ones in terms of their goals and institutional context, has important implications for both operational and strategic HRM. Regarding operational HRM, the institutional context of public organisations affects which HR practices (for instance recruitment, training, compensation, or dismissal practices) are in place and what these look like. Regarding strategic issues, it is important to focus on the question which strategic goals public organisations aim to achieve. Our main argument – developed more fully later in this chapter – is that the core mission of public organisations is to create public value (Vandenabeele et al., 2013), and the main challenge for HRM is how strategic HRM can contribute to this process of value creation. An example of this challenge is how to deliver high quality healthcare or education for citizens, without costs going through the roof

at the expense of the taxpayer. This is especially relevant when we realise many societies are struggling with the question how to keep healthcare affordable while at the same time it is difficult to attract and retain qualified personnel (De Ponte et al., 2014). The same holds for the educational sector where labour shortages negatively affecting the quality of education are a real danger (European Trade Union Committee for Education, 2019). These issues illustrate the importance of thinking strategically about HRM in public organisations and how central HRM is to achievement of public value.

The study of HRM in the public sector brings together two different disciplines, each with their own journals, conferences, and networks. The first one is public administration and public management (PA/PM), which is the main discipline studying public organisations. Leading journals within this discipline include *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *Public Administration*, and *Public Management Review*. The second main discipline is HRM, which studies the management of work and people. Leading journals are *Human Resource Management Journal*, *Human Resource Management*, and *the International Journal of Human Resource Management*. Boselie et al. (2019) recently concluded there is some cross-fertilization between these disciplines, but a lack of it in some areas. There are two journals (*Review of Public Personnel Administration* and *Public Personnel Management*) that deal explicitly with HRM issues in the public sector. Also, main PA/PM conferences like the European Group for Public Administration or the International Research Society for Public Management, and main HRM conferences like the Dutch HRM Network have tracks dealing with these issues. At the same time, however, the institutionalization of the subfield of HRM in the public sector is not straightforward. In our view, this has to do with two issues.

First, not everybody within the PA/PM field seems aware of the importance of HRM for public administration and management. This seems especially true for people studying public policy issues. Some academics (but also practitioners) seem to believe that organisations and people will adapt simply to policy changes and seem to forget that getting and keeping employees able and motivated is not self-evident. Possibly this could explain why some introductions to public administration or public management lack a chapter on HRM (e.g., Henry, 2018; Noordegraaf, 2015; Perry & Christensen, 2015) and why only some public administration programmes have a separate HRM chair.

Second, many academics publishing about HRM outside the public administration field seem to be oblivious to the peculiarities of public organisations (Knies et al., 2018). Within the general HRM field, studies are quite regularly conducted within public organisations (for instance ministries, hospitals or schools) but in those cases the possible effects of these ‘being public’ are seldom discussed. Often these organisations are treated as ordinary organisations following the adage ‘management is management is management’ as expressed by general management sciences (Pollit, 2003; see also Rainey, 2014).

These two observations illustrate the importance of this Research Handbook. To the colleagues within the public administration discipline, we want to show how well-developed our subfield has become. We hope and expect they can incorporate and use the state-of-the-art research presented in the chapters of this Research Handbook within the further development of the field. At the same time, we hope and expect that colleagues within the general HRM field do realise that the public context of organisations matters. Of course, as is shown in many chapters in this volume, general HRM insights are applicable to public organisations. But, the distinctiveness of the (institutional) context makes the applicability of these insights often

different. This book explains why and how that is the case. We believe that this will make clear that HRM in the public sector is *not* business as usual. On the contrary!

Clearly, there are more books covering HRM in the public sector (Beattie & Osborne, 2013; Berman et al., 2019; Burke et al., 2013; Condrey, 2010; Daly, 2012; Klingner et al., 2016; Pynes, 2013; Riccucci, 2017). However, these are mainly introductory handbooks, textbooks, and/or books taking an Anglo-Saxon approach. These are of course highly valuable, but with this Research Handbook we intend to go a step further by showing the state of the art of the knowledge in the field from an international perspective. This Research Handbook thus addresses academics interested in the field, master students with more than superficial knowledge of the topic, and also practitioners interested in evidence-based insights.

In the remainder of this chapter, we first briefly discuss the main themes within the general HRM literature, as these are also highly relevant for the study of HRM within the public sector. Next, we discuss the essence of the public sector and explain to what extent this essence differs from the private sector. At the same time, however, we also show that the answer to the question what is public is not unequivocal. Organisations and whole sectors differ in their degree of publicness and what is being defined as public also differs between countries. After having defined what we mean by the public sector, we outline in the fourth section of this chapter how we conceptualise HRM in the public sector. Finally, we present the structure of the book. Without going into too much detail, we explain why we have selected the themes included in this Research Handbook and why they are arranged the way they are.

HRM: SHORT HISTORY AND CONCEPTUALISATION

It is hard, maybe even impossible, to provide a definition of HRM to which everyone would adhere. As noted by Brewster et al. (2018, p. 3) in their introduction of the *Handbook of Research on Comparative Human Resource Management*, there is some confusion surrounding the concept, which they attribute to the fact that HRM is contextualised, i.e., people from different backgrounds (e.g., countries, institutional backgrounds or with a different research interests), will apply a different meaning to the concept. Here, we follow the widely cited definition of Boxall and Purcell (2016, p. 7): HRM is the management of work and people. HRM is an academic field fed by insights from different disciplines, including but not limited to psychology/organisational behaviour, sociology, and economics. Although the term ‘Human Resource Management’ was first used in the 1960s (Kaufman, 2007), there is general consensus that the history of HRM started in 1984 with two landmark books that were published in 1984 from respectively Fombrun et al. (Michigan model) and Beer et al. (Harvard model). Both books defined the field of HRM as different from personnel management and both stressed the strategic aspect of HRM. In comparison, traditional personnel management has a more limited orientation and focuses on the fulfilment of several important administrative functions (e.g., recruitment, development, compensation) to maintain the workforce (compare Kaufman, 2007). The focus of HRM is broader in scope, as it defines the employee as an important resource in order to achieve organisational goals.

This idea of the human factor as a resource is aligned with the resource-based view of the firm (RBV) (Barney, 1991), according to which organisations acquire competitive advantage by cleverly using the resources they possess. The human factor is such a resource that is essential for achieving organisational success, and therefore it should be managed carefully.

Gratton and Truss (2003) distinguish three factors that contribute to the effectiveness of HRM: horizontal fit, vertical fit, and implementation/action. Below we elaborate on these three elements, and in doing so, we highlight several often-used HRM theories and models (Boselie et al., 2005).

The first two elements are horizontal and vertical fit, which are widely used within the SHRM literature (Boon et al., 2017), and are discussed in more detail in Chapter 2 of this Research Handbook. An overall definition is provided by Nadler and Tushman (1980, p. 40), who defined fit as ‘the degree to which the needs, demands, goals, objectives and/or structure of one component are consistent with the needs, demands, goals, objectives, and/or structure of another component’. An overall assumption within organisational science in general, and HRM literature in particular, is that a better fit is related to better organisational performance.

Horizontal fit (also called internal fit or alignment) refers to the fact that separate HR practices have a stronger impact on outcomes if these are aligned and internally consistent. Based on Ichniowski et al. (1997), Delery (1998, p. 291) noted ‘if all of the practices fit into a coherent system, the effect of that system on performance should be greater than the sum of the individual effects from each practice alone’. This idea of fit is already visible in the original Michigan model, which noted that the various elements of the HR cycle (e.g., selection, recruitment, appraisal, career development, rewards) should be aligned in order to achieve performance. In theory, this idea is clear and easy to understand, but Delery noted already in 1998 that in the real world operationalising this horizontal fit is not so easy. Which HR practices are relevant? Is each practice equally important? Should these practices be additive or interactive to achieve consistency? Can they be substituted? Does consistency mean the same thing for each organisation? Does consistency imply different things for public and private organisations? The answers to these questions are not straightforward or easy, but from a strategic HRM perspective, one could argue that organisations should at least think about these.

Vertical fit or strategic fit/alignment relates HRM to organisational goals and stresses the message that HRM policies should be aligned with the broader organisational strategy (Gerhart, 2007). From this perspective, organisations use HRM strategically if the HR policies and practices fit well with the overall strategy of the organisation. In order to make this rather abstract statement more concrete, we turn to two widely used HRM models: the HRM process model by Wright and Nishii (2013) and the AMO model by Appelbaum et al. (2000). The HRM process model draws our attention to the variables mediating the relationship between HRM and outcomes, pointing to the importance of employees’ attitudes and behaviours. From this model we gather that in order to contribute to performance, HR policies need to be aligned with the required employee behaviours and should facilitate employees to perform their work so that they can contribute to overall organisational performance.

The AMO model, in turn, sheds light on the question what is needed to facilitate effective employee behaviours. HR practices should support employees’ ability, motivation, and the opportunity to perform. It must be noted that interpretations of this model differ. Some argue that ability, motivation, and opportunity (AMO) are outcomes that must be supported and enhanced by HR practices (e.g., Boselie et al., 2005), while others use the distinction to categorise HR practices (e.g., HR practices enhancing A, M or O) (e.g., Jiang et al., 2012). Jiang et al. state that skill-enhancing, motivation-enhancing, and opportunity-enhancing HR practices are three dimensions of HR systems that affect two important employee outcomes, i.e., human capital and motivation. This points to the fact that horizontal and vertical fit are closely related.

Notwithstanding the difference in interpretation, the AMO model is one of the most important theoretical models explaining how HR practices affect performance using the concept of fit.

In order to discuss the third factor determining the effectiveness of HRM, *implementation/action*, we return to the HRM process model by Wright and Nishii (2013). In this model, a distinction is made between intended HRM, actual HRM, and perceived HRM, which ultimately contribute to achieving organisational goals. The intended practices are those designed by the 'firms' decision makers' who believe that these 'will effectively elicit the employee responses desired' (Wright & Nishii, 2013, p. 102). Actual HRM refers to the fact that intentions are in practice seldom realised as intended. For instance, because implementers (such as supervisors or HR professionals) interpret them differently or just do not implement them at all. Finally, implemented HR practices are perceived in a certain way by employees. Individuals can perceive and interpret implemented practices differently, resulting in variation at the individual level. It is important to note that with respect to employee responses, employees' perceptions count and not so much the intended HRM. Following the famous Thomas theorem 'if people define a situation as real, it is real in its consequences' (Merton, 1995), employees' perceptions will affect their behaviour and this will in turn affect organisational performance.

The distinction put forward by Wright and Nishii (2013) draws our attention to the actors responsible for HR implementation. In traditional personnel management, the HR department and/or HR manager was the main implementer of HR policies and practices; however, in recent years more attention is directed at managers at different hierarchical levels as important actors in HR implementation. Purcell and Hutchinson (2007) use the concept people management to conceptualise the role line managers play in HRM implementation. They state that line managers' responsibility is synergistically related to their leadership behaviours, and the largest impact on performance can be expected when both the implementation of HR practices and line managers' leadership behaviours are up to par. Focusing on the role of line managers does not mean that HR professionals no longer play a significant role, but it does mean that their responsibilities have changed. One important present task is the support of line managers in their people management role (Gilbert et al., 2011).

THE ESSENCE OF THE PUBLIC SECTOR

Before we discuss the relevance and distinctiveness of studying strategic HRM in a public sector context, we first need to clarify what constitutes the public sector (Perry & Rainey, 1988). The answer to this question is more difficult than most people would expect, as in the real world the public and private sectors are 'blurred' with a lot of intermediate forms (Rainey, 2014). To categorise organisations nevertheless, we adopt a typology that states the first set of criteria for categorisation are 'formal' in nature and include ownership, funding, and authority. Applying these criteria, organisations are considered public when they are government-owned, government-funded, and when political authorities are the primary stakeholders (Rainey, 2014). This set of criteria works well for some types of public organisations (e.g., local and national government), but not for all. For example, NHS hospitals in the UK are classified as public, whereas in the Netherlands most hospitals are legally private providing a public service. In the same way, schools can be private or public – depending how a country has organised the educational system. Therefore, we complement this set of criteria with the notion of public value (Moore, 1995). According to Moore (2013, p. 8) organisations produce

public value when they improve ‘the quality of individual and collective life for citizens’. To determine what improves our lives, Moore developed a public value account that ‘has to speak to concerns for large, abstract, public values such as the public good and the pursuit of justice but also has to be sufficiently specific, concrete and measurable to recognise the value that the agency produces and the costs it incurs’ (Moore, 2013, p. 112). Adding this criterion, non-profit and private organisations would be classified as ‘public’ when they create public value for citizens. We follow this broader definition by using two sets of criteria to define what constitutes the public sector: formal criteria based on ownership, funding, and authority, and the creation of public value. Organisations that meet (one of) these sets of criteria are considered public. In line with this approach, chapters in this Research Handbook discuss HRM in different sectors including government, healthcare, and education.

In answering the question ‘what makes public organisations distinctive?’ Rainey (2014, pp. 79–83) refers to ‘common assertions and research findings’ discussed in the literature. A short description of these makes the public context of HRM for public sector organisations clearer. Rainey (2014) recognises three main discerning factors: (1) environmental factors, (2) organisation–environment transactions, and (3) organisational, roles, structures, and processes.

With respect to the first point, Rainey (2014, p. 79) notes that ‘public organisations are characterised by an absence of economic markets for outputs and a reliance on governmental appropriations for financial resources’. As a consequence of non-existent or less important markets, governmental institutions (both politics itself as well as legal institutions) play an important role in overseeing what public organisations do – including their HR policies (Truss, 2009). Given this structural aspect, external stakeholders (citizens, mass media, pressure groups) play a more important role for public organisations compared to private ones.

The second point – the nature of organisation–environment transactions – builds on the first point. As public organisations do not operate in markets, they do have not a ‘single bottom-line’ (that is, maximising profit) (Boxall & Purcell, 2016). Instead, achieving the mission is the ultimate goal of public organisations – where the mission ‘defines the value that the organisation intends to produce for its stakeholders and society at large’ (Moore, 2000, pp. 189–190). The mission of public organisations therefore defines the public value to be created and is usually the translation of their broader assignment authorised by politicians. According to Rainey and Steinbauer (1999, p. 13), ‘evidence that the agencies’ operations have contributed substantially to the achievement of these goals [included in the mission] provides evidence of agency effectiveness’. For most public organisations, their mission exists of multiple goals that can sometimes conflict (Rainey, 2014). This is related to the fact that different internal and external stakeholders overseeing public organisations sometimes value different things: public value is in the eye of the beholder (Meynhardt, 2009, p. 199). As a consequence of the multi-dimensional nature of performance within a public sector context, public organisations differ from private organisations. As profit is – albeit with some exceptions – not a suitable performance criterion for public organisations, they have to use other performance criteria. Clearly, (the degree of) mission achievement is an important one, but this still tells us little concrete. In the aftermath of New Public Management (NPM) ‘frugality’ has become a dominant output criterion, but as Hood (1991) eloquently has shown, being effective and efficient is not enough for public organisations. They should also provide rectitude (e.g., decisions should be legitimate, transparent, and fair) and should be resilient (e.g., they must not only provide services today but also tomorrow). However, striving for transparency and

resilience can be at odds with the aim to be efficient, which again illustrates the point that goals of public organisations can and often do conflict.

The fact that public organisations are characterised by goal ambiguity and goal conflict refers to the third main discerning factor mentioned by Rainey – public organisations differ from private organisations with respect to role, structure, and processes. Next to goal conflict, red tape and public service motivation (PSM) are arguably the most important distinctive characteristics of public organisations and their employees. These characteristics also affect HR policies and practices, illustrated by the fact that not all HR practices are suitable for application in public sector organisations (Kalleberg et al., 2006). For instance, the adherence to excessive bureaucratic red tape (in Chapter 19 defined by Pandey as the ‘role-specific subjective experience of compliance burden imposed by an organisation’) has resulted in compliance cultures with managers viewed as ‘guardians’ of established rules and procedures (Bozeman, 1993; Rainey, 2014). This poses limits to both managerial and employee autonomy. Also, the existence of PSM as a specific motivation for public employees affects the way public organisations (should) manage their employees. For instance, one must be aware that financial incentives may ‘crowd out’ intrinsic motivation (Georgellis et al., 2011), which in turn could negatively affect performance.

In the previous sections, we strongly emphasised public/private sector differences. However, it is important to add nuance to the discussion, as over the past decade or so these differences might have decreased. On the one hand, NPM reforms may have resulted in the creation of a market-like context for public organisations and public organisations mimicking private sector organisations, putting more emphasis on ‘private sector values’ such as efficiency and effectiveness (Paauwe & Farndale, 2017). On the other hand, private sector organisations might be mimicking the public sector in order to improve their attractiveness as an employer of choice, to improve their labour market position, and to meet societal expectations regarding social legitimacy (Getha-Taylor, 2018; Riccucci, 2018). Despite these converging processes, there are still public/private differences because some sets of HR practices fit the characteristics of public sector employees, and because not all HR practices are implemented with the strategy in mind.

Our main argument in this Research Handbook is that ‘the public sector is not just another context when it comes to studying questions of HRM and performance. We believe there are often far-reaching implications for the study of HRM within the public sector, so applying “what works” in private sector contexts to the public sector is way too simplistic’ (Knies et al., 2018, p. 2). This is a plea for more cross-fertilisation between the PA/PM and HRM disciplines. Both bodies of knowledge can be enriched by looking across the boundaries of their own discipline, thereby enabling us to gain a deeper contextualised understanding of HRM in the public sector. This is exactly what this Research Handbook sets out to do.

HRM IN THE PUBLIC SECTOR: CONCEPTUAL MODEL

We integrated the insights presented above in a conceptual model that serves as a guiding framework for this Research Handbook. We departed from the model originally developed by Vandenabeele et al. (2013), which we adapted slightly and complemented with recent insights. The model by Vandenabeele et al. is entitled ‘public value creation’ and serves as a contextualised version of the general HRM value chain (Wright & Nishii, 2013), which is now tailored

Source: Adapted from Vandenabeele et al., 2013.

Figure 1.1 Public HRM value chain

for the public sector. The model combines insights from the HRM and public administration/public management bodies of literature.

On the right-hand side of our adapted model (see Figure 1.1), the goals that public organisations aim to achieve are depicted. The ultimate goal of public organisations is to create public value and, to do so, it is of vital importance that the goals formulated in the organisational mission are achieved. Acknowledging that the goals that make up the organisational mission are often multiple and even conflicting, we added the balancing of frugality, rectitude, and resilience as an important goal in itself. We also listed employee well-being as a desirable goal. Beer et al. (1984) already pointed to the importance of recognizing employee well-being as an important outcome variable, besides organisational effectiveness and societal well-being. We argue that this is particularly the case in a public sector context, because public organisations are expected to act as a model employer (Farnham & Horton, 1996).

On the left-hand side of the model, intended, implemented, and perceived HRM can be found. These boxes all relate to the HR practices making up the HR strategy, which are aimed at building human capital, motivation, and opportunity to perform, and ultimately aim to contribute to the realisation of the organisational mission. Intended HRM refers to the strategy and policies related to HRM on a strategic and operational level. Implemented HRM captures the action different actors (senior management, HR specialists, line managers) take to actually manage work and people. These actions result in perceptions employees have of HRM, both individually and collectively. The latter is related to the concept of climate, i.e., the extent to

which ‘employees share a common interpretation of what is important and what behaviours are expected and rewarded’ (Bowen & Ostroff, 2004, p. 204).

The box ‘employee attitudes and behaviours’ links HRM to the realisation of the organisational mission. These attitudes and behaviours are a response to the way HRM is perceived by employees. If they feel supported by the organisation in general and their manager in particular, they will develop positive attitudes, such as satisfaction, work engagement, and commitment, and show high levels of public service motivation, in-role, and extra-role behaviours.

Finally, the upper part of the model pays attention to the wider context in which public organisations operate. This contextual part of the model refers to both the internal and external stakeholders (e.g., politicians, citizens, service users) (Andersen et al., 2016) and the institutional (cultural, legal) context (Paauwe & Boselie, 2007) that influence the organisational mission, the HRM strategy and its implementation, and the mechanisms linking the two.

THE STRUCTURE OF THIS RESEARCH HANDBOOK

This Research Handbook is organised in six parts. The first two parts centre around the main topics of interest, namely strategic HRM and the HRM cycle. This is the left-hand side of our conceptual model. Part I on *strategic HRM* contains chapters about horizontal and vertical fit of HR practices (Chapter 2 by Boselie, Paauwe & Peccei), on leadership (Chapter 3 by Bundgaard, Jacobsen & Jensen), and the overarching concept of people management (Chapter 4 by Penning de Vries & Vermeeren). It also addresses who is charged with HRM responsibilities (Chapter 5 by Op de Beeck, Daniëls & Hondeghem).

Part II on the *HRM cycle* addresses the different functional areas of HRM in a public sector context. The following HR practices are covered: recruitment and selection (Chapter 6 by Løkke), performance management (Chapter 7 by Decramer, Audenaert, George & Van der Heijden), compensation and benefits (Chapter 8 by Llorens), learning and development (Chapter 9 by Thunnissen & Sanders), workforce planning (Chapter 10 by Getha-Taylor), and turnover (Chapter 11 by Sowa).

In Part III we *link HRM to various types of outcomes*. This is the link between the left- and right-hand side of our model. Here, we follow the Harvard model (Beer et al., 1984), which makes a distinction between organisational effectiveness (Chapter 12 by Mostafa), individual well-being (Chapter 13 by Borst & Blom), and social legitimacy (Chapter 14 by Leisink & Boxall). There is a debate in the literature whether individual well-being is a means to an end (i.e., organisational effectiveness) or an end in itself (Kuvaas, 2009). We chose to include a separate chapter on the effects of HRM on employee well-being, because the public sector can traditionally be characterised as a model employer (Farnham & Horton, 1996), therefore valuing employee well-being as a goal in itself.

In Part IV several *mediating mechanisms* linking HRM and outcomes are discussed. These mediating mechanisms are depicted by the arrow in the lower half of the model. Some general theories from the HRM literature are discussed and contextualised for the public sector: the Attraction-Selection-Attrition model and person–environment fit (Chapter 15 by Christensen & Wightman), job demands-resources model and job characteristics model (Chapter 16 by Giauque & Weissbrodt), and self-determination theory (Chapter 17 by Andrews). This section also contains chapters that focus on typical PA/PM concepts, namely public service motivation (Chapter 18 by Ripoll & Ritz) and (bureaucratic) red tape (Chapter 19 by Pandey).

In the final two sections we link HRM and its effects to the broader context (the upper part of our model). In Part V we pay attention to the impact of *context* from a comparative perspective. There is a chapter about public, non-profit, and private differences (Chapter 20 by Bach & Kessler), and two chapters focusing on variation within the public sector, using different administrative systems (Chapter 21 by Breaugh & Hammerschmid) and different countries (Chapter 22 by Mayrhofer & Rapp) as a lens.

In Part VI we look ahead and discuss *challenges that HRM in the public sector is facing*. These challenges relate to work pressure (Chapter 23 by Den Dulk, Gorgievski & Peper), an ageing workforce (Chapter 24 by Van Harten & Rodrigues), a diverse workforce (Chapter 25 by Riccucci & Rodas), technological developments (Chapter 26 by Vermeeren & Dekker), and changing public service provision (Chapter 27 by Van der Wal).

Including the introduction and concluding chapter, this Research Handbook consists of 28 chapters. Including the editors, 51 authors contributed to this volume. They come from different disciplines (HRM, public administration, public management) and from different parts of the world (Europe, New Zealand, North America, South America, Asia). Therefore, this Handbook provides a comprehensive overview of the state-of-the-art insights into HRM in the public sector.

REFERENCES

- Andersen, L., Boesen, A., & Pedersen, L. (2016). Performance in public organizations: Clarifying the conceptual space. *Public Administration Review*, 76(6), 852–862.
- Appelbaum, E., Bailey, T., Berg, P., & Kalleberg, A. (2000). *Manufacturing Advantage: Why High-Performance Work Systems Pay Off*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17(1), 99–120.
- Beattie, R., & Osborne, S. (Eds.). (2013). *Human Resource Management in the Public Sector*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Beer, M., Boselie, P., & Brewster, C. (2015). Back to the future: Implications for the field of HRM of the multi-stakeholder perspective proposed 30 years ago. *Human Resource Management*, 54(3), 427–438.
- Beer, M., Spector, B., Lawrence, P., Mills, D., & Walton, R. (1984) *Managing Human Assets*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Berman, E., Bowman, J., West, J., & Van Wart, M. (2019). *Human Resource Management in Public Service: Paradoxes, Processes, and Problems*. Thousand Oaks, CA: CQ Press.
- Boon, C., Boselie, P., Paauwe, J., & Den Hartog, D. (2017). Measuring strategic and internal fit in HRM: An alternative approach. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 2007(1), 1–6.
- Boselie, P., Dietz, G., & Boon, C. (2005). Commonalities and contradictions in HRM and performance research. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 15(3), 67–94.
- Boselie, P., Van Harten, J., & Veld, M. (2019). A human resource management review on public management and public administration research: stop right there ... before we go any further ... *Public Management Review*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2019.1695880>.
- Bowen, D., & Ostroff, C. (2004). Understanding HRM-firm performance linkages: The role of the “strength” of the HRM system. *Academy of Management Review*, 29(2), 203–221.
- Boxall, P., & Purcell, J. (2016). *Strategy and Human Resource Management*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bozeman, B. (1993). A theory of government “red tape”. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 3(3), 273–304.
- Brewster C., Mayrhofer, W., & Farndale, E. (Eds.). (2018). *Handbook of Research on Comparative Human Resource Management*. Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing.

- Burke, R., Noblet, A., & Cooper, C. (Eds.). (2013). *Human Resource Management in the Public Sector*. Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Condrey, S. (Ed.). (2010). *Handbook of Human Resource Management in Government*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Daly, J. (2012). *Human Resource Management in the Public Sector: Policies and Practices*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Delery, J. (1998). Issues of fit in strategic human resource management: Implications for research. *Human Resource Management Review*, 8(3), 289–309.
- De Ponte, G., Mans, L., Di Sisto, M., & Van de Pas, R. (2014). Health Workers 4all: Health workforce shortages and international mobility in the EU. Retrieved from https://www.west-info.eu/europes-ageing-population-will-face-doctor-shortage/hw4all_synthesis_report_2014_03/.
- European Trade Union Committee for Education (2019). Shape the future of Europe with teachers. Retrieved from <https://www.csee-etuce.org/en/actions/campaigns/shape-the-future-of-europe-with-teachers/2868-shape-the-future-of-europe-with-teachers>.
- Farnham, D., & Horton, S. (1996). *Managing People in the Public Services*. London: Macmillan.
- Fombrun, C., Tichy, N., & Devanna, M. (Eds.). (1984). *Strategic Human Resource Management*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Georgellis, Y., Iossa, E., & Tabvuma, V. (2011). Crowding out intrinsic motivation in the public sector. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 21(3), 473–493.
- Gerhart, B. (2007). Horizontal and vertical fit in human resource systems. In C. Ostroff, & T. Judge (Eds.), *Perspectives on Organizational Fit* (pp. 317–348). London: Psychology Press.
- Getha-Taylor, H. (2018). Expanding the employee engagement model for public service: prioritizing relatedness to achieve collaborative outcomes. In E. Stazyk & H. Frederickson (Eds.), *Handbook of American Public Administration* (pp. 192–204). Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Gilbert, C., De Winne, S., & Sels, L. (2011). Antecedents of front-line managers' perceptions of HR role stressors. *Personnel Review*, 40(5), 549–569.
- Gratton, L., & Truss, C. (2003). The three-dimensional people strategy: Putting human resources policies into action. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 17(3), 74–86.
- Henry, N. (2018). *Public Administration and Public Affairs*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hood, C. (1991). A public management for all seasons? *Public Administration*, 69(1), 3–19.
- Ichniowski, C., Shaw, K., & Prennushi, G. (1997). The effects of Human Resource Management practices on productivity: A study of steel finishing lines. *American Economic Review*, 87(3), 291–313.
- Jiang, K., Lepak, D., Hu, J., & Baer, J. (2012). How does Human Resource Management influence organizational outcomes? A meta-analytic investigation of mediating mechanisms. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(6), 1264–1294.
- Kalleberg, A., Marsden, P., Reynolds, J., & Knoke, D. (2006). Beyond profit? Sectoral differences in high-performance work practices. *Work and Occupations*, 33(3), 271–302.
- Kaufman, B. (2007). The development of HRM in historical and international perspective. In P. Boxall, J. Purcell, & P. Wright (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Human Resource Management* (pp. 19–48). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Klingner, D., Nalbandian, J., & Llorens, J. (2016) *Public Personnel Management: Context and Strategies*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Knies, E., Boselie, P., Gould-Williams, J., & Vandenabeele, W. (2018). Strategic Human Resource Management and public sector performance: Context matters. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*. Online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2017.1407088>.
- Kuvaas, B. (2009). A test of hypotheses derived from self-determination theory among public sector employees. *Employee Relations*, 31(1), 39–56.
- Merton, R. (1995). The Thomas theorem and the Matthew effect. *Social Forces*, 74(2), 379–422.
- Meynhardt, T. (2009). Public value inside: What is public value creation? *International Journal of Public Administration*, 32(3–4), 192–219.
- Moore, M. H. (1995). *Creating Public Value: Strategic Management in Government*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Moore, M. H. (2000). Managing for value: Organizational strategy in for-profit, nonprofit, and governmental organizations. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 29(1_suppl, 2000), 183–204.

- Moore, M. H. (2013). *Recognizing Public Value*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Nadler, D. A., & Tushman, M. L. (1980). A model for diagnosing organizational behavior. *Organizational Dynamics*, 9(2), 35–51.
- Noordegraaf, M. (2015). *Public Management: Performance, Professionalism and Politics*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Paauwe, J. (2004). *HRM and Performance: Achieving Long-Term Viability*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Paauwe, J., & Boselie, P. (2007). HRM and societal embeddedness. In P. Boxall, J. Purcell, & P. Wright (Eds.), *Oxford Handbook of Human Resource Management* (pp. 166–184). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Paauwe, J., & Farndale, E. (2017). *Strategy, HRM, and Performance: A Contextual Approach*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Perry, J., & Christensen, R. (2015). *Handbook of Public Administration*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Perry, J., & Rainey, H. (1988). The public-private distinction in organization theory: A critique and research strategy. *Academy of Management Review*, 13(2), 182–201.
- Pollitt, C. (2003). *The Essential Public Manager*. Maidenhead: McGraw-Hill Education.
- 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.
- Pynes, J. (2013). *Human Resources Management for Public and Nonprofit Organizations: A Strategic Approach*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Rainey, H. (2014). *Understanding and Managing Public Organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Rainey, H., & Steinbauer, P. (1999). Galloping elephants: Developing elements of a theory of effective government organizations. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 9(1), 1–32.
- Riccucci, N. (2017). *Public Personnel Management: Current Concerns, Future Challenges*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Riccucci, N. (2018). *Managing Diversity in Public Sector Workforces: Essentials of Public Policy and Administration Series*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Truss, C. (2009). Changing HR functional forms in the UK public sector. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 20(4), 717–737.
- Vandenabeele, W., Leisink, P., & Knies, E. (2013). Public value creation and strategic Human Resource Management: Public service motivation as a linking mechanism. In P. Leisink, P. Boselie, M. van Bottenburg, & D. Hosking (Eds.), *Managing Social Issues* (pp. 37–54). Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Wright, P., & Nishii, L. (2013). Strategic HRM and organizational behaviour: Integrating multiple levels of analysis. In J. Paauwe, D. Guest, & P. Wright (Eds.), *HRM & Performance: Achievements & Challenges* (pp. 97–110). Chichester: Wiley.