Challenges and opportunities affecting the future of human resource management

Dianna L. Stone [a,*], Diana L. Deadrick [b,1]

[a] Departments of Management, University at Albany, State University of New York, and Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University Address: c/o 866 Fawnway San Antonio, TX 78260, United States
[b] Old Dominion University, Strome College of Business, Department of Management, 2138 Constant Hall, Norfolk, VA 23529, United States

ABSTRACT

Today, the field of Human Resource Management (HR) is experiencing numerous pressures for change. Shifts in the economy, globalization, domestic diversity, and technology have created new demands for organizations, and propelled the field in some completely new directions. However, we believe that these challenges also create numerous opportunities for HR and organizations as a whole. Thus, the primary purposes of this article are to (a) examine some of the challenges and opportunities that should influence the future of HR, and (b) provide an overview of the very interesting articles included in the special issue. We also consider implications for future research and practice in the field.

© 2015 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

"It's been a long time coming. But I know a change is gonna come."

[(Sam Cooke, 1964)]

Although Sam Cooke's quote was written over fifty years ago, it is especially relevant to Human Resource Management (HR) today because the field is experiencing numerous pressures for change. Shifts in the economy, globalization, domestic diversity, and technology create new demands for organizations, which propel the field of HR in some completely new directions. In particular, technology and talent management are considered to be the two primary drivers of change in the 21st century according to a recent survey by the Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM, 2002). Technology typically refers to the use of information technology to store and disseminate HR data (Gueutal & Stone, 2005). Talent management is a fairly vague term, but one of the simplest definitions is that it is the anticipation of HR needs for the organization, and the development of a plan to meet those needs (e.g., Cappelli, 2008; Dries, 2013). Other HR researchers maintain that changes in the field are being triggered by a rise in globalization, increased generational diversity, and expanded interest in innovation and sustainability (Boudreau, Gibson, & Ziskin, 2014; Roehling et al., 2005; Ulrich, 2013).

We believe that these challenges and new opportunities will influence the future of HR, and the primary purpose of this special issue is to examine some of the factors that will affect prospective changes in HR. In this article, we review several of the primary forces that are presenting challenges for HR research and practice. Consistent with the arguments above, organizations, and the field of HR, are facing a number of pressures that will modify the goals of organizations and change the nature of HR processes and practices. In the discussion below, we consider how transformations in the economy, globalization, domestic diversity, and technology will foster new approaches to HR.

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +1 210 497 4965.
   E-mail addresses: diannastone@satx.rr.com (D.L. Stone), ddeadric@odu.edu (D.L. Deadrick).
[1] Tel.: +1 757 83 4224.

1. Change from a manufacturing to a service or knowledge economy

One of the major challenges influencing the future of HR processes is the change from a manufacturing to a service or knowledge-based economy. This new economy is characterized by a decline in manufacturing and a growth in service or knowledge as the core of the economic base. A service economy can be defined as a system based on buying and selling of services or providing something for others (Oxford Dictionary, 2014a). A knowledge economy is referred to as the use of information or knowledge to generate tangible and intangible value (Business Dictionary, 2014a). Some economists argue that service activities are now dominating the economies of industrialized nations, and knowledge-intensive services or businesses are considered a subset of the overall service economy (Anderson & Corley, 2003).

The rise of the knowledge economy has placed new demands on organizations and prompted changes in organizational goals and HR practices. Many of the traditional HR processes were designed during the industrial era, and thus focused largely on manufacturing organizations that were concerned with converting raw materials, components, and parts into finished goods that meet customers' expectations. However, many of the assumptions underlying those traditional HR processes may not be effective with the new service or knowledge organizations. For example, traditional HR practices assume that jobs should be narrowly defined, supervisors should control workers, and efficiency and short term results should be emphasized (Trice & Beyer, 1993). In contrast, knowledge organizations stress that employees' knowledge and skills have a major impact on organizational success, and employee retention is important because individuals' skills are not substitutable.

Knowledge organizations also tend to design jobs broadly so as to encourage innovation, autonomy, continuous improvement, and participation in decision making. Given that individuals with unique skills and abilities are essential in knowledge organizations, the new job requirements have created a shortage and increased competition for talented workers in many fields (e.g., software engineering, nursing). Additionally, the change in the economy has resulted in the displacement and unemployment of people who do not have the skills needed for knowledge-oriented jobs (e.g., Bell, Berry, Marquardt, & Green, 2013; Karren & Sherman, 2012). These changes imply that nations need to alter their educational systems to meet job demands in new organizations (Gowan, 2012).

The goals of knowledge organizations should continue to bring about changes in HR processes in the future (e.g., Schuler, Jackson, Jackofsky, & Slocum, 1996). For instance, it can be expected that HR practices will employ broad based recruiting to ensure that they uncover skilled applicants, design jobs to emphasize autonomy and participation in decision-making, use team oriented structures to enhance collaboration and innovation, stress training and employee skill development, and provide incentives that foster employee identification, innovation, and retention. HR will need to shift its emphasis to employee retention, and meeting the varied needs of knowledge workers. Some of these new practices have already been implemented in organizations, but many organizations still use HR practices that do not support knowledge-oriented organizational goals. Future HR processes will need to be modified if knowledge organizations are to be successful. Research will also be needed to examine the effectiveness of these new practices.

Although we considered the new knowledge economy as a challenge for HR in organizations, it can also be viewed as an opportunity for change. Given that the skills and abilities of knowledge workers are key to the success of new organizations, the transformation to a knowledge economy provides opportunities for the HR function to become a priority in organizations. As a result, we believe that HR will become more of a critical function in organizations, and the field should be viewed as more essential to the overall success of the organizations.

2. Rise in globalization

A second factor calling for changes in HR processes is the rise in globalization. Globalization in this context refers to organizations that operate on a global or international scale (Oxford Dictionary, 2014b). Organizations operating in a global environment face a number of new challenges including differences in language and culture of employees, and variations in social, political and legal systems. Multinational corporations (MNCs) are large companies operating in several countries that are confronted with new questions, including how to create consistent HR practices in different locations, how to develop a coherent corporate culture, and how to prepare managers to work in a diverse cultural environment (Sparrow, 2007).

Research on HR in the international context has focused on three approaches to understanding the issues that arise in global environments: international, comparative, and cross-cultural HR (Parry, Stavrou-Costea, & Morley, 2011). International approaches focus on HR strategies, systems, and practices in different socio-cultural contexts and different geographic territories (Parry et al., 2011). It also outlines the anatomy of MNCs, and considers the unique set of HR issues that occur in these contexts (Budhwar & Sparrow, 2002). Although researchers differ on the factors that affect HR practices in global environments, most agree that the following variables influence these systems: (a) contextual variables (such as the host country's legal system, cultural distance between host country and employees' country), (b) firm-specific variables (such as the stage of internationalization, type of industry, link between strategy and structure), and (c) situational variables (such as staff availability, need for control, locus of decision making) (e.g., Budhwar & Sparrow, 2002; Schuler, Dowling, & De Cieri, 1993; Welch, 1994).

Comparative HR explores the context, systems, and national patterns of HR in different countries, and discusses the idiosyncrasies of various institutions and economic environments (e.g., Aycan et al., 2000; Isenhour, Stone, & Lien, 2012a; Parry et al., 2011). Most of the research on comparative HR indicated that HR practices differ across nations, and are aligned with national cultures (Stone & Stone-Romero, 2008). Two examples of that research include a study by Schuler and Rogovsky (1998) that assessed the relations between Hofstede's national culture dimensions and the design of HR practices. These authors found that a national emphasis on individualism was positively correlated with a company's use of pay-for-performance pay systems. In addition, Gooderham, Nordhaug, and Ringdal (1999) explored cross-national differences in HR practices across European nations. Their results revealed

that individualistic nations (e.g., UK, France, and Spain) were more likely to use calculative HR strategies (e.g., pay for performance) than collective nations (e.g., Scandinavian countries). Conversely, collective nations (Scandinavian countries) were more likely to use collaborative practices (e.g., employee participation) than individualistic countries (e.g., Germany, France and Spain).

Finally, cross-cultural HR examines the degree to which individuals' cultural values influence the acceptance and effectiveness of HR practices (Aycan et al., 2000; Gelfand, Erez, & Aycan, 2007; Isenhour, Stone, & Lien, 2012b; Stone, Stone-Romero, & Lukaszewski, 2007). Most of the theories in HR and Organizational Behavior (OB) were developed in Western nations and assume that the cultural values of individuals in organizations are homogeneous (Gelfand et al., 2007). However, it is clear that employees' cultural values differ in U.S. and global contexts, and organizations need to align their HR processes with these cultural values (e.g., Gelfand et al., 2007; Stone & Stone-Romero, 2008). For example, cross-cultural research indicated that individuals' cultural values shape their reward preferences, and their reactions to negative feedback (e.g., Gelfand et al., 2007; Joshi & Martocchio, 2008; Stone, Johnson, Stone-Romero, & Hartman, 2006; Stone-Romero & Stone, 2002). In particular, individuals who valued individualism preferred reward allocation systems based on equity or proportionality, but those who valued collectivism preferred equality-based allocation systems (Sama & Papamarcos, 2000). As a result, pay-for-performance systems may motivate employees who are individualistic, but group-based or profit-sharing systems may be more effective with those who value collectivism (e.g., Joshi & Martocchio, 2008; Miller, Hom, & Gomez-Mejia, 2001). Furthermore, research by Stone-Romero and Stone (2002) revealed that individuals who endorse collectivism were more likely to accept negative feedback than those who stress individualism.

Given that most organizations are operating in a global environment, we expect that the field will pay even more attention to these issues in the future. One reason is that the employment rates of U.S.-based MNCs have grown consistently over the past decades, and they now employ over 34.5 million workers in multiple countries (Bureau of Economic, 2013). It is anticipated that the numbers of MNCs will continue to expand over time, and HR practices will need to be congruent with these new multicultural and complex contexts. As a result, we expect that future research in HR will focus on the effectiveness and acceptance of HR practices in global environments.

Even though we have considered globalization as a challenge for organizations, we believe that it also provides many new opportunities. For instance, globalization should expand markets for products and services, and may enhance creativity and innovation because organizations will become more culturally diverse. Research showed consistently that diversity increases innovation and creativity, and this should also apply to the field of HR (van Knippenberg, De Dreu, & Homan, 2004). In particular, HR in global contexts will have to use creative solutions for attracting, motivating, and retaining diverse employees. For example, they may have to use unique rewards systems (e.g., cafeteria or flexible reward systems) to ensure that they meet the needs of workers from different cultural backgrounds (e.g., Stone, Deadrick, Lukasz___ & Johnson, 2015). Of course, research will be needed to examine the effectiveness of these new approaches.

3. Growing domestic diversity

Apart from changes in the economy and globalization, organizations are also faced with major shifts in the composition of the U. S. population. In particular, it is expected that our population will be older and more ethnically diverse by 2060 (U.S. Bureau of Census, 2014). For instance, by 2060 one in five Americans will be 65 years of age or older, and the number of working age people in the population (ages 18 to 64) will decrease from 62.7% to 56.9%. Along with the age-related changes, the work values of younger generations are expected to be different than previous groups (e.g., Baby Boomers). As a result, organizations will need to develop HR practices that are aligned with the primary goals and the values of multiple generations of employees (Cennamo & Gardner, 2008; Twenge, Campbell, Hoffman, & Lance, 2010).

3.1. Increased age and generational diversity

Along with the aging workforce come many new challenges for HR. For instance, given the shortage of skilled workers there is a growing concern about the retention of skilled baby boomers. One reason for this is that baby boomers often have unique skills and abilities that are critical to organizational success, and companies are justifiably worried about retaining them in their roles until qualified replacements can be found or trained. In order to retain these individuals, organizations will need to increase flexible work arrangements, allow part-time work, provide a supportive environment, and employ recognition systems to motivate them to stay with the organization (Armstrong-Stassen, Schlosser, & Zinni, 2012; Cheung & Wu, 2013; Shacklock & Brunetto, 2011).

Another challenge facing organizations is that they will be staffed by members of multiple generations, and members of generations differ in terms of work values, attitudes, and behaviors (Cennamo & Gardner, 2008; Twenge et al., 2010). As a result, organizations will have to modify their HR practices in order to attract and retain skilled members of all of these groups. For example, recent research indicated that baby boomers (born 1946 to 1964) placed a strong emphasis on hard work and achievement, valued intrinsic rewards, and stressed loyalty to the organization (Cennamo & Gardner, 2008; Twenge et al., 2010). In contrast, members of generation X (born 1965–1981) were more likely to value extrinsic rewards, leisure time, steady employment, work family balance, and promotion opportunities than baby boomers (Cennamo & Gardner, 2008; Twenge et al., 2010). Research also indicated that the values of generation Y were somewhat similar to those of generation X (born 1982–1999; i.e., they valued leisure time, work–family balance, extrinsic rewards, status), but they were more likely to emphasize freedom than either generation X or baby boomers. In addition, members of generation Y stressed extrinsic rewards less than generation X, but both generations X and Y reported greater intentions to leave organizations than baby boomers (Twenge et al., 2010).

Given these differences in values, organizations are faced with the complex challenge of aligning reward and compensation systems with the values of multiple generations. For example, they may need to expand beyond merely static pay and benefits and incorporate more flexible reward systems. In particular, they might identify the reward preferences of individuals, and develop cafeteria reward systems that provide employees with a total sum for their overall compensation, thus allowing them to select different rewards and benefits (e.g., one person might select vacation time in lieu of pay, whereas others might select pay instead of time off from work; Stone-Romero, Stone, & Salas, 2003).

3.2. Expanded ethnic diversity

There will also be dramatic change in the racial and ethnic make-up of our society. Today, ethnic minorities make up about 37% of the population, but estimates indicate they will comprise 57% of the nation by 2060 (U.S. Bureau of Census, 2014). It has also been projected that the U.S. will become a majority–minority nation by 2043, and the numbers of Hispanic–Americans (Hispanic) will more than double in the coming years (U.S. Bureau of Census, 2014). By 2060, one in three people in the U.S. will be Hispanic.

Even though there has been relatively little HR research on the cultural values of ethnic minorities in the U. S., some studies found that, on average, they have different values than Anglo-Americans (Bell, Marquardt, & Berry, 2014; Guerrero & Posthuma, 2014; Stone & Stone-Romero, 2008). For example, Hispanics, African–Americans, Asian–Americans, and Native Americans are, on average, more likely to endorse collective values than Anglo-Americans (Guerrero & Posthuma, 2014; Stone et al., 2006; Triandis, 1994). In contrast, Anglo-Americans are, on average, more likely to stress individualism than their counterparts, but it should be cautioned that there are within group differences in cultural values for all of these sub-groups (Betancourt & Lopez, 1993).

Given the transformation in the composition of the U.S. population, current HR practices may be less effective with employees from diverse backgrounds than those from the dominant group. The primary reason for this is that traditional HR processes were designed for a homogeneous set of employees with individualistic cultural values, and the new workforce is likely to have value systems based on collectivism and familism (e.g., Gelfand et al., 2007; Stone & Stone-Romero, 2008). Thus, organizations will have to have their HR practices modified so that they are aligned with the values of new generations, and the cultural values of diverse employees. As noted above, members of different ethnic subgroups often have distinctive reward preferences, and unique work values, and should react differently than Anglo-Americans to traditional HR processes.

Thus, in order to attract and retain subgroup members, organizations may have to alter their current reward and benefit systems to meet the needs of these employees. For example, many ethnic subgroup members are more familistic and collective than Anglo-Americans (Phinney, 1996), so they may prefer that organizations offer opportunities for teamwork, work–family balance, time off from work, and group based reward systems. As a result, organizations that develop cafeteria compensation and benefits systems that provide flexibility in terms of reward and benefit allocations may be more attractive to the new workforce than traditional reward systems. For instance, those employees who value familism can choose an extra week of vacation time to spend with their families in lieu of pay or other benefits. Organizations will be able to use these flexible compensation plans to attract talented applicants from all ethnic groups.

In view of the coming changes in generational and domestic diversity, organizations are likely to modify their future HR practices to meet the needs of employees with diverse values. To date, most of the research on domestic diversity has focused on unfair discrimination and relational demography (e.g., Stone-Romero et al., 2003; van Knippenberg et al., 2004). We believe that future HR research will need to be expanded and dig deeper into the value differences, reward preferences, and unique work roles of the new diverse workforce.

In our discussion above, we viewed changes in generational and ethnic diversity as a challenge for organizations. However, they can also be considered opportunities for organizations to utilize the many talents and skills that these individuals bring to the workforce, and should provide a wide array of individuals with the chance to display their skills and talents. Furthermore, the altered composition of the workforce should help organizations reach broader markets for their products and services, and increase the innovation and creativity in organizations (van Knippenberg et al., 2004). They should also prompt organizations to develop new HR practices that will meet the needs of all members of the workforce (e.g., cafeteria reward systems) (Stone et al., 2006).

4. Emerging use of technology

Over the past 30 years, one of the major drivers of change in HR has been the increased use of information technology (hereinafter referred to as technology) to collect, store, and utilize data for decision-making (e.g., Gueutal & Stone, 2005; Strohmeier, 2007; Strohmeier & Kabst, 2009). Technology, especially, the World Wide Web, has transformed key HR processes in organizations (e.g., e-recruiting, e-selection, e-training), and modified the nature of jobs and the relationships between individuals and organizations (Kiesler, Siegel, & McGuire, 1984). For example, it has enabled organizations to use the Internet to advertise jobs, and made it possible for applicants to apply for jobs online (e.g., Dineen & Allen, 2013). In addition, organizations are using various forms of technology to deliver training to employees (e.g., the Internet, intranet systems, video conferencing, online simulations; Salas, DeRouin, & Littrell, 2005). Research on the use of technology to facilitate HR processes indicated that it typically enhances efficiency, and decreases costs associated with HR transactions (e.g., Dulebohn & Johnson, 2013; Dulebohn & Marler, 2005; Strohmeier, 2007). However, some researchers argued that there is no clear evidence that it helps HR meets its primary goals of attracting, motivating, and retaining talented employees (see Stone et al., 2015, for a detailed discussion of influence of technology and the future of HR).

Despite the increased efficiency and cost savings associated with the use of technology in the field of HR, researchers maintained that there are a number of limitations associated with using current technologies to manage HR processes (e.g., Stone et al., 2015;

Stone-Romero et al., 2003). For instance, information technologies are often static and use one-way communication systems that do not allow applicants or employees to ask questions or gain advice from HR professionals (e.g., benefits). As a result, the technologies can be impersonal, inflexible, and create an artificial distance between supervisors and employees. Likewise, the use of technology for training may be less engaging than traditional methods, and may not give trainees the opportunity to practice or gain feedback. Furthermore, technology may actually transfer the work of HR departments to line managers or employees, which may reduce overall productivity in organizations (Stone-Romero et al., 2003).

In spite of possible limitations associated with using technology to manage HR processes, it will continue to transform the field in the future. Furthermore, it can be argued that new technologies will emerge that should decrease some of the major drawbacks associated with current systems. For instance, a number of researchers argued that the use of new interactive technologies (e.g., Web 2.0, social media, virtual simulations or job fairs, chat rooms, cloud computing, mobile devices) should decrease some of the weaknesses associated with current systems (see Dineen & Allen, 2013; Stone et al., 2015; Sullivan, 2014). For example, the use of social media, chat rooms, and high definition cloud computing should enable applicants and employees to engage in an interactive dialogue with recruiters or managers. Similarly, the use of virtual reality should provide applicants with opportunities to attend virtual job fairs, give supervisors the ability to mentor subordinates, and offer trainees the chance to participate in virtual training simulations. All of these virtual environments should increase the degree to which technology-based HR processes are personal, flexible, interactive, engaging, and decrease the interpersonal distance between employees and supervisors. Although these arguments seem plausible, research will be needed to examine the effectiveness and acceptance of these new HR processes.

Despite the fact that we viewed technology as a challenge in the sections above, it should be noted that it also provides new opportunities for the field of HR. For instance, research showed that technology often decreases the administrative burden in HR, increases efficiency, and allows the field to contribute to the strategic direction of organizations (Stone & Dulebohn, 2013). To date, there is no evidence that it helps organizations achieve its primary goals, but we believe that new interactive technologies will facilitate the attraction and retention of critical employees (Stone et al., 2015). One reason for this is that it will allow supervisors and HR professionals to engage in more frequent interaction and communication with employees. As a result, they will be able to identify and meet the needs of critical employees, and ensure that they remain with the organizations. It may also enable organizations to make better HR decisions based on objective information or decision support systems (Dulebohn & Johnson, 2013). Furthermore, it may facilitate interactions with stakeholders inside and outside the organization. For example, supervisors may be able to communicate with external customers in order to improve employees' performance, and HR professionals should be capable of staying abreast of innovative practices used by other organizations (see Ulrich & Dulebohn, 2015, for a detailed discussion of these issues).

5. Overview of articles in special issue

We reviewed several factors that should influence the future of HR in organizations, including changes in the economy, globalization, domestic diversity, and technology. These are only a few of the challenges that will affect the future of the field. The following articles consider more issues that are likely to shape HR in the future. In this special issue we have assembled a very interesting set of articles on the future of the field. Some of these articles take opposing views about the factors that will drive changes in the field, but we have no doubt that they will all stimulate discussion and future research on the issues.

The first article is by Jeanette Cleveland, Zinta Byrne, and Tommy Cavanagh, and offers a very intriguing view of the future of HR. The authors maintain that the field should not only focus on efficiency and organizational performance, but should be equally concerned with the human welfare of members of the organization. They also claim that successful organizations are ultimately built upon the foundation of successful individuals, and HR can play a unique and pivotal role in promoting both. Cleveland, Zinta, and Cavanagh (2015) take a multiple stakeholder perspective, and suggest that HR has traditionally been concerned with managing human resources to meet organizational goals. However, they argue that Bronfenbrenner's (1994) *Ecological Systems Model* can be used to identify and solve problems faced by organizations, and HR should develop a broad long term perspective that is responsive to multiple layers in the environment including employees, the organization, and the larger society. They also make the case that HR should return to being strong advocate for the respect of humanity at work.

The second article, by Ann Marie Ryan and Jennifer Wessel, offers a novel approach, and focuses on how four trends are influencing HR practice and research on "fairness" in organizations. These authors argue that changes in globalization and diversity, technology-mediated relationships, individual psychological contracts, and service-related jobs may change the social comparison process, and the types of comparisons employees make in organizations. As a result, HR will need to revise our understanding of distributive, procedural and interactive fairness at work. Furthermore, Ryan and Wessel (2015) maintain that increased interconnectedness through technology may create a "fairness web" where the treatment of one person may affect how others perceive the treatment they receive. The authors also consider implications of these new fairness issues for future research and HR practice.

The third article, written by Mick Marchington, posits that in its desire to be accepted by senior management, the field of HR is in danger of losing its focus. For example, the author maintains that HR has adopted short term performance criteria, has ignored other stakeholders including employees, and has become obsessed with the strategic or business partner model, thus focused on building talent among top level managers. As a result, he argues that HR should focus on a wider set of stakeholders, and should promote a more inclusive approach to employee engagement and progressive HR practices. By using a more inclusive approach, Marchington (in press) believes that HR can advance both the moral and business case for long-term sustainability in the future. We are confident that the arguments in this article will inspire additional discussion and research on HR.

The fourth article, by David Ulrich and James Dulebohn, describes the evolution of the field, and suggests that HR has moved from operating at a low, administrative level to participating as a strategic business partner in organizations. However, they add that the

field needs to go beyond the current efforts to add value inside the organization by serving employees and managers. In particular, Ulrich and Dulebohn (2015) contend that in the future, the field will need to connect HR to a broader business context, and create value by aligning HR services and activities to meet the needs of external stakeholders (e.g., customers, investors, the community). The authors offer propositions to guide research on these issues, and we know that their arguments will expand the boundary of the field.

In the next article Debra Cohen presents valuable reflections on the current state and future of the HR profession. In particular, she argues that the field has come a long way from the profession of "welfare secretary", but also indicates that the nature and development of competencies in the field must be addressed if HR is to reach its true potential as a strategic business leader. Although HR is viewed positively by some senior leaders as a contributor to organizational success, it is still viewed negatively or tangentially by others. This division in perceptions about the field holds the entire profession back, and Cohen notes that the transactional parts of the field are quite different than the transformational ones. Different skill sets are required to deliver on these different expectations. As a result, Cohen (2015) believes that in the future the field should focus on advancing the profession through the use of HR education, competency development, certification, experience, standards, and academic research.

The final article by Dianna Stone, Diana Deadrick, Kimberly Lukaszewski, and Richard Johnson contends that information technology has had a profound effect on human resources (HR) processes, and it will continue to have a major influence on HR in the future. Despite the widespread use of technology in HR, the authors suggest that there are a number of potential limitations associated with these systems, such as (a) one-way communication systems that are (b) impersonal and passive, which (c) often create an artificial distance between individuals and organizations. Given these limitations, Stone et al. (2015) predict that advancements in technology will influence the future of HR, and offer directions for future research and practice.

In summary, we hope that readers enjoy these articles as much as we have. We know that they will elicit discussion about the future of our field, and we are optimistic that they will foster additional research on the arguments presented by the authors. In summary, we would like to take this opportunity to thank Rodger Griffeth for giving us the opportunity to serve as guest editors for the special issues of *Human Resource Management Review* on HRM: Past, Present, and Future. He is always very supportive and encouraging, and we appreciate all he has done to make these special issues a success. Finally, we would like to thank Kimberly Lukaszewski for her assistance with this article, and others in the special issues.

References

Anderson, B., & Corley, M. (2003). *The theoretical, conceptual and empirical impact of the service economy* (No. 2003/22). *WIDER Discussion Papers//World Institute for Development Economics (UNU-WIDER)*.

Armstrong-Stassen, M., Schlosser, F., & Zinni, D. (2012). Seeking resources: Predicting retirees' return to their workplace. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 27(6), 615–635.

Aycan, Z., Kanungo, R., Mendonca, M., Yu, K., Deller, J., Stahl, G., et al. (2000). Impact of culture on human resource management practices: A 10-country comparison. *Applied Psychology*, 49(1), 192–221.

Bell, M. P., Berry, D. P., Marquardt, D. J., & Green, T. G. (2013). Introducing discriminatory job loss: Antecedents, consequences, and complexities. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 28(6), 584–605.

Bell, M. P., Marquardt, D., & Berry, D. P. (2014). "Diversity", immigration, and the new American multi-racial hierarchy. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 29(3), 285–303.

Betancourt, H., & Lopez, S. R. (1993). The study of culture, ethnicity, and race in American psychology. *American Psychologist*, 48(6), 629–638.

Boudreau, J., Gibson, C., & Ziskin, I. (2014). What is the future of HR? Retrieved August 10, 2014 from http://www.workforce.com/articles/20179-what-is-the-future-of-hr

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1994). Ecological models of human developments. (2nd ed.). In T. Husen, & T. N. Postlethwaite (Eds.), *International encyclopedia of education, Vol. 3*. (pp. 1643–1647). Oxford, England: Pergamon Press/Elsevier Science.

Budhwar, P. S., & Sparrow, P. R. (2002). An integrative framework for understanding cross-national human resource management practices. *Human Resource Management Review*, 12(3), 377–403.

Bureau of Economic (2013). Summary estimates for multinational companies: Employment, sales, and capital expenditures for 2011. Retrieved August 15, 2014 from http://www.bea.gov/newsreleases/international/mnc/mncnewsrelease.htm

Business Dictionary (2014). Definitions. Retrieved August 29, 2014 from http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/knowledge-economy.html

Cappelli, P. (2008). Talent management for the twenty-first century. *Harvard Business Review*, 86(3), 19.

Cennamo, L., & Gardner, D. (2008). Generational differences in work values, outcomes and person-organisation values fit. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 23(8), 891–906.

Cheung, F., & Wu, A. M. S. (2013). Older workers' successful aging and intention to stay. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 28(6), 645–660.

Cleveland, J. N., Zinta, S. B., & Cavanagh, T. (2015s). The future of HR is RH: Respect for humanity at work. *Human Resource Management Review*, 25(2), 146–161.

Cohen, D. J. (2015). HR past, present and future: A call for consistent practices and a focus on competencies. *Human Resource Management Review*, 25(2), 205–215.

Cooke, S. (1964). *A Change is Gonna to Come*.

Dineen, B. R., & Allen, D. G. (2013). Internet recruiting 2.0: Shifting paradigms. In K. Y. T. Yu, & D. M. Cable (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of recruitment* (pp. 382–401). New York: Oxford University Publishers.

Dries, N. (2013). The psychology of talent management: A review and research agenda. *Human Resource Management Review*, 23(4), 272–285.

Dulebohn, J. H., & Johnson, R. D. (2013). Human resource metrics and decision support: A classification framework. *Human Resource Management Review*, 23, 71–83.

Dulebohn, J. H., & Marler, J. H. (2005). e-Compensation: The potential to transform practice. In H. G. Gueutal, & D. L. Stone (Eds.), *The brave New world of eHR: Human resources management in the digital age* (pp. 166–189). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Gelfand, M. J., Erez, M., & Aycan, Z. (2007). Cross-cultural organizational behavior. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 58, 479–514.

Gooderham, P. N., Nordhaug, O., & Ringdal, K. (1999). Institutional and rational determinants of organizational practices: Human resource management in European firms. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(3), 507–531.

Gowan, M. A. (2012). Employability, well-being, and job satisfaction following a job loss. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 27(8), 780–798.

Guerrero, L., & Posthuma, R. A. (2014). Perceptions and behaviors of Hispanic workers: A review. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 29(6), 3–13.

Gueutal, H. G., & Stone, D. L. (Eds.). (2005). *The brave new world of eHR: Human resources management in the digital age*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Isenhour, L. C., Stone, D. L., & Lien, D. (2012a). Advancing theory and research on employee behavior in China. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 27(1), 4–8.

Isenhour, L. C., Stone, D. L., & Lien, D. (2012b). Enhancing theory and research: Employee behavior in China—Part 2. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 27(7), 660–668.

Joshi, A., & Martocchio, J. J. (2008). Compensation and reward systems in a multicultural context. In D. L. Stone, & E. F. Stone-Romero (Eds.), *The influence of culture on human resource processes and practices* (pp. 181–205). New York: Taylor and Francis.

Karren, R., & Sherman, K. (2012). Layoffs and unemployment discrimination: A new stigma. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 27(8), 848–863.

Kiesler, S., Siegel, J., & McGuire, T. W. (1984). Social psychological aspects of computer-mediated communication. *American Psychologist, 39*, 1124–1134.

Marchington, M. (2015). Human Resources Management(HRM): Too busy looking up to see where it is going Longer term? *Human Resource Management Review, 25*, 176–187.

Miller, J. S., Hom, P. W., & Gomez-Mejia, L. R. (2001). The high cost of low wages: Does maquiladora compensation reduce turnover? *Journal of International Business Studies, 32*(3), 585–595.

Oxford Dictionary (2014a). Definitions. Retrieved august 24, 2014 from http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/service-economyOxford

Oxford Dictionary (2014b). Definitions. Retrieved August 28, 2014 from http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/globalization

Parry, E., Stavrou-Costea, E., & Morley, M. J. (2011). The Cranet international research network on human resource management in retrospect and prospect. *Human Resource Management Review, 21*(1), 1–4.

Phinney, J. S. (1996). When we talk about American ethnic groups, what do we mean? *American Psychologist, 51*(9), 919–927.

Roehling, M. V., Boswell, W. R., Caligiuri, P., Feldman, D., Graham, M. E., Guthrie, J. P., et al. (2005). The future of HR management: Research needs and directions. *Human Resource Management, 44*(2), 207–216.

Ryan, A. M., & Wessel, J. (2015). Implications of a changing workforce and workplace for justice perceptions and expectations. *Human Resource Management Review, 25*(2), 162–175.

Salas, E., DeRouin, R., & Littrell, L. (2005). Research-based guidelines for designing distance learning: What we know so far. In H. G. Gueutal, & D. L. Stone (Eds.), *The brave new world of eHR: Human resources management in the digital age* (pp. 104–137). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Sama, L. M., & Papamarcos, S. D. (2000). Hofstede's IC dimension as predictive of allocative behaviors: A meta-analysis. *International Journal of Value-Based Management, 13*(2), 173–188.

Schuler, R. S., Dowling, P. J., & De Cieri, H. (1993). An integrative framework of strategic international human resource management. *Journal of Management, 19*(2), 419–459.

Schuler, R. S., Jackson, S., Jackofsky, E., & Slocum, J. Jr (1996). Managing human resources in Mexico: A cultural understanding. *Business Horizons*, 55–61 (May-June).

Schuler, R. S., & Rogovsky, N. (1998). Understanding compensation practice variations across firms: The impact of national culture. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 159–177.

Shacklock, K., & Brunetto, Y. (2011). A model of older workers' intentions to continue working. *Personnel Review, 40*(2), 252–274.

SHRM (2002). The future of the HR profession eight leading consulting firms share their visions for the future of human resources. Retrieve February 15, 2013 from http://www.shrm.org/pressroom/Documents/future_of_hr

Sparrow, P. R. (2007). Globalization of HR at function level: Four UK-based case studies of the international recruitment and selection process. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 18*, 144–166.

Stone, D. L., Deadrick, D. L., Lukaszewski, K. M., & Johnson, R. J. (2015). The influence of technology on the future of human resource management. *Human Resource Management Review, 25*(2), 216–231.

Stone, D. L., & Dulebohn, J. H. (2013). Emerging issues in theory and research on electronic human resource management (eHRM). *Human Resource Management Review, 23*(1), 1–5.

Stone, D. L., Johnson, R., Stone-Romero, E. F., & Hartman, M. (2006). A comparative study of Hispanic-American and Anglo-American cultural values and job choice preferences. *Management Research, 4*, 7–22.

The influence of culture on human resource processes and practices. Stone, D. L., & Stone-Romero, E. F. (Eds.). (2008). New York: Taylor and Francis.

Stone, D. L., Stone-Romero, E. F., & Lukaszewski, K. M. (2007). The impact of cultural values on the acceptance and effectiveness of human resources policies and practices. *Human Resource Management Review, 17*, 152–165.

Stone-Romero, E. F., & Stone, D. L. (2002). Cross-cultural differences in responses to feedback: Implications for individual, group, and organizational effectiveness. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management, 21*, 275–331.

Stone-Romero, E. F., Stone, D. L., & Salas, E. (2003). The influence of culture on role conceptions and role behavior in organizations. *Applied Psychology, 52*(3), 328–362.

Strohmeier, S. (2007). Research in e-HRM: Review and implications. *Human Resource Management Review, 17*, 19–37.

Strohmeier, S., & Kabst, R. (2009). Organizational adoption of e-HRM in Europe: An empirical exploration of major adoption factors. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 24*(6), 482–501.

Sullivan, J. (2014, March). A walk through the HR department of 2020. *Workforce Solutions Review*, 7–9.

Triandis, H. C. (1994). *Culture and social behavior.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Trice, H. M., & Beyer, J. M. (1993). *The cultures of work organizations.* New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Twenge, J. M., Campbell, S. M., Hoffman, B. J., & Lance, C. E. (2010). Generational differences in work values: Leisure and extrinsic values increasing, social and intrinsic values decreasing. *Journal of Management, 36*(5), 1117–1142.

U.S. Bureau of Census (2014). Population estimates. Retrieved August 27, 2014 from https://www.census.gov/popest/

Ulrich, D. (2013). *Human resource champions: The next agenda for adding value and delivering results.* Harvard Business Press.

Ulrich, D., & Dulebohn, J. H. (2015). Are we there yet? What's next for HR? *Human Resource Management Review, 25*(2), 188–204.

van Knippenberg, D., De Dreu, C. K., & Homan, A. C. (2004). Work group diversity and group performance: An integrative model and research agenda. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*(6), 1008.

Welch, D. E. (1994). HRM implications of globalization. *Journal of General Management, 19*(4), 52–68.