

Achieving a Balance in Human Resourcing Between Employee Rights and Care for the Individual

Lynette Harris

Introduction

The recent expansion of employment law and the growth of work place litigation in the UK is likely to intensify the preoccupation of Human Resource (HR) specialists and line managers with demonstrating procedural fairness in their human resourcing practices. The agenda is increasingly becoming one of "showing that justice has been done" in employment decisions. This paper's central claim is that regulation and escalating litigation can encourage an employee relations environment where HR practitioners and line managers alike place the emphasis on adhering to processes developed to demonstrate moral neutrality as a means of defending managerial decision making.

I will argue that this results in a heavily "proceduralised" approach which can be at the cost of investing in interpersonal relationships that are more conducive to positive employment relationships and individual feelings of fair treatment. Issues of fairness in HR processes will be explored from the perspectives of line managers, HR specialists and, to a lesser extent, of individuals at the receiving end. I will draw upon findings from two case studies of human resourcing policies and practice within two large public sector organizations—a large City Council and the British Library. The discussion will focus on two particular issues:

© *Business and Professional Ethics Journal* 2002. Correspondence may be sent to Lynette Harris at Department of Human Resource Management, Nottingham Business School, The Nottingham Trent University, Burton Street, Nottingham NG1 4BU, UK; or via email: lynette.harris@ntu.ac.uk

- the perceptions of line managers and HR specialists of the fairness of employment processes they had either developed, applied or experienced.
- how they viewed their own responsibilities for ensuring fairness in human resourcing procedures and outcomes.

Concepts of Organizational Justice and Human Resource Management

To examine perceptions of fairness in human resourcing processes requires a consideration of organizational justice theory. Fair treatment has been identified as an important ingredient in encouraging employee commitment. As Folger and Cropanzano (2000: xii) observe, fair treatment breeds "helpful citizenship behaviours that go beyond the call of formal job duties." Prior to the 1980s, the theoretical framework which influenced and informed research into organizational justice was primarily that of distributive (or outcome) justice. This considered the fairness of organizational outcomes in relation to individual or group inputs. Concerns about fairness were dominated by equity theory (Adams, 1965) particularly in terms of how individuals evaluated and reacted to differences in treatment (Miles *et al*, 1989; Campbell and Pritchard, 1976).

The inadequacies of equity theory as a conceptual framework (Locke and Henne, 1986) combined with the growing use of litigation to resolve allegations of discrimination in both the US and the UK, shifted attention away from distributive justice to a concentration on procedural justice in employment processes (Singer, 1993). In the context of legal dispute resolution, control over the process and decisions have been identified as essential determinants of procedural justice (Thibaut and Walker, 1975, 1978) and also as the means of employers proving the "reasonableness" of their decisions. The ability to demonstrate fairness in employment procedures has grown in organizational importance not only in terms of avoiding rule violation but also because of its influence on the likelihood of an individual claiming unfair treatment.

Three different perspectives on procedural justice have informed research and the development of practice (Gilliland, 1993). The first of these is based on the concept of process control defined as the extent of individual opportunity to influence decision making through applicant "voice" (Thibaut and Walker, 1975). For example, Bies and Shapiro (1988) found interviewees' perceptions of procedural fairness in selection to be

higher when they felt that scope existed to demonstrate their personal abilities which could influence the outcomes.

The second perspective is that perceptions of procedural justice are dependent on the extent to which certain procedural rules are satisfied or violated in resource allocation decisions. Leventhal *et al.* (1980) identify the six attributes of fair procedures as consistency, freedom from bias, accuracy, correctability, representativeness of those concerned and ethicality. Organizational justice research suggests that violating dimensions of procedural justice is likely to have a greater impact on feelings of fairness than the distributive justice of final outcomes (Dipboye and de Pontbriand, 1981; McFarlin and Sweeney, 1991). Thus, fair procedures can result in an individual perceiving a decision as just even when there has been an unfavourable personal outcome (Greenberg, 1987; Leung and Li, 1990).

A third, more recently identified, perspective on procedural justice can be described as "interactional justice" (Bies and Moag, 1986; Tyler and Bies 1990). This term is used not only to refer to the explanations and feedback given to individuals about outcomes, but also to the quality of interpersonal treatment received during the decision making process. The to-be-reported case study findings suggest that this is an underestimated dimension of individual perceptions of fair treatment which are heavily influenced by managerial behaviours in the application of the process (Whitener, *et al.*, 1998).

The HR Specialist's Responsibility for Organizational Justice

A responsibility for keeping the organization out of trouble and away from employment tribunals frequently lies in the hands of the HR specialists which results in them having a major stake in employees' perceived fairness of outcomes (Harris, 2000). This can reinforce an organizational role for the HR function of providing ethical leadership (Winstanley and Woodall, 2000) which in turn supports a focus on the consistent application of good practice. The most tangible means of achieving this is through the development of procedures which address the range of human resource activities (Pickard, 1995; Legge, 1995; Bach and Sisson, 2000).

The expansion of employee rights in the 1970s led to a period of employee relations which Torrington and Hall (1987) describe as being dominated by legal wrangling over the interpretation of the rule book. This led to negative perceptions among operational managers about the personnel function's overall contribution to business objectives (Legge, 1988). The essential argument was that corporate personnel departments had become

overly controlling bureaucracies which played too central a role as "industrial relations experts." An erosion of collective rights and a reduction in workplace bargaining in the UK during the 1980s shifted the balance of power away from collective rights and provided greater scope for the exercise of managerial prerogative (Dickens, *et al*, 1995). The HRM agenda and the prevailing political climate lent support to a general organising principle of returning responsibility for the conduct of the employment relationship to where it was held it really belonged, with the line manager (Millward and Stevens, 1986).

In recent years new employment rights and legal decisions have begun to re-address the balance of power between employer and employee after a period in which the employment deal has been strongly weighted against the employee (Herriot and Pemberton, 1995). This may be welcomed by HR specialists as the means of restoring greater humanity in the relationship between employer and employee by providing an ideal opportunity to revisit and apply what Edwards (1979) suggests is enlightened managerialism in employment practice.

Achieving a balance in the pursuit of organizational justice between avoiding rule violation and developing interactional justice or "felt fairness" at the level of the individual is, however, no simple matter. In the face of new employment rights, employer attention can all-too-easily become overly focused on the provision of a defence for decisions within organizations who, to remain competitive, are in pursuit of HR strategies which maximise workforce "leanness" and flexibility.

If increasing labour law and associated litigation result in employers feeling threatened or under siege, it will encourage the adoption of a more defensive approach to the employment relationship. Escalating employment tribunal statistics suggest this could be a likely response. The evidence is that the UK work force is becoming more litigious, for example, in 1990 ACAS received a total of 52,071 cases for individual conciliation with twenty-six percent of these proceeding to tribunal. By 1999 this figure had risen to 164,000 cases with twenty-four percent proceeding to tribunal. The major growth in tribunal applications are due to claims of unfair dismissal with most cases lost by employers being due to procedural lapses (Tremlett and Banerji, 1994). Furthermore as the penalties for employers losing increase—or are seemingly limitless in successful claims of discrimination—so has the value of internal expertise to protect the organization (Harris, 2000). This reinforces a defensive, legal compliance approach to employment issues and a role for the HR function of ensuring procedures are in place and adhered to. There was clear evidence of this in both organizations evaluated in the case studies.

The Studies

The reported findings are based on studies of human resourcing policies and practice at the British Library and a large Unitary City Authority conducted in 2000 and 2001. Among the aims of the research was an exploration of the perceptions of the specialist HR staff and line managers about their respective HR responsibilities as well as the effectiveness and fairness of the present processes. For the purposes of this paper I have decided to concentrate on the findings on selected areas of HR activity, namely recruitment and selection, promotion processes and the handling of grievances and disciplinary issues.

A one-to-one interview approach was adopted to gain insights from diverse sources and to explore the views that implementers of the processes held about their operational fairness. An acknowledged limitation of the research was the lack of opportunity to evaluate the processes from the perspective of employees at the receiving end, although the majority of respondents had direct experiences of being candidates in both selection and promotion processes and these have been reflected in the findings,

The studies initially involved detailed discussions about each stage of organizational processes and practices with staff in the central personnel function. At the Council these interviews were followed by thirty-six interviews with those actively involved in applying the processes and related decision making. Due to the devolvement and decentralisation of HR responsibilities, these interviews were undertaken with line managers, personnel officers, and training and equality officers based in departments as well as a number of senior managers, the Chief Executive and members of the Council. At the British Library, forty interviews were conducted. These involved senior HR practitioners and support staff, Heads and Deputies within Directorates and a number of providers of specialist services.

There was an examination of the written procedures, guidance notes, records, statistical data, internal reports, previous review documents and summaries of any employee surveys that existed for both organizations. At the British Library the interviews were supplemented by focus group meetings with HR staff at the St. Pancras and Boston Spa sites and an interview via video conferencing with trade union representatives for both sites. A focus group meeting of central HR staff was held at the Council. Both samples were selected to take account of the issues facing different departments and to obtain views on current practice from a range of stakeholders with the aim of providing as many different perspectives as

possible. The interview programmes were extended to include any line manager or HR specialist who had expressed interest in contributing to the review. This approach appeared to work well. By the end of both interview schedules the same essential messages were emerging so it was decided that there was little to be gained by further extending the interview programme.

It is recognised that as both case studies are public sector organizations there was a likely predisposition due public accountability, a strong trade union presence and ideology to pay greater attention to issues of demonstrating procedural fairness in their HR practices. Previous studies (Industrial Relations Services (IRS), 1996; 1997) have observed this particularly in public sector recruitment and selection where the essential formula has been to formalise every stage of the process to provide a metaphorical level playing field (Webb, 1997). The research findings are also limited to studies of two organizations so they raise and illuminate issues rather than provide generally applicable conclusions.

The Case Study Findings

At the Council and, to a somewhat lesser degree, at the British Library the recruitment and promotion process had been shaped by the requirements of equal opportunities legislation. This was largely reflected in the development of highly structured "depersonalised" recruitment procedures that focus on job content and task specificity to achieve greater objectivity (McDaniel *et al*, 1994). The aim was to remove any areas in the process which might be influenced by individual judgement or contain potential bias, for example adopting a highly structured approach to interviewing based on a checklist of questions which line managers rigidly adhered to reducing opportunities for a dialogue to develop. This was explained by a belief that to deviate in any way from the set questions was to invite potential claims of unequal treatment.

At the City Council, considerable HR responsibility for these activities had been devolved to line management. To provide a managerial consistency of approach the Central Personnel Unit had developed a detailed recruitment and selection code for every stage of the process. This approach had been endorsed by an Audit Commission report in 1995 which observed that "there was good recruitment practice and record keeping in place should the Council need to defend itself at an industrial tribunal." Even the original architects of the processes in the central personnel function were, however, identifying that the emphasis on "a compliance and penalty avoidance route" (Dickens, 1994: 258) was leading to lack of ownership of the process by

operational managers and a rigidity of approach that was at times resulting in outcomes which took little account of the central objective of any selection process of appointing the best candidate.

Line managers' perceptions of the fairness of the Council's selection and promotion processes revealed a paradox. The very procedures that had been carefully developed to ensure procedural justice and to provide equality of treatment for candidates could result in significant disadvantages for applicants unaware of the rules of a game that the informed candidate knew how to play. As one housing manager observed, "it is a bit like knowing the Queensberry rules, you are disqualified if you don't follow them. You have to play by the rules to get through each round."

Respondents who had experienced the processes first hand expressed frustration at the lack of any developed two-way communication in the process. Their observations supported the findings of earlier research that candidates actually prefer unstructured interviews where they have greater opportunities to participate and have interpersonal input (Schuler 1993; Thornton 1993).

At the British Library, approaches to recruitment, selection and promotion were similarly dominated by the demonstration of procedural fairness at every stage, but here the approach was largely explained by a bureaucratic civil service tradition in employment practices and a trade union involvement. The effect of employment legislation had been to reinforce the appropriateness of this approach. At the time of the study there was minimal devolvement of HR activities to operational management, and the specialist HR function was very much regarded by all respondents acting as the "custodian" of the present procedures. The HR staff not only provided extensive administrative support for the processes, but also made high levels of operational input. These activities were absorbing considerable quantities of staff time which the author's review, previous reports and the specialist function itself identified would be better spent developing more proactive policies to support the Library's changing resourcing requirements.

Promotion could only be achieved at the Council by competition with external candidates. The open access policy was a source of grievance among existing employees and was described as significantly disadvantaging the internal candidate whose known work records could not be taken into account for fear of unequal treatment for the external candidate.

This policy contrasted significantly with that of the British Library where internal recruitment was the first step with external recruitment occurring when there were no "suitably experienced" internal candidates.

Certain line managers were critical that this encouraged and reinforced the existing culture and that more open competition would better support the organizational change process. Whilst the rules were as detailed as the Council's, there was rather more flexibility during selection interviews and managers reported less concerns about the fairness of the eventual outcomes. The fact that a representative from personnel was nearly always present possibly added to their confidence about the fairness of the process and reduced fears about asking probing questions based on applicants' responses. Their main criticisms were the time consuming nature of the processes, excessive documentation and delays caused by the many stages involved. The extent of record keeping was questioned as was the heavy involvement of the HR function in most selection and promotion decisions with a member of Personnel acting as the Chair of Selection and Promotion Boards and ensuring that all the documentation and report of the process were in place. All the respondents of the process tended to regard them as generally fair but far too cumbersome, insufficiently adaptive to different circumstances and providing too few opportunities for managerial discretion.

There were greater reported similarities in the two organizations' approaches to grievances and disciplinary issues. Whilst the HR respondents felt that the present processes were generally fair and adequate, the line managers who applied them were widely criticised for failing to initiate action at an early enough stage. This contrasted with the views of line managers who were almost universally critical of the processes they were required to implement and, at times, about the quality of the advice they received from the specialist function. Line managers' perceptions at both the Library and the Council were that the processes just did not support them in achieving other organizational objectives. The processes were described by these managers "as an obstacle course that was so daunting it was better not to embark on it at all." No action was frequently identified as a better option than starting a course of action that could make matters worse in terms of trying to manage the consequences. This view was summed up by the Head of a Directorate who observed "I phone up Personnel to find out what I can't do and then I can start looking for alternative ways round the problem. We have different aims. I am just trying to cope with operational realities and Personnel are concerned with making sure I don't rock the boat."

The difference between what the HR specialist regarded as fair practice and what was seen as fair by the line managers was significant. It was highly influenced by infrequent encounters with processes that remained

unfamiliar to many operational managers who still had surprisingly little knowledge of the importance of procedural fairness in any legal claims. Not dealing with performance issues was, however, recognised as delivering the wrong message to other staff as individuals could be seen to be "getting away with it"—which had an adverse effect on morale.

At both organizations, a need was identified for operational managers to have a greater understanding of concepts of natural justice and of the implications of not addressing under performance issues. This need was exacerbated at the British Library where the boundaries of responsibility were far from clear. Once a disciplinary matter has been referred under the central procedure to the HR function, the organization's disciplinary procedure stated that "Personnel will decide what action is to be taken" and the Director of HR ultimately was responsible for deciding the appropriate disciplinary action and formal procedures rather than the appropriate line manager. The explanation for this arrangement appeared to lie in ensuring a third party was involved to add to the neutrality and thus the fairness of the process. For managers it had the effect of increasing their reluctance to deal with such issues and a certain degree of "abdication management" (Beaver and Harris, 1996: 8).

A feature shared by all the processes examined was the opportunity for individuals to pursue the "correction" of a decision through well-publicised appeal mechanisms. Whilst most appeal hearings upheld the original decisions, casting doubts in the mind of certain respondents about their value and credibility, most managers felt too much emphasis was being placed on appeal provisions. These were described as "undermining managerial authority" and "breeding an appellant culture where individuals had nothing to lose by pursuing a challenge to any decisions." Certainly appeals were identified as increasing and subsuming considerable amounts of time.

Asked where the responsibility lay for ensuring fairness, line managers still saw this as the role of the HR function as the "architect and interpreter of the rules." Even where there had been significant devolution, the HR specialist were still identified as having the dual responsibilities of achieving "both efficiency and justice" (IPM, 1963) in employment relations. As Cunningham and Hyman (1995) observed in their study of devolution of HR responsibilities, there was a reported reluctance of line managers to take on HR responsibilities because of their existing and escalating workloads. In addition, concerns about the extent of their legal knowledge reinforced a tradition of referring problems to the specialist function. This contributed to the differing perceptions line management and

the Personnel function held about each other's respective HR responsibilities. Respondents felt that these tensions between personnel specialists and line managers were likely to grow as employment regulation and the risks associated with making a mistake increased.

The very managers who had signalled the need for greater freedoms in HR decisions were somewhat less forthcoming about how they would like to see this achieved in practice. There was some evidence, particularly among less-senior managers, that the present rules offered advantages to busy line managers even though they complained about their inflexibility. The prospect of more opportunities to exercise personal discretion was daunting to managers who did not relish the prospect of the quality of their decision making being placed under the spotlight. Sheppard, *et al.* (1994) similarly found managers preferring less participative decision making even when given more powers if they had insufficient supervisory experience.

The trade union perspective at both organizations was illuminating. There was strongly articulated opposition to any changes in the present arrangements which would reduce the involvement of Personnel. They were seen as the arbiters of the process who provided a neutrality essential to individual fairness and contributed to the transparency of decision making. Although this was particularly the case in the application of disciplinary and grievance procedures at the British Library, there was an anxiety about the prospect of the HR function playing a reduced operational role in other areas of HR activity.

Conclusions

The employment processes examined in the case-study organizations reflected the six principles of fair procedures suggested by Leventhal, *et al.*'s allocation preference theory (1980). The studies, however, revealed a paradox. The very processes developed to provide fair treatment could become sources of conflict and grievances between HR practitioners, line managers and individuals experiencing the processes. An emphasis on procedural justice designed to ensure the existence of a documentation trail as a defence against claims of unfair treatment was identified as creating ethical tensions in terms of demonstrating respect and care for the individual.

This highlights a particularly acute dilemma for the HR practitioner which is heightened by an increase in employment regulation. In promoting the consistent application of processes designed to demonstrate equal rights in all employment practice, the scope for adjusting the rules to

accommodate individual needs and circumstances can be diminished. Put another way, the ability to deal with claims of inconsistent treatment was found to be valued more highly by HR staff than any potential benefits accruing from demonstrating greater care in individual cases. This approach is not without justification. This is because it is based on organizational justice research evidence that suggests violating dimensions of procedural justice can have a greater impact on feelings of fairness than outcome justice (Macfarlin and Sweeney, 1992). A pitfall of such an approach is, however, that it can also create "a destructive spiral of ever greater checks and controls followed by more sophisticated avoidance tactics" (Liff, 1989: 32). Such fears were evident in line managers' observations about a growing "appellant culture" and reported perceptions that rules of the game were becoming more important than the justice of the final outcomes.

The case studies illustrated that other important determinants of perceived fairness can be overlooked or underestimated in attempts to maximise the "no difference" approach in HR practices. An undeveloped theme in the organizational justice literature is the impact of the quality of interpersonal treatment on perceived fairness, (Tyler and Bies, 1990). The scope for interactional inputs through a "voice" in the process emerged as a significant influence on individual perceptions of fair processes. Despite blaming excessive levels of rules and regulation for limiting their opportunities to exercise discretion, the reality was that all but the most experienced managers had a preference, in practice, for prescribed processes that reduced their responsibilities for decision making. It was seen as less time-consuming and also as reducing their accountability if things went wrong. Furthermore, there was a reluctance of line managers, also commented on by Gratton, *et al.* (1999), to take on personnel responsibilities that are seen as part of the specialist function's role and a questioning of the wisdom of doing so in the light of the increasing legal complexity of many employment issues.

Academic researchers, however, continue to commend the value of line managers collaborating, explaining decisions, providing opportunities for interaction, maintaining open communication and showing concern for individuals (Whitener, *et al.* 1998). In their resumé of the different ethical frameworks that can inform HR practice, Winstanley and Woodall (2000), suggest that the ethics of care with a shift in emphasis from formal systems to a more personalised approach has much to offer human resource management. In the case study, organizations' social psychological factors had received less attention than developing processes that demonstrated procedural justice. It was this perceived lack of recognition of personal

contribution and circumstances that was identified by respondents as aggravating feelings of frustration and unfairness about HR processes.

Both studies revealed a belief in the value of the HR specialist providing expertise and a third-party presence to preserve fairness. This presents the specialist function with a long-recognised double bind (Watson, 1977). On the one hand, devolving HR responsibilities provides a reduced operational involvement for the personnel function at the critical early stages, which helps to maintain a degree of neutrality. On the other hand, it means that the most time-consuming cases are likely to ultimately involve the function again raising questions about the nature of its wider contribution to the organization.

One rather pessimistic interpretation of the impact increased regulation may have on the HR practitioner's role is that a major evaluator of its success could be a negative one, namely the effectiveness of its policing activities measured by the avoidance of costs associated with claims of unfair treatment (Harris, 1999). HR's role in ensuring the observance of employee rights within the organization could thus be driven by interests of self-preservation rather than any abiding concern to provide ethical leadership. A more optimistic scenario is that it could provide real opportunities for new approaches to resolving individual grievances and problems. One possibility is that, as the costs of litigation escalate, there will be a return to recognising the value of internally resolving individual differences. This would provide an opportunity for line managers and HR specialists alike to develop and hone their skills of conciliation, mediation and arbitration which would encourage a greater sensitivity to individual perceptions of fairness within the workplace.

To conclude, the case studies' findings contained two essential messages for the architects and implementers of HR policies. One message is the importance of developing processes which meet the requirements of procedural justice and equality of treatment but also of the flexibility to allow for sensitive personal interactions which take account of individual need. The second message is that management behaviours in the application and interpretation of organizational rules have a significant impact upon individual perceptions of fair processes which should be reflected in management training and development interventions.

Whilst adopting a more personalised approach runs the risk of eroding a legally defensible equality of treatment approach, the much derided "tea and sympathy" approach associated with the traditional personnel department may have been making a greater organizational contribution than hitherto recognised. For the majority of employees, a perception of

empathetic management with a greater sensitivity to their individual needs could lead to a greater tolerance when mistakes do occur. The likelihood of individuals seeking redress for alleged injustices through external mechanisms could reduce if it is perceived that there are genuine internal attempts at the level of their individual manager to address personal concerns. The dilemma is that increased legislation and litigation is "tipping the balance" in favour of the pursuit of demonstrable procedural justice through a uniformity of approach at the potential cost of developing a more individualist caring approach to HR practice.

Bibliography

- ACAS, *Annual Reports 1991, 2000*, ACAS publications.
- Adams, J.S. (1965) 'Inequality in social exchange,' in L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, Vol. 2, New York: Academic Press, 267-299.
- Bach, S. and Sisson, K. (2000) *Personnel Management in Britain*, Oxford: Blackwell Business.
- Beaver, G. and Harris, L. (1996) 'The hidden price of the disposable workforce,' *Journal of Professional HRM*, Issue 2, 3-8.
- Bierhoff, H.W., R.L. Cohen and J. Greenberg (1986) *Justice in Social Relations*, New York: Plenum.
- Bies, R. and Moag, J. (1986) 'Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness,' in R.J. Lewicki, B.H. Sheppard and M.H. Bazerman (Eds.) *Research on Negotiation in Organizations*, Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, 43-55.
- Bies, R.J. and Shapiro, D.L. (1988) 'Voice and justification: Their influence on procedural fairness judgements,' *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 31, 676-685.
- Campbell, J.P. and Pritchard, R.D., (1976) 'Motivation theory in industrial and organizational psychology,' in M. Dunnette (Ed.) *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, Chicago: Rand McNally, 63-100.
- Cunningham, I. and Hyman J. (1995) 'Transforming the HRM vision into reality. The role of line managers and supervisors in implementing change,' *Employee Relations*, Vol. 17, no. 8, 5-20.
- Dickens, L. (1994) 'Wasted resources? Equal opportunities in employment,' in K. Sisson (Ed.) *Personnel Management—A Comprehensive Guide to Theory and Practice in Britain*, London: Blackwell, 253-296.

- Dickens, L., M. Jones, B. Weekes, and M. Hart (1995) *Dismissed: A Study of Unfair Dismissals and the Industrial Tribunal System*, Basil Blackwell: Oxford.
- Dipboye, R.L. and de Pontbriand, P. (1981) 'Correlates of employee reactions to performance appraisal and appraisal systems,' *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 66; 248-251.
- Edwards, R. (1979) *Contested Terrain*, London: Heinemann.
- Folger R. and Cropanzano, R. (2000) *Organizational Justice and Human Resource Management*, Four Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Greenberg, J. (1987) 'A taxonomy of organizational justice theories,' *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 12, 9-22.
- Gilliland, S. (1993) 'The perceived fairness of selection systems: An organizational justice perspective,' *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 18, no. 4, 694-734.
- Gratton, L., V. Hope Hailey, P. Stiles and C. Truss, (1999) *Strategic Human Management*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Harris, L. (1999) 'Employment law and human resourcing—Challenges and constraints,' in J. Leopold, L. Harris, and T. Watson (Eds.) *Strategic Human Resourcing: Principles, Perspectives and Practices in HRM*, London: Financial Times Pitman Publishing, 265-290.
- _____ (2000) 'Employment regulation, and owner-managers in small firms: Seeking support and guidance,' *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, Vol. 7, no. 4, 352-362.
- Industrial Relations Services (1996) 'Policy and practice in recruitment: An IRS survey,' *Employment Development Bulletin* 81, September, 5-13.
- Industrial Relations Services (1997) 'The state of selection: An IRS survey,' *Employment Development Bulletin* 85, January, 8-18.
- IPM Annual Report* (1983) London: Institute of Personnel Management.
- Herriot, P. and Pemberton, C. (1995) *New Deals: The Revolution in Managerial Careers*, Chichester: Wiley.
- Legge, K. (1988), 'Personnel management in recession and recovery: A comparative analysis of what the surveys say,' *Personnel Review*, Vol. 17, no. 2 (monograph issue).
- _____ (1995) *Human Resource Management—Rhetorics and Realities*, London: Macmillan.
- Leung, L. and Li, W. (1990) 'Psychological mechanisms of process-control effects,' *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 75: 613-620.
- Leventhal, G., J. Karuza, W. Fry, (1980) 'Beyond fairness: A theory of allocation preferences,' in G. Mikula (Ed.) *Justice and Social Interaction*, New York: Springer Verlag, 167-218.

- Liff, S. (1989) 'Assessing equal opportunities policies,' *Personnel Review*, Vol. 18, no. 1, 27-34
- Lind, E.A. and Tyler, T.R. (1988) *The Social Psychology of Procedural Justice*, New York: Plenum Press.
- Locke, E. and Henne, D (1986) 'Work motivation theories,' in C.L Robertson and I. Robertson (Eds.) *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, New York: Wiley, 1-35.
- McFarlin, D.B. and Sweeney, P.D. (1992) 'Distributive and procedural justice as predictors of satisfaction with personal and organizational outcomes,' *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 35, no. 3: 626-637.
- Miles, E.W., J.D. Hatfield and R.C. Husmen, (1989) 'The equity of sensitivity construct: potential implications for worker performance,' *Journal of Management*, 15: 581-588.
- Millward, N. and Stevens, M. (1986) 'British Workplace Industrial Relations—1980-1984,' *The DE/ESRC/PSI/ACAS Survey*, London: Gower.
- Pickard, J. (1995) 'Prepare to make a moral judgement,' *People Management*, Vol. 1, no. 10, 22-25.
- Schmitt, N. and Gilliland, S.W. (1992) 'Beyond differential prediction: Fairness in selection,' in D.M.Saunders (Ed.) *New Approaches to Employee Management: Fairness in Employee Selection*, Greenwich: AI Press, 21-46.
- Schuler, H. (1993) 'Social validity of selection situations: A concept and some empirical results,' in H. Schuler, J. Farr and M. Smith (Eds.) *Personnel Selection and Assessment: Individual and Organizational Perspectives*, Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 11-26.
- Singer, M. (1993) *Fairness in Personnel Selection*, Aldershot: Avebury Publishing.
- Sheppard, B.H., K. Blumenfield-Jones, W.J. Minton and E. Hyder (1994) 'Informal conflict intervention: Advice and dissent,' *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, Vol. 7, 53-72.
- Sisson, K. (1999) 'The new European social model: The end of the search for an orthodoxy or another false dawn?' *Employee Relations*, Vol. 21, no. 5 :445- 462.
- Stewart, G. and Carson, K. (1997) 'Moving beyond the mechanistic model: An alternative approach to staffing for contemporary organizations,' *Human Resource Management Review*, Vol. 7, no. 2, 157-184.
- Thibaut, J. and Walker, L. (1975) *Procedural Justice: A psychological analysis*, Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Thornton, G.C. (1993) 'The effects of selection practices on applicants' perceptions of organizational characteristics,' in H. Schuler, J. Farr and

- M. Smith (Eds.) *Personnel Selection and Assessment: Individual and Organizational Perspectives*, Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 57-69.
- Torrington, D. and Hall, L. (1987) *Personnel Management—A New Approach*, Prentice Hall.
- Tremlett, N. and Banerji, N. (1994) 'The 1992 survey of industrial tribunal applications,' *Department of Employment Research Series*, no. 22, London: Department of Employment.
- Tyler, T. and Bies, R. (1990) 'Beyond formal procedure: The interpersonal context of procedural justice,' in J. Carroll (ed.) *Applied Social Psychology and Organizational Settings*, Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 77-98.
- Watson, T.J. (1977), *The Personnel Managers*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Webb, J. (1997) 'The politics of equal opportunity,' *Equal Opportunities*, Vol. 4, no. 3, 159-169.
- Whitener, E., S. Brodt, M. Korsgaard and J. Werner (1998), 'Managers as initiators of trust: An exchange relationship for understanding managerial trustworthy behavior,' *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 23 no. 3, 513-330.
- Winstanley, D. and Woodall, J. (2000) 'The ethical dimension of human resource management,' *Human Resource Management Journal*, Vol. 10, no. 2, 5-20.