

ABSTRACT

This paper investigates the views of Human Resource (HR) and non-HR managers. The views investigated are on jobs, employee participation, training and development, trade unions and stakeholders. The paper sets out to test one general hypothesis that, because HR managers are more likely to be familiar with the new developments in HRM theories and practice, and their views on the issues investigated would be significantly different from non-HR managers. Analyses of variance between HR and non-HR managers did not provide evidence to support the general hypothesis. The results of the investigation revealed that, the respondents consider both intrinsic and extrinsic rewards as important. They also have favourable attitudes to employee participation and training and development. Although the managers believe that unions should be concerned with issues beyond pay and working conditions (ie Offering some support to trade unionism), they do not believe that trade unions are acting in the organisations' economic interest. The managers also believe that joining unions will be detrimental to their own promotion opportunity. The data analysed provide evidence to suggest that the managers have pluralist perspective. For example, majority of them are willing to promote the interests of multiple stakeholders. The implications of the findings are discussed.

Keywords: Managerial Attitudes; Human Resource Managers

DO HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGERS DIFFER FROM OTHER MANAGERS?: EVIDENCE FROM A SAMPLE OF AMERICAN MANAGERS

In the last two decades, the field of Human Resource Management (HRM) has received and would continue to receive tremendous attention from researchers, theorists and practitioners. The field has undoubtedly developed into a major discipline in its own right. As Becker & Huselid (1999) pointed out, the field is coming of age. Theories of what constitute HRM abound. Also the extent to which HRM ideas are implemented in organizations have been widely researched and commented on (eg Storey, 1995a; 1995b; 2001). Similarly, the impact of HRM practices on organizational performance has been extensively researched. Nonetheless, debate still continues regarding the definition of HRM (Storey, 2001), which model of HRM has the most efficacy for organisational performance, and whether HRM can be considered strategic at all (Porter, 1996).

Arguably, HRM is one of the most widely researched topics in the field of management and organizational theory and yet one of the most polarised and least understood. This state of affair calls for even more research in the field to help shed light on the issues under contention. It is perhaps true to say that most attitudinal research on HRM and Industrial Relations (IR) issues have rightly focused on line managers, employees and their supervisors. Although the focus on these categories of staff has improved our understanding of the field, the recent developments in HRM call for investigation into the views of those who help managers design, implement and interpret HRM strategy and policies. Here we are referring to Human Resource (HR) managers.

Investigation of HR managers' views is important for a number of reasons. Firstly, to provide an understanding of whether their views are in harmony

with some of the ideas associated with HRM models. Secondly, managerial attitudes could help to explain the extent to which HRM ideas have permeated the minds of practitioners. Thirdly, because HR managers play a role in designing, interpreting and advising on HRM policy and strategy, their views on work and organizational issues can shed light on what strategy and policy they might advocate when playing such a role. Fourthly, since HR managers help in the design and interpretation of HRM strategy and policy, if their views conflict with HRM ideas currently advocated, it would be a matter of concern for line managers who might believe in HRM ideas but had to rely on others (HR managers) for advice and interpretation.

In line with issues highlighted above, the present study seeks answers to the following questions: (a) What are the managerial attitudes to trade unions, trade union membership and its perceived effects on managerial career?; (b) Which type of reward(s) do managers consider most important?; (c) What are the managers' attitudes to training and development (T&D)?; (d) Would managers promote interests of multiple stakeholders? To what extent do Human Resource (HR) and non-HR managers differ in their attitudes to the above questions.

BACKGROUND

HRM, like Total Quality Management (TQM), means different thing to different people. In fact, Storey (2001) argued that imprecision, variability, ambiguity and contradiction pervade the definitions of HRM. The discussion of the meaning of HRM is beyond the scope of this paper, therefore we chose some of the elements of the prescriptive and normative models of HRM to form the basis of the background literature. Some of the elements of the models relate to work attitudes, employee participation, trade unionism, training and development, and organizational stakeholders.

One of the central assumptions of HRM is the idea of employee commitment (Legge, 1989). Employee commitment can be engendered through the traditional ideas of intrinsic and extrinsic reward. Thus, the importance of these rewards cannot be ignored under any model of managing employees. For example, Legge (1995: 175) observed that "commitment is often associated with those 'soft' HRM policies of participation, team working and briefing, multiskilling, developmentally oriented appraisal, reward and training policies thought to be generative as well as expressive of individualistic 'high trust' organizational culture, as opposed to the collectivistic 'low trust' cultures of stereotyped 'contracts manager' personnel management". And Guest (1995) argued that autonomy and self-control, as opposed to hierarchy and managerial control, is what characterises HRM. Indeed, reward has been advocated as a means of achieving HRM goals of employee commitment, and organizational performance (Kessler, 1995). To the extent that commitment remains central to any model of managing people, both categories of reward should be considered relevant in achieving organisational objectives. Managers' attitudes to the types of reward could influence their strategies for eliciting employee commitment.

Another key element of practice central to HRM is employee participation. Both normative and prescriptive models of HRM see employee involvement not only as a means of gaining commitment, but as an indication of how the employee is valued by the organization, and the premium managers put on employee contributions to the organization (Marchington & Wilkinson, 1996). However, Marchington (1995: 280) argues that the significance of employee involvement in HRM would depend on the model of HRM. He argues that "if HRM is conceived in terms of its 'hard' variant, where the major issue is how well the management of human resources is integrated with other elements of corporate strategy, then the place of employee involvement is far from assured." Marchington (1995) is of the view that under the 'soft' variant of HRM model, especially when an organisation competes on quality rather than

price, employee involvement is likely to be a significant HRM practice. Although managers adopt participation schemes for a number of reasons, their initial attitudes to the type and extent of participation would probably determine their commitment to it.

Early proponents of HRM such as Beer & Spector (1985) argued that the set of assumptions underlying HRM policies include: (a) people considered as the key asset of the organisation; (b) development of the interests of stakeholders for the common good; (c) participation and informed choice. In line with the idea of putting a high premium on employee contributions through participation, training and development is considered a major means through which this can be achieved. Also, the consideration of employees as the most important assets in the organisation implies that quality rather than the number of employees is the most significant factor. Hence, training and development is considered crucial to achieving HRM objectives, and training and development is particularly emphasised at managerial level. For example, Legge (1989) contends that whereas personnel management focuses exclusively on management of non-managerial employees, HRM focuses on the development of the management team. The emphasis in management development is based on the growing recognition that quality of managers will influence the achievement of organisational objectives. Again managers' attitudes would determine their commitment to T&D as a means of achieving organisational objectives.

Many researchers have argued that the HRM model takes a unitary view of employment relations. For example, in his early attempt to provide better understanding of the differences between Personnel Management and HRM, Storey (1992) argues that the nature of employment relations under an HRM regime would be *unitary*. Indeed, Beer & Spector's (1985) assumption of coincidence of interest between stakeholders smacks of a "common interest" assumption the under unitary perspective of employment relationships.

However, recent theories and research have demonstrated that HRM and Industrial Relations (IR) can coexist side-by-side (Guest, 2001; Kochan & Osterman, 1994; Cully et al, 1999; Storey, 1992; 2001). Guest (2001) argued that "HRM and a union presence are potentially compatible and potentially beneficial" (pp 101). In fact evidence from a British survey indicates that there are more HRM practices in unionised than in non-unionised organisations (Cully et al, 1999). However, to the extent that HRM is unitary in perspective, the promotion of interests of multiple stakeholders in an organisation is not likely to happen. At any rate, the attitudes of managers would influence the extent to which interests of multiple stakeholders are promoted in an organisation.

GENERAL HYPOTHESIS

This brief review of literature shows that some HRM models place emphasis on employee participation, trade unions, multiple stakeholders, training and development and commitment through Job Satisfaction. Therefore, to the extent that HR managers hold views favourable to HR, their attitudes to the above issues should be favourable. It would be interesting to investigate also whether HR managers would be more likely to have favourable attitudes to employee participation and trade unions for example, than non HR managers. Therefore, we hypothesised that because they are more likely to appreciate the ideas advocated by HRM literature, HR managers are more likely to have favourable attitudes to employee participation, trade unions, multiple stakeholders and, training and Development (T&D).

METHODOLOGY

This paper is based on a survey of members of the Miami valley Human Resource Association. 302 members were contacted to indicate their willingness to participate in the survey. The list of members was obtained

from the members' directory. Questionnaires were then distributed to willing members. 110 questionnaires were returned, and all the questionnaires were usable. This makes a 36.4% return rate. 68.2% of the respondents hold managerial position in HRM. 82% are from the private sector. 48.6% of the respondents are male. 40% of the respondents are from the age group 41-50 years. 78.9% of the respondents have been with their current employer for more than one year; while 22.9% of them have been with their current employer for more than ten years. 33.6% of the respondents have been worked for more than one employer. The rest have changed employer between 4 and 8 times.

ATTITUDES TO WORK

Although HRM focuses on commitment as a means of achieving organisational objectives, organisational commitment can be engendered by satisfying employees' psychological and social needs. In order to investigate the respondents' attitude to what they consider important from their job, a set of eight questions was used in a Likert type five-point scale. The respondents were asked to indicate how important they regard certain dimensions of their jobs. The answers to the set of questions should shed light on whether, the rewards from work which can engender commitment are actually considered important by managers themselves. The answers to the set of questions are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Mean and Standard Deviation of Importance Attached to Reward

Thinking of the Job you do, how Important are the following to you	Mean	S.D
1. Feelings of self-esteem	6.02	1.04
2. Opportunity for personal growth	6.09	1.15
3. Autonomy	6.36	0.79
4. Job security	6.10	1.17
5. Pay	5.88	0.97
6. Remuneration package	5.98	1.01
7. Opportunity to make friends	4.43	1.59
8. Opportunity for promotion	5.32	1.65

As can be seen from the data presented, all the dimensions of rewards from work are considered important by the respondents. The study also analysed the importance attached to the eight dimensions of work and found that there are some significant differences in the mean scores. This means that not all the dimensions of reward from work are considered equally important. Thus, to the extent that managers would act according to what they consider important in a job, one would expect the respondents to advocate multiple dimensions of reward in order to elicit employee commitment. But each dimension of reward would have different emphasis from managers.

The paper hypothesised that because HR managers are more likely to appreciate the importance of multiple dimensions of reward, they would differ from non-HR managers in their attitudes to the set of eight items in the construct. To test this proposition analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed.

Table 2. ANOVA of Managerial attitudes to work

Thinking of the Job you do, how Important are the following to you	HRM Managers	Non-HRM Managers	F.	Sig.
1. Feelings of self-esteem	6.02	6.18	.320	.925
2. Opportunity for personal growth	6.23	6.15	.677	.668
3. Autonomy	6.36	6.25	1.387	.227
4. Job security	6.11	6.17	.713	.640
5. Pay	5.79	5.88	.624	.711
6. Remuneration package	5.95	5.88	.979	.443
7. Opportunity to make friends	4.20	4.17	1.424	.213
8. Opportunity for promotion	5.45	5.32	1.198	.313

The analysis of variance revealed no significant differences between HR and non-HR managers regarding attitudes to the dimensions of reward. Contrary to the propositions advanced in the paper, it appears that there is no distinction between those who work in the HR area and other areas. However, this result does not necessarily mean that the two sets of managers would advocate the same types of reward in their organizations. In other words, what they consider important for themselves might not be considered important for employees as well. For example, some managers might want autonomy for themselves, but might be less willing to grant autonomy to their employees. We can conclude from this result that both extrinsic and intrinsic rewards are considered important by the two categories of managers. And the potential of this attitude in influencing managers' strategy for gaining commitment from their employees is still there.

EMPLOYEE PARTICIPATION

Employee participation is central to the HRM model. It is viewed as a means of ensuring that employees contribute to the organisation (Marchington, 1995). Managers who view participation as a means of achieving

organizational objectives are more likely to have favourable attitudes to it. In line with our general hypothesis, we expect HR managers to have more favourable attitudes to employee participation than non-HR managers. To test this proposition, two sets of questions on financial and non-financial participation were used. Tables 3 and 4 provide results of the analyses.

Table 3. Frequency of Managerial Attitudes to Employee Participation

Items	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Indifferent	Agree	Strongly agree	Mean	STD
1. There should be a place for employee participation in all organisations	.9	.9	2.7	42.7	53.6	4.48	.65
2. Managers' views should be "represented" in any scheme for employee participation	.9	3.6	19.1	58.2	19.1	3.93	.73
3. Employers' views should be "represented" in any scheme for employee participation	1.8	1.8	16.4	60.9	20.0	3.97	.72
4. Employee participation diminishes the role of middle and junior managers	29.1	53.6	8.2	5.5	4.5	2.03	1.0
5. Regular meetings between workgroups and their supervisors are an appropriate form of employee participation	.9	5.5	16.4	50.0	28.2	3.97	.86

The data suggest that the majority of the managers (96.3%) believed that there should be a place for employee participation in all organisations. And most of them (82.7%) do not believe that participation diminishes the role of middle managers. However, the respondents would like to see the views of managers (77.3%) and employers (80.9%) represented in any participation scheme. The managers also subscribe to the minimalist view of participation.

This is because they view regular meetings between workgroups and the supervisor as an appropriate form of employee participation (78.2%).

Analyses of variance between the two sets of managers regarding attitudes to employee participation did not provide a significant difference between HR and non-HR managers. This result failed to support the general proposition and the expectation that HR managers are more likely to have favourable attitudes to employee participation than non-HR managers.

Employee participation has a financial dimension. Many writers and practitioners view financial participation as a means of improving employee commitment and productivity (Poole & Jenkins, 1991; Richardson & Nejad, 1986; Nut, 1987). The present study investigated managerial attitudes to financial participation as well. The respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which they are in favour of profit sharing, profit sharing with stock options, and Executive Stock Plans.

Table 4. Frequency of Managerial Attitudes to Financial Participation

To what extent are you in favour of	Strongly not in favour	Not in favour	Indifferent	In favour	Strongly in favour	Mean	STD
1. Profit sharing with Cash	0	1.8	9.1	52.7	35.5	4.27	.82
2. Profit sharing with Stock options	0	1.8	14.5	50.0	33.6	4.20	.87
3. Executive Stock Plans	.9	10.0	35.5	35.6	20.0	3.73	1.28

The data analysed revealed that the majority of the managers are in favour of financial participation. Profit sharing with cash reward is the most favoured ($\bar{x} = 4.27$), while Executive Stock plans is the least favoured ($\bar{x} = 3.73$). In fact, only about half (55.6%) of the sample is in favour of executive stock plans,

whereas 88.2% are in favour of profit sharing with cash. However, based on the data in Table 3, it appears that managers are more in favour of non-financial participation than financial participation. For example, the mean score for "There should be a place for participation in all organisations" is significantly greater ($x = 4.48$) than mean score for the three items in Table 4.

In order to test the proposition that HR managers would differ from other managers on employment relations issues, analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted. The result of the analysis did not reveal any significant difference between the two groups. This means, that attitudes to financial and non-financial factors are similar across the two groups of managers.

ORGANISATION STAKEHOLDERS

The *Pluralist* perspective to employment relations assume multiple interests in an organizational setting. This is based on the notion that employees and unions can have interests that are not identical to the organisation's interests. And many writers have argued that organisational success is influenced by the extent to which interests of stakeholders such as employees, trade unions, customers, and the public at large are satisfied. Yet, some researchers agree that HRM model is *unitary* in perspective. The present study attempts to investigate HR and non-HR managers' attitudes to multiple interests of stakeholders. Using a set of six questions, the respondents are asked to indicate whether they would promote the interests of multiple stakeholders.

Table 5. Managerial Attitudes to Multiple Stakeholders

Whose Interest Should Managers Promote	I definitely don't think So	Neutral	I Definitely think So	Mean	STD
1. Owner/Shareholders	4.5	11.8	83.6	4.21	.86
2. Managers	5.5	21.8	72.7	3.88	.86
3. Employees	1.8	9.1	81.1	4.26	.70
4. Consumers	2.7	8.2	89.1	4.32	.81
5. Suppliers	17.3	30.9	61.8	3.43	.96
6. Public at large	7.3	20.9	71.8	3.87	.88

The analyses of the data revealed that most managers support the idea of promoting the interests of multiple stakeholders. Most of them are willing to promote the interest of multiple stakeholders. Consumers' interest was ranked the highest by the managers ($X = 4.32$). In fact almost ninety percent (89.1%) of the managers believed that management should promote the interest of consumers. Interest of owners ($X = 4.21$) and employees ($X = 4.26$) were considered by the managers as almost of equal importance. This is rather an interesting revelation given that some researchers argued that most organisations put the interests of their owners first. And consumers rather than employees come second in the managers' list of priorities vis-a-vis stakeholders.

A further analysis of the data revealed some significant differences between HR managers and non-HR managers. The significant differences are in promoting the interests of managers ($f = 3.021$; $P = .009$), and employers ($f = 2.453$; $P = .029$). In both cases HR managers are more likely to promote the interest of managers ($x = 4.04$ against $x = 3.88$) and employers ($x = 4.32$ against $x = 4.26$) than non HR managers.

MANAGERIAL ATTITUDES TO TRADE UNIONS

The role of trade unions is one of the most contentious issues in many HRM theories. While early writers such as Beer & Spector (1985) see a role for unions in their HRM model, other writers are sceptical of the HRM model vis-à-vis the position of unions in organisations. Such writers see HRM as essentially unitary, a perspective originating from across the Atlantic (USA). Using a set of six questions, the respondents are asked to indicate the extent to which they agree with statements regarding trade unions in the organisation and the role they play.

Table 6. Frequency of Managerial Attitudes to Trade Unions

Items	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Indifferent	Agree	Strongly agree	Mean	STD
Unions have more power than management	7.3	43.6	22.7	20.9	4.6	2.77	1.19
Unions in USA today have too much power	0.9	26.4	21.8	33.6	17.3	3.40	1.09
Unions do not act in organizations' economic interests	2.7	10.0	14.5	48.2	24.5	3.82	1.01
Unions should be solely concerned with pay and conditions	17.3	35.5	22.7	16.4	8.2	2.63	1.19
Union membership should be purely voluntary	1.8	0.9	8.2	35.5	53.6	4.38	.82
A union should be prepared if necessary to use any form of industrial action which may be effective	35.5	35.5	20.9	3.6	4.5	2.10	1.22

As far as trade unions in America are concerned, about half of the sample (50.9%) believe that they have too much power. A significant percentage (72.7%) of the managers do not believe that trade unions are acting in the organisations' economic interest. Slightly more than half of the respondents (52.8%) believe that trade unions should be concerned with issues beyond pay and working conditions. The overwhelming percentage of managers (89.1%) would like to see trade union membership as purely voluntary. And the majority (71%) do not like trade unions to take industrial action.

As a further attempt to investigate managerial attitudes to trade unions, the respondents were asked to indicate whether they need representation through trade unions. They were also asked to indicate whether they are members of a trade union, and what effect trade union membership can have on their promotion opportunities. The result of our analyses revealed that the majority (92.8%) did not think that they needed any kind of collective representation. Most of the respondents (99.1%) indicated that they are not members of any trade union organisations. Perhaps this is because the majority of the respondents (64.5%) believe that membership of trade unions hinders promotion opportunities.

Analyses of variance between HR and non-HR managers did not reveal any significant differences between the two groups. In other words, attitudes to trade unions as well as perceptions of the need and effect of trade union membership are similar across HR and non-HR managers.

MANAGERIAL ATTITUDES TO TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT

The significance of training and development to individuals and organisations cannot be overemphasised. To proponents of HRM, training and development is central to achieving organisational objectives. Hence, organisations are urged to give top priority to developing their human resources. The training and development literature also recommends that development of human resources should take place at all levels. In addition to the support organisations should give to its managers, they should also encourage their managers to take responsibility for developing their colleagues. The growing importance of training and development and professionalisation of managerial jobs have increased further the impetus to the need for managers to obtain professional qualifications. The acquisition of

professional managerial qualifications is sometimes viewed as a means of furthering managerial careers as well as an indication of how competent managers are.

The present study investigated managers' attitudes to some of the issues highlighted in the T&D literature. Using Likert type five-point scale, the respondents are asked to indicate the extent of their agreement to the statements forming two sets of constructs measuring managerial attitudes to training and development.

Table 7. Managerial Attitudes to Training and Development

Items	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Indifferent	Agree	Strongly agree	Mean	STD
1. Management Development should be a top objective of every organization	0.9	0	4.5	56.4	38.2	4.31	.65
2. Management development should be supported by the organizational resources	0	0.9	1.8	60.9	36.4	4.33	.56
3. There should be a plan for management development at personal level	0	0.9	2.7	51.8	44.5	4.40	.59
4. Managers should be responsible for the development of their colleagues	1.8	5.5	19.1	44.5	29.1	3.97	1.04
5. Organizations should encourage continuous self-development	0	0	0.9	42.7	56.4	4.55	.52
6. There should be encouragement of management certification	0	1.8	10.0	53.6	34.5	4.21	.69

As can be seen from the data presented in Table 7, most of the respondents agree with the ideas advocated in the literature. In a nutshell, the managers believe that T&D should be a primary organisational objective and should be supported with all the resources needed. They also seem to be saying that

T&D should not be left to chance. In line with the concept of the learning organisation and TQM, the managers subscribe to the idea of continuous self-development, and seem to support the view that T&D should not be left to the individual alone. In other words, managers have responsibility for developing their colleagues.

The general proposition advanced in this paper that HR and non-HR managers would differ in their attitudes to employment relation issues was tested. Again analysis of variance failed to provide evidence of significant difference between the two groups of managers. Table 8 provides data on the second set of questions that investigated managerial attitudes to T&D.

Table 8. Managerial Personal Views on Training and Development

Items	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Indifferent	Agree	Strongly agree	Mean	STD
1. Management Development help me to do my job properly	0	0	4.5	65.5	30.0	4.25	.53
2. Training helps to keep up to date with development in my field	0	0	2.7	62.8	34.5	4.32	.52
3. Training helps me to develop as a manager	0	0	5.5	58.1	36.4	4.31	.57
4. Management certification help me to change job	4.5	20.9	40.0	26.4	8.2	3.13	.99
5. Management certification indicates that I am a good managers	19.1	43.6	28.2	9.1	0	2.27	.88
6. Management certification will help me to be promoted	10.0	30.9	32.7	25.5	0.9	2.76	.98
7. Management certification increases my interest in further training	10.9	20.9	32.7	33.6	1.8	2.95	1.03

The data presented in Table 8 indicate that most of the managers acknowledged the benefit of Training and Development to their jobs and

career. For example, a significant majority (95.5%) believe that Management Development will help them to do their job. However, the respondents do not believe that acquisition of formal qualification in Management is an indication of their competency as managers ($\chi = 2.27$). They are also under no illusion that a certificate in management will open up opportunity for promotion ($\chi = 2.76$). Our analyses of variance between the two groups of managers did not provide support to the proposition that HR and non-HR managers would differ in their attitudes to employment relations and HR issues.

CONCLUSION

In spite of the growing interest in research on HRM theory and practice, much work remains to be done. This paper attempts to contribute to the research in the field by examining HR and non-HR managers' views on important issues pertaining to their jobs, employees, T&D, trade unions and stakeholders. The paper set out to test one general hypothesis that, because HRM managers are more likely to be familiar with the new developments in HRM theories and practices, their views on the issues investigated would be significantly different from non-HR managers.

Analyses of variance between the HR and non-HR managers did not provide conclusive evidence to support the general proposition. The only significant difference between the two groups is in attitudes to promoting the interest of stakeholders.

The significant similarity between HR and non-HR managers can be attributed to a number of reasons. Firstly, it could be an indication of the significant impact that the new ideas in managing people have on non-HR managers. As has been stated earlier, in the last two decades the field has witnessed significant development in theory and practice. This development

might have permeated through the minds of all practitioners resulting in similarity of attitudes revealed by the present study. Secondly, given that the sample was drawn from an association of HR practitioners, it is perhaps not surprising that the respondents share similar attitudes. The fact that some of them are not HR managers does not seem to be significant since they share similar interest in HRM issues, which is why they joined the association in the first place. And their affiliation with the association and the people they interact with could have influenced their attitudes, resulting in the similarity of attitudes revealed by the data.

Thirdly, the similarity in attitudes between the two groups to the sets of questions could be attributed to different factors, not common factors. For example, while attitudes to management development and training could have been influenced by the new development in HRM and their affiliation with the HR association, the respondents' attitudes to different aspects of rewards from the job they do could have been influenced by virtue of their position in the organisational hierarchy.

The results of this study have potential implications for theory and research. The first implication is replication of this study across a number of occupational groups and countries. Secondly, to the extent that this result is a representation of the views of all managers in America, the views expressed by some American researchers appear to be well supported. This is because the view that American managers are anti union does not seem to be supported by the data presented. Instead, Kochan & Dyer's (1995) view that HRM and IR can coexist seem to find support from our investigation. Although the majority of the respondents view trade unions as not acting in the organisations' economic interest, they view the role of unions as broader than issues of pay and working conditions. In fact the lack of difference between the two groups of managers seem to support this point of view.

Thirdly, the results of the present study provide some support to the views expressed by Beer & Spector (1985) that an effective HRM model should take into account of multiple stakeholders. The majority of the respondents believe that managers should promote the interests of multiple stakeholders.

Turning to the practical implications of the study to the extent that managerial attitudes will influence their behaviour, it can be argued that managers would advocate some of the ideas put forward by proponents of HRM. Ideas such as employee participation (including financial participation), training and development, mutual commitment advocated by Kochan and Dyer (2001) would find a home in organisations lead by our respondents.

REFERENCES

- Beer, M & Spector, B (1985), Corporate wide transformation in HRM, In R E Walton and P R Lawrence (eds) *Human Resource Management: Trends and challenges*, Boston: Harvard business School Press, pp 219-253.
- Guest, D (1995), Human Resource Management, Trade Unions and Industrial Relations, in J Storey (ed), *Human Resource Management: A Critical Text*, London: International Thomson Business Press, pp 110-141.
- Kochan, T, Mckersie, R B, & Capelli, P (1984), Strategic choice and Industrial Relations theory, *Industrial Relations*, 23(1), pp 16-39.
- Kochan, T, Katz, H C, & Mckersie, R B (1986), *The transformation of American Industrial Relations*, NY: Basic Books .
- Kochan, T, Dyer, L (1995), Human Resource Management: An American view, In J Storey (Ed), *Human Resource Management: A critical Text*. London: International Thomson Business Press, pp 332-351.
- Kessler, I (1995), Reward systems, In J Storey (Ed), *Human Resource Management: A critical Text*, London: International Thomson Business Press.
- Legge, K (1989), Human Resource Management: A critical Analysis, In J Storey (Ed) *New Perspectives in Human Resource Management*, London: Routledge.
- Legge, K (1995), *Human Resource Management: Rhetoric and Reality*, London: MacMillan.
- Marchington, M (1995), Involvement and Participation, In J Storey (Ed), *Human Resource Management: A critical Text*, London: International Thomson Business Press, pp 280-305.
- Marchington, M & Wilkinson, A (1996), *Core Personnel and Development*, London: Institute of Personnel and Development.
- Nuti, D M (1987), Profit Sharing and Employment: Claims and Overclaims, *Industrial Relations*, 26(1), pp 18-29.
- Poole, M and Jenkins, G (1991), The impact of profit sharing and employee-shareholding schemes, *Journal of General Management*, 16(3), pp 52-72.
- Richardson, R & Nejad, A (1986), Employee share-ownership schemes in the UK: An evaluation?, *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 24(2) pp 233-250.

Storey (1989), *New Perspectives in Human Resource Management*, London: Routledge.

Storey (1995), *Human Resource Management: A critical Text*, London, London: International Thomson Business Press.

Storey (2001), *Human Resource Management: A critical Text*, London, London: Thomson Learning.