FIFTH EDITION

CONTEMPORARY HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

TEXT AND CASES

ADRIAN WILKINSON   TOM REDMAN   TONY DUNDON

PEARSON

CONTEMPORARY HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

CONTEMPORARY HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Text and Cases

Fifth Edition

Adrian Wilkinson,
Tom Redman
and Tony Dundon

To Erin and Aidan
and
Rachel and Rosie
and
Diane, Liam and Kate

This page intentionally left blank

BRIEF OF CONTENTS

CONTENTS

PART 2
CONTEMPORARY THEMES AND ISSUES

CASE STUDIES AND EXERCISES

EDITORS

Adrian Wilkinson is Professor and Director of the Centre for Work, Organisation and Wellbeing at Griffith University, Brisbane, Australia. Prior to his 2006 appointment, Adrian worked at Loughborough University in the United Kingdom where he was Professor of Human Resource Management from 1998 to 2006. Adrian has also worked at the Manchester School of Management at the University of Manchester Institute of Science and Technology. He holds Visiting Professorships at Loughborough University, the University of Sheffield and the University of Durham, and is an Academic Fellow at the Centre for International Human Resource Management at the Judge Institute, University of Cambridge. Adrian has authored, co-authored and edited some 25 books, over 150 articles in refereed journals and numerous book chapters. His books (with co-authors) include *Making Quality Critical* (Routledge, 1995); *Managing Quality and Human Resources* (Blackwell, 1997); *Managing with TQM: Theory and Practice* (Macmillan, 1998); *Understanding Work and Employment: Industrial Relations in Transition* (Oxford University Press, 2003); *Human Resource Management at Work* (5th edition, Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development, 2012); *The SAGE Handbook of Human Resource Management* (Sage, 2009); *The Oxford Handbook of Participation in Organisations* (Oxford University Press, 2010); *The Research Handbook of The Future of Work and Employment Relations* (Elgar, 2011); *The Future of Employment Relations* (Palgrave, 2011); *The Handbook of Comparative Employment Relations* (Elgar, 2011) and *The International Handbook of Labour Unions* (Elgar, 2012). *Contemporary Human Resource Management* (Pearson, 2013); *The Oxford Handbook of Employment Relations* (OUP, 2014) and the *Handbook of Research on Employee Voice* (Elgar, 2014).

He is a Fellow and Accredited Examiner of the Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development in the UK and a Fellow of the Australian Human Resource Institute. Adrian was appointed as a British Academy of Management Fellow in 2010. He is an Academician of the Academy of Social Sciences and a Fellow of the Australian Academy of Social Sciences. Adrian is Joint Chief Editor of the *Human Resource Management Journal* (HRMJ).

Tom Redman was Professor of Human Resource Management. Before joining Durham Business School, Tom was a Professor of Human Resource Management at the University of Sheffield. Prior to this he was Professor of Human Resource Management at the University of Teesside. Tom also spent 10 years in industry, in quality, production and HR management positions (mainly with Royal Worcester Porcelain) prior to re-entering academic life. His books include *Managing Managers* (Blackwell, 1993) and *Managing with TQM: Theory and Practice* (Macmillan, 1998) and *The SAGE Handbook of Human Resource Management* (Sage, 2009). He was a Fellow of the Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development. Sadly, Professor Redman passed away suddenly during the production stages of this edition of the book. He will be sadly missed. His work and influence on the field of HRM continues.

Tony Dundon is Professor of Human Resource Management and Employment Relations at Alliance Manchester Business School, University of Manchester, UK, and is a visiting honorary professor at University of St Andrews and the Kemmy Business School, University of Limerick. Tony's research areas include employment relations, human resource management and organisational performance, employee voice and trade union organising. Professor Dundon is a Fellow of the Academy of Social Sciences (FAcSS), former Chief Examiner for the Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development (CIPD), joint Editor-in-Chief of the *Human Resource Management Journal* (HRMJ), Consulting Editor for the *International Journal of Management Reviews* (IJMR); International Advisory Board Member of *Work, Employment and Society* (WES). Tony has held visiting positions at Sydney University; Deakin University, Melbourne; Toulouse Business School, France; and Queensland University of Technology. His books include *Understanding Employment Relations*, (2nd edition, McGraw Hill, 2011); *Cases in Global Management: Strategy, Innovation and People Management* (Tilde University Press, 2012); *Global Anti-Unionism* (Palgrave, 2013) and *Handbook of Research on Employee Voice* (Edward Elgar, 2014).

CONTRIBUTORS

Peter Ackers	Professor of Employment Relations, Department of HRM, De Montfort University, Leicester
Deirdre Anderson	Senior Lecturer in Organisational Behaviour, School of Management, Cranfield University
Thomas A. Birtch	Associate Professor, Department of International Business and Management, University of Nottingham, China, Senior Research Fellow, Institute for Manufacturing, University of Cambridge, UK, and Director, International Centre for Incentives, Rewards, and Performance
Aline Bos	Researcher/Assistant Professor, Utrecht School of Governance Consulting, Utrecht University, The Netherlands
Paul Boselie	Professor, Utrecht School of Governance, Utrecht University, The Netherlands
Michelle Barker	Professor, Griffith Business School, Griffith University
Sara Branch	Research Fellow, Griffith Criminology Institute, Griffith University
Michelle Brown	Professor of Management (Human Resource Management), University of Melbourne
David A. Buchanan	Emeritus Professor of Organizational Behaviour, Cranfield University School of Management
Samantha Callan	Associate Director for Families and Mental Health, Centre for Social Justice – Independent UK think tank
	Honorary Research Fellow, School of Clinical Sciences and Community Health, College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine, Edinburgh University
Catherine Cassell	Deputy Dean of Business School and Professor of Organisational Psychology, Leeds University
Jenny Chan	Lecturer and Junior Research Fellow, School of Interdisciplinary Area Studies, Kellogg College, University of Oxford.
Alistair Cheyne	Professor of Organisational Psychology and Director of Internationalisation and Accreditation, School of Business and Economics, Loughborough University
Flora F. T. Chiang	Professor, Department of Management, Hong Kong Baptist University
David G. Collings	Professor of Human Resource Management, Dublin City University
Edel Conway	Professor of Human Resource Management, Dublin City University
Michael Dickmann	Professor of International Human Resource Management and Program Director MSc in Management, Cranfield University
Tony Dobbins	Professor of Employment Studies, Bangor Business School
Elaine Farndale	Associate Professor of Human Resource Management, School of Labor and Employment Relations, and Center Director, Center for International Human Resource Studies, The Pennsylvania State University
Mark Gilman	Director, Business Improvements and Growth (BIG) Associates Ltd
Irena Grugulis	Professor of Work and Skills, Leeds University Business School
Cynthia Hardy	Laureate Professor, Department of Management and Marketing, University of Melbourne
Philip Hancock	Professor of Work and Organisation, Essex Business School
Geraint Harvey	Senior Lecturer in HRM and Industrial Relations, Birmingham Business School, University of Birmingham
Gail Hebson	Senior Lecturer in Employment Studies, Manchester Business School

Donald Hislop	Reader in Sociology of Contemporary Work, and Head of Discipline, Human Resource Management and Organisational Behaviour, School of Business and Economics, Loughborough University
Louise Hopper	Company HR Manager, Herts for Learning Ltd
Scott Hurrell	Lecturer in Management , Work and Organisation, University of Glasgow
Clare Kelliher	Professor of Work and Organisation, Cranfield School of Management, Cranfield University
Ashlea Kellner	Research Fellow, Centre for Work, Organisation and Wellbeing, Griffith University
Gill Kirton	Professor of Employment Relations, School of Business and Management, Queen Mary, University of London
Nicholas Kinnie	Associate Dean Undergraduate Taught Students, and Professor in Human Resource Management, School of Management, University of Bath
John Loan-Clarke	Former Senior Lecturer in Organisational Development, Loughborough University
Aoife M. McDermott	Senior Lecturer in Human Resource Management, Cardiff Business School, Cardiff University
Paula K Mowbray	Doctoral Student, Griffith University
Sheryl Ramsay	Senior Lecturer, Griffith Business School, Griffith University
Hugh Scullion	Formerly Professor in International Management, at the Cairnes School of Business and Economics, NUIGalway
Agnieszka Skuza	Assistant Professor, Poznan University of Economics and Business
Dora Scholarios	Professor of Work Psychology, Organisational Behaviour and Human Resource Management, University of Strathclyde
Ruth Smyth	Head of HR (Europe and Americas), Alexander Mann Solutions
Juani Swart	Associate Dean Faculty, Professor in HRM and Director, Work and Employment Research Centre (WERC), School of Management, University of Bath
Paul Thompson	Professor of Employment Studies, University of Stirling
Peter Turnbull	Professor of Management, School of Economics, Finance & Management, University of Bristol
Melissa Tyler	Professor of Work and Organisation Studies, University of Essex
Maja Vidović	Lecturer, Rochester Institute of Technology Croatia
Diane van den Broek	Associate Professor, Work and Organisational Studies, The University of Sydney Business School
Steven Vincent	Professor of Work and Organisation, and Head of Leadership, Work and Organisation, Business School, Newcastle University
Geoffrey Wood	Dean and Professor of International Business, Essex Business School, University of Essex
Xiaozheng Zhang	Senior Lecturer in Human Resource Management, Nottingham Business School, Nottingham Trent University

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

As with any book, the list of acknowledgements is extensive, but these are the most important. Thanks to our editor. As usual, our family and friends make a major contribution, and we are grateful to our families for their support while the book was being written.

While this book was being finalised, Tom sadly passed away. He will be missed.

Text

PART 1

FUNDAMENTALS OF HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

CHAPTER 1

HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT: A CONTEMPORARY PERSPECTIVE

Adrian Wilkinson, Tom Redman and Tony Dundon

Introduction

This book is about Human Resource Management (HRM) and is concerned with the way in which organisations manage their people. In this introductory chapter we discuss our own approach to the study of HRM and the rationale underpinning the ordering and presentation of material in the book. Our aim is to chart the broad terrain of a rapidly developing field of study in order to prepare the reader for the more finely grained treatment of specific HRM topics to be found in the individual chapters. In particular, we examine the rise of HRM, the effects of the changing context of work on HRM, the strategic nature of HRM practice, its impact on organisational performance and the changing role of the HR function. The chapter concludes with a consideration of our views on the audience at which the book is targeted and some thoughts on how it may best be used.

The development of HRM

The roots of HRM can be found in the emergence of industrial welfare work from the 1890s, as organisations driven by a mix of humanitarian, religious and business motives began to provide workplace amenities such as medical care, housing and libraries. In addition, employment offices were established to deal with hiring, payroll and record keeping. When scientific management emerged, the principles of science were also to be applied to the management of people as well as the management of production. We see here the shift from direct systems of management (personal supervision, traditional paternalism and simple piecework systems) to more technical systems of management and bureaucratic forms of employment (Gospel, 2009). From here the HRM function came to life, responsible for establishing modern personnel methods (Kaufman, 2010b), and we have seen a growing professionalisation of the role. However, it has been seen as largely an administrative function dealing with the 'labour problem' rather than contributing to strategic goals. The former welfare and personnel administrative tradition is the backcloth to the rise in HRM.

The past 20 years or so have seen the rise of what has been called the new HRM orthodoxy (Bacon, 2003; Guest, 1998; Torrington *et al*., 2014; Wilkinson *et al*., 2009). In the mid-1980s in the UK, and earlier in the US, the term 'HRM' became fashionable and gradually started to replace others such as 'personnel management', 'industrial relations' and 'labour relations'. The practitioners of people management are no longer personnel officers and trainers but are HR managers and human resource developers (and importantly, line managers). The 1990s saw the launch of new journals and the flourishing of university courses in HRM; many of these in the UK are now endorsed and professionally accredited by the Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development (CIPD). A new HRM bandwagon was well and truly rolling.

Early contributions on the implications of the rise of HRM were concerned to define it and to compare it with the more traditional approach to personnel management (e.g. Guest, 1987). HRM was in turn both heralded as 'a new era of humane people oriented employment management' (Keenoy, 1990: 375) and derided as a 'blunt instrument to bully workers' (Monks, 1998), especially with the decline of collective bargaining and the reduced influence of trade unions (Nolan and Wood, 2003). There has been considerable ambiguity in the use of the term, with various commentators using 'HRM' as simply a more modern label for traditional personnel management, as a 're-conceptualising and re-organising of personnel roles', or as a new and distinctive approach, attempting to develop and utilise the potential of human resources to the full in pursuit of an organisation's strategic objectives. It is the promise that is held by this latter view that has most excited practitioners and attracted the attention of management academics (Marchington and Wilkinson, 2012; Kaufman, 2015; Wilkinson and Johnstone, 2016).

There has long been a debate over whether HRM is no more than a relabelling of personnel management, the 'old wine in new bottles' critique, or something more fundamental (Legge, 1995; Kaufman, 2015). Traditionally, personnel management was characterised as having little focus on broader business links and being overly concentrated on the activities of personnel professionals, unions and a range of operational techniques. Thus personnel management was seen as a low-level record-keeping and 'people maintenance' function. The HRM stereotype, in contrast, is characterised as being much more concerned with business strategy, taking the view that HR is *the* most important organisational resource. Thus there has been much talk of an HRM 'revolution' with a transformation from administrative efficiency to the role of HRM as a fully-fledged strategic business partner. HRM, speculate Ulrich and Dulebohn (2015), has been on a journey with the purposeful singular direction which is to 'add value to the firm'.

The new HRM?

Boxall and Purcell (2011: 2) point out that defining HRM is important and should not be rushed. Definitions specify and clarify the intellectual space to be discussed and uncover the different perspectives on which to examine the subject and explain phenomenon. Some of the key defining features of HRM include 'beliefs and assumptions', 'strategic qualities', the 'critical role of managers', and finally 'key levers' (see Table 1.1). An earlier definition of HRM by Storey (1995) emphasises a particular set of policies identified with 'high-commitment management' or 'high-performance work systems':

> Human resource management is a distinctive approach to employment management which seeks to achieve competitive advantage through the strategic deployment of a highly committed and capable workforce, using an integrated array of cultural, structural and personnel techniques. *(Storey, 1995: 5)*

In contrast, a broader definition is provided by Boxall and Purcell:

> HRM includes anything and everything associated with the management of employment relationships in the firm. We do not associate HRM solely with a high-commitment model of labour management or with any particular ideology or style of management. *(Boxall and Purcell, 2000: 184)*

Bacon (2003) points out that if HRM is defined exclusively as high-commitment management then the subject marginalises itself to the discussion of a relatively small number of distinct companies since many organisations pursue a 'low-wage path'. The above 'exclusive' definition thus identifies HRM in contrast to other forms of labour management

Table 1.1 The new HRM model

1 **Beliefs and assumptions**

- That it is the human resource which gives competitive edge.
- That the aim should not be mere compliance with rules, but employee commitment.
- That therefore employees should, for example, be very carefully selected and developed.

2 **Strategic qualities**

- Because of the above factors, HR decisions are of strategic importance.
- Top management involvement is necessary.
- HR policies should be integrated into the business strategy – stemming from it and even contributing to it.

3 **Critical role of managers**

- Because HR practice is critical to the core activities of the business, it is too important to be left to personnel specialists alone.
- Line managers are (or need to be) closely involved as both deliverers and drivers of the HR policies.
- Much greater attention is paid to the management of managers themselves.

4 **Key levers**

- Managing culture is more important than managing procedures and systems.
- Integrated action on selection, communication, training, reward and development.
- Restructuring and job redesign to allow devolved responsibility and empowerment.

Source: Storey, 2007: 9.

(industrial relations or traditional personnel management), whereas the second inclusive definition covers all forms of labour management (Bacon, 2003: 73).

Slippage between these two differing definitions, the new HRM according to Storey and HRM as a more generic term, is the cause of considerable confusion, generating more heat than light in debates on HRM and its meaning. However, although evolution is less exciting than revolution, Torrington *et al*.'s (2014) view was that HRM is merely the next stage in the development of personnel management is persuasive. Torrington (1993), a staunch defender of 'good' personnel management, has also suggested that much of what is now labelled 'HRM' may be seen much more simply as longstanding good people management practice, while what was less effective has been relegated to remain, rather unfairly it seems, with the 'personnel management' brand.

Lewin (2008) defines HRM as the attraction, retention, utilisation, motivation, rewarding and disciplining of employees in organisations, and this connects with other contemporary definitions that see HRM as the 'management of people at work' (Marchington and Wilkinson, 2012). This seems a good approach, which is broad and less subject to fashion. The idea also conveys the shift in terms of a greater emphasis on the ways in which people are managed is as a resource which may positively contribute to organisational success and effectiveness. In discussing the importance of a broad definition, Boxall and Purcell (2011) suggest that:

> HRM refers to all those activities associated with the management of work and people in organisations . . . related terms such as 'employee relations', 'labour management' and 'people management' are used as synonymous for HRM . . . defining HRM as a particular style is obviously a legitimate way to proceed. It opens up questions such as: What practices constitute a high-commitment model. . . . [An] inclusive definition of HRM is more appropriate. *(Boxall and Purcell, 2011: 2, 9)*

In this sense HRM has an aspirational quality that connects with perspectives to elaborate on concepts such as employee motivation, performance, commitment, managerial power and legitimacy and ideology. Even an inclusive definition of HRM about the management of people can have its origins in one or more competing perspectives to the study and practice of HRM. Table 1.2 summarises four such competing approaches.

Table 1.2 Alternative approaches to the study and practice of HRM

Approach	Beliefs and Assumptions	Strategic Qualities	Role Line Mangers	Key Drivers
Matching Models (Hard)	Compliance	Calculative efficiency	Rule-bound	Product demand
(Soft)	Nurturing commitment	People-supportive policies	Coaching	Training and development
Organisational Performance	Performance-enhancing	Bundles of complementary HR policies	Strategic and measured KPIs	Internal and external fit (integration)
Radical (Critical) Management	Exploitation of people at work	Global business model (capitalist) sources of power	Authority agents of owners	Peer surveillance/ Control of labour process
Employee-Centric Approach	Critical of cause-and-effect assumptions	Balance of opposing interests	Significant and active agents	Integration of individual and collective orientated processes

Developed from ideas in Storey, 2007; Sisson, 2010; Kaufman, 2010b, 2015

The first can be labelled as '*Matching HR Models*'. An early and influential Matching Model was that known as the Michigan School of HRM, developed by Fombrun *et al*. (1984) and regarded as 'hard' HRM. The approach is to stress a very tight calculative (hard) fit between business needs and the way people are managed to ensure optimum employee effort and performance. The latter is measured by strict rules to select, reward, train and/ or replace employees. Hard HRM is often seen as an approach that views employees as akin to any other factor of production to be hired and fired on purely efficiency grounds. In contrast, another Matching Model was developed by Harvard Business School and became known as a 'soft' variant of HRM. Pioneered by Beer *et al*. (1985), the starting point was to consider stakeholder interests – including employee well-being – relative to business and context factors. It was known as an approach that sought to stress the word 'human' rather than the word 'resource'. While considered to be richer and more analytically fruitful than its harder variant, it was also more difficult to specify and assess such softer human attributes (Guest, 2015b).

A second perspective to the study and practice of HRM can be described as the '*Organisational Performance*' school. This will be discussed more extensively shortly, for now it is sufficient to acknowledge that for some, people management styles and HRM is 'the' key driver of sustainable competitive advantage and improved organisational performance. The *Organisational Performance* school has its roots in the Matching Models approach noted above; however, contemporary perspectives seek to present something of a universalistic and one-best-way scientific approach to quantify and measure bundles of HR practices that predict causal impact on profit, performance, productivity and employee effort (Huselid, 1995; Pfeffer, 1998). The guiding principle is that performance is first and foremost, with employee interests of lower order importance or significance (Guthrie *et al*., 2011).

A third and long-standing stream of literature engaged with the journey concerned with the way people are managed at work is a '*Radical'* or '*Critical Management*' perspective. Scholars such as Keenoy (1997; 2014), Thompson (2011) and Willmott (1993), among others, have a suspicion of what HRM claims to be from the start, even when they differ in terms of structural or post-structural explanations. The core intellectual contribution is rather than view HRM as a particular discursive model which may be performance-enhancing for the good of the firm, and by association good for employees and society, the radical perspective is much more critical and seeks to contextualise the management of people at work within the stages of capitalist development and managerial power and authority relations. The Radical school is concerned with power relationships at the workplace and across society, often explained by a global neo-liberal economic and political agenda that engenders discrimination and unfairness and not universal performance-enhancing outcomes. Interestingly, radical scholars further question the ethos and evolution of much university business school curricula and what and how the subject of HRM is taught Thompson (2011: 364) articulates the critical agenda to HRM thus:

> Employees do not expect a 'champion', but within the constraints of the capitalist employment relationship and organisational power structure, they would prefer to not be fed crap in the name of communication and to be treated with a degree of fairness. *(Thompson, 2011: 364)*

A final perspective is the '*Employee-Centric Approach*', also summarised in Table 1.2. This perspective maybe defined as more pluralist in seeking to manage and mediate divergent interests that are both cooperative but also antagonistic when managing people at work. It recognises collective as well as individual practices to manage people (Boxall and Purcell, 2011). As a perspective it is critical of normative cause-and-effect claims about HRM leading to improved organisational effectiveness, or as a system premised on an overly simplistic view of mutual cooperation between employer and employee (Boxall, 2013; Marchington, 2015; Purcell, 1999). A key feature of the 'Employee-Centric Approach' is how employees experience work and react to management policy and action. To this end, both workers and line managers are not assumed to be passive recipients but active agents embedded in a

system to balance opposing interests and objectives. As such, HRM involves a process of management–employee mutuality, or the balance of the need to both control employee effort while simultaneously seeking workforce cooperation (Boxall and Macky, 2014). At its very core, it relates back to Boxall and Purcell's (2011) extended discussion about the importance of definition, including influences such as managerial power and authority, union representation as well as non-union voice, management ideologies and societal and institutional embeddedness.

The changing context of work

> Things are happening in employment that are neither a cause nor an effect of HRM but which could have some impact on it. These include the intensification of work, the choices of work location provided by technology and the divisive nature of a society in which many are idle and impoverished while many others are seriously over-worked.
> *(Guest, 1998: 51)*

Even the more 'upbeat' HRM work such as that of Storey (1992), Pfeffer (1998) or Ulrich *et al.* (2007) indicates that changes in the arena of HRM did not come from initiatives designed directly to do this. Change was driven by broader organisational initiatives, and thus personnel specialists have not been seen as the key drivers of change. Similarly, Wood's (1999) work on high-commitment practices suggests that innovations in HRM tend to accompany changes in production systems and that innovations on humanistic grounds are unrealistic. Thus in part HRM can be seen as a consequence of managing in 'uncharted territory' with new rules governing the employment relationship (Wilkinson *et al.*, 2014).

In the main, developments in HRM have been driven by large-scale organisational changes as employers adjust to a more competitive external neo-liberal global economic environment (Sisson, 2010). To meet some of the challenges posed by intense competition, organisations have been downsized, delayered and decentralised (Nolan, 2011). Organisations are now less hierarchical in nature; have adopted more flexible forms and have been subjected to continuing waves of organisational change programmes such as total quality management, business process re-engineering, performance management, modernisation, lean production, outsourcing and off-shoring of core activities resulting in a seemingly relentless pressure on employees and line managers to push through culture change initiatives (Taylor *et al.*, 2014; Townsend and Dundon, 2015).

But we need to be careful: there is a danger that, because of the economic crisis, accounts of new managerial initiatives, internal policy changes or some sort of wider organisational restructuring are portrayed as some major paradigm-shifting transformation, when the reality might be rather different. The rhetoric of organisational change often relies too heavily on hype from unrepresentative examples (Beynon *et al.*, 2002; Thompson and O'Connel Davidson, 1995). Crouch (2013), for instance, argues that the power of large corporations has remained relatively intact if not, paradoxically, increased through the financial crisis. Corporate governance models project an image that some corporations or banks are assumed to be 'too big to fail' with a power resource to shape and control their own markets, dominate supply chain networks and how smaller firms manage their workers. Managers, it seems, often perceive themselves to be in the midst of massive organisational change. Eccles and Nohira's (1992) historical account of post-Second World War management traces how it has been the norm rather than the exception for practitioners and writers to view their organisational environment as turbulent and characterised by transformative change or, as Sorge and van Witteloostuijn (2004) put it, the nature of the change hype changes regularly just as flu viruses mutate over time.

Nevertheless, it does appear that the type of staff employed and the way they are managed has also undergone change. Rubery (2015) charts four specific changes, driven in part