

"A man is
great by
deeds, not by
birth"
-Chanakya

Welcome to IIMK



INDIAN INSTITUTE OF MANAGEMENT KOZHIKODE



Working Paper

IIMK/WPS/722/OBHR/2026/12

April 2026

**Enhancing SHRM's Contribution to Organizational
Performance in Uncertain Environments:
Selection as a Dynamic Capability**

Anjana Karumathil ¹

©

All rights belong to their respective author.

Please contact the corresponding author, if you would like to access the full paper.

¹ Professor, Organizational Behaviour and Human Resources Area, Indian Institute of Management Kozhikode, IIMK Campus PO, Kunnamangalam, Kozhikode, Kerala 673 570, India; Email - anjana@iimk.ac.in, Phone Number - 0484-2415264

Enhancing SHRM's Contribution to Organizational Performance in Uncertain Environments: Selection as a Dynamic Capability

Dr. Anjana Karumathil

Associate Professor of Practice

Indian Institute of Management Kozhikode

Abstract

This article examines how Strategic Human Resource Management (SHRM) equips organizations to build competitive advantage in uncertain environments. Drawing on the dynamic capability (DC) framework, it conceptualizes SHRM as a system capable of sensing, seizing and reconfiguring organizational capability in anticipation of environmental change. It uses a conceptual approach to demonstrate how traditional SHRM practices may be extended into dynamic applications. I focus on traditional employee selection, arguing that it could be reframed as an organization's dynamic capability through ongoing monitoring of changes in how workers perceive Person-Organization (P-O) fit. This enables organizations to anticipate attrition before it occurs. This paper adds to SHRM literature by integrating DC into traditional HR practices and positioning selection as a predictive, rather than reactive, mechanism.

Keywords: SHRM, Dynamic capability, Person-Organization fit, Selection, Organizational performance

1 Introduction

Can organizations thrive amidst environmental uncertainty? Confirming and disconfirming empirical evidence is available. Louçã & Mendonça (2002) report that across the US manufacturing industry, only 28 companies lasted for over 100 years. Foster & Kaplan (2001) demonstrate that the average lifespan of organizations has declined from 90 years in 1935 to 15 years in 2005. Meanwhile, GKN PLC is a 245-year-old company which began with coal mining and now manufactures automobile and aerospace parts. This contradiction has captured scholarly attention from strategy, sociology, personnel psychology, and more recently SHRM scholars (Wang *et al.*, 2012; Schenkel & Teigland, 2017), resulting in multiple theoretical explanations including market-based competitive advantage (Porter, 1979), resource-based view of the firm (RBV; Barney, 1991) and dynamic

capabilities (Teece *et al.*, 1997). An examination of patterns adopted by survivor and martyr organizations in volatile environments indicates that static theories of competitive advantage like RBV have been discarded and replaced by theories explaining organizational agility through combination or reconfiguration of existing resources in response to environmental demands, like the dynamic capabilities (DC) approach (O'Reilly III & Tushman, 2008).

SHRM systems in organizations surviving in uncertain environments adapt because they demonstrate ambidexterity, the ability to balance exploitation and exploration (March, 1991; Swart *et al.*, 2019; Malik *et al.*, 2019; Hansen *et al.*, 2019). Exploitation and exploration may be visualized as the trunk and branches of a tree: exploitation uses existing human capital resources profitably in alignment with cultural norms while exploration creates dynamic capabilities, new knowledge that may generate profits in the long run. The challenge in integrating these two disparate elements may be visualized using the metaphor of a mountaineer at the summit of one peak who must descend it to climb a taller peak nearby. While the taller peak may be more appealing, the descent from the current peak involves acknowledging the risk of losing one's current optima while also being unable to scale the next summit. Similarly, SHRM practitioners must make a conscious decision to invest in exploration by orchestrating and integrating assets to build firm-specific human capital with no guarantee of returns. SHRM systems that manage this through social and formal integration of work and employment practices like selection and training make strategic contributions to the performance of organizations in uncertain environments (Garaus *et al.*, 2016).

How can organizations deploy DCs to monitor decline in applicant perception of Person-Organization (P-O) fit as it occurs? This article offers avenues to answer this question. Given the human tendency to associate with similar others (Edwards & Cable, 2009; Hu *et al.*, 2016), individuals choose to work in organizations where they perceive a

high degree of P-O fit during selection. This perception may decline over time, resulting in attrition. While extant studies have researched this decline, their use of static methods has generated only post-facto results, meaning that the window of opportunity to reverse negative perception was missed. I propose that using a DC approach enables SHRM practitioners to monitor perception change contemporaneously and to predict attrition. Practitioners can then take remedial action to restore employee perceptions so that human capital continues to be retained within the organization.

2 Literature Review

2.1 The Evolution of SHRM

In the *Origin of Species*, Darwin (1859) argues that species come into existence through intergenerational cycles of variation, selection and retention. This biological principle has been extended to the study of organizations (Spencer, 1898) with the argument that any system containing processes of variation and retention, and subject to selection, is bound to evolve (Aldrich, 1999; Lengnick-Hall et al., 2009). The evolution of SHRM can be ascertained by a review of its focus areas over time. In the 1980s, SHRM research was primarily theoretical and focused on three areas: contingency perspectives and fit (Schuler & Jackson, 1987; Baird & Meshoulam, 1988), strategic contribution of HR (Tichy, 1981; Evans, 1986), and SHRM across organization boundaries (Lengnick-Hall & Lengnick-Hall, 1988). The 1990s saw increased focus on SHRM fit in international organizations (Delery, 1998; Wright & Snell, 1998; Milliman et al., 1991) and tensions between SHRM fit and flexibility (Wright & Snell, 1998). Bureaucratic and strategic HRM systems were differentiated (Mesch et al., 1995; Arthur, 1994). Boxall (1996) introduced the construct of ‘human resource advantage’ to explain how RBV could be applied to SHRM. Using RBV, HR systems were shown to contribute to competitive advantage by reducing competitive vulnerability (Lado & Wilson, 1994). Kamoche (1996) proposed a resource-capability view

and argued that a firm's stock of resources generates HR competencies strategic to the extent that they are linked with the core competencies of the organization. In the 2000s, the constructs of fit and flexibility became more intertwined (Ordonez de Pablos, 2005; Boxall & Purcell, 2000) and person-environment fit was proposed as a key determinant of SHRM philosophy (Werbel & DeMarie, 2005). The importance of context as contingency was reinforced empirically (Batt, 2000; Teo, 2000; Ericksen & Dyer, 2005), as was the strategic contribution of HRM towards competitive performance (Khatri, 2000; Harris & Ogbonna, 2001; Huang, 2000; Vlachos, 2008; Lepak et al., 2007; Nikandrou & Papalexandris, 2007). The scope of SHRM was extended to international business (Martin & Beaumont, 2001; Björkman & Lervik, 2007; Wei & Lau, 2005; Wang et al., 2007; Som, 2007; Wöcke et al., 2007; Ngo et al., 2008).

SHRM research continues in emerging economies, sustainable HR, implementation challenges and the possible reciprocal causality between HR systems and organizational performance (Aust et al., 2018; Malik, 2018; Cathy & Gollan, 2018; Shin & Konrad, 2017; King et al., 2017). This evolution appears to occur through multiple cycles of variation, selection and retention. Some 'variations' are triggered by environmental events and others by internal developments. Independent threads of research have become intertwined, such as HR system components and issues of fit (Lengnick-Hall et al., 2009). 'Selection' is manifested through some areas becoming more prevalent than others. 'Retention' is manifested through researchers' ability to build knowledge base and ask nuanced questions. A similar variation-selection-retention mechanism is manifested among HRM practitioners operating in environmental contexts characterized by competitive and strategic uncertainty (Van de Ven & Poole, 1995; Kulkarni & Ramamoorthy, 2005). Using the example of cochlear implant development, Van de Ven & Garud (1993) demonstrate how developing a product is influenced by multiple environmental constraints like research funding and

government approvals. According to Van de Ven & Poole (1995), environmental factors give rise to random organizational variations with unclear and unpredictable causes. In such circumstances, selection of response is based on competition for scarce resources and the feasibility of implementation within the organizational context. By continuously enriching the organization's knowledge base, retention eliminates a constant loop between variation and selection. In summary, whether in theory or practice, it is the decision taken in the 'selection' step that determines subsequent direction. Decisions are the outcome of respondents' skills and judgment which evolve as the field increases in complexity.

2.2 RBV's failure in explaining SHRM contribution to competitive advantage

The fundamental idea of RBV, that higher SHRM efficiency leads to increased firm performance, has triggered several empirical studies in HRM (Becker & Gerhart, 1996). RBV posits that a firm may be viewed as bundle of resources some of which are unique to the firm (Barney, 1991). One such unique bundle of resources is people who contribute to the firm's competitive advantage through the creation of human capital (Gawer, 2014; Wright et al., 2001; Appelbaum et al., 2000). According to Kaufman (2010, p. 292), "human capital represents one of the last and best sources of competitive advantage". By providing a theoretical bridge between SHRM and competitiveness, RBV explains why HR practices lead to competitive advantage, emerging as the "holy grail" (Purcell et al., 2007, p. 533) of SHRM research. Kaufman (2015) subsequently articulated criticisms of RBV to demonstrate its inadequacy for contemporary SHRM. He argued that SHRM incorporated the Valuable, Rare, Inimitable, Non-substitutable (VRIN) part of RBV while ignoring the competitive markets where organizations operated. In his view, this 'more is better' rule was illusory because in competitive markets, the return on all resources would be at a uniform risk-adjusted level,

hence all companies looking to generate additional return from SHRM would implement high performance work practices. Additionally, V in VRIN has been inadequately defined despite many articles on value (Lepak et al., 2007; Schmidt & Keil, 2013; Dattée et al., 2018). In economic terms, V is bound by the maximum price a buyer is willing to pay and the minimum price the firm must get. This implies a demand-supply component to value determination, however, RBV provides no such definition for V (Kaufman, 2015, p. 253). Barney & Clark (2007) argue that value is exogenous to RBV and that its predictions focus on the relationship between attributes of a resource and the sustainability of its competitive advantage. This makes V a tautology, because practitioners cannot invest in a valuable resource if they cannot determine value.

In summary, RBV is inadequate for value prediction in uncertain environments. If V is exogenous, competitive advantage depends on RIN (Kraaijenbrink et al., 2010). But, since market price is based on known information on the value of resources, predictions must be based on limited private information shielded from the market through causal ambiguity and path dependency. By investing in high performance work practices like training and internal promotion to differentiate and protect employees from competition, organizations remain locked into a rigid cost structure with an aging workforce having obsolete skills (Wright & Haggerty, 2005). The VRIN approach works in the short term but leads to long-term failure in competitive and dynamic markets (Kaufman, 2015).

2.3 Integrating DC into SHRM for Uncertain Environments

The shortcomings of RBV in supporting SHRM for uncertain environments have resulted in the DC perspective gaining traction in SHRM research (Wang et al., 2015). Although DCs have been part of strategic management literature for some years, they entered SHRM scholarship only a decade ago (Garavan et al., 2016). This could be because much

SHRM literature continues to be aligned with RBV perspectives (Garavan, 2007) and because DCs continue to be imprecisely defined despite substantial number of scholarly articles in this area (Garavan et al., 2016). In this article, I use the definition proposed by Teece et al. (1997, p. 516) for DCs: "the ability to integrate, build, and reconfigure internal and external competencies to address rapidly changing environments". From SHRM perspective, this means that HRM must create new capabilities while also altering and renewing its existing capabilities in response to demands posed by uncertain environments (Zollo & Winter, 2002). Using the DC approach, SHRM contributes to sustainable competitive advantage by creating distinctive capabilities through which organizations can improve their use of human resources (Vogel & Güttel, 2013; Festing & Eidems, 2011).

Garavan et al. (2016) propose a dynamic capability framework for SHRM as three concentric circles. The outermost ring consists of SHRM enablers: organizational characteristics that trigger the creation of DCs. These include the characteristics of SHRM practitioners, organization's HRM practices, processes and structure, and the alignment of SHRM with business objectives. The second ring indicates the components of these DCs as defined by Teece et al. (1997). Micro-foundations, the underlying individual and group actions that form inputs to organizational strategy, are depicted in the innermost ring (Eisenhardt et al., 2010). These include SHRM sensing, seizing and reconfiguring (Teece, 2007).

Enabling DCs in organizations relies on heterogeneous skills, cognition and action of SHRM practitioners (Mäkelä et al., 2012; Nuruzzaman et al., 2019; Maatman & Meijerink, 2017). In uncertain environments, swift and decisive decisions are achieved through a combination of firm-specific experience and practitioners' social capital (Gubbins &

Garavan, 2009; Garavan et al., 2017). SHRM processes like problem solving and communication along with organizational structures within which practitioners take decisions, influence SHRM capacity to adapt to dynamic environments (Garavan et al., 2016). Structures can be intentionally designed to facilitate the development of SHRM practitioners' social capital (Wang, 2003; Uen et al., 2012). Alignment of SHRM with business includes identifying the information needed to make a decision on SHRM practices, gathering this information and participating HRM practitioners in decision making (Wognum, 2001). For example, on-the-job training is valuable only when aligned with business goals of increased revenue through human capital (Garavan et al., 2016).

SHRM's capacity to co-evolve relationships constitutes an important component of building DCs. New stakeholders may emerge and take priority in dynamic environments. This may include relationships with external partners like training suppliers or internal stakeholders like new business units (Garavan et al., 2016). Coevolution of relationship implies reconnecting 'webs of collaboration' across the organization for optimal benefit. Examples include partnering with new stakeholders to develop new DCs instead of increased investment in current partners (Ketkar & Sett, 2010) or recalibrating HRM practices to meet changing human capital requirements (Ployhart & Moliterno, 2011; Nyberg & Wright, 2015; Wright et al., 2018). The outcomes of reconfiguration are new bundles of SHRM practices and re-bundled extant practices meeting new business priorities (Garavan et al., 2016).

SHRM's ability to sense opportunities before they materialize is critical to the development of DCs. SHRM needs to be alert to opportunities in the environment by spotting, interpreting and pursuing them, so that plans can be initiated to capitalize on them (Eisenhardt & Martin, 2000; Giudici et al., 2018). Seizing is the process of responding to

opportunities thus identified through designing new models, developing new capabilities or tapping into organizational learning. Assigning specific individuals and resources to a task, identifying synergies among resources and defining processes to facilitate collective action are examples of SHRM reconfiguration (Jarzabkowski, 2004).

Reconfiguring organizational capability based on environmental shifts keeps HR aligned with business. This requires that the workforce be fluid and flexible (Camps et al., 2016; Nijssen & Paauwe, 2012; Roberson et al., 2017; van der Velde & van den Berg, 2003). Fluidity means that re-configurations must be created and discarded quickly, while flexibility implies that employees must possess skills and behaviours that enable the organization to pursue multiple strategic alternatives (Beltrán-Martín & Roca-Puig, 2013; Maley, 2019). Examples of SHRM practices that build HR scalability include competency-based training and development activities that create a shared mindset (Tsai et al., 2016). Organizational learning capability equips organizations to manage uncertain environments by going beyond simply developing and applying information to converting extant learning into new knowledge (Garavan et al., 2016; Easterby-Smith & Prieto, 2008). This leads to the organizational capability of change and innovation manifested through job rotation, project-based tasks and exposure to new experiences. Organizations capable of innovation are better equipped to use employees' skills more effectively in a broad-based manner (Wei & Lau, 2010; Beltrán-Martín et al., 2008). In enabling this, SHRM equips employees to improvise, question status-quo, generate ideas and reflect for better understanding (Martin & Reddington, 2010; Amarakoon et al., 2018).

2.4 Ambidexterity as the Foundation of DCs in SHRM

To generate sustainable competitive advantage in uncertain environments, organizations must adopt a dual focus: on one hand, they must scan the environment for new opportunities while on the other they must continue to rely on current revenue generation capabilities. In the short term, organizations stay efficient through control and stability while in the long term, they innovate by taking calculated risks and learning by doing (Tushman et al., 1999). Successful integration of these opposite modes of operation called exploitation and exploration gives organizations the ability to rely on past certainties while being open to new possibilities (Gupta et al., 2006; March, 1991). Such organizational ambidexterity is the requisite foundation for efficient generation and deployment of SHRM DCs (Faisal Ahammad et al., 2015; Garaus et al., 2016; Kostopoulos et al., 2015; Hansen et al., 2019). Under moderate environmental uncertainty, variations in organizational processes and structures result in incremental, exploitative innovation while in radically uncertain environments, large volumes of variations are generated, making the HRM practitioner's adeptness in 'selection' crucial for exploration (Tushman et al., 1999).

High-velocity markets like social media are unpredictable; organizations in such environments must rely on sensing to explore threats and opportunities. Organizations with an exploratory SHRM architecture adapt and innovate based on simple rules in loosely coupled decentralized units (Bingham & Eisenhardt, 2011; Hansen et al., 2019). Here SHRM is 'commitment-based', meaning that it aims to develop loyal employees who can be trusted to make decisions aligned with organizational goals (Arthur, 1994, p. 672). Employment mechanisms are based on creating mutually advantageous relationships (Lepak & Snell, 2002). Employees are staffed based on the congruence between their skills and task requirements. Extensive firm-specific training is provided. On the other hand, in moderately dynamic environments, environmental demands are complex but predictable (Hansen et al., 2019). Examples are automobile and power industries whose leaders have been consistent

over time. Here organizations adopt an exploitative SHRM architecture where HRM systems are based on compliance and employment is job-based (Lepak & Snell, 2002). Organizations have more time to discuss alternatives and make centralized decisions. Tasks are standardized, limited training is provided and processes are replicated across markets to increase efficiency (Szulanski, 1996; Chuang et al., 2016). This architecture applies to organizations employing skilled workers like judges or pilots who are required to conform to preset rules and avoid exploration (Siggelkow & Rivkin, 2006). Ambidexterity is about identifying the right SHRM configuration that balances the need for innovation with inbuilt structural constraints.

The ambidextrous SHRM system proposed by Garaus et al. (2016) offers deeper understanding of how structurally differentiated organizations balance exploration and exploitation through integrative work and employment practices. Simon(2009) argues that ambidextrous HRM systems combine employment practices fostering social integration with work practices creating formal integration. Social integration is created by identifying staff whose values are congruent with the organization. After preselecting candidates with requisite skills, their P-O fit is determined and only candidates with high levels of fit move forward in the process. Long-term employment relationships are sought by selecting locals with similar backgrounds at a relatively young age.

Employee onboarding includes practices that foster emotional integration, such as taking group photographs. Cross-functional training is provided to new employees so that the product or service becomes central to their job irrespective of department. By bringing together people from different departments, a shared understanding of the product is created such that employees ‘fall in love’ with it and seek ways to improve it (Garaus et al., 2016). New employees undertake job rotation so that they understand how and why different departments interact, and what challenges others face.

Work practices in ambidextrous HRM systems comprise boundary spanning functions, cross-functional teams and practices that build social networks to facilitate collaboration and knowledge exchange throughout the organization. For example, business development managers are a group whose role formally integrates exploration and exploitation; while being responsible for timely delivery of existing projects, they are also required to identify new sales opportunities. Product or service ideas are discussed and implemented in joint teams from exploratory and exploitative domains. Through such collaboration, existing capabilities of exploitation are deployed in new ways, creating new DCs. This formal coordination is complemented by firmwide networks. For example, Google creates opportunities for employees to build networks by deliberately designing waiting times and seating arrangements at shared lunch facilities. Such networks further enhance formal integration.

2.5 Ambidextrous Learning in SHRM

In ambidextrous HRM systems, social and formal integration mechanisms contribute to sustainable competitive advantage by creating an environmental climate facilitating organizational learning (Collins & Smith, 2006; Kang et al., 2007; Swart & Kinnie, 2010; Donate et al., 2016). Exploratory learning means the creation of new knowledge for innovation or building new businesses while exploitative learning involves refining existing knowledge for higher efficiency (Lubatkin et al., 2006). Although these occur in different ways, they must happen simultaneously for ambidextrous learning (Kang et al., 2007; Han et al., 2019; Swart et al., 2019). Ambidextrous learning is an outcome of the specific collective behaviour of individuals, so it ties closely with the organization's SHRM systems (Kang & Snell, 2009). The framework proposed by Prieto & Pilar Pérez Santana

(2012) indicates that the three categories of SHRM practices create a social climate that enables knowledge transfer and creation of DCs. The authors argue that ability-enhancing practices like recruitment, selection and training explain the larger proportion of variance in organizational performance.

2.6 Role of P-O fit in Sustainable Competitive Advantage

P-O fit may be defined as the compatibility between people and organizations that occurs when: (a) at least one entity provides what the other needs, or (b) they share similar fundamental characteristics, or (c) both (Kristof, 1996, pp. 4–5). It is part of a larger body of literature around Person-Environment (P-E) fit, and indicates the degree to which the values of the individual and the organization align. Similar to how living organisms thrive in environments conducive to their growth, a Person-Organization (P-O) fit explains why people expend effort to identify a job that fits with their skills and personal needs and why organizations spend resources to identify individuals who fit with their values. Such value alignment is critical because values are expected to stay temporally stable, and alignment increases the likelihood that individual behaviour aligns with organizational goals. This alignment results in higher sustained effort, the ability to see co-workers' problems as one's own and subsequently, enhanced job performance (Sørli, Hetland, Bakker, Espevik, & Olsen, 2022). This approach aligns with Goodman & Svyantek's (1999) argument that contextual performance is an outcome of a strong psychological contract which in turn arises from shared values.

Prominent theories of fit include the theory of work adjustment (Dawis & Lofquist, 1984) and organizational culture (Schneider, 1987). Individuals seek fit because it gives them control over their lives, a sense of belonging and the ability to interact with others, which work best when others are similar to oneself (Yu, 2013; Edwards & Cable, 2009; Hu et al.,

2016). Under the P-O fit umbrella, Person-Vocation fit (Holland, 1997), Person-Job fit (Rounds et al., 1987) and Person-Supervisor fit (Ashforth et al., 2016) are supplementary fits. These fits originate from the evolutionary perspective (Krupp et al., 2008; van Vianen, 2018) which argues that humans associate better with similar others (Van Vianen, 2000). The Attraction-Selection-Attrition (ASA) framework (Schneider, 1987) in the P-O fit literature argues that organizations are defined by the attributes of its people. People are attracted to, selected in and stay with organizations that match their personal value systems; therefore people in an organization are likely to be homogeneous over time (Bradley-Geist & Landis, 2012; King et al., 2017). Some researchers operationalize fit as a perception (Cable & DeRue, 2002; Kristof-Brown et al., 2005) while others calculate the difference between actual and expected personal and environmental attributes (Edwards, 1994; Weller et al., 2019).

Improved P-O fit results in the employee feeling comfortable and at home (Hobfoll, 1989), able to exploit available opportunities and less affected by work pressure or bullying (Vandevelde, Baillien, & Notelaers, 2020). It encourages innovative work behaviour, a set of behaviours around introducing new ideas and implementing them in isolation or in combination with current work processes to increase organization performance and subsequently, achieve competitive advantage. This includes critical thinking, recognizing potential problems before they occur and identifying methods to fix them, along with garnering organization support, testing out solutions in organizational settings and implementing them in a timely fashion (De Jong & Den Hartog, 2010). For organizations functioning in volatile industries, P-O fit plays a key role in enabling the quick generation and implementation of ideas (Afsar, 2016).

Although scholars assert that selection is an ability-enhancing capability contributing to the organization's human capital (Prieto & Pilar Pérez Santana, 2012; Jackson et al., 2014) and subsequently to SHRM (Posthuma et al., 2013), sparsity of research around its strategic

contribution towards competitive advantage raises questions like why all firms do not use selection methods demonstrated to be highly effective (Rynes et al., 2002; Ployhart, 2006). In response, Kim & Ployhart (2018) propose a contingency theory approach from SHRM literature. They argue that firm-wise differences in the usage and consequence of selection practices may be explained by each organization's unique need to balance environmental and firm-level factors. In their study of 413 organizations across multiple industries, they found that organizations perceive selection as a strategic choice about how to acquire the best possible human capital given their unique external and internal conditions; this explains the variation in selection practices. They also found that selection practices may make negative contributions to organizational performance under stable industry conditions. This could be because the value of selection offsets its cost only in environments with heavy competition for talent. These findings imply that while selection is a strategic contributor to SHRM, claims about its universal benefits must be more nuanced.

3 Selection as a Dynamic Capability

3.1 Selection as a Static Capability in Traditional SHRM

Applicant perception of P-O fit is susceptible to temporal change (Rounds et al., 1987; Boon & Biron, 2016), therefore selection scholars seek answers to questions like how fit changes over time and how it can be engineered through intervention (Su et al., 2015). Traditional approaches to selection view it as a static process to assess the suitability of candidates as they enter the organization. This is why selection includes screening for specific skills and competencies that align with organization values. Selection is considered complete once the candidate joins; subsequent talent management tasks including performance management, learning, and compensation are outsourced to other departments within human resources.

These practices align with RBV which conceptualizes human capital as a fairly stable and valuable resource that brings the organization competitive advantage. Depending on the market value and rarity of skills, selection functions as a resource enhancer that acquires targeted high-value human capital. However, as mentioned earlier, RBV-based approaches do not align with environmental dynamism and the rapid obsolescence of value. A limitation of the P-O view is that it does not account for the change in employee perception as they gain experience within the organization and its industry, and any shortfalls they experience between expectation and reality. As organizational contexts shift due to technological or regulatory developments, the requirements underlying earlier hiring decisions may turn invalid, resulting in misalignment between organizational expectations and reality.

3.2 Viewing Selection through a DC lens

Reframing selection as a DC requires that organizations conceptualize it as an ongoing process embedded within their SHRM systems. Selection could be extended to include its microfoundations of sensing, seizing and reconfiguring to align it with uncertain environments. Sensing involves ongoing monitoring of employee perceptions around P-O fit. This requires moving away from traditional evaluation mechanisms like selection tests and towards on-boarding reflections, ongoing feedback processes structured into the employee lifecycle, engagement surveys and behavioural cues captured by managers through astute observation. The objective is to detect early signs of engagement decline before they manifest as quiet quitting or attrition.

Seizing involves acting upon the insights received through sensing. Once early signs of declining engagement are identified, managers must deploy targeted interventions to identify and address the root cause. These may include job redesign, mentoring, job rotations, cross-functional deployments, or adjusting working hours to align with employees' personal

needs. The success of seizing depends on the speed and accuracy of the proposed organizational intervention. The next step of reconfiguration adapts existing SHRM systems to align with changing organizational objectives. This could include revamping HR policies or reconsidering the balance between exploration and exploitation among the tasks performed by its workforce. Through constant incremental reconfiguration, selection shifts from being a static process to being a dynamic capability that shapes and augments the alignment of the organization towards its goals.

3.3 Dynamic changes in P-O Fit

Change in P-O fit may be triggered by multiple sources including strategic realignment, leadership changes, employee attrition, or individual ambition of job change through structured learning and career development. The DC perspective involves reassessing employee fit through ongoing conversations between employee and organization. For example, early signals like decreasing citizenship behaviour, withdrawal from post-work events, or posting negative opinions about the organization on social media, may signal the need for a range of corrective actions. Selection then becomes predictive, aligning with the organizational objective of building DCs rather than reactively assessing the reason for attrition.

3.4 SHRM in Changing Environments

Reconceptualizing selection as a DC shifts the focus of SHRM from incremental gains through optimization of static systems to consistent adaptation to relevant triggers from volatile environments. It shifts the nature of selection from 'hands-off after joining' to an ongoing hands-on approach integrated with other talent management processes. This makes SHRM systems more coherent and aligned to organization performance. Finally, this perspective utilizes the benefit of ambidexterity in organization's HR architecture.

Exploitation-oriented techniques maybe used for continuous improvement and stable revenue

generation while exploration-oriented techniques could enable adaptation and incorporating innovative practices. Treating selection as DC allows organizations to make best use of its existing workforce while remaining responsive to upcoming changes in employee perceptions.

4 Conclusion & Limitations

This article attempts to overlay DCs over traditional SHRM to compensate for the shortcomings of RBV in rapidly changing environments. Garavan et al. (2017)'s framework proposes how the DCs of HR scalability, the ability to learn and to innovate may be incorporated into traditional SHRM. For DCs to be effectively deployed, the organization's SHRM must be ambidextrous: it must find the right balance between compliance and commitment. Resolving this tension creates a climate of ambidextrous learning where existing SHRM capabilities can be reconfigured as DCs in dynamic environments.

Selection is one such SHRM capability. Although extant literature on temporal changes in P-O fit have portrayed selection as a static capability, monitoring the decline as it occurs, learning from it and taking innovative steps to retain key employees extends Garavan et al. (2017)'s framework and reconfigures selection into a dynamic capability that increases SHRM's contribution to organizational performance in uncertain environments. Innovative action may include coaching, incentives or job rotations and the right action may be determined once the cause of the decline in perception is identified.

References

- Aldrich, H. (1999). *Organizations evolving*. Sage.
- Amarakoon, U., Weerawardena, J., & Verreyne, M.-L. (2018). Learning capabilities, human resource management innovation and competitive advantage. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 29(10), 1736–1766.
- Appelbaum, E., Bailey, T., Berg, P. B., Kalleberg, A. L., & Bailey, T. A. (2000). *Manufacturing advantage: Why high-performance work systems pay off*. Cornell University Press.
- Arthur, J. B. (1994). Effects of human resource systems on manufacturing performance and turnover. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(3), 670–687.
- Ashforth, B. E., Schinoff, B. S., & Rogers, K. M. (2016). “I identify with her”, “I identify with him”: Unpacking the dynamics of personal identification in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 41(1), 28–60.
- Aust, I., Muller-Camen, M., & Poutsma, E. (2018). 19. Sustainable HRM: A comparative and international perspective. *Handbook of Research on Comparative Human Resource Management*, 358.
- Baird, L. & Meshoulam, I. (1988). Managing two fits of strategic human resource management. *Academy of Management review*, 13(1), 116–128.
- Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of management*, 17(1), 99–120.
- Barney, J. B. & Clark, D. N. (2007). *Resource-based theory: Creating and sustaining competitive advantage*. Oxford University Press on Demand.
- Batt, R. (2000). Strategic segmentation in front-line services: matching customers, employees and human resource systems. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 11(3), 540–561.

- Becker, B. & Gerhart, B. (1996). The impact of human resource management on organizational performance: Progress and prospects. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(4), 779–801.
- Beltrán-Martín, I. & Roca-Puig, V. (2013). Promoting employee flexibility through HR practices. *Human Resource Management*, 52(5), 645–674.
- Beltrán-Martín, I., Roca-Puig, V., Escrig-Tena, A., & Bou-Llusar, J. C. (2008). Human resource flexibility as a mediating variable between high performance work systems and performance. *Journal of Management*, 34(5), 1009–1044.
- Bingham, C. B. & Eisenhardt, K. M. (2011). Rational heuristics: the ‘simple rules’ that strategists learn from process experience. *Strategic Management Journal*, 32(13), 1437–1464.
- Björkman, I. & Lervik, J. E. (2007). Transferring HR practices within multinational corporations. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 17(4), 320–335.
- Boon, C. & Biron, M. (2016). Temporal issues in person–organization fit, person–job fit and turnover: The role of leader–member exchange. *Human Relations*, 69(12), 2177–2200.
- Boxall, P. (1996). The strategic HRM debate and the resource-based view of the firm. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 6(3), 59–75.
- Boxall, P. & Purcell, J. (2000). Strategic human resource management: Where have we come from and where should we be going? *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 2(2), 183–203.
- Bradley-Geist, J. C. & Landis, R. S. (2012). Homogeneity of personality in occupations and organizations: A comparison of alternative statistical tests. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 27(2), 149–159.

Brown, V. R. & Vaughn, E. D. (2011). The writing on the (facebook) wall: The use of social networking sites in hiring decisions. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 26(2), 219.

Cable, D. M. & DeRue, D. S. (2002). The convergent and discriminant validity of subjective fit perceptions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(5), 875.

Camps, J., Oltra, V., Aldás-Manzano, J., Buenaventura-Vera, G., & Torres-Carballo, F. (2016). Individual performance in turbulent environments: The role of organizational learning capability and employee flexibility. *Human Resource Management*, 55(3), 363–383.

Cathy, X. & Gollan, P. J. (2018). Implementing sustainable HRM: The new challenge of corporate sustainability. In *Contemporary Developments in Green Human Resource Management Research* (pp. 155–175). Routledge.

Cattell, R. B. (1943). The measurement of adult intelligence. *Psychological Bulletin*, 40(3), 153.

Chauhan, R. S. (2019). Unstructured interviews: are they really all that bad? *Human Resource Development International*, 1–14.

Chuang, C.-H., Jackson, S. E., & Jiang, Y. (2016). Can knowledge-intensive teamwork be managed? Examining the roles of HRM systems, leadership, and tacit knowledge. *Journal of Management*, 42(2), 524–554.

Collins, C. J. & Smith, K. G. (2006). Knowledge exchange and combination: The role of human resource practices in the performance of high-technology firms. *Academy of management Journal*, 49(3), 544–560.

Cook, M. (2016). *Personnel selection: Adding value through people-A changing picture*. John Wiley & Sons.

Darwin, C. (1859). *The Origin of Species; And, the Descent of Man*. Modern library.

Dattée, B., Alexy, O., & Autio, E. (2018). Maneuvering in poor visibility: How firms play the ecosystem game when uncertainty is high. *Academy of Management Journal*, *61*(2), 466–498.

Dawis, R. V. & Lofquist, L. H. (1984). *A psychological theory of work adjustment: An individual-differences model and its applications*. University of Minnesota Press.

De Kock, F. S., Lievens, F., & Born, M. P. (2018). The profile of the ‘good judge’ in HRM: A systematic review and agenda for future research. *Human Resource Management Review*.

Delery, J. E. (1998). Issues of fit in strategic human resource management: Implications for research. *Human Resource Management Review*.

Derous, E., Buijsrogge, A., Roulin, N., & Duyck, W. (2016). Why your stigma isn’t hired: A dual-process framework of interview bias. *Human Resource Management Review*, *26*(2), 90–111.

Donate, M. J., Peña, I., & Sanchez de Pablo, J. D. (2016). HRM practices for human and social capital development: effects on innovation capabilities. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *27*(9), 928–953.

Easterby-Smith, M. & Prieto, I. M. (2008). Dynamic capabilities and knowledge management: an integrative role for learning? *British Journal of Management*, *19*(3), 235–249.

Edwards, J. R. (1994). The study of congruence in organizational behaviour research: Critique and a proposed alternative. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *58*(1), 51–100.

Edwards, J. R. & Cable, D. M. (2009). The value of value congruence. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *94*(3), 654.

Eisenhardt, K. M., Furr, N. R., & Bingham, C. B. (2010). Crossroads - microfoundations of performance: Balancing efficiency and flexibility in dynamic environments. *Organization Science*, 21(6), 1263–1273.

Eisenhardt, K. M. & Martin, J. A. (2000). Dynamic capabilities: What are they? *Strategic Management Journal*, 21(10-11), 1105–1121.

Ericksen, J. & Dyer, L. (2005). Toward a strategic human resource management model of high reliability organization performance. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 16(6), 907–928.

Evans, P. A. (1986). The strategic outcomes of human resource management. *Human Resource Management*, 25(1), 149–167.

Faisal Ahammad, M., Mook Lee, S., Malul, M., & Shoham, A. (2015). Behavioral ambidexterity: The impact of incentive schemes on productivity, motivation, and performance of employees in commercial banks. *Human Resource Management*, 54(S1), s45–s62.

Festing, M. & Eidems, J. (2011). A process perspective on transnational HRM systems—a dynamic capability-based analysis. *Human Resource Management Review*, 21(3), 162–173.

Foster, R. & Kaplan, S. (2001). *Creative destruction*. Double day: New York.

Garaus, C., Güttel, W. H., Konlechner, S., Koprax, I., Lackner, H., Link, K., & Müller, B. (2016). Bridging knowledge in ambidextrous HRM systems: Empirical evidence from hidden champions. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 27(3), 355–381.

Garavan, T., McCarthy, A., & Carbery, R. (2017). International HRD: Context, processes and people—introduction. In *Handbook of International Human Resource Development*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

- Garavan, T., Shanahan, V., Carbery, R., & Watson, S. (2016). Strategic human resource development: Towards a conceptual framework to understand its contribution to dynamic capabilities. *Human Resource Development International*, 19(4), 289–306.
- Garavan, T. N. (2007). A strategic perspective on human resource development. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 9(1), 11–30.
- Gawer, A. (2014). Bridging differing perspectives on technological platforms: Toward an integrative framework. *Research Policy*, 43(7), 1239–1249.
- Gherardi, S. & Nicolini, D. (2000). To transfer is to transform: The circulation of safety knowledge. *Organization*, 7(2), 329–348.
- Giudici, A., Reinmoeller, P., & Ravasi, D. (2018). Open-system orchestration as a relational source of sensing capabilities: Evidence from a venture association. *Academy of Management Journal*, 61(4), 1369–1402.
- Gubbins, C. & Garavan, T. N. (2009). Understanding the HRD role in MNCs: The imperatives of social capital and networking. *Human Resource Development Review*, 8(2), 245–275.
- Gupta, A. K., Smith, K. G., & Shalley, C. E. (2006). The interplay between exploration and exploitation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(4), 693–706.
- Han, J. H., Kang, S., Oh, I.-S., Kehoe, R. R., & Lepak, D. (2019). The goldilocks effect of strategic human resource management? Optimizing the benefits of a high performance work system through the dual alignment of vertical and horizontal fit. *Academy of Management Journal*, 62(5), 1388–1412.
- Hansen, N. K., Güttel, W. H., & Swart, J. (2019). HRM in dynamic environments: Exploitative, exploratory, and ambidextrous HR architectures. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 30(4), 648–679.

- Harris, L. C. & Ogbonna, E. (2001). Strategic human resource management, market orientation, and organizational performance. *Journal of Business Research*, 51(2), 157–166.
- Hu, J., Wayne, S. J., Bauer, T. N., Erdogan, B., & Liden, R. C. (2016). Self and senior executive perceptions of fit and performance: A time-lagged examination of newly hired executives. *Human Relations*, 69(6), 1259–1286.
- Huang, T.-C. (2000). Are the human resource practices of effective firms distinctly different from those of poorly performing ones? Evidence from Taiwanese enterprises. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 11(2), 436–451.
- Jackson, S. E., Schuler, R. S., & Jiang, K. (2014). An aspirational framework for strategic human resource management. *Academy of Management Annals*, 8(1), 1–56.
- Jarzabkowski, P. (2004). Strategy as practice: Recursiveness, adaptation, and practices-in use. *Organization Studies*, 25(4), 529–560.
- Kamoche, K. (1996). Strategic human resource management within a resource-capability view of the firm. *Journal of Management Studies*, 33(2), 213–233.
- Kang, S.-C., Morris, S. S., & Snell, S. A. (2007). Relational archetypes, organizational learning, and value creation: Extending the human resource architecture. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(1), 236–256.
- Kang, S.-C. & Snell, S. A. (2009). Intellectual capital architectures and ambidextrous learning: A framework for human resource management. *Journal of Management Studies*, 46(1), 65–92.
- Kaufman, B. E. (2010). SHRM theory in the post-Huselid era: Why it is fundamentally misspecified. *Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy and Society*, 49(2), 286–313.
- Kaufman, B. E. (2015). The RBV theory foundation of strategic hrm: critical flaws, problems for research and practice, and an alternative economics paradigm. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 25(4), 516–540.

- Ketkar, S. & Sett, P. (2010). Environmental dynamism, human resource flexibility, and firm performance: Analysis of a multi-level causal model. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 21(8), 1173–1206.
- Khatri, N. (2000). Managing human resource for competitive advantage: a study of companies in Singapore. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 11(2), 336–365.
- Kim, Y. & Ployhart, R. E. (2018). The strategic value of selection practices: Antecedents and consequences of firm-level selection practice usage. *Academy of Management Journal*, 61(1), 46–66.
- King, D. D., Ott-Holland, C. J., Ryan, A. M., Huang, J. L., Wadlington, P. L., & Elizondo, F. (2017). Personality homogeneity in organizations and occupations: Considering similarity sources. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 32(6), 641–653.
- Kostopoulos, K. C., Bozionelos, N., & Syrigos, E. (2015). Ambidexterity and unit performance: Intellectual capital antecedents and cross-level moderating effects of human resource practices. *Human Resource Management*, 54(S1), s111–s132.
- Kraaijenbrink, J., Spender, J.-C., & Groen, A. J. (2010). The resource-based view: A review and assessment of its critiques. *Journal of Management*, 36(1), 349–372.
- Kristof-Brown, A. L., Zimmerman, R. D., & Johnson, E. C. (2005). Consequences of individuals' fit at work: A meta-analysis of person–job, person–organization, person–group, and person–supervisor fit. *Personnel Psychology*, 58(2), 281–342.
- Krupp, D. B., Debruine, L. M., & Barclay, P. (2008). A cue of kinship promotes cooperation for the public good. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 29(1), 49–55.
- Kulkarni, S. P. & Ramamoorthy, N. (2005). Commitment, flexibility and the choice of employment contracts. *Human Relations*, 58(6), 741–761.

- Lado, A. A. & Wilson, M. C. (1994). Human resource systems and sustained competitive advantage: A competency-based perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 19(4), 699–727.
- Lengnick-Hall, C. A. & Lengnick-Hall, M. L. (1988). Strategic human resources management: A review of the literature and a proposed typology. *Academy of Management Review*, 13(3), 454–470.
- Lengnick-Hall, M. L., Lengnick-Hall, C. A., Andrade, L. S., & Drake, B. (2009). Strategic human resource management: The evolution of the field. *Human Resource Management Review*, 19(2), 64–85.
- Lepak, D. P. & Snell, S. A. (2002). Examining the human resource architecture: The relationships among human capital, employment, and human resource configurations. *Journal of Management*, 28(4), 517–543.
- Lepak, D. P., Taylor, M. S., Tekleab, A. G., Marrone, J. A., & Cohen, D. J. (2007). An examination of the use of high-investment human resource systems for core and support employees. *Human Resource Management: Published in Cooperation with the School of Business Administration, The University of Michigan and in alliance with the Society of Human Resources Management*, 46(2), 223–246.
- Lin, C.-H. & Sanders, K. (2017). Hrm and innovation: a multi-level organisational learning perspective. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 27(2), 300–317.
- Liu, Y., Combs, J., Ketchen, D., & Ireland, R. (2007). The value of human resource management for organizational performance. *Business Horizons*, 503–511.
- Louçã, F. & Mendonça, S. (2002). Steady change: The 200 largest us manufacturing firms throughout the 20th century. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 11(4), 817–845.
- Lubatkin, M. H., Simsek, Z., Ling, Y., & Veiga, J. F. (2006). Ambidexterity and performance

in small-to medium-sized firms: The pivotal role of top management team behavioral integration. *Journal of Management*, 32(5), 646–672.

Maatman, M. & Meijerink, J. (2017). Why sharing is synergy: The role of decentralized control mechanisms and centralized hr capabilities in creating hr shared service value. *Personnel Review*, 46(7), 1297–1317.

Mäkelä, K., Sumelius, J., Höglund, M., & Ahlvik, C. (2012). Determinants of strategic HR capabilities in mnc subsidiaries. *Journal of Management Studies*, 49(8), 1459–1483.

Maley, J. F. (2019). Preserving employee capabilities in economic turbulence. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 29(2), 147–161.

Malik, A. (2018). Special topics in SHRM & ER. In *Strategic Human Resource Management and Employment Relations* (pp. 141–154). Springer.

Malik, A., Pereira, V., & Tarba, S. (2019). The role of HRM practices in product development: Contextual ambidexterity in a US MNC's subsidiary in India. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 30(4), 536–564.

March, J. G. (1991). Exploration and exploitation in organizational learning. *Organization Science*, 2(1), 71–87.

Martin, G. & Beaumont, P. (2001). Transforming multinational enterprises: towards a process model of strategic human resource management change. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 12(8), 1234–1250.

Martin, G. & Reddington, M. (2010). Theorizing the links between e-hr and strategic HRM: A model, case illustration and reflections. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 21(10), 1553–1574.

Mesch, D. J., Perry, J. L., & Wise, L. R. (1995). Bureaucratic and strategic human resource management: An empirical comparison in the federal government. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 5(4), 385–402.

- Milliman, J., Glinow, M. A. V., & Nathan, M. (1991). Organizational life cycles and strategic international human resource management in multinational companies: Implications for congruence theory. *Academy of Management Review*, *16*(2), 318–339.
- Morris, S. S., Snell, S. A., & Wright, P. M. (2006). A resource-based view of international human resources: Toward a framework of integrative and creative capabilities. *Handbook of research in international human resource management*, *2*, 433–448.
- Ngo, H.-Y., Lau, C.-M., & Foley, S. (2008). Strategic human resource management, firm performance, and employee relations climate in china. *Human Resource Management: Published in Cooperation with the School of Business Administration, The University of Michigan and in alliance with the Society of Human Resources Management*, *47*(1), 73–90.
- Nijssen, M. & Paauwe, J. (2012). Hrm in turbulent times: How to achieve organizational agility? *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *23*(16), 3315–3335.
- Nikandrou, I. & Papalexandris, N. (2007). The impact of M&A experience on strategic HRM practices and organisational effectiveness: Evidence from Greek firms. *Human Resource Management Journal*, *17*(2), 155–177.
- Nuruzzaman, N., Gaur, A. S., & Sambharya, R. B. (2019). A microfoundations approach to studying innovation in multinational subsidiaries. *Global Strategy Journal*, *9*(1), 92–116.
- Nyberg, A. J. & Wright, P. M. (2015). 50 years of human capital research: Assessing what we know, exploring where we go. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, *29*(3), 287–295.
- Ones, D. S., Viswesvaran, C., & Dilchert, S. (2017). Cognitive ability in personnel selection decisions. In *The Blackwell handbook of personnel selection*, 143–173.

- Ordóñez de Pablos, P. (2005). Strategic human resource management and organisational competitiveness: the importance of fit and flexibility. *International Journal of Human Resources Development and Management*, 5(1), 1–15.
- O'Reilly III, C. A. & Tushman, M. L. (2008). Ambidexterity as a dynamic capability: Resolving the innovator's dilemma. *Research in organizational behavior*, 28, 185–206.
- Ployhart, R. E. (2006). Staffing in the 21st century: New challenges and strategic opportunities. *Journal of Management*, 32(6), 868–897.
- Ployhart, R. E. & Moliterno, T. P. (2011). Emergence of the human capital resource: A multilevel model. *Academy of Management Review*, 36(1), 127–150.
- Porter, M. E. (1979). The five competitive forces that shape strategy. *Harvard Business Review*, 86(1), 25–40.
- Posthuma, R. A., Campion, M. C., Masimova, M., & Campion, M. A. (2013). A high performance work practices taxonomy: Integrating the literature and directing future research. *Journal of Management*, 39(5), 1184–1220.
- Prieto, I. M. & Pilar Pérez Santana, M. (2012). Building ambidexterity: The role of human resource practices in the performance of firms from Spain. *Human Resource Management*, 51(2), 189–211.
- Purcell, J., Kinnie, N., et al. (2007). HRM and business performance. *Oxford Handbook of Human Resource Management*, 533.
- Raymark, P. H., Schmit, M. J., & Guion, R. M. (1997). Identifying potentially useful personality constructs for employee selection. *Personnel Psychology*, 50(3), 723–736.
- Roberson, Q., Holmes IV, O., & Perry, J. L. (2017). Transforming research on diversity and firm performance: A dynamic capabilities perspective. *Academy of Management Annals*, 11(1), 189–216.
- Rounds, J. B., Dawis, R., & Lofquist, L. H. (1987). Measurement of person-environment

fit and prediction of satisfaction in the theory of work adjustment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 31(3), 297–318.

Rynes, S. L., Brown, K. G., & Colbert, A. E. (2002). Seven common misconceptions about human resource practices: Research findings versus practitioner beliefs. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 16(3), 92–103.

Schenkel, A. & Teigland, R. (2017). Why doesn't downsizing deliver? A multi-level model integrating downsizing, social capital, dynamic capabilities, and firm performance. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 28(7), 1065–1107.

Schmidt, J. & Keil, T. (2013). What makes a resource valuable? Identifying the drivers of firm-idiosyncratic resource value. *Academy of Management Review*, 38(2), 206–228.

Schneider, B. (1987). The people make the place. *Personnel Psychology*, 40(3), 437–453.

Schuler, R. S. & Jackson, S. E. (1987). Linking competitive strategies with human resource management practices. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 1(3), 207–219.

Shin, D. & Konrad, A. M. (2017). Causality between high-performance work systems and organizational performance. *Journal of Management*, 43(4), 973–997.

Siggelkow, N. & Rivkin, J. W. (2006). When exploration backfires: Unintended consequences of multilevel organizational search. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(4), 779–795.

Simon, H. (2009). *Hidden champions of the twenty-first century: The success strategies of unknown world market leaders*. Springer Science & Business Media.

Som, A. (2007). What drives adoption of innovative SHRM practices in Indian organizations? *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 18(5), 808–828.

Spencer, H. (1898). *Principles of sociology, volume 6*. D. Appleton and Company.

Su, R., Murdock, C., & Rounds, J. (2015). Person-environment fit. *APA handbook of career intervention*, 1(1), 81–98.

- Swart, J. & Kinnie, N. (2010). Organisational learning, knowledge assets and HR practices in professional service firms. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 20(1), 64–79.
- Swart, J., Turner, N., Van Rossenberg, Y., & Kinnie, N. (2019). Who does what in enabling ambidexterity? Individual actions and HRM practices. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 30(4), 508–535.
- Szulanski, G. (1996). Exploring internal stickiness: Impediments to the transfer of best practice within the firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, 17(S2), 27–43.
- Teece, D. J. (2007). Explicating dynamic capabilities: the nature and microfoundations of (sustainable) enterprise performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 28(13), 1319–1350.
- Teece, D. J., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18(7), 509–533.
- Teo, S. (2000). Evidence of strategic HRM linkages in eleven Australian corporatized public sector organizations. *Public Personnel Management*, 29(4), 557–574.
- Tichy, N. M. (1981). *Strategic human resource management*.
- Tsai, Y.-H., Joe, S.-W., Chen, M.-L., Lin, C.-P., Ma, H.-C., & Du, J.-W. (2016). Assessing team performance: Moderating roles of transactive memory, hypercompetition, and emotional regulation. *Human Performance*, 29(2), 89–105.
- Tushman, M. L. et al. (1999). Building ambidextrous organizations. Forming your own "skunk works". *Health Forum Journal*, 42(2), 20–3.
- Uen, J. F., Ahlstrom, D., Chen, S.-Y., & Tseng, P.-W. (2012). Increasing HR's strategic participation: The effect of HR service quality and contribution expectations. *Human Resource Management*, 51(1), 3–23.
- Van de Ven, A. H. & Garud, R. (1993). Innovation and industry development: The case

of cochlear implants. *Research on Technological Innovation, Management and Policy*, 5, 1–46.

Van de Ven, A. H. & Poole, M. S. (1995). Explaining development and change in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(3), 510–540.

van der Velde, M. & van den Berg, P. (2003). Managing functional flexibility in a passenger transport firm. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 13(4), 45–55.

Van Vianen, A. E. (2000). Person-organization fit: The match between newcomers' and recruiters' preferences for organizational cultures. *Personnel psychology*, 53(1), 113–149.

van Vianen, A. E. (2018). Person–environment fit: A review of its basic tenets. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 5, 75–101.

Vlachos, I. (2008). The effect of human resource practices on organizational performance: Evidence from Greece. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 19(1), 74–97.

Vogel, R. & Güttel, W. H. (2013). The dynamic capability view in strategic management: A bibliometric review. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 15(4), 426–446.

Wang, C. L., Senaratne, C., & Rafiq, M. (2015). Success traps, dynamic capabilities and firm performance. *British Journal of Management*, 26(1), 26–44.

Wang, C. Y.-P., Jaw, B.-S., & Tsai, C. H.-C. (2012). Building dynamic strategic capabilities: A human capital perspective. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 23(6), 1129–1157.

Wang, G. G. (2003). On the two-way customer service model in HRD practice. *Human Resource Development Review*, 2(4), 453–458.

Wang, X., Bruning, N. S., & Peng, S. (2007). Western high-performance HR practices in China: A comparison among public-owned, private and foreign-invested enterprises.

- International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 18(4), 684–701.
- Wei, L.-Q. & Lau, C.-M. (2005). Market orientation, HRM importance and competency: Determinants of strategic HRM in Chinese firms. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 16(10), 1901–1918.
- Wei, L.-Q. & Lau, C.-M. (2010). High performance work systems and performance: The role of adaptive capability. *Human Relations*, 63(10), 1487–1511.
- Weller, I., Hymer, C. B., Nyberg, A. J., & Ebert, J. (2019). How matching creates value: Cogs and wheels for human capital resources research. *Academy of Management Annals*, 13(1), 188–214.
- Werbelt, J. D. & DeMarie, S. M. (2005). Aligning strategic human resource management and person–environment fit. *Human Resource Management Review*, 15(4), 247–262.
- Wöckel, A., Bendixen, M., & Rijamampianina, R. (2007). Building flexibility into multinational human resource strategy: a study of four South African multi-national enterprises. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 18(5), 829–844.
- Wognum, A. (2001). Vertical integration of HRD policy within companies. *Human Resource Development International*, 4(3), 407–421.
- Wright, P. M., Dunford, B. B., & Snell, S. A. (2001). Human resources and the resource based view of the firm. *Journal of Management*, 27(6), 701–721.
- Wright, P. M. & Haggerty, J. J. (2005). Missing variables in theories of strategic human resource management: Time, cause, and individuals. *Management Review*, 164–173.
- Wright, P. M., Nyberg, A. J., & Ployhart, R. E. (2018). A research revolution in SHRM: New challenges and new research directions. In *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management* (pp. 141–161). Emerald Publishing Limited.
- Wright, P. M. & Snell, S. A. (1998). Toward a unifying framework for exploring fit and flexibility in strategic human resource management. *Academy of Management Review*,

23(4), 756–772.

Yu, K. Y. T. (2013). A motivational model of person-environment fit: Psychological motives as drivers of change. *Organizational fit: Key issues and new directions*, 246, 21-49.

Zollo, M. & Winter, S. G. (2002). Deliberate learning and the evolution of dynamic capabilities. *Organization Science*, 13(3), 339–351.



भारतीय प्रबंध संस्थान कोषिककोड
Indian Institute Management Kozhikode
Globalizing Indian Thought

Research Office
Indian Institute of Management Kozhikode
IIMK Campus P. O.,
Kozhikode, Kerala, India,
PIN - 673 570
Phone: +91-495-2809237/ 238
Email: research@iimk.ac.in
Web: <https://iimk.ac.in/publications>

