Strategic Human Resource Management: Models, HR Architecture, and Organizational Performance

Feng Yutong
Wuhan University of Science and Technology, China

ABSTRACT

Strategic Human Resource Management (SHRM) emphasizes the systematic alignment of human resource practices with organizational strategy to enhance performance and sustain competitive advantage. This paper reviews the major theoretical models and empirical developments that have shaped the field of SHRM. It first examines the Michigan and Harvard models, highlighting the contrasting perspectives of strategic fit and multiple-stakeholder balance. It then discusses Lepak and Snell's HR Architecture framework, which explains how organizations adopt differentiated HR systems according to the strategic value and uniqueness of human capital. The paper further compares the universalist, contingency, resource-based, and Ability-Motivation-Opportunity (AMO) perspectives, with particular attention to the role of High-Performance Work Systems (HPWS). Evidence from Huselid's influential research demonstrates that integrated HR practices can reduce employee turnover while improving productivity and firm market value. In addition, Ulrich's HR Business Partner model illustrates the transformation of HR professionals from administrative specialists to strategic partners, change agents, and employee advocates. Overall, the review demonstrates that strategically designed HR systems can contribute substantially to organizational effectiveness. It concludes by considering how artificial intelligence and the automation of routine HR activities may reshape the strategic role of HR and the future importance of human capital as a source of competitive differentiation.

Keywords: Strategic HRM; SHRM; HR Architecture; AMO Theory; Huselid; Ulrich; Competitive Advantage; High-Performance Work Systems

1. INTRODUCTION

Strategic human resource management (SHRM)—the pattern of planned HR deployments and activities intended to enable the organization to achieve its goals—emerged as a distinct field in the 1980s as researchers began to examine whether HR practices collectively affect organizational performance beyond their individual effects. The shift from personnel administration (processing HR transactions) to human resource management (managing the HR function strategically) to SHRM (integrating HR with business strategy) represents a progressive elevation of the people-management function from administrative support to strategic business partner. Wright and McMahan's (1992) definition of SHRM in the Journal of Management— 'the pattern of planned human resource deployments and activities intended to enable an organization to achieve its goals'—established the foundational framework connecting HR practices to organizational strategy.

2. FOUNDATIONAL SHRM MODELS

2.1 The Michigan and Harvard Models

Two foundational SHRM models established the field's intellectual framework in the early 1980s. The Michigan Model (Fombrun, Tichy, and Devanna, 1984) proposed a 'matching' approach: HR systems should be designed to match (fit) the organization's strategy—different strategic objectives require different HR configurations. The Harvard Model (Beer et al., 1984) took a broader 'multiple stakeholder' perspective: HR policies must balance the interests of multiple stakeholders (employees, shareholders, customers, community) and should be evaluated on their long-run consequences for employee wellbeing, organizational effectiveness, and social welfare as well as short-run financial performance. These models established the two poles—strategic fit versus stakeholder balance—that continue to organize SHRM debate.

2.2 The HR Architecture Framework

Lepak and Snell's (1999) HR Architecture—classifying employees by their human capital uniqueness (idiosyncratic vs. generic) and strategic value (core vs. peripheral)—proposed that different employment modes (internal development, long-

term alliances, job-based employment, contracting) are appropriate for different employee groups. This framework explained why organizations simultaneously use multiple HR systems rather than a single universal 'best practice' approach: the HR practices appropriate for strategic core knowledge workers (extensive training, high commitment HR practices, internal career development) differ fundamentally from those appropriate for peripheral job-based employees (transactional employment, market wages, limited development investment).

Table 1. SHRM frameworks, core propositions, and key empirical findings.

SHRM Framework	Core Proposition	Key Finding
Best practice (universalist)	Some HR practices are always better; universal adoption improves performance	Huselid (1995 AMJ): high-performance work systems → +23% turnover reduction; +16k/employee market value
Best fit (contingency)	Effectiveness of HR practices depends on strategic context	HR-strategy alignment moderates HR-performance relationship
Resource-based view	HR creates competitive advantage when VRIO-qualified	Barney & Wright (1998): human capital rarity, inimitability key
AMO Theory	Performance = f(Ability, Motivation, Opportunity to participate)	Appelbaum et al. (2000): manufacturing plants; high AMO → better quality and performance

3. HIGH-PERFORMANCE WORK SYSTEMS

Huselid's (1995) landmark Academy of Management Journal study—examining HR practices in 968 U.S. firms—provided the most influential evidence that HR practices collectively affect firm performance. Huselid found that a one-standard-deviation increase in High-Performance Work System (HPWS) practices (training, incentive compensation, performance management, participation, information sharing) was associated with a reduction in turnover of 7.05%, a sales increase per employee of $27,044, and a market value increase per employee of $18,641. These effect sizes—economically large relative to the cost of HR practice improvement—supported the business case for strategic HR investment and launched an era of HR-performance research.

4. ULRICH'S HR BUSINESS PARTNER MODEL

Ulrich's (1997) 'Human Resource Champions' proposed a model of HR professional roles that has profoundly influenced HR function design globally: Strategic Partner (aligning HR practices with business strategy); Change Agent (facilitating organizational change); Employee Champion (advocating for employee interests); and Administrative Expert (delivering HR services efficiently). Ulrich's subsequent Evolution of HR work (2009, 2012) refined and expanded this model to address HR's changing context—adding Talent Manager/Organization Designer, Culture/Change Steward, Strategy Architect, and Operational Executor roles. The HR Business Partner model—embedding HR professionals as strategic advisors to business unit leaders—has been widely adopted but inconsistently implemented, with many 'HR Business Partners' in practice functioning primarily as HR generalists rather than true strategic advisors.

5. CONCLUSION

Strategic HRM has established that HR practices collectively affect organizational performance in economically significant ways—providing the intellectual foundation for treating human resource management as a strategic investment rather than a cost center to minimize. The AMO theory (Ability-Motivation-Opportunity) provides the most parsimonious and empirically well-supported framework for understanding how HR practices affect performance: HR systems work by building employee capability, motivating effort, and providing the organizational context (involvement, empowerment, information) that enables employees to apply their motivated capabilities effectively. Future research should examine how AI's automation of routine HR processes (screening, scheduling, payroll, basic analytics) changes the HR function's role and whether the human capital advantage that SHRM claims must be maintained and developed through HR investment remains the primary source of competitive differentiation in increasingly automated organizations.

REFERENCES

[1] Appelbaum, E., Bailey, T., Berg, P., & Kalleberg, A. (2000). Manufacturing advantage: Why high-performance work systems pay off. Cornell University Press.

[2] Huselid, M. A. (1995). The impact of human resource management practices on turnover, productivity, and corporate financial performance. Academy of Management Journal, 38(3), 635–672.

[3] Lepak, D. P., & Snell, S. A. (1999). The human resource architecture. Academy of Management Review, 24(1), 31–48.

[4] Ulrich, D. (1997). Human resource champions: The next agenda for adding value and delivering results. Harvard Business School Press.