Practical future developments in e-HRM, HR SSC's and employee involvement

Master
Business Administration (BA)

Track
Human Resource Management (HRM)

First supervisor	Dr. J.G. Meijerink
Second supervisor	Prof. Dr. T. Bondarouk
Name	Job Hooge Venterink
Student number	1377981
Date	21-02-2017

Acknowledgements

One and a half year ago I started with my master 'Business Administration' at the University of Twente. This master thesis is the final part of my study. Before I started with my master, I graduated for my bachelor 'International Business Administration' at the University of Twente.

I wrote my bachelor thesis about future information technologies in HR Shared Service Centers (HR SSC's). Doing research in the field of HRM, a field which is subject to continuous change, was very interesting for me. Therefore, when my supervisor asked me to analyze a world Café about the future of HRM I was really happy that I could do something that was related to my bachelor thesis. Now this research has come to an end I can say that I have learned a lot about the field of HRM.

In the first place, I want to thank Jeroen Meijerink for his guidance during the last half year to help me write my master thesis. As first supervisor, he provided me feedback and gave me comments to improve my master thesis. Without his support I would not have been able to deliver this research paper.
Second, I want to thank my second supervisor, Tanya Bondarouk, for her feedback on my master thesis. She complemented Jeroen very well, and had some additional comments on my final paper. And last, but not least, I want to thank my family. Sometimes I experienced problems in writing my master thesis, but then my family was there to motivate me to finish this research paper.

I hope you will enjoy reading this master thesis!

Abstract

The central theme of this research is employee involvement in Human Resource Management (HRM). Due to the implementation of electronic HRM (e-HRM) and establishment of HR Shared Service Centers (HR SSC's) in organizations become employees more and more involved in HRM. The goal of this research was therefore to predict future developments in employee involvement. To predict these future developments in employee involvement data of the World Café 'HRM, technology and innovation' was analyzed. This World Café took place at 10 November 2015 at the University of Twente. Within this World Café the future of e-HRM, HR SSC's and employee involvement has been discussed. This research paper describes past developments regarding these three themes. The participants of the World Café consisted of HR managers, HR SSC managers, HR business partners, HRM Consultants and students in HRM. This research provides two interesting new developments. The participants of the World Café predict a changing role for the manager and introduce a new concept: the employee as mini-company. According to them will the boundaries around companies disappear and organizations become loosely coupled networks where employees are contracted for a short period and then leave.

Keywords: Human Resource Management, Employee involvement, HR SSC's, e-HRM

Table of contents

1. Introduction

Recently, employees are becoming more and more involved in HRM. This phenomenon has been driven by the increasing number of organizations implementing electronic HRM (CedarCrestone, 2005) and the increasing establishment of Human Resource Management Shared Service Center´s (HR SSC's) in organizations (Maatman, Bondarouk & Looijse, 2010). Electronic HRM (e-HRM) is defined by Bondarouk and Ruel (2009, p 507) as: "an umbrella term covering all possible integration mechanisms and contents between HRM and Information Technologies aiming at creating value within and across organizations for targeted employees and management." The implementation of e-HRM provides organizations with new applications based on information technology. An example of these applications are employee self-service (ESS) applications. Employees can update their personnel information, change their own benefit selections and register for training (Marler, Fisher & Weiling, 2009). These applications enable employees to become more involved in shaping their HR activities. The increase of organizations implementing e-HRM went hand in hand with the use of HR SSC's in organizations, with which e-HRM operates interdependently (Martin, Reddington and Alexander, 2008).

HR SSC's can be described as semi-autonomous business units which perform HR activities for the business by providing services to various organisational entities that are matched to different end-user groups (Maatman et al. 2010). HR SSC´s centralize HR activities while simultaneously decentralizing control over it to business units (Ulrich 1995; Strikwerda 2004; Janssen and Joha 2006). This decentralization of control is enabled by the use of information technologies. Due to decentralization there is a shift of control from line managers to employees, this leads to more employee involvement in HRM. Concrete examples of job involvement in HRM are job crafting and idiosyncratic deals (I-deals). Job crafting can be seen as the process of employees redefining and reimagining their job designs in personal meaningful ways (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001). I-deals are employment terms individuals negotiate for themselves. These deals can take different forms, varying from flexible schedules to career development(Rousseau, 2001, 2005).

So the reason to study e-HRM, HR SCC's and employee involvement in HRM together is that they are all enabled by the use of information technology. The implementation of e-HRM in organizations enables employees to use employee self-service applications based on information technology and leads to more employee involvement, in HR SCC's information technology enables decentralization of control and this leads to more responsibility for employees. Consequently, we can say that information technologies foster employee involvement in HRM. If we look for example at job crafting, according to Berg, Wrzesniewski & Dutton (2010) it occurs within the context of employees' prescribed jobs and tasks and it may be limited by position in hierarchy and job discretion. So the more discretion in the job, enabled by information technology, the more employees are involved in HRM. So what we see is that employees are becoming more involved in HRM. In the future, different scenarios regarding employee involvement in HRM are possible. It might be that due to the increasing availability of information technology the HRM function will be fully automated in the future and that HR managers are not longer needed. Another scenario is that due to the rise in self-service applications employees can do all HR activities themselves. Problems might occur when employees do things that are not desirable for the organization. This might lead to a changing role of the HR professionals, their focus in the future might be on controlling and helping employees in doing their own HR activities to assure that employees do the ´right´ things. If employees become fully responsible for their own HR tasks this can lead to 'new employment relationships'. Employees will act as a business within a business independent from the company. So these are shortly some possible scenarios that might happen in the future. However, the problem is that we don't know yet what is going to happen.

This study aims to address this problem by exploring practical future developments in employee involvement in HRM. Different future scenarios regarding employee involvement will be raised and discussed. The goal of this research is to generate future perspectives on e-HRM, HR SSC's and employee involvement in HRM to find research themes which are relevant to research in the future. So on the one hand this study is relevant for researchers because they can derive research themes from practical developments in employee involvement in HRM.

The study provides direction for further research by providing future perspectives on e-HRM, HR SSC's and employee involvement. On the other hand this research focus is relevant for organizations because they can anticipate on future developments in employee involvement. It might be that employees become fully responsible for their own HR activities in the future, organizations can anticipate on this by training HR managers in controlling and helping employees with their HR activities.

Therefore, the goal of this study is to explore practical developments in employee involvement in HRM. Therefore, the following research question is formulated:

Which practical developments in employee involvement in HRM are likely to occur in the future?

To answer this research question we use secondary data from a World Café about the future of HRM. This World Café was held in November 2015 at the University of Twente.

First, in the next section, past developments in e-HRM, HR SCC's and employee involvement in HRM will be discussed. Second, the research method and how the research is conducted will be explained. Third, the results of the research will be discussed and interpreted. And last, a discussion and conclusion will be given.

2. Past developments in e-HRM, HR SSC's and employee involvement

In this section we will discuss pas developments in e-HRM, HR SSC's and employee involvement. The reason to discuss these concepts is that these were the topics who were discussed during the World Café. Furthermore, they do all contribute to employee involvement in HRM. E-HRM offers employees the possibility to use digital applications who can be used to perform their own HR activities. An example is a self-service application which employees can use to register for training. An important characteristic of HR SSCs is the decentralization of control to employees. This contributes to employee involvement because employees can decide which service they want to receive from the HR SSC. Regarding employee involvement we focus on job crafting and idiosyncratic deals. Both forms contribute to employee involvement in HRM because in both cases employees can customize their job content. Job crafting is independent from the employer while idiosyncratic deals must be negotiated with the employer.

2.1 e-HRM

e-HRM can be described as the administrative support of the HR function in organizations by using internet technology (Voermans and Van Veldhoven, 2007). Due to the development of the internet, employees and managers are able to access information anywhere and at any time. This has led to e-HRM, "the application of computers and telecommunication devices to collect, store, retrieve, and disseminate HR data for business purposes" (Stone, Deadrick, Lukaszewski, & Johnson, 2015, p. 216). E-HRM has replaced administrative activities for more technology-related-activities (Gardner, Lepak & Bartol, 2003). An example is the use of Employee Self Service (ESS) applications. Due to information technology can employees perform their own HR activities. With the use of ESS applications employees can apply for leave, view internal job vacancies and book training and travel (Hawking, Stein & Foster, 2004). ESS has enabled employees to do their own HR activities and as such they become more involved in HRM.

Developments in the field of e-HRM began in the late 1970s and early 1980s (Heikkila, 2010). Since then the number of organizations implementing e-HRM has been constantly increasing (CedarCrestone, 2005). The way HR processes are currently managed are largely based on information technology. The field of e-HRM has evolved from basic HRIS systems that supported administrative tasks within organizations to cloud based systems aimed to offer a wide array of applications to clients.

One of the first systems introduced in organization that can be seen as a form of e-HRM were Human Resource Information Systems (HRIS). Around the 1980's organizations began to implement HRIS to support the HR department.

HRIS can be defined as: "a systematic procedure for collecting, storing, maintaining, retrieving, and validating data needed by an organization about its human resources, personnel activities, and organization unit characteristics" (Kovach and Cathcart,1999,p.275). HRIS can provide information about personnel planning, supply and demand forecasts, applicant qualification and compensation to serve HR Managers and enable them to make quicker decisions (Kovach and Cathcart, 1999). In the beginning HRIS was mainly used to automate routine tasks (Martinsons, 1994).

In the mid-1990's, HRM departments began to use enterprise resource planning (ERP) systems or web-based systems to achieve the goals regarding recruitment, selection, training, performance and compensation (Johnson et al,. 2015). The main goal of HRM is namely to attract, select, motivate and retain talented employees in their roles (Katz & Kahn, 1978). Organizations putted more emphasis on these goals because they were more and more aware that they were competing with other organizations on the skills and talents of employees (Huselid, 1995). The benefit for organizations to use ERP was that they only had to implement one software package and that they were able to integrate all the data within one system to support HR processes (Johnson et al,. 2015). In this period of time, according to Lengnick-Hall and Moritz (2003), HRM entered the era of e-HRM because more and more transactions were delivered by web-based systems. Online recruitment grew hard from 1999 to 2006 due to the availability of the internet (Parry & Tyson, 2008). The internet made it possible for organizations to attract employees anywhere in the world and applicants could apply for jobs online (Johnson et al., 2015).

Due to the internet boom around the 2000's, organizations began to broaden the scope of e-HRM applications. Besides administrative e-HRM applications organizations started to offer strategic applications like talent acquisition services, performance management and compensation management (CedarCrestone, 2006). The focus was no longer solely on cost reduction but also on increasing the strategic value of HR in organisations (Dery & Wailes, 2005). By outsourcing administrative activities, HR professionals hoped to gain more time for strategic decision making (Lawler et al, 2003). However, according to empirical evidence this is not realized (Gardner, Lepak & Bartol, 2003; Ruel et al. 2004).

Since 2010, organizations are offering HR software in the cloud (Johnson, et al. 2015). Rather than installing HR software on a specific place, HR software is now available on the internet and offered to clients as a service.
The major benefit for organizations to offer HR software in the cloud is cost reduction. They don't have to spend a lot of money upfront to purchase software and hardware and they don't need IT staff anymore because technological responsibilities are outsourced to the cloud vendor (Johnson et al. 2015). Research of Hooge Venterink (2015) indicated that in the near future organizations are moving to the cloud.

At the moment, self-service applications are becoming increasingly popular in e-HRM. Both employee and manager can use self-service applications to perform HR activities. Farndale, Paauwe and Hoeksema (2009) found a trend of companies increasing their e-HRM functionality with the implementation of self-service applications due to the increasing availability of technology. 80% of large organizations are using ESS or planning to use it in the future (CedarCrestone, 2010). Applications that now are delivered by HRIS are administrative applications, talent management applications, workforce management applications, service delivery applications and workforce analysis and/or decision support applications. Thite (2013) assumes that in the next years the focus will be more on transformational activities due to the growth of applications as talent management, social media and workforce optimization applications. Social media, for example, will play a larger role in online recruitment in the future. Stone et al. (2015) argue that in using social media, organizations can take a proactive role in attracting people for their organization. Organizations can scan job profiles, identify qualities of employees and contact them to motivate them to work for their organization.

Workforce optimization applications are becoming more important due to increased competition and globalization on the labour market. Workforce optimization applications provide tools to organizations to improve the attraction, retention and development of talent to have the right talent at the right place at the right time (April et al. 2014). These tools have a transformational impact on organizations because they support the implementation of strategies, programs and policies regarding the management of employees.

The neo-institutional theory can help to explain the expected movement of organizations towards more transformational types of e-HRM in the near future. This theory states that due to coercive, mimetic and normative pressures, organizations in a similar environment become isomorphic over time (DiMiaggio and Powell, 1983; Kostova et al., 2008). With the adoption of e-HRM, organizations might be influenced by mimetic pressures. Mimetic pressures refer to imitations of practices and strategies of competitors as a result of uncertainty (Paauwe & Boselie, 2003). E-HRM software vendors might claim that their software regarding talent management and workforce optimization can be viewed as 'best practice'. In a fast changing environment with constantly new technologies organizations might feel uncertain about the adoption of e-HRM. Consequently, they might imitate competitors or adopt e-HRM software that is viewed as 'best practice' by vendors. As such, will organizations become isomorphic over time and implement the same types of e-HRM.

The expected shift towards more transformational types of e-HRM has also implications for employee involvement. Although ESS applications are still popular and enable employees to become involved in HRM, employees will not be involved in transformational HRM. Transformational e-HRM consists of strategic activities to create a workforce which is aligned with the strategic choices of the company (Ma & Ye, 2015). Strategic decision making takes place at corporate level by top management. Workforce optimization and talent management applications that support strategic decision making will therefore be used by top management and are not aimed to support employees in their work. So, although employees have the ability to perform their own administrative activities, the final decision making takes place at corporate level. Employees will not be involved in this decision-making.

2.2 HR SSC's

The phenomenon studied in this research is employee involvement. HR SSC´s can be seen as one of the main drivers for this phenomenon. Although HR SSC´s are relatively new, many organizations rely on HR SSC´s nowadays. In a HR SSC, activities are bundled into a new semi-autonomous business unit that performs HR activities for the organization by providing services that are shared by various organizational entities and matched to different end-user groups (Maatman et al, 2010). So, in a HR SSC activities are centralized. One other characteristic of HR SSC´s is the decentralization of control, employees and line managers can perform their own HR activities by using the services that are delivered by the HR SCC´s (Farndale, Paauwe & Hoeksema; 2009). Employee self-service (ESS) applications are an example of such a service that is delivered by HR SCC's. According to Gueutal & Falbe (2005) are ESS applications the single most popular form of e-HRM. ESS is based on internet technology and provides employees access to a centralized HR database, which they can use to change their personnel data, enroll in benefits, apply for leave and register for training (Marler & Dulebohn, 2005). So, with the development of ESS applications the responsibility of certain HR tasks shifts away from the HR department to line managers and employees. Activities that were normally performed by HR professionals can now be performed by employees and line managers. By providing ESS applications to employees are HR SCC's for a large part responsible for the increasing employee involvement in organizations. Due to the increasing availability of information technology, more and more technology-based applications will be developed and used by companies and this will lead to more employee involvement in the future.

HR SSC's: Activities

HR SSC´s are relatively new, since the late 1990´s researchers have started to do research into the impact of shared services on HRM performance (Farndale et al. 2009). Since then, organizations have been expanding their portfolio of activities within their HR SCC's. Wright and Dyer (2000) developed a classification for the activities that are performed within a HR SSC. They distinguish three forms of activities: transactional, traditional and transformational. Transactional activities are the basic administrative activities like benefits administration and record keeping. The second category, traditional activities, are more concerned with the management of workers, and are focused on acquiring, supporting and guiding the actions of employees (Lepak, Bartol & Erhardt, 2005). Practices as recruitment, selection, training, performance and compensation are all considered as traditional activities. The last category, transformational, refers to the activities that are focused on achieving firm wide objectives, such as participating in strategic planning, organizational development and knowledge management (Carrig, 1997). This last category consists of activities that can add the highest value to organizations.

In the beginning, HR SSC's mainly provided services that supported transactional HR activities like record keeping, payroll and benefits administration. Payroll, for example, was one of the first processes that became automated in organizations (Lengnick-Hall & Moritz, 2003). The study of Farndale et al. (2009) showed that most of the studied organizations offered ESS applications that supported administrative activities.

With the implementation of online recruitment in HR SCC's around the 2000's, organizations also started to focus on transformational activities. Due to labour market shortages there emerged a war for talent among companies to attract the best employees (Lievens, van Dam & Anderson, 2002). This resulted in companies implementing online recruitment to compete with each other and attract the best employees. e-Recruitment was implemented in organizations to reduce costs, broaden the selection pool and to improve the speed of time to hire (Parry & Tyson, 2008).

Following Bondarouk (2011) are more and more organizations using strategic applications in HR SSC's for transformational HRM. This is in line with research of Thite (2013) who argues that in the next years talent management, social media and optimization applications like workforce planning and analytics are expected to grow 90% or more. These applications can be considered as transformational HRM and indicate an increase in transformational HRM activities within HR SSC's in the next years. In particular, HR analytics are going to play a big role in HR SSC's. Following research of Hooge Venterink (2015), companies are planning to implement HR analytics in the next five years in their HR SSC. HR analytics are defined by Bondarouk and Van den Heuvel (2016) as "the systematic identification and quantification of the people drivers of business outcomes, with the purpose to make better decisions". They believe that the implementation of HR analytics can lead to significant changes in the HR function and therefore have a transformational impact on organizations. An explanation for the movement of organizations to more transformational HRM in the future can be derived from the study of Meijerink, Bondarouk and Maatman (2013). Their results indicate that HR SSC's in organizations follow a growth model in which they start with automating transactional activities with a administrative nature and over time expand their HR SSC services with traditional and transformational activities.

HR SSC's: Control

As already explained in the beginning of this section is an important characteristic of HR SCC's the decentralization of control to business units. Employees are able to do their own HR activities with ESS applications. To make sure that employees perform their HR activities in the right way, they need to be monitored. Therefore is governance an important aspect within organizations. Farndale et al. (2010) studied the control mechanisms within HR SSC's. According to them a HR SCC can be controlled on corporate level by top management or by business units and local staff. This is consistent with Strikwerda (2004) who distinguishes four control structures, namely: central service SSC, within business unit SSC, separate business unit SSC and internal joint venture SSC. In a Central service SSC, control is on corporate level. Within business unit SSC, separate business unit SSC and internal joint venture SSC are governance structures where control is maintained at business unit level.

Meijerink et al. (2013) studied the governance structures within 18 organizations with a HR SSC. From the 18 organizations only three had fully decentralized control to business units. So, despite the theory that HR SSC´s decentralize control to business units do organizations not fully decentralize control in practice yet.
As organizations are moving towards transformational HRM, their focus will be more on achieving strategic objectives. According to Valverde, Ryan and Soler (2006) is taking strategic HRM decisions to achieve strategic objectives the responsibility of top management. Transformational HR activities have an impact on the whole organizations, therefore are organizations not prepared to give full control to business units. So, given the expected movement of organizations towards transformational HRM in their HR SSC's, it's likely that HR SSC's will be controlled on corporate level in the near future.

Furthermore, the increased use of transformational HRM in HR SSC's will also affect the level of employee involvement in organizations. In the introduction we stated that in the last years employees became more involved in HRM due to ESS applications. However, due to the expected increase in transformational HRM, decision making will take place at corporate level and not be decentralized. As such will employees become less involved in HRM.

2.3 Employee involvement in HRM

The focus of this study is on employee involvement in HRM. As opposed to e-HRM and HR SCC's is employee involvement in HRM not a research stream. Employee involvement in HRM is a broad area with several aspects. In this part we explain how employee involvement began and how it developed in the last years.

In the 90's, employee involvement in HRM began with self-managing teams. Self-managing teams can be described as groups of interdependent individuals that can self-regulate their behaviour on tasks (Goodman et al., 1988) The main characteristic of self-managing teams is that employees have discretion over decisions as work methods, work assignment and the scheduling of activities (Goodman, 1988). The employees have interdependent tasks and are responsible for making a product or delivering a service. The reasons for organizations to use self-managing teams in that time were: improvement of productivity, quality, morale and reduction of costs (Lawler, Mohrman & Ledford, 1992).

Last decade, idiosyncratic deals (i-deals) have become popular in organizations. The increased power of employees, the economic situation which forces organizations to be more flexible and the increased individualization of societies have contributed to the rise of i-deals in organizations (Bal, Kooij & Rousseau, 2015). Rousseau (2005) described the concept of i-deals as a form of social innovation in which employees negotiate with their employer to adapt work arrangements to better meet personnel needs. These i-deals can take several forms. Flexible working times, personnel development and workload reduction are some examples of work arrangement that can be negotiated in i-deals (Hornung et al. 2009). According to researchers have i-deals led to several beneficial effects: improved performance, motivation and better work-life balance for employees (Rousseau, 2005; Rousseau et al, 2006; Hornung et al., 2008a). I-deals are typically initiated by employees but require the authorization of top management (Hornung et al., 2010).

The following phenomenon that occurred shortly after the introduction of i-deals was 'job crafting'. Job crafting refers to the proactive and adaptive process in which employees shape their work by making changes in tasks or relational boundaries (Berg, Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2010). In doing so, employees try to improve the fit between the characteristics of the job and their own needs (Berg, Dutton & Wrzesniewski, 2008). Doing tasks in a different way, dropping a boring task or adding a new activity are examples of how employees can craft their jobs to give their jobs more meaning (Hornung et al., 2010). In contrast to i-deals can make employees changes within the boundaries of their job description without authorization of top management. Power and autonomy are found to be important predictors of the opportunity for employees to craft jobs (Berg et al., 2010). It's relatively easier for people high in hierarchy, who experience more discretion in their jobs, to change the nature of tasks within their jobs than for people who are lower ranked. People who are low in hierarchy, have less power and subsequently have to put in more effort to craft jobs.

The main difference between job crafting and i-deals is that i-deals require the authorization of the employer. This is not the case with job crafting where employees can shape their own job depending on the level of autonomy they have. As already explained in previous sections are we expecting an increase in transformational HRM activities in the next years. According to Ulrich & Brockbank (2005) are organisations moving towards more transformational HRM in their HR SSC's. Transformational HRM is aimed to provide strategic direction to firms by aligning HRM with business goals. The latter, is a task of the corporate HR department (Ulrich et al., 2008). Consequently, given the movement towards transformational HRM will decision making take place at corporate level and thereby control also to a large degree be centralized to top management. This development is negative for job crafters because they need autonomy and discretion in their job to craft a job. As decision making will take place at corporate level and organizations are reluctant to decentralize control to employees they have less autonomy to craft jobs. I-deals, are often initiated by employees but require the authorization of the employer. The shift of control to corporate level doesn't really affect i-deals as these deals always rely on the authorization of top management. In line with these arguments, we expect that i-deals will increase in the next years and job crafting will decrease.

3. Methodology

3.1 Method: World Café

The "World-Café" method has been chosen as research method to explore the future of e-HRM, HR SSC's and employee involvement in HRM. The World Café method can be described as a conversational process that helps groups to engage in a constructive dialogue around critical questions, to form personal relationships and to foster collaborative learning (Fouché & Light, 2011). The main purpose of a World Café is to think together and innovate collaboratively to open up new visions or find solutions for problems (Schieffer et al., 2004). While the goal of our study is to generate future perspectives on e-HRM, HR SSC's and employee involvement, the world café method is an appropriate method to use because it enables us to collectively develop a future view on these topics.

In a World Cafe people discuss at different tables in groups of 4-5 people specific topics that are introduced in the beginning of the session (Pidgeon, Harthorn, Bryant & Rogers-Hayden, 2009). At every table the discussions are led by one moderator who documents the conversations on a flip board (Hoffmann, 2011). Between the discussion rounds people randomly rotate between the tables to change the composition of the discussion groups (Browns & Isaacs, 2005). This random rotation of people between the tables allows for ´cross pollination´ of ideas. People take the ideas from other tables with them to new tables and 'seed' the new conversations with these ideas (Brown, 2010). Another benefit from the rotation of people between the tables is that people are able to reject, confirm or sharpen the findings from previous discussion rounds and thereby increase the validity of the World Café outcomes (Pulles et al., 2016). At the end of the World Café, after the last discussion round, there is a concluding session in which the participants may assign points to the findings that are documented on the flip board by the moderators (Hoffmann, 2011).

3.2 Process of World Café

The World Café took place at the University of Twente located in the Netherlands. Before the start of the World Café several things had to be prepared. First, the tables had to be positioned at the right place with flip boards. Second, the moderators had to be briefed about their tasks and what was expected of them in the world café. And third, a presentation to introduce the general topic of the world café had to be prepared. The world café started with a general introduction on the main aim of the world café: exploration of e-HRM, HR SSC's and employee involvement. In this presentation the three topics were shortly introduced and the main goal of the world café was explained. The main goal was to formulate five research questions on future developments in e-HRM, HR SSC's and employee involvement. We discussed these three topics at three tables. At every table there was one moderator who led the discussion. At the start of every discussion the moderator shortly explained the results of the previous groups. He also documented the conversations on the flip board and made sure that the conversations were recorded. The world café consisted of four rounds of discussions. After every session the articipants rotated randomly between the tables to change the composition of the groups. The first round lasted 40 minutes. In this round managers shared their experiences from their business related to the topic at the table and academics elaborated on extant knowledge. In this round, 'what' questions were in particular important. An example of such a question at the table of 'HR SSC's' was "What are the reasons for having HR SSC's in the future?" The second round lasted 25 minutes. In this round, 'who' questions were asked. "Who will play the most important role in (?)" or "Who is a new customer of (?)" are some examples of questions that were asked in this round. In the third round, "How" and "Why" questions were asked. This round was 20 minutes. In the last round, of 15 minutes, the discussion was closed. This last round was aimed to fill the gaps and to make sure that all important things were asked. After the last round, the participants were asked to 'sticker' the most important topics or research questions that were documented on the flip boards.

3.3 Sample

The people that were asked to participate in the World café were practitioners and academics from the field of HRM. The benefit to include both academics and practitioners in the discussion is that both groups can share insights from their field of experience to each other to enhance collaborative learning. As such, the quality of the data will increase.

The number of people that participated in the World Café was 18. During the discussion rounds, these people were spread over three tables. So, at every table six people discussed one topic. The people that participated in the World Café had different roles. There were HR managers, HR SSC managers, HR business partners, HRM Consultants and students in HRM. These people were selected because of their knowledge of the discussed HR topics and/or their experience in the field of HRM.

3.4 Operationalization

To measure the concepts that were proposed in the theory, several questions were asked during four discussion rounds. The logic to organize the World Café in four rounds is that in every round one specific type of question was asked. The participants elaborated in the first round on WHAT-questions, in the second round on WHO-questions and in the third round on HOW- and WHY-questions. After the first, second and third round, the participants randomly rotated between the tables and took the ideas from previous discussions to the new tables. The last round was aimed to fill the gaps.

We were interested in the following five concepts: Type of activities in e-HRM, type of activities within HR SSC, Control in HR SSC, employee involvement in HRM and control regarding employee involvement. Below, we will give some examples of questions that were asked regarding these concepts.

e-HRM:
-Which HRM activities/processes can be digitized and why?

HR SSC's:
- Which HRM services should HR SSC's be offering to its users in the future, and which not? (Type of activities)
-Who are the key actors that guarantee the success of HR shared services? (Control)

 Employee involvement:
 -Which issues related to employees' involvement in HRM will play an important role in the future?
-Who should decide on the roles of employees in HRM? (Control)

In the table below you see definitions of the concepts and corresponding dimensions that we intended to measure. In the right column the coding themes are given. In the next section 'data analysis' we will further explain this right column.

Concept	Dimensions	Coding themes
e-HRM: type of activities Within e-HRM one can distinguish three types of HR activities, namely transactional, relational and transformational HRM.	- Transactional: " Basic administrative activities like benefits administration and record keeping" -Relational: "Activities that are focused on management of employees, like recruitment, selection, training, performance and compensation" -Transformational: "Activities with an impact on the whole organization, like strategic planning, organizational development and knowledge management"	-Transactional: Labor/union relations, administrative work, -Relational: Staffing, training and development, compensation, compliance, employee relations -Transformational: Strategic planning, succession planning, performance management, organizational design, analytics
HR SSC: Service types HR SSC's deliver services to business units that can be divided into transactional, relational and transformational HRM activities.	- Transactional: " Basic administrative activities like benefits administration and record keeping" -Relational: "Activities that are focused on management of employees, like recruitment, selection, training, performance and compensation" -Transformational: "Activities with an impact on the whole organization, like strategic planning, organizational development and knowledge management"	-Transactional: Labor/union relations, administrative work, -Relational: Staffing, training and development, compensation, compliance, employee relations -Transformational: Strategic planning, succession planning, performance management, organizational design, analytics
HR SSC: Controlling principles Governance is an important aspect within SSC's. Who controls the decisions that are made in the HR SSC? The employees themselves or for example people from top management?	-Centralized: "Control on corporate level by top management" -Decentralized: "Control on individual level by employee, for example with employee self-service (ESS) applications"	-Centralized: Standardization, Top-down communication -Decentralized: Customization, Bottom up communication

Employee involvement in HRM: Job crafting or idiosyncratic deals? Employees get more involved in HRM is by shaping their own job content. There are two ways in which employees can influence their contract, these are 'job crafting' and 'idiosyncratic deals'.	-Job crafting: " Proactive and adaptive process in which employees shape their work by making changes in tasks or relational boundaries, for example by doing tasks in a different way, dropping a boring task or adding a new activity" -Idiosyncratic deals: "Form of social innovation in which employees negotiate with their employer to adapt work arrangements to better meet personnel needs, for example flexible working times, personnel development and workload reduction"	Job crafting: Freedom employee, legislation (employee may change his contract once a year) Idiosyncratic deals: Negotiation, different things for different people, new generation of people who is less loyal to company
Employee involvement in HRM: Control Who will have the control in the future? Is it the employee or the manager?	-centralized "Control on corporate level by top management" -decentralized "Control on individual level by employee, for example with employee self-service (ESS) applications"	-Centralized: Standardization, Top-down communication -Decentralized: Customization, Bottom up communication

3.5 Data analysis

There were two sources of data, namely the recorded audio tapes and the notes from the flip board. The first step in analyzing the data was to make transcripts from the recorded conversations of employee involvement and HR SSC's. To analyze these transcripts, the program NVIVO was used. This program helped to distinguish the different concepts and dimensions to make sense out of the data. Using open coding different dimensions were distinguished and codes were assigned to these dimensions. In the right column in table 1 you can see the results of the coding process.

The audiotapes from the discussion on HRM & Technology were missing, therefore the notes from the flip board were used as data to analyze. Using open coding, codes were assigned to the dimensions. Furthermore, the notes from the flip board were used to check the research questions and the number of stickers that were assigned to these research questions by the participants of the World Café. This information was used to support the data from the audiotapes.

4. Results

4.1 Employee involvement: Job crafting or idiosyncratic deals?

In the theory we expected that control would be more on corporate level, which implied that employees would have less autonomy in the future to craft jobs. However, according to the participants of the World café the opposite is true. Due to legislation the employee has now more influence in setting up the contract. Since 1 January 2016, there is a law called "Wet flexibele arbeid" which gives employees the right to change their contract once a year.

"It has to be the employer, but due to change in law it is going to be more and more the employee that designs the contract."

"But now we have new regulations in which employees can change their contract once a year."

In the theory we already explained the difference between job crafting and idiosyncratic deals. In contrast to idiosyncratic deals, job crafting can be done independent of the employer. In the theory we also described that the level of autonomy is found to be an important predictor of the opportunity for employees to craft jobs. Now employees have the ability to change their contract once a year, due to new legislation, their level of autonomy has increased. Consequently, the opportunity of employees to craft jobs has increased.
In particular, the context of the job can be crafted by the employees due to this new law. People may now decide when, where and how much to work.

"People decide now when and where to work and not the company."

"They can change the number of hours they work, they can ask to work on another place (working location)etc."

"At some companies employees have a say in compensation, assessing your contribution and then estimating your compensation, a trend that you assess yourself."

Like in the theory described, job crafting can be done by making changes in tasks or relational boundaries. In this case, the participants of the World Café mainly talk about changes in relational boundaries. Employees may change their working hours, their working location and in some companies they may estimate their own compensation.

So, there is a lot of freedom for the employee to craft their jobs. Too much freedom, in the opinion of the participants of the world café. They talk about an imbalance between the interests of the employee and the employer.

"The government lays a lot of responsibilities to the employer but a lot of freedom to the employee"

"There is a conflict between employee and employer interests which is made possible by the laws."

"Imbalance, employer does too much, and employee has too much freedom, maybe more to educate them about their responsibilities in their work."

So, the participants of the World Café are unsatisfied with the law. From this discussion the following research question was formulated: How to deregulate and how to cope with conflicting laws? After stickering, it appeared that a lot of people were interested in this research question (44,4%).

Related to the discussion of how employees are involved in HR practices, the participants in the World Café discussed how the workforce would look like in five years from now. They talked about a new generation of workers who were focused on career development and less loyal to companies. This new generation of workers can be characterised as young professionals who want to develop themselves in companies and move on when they are not challenged in their work anymore.

"Employees are not loyal to a company for 40 years as it used to be, you can work for a lot of companies throughout your life"

"The new generation is less committed to companies"

One student in HRM, who also participated in the World Café, was asked what he was interested in as a future employee. He confirmed the view that young professionals want to develop their own career.

"Personally, I would think that I would develop my own career, so I want to set goals for myself. What is here for me, so I should benefit from it."

One of the reasons that I-deals became popular in organizations, which is also described in the theory, was the increased individualization of societies. Above quotes about a new generation of workers which is less committed to organizations reflect this individualization. The participants of the World Café feel that there are more people now who want to develop themselves in relation to prior times.

However, they also say that there are different groups within companies who should be treated differently. Besides people who want to develop themselves there are also people who just want to have a steady job and are not interested in development.

"Is it associated with the type of work they do, so again with the polarities, one is a very standardized job who does the same way each time and in repetitions, and the other is you do it differently as required and in different circumstances. So the way that you manage those different approaches is very different."

"So the HR function has to provide different things for different people."

Above quotes illustrate the way people think about HR and how managers should treat different people within the organization. The research question that aroused from this discussion was: How to customize versus standardize HRM for employees? There was a high degree of consensus for this research question.

So, according to the opinion of the participants of the World Café the HR function has to provide different things for different people, they should customize policies for different groups.

"When you start working at the bottom , you want to know how you can get high in the hierarchy. What is here for me so I can get to the top."

Above quote reflects the opinion of the young professionals who want to develop themselves. A form of customization is the use of I-deals to attract young and talented employees. One form of I-deal that we described in the theory was personnel development. So, given the opinion of the participants of the World Café that we should offer different things to groups in the company, and the feeling that more employees are focused on personal development nowadays, it's likely that in the near future more organizations will offer I-deals to employees which include personnel development.

So, on the one hand the legislation increases the opportunity of employees to craft jobs. Due to the ability of employees to make changes in work location and working hours it's likely that job crafting will increase in the next years. On the other hand, due to a newer generation of workers who are focused on personnel development it's likely that companies respond by offering this new generation i-deals that include personnel development.

4.2 Employee involvement : Control?

In the theory we expected organizations to focus more on transformational HR activities and that control would be centralized to top management. Consequently, employees would have less autonomy, the manager decides what employees should do. In previous part about job crafting and idiosyncratic deals, we already discussed the relationship between employee and employer, and it looks like the position of the employee becomes stronger due to regulations.

The manager of today is in most circumstances responsible for the coordination of tasks and the control of employees. In the World Café there was a discussion about the role of the manager. There were mixed opinions on his role nowadays.

"You asked what should we do and not do? At Philips, you're not appreciated to have your own initiatives to set goals, the manager is telling you what to do. What they don't want is the employee to do that"

"I am thinking, then you believe that the managers have the skills, we have a lot of managers who are manager to coordinate a team, it's not about their skills"

"Yes, it's more to manage the administrative process."

On the one hand, one person gives an example of Philips were the manager is strongly responsible for the employees and coordinates what they have to do. On the other hand, another participant suggest that the role of the manager is overrated because he is only there to manage the administrative process. These statements contradict with each other.

However, more looking at the future, the participants were quite convinced that the role of manager is going to change.

"Now the manager decides, but in ten years probably not anymore, then you don't get away with the manager is the one who decides, I think there will go much more autonomy to the employees and the team, we as a team also can decide how to solve a problem, If I get ill why should you solve this? My colleagues are also able to solve this."

"The balance of power will further shift in favour of the employee."

"I think in the model, managers make connections and rather than manage employees, I think the relation between employees and manager becomes different, employees will be less managed but more facilitated."

So according to above quotes do the participants in the World Café expect that the employee will get more autonomy in the future at the expense of the manager. This is the opposite of what we described in the theory where we thought that management would be reluctant to decentralize control to employees. Employees will be more facilitated and less managed by managers.

On the question in which way managers should facilitate employees, they answered: personal development and goal setting. Relating to this discussion the participants of the World Café were interested in the following research question: How to motivate/train employees to become more engaged in personal development and goal setting? 55.5% of the participants was interested in this research question.

According to the participants of the World Café will managers be more facilitators of personal development and might function as a 'coach' for self-managing teams.

" If you take in perspective that teams do will steer themselves, than it's quite interesting to have a concept of a coaching manager of something like that, I think teams are increasingly capable of setting their own goals, the only thing you have to do is to describe the tasks that you have established for your team. What after that basically they are quite good in finding what they have to do."

"But somewhere in the middle is the self-steering team that, I think nowadays businesses are too volatile to have a management on top that steers a whole company and each team in a direction, so each team should also be a little versatile for any kind of changes that may arise."

The first form of employee involvement in the 90s were self-managing teams. Above phrases from the discussion show that these self-managing teams are still developing and subject to changes in the organization. The participants suggest that employees within teams get more autonomy from top management because due to the volatility of businesses they can't steer the whole company.

If we take into account expectations of the people in the World Café about the changing role of the manager towards facilitator of personal development and goal setting and the feeling that employees within teams get more autonomy from top management we can conclude that for the near future the position of the employee becomes stronger. Employees get more autonomy to solve problems themselves according to the discussion in the World Café.

4.3 HR SSC´s: Transactional, relational or transformational?

In the theory we described that the focus of organizations would be more on transformational HR activities in the next years to have a strategic impact on the organizations. Therefore we expected HR SSC´s to expand their portfolio in the next years with more transformational activities, like HR analytics for example.

From the discussion in the World café it becomes clear that the largest part of the activities that are offered in the SSC consists of transactional activities. According to a student who did research into the role of HR SSC's, there will always be a large administrative role for HR SSC's.

"The respondents thought that there would always be an administrative function for the HR SSC due to the bundling and standardization of tasks"

"Yes, you have this decision process which never takes place in the system, only the administrative start and execution of this is done in the system"

Someone who had plans to build a HR SSC was asked which capabilities his SSC would need. He also emphasized the need for administrative support in a SSC.

"A real administrative expert, so all the administrative procedures to manage 100%."

So, according to the participants of the World Café is in many organizations the HR SSC used for transactional administrative activities. In looking for explanations why HR SSC's are mainly focused on the transactional activities, the participants argued that HR SSC's are still a relative new phenomenon.

"I think that a lot of HR SSC's, I'm in a network of HR SSC's, are still in the beginning of centra-lizing and harmonizing processes, we are making the step towards more expertise and services in our center but we have a long way to go, and that is what you see in a lot of companies in the Netherlands."

"I think, the development of a SSC starts with the transactional part, and that expands towards a expertise center with HR analytics, but in the essence you are a supporting device."

" I work at a construction company, so we started at the bottom to have digital, or the benefits are outsourced, step by step, if we are going to fast people will don't understand it."

In the theory we argued that HR SSC´s follow a growth model, in which they start with automating transactional activities and step by step expand this towards more transformational activities. Above quotes from the participants confirm this view. Following them are HR SSC´s still relatively new and expand organizations step-by-step the functionality of their HR SSC.

Due to the large amount of administrative activities within HR SSC's and the automation of activities, one participant asked himself whether employees needed HR knowledge to work in a HR SSC. This led to the following research question: To what extend is HR knowledge required within HR SSC? (33%)

In the World café the participants also talked about the movement of HR towards more transformational HRM and what this would imply for the activities performed in HR SSC´s. According to one practitioner does the HR function as a whole move from administration towards more strategy but is this not the case in HR SSC´s.

"....found in his bachelor research that there is a shift from an administrative function towards a strategic function"

" I guess the whole function of HR is making that movement, but the SSC focuses mainly on the administrative and analytical part"

As a lot of organizations are still in the early phase of setting up their SSC, they are not in the phase of implementing transformational HR activities yet. They focus on the administrative part. However, there was one transformational form of HR which the practitioners predicted to become important in HR SSC's, namely: HR analytics. According to some of them , HR analytics can have significant value for the business.

"HR analytics, I also see the tensions, but what you see is that SSC's process a lot of data, and thereby can provide valuable insights in the more abstract part of the organization, think about absenteeism"

"From certain insights where you are as SSC, HR analytics can be of added value"

In the theory we stated that HR Analytics were going to play a big role in the next years based on earlier research. According to above statements do the participants agree with this. They predict HR analytics to play a large role within organizations due to the large amount of data within HR SSC's. When properly used, HR analytics can add significant value to organizations, according to the participants in the World Café.

Besides the distinction between transactional and transformational activities, a distinction was made between long-term processes and short-term processes. The more long-term processes were development, career development, performance management and R&D, so with a firm wide focus. The short- term processes were the necessary activities, these activities were largely based on administration. This last category of activities was performed in HR SSC's.

"You get a short term focus if you only do the necessary things in the system. The more long term processes like development, career development, performance management and R&D are less likely to occur in HR SSC's."

"In particular, the long term execution of HR processes is mainly coordinated by top management with leadership"

"I think the short-term processes are mainly performed in the HR SSC and the longer-term processes much less"

So above quotes show that the more longer-term processes, that we consider as transformational HRM activities, are coordinated by top management and are not performed in the HR SSC. `The SSC is only used for the necessary activities, and therefore has a short term focus. Transformational activities, like for example performance management, are mainly performed by managers.

"The attention of the managers is mainly directed towards performance management"

So, for the near future this means that the HR SSC is mainly used for the transactional administrative processes. An exception is HR analytics, who can have significant value for organizations due to the large amount of data within HR SSC's. The more longer term processes, like performance management are performed by managers and will not be implemented in HR SSC's yet.

4.4 HR SSC's: Control

One key characteristic of HR SSC´s is the decentralization of control to employees. However, according to research do organizations not give full control yet to employees. It is interesting to know how this will develop in the future, given the movement for example towards more transformational HRM. Is control on corporate level or will line managers and employees get more control?

In the beginning of the discussion, the practitioners talked about their own businesses and HR SSC's. In one company, they had just implemented ESS and MSS in their HR SSC. With the implementation of ESS and MSS, tasks of top management were moved to line managers.

"The number of HR 'koppen'(?) is greatly reduced, the HR business partners have taken over their role. A lot of tasks are moved to the line, to employees and managers. The background of this movement is of course efficiency and cost reduction".

Above quote reflects what we described in the theory about HR SSC's, it's about bundling tasks and decentralizing control over it to employees and line managers. However, according to the discussion do managers face problems with the services they receive from the HR SSC due to standardization. The systems that are used in HR SSC´s are almost always standardized by top management and this often conflicts with the needs of the manager. In theory, in a HR SSC, the user (manager) should be the one who decides which services he wants to receive from the centre. However, in practice this is often not the case.

"It´s becoming very rigid, what I want is a radio button that I can use to say that I want to do this process locally and not with intervention of the manager."

Due to the standardization within HR SSC's managers face difficulties in working with IT systems. In particular managers have trouble in working with the system because they do the more difficult tasks. According to one practitioner do employees only have to fill in their own data and apply for leave.

"The employee processes are relatively easy, these are apply for leave and changing personal data."

So, the ones who need support for their self service processes are the managers. When an employee leaves, the manager has to initiate this in the system. But if he has insufficient knowledge to work with the system he needs support from the HR business partner.

"Managers have to initiate the in- and outflow of people in the system, but if they don't have enough time and knowledge they need support from the low call business partner."

"And that is I guess the problem, we have on the base of ESS and MSS processes, the number of HR business partners reduced, but they kept their controlling role, what is a workload for them".

In the theory we described that a SSC could be controlled on corporate level or on business unit level by local staff. If we believe the participants of the World Café, the HR business partner is the one who controls employees and managers locally. He is the one who provides support to line managers when they face difficulties in working with the system.

Furthermore, the HR business partner has close contact with employees when they make decisions in the system(HR SSC). One participant of the World Café, who had the function of HR business partner, told the following:

"I say, I want one thing, and that is that before you are going to put something in the system you talk to me because I'm not going to sit all day behind the PC."

According to above statement is the business partner partly responsible for the decisions that are made by employees. When an employee wants to execute something in the system, he should first come to the HR business partner to talk about it. Thus, the business partner has a controlling role regarding line managers and employees.

So, according to the participants of the World Café, the HR business partner is the main actor who controls the HR SCC. This means that contrary to what we expected, control within HR SSC's is maintained on business unit level. The HR business partner provides support to line managers and controls the decisions that employees make in HR SSC's.

4.5 e- HRM: HRM &Technology

Within HRM, processes are being more digitalized. In the theory we stated that HRM is moving towards more transformational HRM. Therefore, we expected organizations to implement more transformational e-HRM applications in the future.

According to the participants of the World café do organizations have already digitalized the core HR processes. An example is PostNL, they have moved to the cloud with all HR their processes. So, their software is now online available. A research question that the participants were interested in was: How to innovate beyond digitalize?(33,3%) The feeling that a lot of organizations have already digitalized a lot of processes, how can they keep innovating?

Unfortunately, some companies experience implementation problems in digitalizing processes. Due to new technologies, the user has to change to work with it. Employees and managers have to work with different applications and sometimes this leads to problems. Some employees don't see the benefit of filling in a digital form for example. Therefore is change management hard but important in organizations to successfully implement e-HRM. A common mistake that is made in implementing IT systems, is that the designers of the system ignore the users. Philips is a positive example of how you should manage this. Philips has five full time HR people on user adoption. In their view you should think of users from the start, rather than when it´s already designed.
Another problem is that sometimes the reason to implement a system is not clear. In the theory we already referred to ´mimetic pressures´. Due to uncertainty companies implement the same system as their competitors while maybe a more cheaper system would be enough.

Besides the movement of organizations towards the cloud do organizations also digitalize other processes according to the participants of the World Café. An example is recruitment, this practice benefits from digitalization. For organizations it is now possible to invite people online. Communication is more easy and goes faster now processes are digitalized. Talent management will also benefit from the digitalization of processes. An example is the use of data to learn about relationships patterns for talent programs. Other activities that the participants of the World café mentioned in relation to e-HRM were Performance management and succession planning. With the use of technology companies were moving towards continuous Performance management.

So, in summary we see that several activities are affected by e-HRM. These are for a large part transformational in nature. Recruitment is an example of a relational activity but the rest is more transformational. Talent management, Performance management and succession planning are all transformational activities that will be driven by e-HRM applications in the future.

5. Discussion

5.1 Discussion of concepts

In the theory we had some expectations regarding employee involvement, HR SSC's and e-HRM. In this section we will discuss these expectations and provide explanations for unexpected results. We also discuss new concepts and provide theoretical and practical implications of our results.

In the theory we expected i-deals to increase and job crafting to become less popular in the next years. We expected job crafting to become less popular because we expected the autonomy of employees to decrease. However, this is not the case. Due to legislation, there is a new law which allows employees to change their contract once a year, employees have more freedom to craft jobs. They may change their working hours, working location etc. So, employees have more freedom to craft their jobs. The participants of the World Café do also expect that I-deals will increase due to a new generation of workers who are focused on having a career. According to the participants of the World Café does this generation don't want to work very long in one company. The loyalty of these employees towards their organizations is low. Following Thomas & Feldman (2010) a reason for organizations to use I-deals is to increase organizational commitment and loyalty. Therefore it's likely that in the near future organizations will use more I-deals to keep the employees that are focused on having a career as long as possible in the company.

Due to an expected increase in transformational HRM, we expected top management to be reluctant to decentralize control to employees over HR activities. However, it seems that employees gain more autonomy to make decisions themselves. According to the discussion do the participants believe that within self-steering teams employees get more autonomy from top management. According to them is top management not able to steer the whole company due to volatility of businesses nowadays. Therefore, employees get more autonomy to solve problems and make decisions themselves.

In the theory we expected organizations to centralize more transformational activities in their HR SSC's in the next years. However, according to the discussion in the World Café this is not the case yet. According to the participants the activities performed in SSC's are mainly short term oriented and transactional in nature. The more longer term processes, who have strategic value for the organization are performed by top management. An explanation that transformational activities have not found their way in HR SSC's yet is that a lot of companies are just in the early phase of setting up their HR SSC according to the participants. In line with research of Meijerink, Bondarouk and Maatman (2013), who argue that HR SSC's follow a growth model, they argue that organizations start with transactional activities and step-by-step expand this towards more transformational activities. One exception is HR analytics, the participants of the World Café expected HR analytics to be used by organizations within their HR SSC in the next years. They argue that due to the large amount of data within HR SSC's, HR analytics can provide valuable insights into the abstract part of the organization. HR analytics can be used to check for example absenteeism.

In the theory we distinguished two controlling mechanisms of HR SSC's. A HR SSC's could be controlled on corporate level or on business unit level. Due to the expected increase in transformational HR activities within HR SSC's, we expected that HR SSC's would be controlled on corporate level. However, according to the World Café, HR SSC's are controlled by the business units.

When the employees who work within the HR SSC make decisions in the system, they first discuss this with the HR business partner who acts on business unit level. A possible explanation that HR SSC's are controlled on business unit level instead of corporate level is that according to the participants of the World Café HR SCC's are mainly used for transactional administrative activities. Only HR analytics can be regarded as a transformational activity which will be centralized in HR SSC's according to the discussion in the World Café. Following Lepak et al.(2006) HR SSC's within organizations become strategically important when transformational activities are centralized in these HR SSC's. Consequently, corporate entities of such HR SSC's might be reluctant to decentralize control over these activities to business units. However, our participants mention that HR SSC's are mainly used for administrative activities and not for transformational activities which takes away the necessity of corporate control. Therefore, HR SSC's are controlled on business unit level which is in line with what the concept of HR SSC's supposes (Janssen and Joha, 2006).

The results of our last concept, type of activities in e-HRM, were in line with our expectations. In the near future organizations will use more transformational e-HRM applications.

5.2 New Concept: Employee as 'mini-company'

Related to the discussion on the future employee, the participants of the World Café came up with an interesting concept called 'the employee as a mini-company'. The idea is that organizations become loosely coupled networks who consist of individuals who stay a short period and then leave. The participants sketched a scenario in which the boundaries around companies disappear and organizations become network-organizations who hire freelancers to do a certain job. As such will the definition of employees change and can they be seen as companies itself who offer a service to the company who hires them. If this development will happen we can formulate some interesting research questions for further research. What to think of the negative consequences that might occur when employees become mini-companies? When everyone is working on his one, the culture within companies might disappear for example. Also HR practices might change when organizations become networks consisting of individual employees, which makes the following research question interesting: Which HR practices will change when employees become mini-companies? Maybe there will be less attention for training and development now organizations have less employees with a fixed contract. Organizations might think that employees are responsible for their own development if they move from company to company.

5.3 Reflection on practice

To see our results in perspective we have critically reviewed our results and data and compared these with practice. In the discussion on employee involvement they talked about self-steering teams in which employees will get more autonomy in the future due to a changing role of managers. These teams will be less managed and get more autonomy in solving problems themselves. Self-managing teams were the first form of employee involvement that arose around the 90s. Multiple authors have researched these self-managing teams and concluded that these teams were present in organizations around the 90s (Cascio, 1995; Hackman, 1990; Lawler, 1986; Manz & Sims, 1993). So, twenty years ago they were already using self-steering teams in organizations. We can conclude that these developments in self-steering teams are not new. Another point of discussion is online recruitment, which the participants also name as a new process that is being digitalized. In the mid-1990s organizations started to use internet to recruit employees (Boydell,2002). So, fifteen years ago they were already using online recruitment in organizations which implies that online recruitment is not a new development.
So, in general we see that managers mention developments who are already present in practice. This implies that managers present old developments as something new, they reintroduce old concepts and describe it as something new.

5.4 Theoretical implications

This research adds to literature by describing several practical developments in employee involvement from which new research themes can be derived by researchers.

In the world Café is suggested that the role of the manager is going to change. Employees are gaining more autonomy at the expense of the manager. The role of the manager regarding self-managing teams consists of job design, selection of team members, purchasing equipment and the attraction of financial resources. If these tasks of the manager will be transferred to the members within the self-managing teams it will be interesting to research what the manager will do in the future. A task which managers are likely to remain doing is to communicate the main goal of projects to self-managing teams. Regarding this goal, the self-managing teams are free to decide how to achieve this goal. However, due to insufficient knowledge and experience their might occur problems within self-managing teams. The members within self-managing teams might not have the specific knowledge to attract for example financial resources for projects. Therefore they might want to ask the manager for advice. As such will the manager become a helpdesk who can be consulted for advice when necessary. What also is suggested in the World Café is that managers become a coach for employees and should facilitate them in personnel development. They should create awareness among employees that they are responsible for their own career. So, for researchers it's interesting to research which roles the manager will adopt in the future.

Another practical development which might be interesting for further research is the employee as a 'mini-company'. According to a discussion in the World Café will organizations become loosely coupled networks were employees stay for a short period and then leave. Employees are contracted, deliver a service and then leave. As such can they be seen as a 'mini-company'. Due to this development the structure of organizations might change which is interesting for researchers to research. If employees operate on their own they will have a lot of autonomy. Therefore, it's likely that organizations will be more horizontally structured. Furthermore, when an organization consists of individuals who all do their own job, it's a challenge for managers to coordinate this. This requires a different way of managing from managers. Maybe their role will be more focused on monitoring and controlling employees. So, the employee as 'mini-company' offers a lot of interesting research opportunities.

Although in literature is argued that HR SSC's are offering more transformational activities or will offer in the future this is not the case yet. Besides HR analytics there are no signs of transformational activities in HR SSC's. Maybe it's interesting for researchers to research why transformational activities have not found their way in HR SSC's yet.

5.5 Practical Implications

Several practical implications can be derived from the results of this study that may be interesting for managers within HRM departments.

First of all, according to the results is there a new generation of employees who are focused on having a career. These employees are likely to switch rapidly between companies when they think they can develop themselves better somewhere else. However, within literature some researchers are critical regarding differences in generations. Guillot-Soulez & Soulez (2014) for example, did research into the latest generation of employees, called generation Y. They found that generation Y was a heterogeneous group which is not in line with the concept of generations. According to them are the expectations of employees of generation Y towards employers not similar, which leads to the conclusion that there is not a stereotype of a future employee. This implies that the participants within the World Café were wrong when they argued that there is a new generation of employees. HR managers should stop conceptualizing young and talented employees as generation Y. There is no significant support to assume that the work preferences of generation Y are different compared to previous generations.

Second, following the results is the HR business partner to a large degree responsible for the control of HR SSC's. Besides this he is also busy with helping managers in HR SSC's who experience problems in working with the systems implemented in HR SSC's. So, he has a high workload with controlling employees and helping managers while he is supposed to do other tasks. The HR business partner is namely supposed to deliver strategic value to organizations by focusing on people management, firm competitiveness and organizational change(Kenton & Moody, 2003) To decrease the workload of this HR business partner, organizations could create a helpdesk within the HR SSC to help managers and/or maybe create an extra function who might take over the control of employees within HR SSC's. Then the HR business partner will have more time to do activities which provide strategic value to the organization.

And last, within e-HRM there are often implementation problems. Systems are often designed from the perspective of the ICT which results in problems for the user. Employees and managers often find it difficult to work with e-HRM software. Therefore, should organizations when they implement a new e-HRM system in the future pay attention to the user and ask them what according to them is important. Organizations should pay more attention to change management.

6. Conclusion

This research has examined practical future developments in employee involvement in HRM. These practical developments were researched in relation to e-HRM, HR SSC's and employee involvement in HRM.

With regard to future developments in employee involvement in HRM the focus was on job crafting and idiosyncratic deals. Following the results will job crafting increase in the next years. This is due to a new law which provides employees more freedom to craft their jobs. Idiosyncratic deals are also likely to increase because managers assume that there is a new generation of workers who are focused on having a career. This generation doesn't want to work very long in one company, their loyalty towards companies is low. As a response managers can offer I-deals to these employees to increase loyalty and organizational commitment.

Regarding the control of individual employees we focused on the relationship between manager and employee. The position of the manager is reportedly going to change which influences the position of the employee. Instead of controlling employees, the manager might become a coach for employees and facilitate them in personnel development. Managers should make employees aware of goal setting and prepare them for a career. Employees are said to gain more autonomy to solve problems themselves. In particular, employees within self-steering teams will experience more freedom to solve problems themselves. Due to volatility are organizations not able to steer the whole company, therefore it's likely that employees will gain more autonomy.

Within HR SSC's we focused on the type of activities and control of HR SSC's. Although we expected more transformational activities to be delivered within HR SSC's this was not the case. According to the results will HR SSC's be mainly used for transactional activities in the near future. Although HRM in general is making the movement from transactional towards more transformational HRM, this movement is not there yet in HR SSC's. An exception is HR analytics, a transformational activity, who according to the results will have a large impact on HR SSC's in the future. Due to the large amount of data within HR SSC's, HR analytics can provide useful insights to top management based on these data.

The type of activities within HR SSC's does also influence the level of control in HR SSC's. While we expected more transformational activities to take place in HR SSC's in the near future we also expected that HR SSC's would be controlled on corporate level. However, the HR SSC's is mainly used for transactional administrative activities. This type of activities doesn't require corporate control. Consequently, the participants of the World Café argue that control is on business unit level. The business partner is the main actor who is responsible for the control within HR SCC's. He has a high workload with controlling employees and helping managers.

Regarding e-HRM, like expected, the use of transformational applications will increase. Activities like talent management, performance management and succession planning will be supported by e-HRM applications in the future.

The main goal of this research was to find new future developments regarding e-HRM, HR SSC's and employee development. However, when we critically reflected on our data we found that some developments that were mentioned by the participants were not new. Self-managing teams, online recruitment and HR analytics were all named in the World Café while they are not really new. Also, the participants of the World Café believed that there is a new generation of employees who are focused on having a career while in research there is no support for this theory.

Nevertheless, there were two interesting new developments mentioned by the participants of the World Café: a changing role of the manager and the employee as a 'mini-company'.
The role of the manager in relation to self-managing teams is going to change according to the participants in the World Café. They believe that in the near future self-managing teams are able to solve their own problems and will take over the tasks of the manager. An example is that they will be responsible for hiring and firing team members, a task which is normally performed by managers. A new role for the manager that is suggested in the World Café is that he should facilitate employees in personnel development. He should create awareness among employees that they are responsible for their own career. As such will he become a coach for employees.
Another new future development mentioned in the World Café is the employee as a 'mini-company'. The idea is that organizations will become loosely coupled networks who offer employees short-term contracts. Employees are contracted, deliver a service and then leave. As such can employees be seen as 'mini-companies'. For the future this means that the structure of organizations is likely to change and that employees will be offered less permanent contracts.

7. Limitations & Future research

The conclusion of this research must be seen within the limitations of this research. First of all, this research was only conducted in the Netherlands. The people that were part of the World Café were working or studying in the Netherlands. Therefore, this research might not be generalizable across other countries. For example, the legislation in the Netherlands, which influences job crafting is different compared to other countries. So, for further research, a World Café with HRM people from different countries might provide a better picture of the future of HRM.

Secondly, the recorded audiotapes about the discussion on HRM & Technology were missing. The results of e-HRM were only based on the notes from the flip board which were pretty short. Consequently, the result section on e-HRM is limited.

Thirdly, our study was based on secondary data. We had no influence in the World Café process. While in general the concepts that we wanted to measure in our research were covered by the World Café, there was limited data about the future use of idiosyncratic deals.

And fourth, the World Café as research method might also be limited in predicting future developments. While a benefit of the World Café is that it is extremely useful to generate a lot of data and future insights, the method is not aimed to reach consensus on a future phenomenon. This makes it difficult to predict how likely it is that a future development will happen.

Furthermore, HR managers were also included in the sample that participated in the World Café. It appeared that they presented old concepts as something new and were talking about a new generation of employees while in research there is no support for this. This implied that HR managers are not aware of recent developments and maybe just repeat other HR managers. Due to their position in the company it might be that they are stuck with routines and are not allowed to look in the future of HRM. From that point of view, HRM students might be a more representative population because they are not stuck in routines and are more aware of recent research regarding HRM. So, if we would conduct this research again we should maybe include more HRM students and be critical towards the developments that are sketched by HR managers.

Furthermore, the outcomes of this research provide several practical developments that can be interesting for further research. The participants of the World Café suggest that the role of the manager is going to change towards a facilitator of personnel development for employees.

Related to this discussion, the participants were interested in the question how managers should make employees aware of personnel development and how to motivate/train them. So, for further research it can be recommended to do research into how managers or organizations in general should make employees aware of personnel development.

Another potential research question proposed in the World Café was derived from the type of activities performed in HR SSC's. According to the results are HR SSC's mainly used for transactional, administrative, activities which require a lot of processing work. It is therefore interesting to investigate to what extend HR knowledge is required within HR SSC's if most activities only consist of processing work. While this study provides limited results on the future of e-HRM it can also be recommended to do further research into new e-HRM applications that will be used in the future.

8. References

April, J., Better, M., Glover, F., Kelly, J. P., & Kochenberger, G. (2014). Strategic Workforce Optimization: Ensuring Workforce Readiness with OptForce TM.

Bal, P. M., Kooij, D. T., & Rousseau, D. M. (2015). *Aging workers and the employee-employer relationship* (pp. 129-144). Springer.

Berg, J. M., Dutton, J. E., & Wrzesniewski, A. (2008). What is job crafting and why does it matter. *Retrieved form the website of Positive Organizational Scholarship on* April, 15, 2011.

Berg, J. M., Wrzesniewski, A., & Dutton, J. E. (2010). Perceiving and responding to challenges in job crafting at different ranks: When proactivity requires adaptivity. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 31(2-3), 158-186.

Cascio, W. F. (1995). Whither industrial and organizational psychology in a changing world of work? American Psychologist, 50, 928–939.

Bondarouk, T. V., & Ruël, H. J. M. (2009). Electronic Human Resource Management: challenges in the digital era. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 20(3), p. 507

Bondarouk, T. (2011). *A framework for the comparative analysis of HR shared services models. Electronic HRM in theory and practice*, 8, 83À104.

Boydell, M. (2002). Internet recruitment helps HR careers. Canadian HR Reporter, Feb 11 2002, Canada.

Brown, J. and Isaacs, D. (2005) *The   World   Cafe*. San-Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Brown, J. (2010). *The World Caf: Shaping Our Futures Through Conversations That Matter* (Large Print 16pt). ReadHowYouWant. com.

Carrig,K., 1997. Reshaping human resources for the next century-lessons from a high flying airline. Human Resource Management 20 (4), 485-508.

CedarCrestone. (2005) The CedarCrestone 2005 workforce technologies and service delivery approaches survey, 8th Annual Edition.

CedarCrestone (2006), 'CedarCrestone 2006 Workforce Technologies and Service Delivery Approaches Survey,' 9th annual edn., CedarCrestone

CedarCrestone (2010). CedarCrestone 2009-2010 HR Systems Survey: HR Technologies, Deployment Approaches, Value, and Metrics: CedarCrestone.

Dery, K., & Wailes, N. (2005). Necessary but not sufficient: ERPs and strategic HRM. *Strategic Change*, 14(5), 265-272.

DiMaggio, P., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Collective rationality and institutional isomorphism in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48(2), 147-160.

Farndale, E., Paauwe, J., & Hoeksema, L. (2009). In-sourcing HR: shared service centres in the Netherlands. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 20(3)*, 544-561.

Farndale, E., Paauwe, J. and Boselie, P. (2010) 'An exploratory study of governance in the intra-firm human resources supply chain', Human Resource Management, Vol. 49, No. 5, pp.849–868.

Fouché, C., & Light, G. (2011). An invitation to dialogue 'the world café'in social work research. *Qualitative Social Work*, 10(1), 28-48.

Gardner, S. D., Lepak, D. P., & Bartol, K. M. (2003). Virtual HR: The impact of information technology on the human resource professional. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 63(2), 159-179.

Goodman, P. S., Devadas, S, S., & Hughson, (1988). T. L. Groups and productivity: Analyzing the effectiveness of self-managing teams. In J. P. Campbell, R. J. Campbell, and Associates (Eds.), Productivity in organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass & Associates, pp. 295-325.

Gueutal, H. G., & Falbe, C. M. (2005). E-HR: Trends in delivery methods. The brave new world of e HR: *Human resources management in the digital age*(pp. 190–225). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Guillot-Soulez, C., & Soulez, S. (2014). On the heterogeneity of Generation Y job preferences. *Employee Relations*, 36(4), 319-332.

Hackman, J. R. (1990). Groups that work and those that don't: Creating conditions for effective team work. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hawking, P., Stein, A., & Foster, S. (2004). e-HR and employee self service: a case study of a Victorian public sector organisation. *Journal of Issues in Informing Science and Information Technology, 1,* 1019-1026.

Hoffmann, P. (2011). *Innovative supply risk management: the development of a comprehensive supply risk management system*. University of Twente.

Heikkila, J. (2010). A delphi study on e-HRM: Future Directions. In Proceedings of the 3rd European academic workshop on electronic human resource management (pp. 229-249).
Hooge Venterink, J. J. G. (2015). Exploring future use of information technologies in HR SCC's.

Hornung, S., Rousseau, D.M. and Glaser, J. (2008a), "Creating flexible work arrangements through idiosyncratic deals", *Journal of Applied Psychology* , Vol. 93, pp. 655-64.

Hornung, S., Rousseau, D. M., & Glaser, J. (2009). Why supervisors make idiosyncratic deals: Antecedents and outcomes of i-deals from a managerial perspective. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 24*(8), 738-764.

Hornung, S., Rousseau, D. M., Glaser, J., Angerer, P., & Weigl, M. (2010). Beyond top-down and bottom-up work redesign: Customizing job content through idiosyncratic deals. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 3*1(2-3), 187-215.

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.

Janssen, M. and Joha, A. (2006) 'Motives for establishing shared service centers in public administrations', International Journal of Information Management, Vol. 26, No. 2, pp.102–115.

Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978). Organizations and the system concept. *Classics of organization theory, 161-172.*

Kavanagh, M., Thite,M.& Johnson, R. (2015), Human Resource Information Systems: Basics, Applications, and Future Directions. 3rd ed. SAGE Publications.

Kenton, B. & Moody, D. *The role of the internal consultant. Horsham*: Roffey Park Institute, 2003

Kostova, T., Roth, K., & Dacin, M. T. (2008). Institutional theory in the study of multinational corporations: A critique and new directions. *Academy of management review, 33*(4), 994-1006.

Kovach, K. A., & Cathcart, C. E. (1999). Human resource information systems (HRIS): Providing business with rapid data access, information exchange and strategic advantage. *Public Personnel Management, 28*(2), 275-282.

Lawler, E. E. (1986). High-involvement management. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lawler III, E. E., Mohrman, S., & Ledford Jr, G. E. (1992). The fortune 1000 and total quality. *The Journal for Quality and Participation, 15*(5), 6.

Lawler III, E. E., & Mohrman, S. A. (2003). HR as a strategic partner: What does it take to make it happen?. *People and Strategy, 26*(3), 15.

Lengnick-Hall, M. L., & Moritz, S. (2003). The impact of e-HR on the human resource management function. *Journal of labor research, 24*(3), 365-379.

Lepak, D. P., Bartol, K. M., & Erhardt, N. L. (2005). A contingency framework for the delivery of HR practices. Human Resource Management Review, 15(2), 139-159.

Lepak, D. P., & Snell, S. A. (1998). Virtual HR: Strategic human resource management in the 21st century. *Human resource management review, 8*(3), 215-234.

Lepak, D.P., Liao, H., Chung, Y. and Harden, E.E. (2006) 'A conceptual review of human resource management systems in strategic human resource management research', in Martocchio, J. (Ed.): Research in Personnel and Human Resource Management: A Research Annual, JAI Press, Greenwich, CT, pp.217–271.

Lievens, F., van Dam, K., & Anderson, N. (2002). Recent trends and challenges in personnel selection. *Personnel Review, 31*(5), 580-601.

Maatman,M,Bondarouk, T. & Looijse,J.K.(2010). *Conceptualising the capabilities and value creation of HRM shared service models*

Ma, L., & Ye, M. (2015). The Role of Electronic Human Resource Management in Contemporary Human Resource Management. *Open Journal of Social Sciences, 3*(04), 71.

Manz, C., & Sims, H. (1993). Business without bosses: How self-managing teams are building high performance companies. New York: Wiley.

Marler, J. H., & Dulebohn, J. H. (2005). A model of employee self-service technology acceptance. In J. Martocchio (Ed.), *Research in Personnel and Human Resource Management*(pp. 137–180). Bingley, UK: Emerald.

Marler, J.H, Fisher,S.L & Weiling, K. (2009) *Employee self-service technology acceptance: a comparison of pre-implementation and post-implementation relationships*

Martin, G., Reddington, M., & Alexander, H. (2008). Technology, outsourcing, and HR transformation: an introduction. *Technology, Outsourcing and Transforming HR*, 1-35.

Martinsons, M. G. (1994). *Benchmarking human resource information systems in Canada and Hong Kong. Information & Management, 26*(6), 305-316.

Meijerink, J., Bondarouk, T., & Maatman, M. (2013). Exploring and comparing HR shared services in subsidiaries of multinational corporations and indigenous organisations in the Netherlands: A strategic response analysis. *European journal of international management, 7*(4), 469-492.

Paauwe, J., & Boselie, P. (2003). Challenging 'strategic HRM'and the relevance of the institutional setting. *Human Resource Management Journal, 13*(3), 56-70.

Parry, E., & Tyson, S. (2008). An analysis of the use and success of online recruitment methods in the UK. *Human Resource Management Journal, 18*(3), 257-274.

Pidgeon, N., Harthorn, B. H., Bryant, K., & Rogers-Hayden, T. (2009). Deliberating the risks of nanotechnologies for energy and health applications in the United States and United Kingdom. *Nature Nanotechnology*, 4(2), 95-98.

Pulles, N. J., Schiele, H., Veldman, J., & Hüttinger, L. (2016). The impact of customer attractiveness and supplier satisfaction on becoming a preferred customer. *Industrial marketing management, 54*, 129-140.

Rousseau, D. M. (2001). The idiosyncratic deal: flexibility versus fairness?. *Organizational dynamics, 29*(4), 260-273.

Rousseau, D. M. (2005). *I-deals, idiosyncratic deals employees bargain for themselves*. ME Sharpe.

Rousseau, D.M., Ho, V.T. and Greenberg, J. (2006), "I-deals: idiosyncratic terms in employment relationships", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 31, pp. 977-94.

Ruël, H., Bondarouk, T., & Looise, J. K. (2004). E-HRM: innovation or irritation?: an exploration of web-based human resource management in large companies.

Schieffer, A., Isaacs, D., & Gyllenpalm, B. (2004). The world café: part one. *World, 18*(8), 1-9.

Stone, D. L., Deadrick, D. L., Lukaszewski, K. M., & Johnson, R. (2015). The influence of technology on the future of human resource management. Human Resource Management Review, 25(2), P. 216.

Strikwerda, J. (2004). *Shared Service Centers: van kostenbesparing naar waardecreatie*. Koninklijke Van Gorcum BV, Assen.

Thite, M. (2013). Problems and prospects of technology as an enabler of strategic HRM.

Ng, Thomas, W., & Feldman, D. C. (2010). Idiosyncratic deals and organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 76*(3), 419-427.

Ulrich, D. (1995) Shared services: *From vogue to value*

Ulrich, D., & Brockbank, W. (2005). *The HR value proposition.* Harvard Business Press.

Ulrich, D., Younger, J., & Brockbank, W. (2008). The twenty-first-century HR organization. *Human Resource Management, 47*(4), 829-850.

Heuvel, S., & Bondarouk, T. (2016). The rise (and fall) of HR analytics: a study into the future applications, value, structure, and system support. P.4.

Valverde, M., Ryan, G., & Soler, C. (2006). Distributing HRM responsibilities: a classification of organisations. Personnel Review, 35(6), 618-636.

Voermans, M., & van Veldhoven, M. J. P. M. (2007). Attitude towards E-HRM: an empirical study at Philips. Personnel Review, 36(6), 887-902.

Wright, P.M., and Dyer, L. (2000), 'People in the E-Business: New Challenges, New Solutions,'

Working paper 00-11, Center for Advanced Human Resource Studies, Cornell University, USA.

Wrzesniewski, A., & Dutton, J. E. (2001). Crafting a job: Revisioning employees as active crafters of their work. *Academy of Management Review, 2*6(2), 179-201.

9. Appendix

9.1 World Café: Employee involvement

Ronde 1

Everybody introduces themselves.

M: What I'm curious about is, we have these different practices as: recruitment, selection, training, development, job design, teamwork, I'm very curious in the organizations where you work for where become employees involved in these practices?

P: Employees are responsible for their personal development. We have to facilitate that as a company, first of all the line managers but also HR professionals are responsible for this.

M: What else?

P: Employees are also responsible for their personal data like their address, date of birth. Personal maintenance, birth date, date of marriage, career ambitions, work experiences, educations and qualifications.

M: What else are employees responsible for?

P: Personal goals, performance goals, what they are working on. Both individual and departmen tal goals.

M: So here we have personal development etc, anything else?

P: Feedback to their employees, co-workers. Giving day-to-day feedback and receiving feedback. Better achieving your goals.

M: Are employees stimulated to do this?

P: We train them that they are responsible for their development, we give them insights in their goals. They get training in goal setting, training in soft skills: giving and receiving feedback. Other soft skills are coaching and leadership. What are the goals of the organization, department and person. And ask persons about their personal goals. And that is a puzzle that should fit together.

P: If the people are reaching their goals, the company will reach their goals. Because it's a puzzle all together we reach it.

M: So people in the organization are trained so that personal and organizational goals are aligned.

p: I think there are three groups within organizations. It starts with a group which is interested in working on the metal(?), those are not interested in personal development. The more office workers are divided in two groups: One group is interested in personal development and organizational

development and one group is not interested in this, they are just there to do their job. They also believe that in large organizations, they have less influence because they are not high in hierarchy, they are just a number.

M: What is the difference between these office groups?

P: Engaged and not engaged to the company, and committed and not committed to the company,

P: They are more like, what is in it for me?

P: Is it due to a difference in generations?

P: No, it's not.

M: Do you see the same in your company, Rachel?

P: We also have a lot of technical persons working outside in the construction, they find it more important that they have working clothes, that they work in a safe environment and get paid well. So they are the first group, in the office we also have two groups: Some will contribute to the goals of the organization and the other groups are: what is in it for me? And as long I can develop myself I'm connected to the company, if i can't develop myself within the lines of the organization I look elsewhere

P: Does it depend on age?

P: Last year's we had a difficult time due to financial problems, people were happy that they could stay en keep their jobs so development was at the second place. And the last 1,5 year people got more interested in development, so it's also dependent on the time we came from.

P: So, safety first. And when I'm comfortable and my money is safe, then development comes.

P: Like a golden cage, they are happy where they are. Like,...when they are happy where they are, they feel no need to change and to develop themselves.

P: Times are changing right, now, I think the younger generation is more aware of career development than the older generation .

M: Other practices in where employees become involved?

P: About your contract, if your work 100% or part-time.

M: Can you give an example?

P: I think young people, they are not very interested in a 100%. That is changing but they should influence, most of the time the company was responsible for the contract, But now we have new regulations in which employees can change their contract once a year.

P: People decide now when to work and not the company, where I work. balance between work-life, rostering.

P: They want to have influence over their own working times.

M: There is an interesting concept, called Idiosyncratic deals, which are deals benefits negotiated by the employee/employer, customized deals.

P: It's not all the same anymore, line managers need to know that not everything is the same anymore,

P: What about compensation , at some companies employees have a say in compensation, assessing your contribution and then estimating your compensation, how much bonus do you get?, a trend that you assess yourself

M: Employee responsible or employer?
It has to be the employer, but due to change in law it is going to be more and more the employee that designs the contract. Wet-werk en zekerheid, wet flexibele arbeid(01-01-2016), a lot of laws that, employees have now the right to change the contract once a year,

P: They can change the number of hours they work, they can ask to work on another place (working location)etc.

P: There are nice things about new regulation but also difficulties, When you have a contract that is more than 24 months, you have to pay a transition, than you are responsible 10 years after the employee has left the organization. So it's very difficult fort organizations, to have people on your contract, so on the one side laws make it more easy due to laws that are flexible, but also more difficult and more expensive.

P: The government lays a lot of responsibilities to the employer but a lot of freedom to the employee(challenge)

P: For example when you have an employee who leaves the organization but hasn't another job, and he gets ill, than you have to pay ten years for the employee

P: Imbalance, employer does too much, and employee has too much freedom, maybe more to educate them about their responsibilities in their work

P: Conflict between employee and employer interests which is made possible by the laws.

M: So, because of this possibility for employees once a year, where they can renew their contract, discuss their working hours, location, contract there is a imbalance

M: So, there are these institutional factors on a macro level,   that allow employees to do this, on the other hand , this conflicts with employer

M: Other HRM practices in which employees become involved?

P: Engagement

M: And how would this work?

P: Euhmm.. more looking at, engagement is very broad, for example the challenge we are facing is , that how to even measure engagement, is it something that you ask to your managers or to your employees? The answer is you ask your employees, but then how much do you ask them? Is that once a year or for every day?

M: Is it also a type of feedback? of how much they like their work or?

P: Maybe yea, maybe you can link it together, feedback I mean more with your co workers day to day, and engagement is more about wellbeing and how they feel at their work?

M: Do you want to ask this on day to day base?

P: Some companies ask employees every day in a app how they feel, by clicking on a smiley for example, so you can see that some parts of the organizations are very sad every day, and then you can see the reason

M: So they have to give feedback on their well being

P: What do you mean with engagement?

P: In our case, it is mixed, motivation, how do they feel, link to the company goals, work balance

M: In academics, engagement consists of three components, figure, whether you feel energized, dedication, whether you like your job and are involved, and the third one I forget, it is interesting, do you know thomas? And absorption, whether you feel time is flying. The interesting thing about engagement is that it is how you feel about your job, but not your feeling towards your employer. That is what concepts as commitment tend to measure:.

P: In Philips, we called it an engagement survey, but it is commitment, engagement everything

M: So now we discussed what employees do at your company, but what should employees be doing or not be doing? That is an interesting discussion point, so what should employees do or not do?

P: For goal setting, at Philips it should be the employees who should set their goals, now we are going in a different approach where managers are going to define their goals because they know on the top level what the company wants to achieve and thus what the teams should be doing.

P: I think there is a debate about whether the manager or the employee should set the goals?

M: So, it's like a question mark?

P: For me personally, I don't know what other companies are doing?

M: So this builds the question, under which conditions should they be responsible and which not? When would it be desirable to have employees setting their goals

P: The initiative is more changing, the employee is becoming more the manager

P: You cannot approach is, like top down or bottom up?

M: In terms of goal setting , it is also interesting whether the employees should do it or initiate it?

P: Well we have a practice that we set goals once a year, to keep focused, so it's more a question of who does it, is it I do this, or is it the manager

P: You asked what should we do and not do? at Philips, you're not appreciated to have your own initiatives to set goals, the manager is telling you what to do. What they don't want is the employee to do that

P: Of course in a conversation not of you have to this, but it's like this. I mean a good manager should explain it in a way that the employee takes ownership of it but still comes from top management.

P: Managers should make employees enthusiastic on the central goal.

P: Exactly.

P: They have to be aware of the mission of the company, and it has to be the manager who is responsible for that. But is it less employee involvement then?

P: Maybe not involvement, but the ownership, it can still involve them a lot, and talk about the company goals, but it's not the employees who should come up now with their own initiatives.

M: So, it is in the interaction between the employee and the supervisor where the goals are set, and it's the supervisor who communicate and convince the employees of the goals, and the employees should mould their goals into that.

P: I don't know what the way, but it's indeed the discussion, having a discussion about this is what we are doing as a company, and saying you as an employee , this is your strength, and this is how you can contribute to the company goals. It doesn't work for all groups right

P: I think an employee is more committed to their goals when they have set them their self.

P: So people are asking, tell me what to do? Within this area they have their own influence, but they want to be provided a direction because they are scared to set their goals

P: You have also those people who ask tell me what to do this week, and next week. They are comfortable with that. They want it that way.

M: We also have some future employees? Who are starting their careers, What kind of interests do you have in HRM?

P: In general I'm really interested in the involvement in employees

M: When you become an employee in the future? Which of these would you think are the most interesting

P: Personally, I would think that I would develop my own career, so I want to set goals for myself. What is here for me, so I should benefit from it.

P: I think that is the future employee, companies must be attractive for employees, companies offer attractive things, other companies might offer as much, so it's going to be competitive between companies

M: It is much more on a individual level where employee and employer negotiate how they are going to engage in this relationship.

P: When you start working at the bottom , you want to know how you can get high in the hierarchy. What there for me so I can get to the top.

P: Employees are not loyal to a company for 40 years as it used to be, you can work for a lot of companies throughout your life,

P: The new generation is less committed to companies

M: So you want to be involved in personal development and receive something that for the employer that allows you to do that in order to remain employable.

P: That is difficult because we have a lot of generations in our company, the young professionals, but also the baby boomers. And how do we facilitate them? We can have one HR policy, but now we need different HR policies

M: We have to go to the end of the first round, still plenty of things to discuss in the future

P: We cannot use the same HR instruments for different people in our company, we need different policies, we have to learn the line managers that there are different ways to deal with our people

P: The question is what do these groups want?

P : We are a global organization, you mentioned three groups, but we have a thousand groups,

M: So basically, it means, how they have to customize HR practices for different groups?

P: That a challenge, the company does that the best, will succeed

P: But on the other hand you will have some standardization, if you have a global standard it's cheaper and more efficient. You have to balance that in the right way.

M: So, it's like standardization vs customization

P: Would it be a little bit crazy when you have these different policies for these three groups

P: It's is very difficult but that is the way, because at the KLM for example, the maintenance department is not interested in a part time policies

M: Given what we just discussed, what would you as practitioners like to now?

P: As an HR professional I ask myself, how do I realize all the challenges coming to me?

M: One would be, how to customize vs standardize HR practices within the different generations

P: How to keep up with the changing environment,

P: We fabricate a house upfront, the regulations are changing so fast, that it is maybe not possible to fabricate it next year

P: Two other questions, one question is: How can we burn the collective labour agreement? And the second is: How can we ....the people in the hague? We are making laws laws laws, regulating etc. All rules are contradicting each other, so we have to do something to diminish these rules.

P: Simplifying those rules. It is becoming too complex, when you hire something you have check everything

M: And in terms of employee involvement?

P: For me the main question is: We want employees to own this development? How can we educate them or make them to make them responsible for their own career, we know for example that it is good when they develop themselves. But how do we make them aware of this?

M: Where should employees be more engaged in?

P: So let's say we say that they do all this stuff right, we believe as HR professionals that this is good, but how let we believe them that this is good?

P: I really have to develop myself or otherwise I have no job in the future

M: So the question is how to train and motivate them to secure their own employability? Are there also other challenges or more how to get there which you find particular interesting? How to solve challenges?

P: It's probably the same for line managers, they have a role in making employees aware of goal setting and employee involvement, so I think there is also a kind of education necessary towards line managers, or what is the role of the line manager to make that happen?

M: How get line managers involved in training, motivating to secure their employability? What I think is also very interesting is the conflict, on the one hand employees should be involved and have freedom , but on the other hand the employer should be responsible for the employee to set goals and interests, and to make sure that these are aligned?

P: Very difficult due to different groups and generation,

M: Thank you very much for your input!

Ronde 2

Moderator shortly discusses previous round. ...

M: Do you think there are other practices in which employees are concerned?

P: It feels a bit passive, so if you take the resource based view, the idea that employees can contribute to organization, how can employees with their knowledge and skills to the organizations in order to develop products.

P: I mean something fundamentally, to what degree are employees driving forward the organization

P: Continuous improvement

M: Is it a practice, in terms of training development?

P: Facilitating I think, to create conditions in which employees can use their skills and knowledge

M: Who is responsible for this?

P: For the circumstances?

P: I think this mainly product out, we have a product that consists of ... how can we convince the employee...what I miss is a view of the workforce in the future, and based on this what are the requirements?

M: What do you think will the work floor look like in five years?

P: I think the development will be, based on the fact that knowledge is a individual capability that all the collective instruments that we have developed over the last years will step by step disappear. The worth of the individual knowledge will be the core. The position of the employee will be much stronger that it is now, the core is the individual knowledge.

P: I would say the individual skills, because knowledge is on the internet.

P: The balance of power will further shift in favour of the employee.

M: Work becomes more knowledge based, and as a result the employees with specialized skills and knowledge become more powerful.

M: So on the one hand you have these employees with skills and knowledge from which you benefit as a company, but on the other hand you have to pay a premium price to retain them. ?

P: It's an illusion that you can retain them.

M: Who benefits from this? Is it the employee who has a better bargaining position? Who can negotiate a higher salary

P: You make it an 'or' question, I would rather say it's an 'and' question. Both profit from it in the end, no zero-sum equation. The whole society will profit from it, everyone will become more knowledgeable, the bar will be raised.

P: The premium can be paid in different ways, not necessary financial. It is always the calculation of employees whether to work with other employees or independent of others.

P: Wouldn't that lead to less employee involvement? When everyone has his own line manager

P: I think in the model, managers make connections and...rather than manage employees, I think the relation between employees and manager becomes different, employees will be less managed but more facilitated.

P: So , the employee will be the manager, and the traditional manager will be the facilitator.

P: In this time of environment, IT , former managers will be called concierges,

P: Do you think that all the managers will have these characteristics?

P: I think there are different groups, I don't know how big it is, I remember a lecture about a portfolio career, and many people still have it,
M: So there will be a proportion of workers on the labour market who needs to be stimulated in exactly? So what should this manager do? Different things for different people? Can we make this more tangible.

P: Are we talking about the... You have the traditional pyramid, or a diamond, you are going to have a gap in the middle. So what you have is high level specialists with high salaries, and people doing some very simple service jobs. So you have these polarities, so your management polarity towards one group is completely different from other groups

M: So, your trying to say, that there is this small pool of talents, that should debi or are the ones that are facilitated, or should all employees be facilitated? Cause, these are two totally different approaches, an exclusive approach for only the elite or everybody like an inclusive approach

P: I think an inclusive approach because there will always be a group of people who are not able to do the things that we say you have to do yourself, so there will be a group of people who need support in having a job life or job career.

P: Is it associated with the type of work they do, so again with the polarities, one is a very standardized job who does the same way each time and in repetitions, and the other is you do it differently as required and in different circumstances. So the way that you manage those different approaches is very different.

P: This morning I heard that all organizations will be innovative within 25 years. And they must be because repetitive jobs will also have to continue with improvements. The improvement is on another level.

P: So it's an exclusive strategy, because not all people can work in an innovative organization?

P: yes, I think they do. But innovation is not always high tech knowledge but can also be basic. Why can't someone who has less capabilities not contribute to organization with ideas? I think in all types of employees these discussions are there but in another form of tone of voice

P: So the HR function has to provide different things for different people.

P: Yes, segmentation of HR.

M: That's why segmentation, differentiation and different groups with different interests have to be supported differently?

P: Yes, and we already have that notion that the value proposition of employees has to be different for different kind of groups. This is about work organization.

M: So, the good thing is that given that we want differentiate or customize, facilitates for different groups, what facilities can we think of, independent of the groups?

M: This manager should be a facilitator, but the question: the facilitator of what?

M: How can a manager facilitate personal development?
P: By goal setting, I prefer the word coach instead of facilitator

M: So how would this work if a manager facilitates through goal-setting? What kind of goals should be set?

P: I'm really doubting, even of the term 'coach'. If you take in perspective that teams do will steer themselves, than it's quite interesting to have a concept of a coaching manager of something like that, I think teams are increasingly capable of setting their own goals, the only thing you have to do is to describe the tasks that you have established for your team. What after that basically they are quite good in finding what they have to do.

P: Maybe you can turn it around, maybe you just have to help them with goal setting, and let them self decide which tasks to perform.

P: Okay, but that is the goal setting on high level in terms of this is the problem and we want your team to solve this problem.

P: Regarding that coaching, well HR managers, I am an employee, I would love to have some coaching, but not from a manager, from a general coach, because a manager is working for a serving company, and a general coach could say well it's better for you that you work Philips or for kpn for example.

P: Well, take it from another perspective, because one of the things what interests me is the degree of organizational change, which might not be as striking as in the UK, so for example the train service in Londen is now in its fourth different company in ten years, so which one of them is the brand you associate them. So I think there is an interesting question about the nature of organizational affiliation, which goes back to our one about...

P: So , the distinction could be made between involvement and commitment? You can be involved in a task but not committed to a company.

P: I think it was one of the points of employee involved or disinvolvement, it can be question of how am I involved but also how am I not involved?

M: Let's call it a external coach, I think it's hard to give it a title, but are you saying there are different actors?

P: I can give it a title, it is a independent company, when I work for KPN and I'm coached by KPN I'm sure you have your own agenda and you are not objective, So I need an external objective coach.

M: The question is independent from what?

P: Independent from the employer you work for

P: An interesting question is, why does a company pay for someone independently, in order that you could take your selves to somewhere else, so what is there interesting things , the divisions between organizations, do we want to encourage aversions

P: It's costly in most circumstances

P: Suppose I want to pay for myself, that possible.

P: What direction are you moving, are you moving towards a company that is hiring you, or are you moving away from that, and is the company interested in you?

P: And a potential model is the UK accountancy firms, where they train far too many people in relation to the numbers they employ, and they let a lot of them, and then what they do, they build them in, the sense of the boundaries of the company changes

P: Can i see it as some kind of flexible skill behaviour?

P: Yes, exactly, it's a portable skill perhaps.

M: So ,there is still this issue of return on investment? And how do you can as an employer your return on investment:

P: There are some experiences in the oil industry, where they work with a lot of contractors, and these contractors are contracted on the base of their costs, but they are also supposed to bring in quality, quality that is profitable to the firm, that is exactly the thing that you do propose

P: And in some organizations you see poor boundaries between contracting and employment, you shift backwards and forwards towards these lines of employment depending on the advantage of the parties.

M: We have to end the discussion, but I want to ask you one last thing, what would you as practitioners like to know? What kind of research question related to what we just discussed should academics answer?

P: Okay, what is the strength nowadays between the boundaries of the company? Flexible skill, who is responsible, normal you have a company with employees and other companies also have employees, but it seems to me that these boundaries are not that strict anymore,

M: This is the phenomenon, and what would you like to know about this phenomenon?

P: Future developments, how much these boundaries disappear

P: What are the implications, if it's true and boundaries disappear?

P: Interesting, if you see an organization with roughly 15 nationalities, being employees, so and that is a very strange organizational setting, how does this work, the organization and the end of the day might be a concept from today's perspective that is totally different,

P: And this might be an outcome of outsourcing, right? Yes

P: So in essential, the definition of employees is going to change,

M: That it's an interesting one? What would then be the definition of the employee? Would an employee become like a company itself who is offering his services to a client which is called the employer? And it is the employee who is responsible for developing a value proposition?

P: That is ryanair doing right, they are not employees of ryanair but all freelance (ZZP'ers) pilots.

P: And is that in their advantage that they are exploited by Ryanair?

P: No, it's the other way around, the effect is that they are been exploited by ryanair, given that it is an interesting model that is based on the capabilities of individuals,

P: And I guess who exploits who is the result of the balance of power in the labour market, so we have shortage of pilots

P: So in the end everyone is a company

M: What is interesting in this discussion is the employee becoming a mini-company, and that we are going back towards an economical transactional oriented company with no more hard feeling involved anymore?

Ronde 3

M: Dus het is de medewerker die verantwoordelijk is?

P: Ja, want hij is zelf verantwoordelijk voor zijn eigen boterham. Als hij zelf z'n zaken niet voor elkaar heeft dan heeft hij geen werk.

P: Ik denk dat het belangrijk is als organisatie om je verwachtingen ten opzichte van werknemers uit te spreken. Bij ons hebben wij veel medewerkers die zich niet bewust zijn van het feit dat ze zelf verantwoordelijk zijn voor hun eigen ontwikkeling, maar als ze hier op gewezen worden dan denken ze hier wel aan.

M: Dus eigenlijk zijn het de managers die de persoonlijke ontwikkeling van medewerkers faciliteren maar anderzijds ook een soort van motiveren?

P: Ik denk dat het belangrijk is dat je een soort van verwachting creëert, en dat is afhankelijk van type bedrijf, als je een bedrijf hebt dat niet zo aan zelf ontwikkeling doet dan hoef je dit niet te verwachten,

M: Dus het gaat erom dat medewerkers zich bewust worden van het feit dat het richting een mini-company gaat en dat het belangrijk is dat ze aantrekkelijk zijn voor andere bedrijven.

P: Het werkt eigenlijk twee kanten op he. Aan de ene kant wordt gesuggereerd dat medewerkers blij mogen zijn dat ze bij een bedrijf mogen werken, maar dat is wel heel arrogant om te denken he. Want je kan natuurlijk ook zeggen, een bedrijf moet blij zijn dat ik daar kom solliciteren. Euhm..want ik vind de mini-company wel een fascinerend idee, maaar wat is precies dan het bedrijf? En het grappige is dus dat als wij onze doelstellingen delen , dan ontstaat er een mechanisme waardoor je allerlei excessen voorkomt.

M: Dan wordt een bedrijf eigenlijk een soort van netwerk, waar je misschien wel een aannemer hebt met allerlei ondernemers die dan gezien kunnen worden als werknemers.

P: Het zijn meer nevenaannemers, een onderaannemer hangt onder een andere aannemer, een hoofdaannemer heeft onder aannemers die onder de hoofdaannemer hangen maar ook onderaannemers die er niet onder hangen, die tellen we als nevenaannemers.

P: Er is toch niks mis met het hiërarchie?

P: Nee, je moet hem willen hebben. Uit onderzoek is ook gebleken dat mensen het fijn vinden dat iemand de baas is.

P: Onze hoofdaannemer heeft een coördinerende rol over ook de nevenaannemers die wij zelf gecontracteerd hebben, hoofdaannemer de baas van de mini company, ik wil daar ook wel aan meewerken.

M: Is het dan niet dat als je met allemaal nevenaannemers werkt, is de hoofdaannemer dan nog steeds verantwoordelijk?

P: Dat is inderdaad een mooi discussiepunt als je het hebt over bijv. bouwfouten en garanties, want wie is er dan verantwoordelijk?

P: Dat probleem is wel makkelijk op te lossen, als jij wil meewerken dan moet je afspreken dat 3% in een potje gaat, en met dat potje kun je dan die problemen oplossen.

P: Net zoals dat ZZP'ers een broodfonds hebben, en dit is dan een broodfonds voor garanties.

M: Als ik dit zo hoor, hangt het dan niet af welke rol werknemers/ managers dan wel coördinators hebben van hoe een bedrijf is gestructureerd? Waarbij werknemers die gewoon op de payroll staan de manager nog gewoon verantwoordelijk is? Terwijl als je naar een netwerk organisatie gaat, de werknemers zelf meer verantwoordelijk zijn?

P: Nu bepaalt de manager nog, maar over tien jaar waarschijnlijk niet meer, dan kom je er niet meer mee weg dat de manager wel even bepaalt, volgens mij gaat er veel meer autonomie naar de werknemers en naar het team, wij kunnen ook heel goed samen bepalen hoe we een probleem oplossen, als ik ziek wordt waarom moet jij dit dan oplossen? Mijn collega's kunnen dit ook prima oplossen.

M: Dat komt ook voor een deel door bijv. zelfsturende teams

P: Bij ons zei iemand, een manager moet werknemers vooral dingen laten doen die ze uit zichzelf niet zouden doen.

M: Maar dat is raar toch?

P: Ja, waarom eigenlijk? We hadden een KPI discussie, ze krijgen verzuim mee. Natuurlijk zijn ze daar mee bezig, beetje raar eigenlijk dat wij ze dat gaan opleggen. Wat zouden ze in godsnaam anders moeten doen.

P: Dan is het eigenlijk een soort van middel om te redden, dat het in bepaalde organisaties fout gaat.

P: Nou , dat vraag ik me af. Dat zou kunnen, ik ben eigenlijk bang dat we er nog nooit goed over nagedacht hebben. En dat we dus heel traditioneel sturen op, nou ja beetje het management denken uit jaren '70, we hebben plannen, structuren, KPI's en modellen. Maar uiteindelijk, dat zie je hier weer staan, hoe werken mensen samen, hoe, waarom , ik denk dat daar meer winst valt te halen voor de managers, voor de professionals dan. Ik wordt zelf een beetje allergisch van de white collar, blue collar discussie, vind ik dan heel veel vooroordelen in. Ik denk dat, ik als white collar wordt enorm verrast door blue collar, die kunnen veel meer dan wij denken.

M: Eigenlijk is het een soort geval van dat je medewerkers veel meer in staat stelt om zelf problemen op te lossen en keuzes te maken, en dat je daar geen manager voor nodig hebt.

M: Wat zou dan de rol van de manager zijn? of moeten we die totaal weg laten?

P: Laten we een pilot doen...

P: Dat gebeurt toch ook, daar zijn volgens mij al jaren lang organisaties mee bezig, al die conflicten op de universiteit draaien met name om het ter discussie stellen van leiderschap. Vroeger volgens mij als je de baas was van een faculteit, dan was dat een soort van erebaan, die je om de zoveel jaren moest doen want dan moest je al die professoren in de gaten houden die zelf echt wel wisten wat ze moesten doen.

M: Ik zie dat we nog 5 minuten hebben.

P: He, jammer.

M: Als je nu kijkt naar al die thema's die we nu hebben besproken, wat zouden jullie dan willen weten?

P: Is de manager nog nodig? Wat doet de manager?

M: Hoe zouden zij deze rol dan het beste op zich kunnen nemen, zoals de awareness creeren dat medewerkers met name zelf verantwoordelijk zijn voor hun ontwikkeling?

P: Ik ben zelf manager, en moet dus ook nadenken over hoe ik die mensen aanstuur

M: Oke, maar op welke knoppen moet jij drukken om ze te motiveren?

P: Ik zit even te denken, dan ga je ervan uit dat managers de skills hebben, wij hebben ontzettend veel managers die managers zijn omdat die teams moeten aansturen , het gaat helemaal niet over de skills,

P: Formaliteitje

P: Ja, het is meer om het administratieve proces te managen.

P: Ja, daar zijn we toch binnenkort wel vanaf mag ik hopen van dat administratieve proces. Wat blijft er dan over?

P: Ja, ik weet niet, nu is het dat managers een gesprek voeren met medewerkers, maar gaat het meer om de vorm dan om de inhoud.

P: Wat drives the employee themselves? Zodat je daar op kunt aangrijpen.

M: Oke, we hebben nu heel veel dingen besproken. Even kijken, want beetje de rode draad volgen. Het is dus eigenlijk de vraag, goh hebben we nog managers nodig? zijn werknemers eigenlijk zelf niet capabel om dingen op te lossen of in teams? of als werknemers dat niet zijn we een manager nodig om die awareness te creëren?

P: Wat is de rol van de manager? Die is er wel maar hoe?

M: Bedankt voor jullie bijdrage!

Ronde 4

M: MMhm.. what was discussed during previous round was that mainly frontline employees should be doing this, it's their supervisor or first line manager responsible for facilitating and motivating in activities like this. Mainly because of also the interests that the employees might have, to secure their employability, to balance work-life, so the question is, where are the managers in this? What should the managers do in this?

P: The more the employees do, the less the manager has to do. No, I think the employees know a lot about the business, and they can think for themselves what is helping them to develop themselves. Most of the times the HR managers, the supervisors are thinking about that, but they forget to ask the professionals themselves. But that is in all kind of business. I work at Saxion, we call them professionals who work there, not always professional. But also construction companies, or big magazines, I think they have a lot of things to say about their own work.

M: Just to challenge their thinking, would they also be able to set goals for the entire department?

P: Well, I think they should also think about that. But I think the goals the strategy, the criteria that is something of the board or management. And you should invite professionals to think about that as well, but not everyone wants that. But the solutions, the work is getting done to deliver a part of the entire goal, that is something the employees can do.

P: In many cases, but not always, management is necessary. But I self believe in a more invisible kind of management, not as in the early days the strong manager. But independent employees and managers working together. There are always decisions where people can conflict with each other.

P: But this is self steering teams, in self-steering teams the role of the team as a total is important to solve problems, and there is someone as a coach who can help to get this process ongoing of solving the problem themselves. And if it's not possible for the team to solve the problem, then the team is the problem and they've to do something at the team. And that is also not the role of the manager but the role of the team, to discharge someone of the team and to put someone else in his position. That are self-steering teams.

P: I think that is the highest level you can achieve.

P: Of course, self steering teams like you described would be the best. But somewhere in the middle is the self-steering team that, I think nowadays businesses are too volatile to have a management on top that steers a whole company and each team in a direction, so each team should also be a little versatile for any kind of changes that may arise, so creating a team that also may think about that ?
So not necessarily a team that takes important decisions but at least takes them fast.

M: Are there given the fact that employees might become more involved challenges, are there challenges given the fact that employers ask employees to be more responsible for their development, set goals and idiosyncratic deals?

P: I think when you want to go that way as a organization, you have to use processes as lean, you create value, what is the value that a part of your organization creates, and if that is settles, the team has the responsibility to create that value.

M: And what is challenging here?

P: I think first of all, the team members have to understand that they create value, not doing their job till 5, and that they have to be the problem solving side.

M: But what can be problematic?

P: problematic might be that employees are not willing to think about their own career, thinking that everything is going well, I don't have to do anything more. That is difficult for some people. From what is see in our factories the low educated people we have to stick to them, and the highly educated people they want to follow every training they can get.

M: And what do you do in order to stimulate this?

P: We inform and trigger employees to think about their own career, to follow training programs we offer.

M: What are the tangible things you do there to make sure that they do that?

P: Annual meeting how employees can keep their job

P: So, employability.

P: Creating the possibility of pay, people move from A to B, they see that A is not the place to stay, people move or they see perspective, what is in it for me? Or they see if I stay at A it would be worth, pay or perspective? And this is the category of creating the possibility of pay.

P: And that is more about, reacting out of fear?

P: Yes, reacting out of fear. It's a way.

M: So, then you're sketching a scene in when you don't develop you end up losing your job. There are also more positive ways to stimulate them?

P: Then you go more towards the higher level, creating a challenge for the employee? And it's a challenge to create a challenge for the lower level. To stimulate them to think about their career without the risk of losing their job when they don't.

P: Let me ask, I've set in these sessions over there and talked about shared services, information technology, it seems to me that they are about standardizing and making sure that are limited ranges for initiative. And that I come here and talking about employee involvement and self-steering teams and I guess i'm not quite able to put those together. It seems to me that we have one thing in that direction and the other in another direction and i'm not able to fit those together.

M: Could there be a hybrid approach?

P: Maybe combine them, if you allow people to design more for themselves, and in return use HR analytics, so the top management can use this information and on the other hand the employees get satisfied that they can design more for themselves on other parts of their work. Motivate employees to use HR analytics or more administration.

M: I think what critics refer to is that on the one hand there are organizations who are inclined to standardize with shared services and information technology, and on the other hand here we are having these employees with their i-deals and how to balance those?

P: Well, I think , if this means anything, organizations doing different things. But if they all end up doing the same things than, you have got no involvement, so if organizations are doing no different things , release discussions about let's everybody make standardized as possible, that is a bit a contradiction.

P: It's not a conclusion we should standardize, it was more an important issue for discussion, of should we standardize or customize? and especially things like this, like self managing teams lead to the conclusion that you should much more customize and less standardize.

M: But isn't this a challenge that occurs in real life organizations? I think it does. I think we could talk about this, how to balance this. On the one hand this need for standardization and efficiency, but on the other we hand we try to be responsive to idiosyncratic employees.

P: I think also there is another challenge connected to this question about the employee involvement, that is the differentiation in employee relationships you see nowadays. More and more differentiation, and so that leads the wave from standardization of HR processes and HR data , you just suit that more differentiation on that side, and also more differentiation in HR policies and data.

P: I think what Chris meant, is that strategy structure and system must be in balance. You can't organize strategy in this way, structure in this way and systems in another way. Put them in balance with each other, they have to fit together. If strategy is leading, structure and systems must facilitate to achieve those goals.

P: I like that way of expression, In the time of the industrial revolution, organizations where manufactories with lots of different industries, you produce 1000 units and put them together with units of him, and I give you a contract, I don't care how you manage your people, as long as I get my 1000 units. And in a certain way we go back to that with self managing teams,

P: Scientific management is the beginning of standardization of everything,

P: And important we still have that , he. And one company creates products, and it goes from A to B, and it goes on.

M: We have to wrap up? We should ask more fundamental questions, what is an organization, what is a firm, what is an employee? Is it an individual on the payroll or should we see an employee as a company itself who sells his services to a company?

M: Now in this last round, we are going to put stickers on the slides.

9.2 World Café: Shared service centres

Ronde 1:

M: Zullen we beginnen met het introduceren van welke ervaringen je hebt met het huidige onderwerp shared services? Een beetje achtergrond dus, practicitoner or academic. Ik zal wel beginnen, ik ben zelf wetenschapper, als consultant betrokken bij het onderwerp van shared services. Als wetenschapper doe ik onderzoek naar business outcomes, de value van hr shared services voor businesses. Als consultant ben ik met name bezig met de implementatie van e-HRM systemen in de context van HR shared services.

M: Mag ik jou vragen wat je ervaringen zijn met shared services?

P: Ik ben …., ik ben eindverantwoordelijk voor het HR shared service center van USG People Nederland. USG People Nederland is het moederbedrijf van een aantal grote uitzendorganisaties in Nederland. In HR Shared services center in Nederland verlonen wij alle mensen die in dienst zijn dus niet alle uitzendkrachten. Dat zijn er zo'n 3000. En daarbij ben ik dus verantwoordelijk voor payroll maar ook alles wat daarbij hoort, wagenpark, pensioen, opleiden. Daarnaast ben ik ook HR verantwoordelijke, en stuur ik een drietal HR business partners aan. Waar staan wij nu met HR shared services? Wij werken nu met SGP soft, en wij gaan nu succesfactors implementeren en daar willen we binnenkort mee live gaan.

P: Mijn naam is Niek Olde Monnikhof, ik ben practitioner bij grolsch. Mijn functie is HR business partner, binnen dat terrein richt ik mij op operations, het bouwen verpakken van productie en logistiek. Doe dat sinds drie jaar, daarvoor heb ik zes jaar als consultant bij delloyd gewerkt, Dat was de groep HR transformation, veel transformation projecten gedaan. Waar wij ons nu bevinden met Grolsch is dat wij in Oktober live zijn gegaan met een nieuw SRP systeem, dat een soort van global template heeft, Grolsch is onderdeel van SABmiller en die hebben een soort standaard gemaakt waar alle brouwerijen aan gaan voldoen, ook HR zit daarin en we zijn eigenlijk in die transitie bezig. We hadden we SRP, maar niet op een employee en manager self service wijze, nu wel. En die verandering zijn we nu aan het managen.

P: Mijn naam is ….., ook een practitioner. Ik ben consultant en product manager van een HRM systeem dat is ontwikkeld op .. En dat richt zich op de employee self- service en de manager support van shared services, en op de processen van instroom, uitstroom, doorstroom, verlof. Ik ben bezig met de ontwikkeling van een roadmap.

M: Heb jij specifieke ervaringen met shared services?

P: Ja, vanuit de implementatie kant. Dus als consultant betrokken.

P: Mijn naam is Guus van Emmerik, ben masterstudent hier………………

P: Mijn naam is Ward Uylenberg, ook masterstudent………………………..

P: Ik werk bij Post thermo techniek, ik ben daar technisch schrijver een ook betrokken bij de productontwikkeling. Wat heb ik te maken met shared service centers? Helemaal niks. Waarom zit ik hier? Net als jullie ben ik hier student met als specialisatie HRM.

M: (…) Legt de bedoeling uit van café en ronde 1. Wat is jullie idee van HRM in de context van shared services?

P: Zal ik eens een beginnetje maken. De vraag is denk ik iets te simpel, van wat is HRM? Mijn voorstel is….(slecht verstaanbaar). Onderscheid maken tussen HR central and HR local, deze hebben verschillende behoeften?

M: Wat bedoel je precies met HR central and HR local?

P: Ik vertelde net dat ik werkte voor post thermo techniek, dat is een grote organisatie, ik zelf werk ik Deventer. Daar heb ik te maken met HR local, daarboven zit een HR central, en die bedenken meer de regeltjes van het spel. HR local is wat dat betreft een soort van system operate, en HR central meer een system designer. Daar komen we straks nog op terug bij de ICT systemen. En deze hebben dus allebei een andere behoefte.

P: Wij hebben het HR shared service center bij USG people en dat bestaat nu exact vijf jaar. Wij begonnen zonder ESS en MSS processen. Wij hebben in 2010/2011 SRP met ESS en MSS geïmplementeerd met het effect dat er zo'n 130 HR processen die normaal centraal werden uitgevoerd met lokale aanvoer terug gebracht werden in de lijn wat jij net ook al aan gaf. Het aantal HR koppen is sterk verminderd, dat zijn de HR business partners geworden. Heel veel HR taken zijn in de lijn gelegd bij medewerkers zelf en bij managers. De achtergrond van zo´n traject is natuurlijk efficiency en kostenbesparing. We hebben het verhaal van Chris gehoord, wat bij iedere SRP implementatie gebeurd dat loopt nooit zoals we dat willen, dan is er geld tekort en wat wordt er dan geschrapt , de aandacht voor de gebruiker. Het lijkt er op, alsof men daar niet van leert, want ik hebt recent mensen van de universiteit Maastricht gesproken, waar afgelopen jaar ESS en MSS is geïmplementeerd en waar exact hetzelfde is gebeurd. Waar aanvankelijk in het programma heel veel aandacht was voor de gebruikers, want die moeten met het systeem gaan werken, dat men knel kwam te zitten met de techniek is geschrapt. En volgens mij is daar ook het knelpunt ontstaan wat jij ook wel aangeeft, er is heel veel aandacht voor het systeem en het beleid, maar de mensen die het moeten gaan gebruiken daar is eigenlijk te weinig aandacht voor en die hebben ook te weinig een rol gehad in het maken en het creëren van het systeem. En wij gaan nu succesfactors implementeren en hopen dat we niet dezelfde fout maken. Maar wat je dus ziet is dat de weerstand in het gebruik van het systeem enorm is.

M: Nog steeds na vijf jaar?

P: Ja, nog steeds. Niet zozeer bij de medewerkers, want de medewerkers processen zijn relatief eenvoudig, dat is verlof aanvragen en gegevens wijzigen en daar houdt het ook wel een beetje bij op. Maar managers, wij als shared service center zijn natuurlijk heel erg gefocust op first time right, krijgen wij onze informatie in één keer goed. En wij doen daar al langer onderzoek naar, en dan zie je dat maar 50% van wat wij binnen krijgen in één keer goed. Als je bedenkt dat wij zo'n 8000 mutaties verwerken in één kwartaal bij wijze van spreken, dan is dat dus heel veel re-work en terugsturen.

P: Gaat dat rechtstreeks van manager naar HR SSC?

P: Daar zit nog een HR business partner tussen. En daar zit denk ik ook een probleem, wij hebben op basis van ESS en MSS implementatie, het aantal HR business partners nadrukkelijk verminderd. Maar hun hebben wel die controlerende rol gehouden, wat voor hun een workload is, zeker als je bij start people, bij start people werken alleen al 2000 man met een verloop van heel hoog. Er is heel veel werk op dat vlak, de werkvoorraad van die HR business partner loopt dus heel hoog op, en die wil eigenlijk andere dingen doen want hij is niet voor niets business partner. Wat je inderdaad zegt de local HR, die business partner, heeft hele andere behoeften dan dat zij een werkvoorraad vol hebben staan die zij moeten controleren.

M: Ik begrijp uit jouw verhaal dat door de introductie van SRP dat eigenlijk.. minder belangrijk is geworden

P: nou ja belangrijkheid, er zitten minder mensen op.

M: Belangrijk is misschien niet het juiste woord. Het aantal FTE's is naar beneden gaan. Hiervan heb je de employees, daarvan is het aantal FTE's meer geworden, die moeten meer doen.

P: Er is een verschuiving van HR.

P: Waar zie jij dan de business partner in dit stukje? Zit jij dan op het HR SSC stuk?

P: Ik ben verantwoordelijk voor het HR SSC maar stuur ook business partners aan, business partners zitten op de middelste deel

P: Maar die business partners zouden eigenlijk ook minder administratieve lasten willen hebben, maar SSC stukje? wat dan eigenlijk meer de processen, dat is centraal georganiseerd, en daarin heeft de manager, employee, ...

P: Wat je ziet is dat managers zelf instroom en uitstroom zelf moeten initiëren in het systeem, en daar dan toch vaak onvoldoende tijd en kennis hebben, en eigenlijk daar de ondersteuning van de low call business partner voor nodig hebben en daar knelt hij, want die groep is kleiner geworden.

P: Wat ik interessant vind is, ik gaf laatst een training aan managers, en die zeiden: 'ja, maar als ik straks iets in het systeem zet dan wil ik wel dat je het accordeert', ik zeg ik wil maar één ding dat je eerst met mij gaat praten voordat je iets in het systeem zet want ik ga niet alleen maar achter de computer zitten. En dat was dan al een eye opener, daar waren managers ook al wel tevreden mee. Maar in feite vind er eigenlijk een soort van dubbeling van processen plaats. In eerste instantie liep je over de gang en zei je, ja die heeft opgezegd, Oh ja, dat is jammer dan gaan we even een exit-gesprekje plannen en en vacature stellen en ik stuur jou iets op. Heb je nu hetzelfde gesprek, maar ik sluit af met ga maar een vacature maken in het systeem, ga die persoon maar uit het systeem nemen, eigenlijk krijg je een soort van dubbeling van processen en communicatie, want je kunt niet het één doen zonder het andere, het is dus ook wel nodig. Maar ik vind dat wel een bepaalde inefficiency.

M: Die dubbeling zit hem dat enerzijds in een stukje formalisatie en anderzijds een stukje dat niet zo geformaliseerd is?

P: Ja, je hebt eigenlijk het beslisproces doe je nooit in het systeem, alleen het administratieve starten en verwerken doe je wel in het systeem, en je moet eigenlijk beide dingen doen. Alleen die dingen lopen in de werkelijke wereld een beetje door elkaar heen.

P: En die administratie waar wordt die dan uiteindelijk voor gebruikt? Want als je die beslissingen neemt zonder het syteem, dan vraag je je af? Waarom is het systeem er nog?

P: Nou je neemt allereerst een beslissing, iemand gaat weg dat wil nog niet zeggen dat je automatisch iemand anders wilt aannemen. Het kan ook zijn dat je de positie vacant wilt houden. Dus dat is een bepaalde beslissing tussen twee mensen die je maakt, maar dan moet er iets gebeuren. Dus dan moet er een vacature ergens op de website terecht komen en dit trigger je via een aantal stapjes in het systeem. En dit is het administratieve deel. Ik merk dat daar een stuk inefficiëntie in ontstaat wat ik zelf niet zo handig vind.

P: Wat je ook ziet is dat processen in systemen zijn ingericht vanuit het perspectief van het proces. Welke stappen zijn nodig om bijvoorbeeld een arbeidsovereenkomst uit een systeem te spugen om het maar even zo te zeggen. Maar niet vanuit het perspectief van de klant., en daar zit dan ook vaak de frustratie. Die processen duren vaak veel te lang, want er moeten allerlei accorderingen worden gedaan terwijl de nieuwe medewerker de volgende dag al op de stoep moet staan en aan de slag kunnen. Dat is denk ik met de implementatie van digitale HR processen , dat is veel meer vanuit de technische en ICT kant ingericht, en niet vanuit de HR gebruiker of de manager als HR gebruiker.

M: Wie heeft bij jullie die processen bedacht dan? Die komen ergens vandaan dan. Jullie zijn er niet tevreden over, dat is duidelijk.

P: De houder van het project is de ... organisatie geweest. Er is wel een sounding board geweest. Dus HR eindverantwoordelijken zijn wel betrokken geweest bij het maken van die processen. Maar uiteindelijk waar ze de mist in zijn gegaan denk ik terugkijkend, is dat de manager die uiteindelijk het proces moet gaan uitvoeren niet in dat sounding board zat.

M: Heeft ICT niet een te grote vinger in de pap gehad? Zoals jij het nu verteld lijkt het er een beetje op alsof de ICT afdeling min of meer HRM heeft overgenomen.

P: Vaak in de aanschaf van dit soort systemen, dat zijn natuurlijk enorme IT investeringen die je voor de lange termijn maakt, IT landschappen dat zijn enorme investeringen en worden vaak getriggerd vanuit IT. Wij hadden 'exact' alleen dat kon onze volumes niet aan, dus er moest een ander IT landschap komen. Vervolgens in tweede instantie, wordt er een selectie gemaakt van systemen, SRP dit gaat het worden en dan pas komt de gebruiker in beeld.

M: En dan weet ik van SRP, dat zijn dure systemen, je kunt allerlei modules kopen. In Duitsland hebben ze een aantal dingen opgezet. Als bedrijf kun je daar vanaf wijken en daarvoor moet je ook een grote zak met geld betalen.

P: En dat is ook een fout die we gemaakt hebben, wij hebben heel veel maatwerk in ons systeem.

M: Anderzijds, als je geneigd bent om de goedkope optie te kiezen, dan is eigenlijk de bedenker van jullie HR systeem SRP. Van de kernprocessen wel ja. Terwijl je niet weet waar SRP voor staat. 'System against people'. En dat conflicteert dus met HRM.

P: Spanningsveld, jullie hebben dan veel customized?

P: Ja.

P: Wij hebben bij Grolsch een global template, dat is dus dat iedere brouwerij in de groep van SABmiller, die gaat ongeveer hetzelfde ingericht worden. Dan is het dus interessant he, van wat was nou de trigger om te gaan standaardiseren. Wat was de trigger om te implementeren bij SABmiller? Dat is ook standaardisatie, dat snap ik wel in de levensfase waarin SABmiller zit. Daar is dan elke keer gezegd, 'adopt and don't adapt'. Dus neem het maar over en pas het niet aan, dat deed in het begin pijn omdat je dan best veel veranderd. Voordeel is dat elk kwartaal, heb je nieuwe updates en moet je al die exceptions gaan testen etc. Of als je iets anders wil dan kost dat weer heel veel geld. Ik vond het factor tijd ook wel heel interessant in de presentatie van vanochtend. Omdat je nu iets inricht en daar een tijd lang mee verder gaat.

P: Het is ook op de traditionele manier ingericht he, met een blauwdruk en functionaliteit. Dat is natuurlijk ook in de IT branche helemaal niet meer, het is nu allemaal 'egile'

P: Ik vind het heel star eigenlijk worden, wat ik eigenlijk het liefst zou hebben is dat ik aan de achterkant met een radiobutton kan zeggen, ik wil het proces wel of niet via de manager laten lopen. Dat gaan wij gewoon lokaal bepalen. Die inrichting heeft tien opties en iedere afdeling kiest één optie die het beste bij dat stukje past.

M: SSC wordt met name gezien als standaardisatie en geen customization, jullie focussen nu heel erg op de IT he en op de techniek, een andere vraag die we zouden kunnen bespreken is waar zou een SSC aan moeten bijdragen in een organisatie? Hebben jullie daar een beeld bij?

P: Ik heb voor mijn bachelor opdracht daar dus onderzoek naar gedaan, over welke rol dat dus zou kunnen zijn. En toen heb ik kwalitatief onderzoek gedaan, een vragenlijst opgestuurd naar een aantal HR managers van SSC's. En daar kwam eigenlijk een beetje een tweeledige rol naar voren, de respondenten dachten eigenlijk dat een administratieve functie altijd wel zou zijn weggelegd voor een SSC omdat je eigenlijk een heleboel taken bundelt en standaardiseert. En dat die rol zich daarnaast een beetje zou kunnen ontwikkelen naar advies gevend, van goh hoe moet je bepaalde misschien sollicitaties, payroll uitvoeren, naar lokale hr managers, daar komt dus een beetje een ondersteunende functie weer terug waar lokale HR dus weer naar het HR SSC terug kan gaan voor advies.

M: Dus een advies- rol voor SSC?

P: Dus eigenlijk twee-ledig, administratief en advies gevend, en dat kan dan een beetje afhankelijk zijn in hoeverre een SSC is gericht op de toekomst. Dus een SSC die meer short term gericht is zal wat meer administratieve taken vervullen en naar mate meer lange termijn wordt, meer los staat van de organisatie dan kan het meer een adviesgevende rol krijgen.

P: Zo zijn wij nu ook ingericht, het hr SSC bestaat feitelijke uit het transactionele deel, helpdesk en front- en back office en een aantal expertise afdelingen, opleiden, waar zit dan de toekomst? Want die transactionele afdelingen heb je gewoon steeds meer handen voor nodig, want daar wordt steeds meer mee gedaan. De ontwikkeling en de aandacht gaat steeds meer naar die expert-rol. En daar krijg je ook wel het interessante op HR-gebied. Want dat is feitelijk ook de verschuiving van de operationele HR naar de business partner/ expert HR-rol.

Dat zie je nu eigenlijk binnen het SSC ook gebeuren, en hoe zich dat dan verhoudt tot de rol van de HR business partner dat is dan een interessante discussie. Want wie is straks de expert? Is dat de HR business partner of de expertise die centraal te vinden is?

P: De analytics, ik snap het spanningsveld zelf eigenlijk ook wel, maar wat je wel ziet is dat SSC veel data verwerken, en daarmee veel inzicht kunnen hebben in het abstractere deel van de organisatie. Denk aan ziekteverzuim . Ze kunnen zeker een signalerende functie vervullen voor hun HR business partner om prioriteiten te geven en niet zozeer te zeggen van ik ben nu getraind in verzuim en dat ga ik jou uitleggen. Maar wel vanuit bepaalde insights waar jij op zit als SSC. Daar zie ik wel degelijk een toegevoegde waarde.

P: En dan ook richting het management, of richting die business partner en die praat dan met het management?

P: Ja, dat is een dilemma. Als je het heel simpel zegt zou ik zoveel mogelijk business partner en management laten samen werken, tenzij het transactionele activiteiten zijn waarbij het veel efficiënter is dat het rechtstreeks gaat. Als het om insights gaat en om veranderen en om bijsturen dan zou ik het liefste via een business partner laten verlopen.

P: Dat hangt misschien ook een beetje van de grootte van de organisatie af, denk ik.

P: Ja, vast.

P: Nou, en wat bij ons ook wel heel erg speelt, managers in onze veld organisatie zijn vooral commerciële targets en moeten zo min mogelijk bezig zijn met administratie en eigenlijk het wordt niet gezegd en liever HR eigenlijk ook niet want men moet ook verkopen. Ik voel daar ook wel de spanning want daar, de rol van de manager in HR is gewoon beperkt in die sales organisatie.

P: Stuurt die manager bij jullie mensen aan?

P: Ja

P: Ja, ik zeg altijd ik denk dat de manager meer HR werk verricht dan ik, en dan hebben we het natuurlijk ook over administratieve processen, helemaal mee eens daar moeten managers zo min mogelijk tijd in steken. Maar volgens mij, een goede manager managet zijn team en dat is bijna per definitie dat je met HR taken bezig bent. Dat administratieve stuk snap ik heel goed.

P: De aandacht van managers gaat heel veel uit naar performance management. Maar op andere vakgebieden naar ontwikkeling en lange termijn wordt haal heel snel naar HR gekeken, zoals development and learning. Dan trekt de manager heel snel aan de bel bij HR.

M: En dan over de rol van de lijn?

P: Wij gaan ook steeds meer toe naar transparantie richting de lijn ten aanzien van analytics?

P: Ik denk ook dat vooral de motivatie om daaraan mee te werken, als ze zien dat die analytics resultaat opleveren zullen misschien ook de managers die de werknemers aansturen ook beter dingen kunnen overbrengen op werknemers van, goh daar is daadwerkelijk een belang bij en dan kunnen ze ook duidelijk maken aan de werknemers want daar dan het voordel voor hun is om mee te werken.

P: Het begint ook in de top, heel veel directeuren hebben ook behoorlijk wat workflow en daar zitten de assistentes veel te accorderen. Ik kan ze bijna geen ongelijk geven, maar dan gaat het al snel lang en ik denk als je de juiste HR processen ook naar de managers, als een director ook voor de lange termijn goed die managers aanstuurt, ja dan ga je ook voorbeeldgedrag tonen en dan ga je het ook lager terug zien. En als dat niet gebeurt dan houdt het ook lager al snel op, je wordt bij SAB miller bijv. niet aangestuurd op minder tastbare zaken.

Bij ons is het heel erg op, wat is je bierverlies? wat is je energieverlies? Wat zijn je efficiency's? maar de meer menselijk gerichte aspecten daar wordt niet expliciet naar gevraagd, meer impliciet.

M: Welke relatie heeft dat met het SSC?

P: Met het SSC, goede vraag, in ieder geval met het HR proces dat je een veel kortere termijn focus krijgt als je alleen nog de noodzakelijke dingen doet. Als je ziet dat alleen de noodzakelijke aspecten via het systeem lopen maar de wat lange termijn processen als development en career development, performance management met R&D activiteiten dat die onderbenut worden en dat je daardoor ook minder zult terug zien in het SSC.

P: Ja, maar je ziet natuurlijk ook dat SSC...

P: Ja, dat heeft met name met de lange termijn executie van HR processen wordt vooral aangestuurd vanuit de top door voorbeeld leiderschap

M: Wordt dit door het SSC gedaan?

P: Ik denk dat je de korte termijn processen, dat die hoofdzakelijk via het SSC komen en de langere termijn processen veel minder.

P: Nou wat ik grappig vind, als ik daarop in mag haken. Dit is de tweede keer dat jij zegt van administratie is eigenlijk het belangrijkste. Ward zei aan het begin van de discussie eigenlijk precies het omgekeerde, die had het over een verschuiving van administratie naar strategie. Grappig dat jullie daar allebei een andere visie op hebben.

P: Wat zei jij dat ik had gezegd dan?

P: Dat SSC een belangrijke rol vervullen bij het doen van administratie, analyse van big data heb je genoemd. Ward zei dat hij constateerde bij zijn bachelor onderzoek dat er meer een verschuiving is van de administratieve functie naar een strategische functie.

P: Dat is denk ik de hele HR functie als geheel die maakt die beweging, maar het SSC richt zich met name op het administratieve dan wel het analytische deel.

P: Ik denk dat dat een verschuiving is die nog moet plaats vinden

P: Ik denk dat heel veel HR SSC's nog, ik zit ook in een netwerk van HR SSC's, dat de één zit nog echt in het begin van processen samenvoegen en centraliseren en harmoniseren, wij zijn zelf al de stap aan het maken naar meer expertise en dienstverlening bieden. Dat zit nog echt heel ver, dat zie je echt in allerlei fases in Nederland. Ik zeg altijd, het meest ultieme voorbeeld vind ik zelf Philips, die heeft alle transactionele activiteiten al uitbesteed, payroll, en zij hebben alleen nog maar service managers en expertise managers in dienst in het ssc, en alle uitvoerende taken gebeurt al niet meer in Nederland, dat gebeurt al extern. Dus daar is die ontwikkeling nog veel verder.

M: Ligt dat niet een beetje aan wat de klant wil, jij bent natuurlijk een klant van een SSC. En jij hebt onderzoeken gedaan bij een aantal bedrijven dat zijn ook klanten van SSC. Heb je niet gewoon verschillende klanten waar een SSC zich eigenlijk maar naar moet schikken.

P: Er is ook een verschil van SSC als dat het een losstaande organisatie is of dat het een onderdeel van het bedrijf is. Er zijn verschillende theorieën over van waar je dat center nou het best kunt positioneren. En de klanten van deze SSC zijn eigenlijk de medewerkers, als employees ga je naar het SSC toe met je vragen en informatie,en managers gebruiken daar ook de kennis uit, dus de klanten van een SSC, de vraag is of die heel veel te willen hebben ergens.

P: De continue strijd binnen shared services is dat je aan de ene kant non profit bent, je bent geen profit center maar een cost center dus alles moet zo goedkoop mogelijk, maar die klant wil wel optimaal bediend worden dus daar gaat het vaak scheef. Dat is ook waarom wij bij SAP zo ontieglijk veel maatwerk hebben. Wat natuurlijk heel stom is eigenlijk, daardoor wordt het hele systeem. Maar dat leidt ook tot de continue strijd die je levert, en SSC die geen onderdeel zijn van een bedrijf maar zelf een profit centers, dat zijn een soort SSC's. Die vermarkten hun diensten, dat is een andere situatie.

M: 35:40 (Niet verstaanbaar)

P: Ligt er misschien ook aan waar het centrum voor gebruikt wordt, als het vooral administratieve functies vervult zal het meer de manager zijn die op basis van die gegevens, van die big data, beslissingen neemt, als het een meer ondersteunende functie heeft dan zou de klant eerder de medewerker zijn die naar het SSC gaan voor informatie en advies

M: Laatste 5 minuten,

P: Wat was de hoofdvraag van onze sessie,

M: De hoofdvraag was HRM zonder HR,

P: En wat is de rol van SSC's daarin?

M: Dan hebben we hier wat algemene vragen, Wat zijn toekomstige redenen om een SSC te beginnen? Wat zijn de laatste ontwikkelingen in de rollen van SSC's Wat zou de waarde moeten zijn van een SSC?

P: Nou die waarde en rol, die zijn een beetje hetzelfde toch? Welke waarde de SSC's hebben?

M: Ja, ... denk dat we die vraag wel hebben he, als we kijken naar onze aantekeningen, hier komen ook wat dingen terug he, de rol en verdelingen van activiteiten binnen een SSC

P: Ja, wat ik wilde zeggen, dat is toch eigenlijk een beetje welke waarde een SSC voor je bedrijf heeft

M: ....(slecht verstaanbaar)

P: Toen ik hier ging zitten wist ik nog weinig van SSC's, ik heb nu van verschillende mensen verschillende visies gehoord, en ik krijg echt nu een beetje een beeld van een SSC waaruit gewoon iedereen uit kan halen wat hij hebben wil, dus de één wil er data analyse uit halen, de ander wil er potentie uit halen, nog een ander wil er strategieën uit halen, is dat beeld correct? Kan een SSC dus een heel breed iets zijn waar iedereen uit kan halen wat hij hebben wil?

P: Ik denk niet dat ieder SSC al zover is.

P: Zou dat beeld er kunnen zijn ?

P: Ik denk, de ontwikkeling van Shared services is wel, iedereen begint gewoon met het transactionele gedeelte, en dat breidt zich verder uit als kenniscentrum, expert en die rol in voorspellende waarde, HR analytics, maar in de basis ben je een ondersteunend apparaat, dus een service apparaat.

P: Kan ik het dan zo zien dat je eigenlijk nu op dit moment, je hebt een aantal kruideniers en die zijn gespecialiseerd, en in de toekomst dat je grotere supermarkten krijgt en dat de rol van de kruidenier gaat vervallen.

P: Wij als directieteam van het SSC hebben wel als stip op de horizon gezegd, van hoe mooi het zou zijn als andere organisaties ook van onze diensten gaan gebruik maken, nu zijn we alleen maar SSC van ons eigen bedrijf, van USG, maar uiteindelijk zou je, als je echt ambitie hebt, zo goed willen doen dat ook anderen die diensten van jou willen hebben,

M: ...
P: Van cost center naar profit center ja

P : Dat zou impliceren dat het aantal SSC's dan gaat afnemen. Om aan de analogie vast te houden, het aantal kruideniers zal minder worden, het aantal bakkers zal verdwijnen, maar het aantal supermarkten zal toenemen.

M: ..
M: Wat moet er met de besparing en winst gebeuren van SSC?

P: Als dat ook weer toegevoegde waarde biedt aan de moeder, in dit geval USG, nou ik denk dat het als het ons lukt om geld te verdienen, onze CEO daar heel blij mee zal zijn. Alleen het is natuurlijk wel weer een heel nieuw verdienmodel voor je organisatie.

P: Het zit heel dicht bij onze business als USG, maar als je SSC bent van Bosch ligt het misschien wat verder weg.

P: Als ze bij ons bier gaan brouwen in het SSC dan wordt het anders...

M: Kunnen we eens gaan nadenken over de research question, welke onderzoeksvragen zijn dan interessant? Als we hier naar kijken welke dingen vinden jullie dan interessant en waar zouden jullie meer over willen weten? over de toekomst in het algemeen.

P: Over of in de toekomst je grote SSC's krijgt die meer te bieden hebben, of ga je naar een toekomst waarin je meer specialistenwerk hebt?

M: Wat bedoel je met meer bieden?

P: De supermarktanalogie, in de zin van administratie, strategie, data-analyse, adviesfunctie, dus dat je meerdere verschillende pakketten kunt bieden, afhankelijk van de wens van de klant. Dus wordt SSC een supermarkt?

P: Nou, en wat natuurlijk ook een interessant vraagstuk is, kun je HR vervangen door shared services? Dus hoe verhoudt het pakket van HR shared services tot de rol van de HR business partner? Wij zijn daar nog niet uit wat daarin het ideale model zou zijn. Ik zie ook wel wat de HR business partner.

M: Met business partner bedoel je de lokale HR?

P: Ja, die in de business zit. Of dat dan fysiek is of niet fysiek dat maakt dan niet zoveel uit. Een HR business partner dient de strategie van de business, en hoe kan je dan..

M: Heb ik het zo goed geformuleerd, kan een SSC de rol van de HR business partner vervangen?

P: Ja, dat is opzich een uitdagende vraag.

P: Ik vind het zelf ook nog wel interessant of een HR SSC ook echt een profit center kan worden? En hoe dit zich dan gaat ontwikkelen, dus wat we net ook zeiden dat ze ook hun eigen belangen voor hun bedrijf in acht moeten houden, en of er een mogelijkheid is?

P: Het kan he, want ze bestaan al, de NC.. van deze wereld, dat zijn gewoon profit centers,

P: Het gaat met name om de combinatie tussen je oorspronkelijke bedrijf en ..

P: Kan een SSC van een organisatie een profit unit worden?

P: Wat ik nog wel een interessante vraag vind is de mate waarin control stappen zijn ingebouwd, hoe meer control stappen zijn ingebouwd wat dat doet met the first time right percentages. Want ik denk dat niet meer control leidt tot betere kwaliteit, dus waar ligt zo'n optimum?

P: Ja, dat vind ik ook een hele interessante vraag. Want wij zien dat de processen heel erg vanuit de compliancy worden gemaakt, en niet vanuit een gezond risicomanagement.

M: Zal ik het breder trekken , hoe kunnen we met de introductie van een SSC toch de kwaliteit van data waarborgen? Is dat dan een betere vraag?

P: Ja, want als je iets met HR analytics wil dan moet je data goed zijn.

P: In feite is het inderdaad dezelfde vraag, en ik ben dan met name geïnteresseerd in compliance, want je kunt compliance afdwingen maar dat leidt dan niet altijd tot het noodzakelijke gedrag dat je wilt bereiken, daar zit een soort optimum in. Als jij weinig regels hebt worden er fouten gemaakt, als jij gewoon een goed aantal regels hebt worden er zo min mogelijk fouten gemaakt, en als jij heel veel regels hebt worden er veel meer fouten gemaakt, dat is wel een interessant aspect.

P: Wat je ziet is dat processen ingericht zijn op de drie procent die misbruik maakt van het systeem,

P: Ja, en dan heb vier op de machine, wat ze vanmorgen ook zeiden...

P: Ja,

P: En dan zit de manager alleen maar op de knop te drukken omdat er ergens iemand een keer wat heeft gedaan en dat probeert te voorkomen

P: Ja, en dat er ergens data uit moet komen waarmee je ook de business weer voedt,

M: Je kunt doorgaan hoor, wat willen jullie nog meer weten?

P: Nou ik zit even te denken, want je hebt nu die HR shared service center, maar bij USG misschien ook nog andere shared service centers behalve HR?

P: Ja, we hebben alles in shared services

P: Dus dat zit allemaal bij elkaar, dus in hoeverre dat dan HR, of dit dan alleen maar administratieve handelingen zijn die ook door iemand anders die niet HR achtergrond heeft ook zou kunnen doen, dan heb je natuurlijk weer de business partner dus daar zit dan wel het snijvlak inderdaad, of dit echt nog wel HR is in dat geval

P: Sorry?

P: Of dit echt nog wel HR is in dat geval?

P: Dan een andere vraag, heb je om HR shared service te bedrijven HR kennis nodig?

M: Ja, zal ik die opschrijven?

P: Afhankelijk van de rol die je hebt als SSC, we hebben rollen in het SSC waarbij je geen HR kennis nodig hebt, gewoon processenwerk en instructies volgen

P: Nou en dan heb je natuurlijk de ontwikkeling dat daarin natuurlijk steeds meer die administratieve processen worden geautomatiseerd, dus misschien heb je later daar wel helemaal niemand meer voor nodig?

M: Als je deze vraag stelt, als je in een HR SSC geen HR kennis meer nodig hebt? Waarom zou je dan nog een HR SSC opzetten uberhaupt?

P: Nou dan wordt het meer SSC, dan is dat meer het SSC dat je opbouwt

P: Nou en de wereld verandert, als je iets hebt geautomatiseerd, dan heb je een engineer en die heeft iets gecodificeerd en dat ligt dan vast, en de vraag is dan hoe organiseer je nou het feit dat de klant wat anders wil hebben, je hebt al wat staan een proces dat geautomatiseerd is, maar de wereld wordt wat anders met andere behoeften, hoe heb je nou dat lerende vermogen in zo'n SSC zitten, zijn dat business partners die aan de bel trekken, die een engineer aansturen, die een bepaald geautomatiseerd proces weer veranderen , dus dat is eigenlijk van hoe houd je je SSC automatisering en processen optimaal,

P: Dat is eigenlijk ook wat je in het begin zei he, die grote afhankelijkheid van het systeem, van een SAP wat de grootte en een trage organisatie, ja lijkt me voor jullie ook heel lastig hoor.

Ronde 2

M: Oke, the second round about shared services. In the first session we discussed about the relationship of HRM without HR with shared service centers. We notated the research questions and made some notes. One expectation is that the SSC will shift from an administrative role to a more expert role. Especially about HR analytics, there was a big role for SSC's in that. Another important question was, how can we make sure that the SSC in the future is able to demonstrate compliancy? Also to assure data quality. That is seen as a big issue at the moment, as users, end-users, employees and line managers are involved in HR processes to ESS and MSS, that the SSC is faced with a lot of corrupt data, bad data or missing data or sometimes a duplication of data. Other statement that was made, was a question whether the internal SSC as it exists at the moment in organisations still exists in the future or will it all be outsourced? Another interesting question and maybe also for the next 25 minutes, the participants of the predecessor session saw a conflict between the business partners and the SSC.

There was a conflicting role, how should the division of tasks be made. What also is important, the original definition of a SSC is about standardization and customization. The user is the chooser and should be able to demonstrate and asks to the SSC what he needs. In practice we see that actually the SCC is about standardization and not about customization. For the next 25 minutes we would like to address those topics and especially focus on what the key actors guarantee the success of the SSC, what are the components and capabilities required by the SSC and the other stakeholders. Where should the SSC be positioned within the organisation or external? And then at the end we will again write down the research questions. So would anyone reflect on these discussion points?

P: What I miss is, is this all from the perspective of the service center? What I miss is the question what do line managers or people in an organisation need in terms of HR advisory, HR products to translate the question of that answer, what does that mean in terms of organization of a SSC? The answer on that question, translated to questions for a SSC, so there is a statement about that SSC's are all about standardization and not customization, the question is not what can a SCC do or not do, the question is what do people in organizations need? And when the answer on that question is, 80% of our products are all the same, then that statement stands, but if the answer is 20% of our products are similar then that does not stand, then the question is how can a SSC customize their work, what part?

M: Do you have any opinion about that or examples?

P: It's dependable on how organisations are organized, production lines are similar to other production lines or is comparable to other parts of the organization, if there is a large part of diversity in the line of work that you do then the need of customization will be bigger I think. So that is the main reason I think that standardization and customization doesn't fit in an organization. On the other part I'm also a manager, and as a manager I think that, what I need is no standardization but maximum customization. Isn't the manager also a customer? When I'm a customer of a HR product, support in selection of people, do I need standardization or do I need customization. My answer will be primarily customization.

M: Okay, and how would you formulate it, something that we can discuss and write down on paper. Or maybe formulate a research question?

P: I think the department question would be, what does an organization need, as a department? That would be the main question. And all actors that respond to that question are, one of that is diversification, and you could put a lot of sub-questions to support that question.

P: Yes, what I miss is the position of Small and medium sized enterprises. When we talk about a SSC, at this moment, we especially talk about large organizations. I think I of the most important developments I see for the future is that there will be SSC's for more small medium sized enterprises who work together and within certain sectors. For instance, I do a lot of research in metal industry and I think it will be many opportunities for small enterprises in that sector, to work together. They all have one SSC. I should like to know, and for me is then an important research question: What should be the function of the SSC? What are the competences that are needed? Again the discussion of standardization and customization, and how do you organize that?

P: And how do you organise the interface between the SSC and the organization itself.

P: Organizations and the sector as such,

P: What competences do you need, do you standardize or customize, the question we just talked about, the interface, between systems and people,

M: Data interface or what do you mean?

P: The interface of the organization itself and the SSC, the communication between those two.

P: Another issue is I think, the cost of the service center, because you can talk about competences and the wishes of the management, but you can also talk about the costs of this, because in big organizations, we have a lot of managers, and they all want their own thing, not standardizing and that costs an enormous amount of money, and that's why HR departments are as huge as possible.

P: And the other side of course, what are the benefits?

P: Do you think that managers all want their own thing, because I believe they don't really care as long as it's been taken care of.

P: No, that's talking about standardization and not customization, in KLM, I'm working for KLM, there is a lot of customization because of all the wishes in the company, if you have such a large company, there are so many wishes that you can't if you are not standardizing, it's impossible to create a SSC which is at cost

P: What also would be a good question is, what are the criteria to standardize vs customize?

P: Yes, the interesting thing is, within KLM we have three collective labour agreements, but a thousand ways to interpret this, and that is why it's a very difficult job to do.

P: But then it's not one manager who wants it differently, then the business unit or department I think.

P: Sorry

P: Well, you said, you don't allow one single manager the freedom to interpret a CLE on his own in his own way.

P: It can be one single, because you don't know how high he is in the hierarchy of the KLM company, but it can also be groups or teams of managers, in big companies the big problem is what can a service center do on the subject of standardization and how do you still fulfil the wishes of the management.

P: Of course, I am familiar with this debate. I think as HR we should ask ourselves, for a number of processes, how important is it what the managers want?

P: Like you said, the question is about criteria, when do you diversificate and when do you...

P: Which questions are allowed, which different SSC's are allowed, and that is a cost-benefit question.

P: Yes, that is one of the aspects I think.

P: May I mention another, what I think is important is the responsibility and accountability of management when you create a SSC as separate organization where management must rely on, which effect does that have on reliability and accountability of the responsibility of the management as themselves . I think when you organise something out of the primary line of management, so you separate something, then it's automatically not so that management feels responsible for what happens from the product that is delivered.

So they can always say, yes the SSC is the problem. And line management is responsible and accountable for what happens, (?)

P: But to take this to the extreme, why do we need a SSC at all?

P: The attention between effectiveness, lean and efficiency is creating an organization.

P: Yes, but what's wrong with the process that you need administrative personnel to take care of it for you. We, I think, well that is what they tell me, ten years ago we had 500 people working at the administration at PostNL, now that is 60. So, that is nice. But still 60. So, in the end will this go to 0 or not? That is what I'm wondering.

M: That is a question that we've already recorded in a previous session, but it is interesting to discuss further. What are your opinions on that?

P: Well if everybody has the same question then we will probably don't know the answer, but if someone says 'there will always be a SSC', okay then to do what?

P: That is the same question that we answered over there, why do you need HR as a functionality?

P: Yes, you don't.

M: The topic of the café is do we still need HRM without HR, so without HR professionals. And a SSC is just one mean to support that.

P: The difference between a HR department or a SSC department, is that the distance that is created between the management or people that make the products, and the way its organised. The place is organised. When the distance gets bigger I think, that will be a bigger problem.

M: In a way that responsibilities are taken away from managers but they are still accountable?

P: That means that if you are asking someone else to do something for you, an administrative task, that you are not in control. I don't see the problem because you are making a contract.

P: You don't care, and that is the problem I think.

P: I ask them to do that, and if they don't do it then you say to them you are not doing your job well.

P: That can be because of standardization for instance,

P: That's the project, the project is standardization or not? That's the change, are we going to standardize or not?

P: It can also be an interpretation problem? SSC's declare something, an manager asks for sickness figures, and a SSC delivers some figures and the manager interprets those figures. There is always in this phase a problem possible, sending and receiving.

P: They only got the figures of this year, but they wanted it to compare it with last year for example. This particular example is really good for why do we need a SSC, not to make reports we could make ourselves.

P: Do you have in your company a SSC?

P: Not an external service center.

P: No, but internal?

P: There is a central department doing pay rolling, and my ambition is to build that more like a SSC for the Dutch Ten Cate companies to have less administrative work for the HR business partners.

P: And why not automate it all?

P: You can't automate everything, you have to automate and digitalize as much as you can. But you can't solve any problem and we need HR in the industrial environment with shift workers etc, occasion level very low and very high, it's very complex and not everyone is totally digitalized.

M: You are talking about building a SSC, what kind of capabilities does your SSC need?

P: A real admin expert, so all the administrative procedures to manage 100%. You can build in expertise or an information center for all the employees with the more easy questions, standardized questions when people can't find the information on the internet. Then you can work with fewer HR business partners I think.

P: But you are still in the decision-making process about that?

P: Yes, tell us about your difficulties?

P: Ik zal het jullie straks even uitleggen, wij komen in handen van private equity.

M: What would be a relevant research question for you on which you like to know the answer?

P: The set of indicators that visualize the need for standardization or customization? Or the relation between those two? So I think it's interesting to make a model used in an organization to look at that specific organization in which matter standardization or customization is needed, as base for organising a SSC.

P: For me, the main question would be: what would be the consequences for the HR professionals in organizations when there are more good SSC's implemented. What is then the job that remains for HR, and you get completely new situations in organizations or different relations between line and staff.

P: That is also in relation to what extend the HR knowledge is required within HR SSC's

P: And the competences..

P: Yes, so what for the HR people and what for the SSC's?

P: What do you give to the other center,

P: I'd like to know what they are doing,

P: Yes, that is connected to what we said

P: Yes, it is. What is the remaining or preferred task? Like I said, do we need it? Well, let's say yes, we need it. So what do we let them do, based on what criteria, so you have a HR process model, this process, who is going to do it? What is our service model and why?

P: Do you mean decision making model on which tasks the SSC must do? How do you come at the choices a SSC in a particular situation must do?

P: Yes, or should do yourselves, or shouldn't do at all.

P: And from there, okay, what is the role for the business partner or do we have to standardize this or customize it.

P: Yes, it's a matter of division of labour and tasks.

P: Yes, based on what? Which criteria are we going to use?

P: So, you ask a decision making model to come to that answer.

P: Yes, is this a smart thing to do or not? At the other end of that, how do you measure the success of your SSC?

P: A cost-benefit analysis is not enough, it's not only a economic problem.

P: No, I don't think so.

M: So, about measuring the success of a SSC, do you have any ideas about that?

P: Well, I think it's beyond costs alone, and for instance, I sometimes have discussions with the manager of our SSC and that is when I'm talking about more efficiency, and he says: "I'm very very efficient". I say, I know, I've benchmarked it and we didn't find any SSC that is more efficient than yours. So, congratulations! But...

p: Is it effective?

P: Yes, as a manager, sometimes I'm a manager too, sometimes I have this task, and I filled in this form, it's all digital, but I made a mistake. And the SSC and I did a wonderful job, so it was very efficient in processing it, but it was the wrong task. Not their mistake, but mine. Still, we have to do it again. So, it's about cost-benefits of the whole system. If you look at the costs, look at the whole system, but there must be more than costs as well.

P: To add to that, I can say it is interesting to ask what is the main goal of the SSC? Is that the SSC or is that to make yourself not useful anymore? Is that a goal then you have to create a product that makes that possible.

P: From 200 to 60 administrative, is the goal 0 or keep the SSC as it is?

P: For me an interesting question is, what would be the pro's and con's of an in house or an outhouse SSC?

P: I was at a conference last week, someone asked who is outsourcing HR activities? And I think 90% raised their hand. Next question, and who is satisfied with that? Two hands.... That was really shocking to see.

M: The questions here, that we should ask are more a tooling, but this were the questions: Who are the key actors that guarantee the success of a HR SSC? That one maybe a bit under lied. What are the competences and capabilities of a SSC? We talked about that a little bit. Where should the SSC be positioned? That one we have discussed, internal or external. Maybe we can focus more on what are the key actors to guarantee the success of a SSC?

P: Well, I think, going with your remarks, the top management is very important. So, in the standardization debate.

M: The top management of the SSC or company as a whole?

P: Company as a whole.

M: And why?

P: Because that is where standardization starts and ends most of the time.

P: I think the HR professionals, because they are the experts and they are needed for the input of the system and the structuring of the system. They have an overview, for instance

P: Sorry

P: The HR professionals got to have a overview of the field, of the research questions or the management issues, so that is why they are very important key actors.

P: I think the line managers, because they are the customers.

P: That is a question, employees can also be users of the system.

P: Don't forget the employees.

Ronde 3

M: Oké, the next session is 20 minutes. In this session we are going to think about which HRM strategies the HR shared services are offering or Will offer in the future.

P: Can I ask you a question? This three legged stool model with business partners, the centers of excellence and shared services. What is the difference beween a shared service center and a center of excellence?

M: Of course again, the definition of, in my opinion how I use it, a center of expertise is more like based on the more traditional practices like recruitment, selection, benefits, training and development, they are more focused on the traditional HR practices. A HR SSC has a more diminished focus, and again it can still be directed from the administration of for example benefits, administration of the outcomes of recruitment and selection, entering an employee who has been hired, but that would be the difference for me.

P: Do you also say that shared services is more like a One size fits all approach, no real customization. So for instance, I'm wondering how you see that, because I generally do agree.

M: It depends, that is an interesting discussion point. Maybe it should be like that but maybe not.

P: It's so dependable on the development of the organization, where are you standing, What is the context, is it possible, What is possible, has it value, if it doesn't then why should you do it as a shared service center. It must be a logical process of the next step, implementing a shared service center should be a Natural next step.

P: Maybe we should ask the question, how does the workforce look like in 25 years? So What value can we add to that development?

P: Does your company have this?

P: No only a little part of it, I work at a construction company, so we started at the bottom to have digital, or the benefits are outsourced, step by step, if we are going to fast people will don't understand it. So Maybe in 25 years from now than maybe we have to.

P: Well, I hear very different opinions here, about for instance if people will be self complained or will be completely dependent on organizations in 25 years. Will they strive to have colleagues or do they prefer to work alone? Will there be knowledge based or not knowledge based? Will there be a need for coordination or not? I have some ideas about that, Well I think at least there Will be different kinds of employees in the future. There Will be place for the traditional employee, who wants to be part of an organization and does a lot for it. But Maybe this amount is diminishing.

P: In 2008 we had 800 employees with a turnover of 115 million euro's. Today we have 300 employees with the same turnover. But we organised it different, we have a network around it. And to coördinate that, we need that kind of resources. So Maybe in the future, I don' t believe in traditional contracting, that everybody is for 40 Hours a week and that everybody is 40 years in the company. That's over, so to organise that might be a solution.

P: Why is that over? Everybody is saying so, but why is that over?

P: The younger generation don't want to stay very long in a organization, they ask themselves what's in it for me, and when they can develop themselves they are connected to the company. They don't want to stay there for forty years if they don´t feel well enough and they can't develop. But Some will still stay, because they think if they got no money then...

P: That's the Largest Group, and I think there is just a small Group who wants to develop and wants to choose the company where he of she is working. And I think most of the young people in my organization as well want a steady job. Because they got a family, they have children. They want money.

P: And the interesting thing is, this has probably not changed. If you go bank 60 years, younger people always wanted something.

P: What kind of company do you work?

P: I work at Saxion, university of applied sciences.

P: So you are talking about teachers?

P: Yes, when we attracted young teachers last years, everybody is wanting a steady job and I can understand. Now we have to get rid of a few people with not steady jobs or temporary contracts, and I had to say to 8 of the 114 people, well we are not continuing your contract. And it really is a disaster for all of them. And they know it's temporary, but they still want to be in a organisation, they are loyal, they have family,

P: This also varies by industry, I don't know what it's like in the living industry. When I was in construction industry in the UK it was much more about bringing scale of little business to be on side of the right time to do the right sort of thing. Most of the things we did we didn't involved them.

P: That only grows

P: We didn't employ the plumbers or the electricians, they came from other companies.

P: Maybe it's depending on the ...

P: yeah, but it's changing too quickly, today we need a plumber and that changes a lot how we build houses. So, the professions are changing changing changing. You can't have all of them in your company.

P: You need to have the best,

P: The best, and than your project is there.

P: Innovation makes it difficult, and also the legislations in the Netherlands. We have a lot of laws that make it very difficult to have a lot of people on contract.

P: What would be the effect on the shared services, if you would increase or not increase contract workers?

P: Maybe it will increase in some industries and not in the others, if you don't employ all the people that are actually working on your project, they.. SSC because they are employed somewhere else.

P: You might also than argue that, there are a lot of companies, at least in the Netherlands, they use now 'detacherings' companies, so they hire from another company, but these are national companies so they have employees scattered over the whole country. That is a phenomenon that I see that is growing and growing, that because you have these flexible relationships with the employees, they are employed in a company where they don't have a real connection with, they are headquartered in Amsterdam but they don't need a connection either. The only thing, ofcourse, that they do need is the benefits, the administrational partners, in that way a SSC might fit in.

P: That is an interesting question I think, what does an employer want from his employees? Because if you think of long term goals, long term purposes, that goes beyond a simple project, then you want something more of your employees than just working on your project. So how do you .... to them, I don't know maybe with some service, that they can think with you about your future, and that they are willing to contribute to the future of your company and not someone else company.

P: You want them that they like to work for you?

P: Yes, because it's in your interests. Because you want to expand in some kind of industry.

M: What would be the effect on the SSC?

P: I think, you have to think of something, some kind of service, that relates people to your company. Because it's a competitive world, and not every organization is going to survive I think.

P: The first question, when I think of a SSC, is that it's kind of a reactive phenomenon, your employee approaches a SSC. But this indicates that you should be proactive, otherwise don't .... The question before is than, how does your SSC become proactive? That is a difficult one.

P: There is also a sort of relationship between a SSC and centers of excellence and the business partner, I mean when things go wrong they go wrong in the SSC, if people will not be getting benefits or there will be problems there, but it seems to me it's quite possible for centers of excellence to carry on in........... of that, instead of helping to resolve that problem, they don't know anything about it so they just carry on thinking about brilliant innovative ideas, not noticing that actually the system is already falling apart.

M: Actually one interesting topic might be, how to make sure that you still have one HRM function in the company, not all different parties with different interests

P: At the moment it probably works in your company, if there is any problem everyone mounts to the HR specialist. So you know where the problems are, but in a SSC it's more difficult.

M: Coming back to the questions, we are almost there.....   The business partner and the SSC need to work on the same thing, if the business partners see that the SSC's are missing something they should help the SSC.

P: A SSC can be outside the company?

M: When I talk about a SSC, I mean an internal SSC, but you can also for example have those small SME's who together set up a SSC, they share the SSC. It depends on how you make the distinction, in my research I'm especially focusing on internal SSC's.

P: External SSC sounds a bit to me as outsourcing,

M: Yes, but also a internal SSC can still be irrespective of the business, in perspective of the end-user can still be some kind of outsourcing. In some companies where they don't outsource, when you ask them, do you deliver your mail yourselves, they say no, but that is also some form of outsourcing. That's very difficult in some subjects in SSC. First of all you have the definition of the expertise center and what's the SSC, What's the difference between a SSC and a HRM department,

M: A lot of organizations say that they have a SSC, but you close in to it's not that different from a HRM department, where they use ESS /MSS , sometimes the difference is not that big. So there are a lot of definitions questions?

M: The discussion that we are always having , some organizations say yes we do have a SSC for administration only, other organisations say we have a SSC with recruitment and selection, but when you ask further and further, it often means that they only record applicants and do a different on boarding process of the administration how they hire, but that is not recruitment and selection, recruitment and selection is .. by a business partner or line manager himself or even by a third party. It's really difficult issue, there are a lot of definition issues.

M: One question that we didn't ask is, how should we measure the success of a SSC? And is the SSC successful?

P: I guess it's unsuccessful when there are complaints, for example when I don't get my salary this week

P: But you can disagree about the purpose of the center, so complaints can be coming from not understanding what they are doing, I come to that because earlier this morning we talked about being a partner of management, and being partner does not mean that you just execute what the manager tells you to do but also that you can convince management of your ideas, about new ideas, about new ways of behaving or new services, so maybe complaints is not always a way of measuring how you are doing, it can also be a difference in perspectives in what you ought to do.

M: I asked the question , how do you measure the success of the SSC? He said, the amount of 'pols' (fouls?)handled.

P: For instance

Ronde 4

M: The last session is about wrapping up, and checking whether we missed anything, we have 15 minutes and I will give you 10 minutes to think about your businesses. One was about the shift of the SSC towards towards an more expertise role, maybe we can address only the research questions

P: The ones with a square around it,

M: SSC's are ofcourse about standardization on the one hand and customization on the other hand, in previous sessions there was a discussion about that it's almost always about standardization and not customization, so that is one research question. Another is about customer needs, whether a SSC will be able to offer customers what they want in the future, and how should they do that? This is not actually a research question. One of the questions is related to the three legged stool that is also used sometimes, how to keep the HR function integrated with the business partners, line managers, the SSC's the expertise centers. They have to work on the same system, and to make sure that all different parties are integrated. One research question was about a decision model, what activities are performed by a SSC and what activities are performed by line managers and what activities are performed by employees. So I need a model on some criteria that divide activities and responsibilities. Another question is, how to measure the success of a SSC, we talked about measuring the amounts of complaints, there was one question, we should study how to measure the success of a SSC? Also, what should be the main goal of a SSC? Of course, it depends from what perspective you are looking. When you look from an employee perspective you have other goals than when you look for an organizational perspective, What are the proven pro's and con's of business processes outside a SSC? One question about the relialibility of management, what was meant in the end was that a shared service centers performs activities for management, that management does not feel involved anymore, what about accountability? Another question was, wat is the consequence of SSC's for business partners and the effect on line managers? What kind of activities should an HR SSC do? Another question is, how to make sure compliancy is met? One of the issues that a lot of practitioners mentioned is that the data quality in SSC is poor? So how can we group that? One other interesting research question is, in the end do we still need business partners when activities are performed by SSC's? That are the main topics and perspectives so far, do you miss an interesting topic related to SSC's?

P: For me it is, we talked about HR SSC's but we know that also other functions like finance have service centers, so the question for me would be, maybe in the future would they be all be combined, so that managers call one number, orders one function supporting them for everything? Finance to IT, to HR?

M: So the question would be?

P: What are the advantages of cross functioning shared services?

P: Something that I don't see, or maybe missed, is something about the employees of a SSC, there are questions about job design and job satisfaction, so are we creating very narrowly defined jobs that are very satisfying to do, another question is roots into shared services, so can you see what roots in career terms in SSC's, so you know there is a big gap between being in a SSC or a business partner or expert, and where are these business partners and experts going to come from? So something about career development, or working in SSC's.

P: Also, what maybe links to the other group is what are the skills needed for employees for SSC's vs HR business partners, because these are totally different but maybe beneficial, like you mention to do for every HR business partner to work for sometimes in the HR SSC?

P: For rotation, or what some companies are doing, the first job in HR you work in a HR SSC so you are the sharp end and hear old stuff,

P: As you choose the question for people working in SSC's, to what extend do they need to have that business focus that other HR people have to have? Understanding the nature of the business

P: What strikes me, we formulated a lot of questions that from other perspective or other domains are quite obvious, if we look how banks are dealing with customers or customer service centers in their line industry are operating than a lot of discussions are..

P: The trouble with SSC's is it's covering a variety of different types of work, some of it is very administrative, transactional stuff, and some working in a call center, and some different. And you do know how quite different models of how you deal with it, so the tradition in the SSC's you have the most junior person, feels involved and they escalating them up if they can't answer them, whereas now in some service centers you start the opposite way around, you have the most expensive person on the court to deal with it once,

P: What do you think, for KLM we have in the customer service center for the platinum elite,

P: ... so you pay for it?

P: Yes, for sure.

P: But if I go back, we had a discussion over there in relation to E-HR, if you don't solve the problem the first time then it become quite expensive to solve it. So you have a first person responding, and then an expert

P: The only difference is the employee won't go away, because a customer will go away. If you deal with a service center along the lines that you are dealing with like customers, then you easily fail in your answers.

P: Yes, but I think an interesting question is, if you solve the problem over here, that line managers become better able to do that people management stuff, you get fewer higher quality questions into the service center in which quest you need fewer higher quality people answering those questions.

P: Related to that I think a very crucial question is how much money do we invest in HR systems compared to what we invest in customer service center systems. So, and there you are finding the answer, if you would have the intelligence in HR compared with the customer center service than you will have solved a lot of issues.

P: But maybe, also to your comment that you will get different types of questions if you get managers to do their job right, the question is then, is the shared services or the contact center still the best place to answer those questions or will the questions become so business focused that you don't need a SSC anymore but a business partner who knows the context.

P: Could I add one word to that? One is specific business related, because the SSC does well with generic question and it doesn't do well with very specific questions. Because they much better dealt with close to the business. Yes, absolutely. So your research question is will shared service contact centers become redundant as line manager become better?

P: Yes, exactly.

P: Maybe that is related to the question, could HR SSC's replace the HR business partner? But maybe it's the other way around

P: Maybe Business partners will get better if they are supported by HR SSC's?

P: So, it's actually the connection is between the quality of the E enabled, but that is really good, we got really good line managers, than the nature of the role changes fundamental.

P: The problem, I don't think it will ever get there.

M: Do you have other things that we've missed and should focus on?

P: What is the scope of cross organizational shared service centers outside of the public sector? Well you know, you got it in the Netherlands, cross organizational shared services in the public sector. There are very few examples that I know of cross organizational private sector shared services? But in certain circumstances, particularly if it's generic you could see some advantages.

M: And what would be the question then?

P: The first question is about frequency, so are there some of these centers? Second is what are the advantages of this?

P: Penches is an example he, cross organizational organised he, service and information.

P: One answer would be to outsource, but if you don't want to outsource would you go to a consultant?

P: You could say for training, then you have some specific interests questions to be answered

P: You certainly see that in the public sector, that training is outsourced.

P: Maybe another one is, what is the role of HR SSC's in advising HR, so not to external clients, to employees and managers, but internally within HR.

P: Maybe there is a question that comes from those your two interventions which was about learning from other functions, so what can HR learn from other shared services? So the research question might be then, what inhibits that learning from other functions?

M: Do you have anything else that you would like to address us in the future?

P: I don't know, but maybe there is something about the relative advantages of outsourcing compared to in sourcing?

M: Yes, that one do we have. I don't know where, but it's somewhere. Maybe something about the data within a SSC?

P: Does the SSC see itself as a data receptacle and user of that data?
M: That is something interesting.

P: Is that about the ownership of the data?

M: No not only ownership, but what would you do with it? Can a SSC do a…. for example. Are there common grounds requested for line managers that they can manage data in a proactive manner?

P: I was talking over there, that if there are people in a SSC who don't understand what the point of data is, they are not going to look after the data in the right situations.

P: Relating to that, they are on their own side analyzing all the data and people that are in that service center and providing the Dutch society