

# Literature Review

## **Contents**

Abstract: .....	3
Introduction: .....	3
Literature and critical Review: .....	4
Conclusion: .....	7
References: .....	10

**Abstract:**

Keeping in mind the ultimate goal to succeed and exceed expectations in rapidly changing workplace, firms need to efficiently utilize different sorts of procedures and a wider range of methods in order to be more productive. In this era of strict competition, downsizing, rightsizing, reallocating and deployment can be typified as radical administration methodologies. Although researchers have focused on the area of this organizational change extensively but no conclusive evidence regarding downsizing, rightsizing, reallocating and redeployments can be linked to firm's performance. This would in turn disgruntle large number of employees physically, monetarily and mentally. Furthermore it is forcing long haul torment on staff looking for fleeting benefit. It is pertinent that this issue should be addressed. During the course of research on organizational change, the purpose of this essay is to highlight the effect of these procedures on employees which often leaves long term pain for short term benefits. This is a qualitative research, which would encompass variety of practical as well as empirical material, this would also include references from many different types of case studies, personal experiences of employees. The purpose of this essay is to critically evaluate the impact of downsizing, rightsizing, reallocating and redeployments due to which employees seek short term profit. As this topic involves studying human behavior as well as the impact of organization's practices therefore qualitative research will support the topic as it is used to investigate issues of organization's operations in society and its effect on the people.

**Introduction:**

From late 1980s onwards, it was observed that with the specific goal to succeed and exceed expectations in the dynamic workplace environment, human resource management practices like

downsizing, rightsizing, reallocating and redeployments turned into a visible component of authoritative life as indicated by Dawkins et al., (1999). This resulted in dehumanizing mentalities and practices and brought about overwhelming impact on mental wellbeing of employees in correlation to greater profits. It is important to assess the long term impacts due to downsizing, rightsizing, reallocating and redeployments which are actually aimed to seek short term profits. As indicated by Day (1996), there are numerous thousand impacts of intentional downsizing, rightsizing, reallocating and deployment on employees but human resource take these initiatives as they want to seek short term profit. Thus, as indicated by Thornhill and Saunders, (1998) intentional downsizing, rightsizing and reallocating does not solve the short term problems only but the noteworthy aspect is that they bring up long term pain for employees which is actually referred to the dehumanization by human resource department. This essay sheds light on effect of these methodologies on workers which is imposing long term pain on staff looking for short term profit.

### **Literature and critical Review:**

According to CCH (1994) downsizing is a procedure that is nurtured when employment or work vanishes as an aftereffect of progress, for example, organization merger, takeover or rebuilding rather than execution related issues. As indicated by Clark and Seward (2000), when employees are in surplus with reference to necessities it would result in downsizing, rightsizing, reallocating and redeployments. Dehumanization is the classification of orientation in a person's world by which people of other groups or categories are not perceived as human as oneself. This is the process by which large number of individuals assert inferiority of another group, directed by an organization. Dehumanization in organizations occur when one employee views another person in negative ways, which leads to belief the other person is undeserving of respect and

kindness usually afforded to one self (Richardson,1994). Dehumanization has greater impact on employees;everyday interpersonal maltreatments can leave feeling of corrupted, discredited or dampened. There is broad research into the pessimistic outcomes of being denied self-governance., embarrassed, not perceived as human being, all circumstances that are probably going to be experienced as dehumanizing (Miller 1993; Honneth, 1992).

According to Cronshaw, Davis, and Kay (1994), at times of high authoritative push, senior administration is constantly assessing such human resource techniquesfor making their future secure because of the present conditions. When the external environment conditions become tough, human resource management in combination with the top management devises such strategies that the ultimate impact of rough economic satiations is on the employees. Instead of adopting such strategies which could allow them to deal with the tough economic conditions, human resource managers devise strategies to treat the human beings as an inanimate thing. As indicated by Kirby (1998) there are numerous impact of such human resource practices which are not considered by the human resource when they actually devise such strategies. Many organizations were at that point wanting to expand deductibles, co-installments, co-protection or out of box spending limits which will move more expenses to employees. Broadly, educating employees and moving them to their most fundamental capacities is known as the reallocating employees. reallocating and deployment of human resource is one of such strategies which where education, skill and competencies of employees are used at various places as per the need of the organization (Fisher and White, 2000).Thus, as indicated by Thornhill and Saunders, (1998) intentional downsizing, rightsizing and reallocating are not liable to decrease the short term problems but they actually result in long term pain. Therefore, it can be said that when human resource managers do not consider the long term consequences of their practices and

strategies, they actually lead their organization towards the dehumanization where the individuality of employees is not respected and they are only treated as inanimate objects (Cascio, 2002). When human resource does not analyze the consequences of their strategies and they introduce the practices for offsetting short term problems and issues, they actually forget that they are putting their employees in the long term pain. There are various issues which employees have to face in long term as a result of downsizing, reallocating and deployment. To mention few, when employees are laid off, the survivor employees actually need to be mentally ready for such strategies in future (Baruch and Hind, 2000). They come in tension that their job is not secure, therefore, they are in continuous mental pressure to look for another job. Once the downsizing is introduced in an organization, the remaining employees already start finding new jobs and their intention to leave the organization increases. So the biggest disadvantage associated with the downsizing is that with the poor performers, star performers start planning to leave the organization. Likewise, when employees are deployed or reallocated in a different unit, city or country, their psychological well being is harmed (Bardoel et al., 2014). When an employee is not satisfied psychologically, his/her commitment and engagement could never be ensured. When human resource is actually putting its employees in such situations where they are not comfortable, it is quite obvious that they are actually promoting the dehumanizing in their organization. For the sake of improving profitability, they actually move or lay off the employees (Mariappanadar, 2012).

As per Godard (1991), if an organization decides that downsizing is vital, employees have a vital part to ensure that the downsizing is reasonable and to regain the trust of the survivors. These representatives who are the survivors actually will have to bear more. It is responsibility of human resource managers to ensure they get sufficient information on how the future looks.

When human resource managers remain unable to provide the sufficient information to survivors regarding their future, this gives an impression that they actually do not care regarding the concerns of other individuals, which is actually the dehumanization (Marques et al., 2014).

According to Huselid(1995), while taking the decision related to the downsizing human resourceconcentrate on enhancing profitability and itidentifies which worker projects can drive a sensational increment in efficiency. Human resource managers often track deals per worker or benefit per representatives and watch it month to month and they decide how to enhance the present approach. As said by Appelbaum, Everard and Huang (2011), this clearly shows the agenda of human resource where they are actually ready to terminate the employees for the sake of profitability. Though, this is not unjust to introduce such strategies which can improve the profitability, but as an human resource personnel, it should never be neglected that human resource is not like other machines and objects which should be disposed off if it is not working properly or which should be moved or transferred to other unit of production if it is not needed. Human resource has its own importance, and there should be alternate programs instead of such programs that give impression to the employees that their well-being is not important for their organization. They could give motivations through wellbeing programs - offer motivators to urge workers to take an interest in effective programs if they feel that their productivity is going low.

### **Conclusion:**

Scaling down procedures have gotten to be regular and well known practices for firms and they are additionally esteemed as common procedures inside an organizational life cycle. In any case, the relationship between scaling down such as downsizing, rightsizing, reallocating and redeploymentsprocedures and firm execution are still under researched. These strategies have

great impact on both employees as well as on organization due to which none of them excel, organizations are failed to get there profit and employees are always in search of short term profits. That is the main reason the outcomes of scaling back methodologies to firm execution have not been emerged over these years. The final design is to guide scholastic research and administrators to find more dependable and exhaustive cutting back techniques which would enhance both associations' execution and workers' welfare, furthermore lessen the social pressures brought about by scaling down. The current discussion in this essay could only lead towards the conclusion that as per the current practices, human resource department often adopt such strategies which are actually harmful for their long term. The downsizing, reallocation, deployment and rightsizing have such consequences which should not be overlooked for the long term. Therefore, this essay concludes that the given statement was true. If human resource does not look at the long term pain of its employees, it is actually leading towards the orientation which leads an organization towards the dehumanization.

This essay has contended that organization should have to pay special attention on the strategies that lead to retain the employee for long term so that they should give their best and do not spend their time in search on short term profit. Moving from a "situating" to a more systemic and element origination of methodology will help organizations to investigate the different strategies in which HRM adds to the vital administration of firms. The asset based perspective of the firm indicates wellsprings of 'human asset advantage' in remarkable human capital and extraordinary human procedures. It places prominence not just on actualizing foreordained focused situations but on building key ability, on enhancing the long haul strength of the firm. As a result of this, employees instead of search short term profit will work with more dedication and show more commitment which will ultimately resulted in organizational success.





## References:

1. Appelbaum, S.H., Everard, A. and Huang, T.S, 2011. Strategic downsizing: critical success factors, *Management Decision*, 37(7), pp. 535-52.
2. Baruch, Y. and Hind, P., 2000. "Survivor syndrome" – a management myth. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 15(1/2),pp. 29–45
3. Bardoel, E.A., Pettit, T.M., De Cieri, H. and McMillan, L., 2014. Employee resilience: an emerging challenge for HRM. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 52(3), pp.279-297.
4. Cascio, W.F., 2002. Strategies for responsible restructuring, *Academy of Management Executive*, 16(3), pp. 80-91
5. CCH, 1994.*Termination of Employment: the New Federal Law*, North Ryde, NSW: CCH Australia.
6. Clark, R. and Seward, J., 2000. *Australian Human Resources Management*, Sydney: McGraw-Hill.
7. Cronshaw, M., Davis, E., and Kay, J., 1994. On Being Stuck in the Middle or Good Food Costs Less at Sainsbury's, *British Journal of Management*, 5(1), pp. 19-32.
8. Dawkins, P., Littler, C.R., Valenzuela, M.R. and Jensen, B., 1999.*The Contours of Restructuring and Downsizing in Australia*, The University of Melbourne, Melbourne Institute of Applied Economic and Social Research.
9. Day, A., 1996. Rail: a special report. *Australian Financial Review*, 29 October: 52.
10. Fisher, S. and White, M., 2000. Downsizing In A Learning Organization: Are There Hidden Costs?, *Academy of Management Review*, 25(1), pp. 244-251.

11. Godard, J., 1991. The Progressive HRM Paradigm: A Theoretical and Empirical Re-Examination, *Relations industrielles*, 46(2), p. 378.
12. Honnet, A., 1992. Integrity and disrespect: principles of a conception of morality based on the theory of recognition. *Political Theory*, 20, pp.187-192.
13. Huselid, M., 1995. The Impact Of Human Resource Management Practices On Turnover, Productivity, And Corporate Financial Performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(3), pp. 635-672.
14. Kirby, J., 1998. 'The firing squad'. *Business Review Weekly*, 2 March: 44–48.
15. Marques, T., Galende, J., Cruz, P. and Portugal Ferreira, M., 2014. Surviving downsizing and innovative behaviors: a matter of organizational commitment. *International Journal of Manpower*, 35(7), pp.930-955.
16. Mariappanadar, S., 2012. Sustainable HRM: a counter to minimize the externality of downsizing. *Handbook of Sustainability and Human Resource Management*.
17. Miller, W.I., 1993. *Humiliation: and other Essay on Honor, Social Discomfort and Violence*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press
18. Murray, S. and Powell, A., 2008. *Working it Out: Domestic violence issues and the workplace*. *Australian Domestic and family Violence Clearinghouse*, Issues Paper 16, April.
19. Richardson, D.R., 1994. *Human Aggression*. United States: Plenum Publishing Corporation.
20. Thornhill, A. and Saunders, M., 1998. The meanings, consequences and implications of the management of downsizing and redundancy: a review, *Personnel Review*, 27(4), pp. 271-295.

