

Why we hate hr? – assignment

[Business](#), [Management](#)



The Issue here we are addressing in this assignment below is the problems of Human Resource Management, the author here has through the topic “ Why we hate HR? ” Has come out with all Issues faced such by the human resource management – managers and their quite a number of times having the disconnect with the employees at most times. He has started his case by bring up “ why does human-resource do not do such a good job – and how can we fix it? then he continues with the Sarcastic criticism of the general outlook of people towards HR – that the HR people just find a great excuse of partying – by calling it a HR leadership training program at the most expensive resorts. Considered by many as a waste of time. Answering of Queries asked: Analysis of the case and identifying the issues regarding the practice of HRM: 1)” HR people aren’t the sharpest tacks in the box. ” There is an increasing gap between the capabilities of those functioning in HR and the business intelligence needed for them to be successful strategic partners in a business organization.

Anthony Rucci, EVP at Cardinal Health Inc. , summarizes this in one statement, “...business acumen is the single biggest factor that HR professionals in the U. S. lack today. ” Therefore soft skills are not enough. The core burden of Human resource Manager is to serve the organization’s business objectives; therefore, if Human Resource Manager does not understand all aspects of business, he or she will not be able to do his or her duties effectively. Those skills must be used in context with the strategic function of the company. 2. “ HR pursues efficiency in lieu of value. The departments waste a lot of time reporting efficiency measures such as the percentage of workers with superior training or the degree of worker

satisfaction because it is easier to measure than the impact of those activities on the organization's bottom line. Human Resource departments argue that these activities and metrics are important to know, but those metrics don't sustain in a vacuum. Most program and/or activity that the HR division endorses and implementation must bring significant value to the companies and help it achieve soaring performance.

Just as the metric 'Return on Investment' explicates the impact of investments on an individual's or an organization's bottom line, so must the managers of this department develop a similar metric to understand the financial impact their activities have on the success of an organization. 3. "HR isn't working for you." Human Managers, once believed to be an advocate for the employees, is now seen as a 'bad cop' or a puppet of the top management. They are seen as the "rule enforcer" to ensure equality across the organization.

In the age of lawsuits, low state of compliance is easier to manage and justify than exceptions to the rule and the fear of litigation, hence leaving the organization's corporate assets vulnerable, has pushed the Human Resource Manager (as the organization's representative) toward a "one-size-fits-all" approach to managing the workers. The eventuality approach to understanding organizations clearly argues that the 'one-size-fits-all' approach ignores the unique contributions individuals bring to an organization, which is what drives organizational success in the end.

Finally If the HR division reports to the CFO, this reinforces the belief that costs and liabilities must be managed at the cost of individual differences. 4.

“ The corner office doesn’t get HR (and vice versa). ” For any number of reasons, not least of which is the obsolete notions of the HR department’s role of solely the picnic planner to boost employee morale, most organizations do not understand nor empower Human resource to play a strategic role, even when Human Resource has the ability and desire to do so.

The assumption among many top Officials is that there can only be two stances: one that takes a softer approach, dealing with employee needs, development and commitment, versus the other, which takes a harder approach—the organization’s interest prevails over those of the individuals within the business. Truth is that it is not a variable with only two options. The truth situated somewhere on the continuum between the two extremes—balancing both the needs of the organization and the needs of the workforce within it.

In many companies issues can be addressed by first addressing the needs of the employees. As those needs are given an ear and addressed, organizational performance can be enhanced. The validity of the author’s contention about hating HR. My views on the issue? Why he Loves to Hate HR Keith Hammonds, Deputy Editor of Fast Company magazine lit up HR managers with his long August 2005 article entitled, “ Why We Hate HR. ” He made a number of harsh accusations about HR people. As we have seen the article is provocative.

I know many people think such accusations are true for some in the line of work, though as generalizations all are wrong. Should HR say nothing... or

what exactly should they say instead? In fact Human Resource is making vast leaps forward as we speak. Instead of bashing pet peeves in the profession we should look into what is working. Punching at a problem rarely encourages improvement, though it gets lots of notice and expected email – both from irritated HR people and those who love to instigate them.

It's time for an equally pointed response. The Usual Humdrum The author drags out most of the cliché, tired-but-not-yet-dead accusations. He ploughs out four in particular: that HR people are “not the sharpest tacks,” that they are paper and policy mongers, that they are by treating everyone exactly equally “the mistaken belief” this is fairness, and that the HR managers cannot see the bigger picture. The last is truly the key issue. The others, nonetheless, grow from this.

If they miss the larger picture of creating value, they are missing it not only for the companies they work for, but the individuals and their needs as well. It is stupid to compare Human Resource to finance and other support operations. As all HR managers make pretty much the same accusations about all of these sectors. They joke about “blinker eyed” accountants who only focus on lockstep processes and can't see the value of investing in pioneering ventures.

HR managers at the same time support divisions needle line executives for their tendency to brush off “technical” issues in their hurry to take shortcuts just to make their bonus numbers. Such digs may be humorous, but none of this is constructive. “Not The Sharpest Tacks”? Let's look at HR in perspective against Keith's claim that HR Managers are generally dull, side-

lined executives who couldn't make it in other fields. Keith alludes to, but doesn't spell out that HR is relatively new as a profession without the 400 year history that, for example, accounting has.

It was born out of payroll administration to take on a chaos of work that line executives didn't want to make time for such as hiring, familiarising with company atmosphere, training, terminations, HR legal issues, human rights, health and safety rules and literally dozens of other tasks loosely related to people. It can be a punching bag for all departments and Head Honchos and add to that few functions have to deal with the complexity of issues that HR does.

Clear cut accounting rules have become increasingly complex lately, but nothing to compare with the massive grey areas and differing legislation that HR executives routinely have to deal with – many of which offer few absolute, clear-cut answers to tell your CEO or staff. Do really dumb people get stuck in HR? As per Keith's views many line managers, still sideline weaker managers into the function and assign them mainly paper-pushing tasks, " party-planning" and police duty as he notes. Nevertheless those who may look like losers frequently aren't.

HR is often asked to impose rules, sometimes pretty stupid ones, mostly not thought up by HR at all, but by irritated fuming CEO's demanding spontaneous responses to routine organizational problems better handled in other ways. In one situation HR was routinely held responsible for a poorly designed bonus plan that time after time paid out top awards, including even south sea cruises, to some of the worst performing area head, which were

only good at sweet talking. Dumping weak executives into HR shows as much or more a failing of line managers than of the individuals who end up in the HR function.

This will be fatal going forward and won't be allowed to continue. A bigger issue is whether senior teams can learn to effectively absorb the input of their HR members as valuable. Agreed not everyone is great, but HR certainly isn't the only area with some weaker players by any means as every function holds its share of those who couldn't make it elsewhere, but have hung on where they started, barely coping with the basics. What Keith doesn't seem to be aware of is that most executives never reach the top jobs in any case, nor could they.

Organizations thrive because they're tough on people in every function and ideally only the best rise to the top. As we know that every function needs solid journeymen. Should The HRM function be organised? How can HR establish relevance and credibility Yes, Reasons: 1)Organisation of the work and the officialdom through work analysis, job design/redesign, and designing suitable organisational structures to facilitate optimal work flow, workforce planning through the preparation of job descriptions and specifications and matching projected supply and demand of labour.)If a proper flow chart be designed for HRM functions such as a)Human beings to be employed; such as job specific physique, needs, intelligence, aptitude and abilities b)Then maintaining of HR Systems would make accessing of talent easier and more potent for the job requirement. c)It helps reduce recruitment time, process such training, acclimatisation with the work

environment 3)Appraising and managing work performance, becomes easier because of the systematic data percolation into proper criteria for easy evaluation. 4)For better management of resignations, transfers & replacements.)Strategic partner equals aligning HR and business strategy, therefore for a proper function for co-ordination of the two is necessary. The HR can establish relevance and credibility by: Credibility is created when promises are kept and trust is built. It should be beached in sincerity, frankness, and follow-through. HR becomes credible when its relations and performance are in harmony — in other words, by “ walking the talk. ” Through this, HR builds contact and strengthening its reputation. but this will takes time. Also by compassion, in showing care and concern for the company, employees and stakeholders.

HR must exhibit solid compassion and care in all areas in the organisation. Therefore when the HR function adopts these morals and principles, the staff will come to view HR as a store of right information for career development and also a problem-solver. Without these three basic code of belief, the HR function will never achieve its full potential. Lastly as an HR manager you cannot be a faceless manager, but mingle and get to know your staff better, build a good reputation and trust so that it also builds credibility and support for your organization and department.