

Rethinking Strategic Human Resource Management: Challenges at the Frontiers of Workforce Fragmentation, Measurement Inconsistency, and Contextual Sensitivity: A Conceptual Paper

Adjei Eric Gyan
Catholic University, Ghana
adjeigyane@gmail.com

doi: <https://doi.org/10.37745/gjhrm.2013/vol14n31728>

Published May 31, 2026

Citation: Gyan A.E. (2026) Rethinking Strategic Human Resource Management: Challenges at the Frontiers of Workforce Fragmentation, Measurement Inconsistency, and Contextual Sensitivity: A Conceptual Paper, *Global Journal of Human Resource Management*,14 (3),17-28

Abstract: *Strategic human resource management (SHRM) faces challenges from three core assumptions: the boundary assumption, the measurement assumption, and the universality assumption. These assumptions are becoming increasingly problematic within today's evolving work environments. The paper tackles these challenges by introducing three new frameworks: The Fragmented Workforce Integration Theory (FWIT), which centers on psychological inclusion; the Human Capital Measurement Coherence Theory (HCMCT), offering a multi-layered model of human capital; and the Contextual SHRM Effectiveness Theory (CSET), which pinpoints factors that moderate SHRM effectiveness. Together, these frameworks create an integrated SHRM Recalibration Model that redefines SHRM effectiveness through the lenses of workforce boundary definition, construct coherence, and contextual sensitivity. This model highlights inconsistencies in mainstream SHRM theory and points toward future research and practical applications within organizations.*

Keywords: strategic human resource management, human capital, workforce fragmentation, gig economy, measurement coherence, contextual SHRM

INTRODUCTION

Over the past forty years, strategic human resource management (SHRM) has grown into a crucial aspect of both organizational theory and practice. Influential scholars such as Boxall and Purcell (2022) and Boon et al. (2018) emphasize the need to align people management with organizational strategy to secure a competitive edge. Yet, the field still grapples with outdated assumptions that once worked in the late twentieth century but no longer fit the modern workplace.

This paper focuses on three main assumptions related to strategic HR practices. First, the boundary assumption views the workforce as a clearly defined group. Second, the measurement assumption claims human capital can be precisely measured. Third, the universality assumption holds that best

SHRM practices apply across various contexts. Each of these is challenged by theoretical critiques, empirical findings, and shifting work structures.

The boundary assumption, in particular, faces growing scrutiny due to the rise of non-traditional work arrangements, especially within the gig economy. Stewart and Stanford (2017) point out that many workers now function in ambiguous roles, relying on platforms and often existing outside standard HR frameworks. Despite these changes, traditional SHRM still tends to consider only employees on formal payrolls, a limitation that complicates the relevance of HR practices. This has major implications: if strategic HR aims to boost organizational capability, models based on a narrowly defined workforce overlook a significant portion of today's labor market.

Zhang et al. (2023) uncover notable inconsistencies in how human capital resources are defined and measured, pointing out that indicators like education, tenure, and skill assessments often produce conflicting empirical findings. This inconsistency challenges SHRM's claims about competitive advantage, since accurate definitions and measurements are essential for building strong theoretical and empirical frameworks. Although Gerhart and Feng (2021) and Supian and Fuad (2025) acknowledge this problem, they stop short of offering a comprehensive solution. Knies et al. (2024) question the assumption that HR systems are universally applicable, emphasizing that factors like institutional and regulatory contexts influence HR effectiveness in ways that universal best practices can't address. Alexandro (2025) adds to this critique by examining micro, small, and medium enterprises in Indonesia, where the lack of infrastructure and labor market conditions found in large Western firms is evident. Collectively, these works suggest that assuming universality oversimplifies and misguides both theory and practice in HR system design.

This paper pursues three main goals: first, it explores three major shortcomings within mainstream Strategic Human Resource Management (SHRM) theory, highlighting how these fall short of reflecting today's organizational realities. Next, it introduces three innovative theoretical models—Fragmented Workforce Integration Theory (FWIT), Human Capital Measurement Coherence Theory (HCMCT), and Contextual SHRM Effectiveness Theory (CSET)—designed to overcome these gaps. Lastly, it weaves these models together into the SHRM Recalibration Model, which reshapes the understanding of SHRM effectiveness by emphasizing workforce boundary definitions, coherence in human capital measurement, and sensitivity to context.

The paper makes key theoretical contributions by treating workforce fragmentation, measurement inconsistency, and lack of contextual awareness as linked failures in underlying assumptions. It draws connections among previously separate bodies of research on gig work, human capital measurement, and comparative HRM. Moreover, it proposes a multi-layered view of human capital, distinguishing baseline, relational, and adaptive components, which lays the groundwork for improved future measurement. The SHRM Recalibration Model acts both as a diagnostic framework and a guide for developing HR studies that are context-aware, inclusive of workforce boundaries, and consistent in measurement.

The paper is structured into six parts: Section 2 examines the theoretical foundations of Strategic Human Resource Management (SHRM), focusing on three key assumptions that are being questioned. Section 3 addresses the shortcomings of these assumptions and introduces FWIT, HCMCT, and CSET as theoretical solutions. In Section 4, these frameworks are combined within the SHRM Recalibration

Model, highlighting how they interrelate. Section 5 considers the consequences of this integrated approach, while Section 6 wraps up the discussion and points to future research directions.

2. Theoretical Foundations of Strategic Human Resource Management

Strategic Human Resource Management (SHRM) is rooted in two primary branches of organizational theory: the contingency perspective, which stresses aligning HR practices with the organization's strategy, and the resource-based view (RBV), which underscores the strategic value of unique human resources. This framework suggests that effective HR systems need to be aligned with strategic goals and built upon the organization's distinctive human capital. This idea has continued to shape research in the field over time.

Barney (1991) first introduced the resource-based view, which Wright and McMahan (2011) later expanded, redefining employees as possessors of unique capabilities that can offer a lasting competitive edge. This approach shifts attention away from individual workers to the firm's collective human capital, highlighting the strategic importance of HR practices that competitors find hard to replicate. Gerhart and Feng (2021) back this framework, pointing out that although the theoretical promise of resource-based strategic human resource management (SHRM) is significant, empirical evidence has been inconsistent. Boon et al. (2018) have made a key contribution to SHRM by clarifying the distinction between strategic human capital—referring to the value embedded in individuals' knowledge, skills, and abilities—and SHRM itself, which focuses on the processes used to manage that capital. This distinction resolves earlier confusion in the literature. The success of SHRM processes in harnessing human capital is vital, and challenges like measurement errors and unclear boundaries are not just methodological problems but fundamental theoretical issues.

Since the mid-2010s, SHRM scholarship has increasingly focused on employee well-being as both a crucial outcome and a mediator of HR practices. Guest (2017) calls for a new analytical framework that puts well-being front and center, stressing its inherent value beyond just practical benefits. This shift requires a closer look at employees' subjective experiences and how they perceive HR systems. Supporting this view, Van Beurden et al. (2022) reviewed employee perspectives and uncovered notable gaps between the HR systems managers intended to implement and the actual experiences of workers.

The discussion also underscores how organizational and institutional contexts shape the effectiveness of Strategic Human Resource Management (SHRM). Bratton et al. (2021) and Armstrong and Taylor (2023) point out that aspects like legal frameworks, labor markets, cultural norms, and sector-specific dynamics play a significant role in influencing HR practices. Stone et al. (2024) and Wilton (2022) recognize this context sensitivity but highlight the lack of a strong theoretical framework to thoroughly investigate these moderating factors. Addressing this shortfall, Knies et al. (2024) and Alexandro (2025) propose the CSET framework to deepen understanding in this area.

The theoretical foundations of Strategic Human Resource Management (SHRM) represent a unified framework that highlights the alignment of strategy and personnel management, the value of HR grounded in resource logic, and a growing emphasis on employee well-being and sensitivity to context. Despite this, notable limitations persist, tied to three key assumptions introduced earlier. The following

section examines these assumptions, critiques their shortcomings, and proposes a constructive framework as a response.

The Three Assumption Failures: Diagnosis and Theoretical Response

This section unfolds in three parts, each addressing one of the assumption failures mentioned in the introduction. Each part begins by outlining the assumption within mainstream SHRM theory, then offers both theoretical and empirical evidence of its failure, and ends with a suggested theoretical framework—FWIT, HCMCT, and CSET. Together, these frameworks underpin the integrated model presented in Section 4.

The Boundary Assumption Failure and the Fragmented Workforce Integration Theory (FWIT)

In SHRM research, the boundary assumption often remains unspoken, embedded in study designs and theoretical frameworks that primarily address formally employed workers. Boxall and Purcell (2022) define HR strategy as decisions related to managing employees, while Armstrong and Taylor (2023) focus on the traditional concept of the employment relationship. This assumption made sense historically, when standard contracts clearly outlined the limits of work and organizational involvement.

Stewart and Stanford (2017) contend that the gig economy represents a fundamental shift in work structure, reshaping the traditional employer-employee-work relationship through algorithmic control and ambiguous contracts. Sinambela et al. (2022) point out that organizational success increasingly depends on workers occupying this in-between space, who contribute value despite lacking formal HR inclusion. This creates a widening gap between Strategic Human Resource Management (SHRM) theory and the actual nature of value-creating work.

The differing assumptions about boundaries concerning gig workers carry important theoretical consequences, influencing how human capital management is understood within Strategic Human Resource Management (SHRM). According to Gerhart and Feng (2021), a firm's competitive advantage arises from unique configurations of human capital. Therefore, an SHRM approach that ignores a vital segment of human capital risks misinterpreting the strategic HR role and the possible benefits. Although Boon et al. (2018) acknowledge that firm boundaries shape human capital management, they don't clarify how these boundaries should be determined in uncertain organizational settings. The Fragmented Workforce Integration Theory (FWIT) suggests shifting the definition of workforce boundaries from contractual terms to psychological ones. It highlights that psychological inclusion—where employees feel valued and supported by their organization—acts as a bridge between HR practices and employee behavior. As a result, workers who perceive organizational investment, regardless of their formal employment status, tend to demonstrate discretionary effort, organizational citizenship behaviors, and ongoing strong performance.

This new approach to Strategic Human Resource Management (SHRM) expands its focus beyond just payroll to encompass all workers who share a meaningful psychological connection with the organization. It reveals a strategic chance for organizations to boost performance by applying HR practices to non-standard workers—potentially tapping into contributions that competitors, who concentrate solely on formal employees, might miss. Moreover, it encourages further research into the HR strategies that effectively sustain psychological inclusion across different types of employment contracts, a subject that remains underexplored in current studies.

FWIT puts forward three main propositions: first, psychological inclusion plays a vital role in connecting HR practices to worker performance, relevant to anyone who feels valued by the organization, no matter their employment status. Second, organizations that integrate non-standard workers into their HR systems tend to show higher innovation and stronger operational resilience compared to those that limit their focus to formally employed staff. Third, consistent with Aldabbas et al. (2023), the performance of non-standard workers is positively influenced by their perception of organizational support.

The Measurement Assumption Failure and the Human Capital Measurement Coherence Theory (HCMCT)

In SHRM scholarship, the measurement assumption suggests that human capital can be represented by accessible indicators like educational attainment, occupational tenure, compensation levels, and skill certification. Although these proxies are convenient because they're easy to obtain and quantify across organizations, their theoretical validity remains questionable.

Zhang et al. (2023) thoroughly examine definitions and measures of human capital resources within management literature, revealing considerable variability in how the term is defined. They point out that "human capital" covers a wide range of constructs, differing in scope, level of analysis, temporal perspective, and its connection to organizational performance. This inconsistency poses a scientific problem, implying that SHRM research's aim of building cumulative knowledge is essentially compromised, as studies might seem to explore the same relationships but, in reality, address different ones.

The discussion points out gaps in how human capital is understood and measured within Strategic Human Resource Management (SHRM) and Resource-Based View (RBV) frameworks. Gerhart and Feng (2021) stress that human capital's strategic importance lies in its rarity, value, and uniqueness, which go beyond simply holding educational credentials. Similarly, Wright and McMahan (2011) argue for a broader perspective that embraces tacit knowledge and relational capabilities as part of human capital. Despite these theoretical insights, current empirical work in SHRM often overlooks these complexities, creating a divide between theory and practice. This disconnect is evident in studies by Supian and Fuad (2025) and Vithana et al. (2023), which identify the issue but fall short of offering solutions.

The Human Capital Measurement Coherence Theory (HCMCT) proposes a layered model comprising three distinct dimensions of human capital. The first layer, baseline human capital, covers formal qualifications and skills acquired through education; it is the most visible and transferable. The second layer, relational human capital, involves social skills and network resources cultivated within organizations, which tend to be less visible and more dependent on context. The third layer, adaptive human capital, relates to the capacity to modify knowledge and skills in response to changing environments, making it the least visible but strategically crucial in dynamic settings.

HCMCT argues that the weak connections between human capital (HC) and firm performance partly result from inadequate measurement across the various HC layers. The theory makes three main claims: first, a strong HC-performance link emerges when considering all layers rather than relying on single-layer proxies. Second, the influence of each layer changes depending on environmental dynamism: stable conditions emphasize baseline HC, moderately dynamic ones bring relational HC to

the fore, and fast-changing environments prioritize adaptive HC. Finally, the relational and adaptive layers are most closely associated with an organization's sustainable competitive advantage because they're the hardest for other firms to replicate.

The Failure of the Universality Assumption and the Contextual SHRM Effectiveness Theory (CSET)

The universality assumption in SHRM claims certain HR practices are effective across all organizations, offering performance advantages regardless of context. In its strongest form, it treats these practices as best practices that work unconditionally everywhere. The weaker version accepts that context might affect how well these practices perform but insists their core impact and nature remain unchanged. Both versions have played a major role in spreading HR models from large Western companies to other settings.

Critics of universalism in Strategic Human Resource Management argue that national institutional frameworks shape HR practices and their impact on performance. Recent research by Knies et al. (2024) points out that SHRM-performance links in the public sector depend on distinct factors such as public service motivation and political accountability, which are typically missing from private sector models. Their results pose a fundamental challenge to the Universalist view common in SHRM studies. Biron and Alexandro's study sheds light on the gap in implementing SHRM within Indonesian MSMEs and startups, emphasizing the importance of addressing contextual constraints to close this divide. The Contextual SHRM Effectiveness Theory (CSET) suggests that how well a Strategic Human Resource Management (SHRM) setup works depends not only on the quality of its design but also on how well it fits three key contextual aspects of the organizational environment. These aspects are: 1) ****Institutional Environment****: The strength and supportiveness of external frameworks around the organization; robust environments improve HR system effectiveness, while weaker ones impose limitations. 2) ****Organizational Scale****: The organization's size and complexity, which affect both the design and the ability to implement HR systems. 3) ****Workforce Formality****: The degree to which the workforce is employed through formal contracts, influencing how accessible human capital is for HR initiatives.

CSET suggests that the success of advanced HR systems in boosting organizational performance depends on the strength of the institutional environment. In environments with strong institutions, the gains in performance tend to be higher than in weaker settings. Moreover, when formality is low, relational HR practices prove more effective than structural ones in predicting outcomes. Lastly, the optimal level of HR system sophistication varies depending on context, since overly detailed systems can create implementation gaps that reduce their intended impact.

The SHRM Recalibration Model: An Integrated Theoretical Framework

The three frameworks introduced in Section 3—FWIT, HCMCT, and CSET—address distinct shortcomings in HR practice assumptions. FWIT revises how workforce is defined, HCMCT offers a new way to measure human capital, and CSET emphasizes the importance of context in HR system application. While each framework individually advances understanding, together they reveal the necessary structural links for a comprehensive SHRM effectiveness model suited to contemporary organizations.

The SHRM Recalibration Model emphasizes that the success of Strategic Human Resource Management (SHRM) depends on three interconnected dimensions: defining workforce boundaries, ensuring coherence in the human capital construct, and maintaining sensitivity to context. If any one of these dimensions falls short, SHRM's effectiveness can suffer significantly, especially since weaknesses in one area tend to amplify problems in the others. For instance, an HR system that sets broad boundaries but lacks coherent measurement might engage a scattered workforce without properly developing human capital. On the other hand, a system with consistent measurement but little contextual awareness may collect valuable data yet struggle to apply it effectively within the organization's environment. Lastly, a context-sensitive system that overlooks boundaries could fine-tune practices for formal employees but miss the growing value generated beyond those limits.

These three dimensions—boundary, measurement, and context—are deeply interconnected rather than simply additive. The boundary aspect (FWIT) determines the group targeted for human capital measurement (HCMCT) and for contextual adjustment (CSET). Narrowly set boundaries risk producing biased evaluations of human capital and HR effectiveness. Meanwhile, the measurement dimension (HCMCT) shapes the quality of information feeding into contextual calibration, enabling more accurate HR practice modifications across different human capital layers. Furthermore, the contextual dimension (CSET) influences how feasible it is to design inclusive HR systems and the dependability of multi-level measurement, since the supporting infrastructure depends heavily on context.

The SHRM Recalibration Model rethinks traditional multi-factor HR approaches by stressing the importance of addressing boundaries, measurement, and contextual calibration all at once. It suggests that progress in any one area depends on the condition of the others, meaning HR systems improved through partial or step-by-step changes often fall short of their full potential. This model acts as a diagnostic tool for both organizations and researchers, allowing them to assess HR systems across three areas: boundary-deficiency, measurement-deficiency, and context-deficiency. Each deficiency points to a specific theoretical framework—FWIT, HCMCT, or CSET—that offers targeted solutions. Importantly, the SHRM Recalibration Model ensures that fixing one issue doesn't create problems in the other dimensions. A significant insight from this model is its expansion of the Resource-Based View (RBV) in strategic human resource management (SHRM). While recognizing that rare and hard-to-copy human capital remains vital, it argues that the combined design of boundaries, measurement systems, and contextual calibration in an HR system is even more difficult for competitors to imitate. This integrated HR system acts as a second-order source of competitive advantage, reinforcing and protecting the primary advantage that comes from human capital.

Theoretical Propositions

These propositions bring together theoretical insights from FWIT, HCMCT, and CSET, integrating them within the SHRM Recalibration Model. They act as formal theoretical statements intended to guide future empirical research.

Propositions from the Fragmented Workforce Integration Theory (FWIT)

- Psychological inclusion, which refers to how much employees feel valued and supported by their organization, functions as the central mechanism linking HR practices to performance among fragmented workforce members.

- Organizations that extend developmental HR practices—such as training, performance feedback, career support, and recognition—to non-standard workers tend to achieve higher innovation and greater operational resilience than those limiting these practices to formal employees.

- The positive effect of boundary-inclusive HR practices on non-standard worker performance is mediated by perceived organizational support, consistent with the social exchange framework described by Aldabbas et al. (2023) in formal employment settings.

Propositions from the Human Capital Measurement Coherence Theory (HCMCT)

Measuring human capital across baseline, relational, and adaptive layers provides a much stronger explanation of firm performance than relying on single-layer indicators like educational level or job tenure alone.

The importance of each human capital layer shifts depending on environmental change: baseline human capital matters most in stable conditions, relational human capital plays a pivotal role in moderately changing environments, and adaptive human capital is critical in fast-moving, digitally disrupted settings.

The unique value of human capital lies in its inimitability, especially within its relational and adaptive dimensions, which are deeply embedded in organizations and hard to replicate across firms.

Propositions from the Contextual SHRM Effectiveness Theory (CSET)

The success of advanced strategic human resource management (SHRM) systems in boosting organizational outcomes heavily depends on the robustness of the institutional environment. Specifically, sophisticated HR practices tend to deliver greater performance gains in well-established institutional contexts compared to weaker or more unstable ones.

In settings with less formal structure, such as MSMEs and platform-based organizations, relational HR practices outperform structural ones, since the latter rely on formal systems that these organizations often lack.

SHRM systems that exceed an organization's contextual capacity often cause implementation gaps, which in turn lower performance. This results in an inverted-U shaped relationship between the level of HR system sophistication and its effectiveness in environments with limited capacity.

Integrated Propositions from the SHRM Recalibration Model

SHRM effectiveness—meaning an HR system's ability to deliver its intended performance—relies on adequate alignment across three dimensions of the SHRM Recalibration Model: boundary definition, construct coherence, and contextual sensitivity. A shortfall in any single dimension significantly undermines the overall effectiveness, no matter how well the other dimensions perform.

The competitive edge gained from a well-crafted HR system stems not only from an organization's human capital but also from its distinct boundary structure, measurement framework, and contextual tuning; these aspects are rare, valuable, and difficult to imitate.

Organizations that apply the SHRM Recalibration Model to identify and fix weaknesses across all three dimensions will achieve greater improvements in HR system effectiveness than those focusing on reforming only one dimension while ignoring the others.

IMPLICATIONS

Implications for Theory

The SHRM Recalibration Model advances the SHRM literature by shifting the focus from simply aligning HR practices with strategy to tackling deeper definitional questions around the workforce, human capital, and context-dependent effectiveness. The paper suggests that alignment efforts risk being unstable if these foundational elements aren't clearly defined.

This work extends the Resource-Based View (RBV) in Strategic Human Resource Management by proposing that the logic of inimitability should encompass the HR system as an architectural entity, not just human capital alone. While Gerhart and Feng (2021) emphasize human capital as a vital RBV advantage, this paper argues that the integrated HR system—its structure, measurement, and contextual adaptations—is just as essential to sustaining inimitability. This approach resonates with the dynamic capabilities literature, which highlights a firm's capacity to reconfigure resources, thereby creating a theoretical link between SHRM and dynamic capabilities that remains underexplored.

HCMCT provides a theoretical framework designed to resolve measurement inconsistencies in human capital research, as identified by Zhang et al. (2023). Its three-tier model offers a comprehensive taxonomy that captures multiple dimensions of human capital while remaining flexible for various research contexts. Future studies might investigate the dynamic interplay among these tiers, such as how relational human capital influences social infrastructure or how technological disruptions affect the value of each tier across career stages.

Implications for Practice

HR leaders should conduct a boundary audit of current HR systems to identify all worker categories—formal, contingent, platform-sourced, and freelance—that are vital for organizational success. They need to evaluate the level of support each group receives and extend key psychological inclusion practices, such as developmental investment and performance feedback, to those not fully covered by existing HR approaches, even when full structural inclusion proves difficult.

HR leaders should review their organization's human capital measurement methods using the three-stratum framework from HCMCT. Relying only on basic metrics like credentials and qualifications risks overlooking relational and adaptive dimensions of human capital, which can impact talent management and workforce strategies. By redesigning measurement systems to include relational metrics like collaboration quality and adaptive traits such as learning agility, organizations gain a more complete view of their human capital.

HR leaders must avoid applying HR system designs from other contexts without modification. Organizations operating in weak institutional environments, on smaller scales, or with informal workforces require HR frameworks tailored to their specific setting, leveraging existing capabilities and aligning with available infrastructure instead of idealized standards.

Implications for Future Research

The SHRM Recalibration Model highlights several key directions for future studies, emphasizing the need to empirically verify the role of psychological inclusion in connecting HR practices to

performance within fragmented workforces. Achieving this will require innovative approaches, such as involving non-standard employees and developing reliable measures of perceived organizational support and psychological inclusion tailored to various contractual arrangements. Conducting comparative research across organizations with differing levels of HR boundary inclusiveness is also recommended to gain deeper insights.

The second focus area is the operationalization and validation of the three-stratum human capital model proposed by HCMCT. This effort entails creating practical and reliable tools to measure relational and adaptive human capital. Since the impact of human capital investments on performance outcomes may take time to emerge, longitudinal study designs are essential, as emphasized by the Longitudinal Human Capital Accumulation Theory discussed in this research program.

The third priority involves testing the contextual moderation hypotheses of CSET across diverse countries and industries. The theory predicts interaction effects between SHRM sophistication and three contextual factors: institutional environment, organizational size, and workforce formality. To effectively examine these relationships, comparative studies that maximize variation in these dimensions are needed. This will require collaboration among researchers from both developed and emerging economies, as well as across private, public, and non-profit sectors, to ensure the necessary breadth of contextual diversity.

CONCLUSION

This paper argues that the foundation of strategic human resource management (SHRM) rests on three assumptions that are becoming increasingly questionable: the boundary assumption, the measurement assumption, and the universality assumption. The boundary assumption is undermined by the growth of fragmented and platform-mediated work. The measurement assumption faces challenges due to inconsistent findings in empirical studies, as highlighted by Zhang et al. (2023). Lastly, the universality assumption is weakened by evidence showing that the effects of SHRM vary depending on context, especially in the public sector, micro, small, and medium enterprises (MSMEs), and emerging economies.

To address these assumption failures, the paper introduces three theoretical frameworks—FWIT, HCMCT, and CSET—that reconceptualize SHRM in light of contemporary organizational realities. These frameworks are integrated into the SHRM Recalibration Model, which argues that SHRM's effectiveness hinges on achieving adequacy simultaneously in defining workforce boundaries, ensuring coherence in human capital constructs, and maintaining sensitivity to context. The model stresses the interconnectedness of these dimensions, emphasizing that progress in one area depends on advances in the others, making partial reforms insufficient compared to a full recalibration.

This paper broadens the resource-based view of firms by moving beyond seeing human capital as just a static resource, instead emphasizing the integrated HR system as a strategic framework. It argues that an organization's distinctive boundary design, measurement systems, and contextual adjustments offer a second-order competitive advantage that builds on the initial gains from human capital. This approach encourages meaningful dialogue with dynamic capabilities theories and the growing body of research on HR analytics and AI-enhanced HR systems, spotlighting a significant but still underexplored topic within strategic human resource management (SHRM). The SHRM Recalibration

Model presented here is a theoretical construct that requires empirical validation across diverse organizational, sectoral, and national contexts. It calls for further theoretical development, particularly concerning the changing nature of human capital, the influence of psychological inclusion in platform-based work, and how organizational capabilities and managerial innovation can overcome contextual limitations. The paper intends to clearly frame these issues to support deeper investigation.

REFERENCES

- Aldabbas, H., Pinnington, A., & Lahrech, A. (2023). The influence of perceived organizational support on employee creativity: The mediating role of work engagement. *Current Psychology*, 42(8), 6501–6515.
- Alexandro, R. (2025). Strategic human resource management in the digital economy era: An empirical study of challenges and opportunities among MSMEs and startups in Indonesia. *Cogent Business & Management*, 12(1), 2528436.
- Armstrong, M., & Taylor, S. (2023). *Armstrong's handbook of human resource management practice: A guide to the theory and practice of people management*. Kogan Page Publishers.
- Biron, M., Boon, C., Farndale, E., & Bamberger, P. A. (2024). *Human resource strategy: Formulation, implementation, and impact*. Routledge.
- Bonilla-Chaves, E. F., & Palos-Sánchez, P. R. (2023). Exploring the evolution of human resource analytics: A bibliometric study. *Behavioral Sciences*, 13(3), 244.
- Boon, C., Eckardt, R., Lepak, D. P., & Boselie, P. (2018). Integrating strategic human capital and strategic human resource management. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 29(1), 34–67.
- Boxall, P., & Purcell, J. (2022). *Strategy and human resource management*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Bratton, J., Gold, J., Bratton, A., & Steele, L. (2021). *Human resource management*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Garengo, P., Sardi, A., & Nudurupati, S. S. (2022). Human resource management (HRM) in the performance measurement and management (PMM) domain: A bibliometric review. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 71(7), 3056–3077.
- Gerhart, B., & Feng, J. (2021). The resource-based view of the firm, human resources, and human capital: Progress and prospects. *Journal of Management*, 47(7), 1796–1819.
- Gong, Q., Fan, D., & Bartram, T. (2025). Integrating artificial intelligence and human resource management: A review and future research agenda. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 36(1), 103–141.
- Guest, D. E. (2017). Human resource management and employee well-being: Towards a new analytic framework. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 27(1), 22–38.
- Knies, E., Boselie, P., Gould-Williams, J., & Vandenabeele, W. (2024). Strategic human resource management and public sector performance: Context matters. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 35(14), 2432–2444.
- Sinambela, E. A., Darmawan, D., & Mendrika, V. (2022). Effectiveness of efforts to establish quality human resources in the organization. *Journal of Marketing and Business Research (MARK)*, 2(1), 47–58.
- Stewart, A., & Stanford, J. (2017). Regulating work in the gig economy: What are the options? *The Economic and Labour Relations Review*, 28(3), 420–437.
- Stone, R. J., Cox, A., Gavin, M., & Carpini, J. (2024). *Human resource management*. John Wiley & Sons.

- Supian, D. S., & Fuad, M. (2025). The strategic role of human capital in value creation and financial performance: A systematic literature review based on the resource-based view. *Jurnal Economic Resource*, 8(1), 379–385.
- Taylor, T., Doherty, A., & Kerwin, S. (2024). *Managing people in sport organizations: A strategic human resource management perspective*. Routledge.
- Van Beurden, J., Van De Voorde, K., & Van Veldhoven, M. (2022). The employee perspective on HR practices: A systematic literature review, integration and outlook. *Strategic Human Resource Management and Organizational Effectiveness*, 135–169.
- Vithana, K., Jayasekera, R., Choudhry, T., & Baruch, Y. (2023). Human capital resource as cost or investment: A market-based analysis. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 34(6), 1213–1245.
- Wilton, N. (2022). *An introduction to human resource management*. SAGE Publications.
- Wright, P. M., & McMahan, G. C. (2011). Exploring human capital: Putting 'human' back into strategic human resource management. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 21(2), 93–104.
- Zhang, L., Van Iddekinge, C. H., Ployhart, R. E., Arnold, J. D., & Jordan, S. L. (2023). The definition and measurement of human capital resources: A content and meta-analytic review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 108(9), 1486.