

Territorial-Human Resources Management (T-HRM): From History to Emergence

Ndiaga Niasse

The University of Gaston Berger

Demba Kane

The University of Gaston Berger

The paper aims to highlight a relatively new phenomenon in management sciences: Territorial-Human Resources Management (T-HRM). Since its inception in the Francophone literature more than fifteen years, this topic has been subjected to a growing body of research, including both empirical and theoretical developments. The paper relies on a theoretical approach that stands from recalling T-HRM historical perspective to shedding the light on the following questions : how does T-HRM emerge ? How it is defined and what are the main practices ? On the basis of what line of research it may be associated ? Limitations derived from the French model of T-HRM allow providing a new and extended definition quite useful for future research that merely will be based on the Western perspective of T-HRM that we lay the foundation for. In contrast to previous studies that still confine T-HRM in the Francophone literature, our study goes beyond these precursor works and provides new insights for worldwide scholars with a new and extended definition of T-HRM. This may be the first study conducted in English about the topic and the paper may be helpful for those new in this field.

Territorial-Human Resources Management (T-HRM) emergence can be traced back to the 2000s in the French academic world where it is considered as the extension of HRM scope to the territory (Defélix et al., 2013). By the way, the phenomenon has drawn a number of scholars' attention in becoming a particular research focus. It is also a particularly innovative model in the sense that it aims to tackle HRM issues at the territorial level. A leading literature with a French connotation often attempts to describe it with the use of several theoretical frameworks: network actor theory (Mazzilli, 2010, Mazzilli & Pichault, 2015), social network theory (Loubès et al., 2012), theory of institutional entrepreneurship and network actor (Calamel et al., 2016). On top of that, the identification of the main works on such a phenomenon allows us to notice three waves of research: The first one, made up of precursory works, focuses on the description and characterization of T-HRM (Defélix et al., 2008, 2010, 2013). The second emphasizes the identification and characterization of types of Territorial-HRM mechanisms of construction (Mazzilli, 2010, 2011; Mazzilli & Pichault, 2015). Finally, the third one focuses on how territorial networks guide and structure a type of HRM extended to the territory (Bobulescu & Calamel, 2009; Bories-Azeau et al., 2008; Calamel et al., 2011, 2016; Calamel & Cateura, 2014; Colle et al., 2009; Everaere & Glèe, 2014; Loubès et al., 2012). The underlined works go beyond describing and characterizing the phenomenon but also make it possible to understand what it is about. They put out strong insights in terms of understanding and defining the scope of Territorial-Human Resources Management (T-HRM).

However, in spite of its proliferation in the Francophone literature, it is obvious to notice a poor description of the phenomenon from a worldwide perspective. Generally speaking, this may be due to several reasons. First, the lack of knowledge about the topic and its lack of exploration in other contexts, especially anglo-saxon areas but above all the poor attractiveness of worldwide scholars on such a relevant topic of investigation. And yet the existing literature has shown that this phenomenon is full of enormous potential and its exploration in different contexts could not only generate promising results but bring significant theoretical contributions to the scientific community.

Nevertheless, studies that rely on both Anglo-Saxon context and style to alert about the relevance and promising outcomes of such a topic are rare. From a much broader perspective, except for the particular work of Rivière et al. (2019) published in English version by the French journal @grh, it is difficult to observe works that make a big step in terms of providing in-depth insights to understand the basis of such a phenomenon for worldwide researchers. The authors focus on the Mechanisms for the construction and appropriation of a GPEC tool expanded across the territory (GPEC-T) in the healthcare and medico-social sector. They found that a Forward-Looking Management of Jobs and Skills tool (GPEC tool) expanded across the territory allows for building territorial skills through a collective approach. But their work is far from being a seminal one due to the fact that it does not attempt to put out the ins and outs of such a phenomenon. Hence, there still be a lack of empirical and theoretical work on

the topic based on other contexts different from its context of emergence. More precisely, Territorial-HRM is little explored in the English-speaking academic world whose context may be attractive in terms of social and cultural backgrounds that allow a better understanding of the phenomenon. Thus, there is a clear need to develop both significant descriptive and empirical contributions that help introduce the topic of T-HRM to a large public of scholars. Therefore, this paper aims to trace back the history of Territorial-HRM by putting out its relevance as a potential field of research for worldwide scholars. In light of this, the paper contributes to first providing useful insights to understand T-HRM and then constitutes a reminder for researchers from other parts of the world about the importance of such a phenomenon, if conducted in territories whose contexts differ completely from those of French-speaking countries.

The paper is divided into five sections: First, we begin by recalling the history of Territorial-HRM by essentially relying on the francophone literature which constitutes its birthplace. Second, we define and describe Territorial-HRM and also underline the main practices it covers. Third, we focus on the two lines of research that mainly draw researchers' attention about the topic and fourth we underline the normative and constructive nature of T-HRM. The last section brings out relevance of the topic for academics and readers and above all limitations that allow proposing another definition of T-HRM and possible perspectives of research namely in Informal Territorial Networks. The choice of this train of thought lies in our desire to first immerse the reader in the foundations of the phenomenon, to understand its object and its functioning as well as types of theoretical perspectives it encompasses. This will make it possible to consequently consider limitations and theoretical relevance of the phenomenon.

The History of Territorial-HRM

The recent Francophone literature, as the birthplace of Territorial-HRM, informs that the idea of extending HRM to the level of the territory was first put forward in the renowned report by Henri Rouillault (2007) on the three-year requirement to negotiate forward-looking management practices delivered to the French Minister of Employment. In that report, he gave a special emphasis to a territorialized approach for the forward-looking management of jobs and skills (Dèfelix et al., 2013). Once the initiative was launched, then the phenomenon definitively emerges during the same period with the basic principle of broadening HRM practices at the territorial level. By this time, numerous conferences, seminars, and scientific days specifically dedicated to the topic of territorializing HRM took place (Dèfelix et al., 2013). More specifically, the 2008-2010 period is mainly marked by the first communications on Territorial -HRM at the Francophone Human Resources Management Association (AGRH) series of conferences (Bories-Azeau et al., 2008; Bories-Azeau & Loubès, 2009; Defelix et al., 2010). In the same vein, the French journals named *@grh* and *Gestion des*

Ressources Humaines respectively devoted the works of Dèfelix et al. (2008) about considering the human dimension in Competitiveness Clusters and that of Beaujolin-Bellet (2008) who view the territory as a laboratory of innovation in the management of restructurings consequences.

In the line of these seminal works, it must be emphasized that two main factors generally lead to the territorialization of HRM: internal factors such as the shortness of breath of internal HRM practices in companies and external factors as political pressure (Defelix et al., 2010). The authors put out nine parameters that characterize an HRM territorialization process. These are the leading actor, the partnership composition, the target site or sites, the components of the territory, the nature of developed actions, the time horizon of mobility, the targeting of a protected or exposed domestic market, the distinction between dialogue and negotiation processes with the social partners or not, and the notion of territorial attachments (Mazzilli, 2010). In sum, these pioneering works clearly shed the light on the process of territorializing HRM, and give rise to promising new literature that is being more and more prolific. We now should take an interest in what the French literature means by Territorial-Human Resources Management and the practices it covers.

Territorial-Human Resources Management (T-HRM): What It Is and What are the Main Practices?

Territorial-Human Resources Management (T-HRM) refers to a model that « implies fostering close links between public and private actors, reinforced by collective actions and structured by links where HR issues are gradually brought to the territorial level where they can be jointly addressed » (Bories-Azeau et al., 2008). This new model breaks with the so-called Traditional HRM historically confined inside the company and aims at taking into account the territorial dimension of HR actions. More specifically, it is considered as the « implementation of a consultation approach, developed jointly by several legally independent organizations, associating private and public actors and attempts to regulate, in a sustainable way, human resources at the level of the territory where they are located » (Mazzilli, 2011, p. 335). This definition underlies several components that characterize T-HRM. First, it deals with broadening the HRM scope of action to its territory. Second, Territorial-Human Resources Management (T-HRM) is supposed to include the criterion of actors' heterogeneity (public, private, and institutional) and coordination. Third, it requires close collaboration between actors for a sustainable rather than a momentary resolution of HR issues on the territory. Such a collaboration is justified in most cases by the fact that they are relatively close to each other, i.e. they are locally close or practically reside on the same territory. On top of this, a practice of T-HRM can be defined as « one or more HRM activities which are established between at least two companies and in which various third party organizations (administrations, associations, etc.) may participate » (Mazzilli, 2008, p.4). In this regard, three grouping

levels of T-HRM practices can be listed: Acquisition practices, Networking and communication practices, and Resource regulation practices (Mazzilli, 2010, 2011). The first one refers to mutualizing recruitment procedures (creating common recruitment platforms, posting online common CVs, lending labor and also communicating to attract the territory's employees). The second deals with sharing information between members of the same network, sharing HR data, holding exchange meetings or HR clubs such as initiatives that aim at producing links between HR managers of companies of the same territory, and also creating common remote working platforms (Mazzilli, 2010; Calamel & Roquelaure, 2014; Bobulescu & Calamel, 2009; Everaere & Glée, 2011). The third one is concerned with the mutualization of training procedures between companies of the same geographical area, inter-trade supply, career management and, above all the deployment of Territorial Forward Looking Management of Jobs and Skills (Mazzilli, 2011; Dagand, 2010). To this should be added the Inter-firm mobility which is concerned with employees moving from one organization to another.

However, behind these underlined practices, lies something interesting related to the place where they are generally undertaken. This is to say that unlike the so-called traditional HRM which stands from the individual scope of organizations, T-HRM practices are often developed in spaces labeled as 'territorial networks'. These can be formal or even informal. The following section provides more insights about T-HRM propelled by Formal Territorial Networks.

Territorial -HRM: on the Discovery of Two Lines of Research

Most of the promising works on the present topic focus on how territorial networks guide and structure a type of HRM extended to the territory (Bobulescu & Calamel, 2009; Bories-Azeau et al., 2008; Calamel et al., 2011, 2016; Calamel & Cateura, 2014; Colle et al., 2009; Everaere & Glée, 2014; Loubès et al., 2012; Loubès & Bories-Azeau, 2016). Territorial networks with a « French or Western -style » such as Competitiveness Clusters (CC) or Local Productive Systems (LPSs) are assumed to be mostly formal in that they are governed by contractual links (Joyeau et al., 2019). In other words, relations between actors are assumed to be based on explicit rules of functioning of the network.

In their seminal work, Ehlinger et al. (2007, p.156) give a clear definition of territorial networks which includes their formal nature: « coordinated sets of heterogeneous, geographically close actors who cooperate and collectively participate in a production process ». This definition allows putting out several aspects such as the actors' heterogeneity, the existence of certain proximity between them, and above all the cooperative dimension of the network. These three core elements stand as the cement that promotes the interactive dynamic of the interconnection between various networked actors around a territory. In this respect, the current literature shows several forms of

labeling territorial networks, depending on the context or the area of evolution. For instance, we have Clusters in the USA, Industrial Districts in Italy, Competitiveness Clusters and Local Productive Systems in France (Levesque et al., 1998). These latter two types of networks remain, in our view, the most coveted by researchers of the French model of Territorial-HRM. These networks may be considered suitable spaces for the development and resolution of human resources management issues due to their flexibility, the proximity effect, and their inclusion in a social and territorial dynamic. They provide interesting perspectives for all actors involved in a Territorial-HRM approach (Lethielleux, 2017). Thereby, the resolution of employment and skills problems traditionally done within the individual scope of organizations is gradually disappearing and giving rise to a model extended to the territory where the common HR problems of the network's organizations are taken into account. We therefore retain two lines of research on HRM in Formal territorial networks : HRM in Competitiveness Clusters and HRM in Local Production Systems (LPSs).

HRM in Competitiveness Clusters

The first line of research refers to unpacking HRM practices in Competitiveness Clusters and it seems to be caught in the eyes of many researchers (Arnaud et al., 2013; Calamel et al., 2011; Chabault & Hulin, 2011; Defelix et al., 2008). Competitiveness Clusters (CC) have a French particularity and were set up by the Government in 2005 to meet industrial competitiveness and innovation challenges (Calamel et al., 2016; Defelix et al., 2013). They are defined as « a combination, in a given geographical space, of companies, training centers and public and private research units engaged in a partnership approach intended to generate synergies around joint projects of innovative nature » (DATAR, 2004). This way of designing Competitiveness Clusters allows underlining a certain specificity related to the diversity of actors throughout the presence of the Industry-Training-Research triptych. Therefore, what distinguishes them from other forms of inter-firm collaboration lies in the plurality of involved partners and the impulsive force of public authorities (Calamel & Roquelaure, 2014). In this regard, the issue of taking into account the human dimension may be essential in Competitiveness Clusters and constitutes so far a challenge to be taken up for Human Resources specialists and managers who have to deal with overlapping people of diverse origins and cultures. Defelix et al. (2006) affirm that the recognition of the human dimension in Competitiveness Clusters was proposed along four axes in the DATAR report (2004) : encouraging forward recruitment plans, providing collective training, providing collective management of Human Resources within the network and encouraging common structures as employers groups.

However, we owe to Colle et al. (2009) one of the first concrete experiences in understanding and describing HRM practices in Competitiveness Clusters. In the course of their work on the Competitiveness Clusters of the Rhône-Alpes region in France, the authors compile HRM

practices they found through four levels: The Member-Organization, the Collaborative Project, the Cluster itself, and the territorial level or intercluster level (Colle et al., 2009). The first level refers to raising employees' awareness and offering mutualized training. The second deals with a more or less permanent test of groups of workers who belong to different employers. The third level represents the HRM practices to be used on behalf of all member organizations of the Cluster (for example, the joint recruitment procedure). The fourth level of HRM which is that of the territory, refers for example to the construction of a Territorial or sectorial Forward-looking management of jobs and skills. Following these initial observations, it was revealed that HRM practices used in Competitiveness Clusters can also be grasped through the mobilization of two main reading grids : the contextualist approach (Pettigrew, 1987) and the proximity approach (Bouba-olga & Grosseti, 2008).

On the one hand, research carried out by Calamel et al. (2011) through the contextualist approach provides an overview of HRM practices identified in Competitiveness Clusters based on two dimensions: the time horizon of the expected major impact and the preferred level of intervention. The authors in turn retain several levels of the established HR practices: the practices developed bilaterally between the Cluster and a single organization, the inter-firm practices, the practices which affect the whole Cluster and particularly those that go beyond the Cluster, that is to say the HR practices extended across the territory (Calamel et al., 2011). Calamel and Cateura (2014) use the same contextualist approach and discover the emergence of new HRM practices with certain particularity in Competitiveness Clusters: advance planning of upcoming training that can subsequently fit with skills evolution or even the creation of a LinkedIn Group in parallel with HR and training workshops.

On the other hand, the proximity approach (Bouba-olga & Grosseti, 2008) helps distinguish a list of HRM practices that are more or less extended to the territory. They are among others the creation of a joint recruitment platform (CV and application), the inter-firm training offerings, the setting up of an HR unit, the common HR diagnostic, and especially the labor loan between member organizations (Calamel & Roquelaure, 2014).

Finally, these observations derived from both contextualist and proximity approaches are in line with the work of Mazzilli (2010) who makes similar conclusions by putting out three axes of Territorial-HRM-practices in her research on the « HRM Program » of a Competitiveness Cluster in France. These are the establishment of Forward-looking management of jobs and skills for all members of the Cluster, the development of a « GTEC » tool, and the inter-firm training offer for employees of member organizations of the Cluster. In summary, it must be emphasized that these works clearly indicate how human resources management practices in Competitiveness Clusters strongly draw researchers' attention (Calamel et al., 2016).

HRM in Local Productive Systems (LPSs)

The second line of research is concerned with the construction of HRM practices in the particular site of formal territorial networks labeled 'Local Productive Systems' (LPSs). The latter refers to « groups of firms and institutions that are geographically close and which collaborate in the same line of business » (Largier et al., 2008, p.44). In contrast to Marshallian districts, Local Productive Systems are marked by some strong coordination links and financial support from public authorities (Loubès & Bories-Azeau, 2010).

In addition, unlike the Competitiveness Cluster trajectory, LPSs emerged well before and have been the subject of several experiments on joint HRM. From the « Club des Districts Industriels Français » (CDIF, 2005) perspective, it is generally accepted that most LPSs HRM practices deal with inter-firm training, joint or mutualized recruitment procedures, creation of HR exchange clubs, skills sharing and so on (Colle et al., 2009; Le Boulaire et al., 2010). These results are supported by the work conducted by Bobulescu and Calamel (2009) who focus on six LPS of « Bretagne, Rhône-Alpes et Centre » regions. The authors stress four stages of developing a mutualized HRM at the LPS level : communication which facilitates the sharing of information between network members, mutualizing training that involves various actors in the training of network members, and mutualizing recruitment procedures illustrated by the posting of online CVs, lending labor and at last managing skills common to all members of the SPL which seems to be the most advanced phase (Bobulescu & Calamel, 2009). Loubès et al. (2012) make similar remarks by highlighting the existence of collective learning and training between members of the CAMDIB LPS in France. The authors put out the essential role of social capital between territorial actors as a driving force of the emergence of T-HRM practices within the network.

Thus, the above clearly outlines that practices found in Local Productive Systems converge on the same idea of a mutualized Human Resources Management and extended to the territory than that of Competitiveness Clusters. This is mainly characterized by inter-firm training, common recruitment procedures, the creation of collective learning platforms concerning the territorial management of skills, etc. (Bories-Azeau et al., 2008; Loubès & Bories-Azeau, 2010). Hence, one may understand that this kind of extending HRM to the territorial level of a set of companies comes from a more collaborative and constructive approach made up by several actors.

Territorial-HRM: Towards a Constructive and Normative Concept

The underlined HRM practices found on both sides (Competitiveness Clusters and Local Productive Systems) allow affirming that they rely on collaboration between territorial actors; suggesting that one of the main features of HRM in Formal territorial networks (Competitiveness Clusters and LPS) lies in its ecosystem approach includ-

ing a diversity of public and private actors (Calamel & Cateura, 2014). It has a mutualizing nature and is considered as a constructed concept, driven by a certain public and entrepreneurial initiative (Fedida & Saint-Germes, 2018). In other words, the implementation of a Territorial-HRM approach in formal territorial networks is not fortuitous, it stems from a long construction process that involves a range of public, private, and institutional actors.

Furthermore, the term ‘construction project of a T-HRM’ has become famous in the literature (cf. Mazzilli, 2011, Everaere & Glée, 2014). This is to say that T-HRM propelled by formal territorial networks has a normative dimension and is supposed to be under public governance. It ideally refers to a construction project that would describe the existence of a public initiative encouraging companies to bring their common HR issues to the territorial level where they can be resolved through a local development perspective. The logic of a formal approach to coordination and cooperation, barely lasting, between public and private actors to lay the groundwork for HR projects at the territorial level, is therefore well implemented : « Territorial HRM projects take roots in the need to see the development of new forms of collaboration between private and public actors at the local level » (Mazzilli & Pichault, 2015, p.45). These projects would therefore be undertaken by a synergy of companies, including actors and institutions who will carry out collective actions at the territorial level in order to provide relevant answers to a management issue whose implementation would be impossible at an organizational level (Bories-Azeau et al., 2008). Even though that T-HRM projects are hosted by Formal Territorial Networks such as Competitiveness Clusters and Local Productive Systems, it must be argued that these networks, despite their core role in the recruitment procedures as well as the sharing, exchange of employees and their mobility, need public governance support (Bories-Azeau & Loubès, 2011). Diverse intervention (both public and entrepreneurial) in the implementation of a Territorial-HRM approach shows all the interest of the normative dimension of the concept in that it is not considered as an emergent process, rather it is more about a construction project that come from common initiatives.

To sum up, it is important to keep in mind the following characteristics that may allow considering Territorial-HRM as a normative and constructive concept:

- The existence of a T-HRM project with a state involvement for support and governance. This means that the T-HRM approach does not result from hazardous actions, nor is it spontaneous but it requires prior design and rigorous planning from territorial actors;

- There is a deliberate inclusion of public authorities to integrate the territory as a strategic variable (Mercier & Colin, 2017) which makes it possible to meet organizational needs according to local development principles;

- A third component that justifies this nature of T-HRM lies in its integrative dimension which brings together

several actors (companies, private and public services, territorial actors, institutions, research organizations) into a form of partnership in order to achieve common goals. We therefore argue that this normative and constructive nature of T-HRM would be rooted in the actors’ DNA and formal mechanisms of territorializing HRM. The table below provides a summary of main features of Territorial-HRM propelled by Formal Territorial Networks.

Like any other model, this French model of extending HRM practices to the territory may have some conceptual limitations that need to be highlighted.

Territorial-HRM: A Prototypical Model with Limitations

In light of the extant literature on Territorial-Human Resources Management (T-HRM) we have shown the importance, it is obvious to recognize the collaborative dimension of such a model of managing human resources. Territorial-HRM generally deals with consultation, dialogue, anticipation, and, above all, the mutualization of human resources and actions on both sides. It is therefore a prototypical model of HRM, of which we bear in mind three following identification parameters : the existence of a common willingness to bring HR issues to a territorial level, the consideration of the territory as a reference unit (Mazzilli, 2008) which means focusing on a territorial issue, and the transformation of the latter into a strategic variable (Mercier & Colin, 2017), becoming a source of territorial social dialogue. These given parameters make it now possible to identify some limitations that could compromise the HRM territorialization process. First, the existence of a social dialogue based on a win-lose strategy, potentially in disfavor of one of the stakeholders. This could somehow threaten the sustainability of employee exchange or recruitment practices at the territorial level. And second, the failure of some companies to comply with the environmental and legal constraints of the prescribed territory.

The above-mentioned limitations then mark a path for proposing another definition of T-HRM which takes into account failings that may affect its process of implementation. We, therefore, define Territorial-Human Resources Management (T-HRM) as a voluntary approach undertaken by two or more organizations to extend their common HR issues to the territorial level where they can be treated via territorial cooperation (with various territorial actors) based upon strict respect for ethics, equity and transparency principles. This definition brings out something essential for conducting a T-HRM approach: the sustainability of practices. This should be accompanied by the central role of institutions that are responsible for the public governance of the human resources management territorialization approach.

In spite of this, the review of extant literature has outlined that studies focusing on T-HRM are generally conducted in Formal Territorial Networks (FTN) such as Competitiveness Clusters (CC) and Local Productive Systems (LPSs). The same literature has remained silent

Table*Main Features of Territorial-HRM in Formal Territorial Networks*

Territorial-HRM in Formal Territorial Networks	Features
Nature	A normative and constructive process
Type of governance	Subjected to public governance
Hosting sites	Formal Territorial Networks: Competitiveness Clusters, Local Productive Systems and so on
Nature of T-HRM practices	Mutualized practices
Types of identified practices	Mutualized recruitment process Mutualized training process External Mobility Labor loan between organizations
Types of involved actors	Territorial actors: companies, industries, research institutes, financial institutes, training centers

about conducting T-HRM within Informal Territorial Networks. These latter refers to the regrouping of very small production units, carrying out informal activities around a delimited space and from which interactions with third-party organizations are more or less valued. We mean by informal activity, activity in which the exercise is beyond the control of the government and whose actors themselves practically all intervene without legal authorization.

In general, Informal Territorial Networks are made up of non-contractual links and are particularly based on relationships of trust and cooperation between actors (Torre, 2016). They are mainly located in developing countries : Africa, Asia, and Latin America. In contrast to Formal Networks, Informal Territorial Networks emerge spontaneously and are free from any public initiative. They largely come from the actors' willingness without prescribed operating rules. These networks can be distinguished by existing cultural roots, mutual aid and solidarity relationship based on a common identity, and their attachment to work values (Bagla- Gökalp, 2000; Nimaga, 2021). They are also suitable places for social and eco-

nomic exchange between individuals and groups of individuals directly or indirectly involved in the activities of various production units, given the interactions that exist between the latter and their external environment (Simen & Tidjani, 2016). Their inclusion in a traditional and historical dynamic of the territory allows existing social norms to implicitly govern the operation mode. Unlike Formal Territorial Networks (Competitiveness Clusters and LPSs), the absence of a state labeling remains the main characteristic of Informal Territorial Networks. Therefore, we believe that it would be relevant to reflect on how human resources may be managed in these networks, since they have special configuration and type of organization that differ from that of formal networks.

In sum, our paper is full of theoretical interest and so relevant for both readers and scholars. It introduces them to a new research perspective that was previously little known and confined into the Francophone literature. On the basis of the above developments, they now have clear ideas about the ins and outs of territorial HRM, what it stands for and how it works. Also, the main types of Territorial HRM practices we have highlighted can be con-

sidered as basic conceptual tools for researchers who want to investigate the phenomenon in other contexts. They can refer to our definition of T-HRM and use the given practices as a guideline to explore the phenomenon in their own contexts for more predictions. Finally, as outlined, the lack of exploration of the phenomenon in Informal Territorial Networks, despite the formal ones, could also constitute a relevant and interesting line of research to explore for academics.

Conclusion

The purpose of this paper is to highlight the foundation of a relatively new phenomenon in management sciences: Territorial-Human Resources Management (T-HRM). This phenomenon emerged in the French academic world in the 2000s where most of the studies have been remaining confined. The paper goes beyond reminding the history of T-HRM by defining and characterizing it with a focus on two lines of research : HRM in Competitiveness Clusters and HRM in Local Productive Systems. To this end, in addition to highlighting the constructive and normative nature of the concept, certain limitations have also been set out. The paper then contributes to laying the foundations for a new research perspective that could be interesting to researchers worldwide by proposing a new definition of T-HRM inspired by Francophone works. Based on our study, it will be possible to rely on a clear groundwork that will make Territorial-HRM the subject of promising research in both French and Western academic contexts. We thus urge for future research about the phenomenon derived from a worldwide context and not to consider it as a research area that is exclusively suitable for the French academic world.

References

- Arnaud, N., Fauvy, S. & Nekka, H. (2013), La difficile institutionnalisation d'une GRH territoriale, *Revue Française de Gestion*, 2(231),15-33. <https://doi.org/10.3166/rfg.231.15-33>
- Beaujolin-Bellet, R. (2008), *Le territoire, laboratoire d'innovations en matière de pilotage multi acteurs des restructurations*, XIXe Congrès de l'AGRH, Dakar, Sénégal,
- Bobulescu R. & L. Calamel (2009). *Les pratiques RH dans les systèmes productifs locaux : six cas en France*, 6ème Journées de la proximité.
- Bouba, O. & Grossetti, M. (2008), Socio-économie de proximité, *Revue d'économie régionale et urbaine*, 3, 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.3917/reru.083.0311>
- Bories-Azeau I., Loubès A. & J.M. Esteve (2008). *Emergence d'une GRH territoriale et réseau inter firmes*, 19ème Congrès AGRH, Jan 2008, Dakar, Sénégal.
- Bories-Azeau, I. & Loubès, A. (2009), *Les maisons de l'emploi, un dispositif en faveur d'une gestion territoriale des ressources humaines*, 20ème Congrès de l'AGRH, Toulouse, France
- Calamel, L., Defelix, C., Mazzilli, I. & Retour, D. (2011), Les pôles de compétitivité : un point de rupture pour la GRH traditionnelle ? Une analyse des dispositifs RH au sein des 12 pôles de la région Rhône-Alpes, *Management et Avenir*, 1 (41), 175-193. <https://doi.org/10.3917/mav.041.0175>
- Calamel, L. & V., Gallego-Roquelaure (2014), Le prêt de main-d'œuvre : un dispositif innovant au service des territoires. *Relations Industrielles*, 69(3), 575-596. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1026759ar>
- Calamel, L. & Cateura, O. (2014), *Emergence de dispositifs de GRH inter organisationnels : le cas d'un Pôle de compétitivité Rhône-Alpin*, Congrès AGRH, Chester
- Calamel, L., Defélix, C. & Pichault, F. (2016), Les pôles de compétitivité, des formes organisationnelles aptes à innover en gestion des ressources humaines ? *Management International*, 20(4),146-157. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1051680ar>
- CDIF (Club des districts industriels français), « *SPL et ressources humaines : les plans collectifs de formation* » (cahier n° 1), « Gestion collective des ressources humaines dans les SPL » (cahier n° 3), mai 2005.
- Chabault, D. & A. Hulin (2011), Embaucher et former le personnel au sein de grappes ou de pôles de compétitivité, *Gestion*, 36 (3),43-49. <https://doi.org/10.3917/riges.363.0043>
- Colle R., Culié J.-D., Defélix C., Hatt F., & Rapiou M.-T. (2009), Quelle GRH pour les pôles de compétitivité?, *Revue Française de Gestion*, 10(190), 143-161. <https://doi.org/10.3166/rfg.190.143-161>
- DATAR (2004), La France, puissance industrielle. Une nouvelle politique industrielle par les territoires. *Réseaux d'entreprises, vallées technologiques, pôles de compétitivité, rapport de la DATAR*, 131 p
- Defelix, C., Culié, J.D, Retour, D & Valette, A. (2006), les Pôles de compétitivité, laboratoires d'innovation en ressources humaines, *Revue Française de Gestion Industrielle*, 25(3),69-86. <https://doi.org/10.53102/2006.25.03.561>
- Defélix, C., M.T, Rapiou & R. Colle (2008), Prendre en compte le facteur humain au sein des pôles de compétitivité : la longue marche vers l'innovation sociale, *Management & Avenir*, 20, 9-29. <https://doi.org/10.3917/mav.020.0009>
- Defélix, C., Dègruel, M. & Le Boulair, M. (2010), *Territorialisation de la GRH : de nouvelles démarches d'entreprise et une nouvelle GRH*, 21ème Congrès AGRH, Rennes
- Defélix, C., Degruel, M., Le Boulair, M. & Retour, D. (2013), Élargir la gestion des ressources humaines aux dimensions du territoire : quelles réalités derrière les discours ? *Management & Avenir*, 59, 120-138. <https://doi.org/10.3917/mav.059.0120>
- Ehlinger, S., Perret, V., & Chabaud, D. (2007), Quelle gouvernance pour les réseaux territorialisés d'organisations ? *Revue Française de Gestion*, 33(170), 155-171. <https://doi.org/10.3166/rfg.170.155-171>
- Everaere, C. & C. Glée-Vermande (2011), *Observatoire de l'évolution des emplois et des compétences de la ville de Lyon : une contribution à une GRH Territoriale durable ? Développement durable, Territoires et localisation des entreprises : vers une attractivité durable ?* Bordeaux, France
- Everaere, C. & C. Glée- Vermande (2014), Une GPEC territoriale ? De l'outil de gestion à l'institutionnalisation d'une nouvelle forme de GRH, *Management & Avenir*, 73,73-91. <https://doi.org/10.3917/mav.073.0073>
- Fedida, L., & Saint-Germes, E. (2018), L'engagement durable des parties prenantes dans une démarche de GRH Territoriale : Le cas de la GTEC de Sophia Antipolis, *Revue de Gestion des Ressources Humaines*, 4(11), 18-40. <https://doi.org/10.3917/grhu.110.0018>

- Joyeau A., Le Gall, S., & Poilpot-Rocaboy, G. (2019). Le groupement d'employeurs et ses parties prenantes : Quelles conditions de réussite du réseau ? Une application au métier de RRH à temps partagé, Actes du 30ème Colloque de l'AGRH.
- Levesque, B., Klein, J.L., & Fontain, J.M (1998), *Les systèmes industriels localisés, état de la recherche*, UQAM
- Le Boulaire M., Dégruel M., Defélix C. & D. Retour (2010), *Nouveaux territoires, nouvelle GRH ? Quand la GRH se « territorialise »*, Entreprise et Personnel, Etude, N° 268.
- Lethielleux, L. (2017), Réseaux et nouvelles configurations RH territoriales : Le rôle des groupements d'employeurs ? *Management & Avenir*, 5(95), 171-188. <https://doi.org/10.3917/mav.095.0171>
- Loubès, A. & I. Bories-Azeau (2010), Les réseaux territorialisés de PME : Quels effets sur la formation professionnelle continue des salariés?, *Management & Avenir*, 9(39),163-175
- Loubès, A., Bories-Azeau, I. & Fabre, C. (2012), Les enjeux du capital social dans le processus d'émergence d'une GRH de réseau: Le cas d'un système productif local constitué de PME, *Revue internationale PME*, 25(3),195-228. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1018421ar>
- Loubès, A. & I. Bories-Azeau (2016), Les logiques de la GPEC élargie au territoire : *Une proposition de typologie*, *Gestion 2000*, 33(2), 141-160. <https://doi.org/10.3917/g2000.332.0141>
- Mazzilli, I. (2008), *Une Gestion des ressources humaines à l'interface des organisations : vers une GRH territoriale?* Cahier de recherche du CERAG: 2008-02 E
- Mazzilli, I. (2010), *GRH, Territoire et Traduction, ou la difficile naissance d'une gestion territoriale des ressources humaines*, XXIème congrès AGRH, Rennes/Saint-Malo
- Mazzilli, I. (2011), *Les dispositifs de GRH territoriale : d'une logique de transposition à la construction d'un modèle nouveau?* 22ème Congrès AGRH, Marrakech
- Mazzilli, I. & Pichault, F. (2015), La construction des dispositifs de GRH territoriale : grille d'analyse et modalités du processus de traduction, *Management International*, 19(3), 31-46. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1043001ar>
- Mercier, E. & T. Colin (2017). Le territoire : De nouvelles opportunités pour la fonction RH ? *Management & Avenir*, 5,107-127. <https://doi.org/10.3917/mav.095.0107>
- Pettigrew, A. (1987). Context and Action in the Transformation of the Firm, *Journal of Management Studies*, 24(6), 649-670. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.1987.tb00467.x>
- Rivière, A., Loubès, A. & Oriou, L. (2019), Mechanisms for the construction and appropriation of a GPEC tool expanded across the territory (GPEC-T) in the healthcare and medico-social sector: An exploratory case study in Languedoc-Roussillon, *@GRH*, 31(2), 65-89.