

Organizational career management practices

The role of the relationship between HRM and trade unions

Received 5 February 2018
Revised 27 May 2018
Accepted 2 July 2018

Tomislav Hernaus

*Department of Organization and Management,
Faculty of Economics and Business, University of Zagreb,
Zagreb, Croatia*

Dejana Pavlovic

Institute of Economic Sciences, Belgrade, Serbia, and

Maja Klindzic

*Department of Organization and Management,
Faculty of Economics and Business, University of Zagreb, Zagreb, Croatia*

Abstract

Purpose – Organizations profoundly create development paths of individual's careers. Therefore, the purpose of this paper is to gain understanding about how organizational context (shaped by the complex relationship between trade union strength and HRM strength) influences the application of organizational career management (OCM) practices seen through the lens of the theory of cooperation and competition (Deutsch, 1949; Tjosvold, 1984).

Design/methodology/approach – Inferential statistical analyses (Kruskal–Wallis and Mann–Whitney tests) were applied to test the CRANET survey data collected from 92 large-sized private-sector organizations within an EU country characterized by a medium to high-trade union density.

Findings – Results offered consistent empirical evidence that a comprehensive set of OCM practices are applied differently across four distinctive modalities of the union-HRM relationship. Specifically, the “union-HRM synergy” relationship (high-HRM/high-unionization) has been recognized as the most promising for adopting such developmental practices, providing an evidence of complementarities between trade unions and HRM professionalism.

Practical implications – The research suggests that synergistic collaboration between trade unions and HRM might provide employees with even more career development opportunities than when organizations pursue the asynchronous single-sided “Total HRM strategy.”

Originality/value – This study rejuvenate a traditional career management research agenda by introducing a new theoretical lens for studying the interplay between trade unions and HRM and have put an emphasis on how their strength is related to the incidence of OCM practices.

Keywords HRM, Trade unions, Organizational career management, Theory of cooperation and competition, Union-HRM relationship

Paper type Research paper

Introduction

Organizations achieve competitive goals by successfully managing people for the long run. To retain and further improve company's market position through people, managers strive to develop employees through organizational career management (OCM) practices, i.e. a system-wide deliberate human resource development efforts provided to support employees' career success. Such attempts – while not undermining personal responsibility for the career but accepting career self-management as an emerging type of vocational behavior (e.g. King, 2004) – emphasize that careers do not occur in a vacuum (Sullivan and Baruch, 2009), and thus should be examined from an organizational viewpoint (Budhwar and Baruch, 2003). Organizations should link the individual's career needs with the organization's workforce



requirements (Schein, 1978; Tzabbar *et al.*, 2003). Such an approach is not only positively associated with individual career effectiveness (e.g. Orpen, 1994) but also has a positive impact on organizational outcomes (e.g. De Vos and Cambre, 2017).

Career management has been established as one of the core human resource management (HRM) elements (Lazarova *et al.*, 2012) and it might be a relevant topic for trade union representatives as well (e.g. Healy, 1999). Existing research, however, mainly focused on the union–non-union differences in the presence of career management in general (e.g. Bradley *et al.*, 2004; Healy, 1999), or more specifically in terms of HR activities such as training incidence and duration (e.g. Green *et al.*, 1999). Studies so far have not clearly explained the role of trade unions in either promoting or hindering the adoption of career management practices (see Gill, 2009). For instance, such practices might differ with regard to the relationship between trade unions and HRM, as the two do not exclude one another (e.g. Gill and Meyer, 2013). Despite of their importance, we still witness a scarcity of research on career development practices regarding the union-HRM relationship (e.g. Cristiani and Peiró, 2015; Vernon and Brewster, 2013). As trade unionism and HRM professionalism might co-exist (Guest, 1995; Guest and Conway, 1999) or substitute each other (Machin and Wood, 2005), the nature of their interaction can potentially influence the extent to which OCM will be adopted within an organization.

Accordingly, with an aim to gain understanding of the contextual background created by the complex relationship between trade union “strength” and HRM “strength,” we followed the theory of cooperation and competition (Deutsch, 1949) to make initial assumptions and further analyzed survey data on career management practices collected from 92 large-sized private-sector organizations. In total, 14 OCM practices were examined as outcomes both individually and as bundles of practices in four different modalities of the union-HRM relationship.

Our results offer consistent empirical evidence on the positive effects of cooperative behavior, beyond what could be achieved by pursuing conflict and competition between unionism and managerial opposition. Thus, we attempted to move beyond a traditional industrial relations research by introducing a new theoretical lens for studying the interplay between trade unions and HRM; and have put an emphasis on how their relationship is related to the occurrence of OCM practices.

The relationship between HRM and trade unions

Trade unionism represents a collective voice of employees primarily established to provide a counter-balance to managerial opportunism. Although trade unions have been losing power in the last decades (e.g. Ebbinghaus, 2002; Hyman, 2018; Rau, 2012), they still play a relevant role in industrial relations, especially in some of the most developed European countries such as Finland, Denmark or Sweden (Hyman, 2018).

The interests of organizations and unions are often seen to be in competition (Deery *et al.*, 2014). More specifically, HR practices are mainly perceived to be anti-union and detrimental to union growth (Dhal, 2015), with high performance work practices (HPWPs) especially being treated as substitutes for trade union activities (Gill, 2009; Pohler and Luchak, 2014). Indeed, coinciding with the decline in trade unionism in the last couple of decades has been an increase in the use of human relations practices and new forms of work organization (Liu *et al.*, 2009; Machin and Woods, 2005). While a confrontational approach between management and trade union representatives was dominant throughout the last century, since the late 1990s we witness the growing enthusiasm about the idea of partnership (Guest and Peccei, 2008) and cooperative industrial relations (Antonioli *et al.*, 2011).

Already Freeman and Medoff (1984) argued that the quality of the relationship between trade unions and management determines whether trade unions will have a positive or negative impact on business activities while Kochan *et al.* (1986) concluded that two parties

are sometimes compatible and sometimes not. Though it is tempting to treat trade unions and HRM as substitutes for each other (e.g. Gill, 2009), such a position ignores their strivings to promote efficiency and equity in the workplace (Pohler and Luchak, 2014). For instance, in situations where both sides acknowledge their conflicting interests but prioritize the search of a common goal (e.g. Cristiani and Peiró, 2015) there is a high chance of mutual gains occurrence.

Despite certain debates about whether HRM has come to replace trade union activities (Guest, 1995; Fiorito, 2001), several authors challenged the notion of hostility and incompatibility between trade unions and HRM. For instance, De Silva (1998, p. 9) stated that “[...] HRM is not *per se* anti-union.” The existing empirical evidence does not give credence to the view that the practice of HRM is incompatible to union presence (e.g. Roche and Turner, 1994); instead, Machin and Wood (2005) have rejected such a substitution effect hypothesis. In fact, it has been argued that the industrial relations system has passed through the age of conflicting relations and is heading toward an era of cooperation (e.g. Dhal, 2015), the viewpoint widely accepted by governments, employers and political parties (e.g. Bacon and Storey, 1993; Terry, 2003).

Organizations can obviously choose between having either adverse or cooperative industrial relations (Gill, 2009; Purcell, 1987). Such reasoning is in line with the theory of cooperation and competition proposed by Deutsch (1949), who emphasized that most situations in everyday life involve a complex set of trade-off goals and sub-goals. Tjosvold (1984) made additional insights about how cooperation has the potential of both fulfilling the needs of individuals and the requirements of organizations. He concluded that different stakeholder groups (e.g. trade union representatives and HR professionals) must respond to each other’s requests and in other ways coordinate.

This leads us to understand the relationship between trade unions and HRM as a two-dimensional continuum of labor relations policy choices. While the basic dimension includes self-existence or co-habitation of trade union(s) and HRM in an organization, the additional dimension represents the level of their collaboration (dualism-weak or synergy-strong). Guest (1995) was among the first who outlined four broad options of the policy choices with respect to HRM and industrial relations: the new realism (high-HRM priority/high-industrial relations priority), individualized HRM (high-HRM priority/low-industrial relations priority), traditional collectivism (low-HRM priority/high-industrial relations priority), and the black hole (low-HRM priority/low-industrial relations priority). While different authors developed similar trade union-HRM relationship modalities (e.g. Abbott, 2007), Poloski Vokic (2012) more recently adapted Guest’s (1995) framework and after conducting a dozen of interviews with HR experts re-labeled four modalities of the union-HRM relationship according to their power/strength: “Total HRM strategy,” “Union-HRM synergy,” “Union-HRM dualism,” and “Union dominance.”

Union dominance represents some continuity with industrial relations environment of the pre-1980s era (Guest and Conway, 1999). This modality is present in organizations where employees’ needs are exclusively or mostly union’s business, leading to HRM being either weak or not present at all (Poloski Vokic, 2012). Such a misbalance in the favor of trade unions might be perceived by managers as a problematic deviation, an obstacle to effective governance and a sign of the failure of HR functions (Vernon and Brewster, 2013). In such circumstances, when trade unions do not have a counter-balance in HRM professionalism, they are likely to have a negative impact on the effective adoption of HRM practices such as HPWPs (e.g. Gill, 2009) or career development activities.

Union-HRM dualism is a model of coexistence of trade unions and HRM practices in an organization, characterized by the strict division of tasks and areas of authority and control between trade unions and HR department. According to this model, two actors represent separate silos and do not collaborate, or they have developed a weak collaboration. A lack of

collaboration might be a result of having completely different agendas (e.g. Poloski Vokic, 2012), or because either the trade unionism is not robust or the HRM efforts are limited (Machin and Wood, 2005). In such circumstances, trade unions are recognized and accepted as inevitable, centering their efforts on the need for stability and control (Joordan and Cillie, 2015).

Union-HRM synergy is a model of partnership characterized by strong collaboration and mutual supportive HRM and trade union practices (e.g. Poloski Vokic, 2012). In workplace contexts where trade unions are established, this usually means working with rather than against a trade union (Guest and Conway, 1999). Both sides are strong and influential players who work together to create effective workplace practices. Specifically, unionism is seen as a structural foundation upon which HR functions establish a wider strategic role (Vernon and Brewster, 2013). However, for the functioning of the organization both the management and trade union representatives must take the initiative to maintain an amiable relationship (Dhal, 2015).

Finally, total HRM strategy is a modality type in which there is a high level of investment in the employee as a “resource” (Joordan and Cillie, 2015), while both presence and influence of trade unions is marginal or non-existing at all (Poloski Vokic, 2012). This approach is strongly proclaimed by Pfeffer and Cohen (1984), as well as Boxall (1993), where the latter argued that HRM is essentially a non-union form of employee management practice (i.e. antithetical to trade unionism, cf. Machin and Wood, 2005). Legge (1995) went even further by stressing that more sophisticated HRM acts to inhibit or erode unionism, which is in line with union substitution arguments (e.g. Fiorito, 2001). While the strength of the HRM system does have a positive direct and indirect (via OCM practices) effect on organizational performance (Cunha and Cunha, 2009), the HRM intensity does not represent an inherently linear concept for achieving incremental gains (White and Bryson, 2013).

Career management across different union-HRM modalities

Career management is a highly relevant set of policies, programs or activities that regulate the movement and life-cycle of employees over time by offering a long-term developmental perspective. Nowadays, careers are viewed in many ways – as a series of jobs, as a cumulative set of experiences, as vehicles for self-expression and a process of adult development (Newman, 2011). Although a career primarily belongs to the individual (Baruch, 1999; Healy, 1999) who should plan and manage his or her own “fortune,” organizations strive to help their employees in facing career requirements (Heraty and Morley, 2000; McDonald and Hite, 2016). While the research focus in the last two decades has been moved away from organizational (system-wide policies) to the role of an individual (proactive behavior) in managing his or her boundaryless/protean career (e.g. Newman, 2011), empirical findings show that individuals still appreciate having career management programs offered not just by their employers (Lazarova *et al.*, 2012), but by trade unions as well (Healy, 1999; Hocque and Bacon, 2008).

Likewise, organizations recognize their role and the importance of career management policies attended to develop internal talent (Russell, 1991), facilitate internal mobility (Eby *et al.*, 2005), ensure the long-term availability of skilled and knowledgeable workforce (De Vos *et al.*, 2008) and maintain employees’ career satisfaction (Kong *et al.*, 2012).

Existing career research shows that the content of the OCM practices varies, although it is possible to identify some commonalities across studies. We can recognize a wide range of OCM practices that might be used for career development, as shown in Table I.

Similar to other HR practices, career management practices have often been grouped into bundles or various clusters (De Vos *et al.*, 2008; De Vos and Cambre, 2017) that relate to certain characteristics of the organization such as size, age or culture (Baruch and Peiperl, 2000). For instance, in a study carried out by a group of authors (Eby *et al.*, 2005), four types

Organizational career management practice	Research studies	
Special tasks for career management	Various business tasks that provide experience and enable personal and professional development (Berber and Slavic, 2016)	Barber and Slavic (2016)
Cross-functional projects	Taskforces composed of individuals with different functional home base who solve complex organizational issues (Kettley and Hirsh, 2000)	Baruch (1999), Baruch and Peiperl (2000) and Barber and Slavic (2016)
On-the-job-training	Refers to a structured or non-structured system of training that occurs in the workplace (Rothwell and Kazanas, 1994)	Barber and Slavic (2016)
Project team work	Time limited and focused collaboration on tasks that involve a considerable amount of judgment and expertise (Ishak and Ballard, 2012)	Baruch and Peiperl (2000) and Barber and Slavic (2016)
Formal networking schemes	Involvement in organizational events and gatherings, as well as membership in professional societies or participation at professional conferences	Barber and Slavic (2016)
Formal career plans	Activities of matching organizational objectives and individuals' goals (MacDonald and Arthur, 2005)	Baruch (1999), Budhwar and Baruch (2003), Baruch and Peiperl (2000), Barber and Slavic (2016), Cunha and Cunha (2009), Heraty and Morley (2000) and Mayrhofer <i>et al.</i> (2004)
Development centers	Evolved from assessment centers; focused on general development and enhancement of employees preparing them for future roles (Baruch, 1999)	Barber and Slavic (2016) and Budhwar and Baruch (2003)
Succession plans	Organization evaluates the potential for promotion and determines the possible replacement for every (managerial) position (Budhwar and Baruch, 2003)	Baruch (1999), Baruch and Peiperl (2000), Barber and Slavic (2016), Cunha and Cunha (2009), Heraty and Morley (2000) and Mayrhofer <i>et al.</i> (2004)
Planned job rotation	HR tool for exposing employees to a greater variety of work experience (Mayrhofer <i>et al.</i> , 2004) by practising task or job switching	Barber and Slavic (2016), Cunha and Cunha (2009), Heraty and Morley (2000) and Mayrhofer <i>et al.</i> (2004)
High-flier schemes	A formal identification and development procedure established with the intention to identify a limited group of employees who are believed to be capable of making a unique contribution to the future of the organization (Baruch, 1999; Mayrhofer <i>et al.</i> , 2004)	Barber and Slavic (2016), Cunha and Cunha (2009), Heraty and Morley (2000) and Mayrhofer <i>et al.</i> (2004)
International work assignments	An opportunity to have a cross-cultural and personal growth experience (Adler, 1986)	Cunha and Cunha (2009) and Heraty and Morley (2000)
Coaching	Active involvement on the part of the organization in the careers of individuals and a planning element that considers the individual's development over time (Baruch and Peiperl, 2000)	Baruch and Peiperl (2000)
Mentoring	Development (counseling) program through which senior manager provides advice and tutoring to a person with managerial potential (Baruch, 1999)	Baruch (1999), Baruch and Peiperl (2000) and Barber and Slavic (2016)
Computer-based packages/ e-learning	Simulation or learning tools for professional development	Barber and Slavic (2016)

Table I.
Organizational career management practices

of OCM practices are defined: succession management, potential assessment, development and feedback. In addition, Barnett and Bradley (2007) examined two groups of career development: formal support (e.g. career planning and training) and informal support (e.g. mentoring and coaching). Obviously, career management activities should not be addressed only separately, but also examined as bundles of practices.

No matter which approach we take (i.e. individual or configurational), we do not know much about how the nature of union-HRM relationship might reflect on the occurrence of OCM practices. For instance, research on performance effects of trade unions and HPWPs has often been conducted in isolation (Addison, 2005). Few studies examining the presence of different HR practices in either unionized and/or non-unionized settings provided an evidence that trade unions can make organizations more or less likely to introduce certain HRM practices (e.g. Bryson *et al.*, 2005; Godard, 2009; Liu *et al.*, 2009).

With regard to specific HPWP activities, extant research revealed that activities such as performance appraisal (Ng and Maki, 1994) or the introduction of individual variable pay (e.g. Gunnigle *et al.*, 1998) are less likely to be found in unionized settings while communication and voice mechanisms such as collective negotiations, employee surveys and meetings, involvement and HRM consultation practices were found to be positively related to the presence of trade unionism (e.g. Benson, 2000). More generally speaking, Bryson *et al.* (2005) found that HPWPs have a positive impact on labor productivity; however, the effect was restricted to unionized settings.

Unlike other HPWP practices, existing literature is almost silent about career management practices within (non)union work contexts. Evetts (1992) among the few pointed out that both representatives of employers (such as HR professionals within an organization) and trade unions might be influential when negotiating about career structures. Furthermore, Healy (1999) found that the majority of teachers perceived the trade union as having a collectivist role in career management. Similarly, Baruch and Peiperl (2000) showed evidence that the presence of trade unions represents a relevant context for OCM groupings. On the other hand, Heraty and Morley (2000) did not find significant differences in career management practices between unionized and non-unionized organizations.

Overall, the mixed results about the influence of trade unionism on the implementation of the majority of HPWPs in general is well established in the literature (e.g. Gill and Meyer, 2013; Liu *et al.*, 2009; MacKenzie *et al.*, 2015), with far less evidence on OCM practices. Such inconclusive results indicate that organizations should not be approached solely as being unionized or non-unionized; instead, the relationship between trade unions and HRM should be put upfront as an important contextual factor (e.g. Godard, 2009) for adopting specific OCM practices. Emerging empirical evidence indeed suggests a more complex relationship between trade unions and HRM practices – the influence trade unions might have on the adoption of HPWPs was shown to depend on various internal and external factors, but more importantly on trade union characteristics and preferred style of union-management relationships (MacKenzie *et al.*, 2015).

While a very few studies conducted (e.g. Deery *et al.*, 2001; Wood, 1996) showed mixed findings in terms of career management practices in (non)union working contexts (such results are expected as the role of HRM has not been taken into account), none of the previous research attempts addressed how these practices vary across different union-HRM relationship modalities. Career management activities underline the employer-employee relationship and while each individual negotiates his or her work package with an employer, trade unions might be a mediator or moderator of their relationship (Cristiani and Peiró, 2015). Specifically, both HRM and trade unions create an environment for making decisions about work employment and industrial relations.

Due to lack of previous research, we decided to build our arguments and develop hypotheses by starting from a more extant HPWP literature since career management

practices might be understood as a specific practice of HPWPs. Despite scholars who made *a priori* assumptions that unionized workplaces are less likely to adopt HPWPs (Bryson *et al.*, 2005), we follow Kochan and Osterman's (1994) view that HPWPs are compatible with the interests of trade unions (see Liu *et al.*, 2009) and that unions may sometimes lead firms to use more progressive HR policies and practices (Verma, 2005), making their impact on organizational competitiveness positive (Gill, 2009; Gill and Meyer, 2013). What is more, proponents of HPWPs have argued that these practices can benefit trade unions by enabling them to discard their traditional adversarial role in favor of more collaborative one, in which they develop a "partnership" or "mutual gains" relationship with management (Kochan and Osterman, 1994; Godard, 2009). For example, Dhal (2015) showed that specific HR practices, including those related to career management (e.g. performance feedback, promotion and reward systems) helped both union and management in maintaining a cordial relationship. If trade unions' position in organization is weak, one might expect a weak or even an absence of relationship between managers and trade union representatives, with no participation of trade unions in development of innovative practices (e.g. MacKenzie *et al.*, 2015). In line with the previous, we build our first set of hypotheses:

H1. OCM practices differ across modalities of the union-HRM relationship.

H2. Bundles of OCM practices differ across modalities of the union-HRM relationship.

Trade unions have always had a role in career development, particularly in relation to the perceived equity associated with both the allocation of career development resources such as training (e.g. Dhal, 2015; Healy, 1999), with decisions surrounding career progression (e.g. Healy, 1999) and curtailment, such as discipline and dismissal (Healy, 1999). However, in climate of union modernization and greater sensitivity to members broader interest, the overall role of trade unions might be changing (Bradley *et al.*, 2004), especially by promoting collective voice as one of the more recent developments in the field of industrial relations (Pohler and Luchak, 2014). By promoting "voice" instead of "exit," trade unions extended job tenure and, as such, provided a platform for employers (and workers) to invest in firm-specific human capital, in the knowledge that they would reap more of the rewards than they might have done in the absence of a union (Bryson *et al.*, 2005). Pohler and Luchak (2014) propose that these institutions are better seen as complements whereby greater balance is achieved between efficiency, equity and voice when HPWPs are implemented in the presence of unions.

Additionally, in line with Bryson *et al.* (2005), we argue that where managers acknowledge trade unions as legitimate employee representatives and reciprocate union intentions to resolve labor-management tensions in a supportive manner, the likelihood of organizations adopting and sustaining HPWPs, including career management practices, may increase (Gill and Meyer, 2013; Vernon and Brewster, 2013). Thus, similar to MacKenzie and colleagues' (2015) insights about HPWPs, we believe that according to the theory of cooperation and competition (Deutsch, 1949) strong and collaborative trade unions will foster the adoption of OCM practices, while union militancy toward management should result in implementation avoidance of such developmental practices.

In other words, the nature of organizational context (i.e. the presence and strength of trade unions and/or HRM professionalism) might play a key role in making adequate career management decisions. Cohen and Pfeffer (1986) asserted that the conflict of interest between trade unions and HR departments (i.e. "Union-HRM dualism") means that HPWPs are less likely to exist in organizations with a high percentage of unionized employees. On the other hand, *in situ* where managers acknowledge trade unions as legitimate labor-management partners (i.e. "Union-HRM synergy"), the likelihood of adopting and sustaining HPWPs (and thus career management practices) may be high (Gill and Meyer, 2013;

Vernon and Brewster, 2013). Such an assumption should be valid both for individual and bundled OCM practices; therefore, we hypothesize the following:

- H3.* OCM practices are most adopted in organizations pursuing the union-HRM synergy relationship.
- H4.* Bundles of OCM practices are most adopted in organizations pursuing the union-HRM synergy relationship.

Method

Procedure and sample

As we investigate the level of OCM practices within different union-HRM relationship modalities, the unit of analysis is the organization. Therefore, HR managers as professionals who are most likely to be acquainted with people management practices (e.g. Budhwar and Baruch, 2003) as well as engaged to resolve labor relations-related issues (e.g. Kaufman, 2001) were invited to provide information about OCM practices in their organizations.

The data collection was conducted as a part of the 2014–2015 CRANET research in an EU country characterized by a medium to high-trade union density (at 34 percent in 2012; European Commission, 2015). The questionnaires have been administered by e-mail and supplemented with a brief covering letter explaining the purpose and importance of the research. While we managed to collect 171 responses from a heterogeneous sample of Croatian organizations listed in the Croatian Chamber of Economy web database (response rate of 23.7 percent), for the purpose of this study we decided to narrow our focus on large-sized private-sector organizations. We did so to avoid omitted variable bias as previous research recognized organizational size as a significant control either for HRM, OCM or union activity (e.g. Vernon and Brewster, 2013). For instance, in smaller organizations (fewer than 150 persons) there is usually no HR department and, thus, a lack of system-wide OCM policy (Baruch and Peiperl, 2000). On the other hand, larger organizations are likely to have more extensive career management practices because of their greater financial resources (Perry-Smith and Blum, 2000). Along the same line, while being less often unionized, private-sector organizations record greater levels of needs analysis than do public-sector counterparts (Heraty and Morley, 2000).

After initially excluding 13 cases due to missing values or because a very weak HRM or union activity were reported to exist, additional cut-offs were applied in terms of ownership type (i.e. private-sector organizations) and workforce size (i.e. 250+ employees), eventually resulting with 92 sampled organizations (26.1 percent involved in wholesale and retail trade; and 16.3 percent operating in the food-processing industry). The majority of survey respondents were highly educated females (74.2 percent) have been working in the HR department for five years at least (80.0 percent) and 48.9 percent of them were the most senior HR experts in the organization.

Measures

The standardized and previously validated CRANET questionnaire (Parry *et al.*, 2013) has been used for analyzing the occurrence of OCM practices in organizations applying one out of four modalities of the union-HRM relationship.

Trade union strength. We evaluated the strength of union activity within sampled organizations by gathering data on four questions: the proportion of employees that are members of a trade union in six bands (0, 1–10, 11–25, 26–50, 51–75, 76–100 percent), extent to which trade unions influence organization (0 – not at all; 4 – to a very great extent), extent to which employees communicate through trade union representatives (0 – not at all; 4 – to a

very great extent) and whether trade unions are recognized for the purpose of collective bargaining (0 – no; 1 – yes).

HRM strength. The level of HRM professionalism within an organization, similar to other research attempts based on the CRANET data (e.g. Cunha and Cunha, 2009) was measured by posing the following three questions: “What is the ratio of HR employees within the total workforce?” (The HR staff ratio of 1.1 was used as a benchmark; see Moorstein *et al.*, 2015); “Does the person responsible for HR have a place on the corporate board?” (0 – no, 1 – yes); and “Does your organization have a written Personnel/HRM Strategy?” (0 – no, 1 – yes).

OCM practices. HR managers were asked to report the usage of 14 well-recognized career management practices (see the list of OCM practices in Table II) with a single item for each. However, we did not apply a checklist-type format where respondents usually indicate if their organization utilizes each practice (Eby *et al.*, 2005); instead, our respondents had to grade the usage of a particular method in the form of Likert-type scale (0 – not at all; 4 – to a very great extent).

Data analysis

Initially, we had to group the sampled organizations into four clusters according to the respective modality of the union-HRM relationship (“Union dominance,” “Union-HRM dualism,” “Union-HRM synergy,” or “Total HRM strategy”). Two raters (first-two authors of the paper) conducted three rounds of ratings to assign each organization to its corresponding type. An inter-rater reliability analysis using the κ statistic was performed to determine consistency (or disagreement) between raters. The initial inter-rater reliability was found to be convincing at the level of $\kappa = 0.677$ ($p < 0.001$). However, we also wanted to take into account the degree of disagreement and, thus, calculated the weighted Cohen’s $\kappa = 0.736$ ($p < 0.001$), 95% CI (0.622, 0.850). Following a Delphi method procedure, we conducted another round of ratings which resulted in almost perfect agreement between the raters, where $\kappa = 0.907$ ($p < 0.001$) and weighted Cohen’s $\kappa = 0.936$ ($p < 0.001$), 95 % CI (0.884, 0.987). A final decision about cluster grouping was made by lead author in the third round, resulting in the balanced ratio of organizations characterized either by strong-HRM (21.7 percent of organizations pursuing “Total HRM strategy”; and 28.3 percent creating a

	Response counts (total sample) ^b					Mean value	Component OCM bundle	
	1 (%)	2 (%)	3 (%)	4 (%)	5 (%)		1	2
Organizational career management practices								
Use of special tasks for career management	12.6	14.9	29.9	28.7	13.8	3.159	0.706	0.411
Use of projects to stimulate learning for career management	11.6	12.8	31.4	30.2	14.0	3.222	0.672	0.438
Use of on-the-job-training for career management	5.7	13.8	20.7	39.1	20.7	3.553	0.630	0.430
Use of participation in project team work for career management	10.5	14.0	29.1	32.6	14.0	3.262	0.782	0.244
Use of formal networking schemes for career management	39.8	25.3	19.3	10.8	4.8	2.155	0.593	0.487
Use of formal career plans for career management	24.1	19.3	26.5	15.7	14.5	2.775	0.475	0.708
Use of development centers for career management	45.2	22.6	9.5	7.1	15.5	2.248	0.307	0.755
Use of succession plans for career management	30.5	19.5	22.0	17.1	11.0	2.589	0.388	0.647
Use of planned job rotation for career management	15.5	28.6	32.1	16.7	7.1	2.713	0.731	0.080
Use of high-flier schemes/high potentials for career management	16.3	15.1	20.9	26.7	20.9	3.205	0.674	0.510
Use of international work assignments for career management	47.1	11.8	15.3	18.8	7.1	2.273	0.619	0.395
Use of coaching for career management	25.9	17.3	25.9	23.5	7.4	2.692	0.209	0.673
Use of mentoring for career management	4.7	11.8	17.6	38.8	27.1	3.718	0.402	0.633
Use of computer-based packages/e-learning for career management	25.0	27.4	21.4	14.3	11.9	2.607	0.159	0.757

Notes: ^aRotation converged in three iterations; ^balthough original response counts were from 0 (not at all) to 4 (to a very great extent), we have recoded the values (0 to 1, 1 to 2, 2 to 3, 3 to 4 and 4 to 5) to allow for statistical analysis

Table II. Results of principal components factor analysis (Varimax rotation)^a

“Union-HRM synergy”) or weak-HRM situations (40.2 percent of organizations with “Union-HRM dualism”; and 9.8 percent characterized by “Union dominance”).

Next, we ran a confirmatory factor analysis to identify bundles of OCM practices. An initial scree plot test showed a clear break after the second component. Further results of principal component analysis with varimax rotation, and based on the 0.6 cut-off value of eigenvalues, supported a two-factor structure (development and mobility OCM activities and formal OCM infrastructure). Career management bundle solutions were computed by combining the components of each group of individual OCM practices. The scale reliability for two aggregate measures was above the cut-off value of 0.7 (Nunnally, 1967). Descriptive results (response counts and mean values) and rotated factor matrix results are shown in Table II.

Shapiro-Wilk tests indicated that our data do not come from a normal distribution ($p < 0.001$) and therefore non-parametric statistics was used.

Results

Mean values (see Table II) show that sampled organizations use most extensively mentoring ($M = 3.72$; $SD = 1.130$) and on-the-job-training ($M = 3.53$; $SD = 1.139$), while the least represented OCM practices are formal networking schemes ($M = 2.16$; $SD = 1.204$) and development centers ($M = 2.25$; $SD = 1.480$). Other practices are used either rarely (ranging from 2.27 to 2.78; e.g. formal career plans or coaching) or moderately (ranging from 3.16 to 3.26; e.g. high-flier schemes or project team work). High values of standard deviations indicate differences across organizations so we checked to what extent the modality of the union-HRM relationship is a differentiator of OCM practices. A preliminary analysis showed that organizations pursuing the “Union-HRM synergy” relationship reported the highest mean values in comparison to other modalities examined, with mentoring ($M = 3.96$; $SD = 0.955$) and on-the-job-training ($M = 4.40$; $SD = 0.978$) still being mostly used OCM practices. On the other hand, organizations characterized by the “Union dominance” did not even introduce formal networking schemes, while development centers were the least used across modalities ($M = 1.40$; $SD = 0.894$).

To provide a systematic and more rigorous evidence of differences across the clusters of organizations, we ran the independent-samples Kruskal-Wallis H -tests. As shown in Table III, the four modalities of the union-HRM relationship differ significantly in terms of the extent to which they use 12 out of 14 OCM practices examined. The only two non-significant differences between clusters were revealed for the use of formal networking schemes ($\chi^2(3) = 7.127$, $p = 0.068$) and development centers ($\chi^2(3) = 2.881$, $p = 0.410$). However, these OCM practices were already recognized as the least used across sampled organizations (the highest mean value for formal networking schemes is 2.47 in the “Total HRM strategy” mode; and 2.52 for development centers in the “Union-HRM synergy” mode), so we can conclude that well-represented OCM practices really differ across modalities of the union-HRM relationship thereby providing support for $H1$.

The same procedure was followed for analyzing differences between OCM bundles. As expected, our results showed statistically significant differences across modalities for OCM bundle 1 – development and mobility activities ($\chi^2(3) = 15.426$, $p = 0.001$) and OCM bundle 2 – formal OCM infrastructure activities ($\chi^2(3) = 14.078$, $p = 0.003$), thus confirming $H2$.

Furthermore, Mann-Whitney U -tests were conducted to examine and compare the extent of incidence of OCM practices across different paired modalities of the union-HRM relationship (see Table III). The inferential statistical analyses revealed that theory-driven arguments favoring the “Union-HRM synergy” mode as being the best option for OCM practices are valid for succession plans ($F(3, 81) = 5.323$, $p = 0.002$) and computer-based packages/e-learning ($F(3, 83) = 4.532$, $p = 0.006$). For these two career management practices, the “Union-HRM synergy” mode is statistically significantly different from other

Table III.
Statistical differences
in OCM practices
among modalities of
the Union-HRM
relationship

Organizational career management practices (individual or bundled)	Kruskal–Wallis tests				Mann-Whitney tests				Synergy vs total HRM		
	Total sample χ^2	sample σ	Synergy vs dominance		Synergy vs dualism		U	σ	U	σ	
			Cohen's <i>d</i>	Cohen's <i>d</i>	Cohen's <i>d</i>	Cohen's <i>d</i>					
Use of special tasks for career management	10.835	0.013*	132.5	0.002**	1.68	0.55	575.0	0.056	224.5	0.549	0.24
Use of projects to stimulate learning for career management	13.654	0.003***	112.0	0.001**	2.28	0.68	604.5	0.013*	220.0	0.624	0.26
Use of on-the-job-training for career management	14.178	0.003***	114.0	0.002**	1.75	0.75	662.0	0.002**	223.0	0.512	0.29
Use of participation in project team work for career management	11.441	0.010**	111.5	0.004**	1.86	0.35	559.0	0.097	235.0	0.718	0.09
Use of formal networking schemes for career management	7.127	0.068	102.5	0.011*	–	0.14	464.5	0.473	239.5	0.771	–0.17
Use of formal career plans for career management	12.456	0.006**	109.5	0.006**	1.99	0.57	580.0	0.029*	153.5	0.072	0.56
Use of development centers for career management	2.881	0.410	86.0	0.208	0.84	0.31	481.5	0.485	244.0	0.871	0.03
Use of succession plans for career management	13.289	0.004**	109.0	0.007**	1.96	0.67	580.0	0.015*	130.0	0.017*	0.78
Use of planned job rotation for career management	8.232	0.041*	108.5	0.007**	1.54	0.34	515.0	0.228	205.5	0.432	0.26
Use of high-flier schemes/high potentials for career management	12.087	0.007**	122.0	0.001**	2.49	0.39	578.0	0.106	224.0	0.586	0.21
Use of international work assignments for career management	8.651	0.034*	107.5	0.019*	–	0.48	567.5	0.087	183.0	0.121	0.46
Use of coaching for career management	8.539	0.036*	103.0	0.011*	1.75	0.26	469.5	0.317	220.5	0.907	–0.06
Use of mentoring for career management	8.230	0.041*	124.0	0.005**	1.63	0.24	490.5	0.346	226.5	0.969	0.15
Use of computer-based packages/e-learning for career management	12.232	0.007**	111.0	0.005**	1.84	0.65	602.5	0.022*	133.5	0.021*	0.72
OCM bundle 1 – development and mobility activities	15.426	0.001***	122.0	0.000***	2.67	0.57	593.5	0.035*	225.0	0.567	0.25
OCM bundle 2 – formal OCM infrastructure activities	14.078	0.003**	119.5	0.000***	2.25	0.59	581.0	0.031*	178.0	0.158	0.43

Notes: * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$

three modalities. However, the results for other career management practices are somewhat mixed and less straightforward. For instance, we might conclude that in terms of career management practices “Union-HRM synergy” is significantly different from “Union dominance” (13 out of 14 OCM practices; development centers being an exception). Yet, we are missing significant career management differences between “Union-HRM synergy” and “Total HRM strategy” modes (2 out of 14 OCM practices, i.e. succession plans and computer-based packages/e-learning), while mixed results emerge when comparing “Union-HRM synergy” to the “Union-HRM dualism” mode (5 out of 14 OCM practices). Although size effect statistics and Cohen’s *d* calculated showed that organizations within the “Union-HRM synergy” mode have used the majority of OCM practices more extensively than organizations having other union-HRM modalities (except for coaching and formal networking schemes), we can only partially accept our *H3*.

In terms of OCM bundles, again our findings are not straightforward. Mann-Whitney tests showed that both clusters of OCM practices differ significantly in two (i.e. “Union-HRM synergy” vs “Union dominance”; and “Union-HRM synergy” vs “Union-HRM dualism”) out of three pair comparisons. While “Union-HRM synergy” and “Total HRM strategy” modes were not statistically significantly different for OCM bundle 1 – development and mobility activities ($U=225.0, p=0.567$) and OCM bundle 2 – formal OCM infrastructure activities ($U=178.0, p=0.158$), Cohen’s *d* effects sizes were small to medium in magnitude thus favoring the “Union-HRM synergy” mode. Thereby, we provided support for *H4* that bundles of OCM practices are mostly represented in organizations pursuing this specific modality.

Discussion and conclusion

Even though the career primarily belongs to the individual, organizations still play a role in career development of their employees. Our goal in this research was to examine to what extent OCM practices might differ as a result of the level of unionism and HRM dominance within an organization. Both trade union strength and HRM strength were taken into account as relevant contextual (collaborative or competitive) factors for managing careers at the organizational level. The study results addressed the heterogeneity in the organizational use of career management practices (e.g. Mayrhofer *et al.*, 2004). Our data showed that a comprehensive set of OCM practices occur differently across four distinctive modes of the union-HRM relationship. Specifically, the “Union-HRM synergy” relationship (high-HRM/high-unionization) has been recognized as most promising for adopting such developmental practices, providing an evidence of compatibility between trade unions and HRM professionalism.

We hope to provide a meaningful contribution both to the career management and industrial relations literature by putting an emphasis on the concurrent influence of trade unionism and HRM professionalism. Although the practice of providing lifetime employment is consistent with the desire of the trade union to provide job security for its members (Othman, 1997), until today surprisingly few studies have dealt with their complex relationship. Moreover, the theory of cooperation and competition (Deutsch, 1949; Tjosvold, 1984) was recognized as a useful framework that supports our initial assumptions and consistent empirical findings about positive career management implementation effects of the union-HR collaboration. In other words, organizations having a highly developed HRM philosophy and whose employees are strongly union represented, prefer to establish a collaborative relationship (e.g. Othman, 1997), have more person-centered HRM practices (Cristiani and Peiró, 2015), and may use more progressive HR policies and practices (Verma, 2005).

From the practical standpoint, managers obviously need to find a common language with trade union representatives and treat them as business partners. Thus, organizations

might revisit their policies on industrial relations and strive to set up the HRM agenda and career management priorities with trade unions (Cristiani and Peiró, 2015). If two parties manage to reach higher levels of common understanding and cooperation (e.g. Gill, 2009; Machin and Wood, 2005) regarding general HR policies and specific career management issues employees will benefit the most, which would also have positive long-term effects for organizational success. Such synergistic collaboration within the established systems of institutionalized industrial relations (e.g. Hyman, 2018) such as in Croatia might result in providing employees with even more career development opportunities than when pursuing the asynchronous single-sided “Total HRM strategy.”

Nevertheless, certain limitations of the research do exist. For instance, our data were cross-sectional and were collected from a single source. While we were not able to make causal inferences, we still find our results reliable as the CRANET methodology collects factual responses. In addition, the number of organizations surveyed and the expertise of the respondents provide additional arguments for validity (e.g. Huselid and Becker, 2000). More rigorous insights might be possible by using multiple informants for examining cross-level effects. As workforce is increasingly differentiated, we need to address specifics of career development within distinctive departments/units or jobs/positions. Existing research conducted by Eby *et al.* (2005) who investigated the relationship between organization-level career management practices and individual-level career attitudes can certainly be a good showcase. We were also somewhat limited with the “HRM strength” and “Union strength” measures used from the pre-defined CRANET questionnaire. The future research should include additional items for measuring these constructs to more clearly delineate between different union-HRM modalities. Relatedly, four modalities of the union-HRM relationship examined do not cover the continuum of options. In practice, some organizations might go even beyond the Guest’s (1995) black hole cases and represent a potential situation in which HRM and trade union activities barely exist. While we originally had several of such cases in our data set, too few of them left after sample reduction to be included in the analytical procedure. Finally, no matter how many career management practices a (non)unionized organization provides, we cannot be sure how employees will perceive them (e.g. Crabtree, 1999). Therefore, in future research attempts we should study a cost-benefit of such career development opportunities within different union-HRM contexts, as well as apply a lifespan perspective for understanding career management (Jung and Takeuchi, 2018).

References

- Abbott, K. (2007), “Employment relations: integrating industrial relations and human resource management”, *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, Vol. 5 No. 1, pp. 61-71.
- Addison, J.T. (2005), “The determinants of firm performance: unions, works councils and employee involvement/high-performance work practices”, *Scottish Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 52 No. 3, pp. 406-450.
- Adler, N.J. (1986), *International Dimensions of Organizational Behavior*, Kent Publishing, Boston, MA.
- Antonioli, D., Mazzanti, M. and Pini, P. (2011), “Innovation, industrial relations and employee outcomes: evidence from Italy”, *Journal of Economic Studies*, Vol. 38 No. 1, pp. 66-90.
- Bacon, N. and Storey, J. (1993), “Individualization of employment relationships and the implications for trade unions”, *Employee Relations*, Vol. 15 No. 1, pp. 5-18.
- Barnett, B.R. and Bradley, L. (2007), “The impact of organisational support for career development on career satisfaction”, *Career Development International*, Vol. 12 No. 7, pp. 617-636.
- Baruch, Y. (1999), “Integrated career systems for the 2000s”, *International Journal of Manpower*, Vol. 20 No. 7, pp. 432-457.

- Baruch, Y. and Peiperl, M. (2000), "Career management practices: an empirical survey and implications", *Human Resource Management*, Vol. 39 No. 4, pp. 347-366.
- Benson, J. (2000), "Employee voice in union and non-union Australian workplaces", *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, Vol. 38 No. 3, pp. 453-459.
- Berber, N. and Slavic, A. (2016), "The practice of career development in the international human resource management of the European countries", *Journal of Engineering Management and Competitiveness*, Vol. 4 No. 1, pp. 21-26.
- Boxall, P. (1993), "The significance of human resource management: a reconsideration of the evidence", *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 4 No. 3, pp. 645-664.
- Bradley, H., Healy, G. and Mukherjee, N. (2004), "Union influence on career development – bringing in gender and ethnicity", *Career Development International*, Vol. 9 No. 1, pp. 74-88.
- Bryson, A., Forth, J. and Kirby, S. (2005), "High-performance practices, trade union representation and workplace performance in Britain", *Scottish Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 53 No. 3, pp. 451-491.
- Budhwar, P.S. and Baruch, Y. (2003), "Career management practices in India: an empirical study", *International Journal of Manpower*, Vol. 24 No. 6, pp. 699-719.
- Cohen, Y. and Pfeffer, J. (1986), "Employment practices in the dual economy", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 31 No. 1, pp. 1-23.
- Crabtree, M.J. (1999), "Employees' perceptions of career management practices: the development of a new measure", *Journal of Career Assessment*, Vol. 7 No. 2, pp. 203-212.
- Cristiani, A. and Peiró, J.M. (2015), "Human resource function strategic role and trade unions: exploring their impact on human resource management practices in Uruguayan firms", *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 26 No. 3, pp. 381-400.
- Cunha, R.C. and Cunha, M.P. (2009), "Impact of strategy, strength of the HRM system and HRM bundles on organizational performance", *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, Vol. 7 No. 1, pp. 57-69.
- Deery, S., Walsh, J. and Knox, A. (2001), "The non-union workplace in Australia: bleak horse or human resource innovator?", *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 12 No. 4, pp. 669-683.
- Deery, S.J., Iverson, R.D., Buttigieg, D.M. and Zatzick, C.D. (2014), "Can union voice make a difference? The effect of union citizenship behavior on employee absence", *Human Resource Management*, Vol. 53 No. 2, pp. 211-228.
- De Silva, S.R. (1998), *Human Resource Management, Industrial Relations and Achieving Management Objectives*, International Labor Organization ACT/EMP Publications, Bangkok, available at: www.ilo.org
- De Vos, A. and Cambre, B. (2017), "Career management in high-performing organizations: a set-theoretic approach", *Human Resource Management*, Vol. 56 No. 3, pp. 501-518.
- De Vos, A., Dewettinck, K. and Buyens, D. (2008), "To move or not to move? The relationship between career management and preferred career moves", *Employee Relations*, Vol. 30 No. 2, pp. 156-175.
- Deutsch, M. (1949), "A theory of cooperation and competition", *Human Relations*, Vol. 2 No. 3, pp. 129-152.
- Dhal, M. (2015), "HR practices & union management relationship", *The Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, Vol. 50 No. 4, pp. 652-666.
- Ebbinghaus, B. (2002), "Trade unions' changing role: membership erosion, organizational reform, and social partnership in Europe", *Industrial Relations Journal*, Vol. 33 No. 5, pp. 465-483.
- Eby, L.T., Allen, T.D. and Brinley, A. (2005), "A cross-level investigation of the relationship between career management practices and career-related activities", *Group & Organization Management*, Vol. 30 No. 6, pp. 565-596.
- European Commission (2015), *Industrial Relations in Europe 2014*, Publications Office of the European Union.

- Evetts, J. (1992), "Dimensions of career: avoiding reification in the analysis of change", *Sociology*, Vol. 26 No. 1, pp. 1-21.
- Fiorito, J. (2001), "Human resource management practices and worker desires for union representation", *Journal of Labor Research*, Vol. 22 No. 2, pp. 335-354.
- Freeman, R.B. and Medoff, J.L. (1984), *What Do Unions Do?*, Basic Books, New York, NY.
- Gill, C. (2009), "Union impact on the effective adoption of high performance work practices", *Human Resource Management Review*, Vol. 19 No. 1, pp. 39-50.
- Gill, C. and Meyer, D. (2013), "Union presence, employee relations and high performance work practices", *Personnel Review*, Vol. 42 No. 5, pp. 508-528.
- Godard, J. (2009), "Institutional environments, work and human resource practices, and unions: Canada versus England", *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, Vol. 62 No. 2, pp. 173-199.
- Green, F., Machin, S. and Wilkinson, D. (1999), "Trade unions and training practices in British workplaces", *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, Vol. 52 No. 2, pp. 179-195.
- Guest, D. (1995), "Human resource management, trade unions, and industrial relations", in Storey, J. (Ed.), *Human Resource Management*, Routledge, London, pp. 110-141.
- Guest, D. and Conway, N. (1999), "Peering into the black hole: the downside of the new employment relations in the UK", *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, Vol. 37 No. 3, pp. 367-390.
- Guest, D. and Peccei, R. (2008), "Does partnership at work increase trust", *Industrial Relations Journal*, Vol. 39 No. 2, pp. 124-152.
- Gunnigle, P., Turner, T. and D'Art, D. (1998), "Counterpoising collectivism: performance-related pay and industrial relations in greenfield sites", *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, Vol. 36 No. 4, pp. 565-579.
- Healy, G. (1999), "The trade union role in career development: a membership perspective", *Industrial Relations Journal*, Vol. 30 No. 3, pp. 212-229.
- Heraty, N. and Morley, M.J. (2000), "Human resource development in Ireland: organizational level evidence", *Journal of European Industrial Training*, Vol. 24 No. 1, pp. 21-33.
- Hocque, K. and Bacon, N. (2008), "Trade unions, union learning representatives and employer-provided training in Britain", *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, Vol. 43 No. 4, pp. 702-731.
- Huselid, M.A. and Becker, B.E. (2000), "Comment on 'Measurement error in research on human resources and firm performance: how much error is there and how does it influence effect size estimates?' by Gerhart, Wright, McMahan, and Snell", *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 53 No. 4, pp. 835-854.
- Hyman, R. (2018), "What future for industrial relations in Europe?", *Employee Relations*, Vol. 40 No. 4, pp. 569-579.
- Ishak, A.W. and Ballard, D.I. (2012), "Time to re-group: a typology and nested phase model for action teams", *Small Group Research*, Vol. 43 No. 1, pp. 3-29.
- Joordan, B.J. and Cillie, G.G. (2015), "From silos to synergy: HRM & ER as two sides of the same coin", paper presented at the 17th ILERA World Congress, Cape Town.
- Jung, Y. and Takeuchi, N. (2018), "A lifespan perspective for understanding career self-management and satisfaction: the role of developmental human resource practices and organizational support", *Human Relations*, Vol. 71 No. 1, pp. 73-102.
- Kaufman, B.E. (2001), "Human resources and industrial relations: commonalities and differences", *Human Resource Management Review*, Vol. 11 No. 4, pp. 339-374.
- Kettley, P. and Hirsh, W. (2000), *Learning from Cross-functional Teamwork*, IES Report 356, The Institute for Employment Studies, Brighton.
- King, Z. (2004), "Career self-management: its nature, causes and consequences", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 65, pp. 112-133.
- Kochan, T.A. and Osterman, P. (1994), *The Mutual Gains Enterprise*, Harvard Business School Press, Boston, MA.

- Kochan, T.A., Katz, H.C. and McKersie, R.B. (1986), *The Transformation of American Industrial Relations*, Basic Books, New York, NY.
- Kong, H., Cheung, C. and Song, H. (2012), "From hotel career management to employees' career satisfaction: the mediating effect to career competency", *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, Vol. 31 No. 1, pp. 76-85.
- Lazarova, M.B., Morley, M. and Tyson, S. (2012), "Introduction: international comparative studies in HRM and performance – the Cranet data", in Lazarova, M.B., Morley, M.J. and Tyson, S. (Eds), *International Human Resource Management: Policy and Practice*, Routledge, London, pp. 1-9.
- Legge, K. (1995), *Human Resource Management: Rhetorics and Realities*, MacMillan, Basingstoke.
- Liu, W., Guthrie, J.P., Flood, P.C. and Maccurtain, S. (2009), "Unions and the adoption of high performance work systems: does employment security play a role?", *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, Vol. 63 No. 1, pp. 109-127.
- McDonald, K. and Hite, L. (2016), *Career Development: A Human Resource Development Perspective*, Routledge, New York, NY.
- MacDonald, S. and Arthur, N. (2005), "Connecting career management to repatriation adjustment", *Career Development International*, Vol. 10 No. 2, pp. 145-158.
- MacKenzie, R., Cook, H., Forde, C. and Valizade, D. (2015), "The effect of trade unions on high performance work systems (HPWS): does industrial relations climate matter?", paper presented at the 17th ILERA World Congress, Cape Town.
- Machin, S. and Wood, S. (2005), "Human resource management as a substitute for trade unions in British workplaces", *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, Vol. 58 No. 2, pp. 201-218.
- Mayrhofer, W., Meyer, M., Iellatchitch, A. and Schiffinger, M. (2004), "Careers and human resource management – a European perspective", *Human Resource Management Review*, Vol. 14 No. 4, pp. 473-498.
- Moorstein, G.C., Hellwege, A.J., Geffney, C.D., Sala, S.J. and Reidy, J.M. (2015), *HR Department Benchmarks and Analysis 2015-2016*, Bloomberg BNA, The Bureau of National Affairs, Arlington, VA.
- Newman, K. (2011), "Sustainable careers: lifecycle engagement in work", *Organizational Dynamics*, Vol. 40 No. 2, pp. 136-143.
- Ng, I. and Maki, D. (1994), "Trade union influence on human resource management practices", *Industrial Relations*, Vol. 33 No. 1, pp. 121-135.
- Nunnally, J.C. (1967), *Psychometric Theory*, McGraw-Hill, New York, NY.
- Orpen, C. (1994), "The effects of organizational and individual career management on career success", *International Journal of Manpower*, Vol. 15 No. 1, pp. 27-37.
- Othman, R. (1997), "Union-HRM compatibility: an empirical assessment", *Jurnal Pengurusan*, Vol. 16, pp. 47-58.
- Parry, E., Stavrou, E. and Lazarova, M. (Eds) (2013), *Global Trends in Human Resource Management*, Palgrave Macmillan, London.
- Perry-Smith, J.E. and Blum, T.C. (2000), "Work-family human resource bundles and perceived organizational performance", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 43 No. 6, pp. 1107-1117.
- Pfeffer, J. and Cohen, Y. (1984), "Determinants of internal labor markets in organizations", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 29 No. 4, pp. 550-572.
- Pohler, D.M. and Luchak, A.A. (2014), "Balancing efficiency, equity, and voice: the impact of unions and high-involvement work practices on work outcomes", *ILR Review*, Vol. 67 No. 4, pp. 1063-1094.
- Poloski Vokic, N. (2012), "The relationship between the quality of human resource management practices and the role of trade unions in organizations", paper presented at the 11th World Congress of the International Federation of Scholarly Associations of Management, Kemmy Business School, Limerick.
- Purcell, J. (1987), "Mapping management styles in employee relations", *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 24 No. 5, pp. 533-548.

- Rau, B.L. (2012), "The diffusion of HR practices in unions", *Human Resource Management Review*, Vol. 22, pp. 27-42.
- Roche, W.K. and Turner, T. (1994), "Testing alternative models of human resource policy effects on trade union recognition in the Republic of Ireland", *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 5 No. 3, pp. 721-753.
- Rothwell, W.J. and Kazanas, H.C. (1994), *Improving On-The-Job Training: How to Establish and Operate A Comprehensive OJT Program*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA.
- Russell, J.E.A. (1991), "Career development interventions in organizations", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 38 No. 3, pp. 237-287.
- Schein, E.H. (1978), *Career Dynamics: Matching Individual and Organizational Needs*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA.
- Sullivan, S.E. and Baruch, Y. (2009), "Advances in career theory and research: a critical review and agenda for future exploration", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 35 No. 6, pp. 1542-1571.
- Terry, M. (2003), "Can 'Partnership' reverse the decline of British trade unions?", *Work, Employment and Society*, Vol. 17 No. 3, pp. 459-473.
- Tjosvold, D. (1984), "Cooperation theory and organizations", *Human Relations*, Vol. 37 No. 9, pp. 743-767.
- Tzabbar, D., Vardi, Y. and Baruch, Y. (2003), "Organisational career management in Israel", *Career Development International*, Vol. 8 No. 2, pp. 88-96.
- Verma, A. (2005), "What do unions do in the workplace? Union effects on management and HRM policies", *Journal of Labor Research*, Vol. 26 No. 3, pp. 415-450.
- Vernon, G. and Brewster, C. (2013), "Structural spoilers or structural supports? Unions and the strategic integration of HR functions", *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 24 No. 6, pp. 1113-1129.
- White, M. and Bryson, A. (2013), "Positive employee attitudes: how much human resource management do you need?", *Human Relations*, Vol. 66 No. 3, pp. 385-406.
- Wood, S. (1996), "High commitment management and unionization in the UK", *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 7 No. 1, pp. 41-58.

Corresponding author

Tomislav Hernaus can be contacted at: thernaus@efzg.hr