



Call for Abstracts

11th Biennial International Conference of the Dutch HRM Network

“The Societal Impact of HRM”

14th and 15th November 2019

Organized by the Department of Human Resource Studies, Tilburg University, Tilburg, the Netherlands

On behalf of the Dutch HRM Network:

Prof. dr. Marc van Veldhoven, Tilburg University, the Netherlands

Prof. dr. Paul Boselie, Utrecht University, the Netherlands,

Prof. dr. Tanya Bondarouk, University of Twente, the Netherlands

Prof. dr. Dirk Buyens, Vlerick Business School, Belgium

Prof. dr. Deanne Den Hartog, University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands

Prof. dr. Beatrice van der Heijden, Radboud University Nijmegen, the Netherlands

Prof. dr. Svetlana Khapova, VU University Amsterdam, the Netherlands

Prof. dr. Onne Janssen, University of Groningen, the Netherlands

Dr. Laetitia Mulder, University of Groningen, the Netherlands

Prof. dr. Sophie de Winne, KU Leuven, Belgium

Prof. dr. Dirk van Dierendonck, Erasmus University Rotterdam, the Netherlands

Prof. dr. Bram Steijn, Erasmus University Rotterdam, the Netherlands

Deadline for abstract proposals

3rd May 2019

Via info@hrm-network.nl

Dutch HRM Network Conference 2019: “The Societal Impact of HRM”

Although the field of Human Resource Management has established itself over the past decades as both an applied profession and as an academic research field (Beer, Boselie, & Brewster, 2015; Paauwe, Guest & Wright, 2013; Jiang & Messersmith, 2017), voices of concern have been expressed. These concerns focus on different issues. First, Marchington (2015) states that the field of HRM is too busy “looking up” by focusing on gaining recognition in the boardroom and in doing so neglects many of the key stakeholders in society. Similarly, Legge (1978) and Kochan (2007) worry that the HRM profession is losing its social legitimacy because it tends to side more and more with management rather than with other relevant societal actors. Second, in the past, trade unions were considered to represent powerful actors to bring issues to the table on behalf of workers such as participation, democratization, and equality of income distribution. However, it appears the role of trade unions and collective voice is increasingly being neglected in much of the mainstream strategic HRM literature and the debate on workforce differentiation, individualized HRM and i-deals is raging. This all raises questions about the role of industrial relations, participation and equality in HRM research and whether it has too often been surpassed in the HRM field’s quest to increase performance and gain boardroom recognition. Finally, Dundon and Rafferty (2018) believe the field is at risk of impoverishment because of the dual mechanisms of individualization and marketization of HRM. And even more fundamental critiques have been levied that HRM is seen as a means to discipline and to impose an identity on workers (Townley, 1998).

These critical voices regarding the role and societal implications of HRM are relevant because since its inception, one of the primary goals of HRM is to positively impact societal well-being (Beer, Spector, Lawrence, Quinn, & Walton, 1984; Beer et al., 2015). In addition, in order to achieve social legitimacy (Paauwe & Boselie, 2017) and strategic balance (Deephouse, 1999), the HR function needs to be concerned with maximizing societal well-being. Although critical voices of concern have been raised which paint a negative picture of the state of the field with respect to societal impact, many important steps have been made in addressing other actors than managers and other stakes than organizational performance in HR research. For example, there is growing conceptual work which recognizes the importance of well-being in HR research (e.g. Purcell, 1999; Wright & Boswell, 2002) which has also gained empirical scrutiny (Van de Voorde, Paauwe, & van Veldhoven, 2012; Peccei, Van de Voorde, & Van Veldhoven, 2013). In addition, HR professionals and scholars have ventured far from the realms of the multinational business-for-profit context. Indeed they are now contributing more and more in contexts like health care organizations, education and other public sub-sectors, international governmental organizations (IGOs), non-governmental organizations, mission driven organizations, SME’s, self-employed and unemployed workers as well catering for people with a distance towards the labor market (Brewster & Cerdin, 2018; Harney & Dundon, 2006; Kroon & Paauwe, 2013; Kulkarni & Valk, 2010; Leggat, Bartram, & Stanton, 2011; McKeown & Cochrane, 2017; Runhaar, 2016). In doing so the field is reaching many more workers with HRM-related ideas, principles and approaches. Finally, several researchers have also questioned many of the mainstream strategic HRM models such as the overly positive view on workforce/HR differentiation or i-deals (Marescaux, De Winne & Sels, 2013; 2017), the salience of HRM system strength (Gilbert, De Winne & Sels, 2015) and highlighted the neglected role of line managers in the implementation of HRM (e.g. Bos-Nehles & Bondarouk, 2017; Knies, 2017; Purcell & Hutchinson, 2007).

As shown above, the societal impact of HRM is a topic of lively debate. In fact, paying more attention to the societal impact of HRM is very much critical to the viability of the field in general and the HR function in particular. Challenges are omnipresent in the areas of growing inequality, technology substituting labor, ageing populations, migration and diversity (inclusion and exclusion), BREXIT and EU instability etc. Questions remain about how organizations should respond to these societal challenges and the role of HR professionals? From a purely academic point of view, research funding in Europe is also shifting more and more to calls for research that specifically enhance societal well-being. Therefore, researchers in the area of HRM also need to give careful thought to the question of how they would like to position themselves in relation to other research fields and in relation to a range of societal actors (funding bodies, co-applicants, and consortium-partners).

Conference theme

During this conference we will ask ourselves the question whether the HRM field has indeed focused too much on “looking up” and on organizational performance to make it relevant for society or whether such a pessimistic view is exaggerated. Recent editions of the biennial Dutch HRM conference would suggest considerable interest outside the topic of organizational performance. Recent conferences have definitely paid attention to topics which are more societally inclined, such as “H vs. R” (Leuven, 2013), “Re-contextualizing HRM” (Utrecht, 2015), and “Sustainable HRM” (Nijmegen, 2017). However, which research streams address such relevant societal issues directly and what is the state-of-the-art in terms of these research streams? And how can a focus on the employee-employer relationship possibly be reconciled and/or combined with societal impact?

The aim for the 11th International Conference of the Dutch HRM Network is to map research efforts in the area of the societal impact of HRM, and to bring together international scholars to present the state-of-the-art of current scholarly work in the field, to reflect on the progress that has been made, and to define avenues for further research.

Call for abstracts

In this edition of the Dutch HRM Network Conference invite, we invite participants to reflect on these, and related, questions. Conference submissions are preferably focused to, yet not per se limited to, the conference main theme. The conference covers the complete field of HRM research and abstract proposals from any subfield are considered (e.g. strategic HRM; HR practices; HRM outcomes; employer engagement; the employment relationship; talent management; leadership; workplace and job design; careers; employability; international, institutional, cultural and contextual issues in HRM; organizational behavior and HRM issues). The width of proposals received will determine the final list of conference subthemes.

Abstract proposals which explicitly or implicitly stimulate discussion around the central theme are especially welcome. Issues which could be referred to include, but are certainly not limited to the following conference subthemes:

1. HR Analytics for the greater good.....	9
2. Towards improving the societal impact of work-life practices.....	10
3. Digitalization of HR(M), innovation, and the future of jobs.....	11
4. Inclusive HRM and employer engagement for vulnerable workers.....	12
5. Tensions between employer and employee interests in society arising from HRM.....	13
6. Comparative HRM across societies.....	14
7. Human Resource Management and successful aging at work.....	15
8. Human Resource Management and sustainable employability.....	16
9. The societal impact of public organizations: the role of HRM.....	17
10. HRM and Leadership.....	18
11. HRM of professionals in today's society.....	19
12. Big Data and HR Analytics as drivers for societal impact of the HR function. A fad or here to stay?.....	20
13. The societal impact of Employer Branding; is there evidence that EB leads to better fit between people and jobs?.....	21
14. Strategic HRM and the decent work agenda.....	22
15. Career Decisions: Hireability, Talent, and Employability.....	23
16. Finding meaning in work by engaging in proactive sustainable behaviors: The role of HRM..	24
17. Managing new employment relationships: Organizational and Societal Consequences.....	25
18. Evidence Based HRM.....	26
19. Learning, Development and Talent Management.....	27
20. The role of HRM in enhancing worker health and well-being over the life-span.....	28
21. The process and development of leadership.....	29
22. HRM practices in today's academia.....	30
23. Understanding learning (agility) in order to survive	31

References

- Beer, M., Boselie, P., & Chris Brewster, C. (2015). Back to the Future: Implications for the Field of HRM of the Multi-stakeholder Perspective Proposed 30 Years Ago. *Human Resource Management* 54(3), 427–438.
- Beer, M., Spector, B., Lawrence, P., Quinn, M., & Walton, R. E. (1984). *Managing human assets*, New York: The Free Press.
- Brewster, C., & Cerdin, J.-L. (2018). *HRM in Mission Driven Organizations: Managing People in the Not for Profit Sector*. Palgrave Mac Millan: UK.
- Bos-Nehles, A., & Bondarouk, T. (2017). HRM implementation in Europe – the need for a dialogue between HR and line management. *European journal of international management*, 11(5), 511–514.
- Deephouse, D. L. (1999). To be different, or to be the same? It's a question (and theory) of strategic balance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 20(2), 147–166.
- Dundon, T., & Rafferty, A. (2018). The (potential) demise of HRM? *Human Resource Management Journal*, 28(3), 377–391.
- Gilbert, C., De Winne, S., & Sels, L. (2015). Strong HRM processes and line managers' effective HRM implementation: a balanced view. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 25(4), 600–616.
- Harney, B. & Dundon, T. (2006). Capturing complexity: Developing an integrated approach to analysing HRM in SMEs'. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 16(1), 48–73.
- Leggat, S. G., Bartram, T., & Stanton, P. (2011). High performance work systems: the gap between policy and practice in health care reform. *Journal of Health, Organisation and Management*, 25(3), 281–297.
- Legge, K. (1978). *Power, innovation and problem-solving in personnel management*. London: McGraw Hill.
- Kochan, T. A. (2007). Social Legitimacy of the HRM Profession: A US Perspective. In P. Boxall, J. Purcell & P. Wright. *Oxford Handbook of Human Resource Management*, Oxford: New York: Oxford University Press, 599–619.
- Kulkarni, M., & Valk, R. (2010). Don't ask, don't tell: Two views on human resource practices for people with disabilities. *IIMB Management Review*, 22(4), 137–146.
- Marescaux, E., De Winne, S., & Sels, L. (2013). HR practices and affective organisational commitment:(when) does HR differentiation pay off?. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 23(4), 329-345.
- Marescaux, E., De Winne, S., & Sels, L. (2017). Idiosyncratic deals from a distributive justice perspective: Examining co-workers' voice behavior. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 1–19.
- Marchington, M. (2015). Human resource management (HRM): Too busy looking up to see where it is going longer term? *Human Resource Management Review*, 25(2), 176–187.

- McKeown, T., & Cochrane, R. (2017). Independent professionals and the potential for HRM innovation. *Personnel Review*, 46(7), 1414–1433.
- Peccei, R., Voorde, K. V. D., & van Veldhoven, M. (2013). HRM, Well-being and Performance: A Theoretical and Empirical Review. In J. Paauwe, D. Guest, & P. Wright. (eds), *HRM and Performance: Achievements and Challenges*. Chichester: Wiley.
- Purcell, J., & Hutchinson, S. (2007). Front-line managers as agents in the HRM-performance causal chain: theory, analysis and evidence. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 17(1), 3–20.
- Purcell, J. (1999). Best practice or best fit: chimera or cul-de-sac. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 9(3), 26–41.
- Jiang, K. & Messersmith, J. (2018). On the shoulders of giants: a meta-review of strategic human resource management. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 29(1), 6-33.
- Kroon, B., & Paauwe, J. (2014). Structuration of precarious employment in economically constrained firms: the case of Dutch agriculture. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 24(1), 19-37.
- Paauwe, J, Wright, P., & Guest, D. (2013). HRM and performance: what do we know and where should we go? In J. Paauwe, D. Guest & P. Wright. (eds), *HRM and Performance: Achievements and Challenges*. Wiley, Chichester, Sussex, 1-13.
- Paauwe, J., & Boselie, P. (2007). HRM and societal embeddedness. In Boxall, P., Purcell, J., & Wright, P. *Oxford Handbook of Human Resource Management*. Oxford University Press: New York.
- Runhaar, P. (2016). How can schools and teachers benefit from human resources management? Conceptualising HRM from content and process perspectives. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 1–18.
- Townley, B. (1998). Beyond good and evil: depth and division in the management of human resources. *Foucault, management and organization theory*, 191–210.
- Voorde, K. V. D., Paauwe, J., & Veldhoven, M, V. (2012). Employee Well-being and the HRM-Organizational Performance Relationship: A Review of Quantitative Studies. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 14(4), 391–407.
- Wright, P.M., & Boswell, W.R. (2002). Desegregating HRM: A Review and Synthesis of Micro and Macro Human Resource Management Research. *Journal of Management*, 28(3), 247–276.

Organization and preliminary schedule

The conference has been designed as a two-day programme (14 and 15 November 2019), preceded by a one-day PhD student consortium (13 November, organized by Phresh). A detailed conference programme will be made available on the website: www.hrm-network.nl.

Venue and travel

The venue of the conference will be Tilburg University, Tilburg and is organized by the department of Human Resource Studies (HRS). The department of HRS, located in the Tilburg School of Social and Behavioral Sciences, have expertise and carry out research in the following four themes: 1) The balanced approach to strategic human resource management, 2) Enhancing worker health and wellbeing over the life span 3) The strength-based approach to talent development and lifelong learning, and 4) Inclusive HRM.

The city of Tilburg is easily accessible by car, train or bus from all parts of the country. For nation-wide travel, trains are the best option. The conference venue is located at the University campus and easily accessible by train, bus and car. From Eindhoven Airport, there is a bus (approx. 20 minutes) to Eindhoven Central Station where a train connection can be taken to Tilburg Central Station (approx. 20 minutes) and there is an indirect train connection via Schiphol Airport (approx. 90 minutes) to Tilburg Central Station.

Procedure for submitting abstracts

Conference submissions are preferably focused on, yet not per se limited to, the conference main theme. Contributors are asked to submit an abstract of their proposed paper (with a maximum of 400 words, including references) before the 3rd of May 2019 via email: info@hrm-network.nl. Please follow the guidelines to ensure your abstract is reviewed:

- Submissions instructions
 - o Please indicate for each abstract your first and second subtheme of preference.
 - o No changes in the paper title, abstract and authorship can be made *after* the abstract deadline.
 - o The Dutch HRM Network board has decided to limit the number of abstract submissions to three per person, regardless the author sequence.

- Format instructions
 - o Report the full name of your *first* and *second* subtheme of preference as a header (*upper right*) on the first page of the abstract.
 - o Please indicate the title, authors and their affiliations on the first page of the uploaded abstract.
 - o The maximum length of the abstract is 400 words (including references; excluding title, information on the authors and their affiliations).
 - o Please save your document as a .pdf file.
 - o Please name your .pdf file as follows: "First Author_*first* and *second* subtheme of preference _Title of your abstract". For example: *Paul Jansen_Careering organizations_Evidence Based HRM_The impact of HRM on employability.pdf*

NOTE: Abstracts that do not follow these formatting instructions will NOT be reviewed.

Contributors will be informed whether their abstract has been selected ultimately by the beginning of July 2019. Final papers must then be submitted by the 1st of October 2019, to compete for the best paper award. Detailed instructions regarding final submissions will be sent once proposals have been accepted.

Best paper and best dissertation award

To compete for the *best paper award*, a full paper must be submitted before the 1st of October 2019.

To compete for the *best dissertation award* the following criteria apply:

- The topic of the dissertation should be HRM or related to HRM;
- The dissertation should be defended between 2nd of August 2017 and 1st of August 2019;
- The dissertation should be defended at a Dutch or Flemish university;
- An electronic copy of the full dissertation should be sent by e-mail to info@hrm-network.nl before 1st October 2019.

We look forward to receiving your contributions!

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact us via info@hrm-network.nl

The organizing committee

Prof. Dr. Marc Van Veldhoven, PhD Chair
Dr. Steven Kilroy, Secretary of the Dutch HRM Network
Daphne Van der Kruijssen, MSc
Karen Pak, MSc

Contact

Dr Steven Kilroy
Secretary of the Dutch HRM Network
Assistant Professor
Department of HR Studies
Tilburg University
PO Box 90153 5000
LE Tilburg
The Netherlands
Tel: 31 (0)13 466 4431
Web: www.hrm-network.nl
E: info@hrm-network.nl

Key dates and deadlines

Deadline for submitting abstracts:	3 rd of May 2019
Deadline for decision and selection of selected abstracts:	beginning of July 2019
Deadline for submitting full papers:	1 st of October 2019
Deadline for submitting dissertations:	1 st of October 2019
Abstract submission via email:	February until 3 rd May 2019
Registration and payment system opens:	1 st of March 2019
Registration and payment deadline:	to be announced



1. HR Analytics for the greater good?

Conveners: Sophie De Winne (KU Leuven), Patrizia Zaroni (Hasselt University and Utrecht University), Mayra Ruiz Castro (University of Roehampton), and Dirk Buyens (Vlerick Business School, Ghent University)

HR analytics is the process of collecting and analyzing (big) data in search of patterns, trends, and insights in human behavior and its impact on business performance, and is considered a *'must have capability'* for the HR profession. Especially when HR and employee data are combined with performance data, it can be used to increase the understanding of how HRM can contribute to organizational success and generate actionable insights. HR analytics can be an interesting tool from a strategic point of view, as it can help HR managers to take on their strategic partner role and strengthen their position in the board of directors. Moreover, the use of data and HR analytics can be used for optimizing HR decision making at lower levels in the organization (e.g. to decide upon who gets the promotion or bonus).

From a more societal and stakeholder point of view, HR analytics comes with major challenges. One of these challenges is to balance the interests of many different stakeholders in determining the purpose and use of HR analytics in the organization, i.e. shareholders, employees, line managers, trade union representatives, customers and society. A second challenge is the balance between the use of objective data and subjective judgments. Relevant questions related to these two challenges are: What will be the main dependent variables in HR analytics: efficiency, productivity, financial performance, employee well-being, fairness, inclusion or customer satisfaction? Does the organization have the necessary skills to ask the right questions, to accurately analyze the data, to correctly interpret the results and to translate conclusions into valuable actions? And what are the consequences when the organization does not have these skills? What about employees' right to privacy? Is it ethical to look at employees as data points? How will HR analytics affect employee diversity? Will it lead to more or less inclusion? What if the data, and subsequently the results reproduce stereotyping rather than combat it? Will data-driven HR decision making change the role of line managers? And to what extent will employees accept data-driven only HR decision making?

For this track we invite submissions that increase our insights in ...

- The phenomenon and process of HR analytics, its critical success factors and its pitfalls;
- The potential of HR analytics from a societal and stakeholder point of view (for the greater good);
- The ethical boundaries/dark side of HR analytics;
- How HR analytics influences the HR function and its competencies, the HR role and HR decision making of line managers, HR practices, the professional practice of HR intermediaries, diversity management and inclusion;
- Reactions of employees to HR analytics.

2. Towards improving the societal impact of work-life practices

Conveners: Marijke Verbruggen, Rein De Cooman (KU Leuven) and Pascale Peters (Radboud University, Nyenrode Business Universiteit)

Work-life practices, i.e. organizational HR practices designed to help employees balance their work with other life roles (e.g. flexitime, teleworking), have become an increasingly popular research topic in the past few decades. Since more and more employees have to combine work with home responsibilities, offering these practices has become an important way for organizations today to attract, motivate and retain employees.

Although work-life practices have a potentially high societal impact– e.g., improving workers’ work-life balance, increasing labor market participation rates of people with caring responsibilities and stimulating more equality in society by facilitating the work-non-work roles combination– this potential is far from realized today. In fact, national legislation and/or national cultural norms may complicate the successful implementation of work-life practices. For instance, not all groups in the labor force may have equal access to work-life practices (e.g., lower educated employees are more often denied access to flexibility practices such as telework). Moreover, not all who have access to and are in need of work-life practices actually make use of them because of the so-called “work-home backlash”, i.e., the (perceived or real) opposition from supervisors and/or co-workers to do so, or the (anticipated) penalties hereof. Also, employees using these HR practices may experience negative consequences, such as career penalties, increased work overload and stress.

We invite research that can help to improve our understanding of how the societal impact of work-life practices can be improved. Studies can address questions such as:

- How do country-level characteristics (e.g., legislation, national culture) affect the presence and success of certain work-life practices?
- Which groups of workers have more/less access to which types of work-life practices, why and which measures can help to avoid these forms of stratification?
- How do causes and effects differ across types of work-life practices and how can this be explained?
- How can organizations, HR managers, supervisors and individuals avoid the work-home backlash and negative consequences of using work-life practices?

3. Digitalization of HR(M), innovation, and the future of jobs

Conveners: Tanya Bondarouk, Anna Bos-Nehles, Jeroen Meijerink (University of Twente), Stefan Strohmeier (Saarland University, Germany), and Hertta Vuorenmaa (Aalto University, Finland)

Digitalization of work, jobs and HRM is argued to impact individual workers, organizations and societies. It opens up new business and societal opportunities, and it challenges traditional job design. Societal impact is exercised through new technological, social, emotional, and creative skills of workers. Changes in time, space, and employment type of work extend new opportunities to the workforce by relying on new jobs, smart, “gig”, shared, and new ways of working. These developments also force organizations to redefine and continuously innovate their management practices and structures, and to better cope with the increasing diversity of the workforce innovations. Sensors, algorithms and artificial intelligence may favour new management styles.

To support the debate about digitalization, innovation and future of jobs, this track invites papers that discuss such topics like:

- Digitalization and innovation of HRM, and Innovative Work Behavior;
- Future of jobs in industry 4.0 & 5.0;
- Digital work, flexible workplace, and agile working;
- Managing robots, AI, and algorithms in the workplace;
- HRM for online labor platforms and smart services;
- HRM and virtual and augmented reality;
- Management of hybrid teams (robots and humans);
- HRM ethics and digitalization of work.

4. Inclusive HRM and employer engagement for vulnerable workers

Conveners: Charissa Freese, Irmgard Borghouts (Tilburg University), Rik van Berkel, Paul Boselie (Utrecht University), Marlos Van Engen and Lena Knappert (Tilburg University)

The central issue in this track is how vulnerable workers may benefit from the advantages of inclusive HRM and employer engagement to improve working conditions, employment security, employment relations, and societal well-being. As such, inclusive employers are engaged with sustainable labor market participation. They take the interests of all (potential) vulnerable workers into account, considering minorities, people with reduced work capacity, currently unemployed, precarious workers, refugees, and people on flexible employment relationships (including self-employed). This track is closely linked to the societal issue of growing inequality of citizens and workers. In deregulated societies and decreasing governmental control with regard to employment relationships, the platform economy and the decline of unionization, the role of employer engagement in shaping inclusive societies is becoming increasingly important. Job offers and decent working conditions are primarily the responsibility of employers (in addition to governmental laws and regulations). Precariousness and inactivity are associated with a range of social issues such as poverty, debts, bad health, low wellbeing, social exclusion etc. Although different streams of literature, such as sustainable HRM and Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) now acknowledge social legitimacy as a desired outcome of strategic HRM activities, and there is some recognition of the business case for hiring and retaining vulnerable groups, empirical studies on this topic are very limited. As societal challenges ask for a multi-disciplinary approach, we invite scholars from different scientific backgrounds to present a paper investigating how HRM activities affect societal and individual wellbeing, by focusing on the position of the vulnerable worker. It may cover the following research questions (but are not limited to) the following topics:

- What are effective HR-practices for (sustainable) integration for (potential) vulnerable workers?
- Which employment conditions lead to well-being or stress of vulnerable workers?
- How can social policies and labour-market intermediaries motivate and support employers' engagement?
- How do networks of employers and governmental institutions collaborate on addressing issues like unemployment, the inclusion of disabled workers, refugees etc.?
- Do innovative collaborations between employers lead to new forms of inclusive HRM? What are the outcomes of inclusive HRM and employer engagement on organizational, employee and societal level?
- How can inclusive HRM reap the benefits of workforce diversity?

5. Tensions between employer and employee interests in society arising from HRM

Conveners: Karina Van de Voorde (Tilburg University), Riccardo Peccei (Kings College London), and Steven Kilroy (Tilburg University)

In this track we wish to focus attention on the potential tensions which exist between employer and employee interests when firms adopt HR practices. Through the adoption HR practices, some organizations manage to satisfy the interests of both parties, while others manage to satisfy the interests of the employer but in doing so negate the interests of employees. Indeed when employers introduce HRM interventions, there are often trade-offs between their interests (e.g. organizational performance), and employee interests (e.g. well-being) (Grant et al., 2007). As there might be a trade-off with respect to achieving performance and maintaining employees health related well-being (Grant et al., 2007; Peccei et al., 2013), the societal implications of HRM could be called into question. To have a real endured impact, HRM should have a societal impact by being socially responsible and satisfying its multiple stakeholders and especially employees (Guest, 2017; Paauwe, 2009).

Against this background, the specific focus of the track is on key question of how to optimally balance the interests of employers and employees thereby minimizing any potential trade-offs which exist between them. In this track, we welcome papers that investigate and/or conceptualize how HR practices:

- can help to jointly optimize and align employer and employee interests i.e. well-being and organizational performance;
- are more likely to be associated with win-win situations for both employees and the employer;
- reconcile the potential trade-offs which might exist between employer and employee interests as well as other relevant stakeholders in order to ensure societal impact;
- can be influenced by broader societal actors to ensure that the potential benefits or drawbacks of HRM can be enhanced and mitigated respectively;
- can be used alongside other innovative management/leadership approaches to satisfy the multiple interests which coexist in the employment relationship.

6. Comparative HRM across societies

Conveners: Elaine Farndale (Tilburg University) and Emma Parry (Cranfield University)

Comparative HRM explores how societal contexts influence HRM practice and, as such, is ideally positioned to have an impact on the societies in which the research is conducted. Comparative HRM was born out of the comparative industrial relations tradition, particularly in European countries, yet has largely forgotten these roots. We propose that it is opportune to revisit this starting point to avoid too strong a US-influence dictating what constitutes HRM research. It is encouraging that the comparative HRM field has typically been resistant to becoming universalistic in its outlook, describing differences in HRM between countries rather than seeking formulae to link HRM to performance as in the strongly US-influenced strategic HRM field. In other words, the HRM practices themselves are often the dependent variable in comparative HRM studies. This provides a valuable counterbalance to prevent the HRM field becoming too myopic. Yet we still need to encourage innovation in how we conduct comparative HRM studies in terms of the variables of interest, the methodologies adopted, and combining different levels of analysis (linking societal effects to organizational practice and individual employee outcomes). To date, we have developed a strong understanding of why and how HRM practices come about across different countries, but are less clear about the consequences for organizations or other stakeholders within given societal contexts. We therefore encourage submissions to this track to broaden how we perceive and research comparative HRM. Importantly, we invite submissions that are both empirically novel and strongly embedded in relevant (e.g. cross-cultural, institutional) theory.

7. Human Resource Management and Successful Aging at Work

Conveners: Dorien Kooij (Tilburg University), Beatrice Van der Heijden (Radboud University Nijmegen), and Annet De Lange (HAN University of Applied Sciences)

Since societies are aging across the world, HRM can have a huge societal impact by facilitating workers to age successfully at work. However, many researchers and practitioners are still struggling with conceptual, that is theoretical, versus more applied research questions, such as, which definitions and conceptualisations best fit the concept of successful aging at work, and which research designs and methodologies are most appropriate, versus questions that are more attuned to applied research, such as, which organizational, team, job, and individual factors extend the working lives of employees, how can organizations help them to maintain or enhance their ability and motivation to continue working, through which underlying processes does HRM influence successful aging at work, how to develop sustainable careers within organizations, what is the role of significant life events, individual agency, and other stakeholders involved in successful aging at work, etc. This track offers a platform to discuss papers related to these issues.

8. Human Resource Management and Sustainable Employability

Conveners: Beatrice van der Heijden (Radboud University), Yvonne van Rossenberg (Radboud University), Mieke Audenaert (Ghent University), and Adeliën Decramer (Ghent University)

In the past decades, employability has received increased attention. Changes within and around organizations have emphasized the need for flexible organizations and a multi-skilled work force, and HRM plays an important role in protecting and further enhancing employability (e.g., throughout the career, or for specific categories of workers, such as vulnerable employees, temporary workers, older workers, etc.) in order to protect the sustainability of careers (De Vos, Van der Heijden, & Akkermans, 2018). However, both theoretical and empirical controversy abounds with regard to the understanding and potentials of the concept of employability (Forrier & Sels, 2003; Harvey, 2001; Van der Heijden & Thijssen, 2003), in particular sustainable employability, and researchers and practitioners are struggling to align scholarly and more applied research approaches. This track is aimed to better understand which conceptualizations, and which research methodologies are most suitable to address societal questions such as: Which (intended, implemented, and perceived) HRM practices at different levels (i.e., organization, team, line management, and employee) can be used to enhance one's sustainable employability? What is the role of different stakeholders, such as top management, HR professionals, line managers, employees themselves, and their relatives? Which HRM practices determine employability, and are there any cross-cultural differences as regards their predictive validity. This track enables researchers and practitioners to discuss these issues and to critically address how valorizations of the outcome can be optimized.

9. The societal impact of public organizations: the role of HRM

Conveners: Bram Steijn (Erasmus University Rotterdam), Eva Knies (Utrecht University), and David Giaouque (UNIL-Mouline Lausanne)

Almost by definition public organizations aim to have societal impact. Accordingly, public sector HRM research stresses the importance of 'public value' or 'public values', recognizes the importance of multiple stakeholders for public organizations, and define organizational performance as broader than only efficiency or effectiveness by also stressing the importance of fairness, resilience or client satisfaction.

In the past, it has been argued that public organizations could be seen as 'model employers' and also provide an example to private organizations about how the organization should be governed and employees be managed. In the debate about representative bureaucracy and diversity management this reference to public sector organizations as model employers is still made. At the same time, however, the empirical question is to what extent the introduction of New Public Management instruments has hollowed out this model of employership. In this track, we welcome contributions from several angles studying the role of HRM in relation to the societal impact of public organizations (including government, schools, hospitals, etcetera), for instance:

- Is the HR function in the public sector changing with respect to societal impact, for instance with respect to the model employer role, but also with respect to issues such as diversity management or recruitment policies?
- What is the effect of specific HR practices (or bundles of practices) on various performance indicators within a public sector context?
- What is the role of managers on different hierarchical levels on the design and implementation of HRM in relation to the societal impact of public organizations?
- Which factors moderate the relation between HRM and employee or organizational outcomes (for instance public service motivation)?
- How are employee relations in the public sector changing?

10. HRM and Leadership

Conveners: Corine Boon and Deanne Den Hartog (University of Amsterdam Business School)

While the leadership field has long recognized the importance of the role of leaders for employee outcomes, recently in the strategic HRM field there has been growing attention for the role of leaders or managers in delivering or implementing HRM, and for the need to integrate HRM and leadership (Leroy, Segers, van Dierendonck, & den Hartog, 2018). Research has suggested that consistent implementation of HRM and aligning employee perceptions, attitudes and behaviors throughout the organization is a major challenge, which is influenced greatly by managers (Den Hartog & Boon, 2013; Den Hartog, Boselie, & Paauwe, 2004; Nishii & Wright, 2008). Employees are likely to be influenced by their direct managers in two ways; first, by the quality of managers' implementation of HR practices, and second, by the managers' leadership style (Den Hartog & Boon, 2013; Purcell & Hutchinson, 2007). Both can have a large impact on employees' perceptions of HRM, and their attitudes, behaviors, and well-being at work. Also, manager can help to deliver HRM in a way that takes into account employee interests alongside those of the organization.

Although attention for the role of managers in HRM is increasing, many questions still remain unexplored. This track, therefore, aims to advance our understanding of the role of HRM and leadership in affecting employees. Papers may focus for example on the role of managers in implementing HRM, the role of leader behavior and leadership styles in HRM perceptions and outcomes, and the role of managers/leaders in affecting employees' work experience, attitudes, behaviors, and well-being.

11. HRM of professionals in today's society

Conveners: Jasmijn van Harten (Utrecht University), Steven Kilroy (Tilburg University), Peter Leisink (Utrecht University), and Paul Boselie (Utrecht University)

Professionals are traditionally regarded as an employee group who are intrinsically motivated to contribute to society, for instance through providing high-quality and accessible healthcare (medical specialists and nurses) or contributing to children's talent development (teachers in primary and secondary education). The nature of professional work is changing drastically, and is under significant pressure. For instance, the rise of excessive regulation is hindering the ability of professionals to focus on their core job tasks as they are required to devote an increasing amount of time to administrative work. This potentially affects the performance and well-being of professionals which could eventually lead to an impaired quality of service delivery as well as retention problems for organizations that heavily depend on professionals.

Effective approaches to manage professionals' needs to take their professional autonomy into account. Professionals are generally expected to be able and willing to maintain their own level of up-to-date expertise and to decide on how they do their job. However, they are also heavily influenced and affected by professional associations that focus on training and development, professional norms and values, and disciplinary mechanisms. In light of the importance of professionals in our society and the growing pressures they face, this track aims to examine what HRM approaches are necessary to enhance the performance and well-being of today's professionals. Issues that can be explored by theoretical and empirical papers include among others:

- Engaging professionals through meaningful and purposeful work;
- Managing and retaining professional workforces by e.g. distributed leadership;
- HRM of new professional roles or occupations that are increasingly regarded as professionals;
- Impact of changing professional work on (professional) motivation and well-being;
- Enhancing professional and career development and sustainable employability.

Amongst many others we consider the following employee groups as professionals: Accountants, judges, lawyers, medical specialists, nurses, police officers, researchers, teachers and veterinarians.

12. Big Data and HR Analytics as drivers for societal impact of the HR function. A fad or here to stay?

Conveners: Sasa Batistič, Marinus Verhagen, and Marc van Veldhoven (Tilburg University)

Big data is a buzz word in practice and organizations start to invest heavily in analytics (Batistic & van der Laken, 2018). However, empirical evidence, especially in the HR field, about the impact (HR) analytics could have on the firm and broader society is scant (e.g., van den Heuvel & Bondarouk, 2016; Marler and Boudreau 2016). This scarcity of evidence leads some authors to speculate that HR analytics might be considered a fad and destined to fail (Rasmussen & Ulrich, 2015; Angrave et al., 2016). To overcome this stagnation some authors suggest that HR needs to build functional bridges (Batistic & van der Laken, 2018) and should also try to connect its mission with big data methods (e.g., George et al., 2014; van der Laken, Bakk, Giagkoulas, van Leeuwen, & Bongenaar, 2018) in order to more effectively explore HR problems.

The lack of empirical and theoretical evidence suggests that more research is needed in the HR analytics field, especially looking at how HR analytics can help organizations to achieve competitive advantage, but not at the expense of employees' well-being or society. HR analytics projects tend to focus on the analysis of performance, employee turnover and talent management, often with an implicit emphasis on helping organizations achieve better financial performance to prove the importance of the function to the boardroom (e.g., Marchington, 2015). However, we advocate that there needs to be a balance, and other stakeholders also need to be acknowledged as only in this way we can explore the true potential of HR analytics for the organization and society.

This track wishes to focus its attention on the way HR analytics can be used by organizations to enhance their competitive position while also looking beyond this goal – to make a clear societal impact and focus on the employees' well-being in profit, but also non-profit settings.

13. The societal impact of Employer Branding; is there evidence that EB leads to better fit between people and jobs?

Conveners: Greet Van Hoye (Ghent University) and Dirk Buyens (Vlerick Business School & Ghent University)

Due to increased labor market mobility, job search is now an integral part of people's work life. The "war for talent" continues as organizations struggle to strike a balance between keeping a lean workforce yet attracting and retaining the necessary talent to ensure organizational success and survival. Demographic trends suggest that valuable human capital will be even scarcer in the future. Consequently, the traditional recruitment function of identifying and attracting new employees has evolved to a more strategic and sustainable process of human capital acquisition. To win the war for talent in an increasingly tight labor market, organizations need not only be attractive employers, they should also differentiate themselves from other employers. Both parties are obliged to make the 'implicit psychological contract' that quite often exists at the start of a working relation, much more explicit.

As a more sustainable approach to talent acquisition, employer branding is defined as "the process of creating and communicating – both inside and outside of the organization – a clear image of what is attractive and distinctive of the organization as a place to work". Since the 'birth' of the EB concept launched by Simon Barrow in 1990, the interest in the construct both in the HR literature but also in the world of the HR practitioners has gone up and down, in a reversed way with the availability of talent on the labor market. The higher the shortage of talent on the market the more interest and focus on EB. So far, research on employer branding has mainly focused on identifying the key components of organizations' perceived image as an employer and how these relate to organizations' attractiveness for (potential) applicants and employees (i.e., *image audit*). Taking it to the next layer, could mean that we try to find evidence that EB contributes to the fact that people more often make the right choice leading to a higher individual well-being score.

On the reverse side, organizations with a negative EB, eventually because of 'mal-practices' or 'old-fashioned' HR systems and practices might be 'punished' for that by the relevant labor market, and in that way EB would have a self-correcting effect on the labor market. Because of the latter sooner or later organizations both public and private will have to strive to become 'a good employer' in order to be capable to still attract people on that labour market.

We welcome submissions addressing questions such as:

- What are effective ways to communicate the organization's desired employer brand?
- How can social media be used in employer brand management?
- How can organizations differentiate themselves from other employers? And what does the evidence show, does it pay off?
- Can we find evidence that negative employer brand perceptions force organizations to change their HR practices and policies?
- How can external and internal employer brand perceptions be aligned?
- How can employees be stimulated to become employer brand ambassadors and does it increase their personal well-being?
- How does employer branding affect organizational performance / Individual well-being?

14. Strategic HRM and the decent work agenda

Brigitte Kroon, Jaap Paauwe (Tilburg University), and Anne Keegan (University College Dublin)

One of the Sustainable Development Goals for 2030 proclaimed by the United Nations calls for inclusive and sustainable economic growth, employment and decent work for all. The track aims to present responses of SHRM researchers to the call of the decent work agenda. The decent work agenda steers towards economies that provide men and women with opportunities to obtain work that allows earning a decent income under conditions of freedom, equity, security and human dignity, which may imply a political rather than a purely business agenda. Although the economic, societal and regulatory environments of work are essentially contextual to SHRM, they find their way to businesses in the establishment of codes of conduct, inclusion charters, CSR, socially responsible (SR-) HRM and fair trade agreements. Another part of the decent work agenda directly aims at improving the quality of work by advocating for adequate earnings, decent working hours, and security of work as the fundamental characteristics that provides employees with sufficient income to live independently and freely. Other characteristics include safe and equal work environments, whereby employees are treated with dignity and have social dialogue and worker representation. Research that integrates SHRM with the contribution of businesses to the societal goal of providing decent work is still scarce. Potential pathways on SHRM's potential to contribute to the decent work agenda may include:

An instrumental perspective: how, why and when can the integration of SHRM and the decent work agenda contribute to the realization of business goals? Illustrative research has looked into the detrimental effects of precarious work conditions (the opposite of decent work) for business results (e.g. Litwin, Avgar, & Becker, 2017; Kroon & Paauwe, 2014).

A social integrative perspective: As organizations and employees - as citizens of societies - depend on each other (stakeholder perspective), can the integration of SHRM and the decent work agenda contribute to achieving mutual gains? In particular empirical research that shows how, why or under which conditions shared value creation between SHRM and stakeholders really works is needed (Paauwe & Farndale, 2017).

The political perspective: The political perspective puts the power imbalance to the fore when the protection of the rights and responsibilities of vulnerable workers is at stake. What power and influence do SHRM actors in organizations wield to contribute to decent work when governments are unable or unwilling to do so? Research on the causes and effectiveness of the contributions of SHRM to decent work throughout supply chains, or in multinational organizations where SHRM has room to maneuver to change institutional contexts, is called for. Furthermore, how can organizations – through their own policies on outsourcing - advocate for decent work in the emerging gig economy enabled by global technology platforms?

And a moral-professional perspective: Asking questions on the role of the HR profession in the integration of decent work and SHRM, particularly given the shift in the purpose of the HR function towards business partnering (Keegan and Francis, 2010), organizational agility and outsourcing, and delegating HR tasks to line involvement (Marchington, 2015). What is the potential of the HR function in bridging SHRM with the decent work agenda? What is the 'raison d'être' of the HRM function in the balancing act between shareholder value and stakeholders welfare?

We welcome contributions related, but not limited to, one or more of these perspectives on SHRM and the decent work agenda.

15. Career Decisions: Hireability, Talent, and Employability

Conveners: Jos Akkermans, Sanne Nijs, Janneke Oostrom, and Paul Jansen (Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam)

Different disciplines within HR research seem to talk different languages. A good example of these different languages can be found in the area of assessment. Employees are constantly evaluated in terms of their current and future competencies: When applying for a job one's hireability is assessed and when being considered for a promotion, one's talent or potential is being assessed. In the meantime, employees are expected to be proactive in staying employable and competitive in the job market. Although there is considerable overlap in the definitions of these constructs – they are all related to one's current or future skills and competencies as well as opportunities for employment – they have been the focus of independent research streams – for example in IO Psychology, HRM, management, and career research. Moreover, important career decisions are being made based on these assessments, which makes it crucial to explore the relations between hireability, talent, and employability. The goal of this track is to combine contemporary research on hireability, talent, potential, and employability, and to look at new developments within each research stream. In addition, the track aims to detect overarching themes such as construct specification, decision-making processes, diversity, individual differences, and scale development. Both theoretical and empirical work is very welcome.

Submitted papers may address questions such as, but not limited to:

- What is the (conceptual and empirical) interplay between hireability, talent, and employability? Is someone with high levels of employability automatically hireable? Is an identified talent by default employable?
- How do the three constructs relate to individual-level work and career outcomes, such as well-being, performance, and career success?
- How can the dominant streams of literature in research on hireability (IO Psychology), talent (HRM), and employability (careers) be integrated, and what can the disciplines learn from each other in terms of hiring and developing people?
- What decision-making processes underlie employers' judgements of hireability, talent, and employability?
- Do employers / HR-consultants assess these constructs differently and are the judgments of these different constructs prone to different biases (e.g., based on age or gender)?

16. Finding meaning in work by engaging in proactive sustainable behaviors: The role of HRM

Conveners: Evgenia Lysova, Sabine El Baroudi, and Svetlana Khapova (Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam)

People want to have work that not only provides income and joy, but also a deep sense of meaning (Cascio, 2003; Lysova, Allan, Dik, Duffy, & Steger, 2018). Research shows that individuals experience their work as meaningful when they have an opportunity to benefit or impact others (Allan, Duffy, & Collinson, 2018). Therefore, work that enables individuals to see the impact they make on their clients and other stakeholders is seen to lead to greater experiences of work meaningfulness (Grant, 2007). However, not all employees have work that is designed to foster meaningful experiences, and to address their needs these employees may proactively engage in behaviors to still make an impact with their work. For instance, they may proactively seek to be involved with sustainability initiatives provided by their organization (Carmeli, Brammer, Gomes, & Tarba, 2017). When such organizational initiatives are absent, they may take the initiative to propose and design sustainability practices or to craft their job to make it more meaningful (Bauman & Skitka, 2012). It is necessary to further investigate how such proactive sustainable behaviors can be facilitated by organizations through HR practices, to support employees in finding more meaning in their work. So far, little distinction has been made between employee in-role sustainable behavior and sustainable behavior initiated by the employee (Dumont, Shen & Deng, 2017), despite the evidence that organizational sustainability policies and practices such as HR do influence both types of behaviors differently (Norton, Zacher & Ashkanasy, 2014). Increasing our knowledge on this matter will enable a better understanding of how the employee-employer relationship should be reconciled to allow employees to have a greater societal impact and sense of work meaningfulness.

Empirical and theoretical contributions are welcomed, with topics including (but not limited to):

- Understanding how and under which conditions engaging in proactive sustainable behaviors contribute to greater experiences of meaningful work.
- Understanding how employees engage in proactive sustainable behaviors and what role sustainable HRM policies and practices have in facilitating these behaviors.
- Understanding how sustainable HRM policies and practices should be designed to facilitate proactive sustainable behaviors and meaningful work experiences. Should the policies and practices be offered as a bundle or individually to be more effective in fostering proactive sustainable behaviors and meaningful work experiences? Should they be designed differently to foster proactive sustainable behaviors and meaningful work experiences at the three distinct organizational levels i.e., individual, team and organizational level? And maybe also differently for different industries?
- What is the role of sustainable HRM policies and practices in fostering proactive sustainable behaviors and meaningful work experiences of future employees? What are business students' attitudes towards meaningful work, proactive sustainable behaviors and sustainable HRM? Does the future workforce believe in sustainable HRM? Would sustainable HRM increase business students' willingness to engage in proactive sustainable behavior in their future jobs?
- Understanding whether and how sustainable HRM can retain employees through facilitating their engagement in proactive sustainable behavior.

17. Managing new employment relationships: organizational and societal consequences.

Conveners: Ferry Koster, Laura den Dulk (Erasmus University Rotterdam), and Matej Černe (University of Ljubljana)

The rise of new employment relations (e.g. workforce externalization, self-employed workers and workers in the sharing economy) has both organizational and societal consequences. At the individual level, these relations may be increasingly unbalanced, meaning that workers have to bring more to the deal than organizations. Secondly, at a macro level, issues arise concerning labor market inequality as these new employment relations may lead to a stronger divide between internalized workers (enjoying benefits such as learning opportunities and stable careers) and externalized workers (who need to move from gig to gig without enjoying organizational investments). At the same time, they pose obvious challenges to organizations related to the management of a diverse workforce. We invite researchers to submit papers that focus on the following issues and questions:

- How do organizations/employers shape the new employment relationships?
- How does the use of new employment relationships affect intra-organizational dynamics (e.g. cooperation, identity, culture, and so forth)?
- What is the societal impact of new employment relations, and how can HR policies mitigate negative consequences?

18. Evidence-based HRM

Conveners: Wouter Vandenabeele and Paul Boselie (Utrecht University)

The impact of management in general and HRM in particular has always been argued on the basis of either organizational or societal relevance (Paauwe & Farndale, 2018). As management has been defined in various ways, a good encompassing and early definition would be provided by Koontz as ‘a process of getting things done through and with people operating in organized groups (1961: 175)’. This process, be it in terms of what is relevant for the organization or society at large, implies a relationship between the process itself and a certain outcomes (what ‘gets done’).

Therefore, before such impact – either organizational or societal – can be claimed, it is necessary to assess whether there is any such relationship at all. Pfeffer and Sutton (2006) claim this to be even more important as management is rife with assumed knowledge that is actually not true. Pfeffer and Sutton (2006) categorize knowledge about management to be either true (hard facts), clearly false (total nonsense) or plausible yet false (half-baked truths). Examples of such general half-baked truths in the field of HRM are generational thinking (Twenge et al 2008) or the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator as a set of stable (work) personality traits (McCrae & Costa, 1989). In these cases, research has demonstrated that, despite the claims being plausible, the acclaimed outcomes actually are not supported by available evidence.

A solution to go about with this would be the application of evidence-based management. In line with the evidence-based approach found in medicine, evidence-based practice is about making decisions through the conscientious, explicit and judicious use of the best available evidence from multiple sources (Sackett 1996). Consequently, Rousseau (2012) has defined evidence-based management as ‘the systematic, evidence-informed practice of management, incorporating scientific knowledge in the content and process of decision-making’. In doing so, she identifies two major knowledge bases to evaluate claims of evidence: scientific studies and data collected within a particular organization.

One of the issues with the application of evidence-based management, and in particular evidence-based HRM, is its limited range of implementation. Despite the superiority of evidence-based practices in terms of effectiveness (Meehl 1954; Sloman & Fernbach 2017), HRM practices are not often evidence-based. In explaining this, both psychological characteristics of managers (Rousseau & Gunia 2016) as institutional characteristics of the environment are possible directions (Marler & Boudreau 2017).

This track seeks papers that address questions surrounding the topic of evidence-based management. First, this could entail instances of ‘myth-busting’, in which popular HRM practices are put to the test. Second, papers could also entail studies of implementation, investigating why or why not it has not been implemented. Third, a link between evidence based management and contemporary HR analytics can be made. Organizational data provide opportunities for analyzing both societal and organizational HRM issues.

19. Learning, Development and Talent management

Convenors: Sasa Batistic, Christina Meyers, Rob Poell, Marianne van Woerkom (Tilburg University), and Luc Sels (KU Leuven)

Many organizations spend a lot of resources on training and development in order to enhance employee knowledge, skills and abilities, and to improve positive work-related attitudes. In practice, however, the gap between what is learned in training and sustained workplace performance is not easy to bridge. Characteristics of the learners, of the intervention design and delivery, and of the work environment all play a role in the transfer of training to the workplace. The most important source of learning however, is the work itself and the interactions with other people in the workplace.

Managers play an important role in stimulating the development of their employees. In doing so, they often focus on the deficits of their employees, aiming at assessing and overcoming individual weaknesses. In contrast, organizations with a strengths-based approach target the achievement of exceptional individual and organizational outcomes by a process of identifying and valuing employee talents, developing them into applicable strengths and putting these strengths into practice. This is also related to the talent management practices that are employed in a particular organization. These practices may have an exclusive focus, aiming at a small group of talented employees, or an inclusive focus, addressing the strengths and talents of all employees.

Learning in organizations does not only take place on an individual basis but also on a collective basis. Many organizations have adopted team-based structures. Since team members can interact with one another, knowledge and skill gathered by one team member can be transferred to the other team members. Organizational learning processes that lead to knowledge creation have become important for improving a firm's competitiveness and sustainability. Organizational learning presupposes a specific organizational climate in which there is commitment to learning and a tolerance for failure.

In view of the conference theme, research questions focusing on the societal dimension of learning, development and talent management are especially encouraged. For example, to what extent do workers have equal access to learning and development opportunities, what is the societal impact of unequal access, what (can) organizations do to contribute to equal access and reducing inequality? This track will accept high-quality submissions in the areas mentioned above and on related topics in the field of learning, development and talent management.

20. The Role of HRM in Enhancing Worker Health and Well-being Over The Life-span

Conveners: Jessica de Bloom, Laetitia Mulder, and Onne Janssen (University of Groningen)

Most European managers are concerned about stress in their workplaces (EU-OSHA, 2012). Stress among employees has been shown to relate to reduced work motivation, increased levels of work accidents due to mistakes, and reduced organizational productivity (e.g., Gilboa et al., 2008; van der Linden et al., 2005; Tucker, 2003). In recent years, we have seen ongoing work intensification and acceleration of working life entailing globalized 24/7 economies, vanishing boundaries between work and private life, and more poorly paid, temporary- and project-based work with high-levels of job insecurity (Allvin et al., 2011; Kubicek & Tement, 2016; Rosa, 2013). Due to this work intensification, employees increasingly face high job demands and need to continuously update their knowledge and learn new skills (Green, 2004; Major & Germano, 2006; Ulferts, Korunka, & Kubicek, 2013). This is particularly challenging for certain groups of employees, for example older workers, workers entering the job market, and workers struggling with heightened responsibilities at home due to their family situation.

For this track, we invite submissions focusing on the role of various stakeholders in HRM (e.g., HR professionals, supervisors and leaders, trade union representatives, policy makers) for sustaining and enhancing workers' resilience, health, and well-being in high-intensity workplaces. Submissions are sought that will help to get a more profound understanding of the causes and consequences of job stress and resilience during different life-stages of employees. Moreover, we invite submissions on interventions to lower psychosocial risk factors in the work environment, to successfully manage high levels of job demands or to support employees in reintegrating at work after stress-related illnesses.

21. The process and development of leadership

Conveners: Omar Solinger, Paul Jansen, Edina Doci, Inge Brokerhof, and Jesse Vullingsh (Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam)

Leadership is a core function in the world of business and is therefore of critical interest to scholars active in the world of HRM. Over the years to this date, leadership scholars have come up with over 66 different approaches to leadership and have developed many different “gestalts” (or types) of leadership in order to come to grips with the complexity of the leadership process. Yet only a few of them focus on leadership that unfolds as a process over time. When viewed as a process, leadership is not seen as a person, nor merely as an attribution from followers, but a set of occurrences or an episode where a person, or a set of persons, become(s) a focal point of influence in order to address an issue that a group is facing. The notion of leadership as process will naturally involve studies which look at ‘what happens’ in the leader-follower relationship and how the leader-follower relationship develops over time. Think, for instance, of what happens in a leader-member exchange relationship when, for instance, one follower becomes part of a leader’s inner circle while others move toward the periphery of a leader’s attention and focus. Another case in point is the development of *moral* leadership. Leaders developing a “moral muscle” will contribute to a more systematic inclusion of the ethical component in business decisions. However, the “muscle” metaphor signals a temporal component, namely something which takes practice and training, or may weaken over time in the absence of training. Moral leadership can thus, also be seen as a dynamic concept, which takes time and effort to develop and can vary over time and across situations. Our increased knowledge of the development and process of leadership will therefore strengthen HRM research and practitioners in their ability to facilitate, promote, and channel the development of leadership in organizations.

This track therefore focuses on *the development and process of leadership*, including, but not limited to:

- The dynamic development of a moral muscle in business ethics education and/or HR programs.
- The effectiveness of leadership development programs (crucial HR function), e.g. individual learning where a leader grows in leadership competencies.
- the initiation of the leadership process, such as contextually induced shifts in moral awareness or personally induced shifts (e.g., job change);
- the dynamics of Leader-Member Exchange;
- The restoration of trust and injustice in the leader-follower interactions.
- temporal shifts in leadership behaviors following changes of context (e.g., from neutral to crisis or vice versa);
- Situations whereby employees in companies show courage, and mobilize others to spur social change (e.g., social movement approaches).
- temporal shifts in, or the temporal development toward, the “dark side” of leadership where purportedly “good” leadership (e.g., transformational, authentic, ethical) leader behaviors are followed by purportedly “dark” behaviors;
- Experimental methods or simulations revealing temporal shifts in leadership and/or followership attitudes and behaviors following a particular “treatment” vs “controlled” conditions.
- qualitative approaches to leadership where leadership is studied as an unfolding interaction (e.g., the relational leadership approach);
- Archival approaches, case studies, narrative methods in the study of leadership.

22. HRM Practices In Today's Academia

Conveners: Yvonne van Rossenberg (Radboud University), Xander Lub (Breda University of Applied Sciences & Nyenrode Business University), Matthijs Bal (Lincoln International Business School, University of Lincoln), and Edina Dóci (Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam)

As the theme of the conference indicates, as HRM researchers we are increasingly aware of our societal role and responsibility towards employees. We are more and more critical of HRM practices that handle individuals as mere organizational resources and regard them as mere instruments to be used for organizational purposes. At the same time, we do not apply our understanding of (in/)humanistic HRM practices in the very workplaces we inhabit. Our own organizations offer working conditions that have detrimental effects on employees' well-being. In today's university, student numbers and work pressure are continuously increasing while organizational resources stagnate at best; precarious contracts and job insecurity prevail; academic organizational practices foster competition instead of collaboration between academics; the pressure to acquire competitive funding to be able to do our core tasks is constant; academics are under immense pressure to publish in high impact factor journals while lacking the resources and time needed to conduct high quality research; academics are incentivized by extrinsic rewards and are constantly evaluated by quantitative metrics, their worth being judged on the basis of narrowly defined quantitative output indicators. Resulting of the highly managerial, instrumental and individualistic organization of work and human resource processes academia, academics reportedly struggle with mental and physical health problems. At the same time, there's a widespread agreement among HRM scholars that we need to increase our societal impact. However, if we want to be societally relevant as a field, if we want to advise organizations on working conditions that benefit both employees and organizations, we need to first examine ourselves and the ways we organize our own work. If we are to advice practitioners about positive organizational practices, we need to become practitioners within our own organizations and implement our expertise to safeguard the well-being of academic employees. Achieving positive change is always the most feasible on the local level. If we strive for societal relevance, we need to first improve the workplaces we inhabit: the universities. The goal of this session is to use our collective intelligence and expertise in envisaging the HRM practices of a university that provides its employees with stability, security, and a psychologically safe and supportive environment where health abounds and creative thinking and research can flourish.

The session organized around this track will have an interactive workshop design (no individual presentations). Researchers can apply with abstracts in which they describe their ideas on designing this workshop & how they would contribute to the organization and facilitation of this workshop.

The track will be organized by the funders of the Future of Work and Organizational Psychology Group (<https://www.futureofwop.com/>). The track will build on earlier activities of the FoWOP group, including symposia at EAWOP conferences and a very successful Small Group Meeting on the Future of Work & Organizational Psychology, hosted in Breda, May 2018.

23. Understanding Learning (Agility) in order to survive

Conveners: Dirk Buyens and Sophie De Winne (KU Leuven)

As organizations need to be adaptable and proactive to survive (Grant & Ashford, 2009; De Stobbeleir, Ashford & Buyens, 2011), scholars have increasingly recognized the role of learning from experience in the organizational context (McCall, Lombardo, & Morrison, 1988). One variable in particular can explain the reason for (not) thriving in this complex environment: *learning agility*, i.e., a person's ability to come up to speed quickly in one's understanding of a situation and to move across ideas flexibly in service of learning both within and across experiences (DeRue, Ashford, & Myers, 2012).

Recently, the concept of learning agility has come to the attention of both HRM professionals and HRM academics in order to enhance talent management processes and prepare their workforce for the uncertain future. We can assume there will be a payoff for companies that can better identify and develop highly agile learners and create an organizational climate which fosters (agile) learning. Human resources departments are more and more challenged to implement systems that enhance individual development and organizational learning (De Vos, Buyens & De Stobbeleir, 2004). Equally important is the question as to whether learning agility will play an important role in the development of gig workers, who constantly have to redeploy old skills in new work contexts in service of different aims. In that way learning agility is not only relevant within the context of the corporate organizational world, but also from a 'societal' point of view. Increasing the learning agility of a community or society might have an important participative effect on that society (Gino, 2018). Even if one scores high on individual differences that pave the way to learning (e.g. learning goal orientation, openness to experience and cognitive ability), which other elements (such as job complexity, time or learning opportunities) can highly affect whether a person will demonstrate (agile) learning behaviour (Tannenbaum, Beard, McNall & Salas, 2010)? And which organizational factors can affect the degree to which people translate their learnings into concrete outcomes, hence influencing the learning advancement not only within their jobs and their professional careers, but also in their 'societal' life a citizens participating in their societies and communities (Kashdan, Disabato & Goodman, 2018)? Talking about transfer of the learning, some would even argue that the more people will demonstrate (agile) learning behaviour and this basic sense of 'curiosity' the more the KSA's that they developed in one company or organization, might be 'transferable' to other organizations, and to their private and/or societal life (Fernández, Roscoe & Aramaki, 2018).

For this track we invite submissions that increase our insights in:

- Organizational/situational factors that influence on-the-job learning;
- Organizational outcomes of learning (agility);
- The role of learning (agility) in the gig economy;
- The importance of L&D efforts towards the employability development of individuals and societies;
- How can learning (agility) increase the transfer of knowledge outside the organization, towards people's private and societal life?
- What evidence can we find around the so called 21st century skills like Learning agility, curiosity and resilience, and how to they improve the way employees cope with issues and obstacles in their private or societal life?