



Call for Abstracts

HRM FOR RESILIENT SOCIETIES: A CALL FOR ACTIONABLE KNOWLEDGE

12th Biennial International Conference of the Dutch HRM Network

November 9 – 11, 2022

E: info@hrm-network.nl

Abstract submission: March 1, 2022

Both the economic crisis in mid-2008 and the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020 made clear the need for continued resilience in organizations and societies. The two crises have likewise challenged HRM scholars in terms of flexibility and resilience, and emphasized the importance of our research (and the knowledge we create) on the well-being of the wider society in which we live and work. After the success of the HRM Conference in Tilburg (2019), we continue the scholarly tradition with an exploration of the contribution of Human Resource Management to Societal Challenges. The 12th International Conference of the Dutch HRM Network will take place at the University of Twente (the Netherlands), an institution with an embedded multidisciplinary research tradition, multifaceted research programmes in People First High-Tech systems, and a mission to empower a resilient society through sustainable solutions.

We invite scholars to contribute to the academic and societal debates about HRM's role in crafting resilient societies and organizations. The notion of resilience in its modern guise, gained prominence in the 1970s and has since become increasingly popular in a wide range of scientific disciplines (Ossewaarde et al., 2020; Woods, 2015)¹. Throughout history, its main concept has survived: societies exist in continuous interaction with their surrounding natural, political, social, cultural, economic and technological environments.

The COVID-19 pandemic, as an example, has become not merely a healthcare issue, but a call to reform established modes of thought including rectifications of (Ossewaarde et al., 2020) and reflections on systems of law, finance, governance, management and the management of human resources. Modern HRM systems, afforded by digitalization, robotization, and interconnectedness, while emphasizing workplace dignity and the meaningfulness of jobs, have had unanticipated effects on organizational life and the wellbeing of societies, organisations and individuals. Some unintended consequences for example, increasing workloads, have led many HRM scholars, from various sub-areas, to note that some HRM and work systems appear to be more resilient than others. The perception that systems have properties which can be interpreted as *resilience* has recently emerged and become extremely fashionable in HRM research (Bal et al., 2020; Branicki et al., 2019; Cooke et al., 2019; Liu et al., 2019; Mitsakis, 2020).

Used as a concept, a framework, a style of thinking, metaphor or discourse, *resilience* appears attractive as a theme for interdisciplinary research, including the bridging of social and technical sciences (Ossewaarde et al., 2020; Thorén, 2014). In this Call, we welcome discursive and conceptual papers on a varied and broad understanding of *resilience*:

- 1) *Rebounding* from disrupting or traumatic events and returning to previous or normal activities (from Latin *resilire*, meaning rebounding).

¹ Many refer to the paper by Holling, C. S. (1973). Resilience and stability of ecological systems. *Annual review of ecology and systematics*, 4(1), 1-23.

- 2) The equivalent of the concept of *robustness* in systems, i.e., how systems manage increasing complexity, stressors and challenges.
- 3) Graceful extensibility, i.e., how a system extends performance, or brings extra adaptive capacity to bear when surprise events challenge its boundaries.
- 4) Adaptability, i.e., system architectural properties which produce *sustained adaptability* (after Woods, 2015).

We also welcome studies which further enhance the already accumulated knowledge on relationships between HRM interventions and multilevel manifestations of resilience. Here, it has been shown that HRM practices and micro-processes influence individual and organizational level resilience (Branicki et al., 2019; Ijntema et al., 2019); that HPWSs advance employee resilience when combined with engagement (Cooke et al., 2019); and that employee resilience impacts an inclusive organizational climate (Davies et al., 2019) and perceived workload (Huang et al., 2019). Further, resilience has been shown to be highly contextually dependent on national culture (Liu, 2020), occupational contexts (Kossek & Perrigino, 2016) and industry (Khan et al., 2019).

Overall, this Conference *aims to accelerate the scholarly HRM contribution to the interdisciplinary multilevel and multi-actor research on resilience and resilient societies.*

The Board of the Dutch HRM Network calls for HRM scholars and professionals interested in scientific research to join the discussion regarding **the creation of actionable HRM knowledge towards establishing HRM which is responsible for resilient societies and organizations.** We often hear that HRM research is not as influential as research in fields such as economics, finance, medical or engineering sciences. We also often hear that HRM research is not as relevant or as helpful as it could be. To develop actionable knowledge requires an understanding of how employees and managers can make a difference; and how HRM can contribute to resilience, whilst being resilient itself.

We welcome conceptual and empirical contributions which:

- Enhance our knowledge of HRM's contribution to resilient societies, whilst being resilient itself
- Advance theoretical development through enhancing multidisciplinary and multilevel approaches to study resilient societies, organisations, teams, individuals; and supportive HRM systems
- Advocate methodological pluralism in the research of HRM for resilient societies
- Create actionable HRM knowledge through practice and intervention

Submission requirements

Authors should submit extended abstracts, with the understanding that accepted submissions will be developed into a paper in time for the actual conference. All abstracts will be reviewed and if accepted (for development into full papers for presentation at the conference) will be included in a volume of collected abstracts distributed to all participants.

Submitted abstracts should not exceed 1000 words and should contain (where applicable):

- A brief and convincing description of the theoretical framework
- Research design and approach to data analysis
- Key findings and theoretical and practical implications
- Illustration of HRM-in-action for resilient societies

Publication possibilities

Selected papers will be eligible for inclusion in a follow-up book, and potentially in a Special Issue of [The International Journal of Human Resource Management](#).

Best Paper Award and Best Dissertation Award

The Best Paper Award will be again sponsored by [The International Journal of Human Resource Management](#).

To compete for the **Best Paper Award** and/or the **Best Dissertation Award**, a full paper and/or an electronic copy of the full dissertation should be submitted prior to 1st October 2022, via info@hrm-network.nl.

Best Dissertation Award qualification criteria:

- The topic of the dissertation should be HRM-related
- The dissertation should be defended between 2nd August 2019 and 1st August 2021
- The dissertation is defended at a Dutch or Belgian/Flemish university

Key dates

Deadline for submitting abstracts	March 1, 2022
Decision of selected abstracts to the authors	April 20, 2022
Early Birds Registration	May 1 – August 1, 2022
Registration deadline	October 15, 2022
Deadline for full paper submission (if you want to compete for the Best Paper Award), to be submitted to your track convenor	October 1, 2022
Best PhD Award deadline for dissertation submission, to be submitted via info@hrm-network.nl	October 1, 2022

References

- Bal, M., Kordowicz, M., & Brookes, A. (2020). A Workplace Dignity Perspective on Resilience: Moving beyond Individualized Instrumentalization to Dignified Resilience. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 1-14.
- Branicki, L., Steyer, V., & Sullivan-Taylor, B. (2019). Why resilience managers aren't resilient, and what human resource management can do about it. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 30(8), 1261-1286.
- Cooke, F. L., Cooper, B., Bartram, T., Wang, J., & Mei, H. (2019). Mapping the relationships between high-performance work systems, employee resilience and engagement: A study of the banking industry in China. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 30(8), 1239-1260.
- Davies, S. E., Stoermer, S., & Froese, F. J. (2019). When the going gets tough: the influence of expatriate resilience and perceived organizational inclusion climate on work adjustment and turnover intentions. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 30(8), 1393-1417.
- Huang, Q., Xing, Y., & Gamble, J. (2019). Job demands–resources: a gender perspective on employee well-being and resilience in retail stores in China. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 30(8), 1323-1341.
- IJntema, R. C., Burger, Y. D., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2019). Reviewing the labyrinth of psychological resilience: Establishing criteria for resilience-building programs. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 71(4), 288.
- Khan, Z., Rao-Nicholson, R., Akhtar, P., Tarba, S. Y., Ahammad, M. F., & Vorley, T. (2019). The role of HR practices in developing employee resilience: A case study from the Pakistani telecommunications sector. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 30(8), 1342-1369.
- Kossek, E. E., & Perrigino, M. B. (2016). Resilience: A review using a grounded integrated occupational approach. *Academy of Management Annals*, 10(1), 729 - 797.
- Liu, Y., L. Cooper, C., & Y. Tarba, S. (2019). Resilience, wellbeing and HRM: A multidisciplinary perspective.
- Liu, Y. (2020). Contextualising risk and building resilience: Returnees versus local entrepreneurs in China. *Applied Psychology*, 69(2), 415-443.
- Mitsakis, F. V. (2020). Human resource development (HRD) resilience: a new 'success element' of organizational resilience. *Human Resource Development International*, 23(3), 321-328.
- Ossewaarde, R., Filatova, T., Georgiadou, Y., Hartmann, A., Özerol, G., Pfeffer, K., ... & Borsje, B. (2020). Towards context-driven research: a state-of-the-art review of resilience research on climate change. *Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences Discussions*, 1-40.
- Thorén, H. (2014). Resilience as a unifying concept. *International Studies in the Philosophy of Science*, 28(3), 303-324.
- Woods, D. D. (2015). Four concepts for resilience and the implications for the future of resilience engineering. *Reliability Engineering & System Safety*, 141, 5-9.

Organizing committee

On behalf of the Board of the Dutch HRM Network,

Prof. Dr Tanya Bondarouk, Chair

Dr Maarten Renkema, Secretary of the Dutch HRM Network

Table of Contents

Track 01	5
Imagining the distant future of work.....	5
Track 02	6
HRM, algorithms and artificial intelligence.....	6
Track 03	7
Care post-Covid: Establishing priorities for sustainable care work and employment systems in care	
Track 04	8
HRM and resilience in the public sector	8
Track 05	9
Individual, contextual, and temporal influences on resilience as a foundation for career sustainability	9
Track 06	10
HR Analytics and organizational/workforce resilience.....	10
Track 07	11
The role of HRM in creating meaningfulness and resilience at work	11
Track 08	12
Discouraged workers in the labour market.....	12
Track 09	13
Labour market discrimination and inequalities before and after the pandemic	13
Track 10	14
Advancing HRM by creating decent work for forgotten workers.....	14
Track 11	15
Resilience while working from home: what can HRM learn from Covid-19?.....	15
Track 12	16
15. Building resilient professionals.....	16
Track 13	18
Crafting resilient workers: The role of workplace interventions	18
Track 14	19
HRM during crisis: Building sustainable working lives in challenging times.....	19
Track 15	20
The implementation of resilient HRM: The role of managers in resilient organizations	20
Track 16	21
Holding executives accountable for organizational culture:What can they really do?.....	21
Track 17	22
Unraveling the symbiotic relationship in people management: How do leadership behaviours and HR practices combine in affecting employees?	22
Track 18	23
Organizational feedback culture and employees' outcomes: Challenging the HRM role.....	23

Track 19	24
Do responsible organizations build resilience? And how can HRM help?.....	24
Track 20	25
Strategic HRM and organizational agility in uncertain times.....	25
Track 21	26
Team resilience – Spanning boundaries to deal with disruptions	26
Track 22	27
Learning, development and Talent management in a resilient society.....	27
Track 23	28
The future of Performance management in the 21 st Century.....	28
Track 24	29
Talent management and employer branding during and beyond ‘rough’ times.....	29
Track 25	30
Is there room for everyone’s talent? Talent management in academia	30

TRACK 01

IMAGINING THE DISTANT FUTURE OF WORK

*Nicky Dries, Sophie De Winne, Sarah Vansteenkiste
KU Leuven*

McKinsey & Company (2020) state on their website: “The world of work is changing. Artificial intelligence, automation, and robotics will make this shift as significant as the mechanization in prior generations of agriculture and manufacturing. While some jobs will be lost, and many others created, almost all will change.” Nobody knows exactly how and how fast the world of work will change. Different long-term scenarios are out there (e.g., Janssens, 2019), predicting on the one extreme a utopian scenario with a more inclusive society, more entrepreneurial opportunities, and high prosperity; and on the other extreme, a dystopian scenario with high unemployment, more inequality and insecurity, and more surveillance systems.

In their literature review, Balliester and Elsheikhi (2018) define the future of work along five dimensions: (1) the future of jobs (i.e., job creation and destruction, and composition of the labour market); (2) the future of the quality of jobs (i.e., working conditions); (3) wage and income inequality; (4) social protection systems; and (5) social dialogue and industrial relations. They map drivers and consequences of changes in each of these fields, but also point to several gaps in the literature. To make sure that societies, organisations, HR departments and employees are resilient and able to anticipate to these changes in the very long term, we need to tackle these gaps and make more precise predictions about the distant future of work. In addition to the ‘prediction’ paradigm, other paradigms can also be interesting, such as ‘societal imaginaries’ of the future of work, bringing in a more sociological and politicized lens (Beckert & Bronk, 2018). According to this view, the future cannot so much be predicted, but instead is ‘willed into being’ by powerful stakeholders such as politicians and tech billionaires.

To support the debate about the distant future of work and its consequences we invite papers which contribute to, and help us to develop actionable knowledge about the following topics:

- Different scenarios regarding the distant future of work
- Consequences of artificial intelligence, automation and robotics for labour markets, organisations, HR departments, jobs, and employees
- The social, political, and democratic processes surrounding the future of work
- Issues of power, inequality, and vested interests that may differ between stakeholder groups e.g., workers versus entrepreneurs, or policy makers versus employers
- The role of imagination and sensemaking
- Consequences of the above for the HR function.

Balliester, T., & Elsheikhi, A. (2018). The future of work: A literature review. ILO Research Department Working Paper, 29.

Beckert, J. & Bronk, R. (2018). *Uncertain futures: Imaginaries, narratives, and calculation in the economy*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Janssens, G. (2019). *Waardevol werkloos. Maatschappelijke gevolgen van digitalisering, robotisering en artificiële intelligentie*. LannooCampus.

JMS conference on the Future of Work, see call for papers and interesting research questions on <http://www.socadms.org.uk/jms-conference-2020-call-for-papers/>.

McKinsey & Company (2020). <https://www.mckinsey.com/featured-insights/future-of-work> (6/10/2020).

HRM, ALGORITHMS AND ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

Jeroen Meijerink¹, Ulrich Leicht-Deobald², Anne Keegan³, Maarten Renkema¹, Anna Bos-Nehles¹
¹ University of Twente, ² University of Konstanz, ³ University College Dublin

This track invites papers on the intersection between HRM, Algorithms and Artificial Intelligence (AI). We broadly define HRM algorithms as a set of computer-programmed steps to automatically execute HRM activities by transforming machine-readable big data into output. This can range from descriptive algorithms which sort and analyse worker data, to prescriptive AI-based algorithms which replace humans in HR decision-making (Leicht-Deobald et al., 2019). While some organizations are slowly experimenting with HRM algorithms, other areas are fully reliant, such as smart industries and the gig economy (Habraken & Bondarouk, 2017; Meijerink & Keegan, 2019).

We see at least two applications for algorithms in HRM research and practice:

- 1) **HRM for managing algorithmic-enabled work.** Algorithms can foster human-machine interactions where social robots/cobots assist workers in executing tasks. Here, HRM activities can enable and/or motivate workers to collaborate with social robots. Moreover, HRM activities can induce humans to incorporate algorithmic-enabled recommendations into decision making processes. Accordingly, we call for research which examines the role of HRM in supporting resilient collaborations between humans and software algorithms at work.
- 2) **Algorithms for executing HRM activities.** Software algorithms and AI augment, can replace human managers in making HR-related decisions related to staffing, appraisal, training, and job design (Strohmeier & Piazza, 2015). Little is known about the way in which workers attribute human-like characteristics to HRM algorithms. Here, questions about the reinforcement of human bias and injustice, and the reduction of personal integrity and human dignity, are particularly salient especially when non-traditional HRM actors e.g., customers, feed HRM algorithms with worker performance data (Duggan, Sherman, Carbery, & McDonnell, 2020).

To support the debate about the intersection between HRM, Algorithms and AI, we invite papers which contribute to, and help us to develop actionable knowledge about the following topics:

- The role of HRM in algorithmic-enabled workplaces e.g., smart industries and the gig economy
- Smart HRM solutions for fostering human-machine collaboration
- Fairness, power and accountability of algorithmic HR decision-making
- Worker perceptions of, and responses to HR algorithms
- The role and perceived legitimacy of non-traditional HR actors in algorithmic HR decision making processes.

Duggan, J., Sherman, U., Carbery, R., & McDonnell, A. (2020). Algorithmic management & app-work in the gig economy: A research agenda for employment relations & HRM. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 30(1), 114-132.

Habraken, M., & Bondarouk, T. (2017). Smart industry research in the field of HRM: Resetting job design as an example of upcoming challenges. In T. Bondarouk, H. Ruel, & E. Parry (Eds.), *Electronic HRM in the Smart Era* (pp. 221-259): Emerald Publishing Limited.

Leicht-Deobald, U., Busch, T., Schank, C., Weibel, A., Schafheitle, S., Wildhaber, I., & Kasper, G. (2019). The Challenges of Algorithm-Based HR Decision-Making for Personal Integrity. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 160(2), 377-392.

Meijerink, J. G., & Keegan, A. (2019). Conceptualizing human resource management in the gig economy: Toward a platform ecosystem perspective. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 34(4), 214-232.

Strohmeier, S., & Piazza, F. (2015). Artificial intelligence techniques in human resource management—a conceptual exploration. In J. Kacprzyk & L. Jain (Eds.), *Intelligent Techniques in Engineering Management* (pp. 149-172). New York: Springer.

CARE POST-COVID: ESTABLISHING PRIORITIES FOR SUSTAINABLE CARE WORK AND EMPLOYMENT SYSTEMS IN CARE

Lander Vermeerbergen¹, Valeria Pulignano², Stefania Marino³, Aoife McDermott⁴, Mathew Johnson³
¹Radboud University, ²KU Leuven, ³The University of Manchester, ⁴Cardiff University

The COVID-19 pandemic has revealed risks to the resilience of national care systems associated with poor quality jobs and working conditions in the care sector. Many care workers are employed on insecure job contracts and face very challenging working conditions for which they are inadequately rewarded (Rubery et al., 2015). These issues have been exacerbated during the pandemic due to inordinate job demands, raising the potential for detrimental consequences for workers themselves, and for the quality of care they provide.

The issue at stake is how care work and the employment systems (resulting from structures of employment regulations and organizations) can be made sustainable. Care is a labour-intensive sector which is chronically under-funded and under-valued when compared to the health sector (e.g., Burns et al., 2016). Prior to COVID, there was recognition of the need to potentially make work more varied, interesting and satisfying, with stronger systems of training and career development (Cooke & Bartram, 2015). In moving to address existing and emerging issues, care systems across nations face budget deficits, labour shortages and a predominantly female workforce. Any response to improve work conditions or the work environment could potentially lead to improved care and to enhanced social cohesion and equality.

This track will bring together a variety of international, comparative and critical perspectives on employment systems and their implications for the care sector. It will take account of both care work, and the organisational and employment systems which shape this sector. Discussion will be informed by, and acknowledge the tensions within and across institutions and organisations, as well as the merits of different employment systems for work and care. Taken together, analysis of the relationships between institutions, organisations and the lived experience of work will inform exploration of the potential for transformation of models of employment to ensure decent and sustainable work in the sector.

To support the debate surrounding improved work in the care sector, we invite papers which contribute to, and help us to develop actionable knowledge about the following topics:

- How do institutional differences (e.g., bargaining structures or funding models) across countries explain work outcomes for care workers in precarious and vulnerable work positions?
- How and which organizational characteristics (e.g., HRM system; organisation design; rewarding and performance systems; business model; and ownership structure) enable less precarious work, and thus a higher quality of working life in the care sector?
- What are the implications of changes in employment regulations and care policy interventions (at a national and organisational level) on care workers experiences?
- How do tensions in care systems and organisational models impact care workers' quality of working life?
- How do we reward and attribute value to work in care within different institutional and organisational settings?
- How does the relationship between patients/residents and workers impact the working life of care workers within and across different employment systems and organisational models?
- How do care workers in precarious positions reconcile personal achievements (e.g., academic qualifications, previous career) with their current working experiences? How do they make sense of their current positions in the context of their whole work and life biographies?

Burns, D. J., Hyde, P. J., & Killelt, A. M. (2016). How financial cutbacks affect the quality of jobs and care for the elderly. *ILR Review*, 69(4), 991-1016.

Cooke, F. L., & Bartram, T. (2015). Guest editors' introduction: Human resource management in health care and elderly care: Current challenges and toward a research agenda. *Human Resource Management*, 54(5), 711-735.

Rubery, J., Grimshaw, D., Hebson, G., & Ugarte, S. M. (2015). "It's All About Time": Time as contested terrain in the management and experience of domiciliary care work in England. *Human Resource Management*, 54(5), 753-772.

TRACK 04

HRM AND RESILIENCE IN THE PUBLIC SECTOR

Bram Steijn¹, Eva Knies², Jessica Sowa³

¹Erasmus University of Rotterdam, ²Utrecht University, ³ University of Delaware

In this track we invite papers which address HRM and *resilience* in a public sector context. Recent crises have highlighted and reinforced the importance of organizational and societal resilience, and have raised questions about how HRM can contribute to and stimulate resilience, an important issue for all organizations, but particularly for public organizations because of their core mission to contribute to societal well-being and legitimacy. An example of a topical issue is a recently renewed appreciation for healthcare and education professionals. Previously, the subject of resilience has rarely been studied explicitly in a public sector context, although implicitly it does feature in various studies.

We will address issues of HRM and resilience in a public sector context on three levels of analysis (see Liu et al., 2019):

- **Macro level:** how can HRM contribute to nurturing more resilient societies, one of the core tasks of any public organization? (e.g., Van Loon, 2015)
- **Meso:** how can HRM contribute to nurturing resilient and flexible public organizations? (e.g., Leisink & Knies, 2018)
- **Micro:** how can HRM contribute to employees' resilience and vitality within the public sector? (e.g., Cunningham, 2010; Cvenkel, 2020)

We invite papers which address questions of HRM and *resilience*, and related issues, in a public sector context on one, or several levels of analysis. We understand the public sector to include organizations in government, healthcare, and education. We also have a broad definition of *resilience* to accommodate a wide range of papers on diverse subjects.

To support the debate about HRM and *resilience* in the public sector, we invite papers which contribute to, and help us to develop actionable knowledge about the following topics:

- HRM and societal resilience, well-being, and legitimacy in a public sector context
- HRM and resilience: the role of public values
- HRM and organizational resilience and flexibility in a public sector context
- HRM and employees' resilience, competences, and vitality in a public sector context
- The dark side of supporting and stimulating resilience in a public sector context
- Role of various actors (HR department, line managers, and employees) in stimulating resilience in a public sector context.

Cunningham, I. (2010). Drawing from a bottomless well? Exploring the resilience of value-based psychological contracts in voluntary organizations. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 21(5), 699-719.

Cvenkel, N. (2020). Evaluation of workplace well-being research: Developing healthy, resilient and sustainable organisation: A public sector case study. In *Well-Being in the Workplace: Governance and Sustainability Insights to Promote Workplace Health* (pp. 345-368). Springer, Singapore.

Leisink, P., & Knies, E. (2018). Public personnel reforms and public sector HRM in Europe. In *The Palgrave Handbook of Public Administration and Management in Europe* (pp. 243-259). Palgrave Macmillan, London.

Liu, Y., L. Cooper, C., & Y. Tarba, S. (2019). Resilience, wellbeing and HRM: A multidisciplinary perspective. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 30(8), 1227-1238.

Van Loon, N. (2015) Is public service motivation related to overall and dimensional work unit performance as indicated by supervisors? *International Public Management Journal*, 19, 78-110.

**INDIVIDUAL, CONTEXTUAL, AND TEMPORAL INFLUENCES ON RESILIENCE AS A
FOUNDATION FOR CAREER SUSTAINABILITY**

Jos Akkermans¹, Ans De Vos², Beatrice Van der Heijden³

¹ Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, ² Antwerp Management School, ³ Radboud University

Research on sustainable careers has gained momentum in recent years as a complementary perspective to the dominant discourse on individual agency in career development. According to the sustainable career perspective, to be happy, healthy, and productive throughout a career (De Vos et al., 2020; Van der Heijden et al., 2020) it is necessary to look beyond individual competencies and behaviours, and include contextual and temporal factors (ibid.). For example, someone might be a top performer and gain rapid promotion, but soon suffer from burnout because the performance pressures were too high to maintain for an extended period. Resilience is a key factor in sustainable career theorizing but until now, has avoided empirical scrutiny. Indeed, people's ability to adjust, develop, and fit into an ever-changing work environment could be critical to career sustainability (De Vos & Van der Heijden, 2017). This is particularly relevant when considering societal developments around ever more flexible and complex (i.e., VUCA) careers, which are characterized by career shocks (such as the COVID-19 pandemic) as "the new normal" (Akkermans et al., 2020, 2021). The ability to deal effectively with career shocks is dependent on an individual's resilience and adaptability (Seibert et al., 2016). This prompts the question: *what is the role of resilience in developing a sustainable career?* This track aims to find possible answers to this question, focusing on individual, contextual, and temporal factors which may explain the role resilience plays in creating career sustainability.

We invite papers which contribute to, and help us to develop actionable knowledge about the following topics:

- What is resilience from the perspective of a sustainable career? How can the concept of resilience contribute to theorizing about sustainable careers?
- How can individuals actively enhance their resilience to engender career sustainability? In which ways can resilience impact career sustainability?
- How can individual, contextual (e.g., work-life, organization or labour market) and temporal factors *enhance* or *diminish* resilience as a foundation for sustainable careers? For example, how do personality traits, competencies, HRM practices, and career shocks affect resilience?
- How is the development of resilience across different types of career stages, industries, and types of workers (e.g., flex workers, project workers or gig workers) affected by differences in opportunities? How does this impact their career sustainability?

Akkermans, J., Collings, D.G., da Motta Veiga, S.P., Post, C., & Seibert, S. (2021). Toward a broader understanding of career shocks: Exploring interdisciplinary connections with research on job search, human resource management, entrepreneurship, and diversity. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 126. Article 103563.

Akkermans, J., Richardson, J., & Kraimer, M. L. (2020). The Covid-19 crisis as a career shock: Implications for careers and vocational behaviour. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 119, Article 103434.

De Vos, A., & Van der Heijden, B. I. J. M. (2017). Current thinking on contemporary careers: the key roles of sustainable HRM and sustainability of careers. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, 28, 41-50.

De Vos, A., Van der Heijden, B. I. J. M., & Akkermans, J. (2020). Sustainable careers: Towards a conceptual model. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 117, Article 103196.

Seibert, S. E., Kraimer, M. L., & Heslin, P. A. (2016). Developing career resilience and adaptability. *Organizational Dynamics*, 45(3), 245-257.

Van der Heijden, B., De Vos, A., Akkermans, J., Spurk, D., Semeijn, J., Van der Velde, M., & Fugate, M. (2020). Sustainable career across the lifespan: Moving the field forward. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 117, 103344, Article 103344.

HR ANALYTICS AND ORGANIZATIONAL/WORKFORCE RESILIENCE

Jan de Leede¹, Sophie De Winne², Tommaso Fabbri³, Anna Chiara Scapolan³, Patrizia Zanon^{4,5}

¹University of Twente, ²KU Leuven, ³University of Modena and Reggio Emilia, ⁴Hasselt University, ⁵Utrecht University

HR analytics collects and analyses big data in search of patterns, trends, and insights in human behaviour, and its impact on business performance. This process is increasingly considered a ‘must have capability’ for the HR profession (Huselid, 2018). When HR and employee data are combined with digital behaviour and performance data, it is particularly useful in increased understanding of HR and generating actionable insights for HRM which contribute to organizational success. From a strategic point of view, HR analytics can be an interesting tool, as it can help HR managers ground their policies in more complex analyses of available data, enabling them to take on a strategic partner role and to strengthen their position in the board of directors. At lower levels of the organizations, HR analytics can be used for increasing the objectivity of HR decisions (e.g., to decide who deserves a promotion or a bonus).

A frequent criticism is that HR analytics is based on out-of-date data, and therefore dooms organizations to become more of the same. HR analytics might automatically reproduce the profile of personnel historically present in an organization, hampering the organization’s ability to attract new people with new knowledge and other competences. This might render the organization less, rather than more, resilient (Denyer, 2017; Lim et al., 2020), hamper innovation and diminish its capacity to address both long-term evolutions (e.g., the learning organization, workforce diversity) and sudden unexpected events with huge consequences (e.g., COVID-19). In the same vein, Banerjee et al. (2013) warns that HR analytics can lead to reduced creativity in decision making, and recommends a healthy balance between data, experience and vision. As environments become more and more dynamic, and occasionally even turbulent, the question then is *what is the argument for using HR analytics?* Can HR analytics help organizations and their workforce become more resilient? If so, under which conditions, and what are the possible consequences for organizations and their workforce? Which critical perspectives and ethical considerations (Tursunbayeva, et al., 2021) are needed here?

To support the debate about HR analytics and organizational resilience, we invite papers which contribute to, and help us develop actionable knowledge about the following topics:

- HR analytics in different contexts (e.g., firm size, environmental dynamics, industry, knowledge intensity)
- HR analytics in times of crisis and crisis management
- HR analytics, creativity in decision-making and the learning organization
- HR analytics, discrimination, diversity and organizational resilience
- HR analytics and procedural and distributive justice in HRM
- HR analytics, enterprise collaborative tools (e.g., Slack, Yammer) and digital workplaces (e.g., O365, G Suite) crowd-work and digital labour platforms
- HR analytics and its potential to create a resilient workforce (i.e., HR professionals, supervisors and employees)
- HR analytics: measuring and describing workforce resilience, building multi-level models to explain and predict workforce resilience
- HR analytics: critical and ethical perspectives.

Banerjee, A., Bandyopadhyay, T., & Acharya, P. (2013). Data analytics: Hyped up aspirations or true potential? *Vikalpa*, 38(4), 1-12.

Denyer, D. (2017). *Organizational Resilience: A summary of academic evidence, business insights and new thinking*. BSI and Cranfield School of Management.

Huselid, M.A. (2018). The science and practice of workforce analytics: Introduction to the HRM special issue. *Human Resource Management*, 57, 679-684.

Lim, D.H., Hur, H., Ho, Y., Yoo, S. and Yoon, S.W. (2020). Workforce Resilience: Integrative Review for Human Resource Development. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, 33(1), 77-101.

Tursunbayeva, A., Pagliari, C., Di Lauro, S., & Antonelli, G. (2021). The ethics of people analytics: Risks, opportunities and recommendations. *Personnel Review*, Advance online publication; DOI 10.1108/PR-12-2019-0680.

THE ROLE OF HRM IN CREATING MEANINGFULNESS AND RESILIENCE AT WORK

Steven Kilroy¹, Karina Van de Voorde¹, Jeske Van Beurden¹, Susanne Beijer², Riccardo Peccei³

¹Tilburg University, ²Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, ³Kings College London

Although work provides the means for making a living, to occupy one's time and to satisfy the need to achieve, what actually makes work worthwhile, is much more complex. People want work which they perceive as meaningful: work which has significance and is worthwhile (Lysova, Allan, Dik, Duffy & Steger, 2019). Likewise, individuals look for psychological development; and with the complexity of the modern workplace, comes a desire for, and a need to grow stronger as individuals deal with and bounce back from challenging circumstances (Hartmann, Weiss, Newman & Hoegl, 2020). In other words, they want to acquire and enhance the requisite resilience in order to deal with the stressors at work. Both meaningfulness and resilience are outcomes of paramount importance not only in helping individuals perform better at work, but also in ensuring that they experience positive well-being (Hartmann et al., 2020; Lysova et al., 2019).

However, not all employees find meaning in their jobs or possess resilience. Workers often do not see the significance of their work or its impact, and while some individuals can bounce back quickly after failures, others can descend into a depression. Consequently, HR professionals are tasked with identifying which HR-related interventions and strategies can be employed most effectively in their organizations, so that employees can experience increased meaningfulness (Soane, Shantz, Alfes, Truss, Rees & Gatenby, 2013) and possess the level of resilience required to cope with and succeed at work (Jiang & Messersmith, 2018). However, the antecedents of meaningfulness and resilience (and in particular, the role of HR practices) are still not fully known (Hartmann et al., 2020; Lysova et al., 2019). In addition, the extent to which resilience-building interventions actually work has been vigorously debated by scholars (Vanhove, Herlan, Perez, Harms & Lester, 2015). Increasing our understanding of whether, what and how HR practices can enhance meaningfulness and resilience is of paramount importance for employees and organizations, and represents an ongoing and fruitful line of research inquiry.

We welcome qualitative and quantitative, empirical and theoretical contributions on this topic, which include but are not limited to the following:

- Understanding if and how (specific bundles of) HR practices lead to increased meaningfulness and resilience at work.
- Understanding whether and how HR/job design and training interventions, both short-term and long-term, play a role in developing meaningfulness and/or resilience.
- Expanding the nomological network of meaningfulness and resilience by investigating its relevant HR antecedents and outcomes, such as employee well-being and/or performance.
- Understanding the conditions (e.g., leadership behaviour) under which HR practices (or job design features) can foster meaningfulness and/or resilience at work.
- Exploring the role of HR professionals, HR managers and line managers in developing meaningfulness and/or resilience on the organizational, team and individual level.
- Understanding how organizations can maintain meaningfulness and resilience in the face of large-scale organizational transformation and turbulence i.e., strategic organizational changes, changes brought about by global pandemics, and drastic economic shocks.

Hartmann, S., Weiss, M., Newman, A., & Hoegl, M. (2020). Resilience in the workplace: A multilevel review and synthesis. *Applied Psychology*, 69(3), 913-959.

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

Lysova, E. I., Allan, B. A., Dik, B. J., Duffy, R. D., & Steger, M. F. (2019). Fostering meaningful work in organizations: A multi-level review and integration. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 110, 374-389.

Soane, E., Shantz, A., Alfes, K., Truss, K., Rees, C., & Gatenby, M. (2013). The association of meaningfulness, wellbeing and engagement with absenteeism: A moderated mediation model. *Human Resource Management*, 52(3), 441 – 456.

Vanhove, A. J., Herlan, M. N., Perez, A. L. U., Harms, P. D., & Lester, P. B. (2015). Can resilience be developed at work? A meta-analytic review of resilience-building programme effectiveness. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 89(2), 278–307.

TRACK 08

DISCOURAGED WORKERS IN THE LABOUR MARKET

Ilke Grosemans¹, Nele De Cuyper¹, Anneleen Forrier¹

¹*KU Leuven*

Much research has looked at an individuals' career with the implicit assumption that individuals strive towards building a sustainable career and the associated benefits, such as financial stability, wellbeing, status, personal development, and identity building (e.g., Warr, 2007). Yet, a disproportionate share of individuals seem to be discouraged from this endeavour. The prototypical example relates to unemployed individuals who would like to work but have stopped searching. (Baum & Mitchell, 2009). Another example would be individuals who have experienced discrimination which consequently induces structural and psychological barriers to employment or any further investment in their career (Heslin, Bell, & Fletcher, 2012).

Discouragement has attracted substantial research attention along two core routes. One route concerns identification of groups of individuals and is often highly descriptive in nature. Another route focuses on activities and interventions that can bring discouraged workers back to the labour market, mostly related to job search or employability enhancement (e.g., Koen, Klehe, Van Vianen, Zikic, & Nauta, 2009). On top of these established routes of research, some research questions remain unanswered. Firstly, little is known about the very experience of being discouraged (Heslin et al., 2012). This is surprising, given that discouragement carries psychological loading. Secondly, and on a related note, most studies start to research discouragement without understanding its earlier antecedents. Comparatively few studies have probed into the process that ultimately leads to discouragement (Aldrich & Dickie, 2013). Discouragement is usually caused by a complex interplay between individuals, personal history and previous experience, and context (Heslin et al., 2012). Consequently, this track aims to focus on the study of discouraged workers in the labour market, to increase understanding of an individual's experience, the process of discouragement, its antecedents and outcomes.

To support the debate about the experience and process of discouragement, this track invites papers which discuss such topics such as:

- Groups/profiles of discouraged workers and their experiences
- Antecedents of discouragement
- The underlying process leading to discouragement
- Interventions to bring discouraged workers back to the labour market
- Discouraged workers and career inaction.

Aldric, R., & Dickie, V. (2013). "It's hard to plan your day when you have no money": Discouraged workers' occupational possibilities and the need to reconceptualise routine. *Work*, 45, 5-15.

Baum, S., & Mitchell, W. F. (2009). Labour underutilization and gender: Unemployment versus hidden unemployment. *Population Research and Policy Review*, 29, 233-248.

Heslin, P., Bell, M., & Fletcher, P. (2012). The devil without and within: A conceptual model of social cognitive processes whereby discrimination leads stigmatized minorities to become discouraged workers. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 33, 840-862.

Koen, J., Klehe, U., Van Vianen, A., Zikic, J., & Nauta, A. (2010). Job-search strategies and reemployment quality: The impact of career adaptability. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 77, 126-139.

Warr, P. (2007). *Work, happiness and unhappiness*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

TRACK 09

LABOUR MARKET DISCRIMINATION AND INEQUALITIES BEFORE AND AFTER THE PANDEMIC

Lena Knappert¹, Edina Doci¹, Janneke Oostrom¹, Sanne Nijs²
¹Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, ²Tilburg University

Challenging societal resilience worldwide, the COVID-19 crisis and its consequences have exacerbated existing inequalities as they have disrupted the labour market and led to an uneven increase in unemployment rates across sections of the population. For this reason, the long-term economic effects of the COVID-19 crisis are expected to be more detrimental for specific groups in the working population. In fact, individuals who before the crisis were already disadvantaged in the labour market, or were in a more vulnerable position (e.g., women, precarious workers, migrants or self-employed) were hit the hardest, both in terms of unemployment rates and a decline in productivity (Cavalleri & Causa, 2020; Madgavkar et al., 2020, Viglione, 2020).

This growing economic inequality fuels societal polarization while threatening societal strengths and adaptability. To bring these developments to a halt and bolster societal resilience, it is important to shed light on the effects of COVID-19 and its consequences on the labour market, working conditions, and career progression of women, minorities and vulnerable workers, including an examination of the underlying mechanisms of these effects. Further, to reduce existing inequalities, we need to better understand what individuals, organizations, and societies can do to prevent or overcome labour market discrimination, and to promote equity and equality in the workplace instead.

To support this much needed debate, this track invites papers which discuss, but are not limited to the following topics:

- To what extent has the COVID-19 crisis, and accompanying measures, influenced diversity and inclusion in the labour market?
- How do organizations translate equity and equality directives into termination and downsizing policies related to the COVID-19 crisis?
- How do former or future employees experience and engage with enforced inequalities due to the economic consequences of the COVID-19 crisis?
- What can individuals, organizations, and societies do to prevent labour market discrimination and inequalities?
- What can individuals, organizations, and societies do to promote inclusive and sustainable careers?
- How do employers and employees experience and engage with governmental regulations and initiatives which are supposed to address/buffer the consequences of the COVID-19 crisis?
- What can we learn from international comparisons? Which countries have taken steps towards reducing existing inequalities regardless of crises?

Cavalleri, M. C., & Causa, O. (2020). *COVID-19: How governments can protect vulnerable workers*. Retrieved on September 25, 2020 from <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2020/07/how-non-standard-workers-are-affected-and-protected-during-the-covid-19-crisis-stylised-facts-and-policy-considerations/>

CBS (2020). *Wat zijn de gevolgen van corona voor arbeid en inkomen?* [What are the consequences of corona for work and income]. Retrieved on September 24, 2020, from <https://www.cbs.nl/nl-nl/dossier/cbs-cijfers-coronacrisis/wat-zijn-de-gevolgen-van-corona-voor-arbeid-en-inkomen>

Madgavkar, A., White, O., Krishnan, M., Mahajan, D. & Azcue, X. (2020). *COVID-19 and gender equality: Countering the regressive effects*. Retrieved on September 25 from <https://www.mckinsey.com/featured-insights/future-of-work/covid-19-and-gender-equality-countering-the-regressive-effects>

ADVANCING HRM BY CREATING DECENT WORK FOR FORGOTTEN WORKERS

Robin Bauwens¹, Marloes van Engen², Charissa Freese¹, Sjanne Marie van den Groenendaal¹, Brigitte Kroon¹,
Sanne Nijs¹, René Schalk¹, Frederike Scholz¹, Mahi Spanouli¹

¹Tilburg University, ²Radboud University Nijmegen

In the quest for resilient societies, a crucial element is ensuring decent work: the minimal standard for jobs that allow a good quality of life (ILO, 2019). HRM plays a major role in providing decent work opportunities within organizations. In order to conform with the UN Sustainable Development Goals, HRM needs to account for (1) an independent living (i.e., paid overtime and secure employment contracts); (2) freedom from discrimination (i.e., equal opportunities and treatment); (3) dignity in people's private lives; (4) acknowledgement of care responsibilities, work-life balance and healthy and safe work environments; as well as (5) a social dialogue, representing employers' and workers' interests. Societal challenges such as economic, political and migratory crises, and the digital transformation (Di Fabio & Blustein, 2016) are rapidly changing workers' access to decent work. Many contemporary workers do not benefit from HRM and decent working conditions, are not covered by social security benefits, and only experience minimal levels of HRM (e.g., Weil, 2014). These 'forgotten' workers (e.g., precarious/non-standard workers, minorities, people with a disability, refugees, flexible workers, etc.) are held accountable for investing in their career planning, training, and development, while often having poor living conditions and experiencing high levels of job insecurity. Scholars of inclusive HRM, studying how organizations can create workplaces which include and provide equal opportunities for all potential workers in the labour market, argue that decent work should comprise the availability of work (to combat unemployment); social security to protect those who cannot fully work; and the prevention of illegal types of employment (e.g., trafficking and child labour) (Borghouts & Freese, 2017).

To support this debate on how HRM can reach these forgotten workers, so that they benefit from decent work to build more resilient societies, we invite papers which discuss, but are not limited to, the following topics:

- How can HRM help to create decent work for vulnerable workers?
- How can HR practices/systems be made more inclusive to acknowledge individual and/or group differences?
- What is the moral view on the role of the HR profession in advancing decent work for forgotten workers?
- What can we learn from the experiences of forgotten workers to help foster a more inclusive HRM?
- How can different types of flexible workers (e.g., self-employed) be supported and managed by employers to build sustainable careers?
- How can HRM contribute to advancing decent work for migrant workers in fissured employment relations?
- How can organizations better support digital labour (e.g., virtual, platform and gig workers) in terms of leadership, infrastructure, literacy and work-life balance?
- How can organizations be stimulated to become an inclusive employer, and which HR practices and HR systems foster inclusive HRM (for instance, related to CSR)?

Borghouts-van de Pas, I., & Freese, C. (2017). Inclusive HRM and employment security for disabled people: An interdisciplinary approach. *E-Journal of International and Comparative Labour Studies*, 6(1).

Di Fabio, A., & Blustein, D. L. (2016). From meaning of working to meaningful lives: The challenges of expanding decent work. *Frontiers in psychology*, 7, 1119.

ILO (2019). *Time to Act for SDG 8: Integrating Decent Work, Sustained Growth and Environmental Integrity*. Geneva, Switzerland. Retrieved from: https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---inst/documents/publication/wcms_712685.pdf

Weil, D. (2014). *The fissured workplace: Why work became so bad for so many and what can be done about it*. Harvard University Press

TRACK 11

RESILIENCE WHILE WORKING FROM HOME: WHAT CAN HRM LEARN FROM COVID-19?

Maral Darouei¹, Evgenia Lysova¹, Svetlana Khapova¹, Marc van Veldhoven², Dorien Kooij², Bram Steijn³,
Brenda Vermeeren³, Laura den Dulk³

¹Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, ²Tilburg University, ³Erasmus University Rotterdam

COVID-19 greatly challenges the resilience of our society. It is impacting us both in our private and work life (Ahrendt et al., 2020). One of the biggest impacts precipitated by COVID-19 is perhaps the abrupt shift to working from home (WFH). WFH has become the norm rather than an exception for a great proportion of employees. By so doing, workplace flexibility has shifted from being a characteristic of specific employment types (e.g., self-employed) and policies, to being a required way of working in many organizational settings.

Thus far, research on workplace flexibility has focused on the way employees build their resilience while WFH under “normal” conditions (i.e., having autonomy in the decision to WFH). Yet, little is known about employees’ WFH experiences in a context where it is mandatory. This raises the question of *how individuals navigate the challenges associated with enforced WFH to build their resilience and to thrive in a new work environment*. Indeed, enforced WFH has become a central topic of debate which requires urgent attention (Carnevale & Hatak, 2020; Rudolph et al., 2020). Exploring the consequences of enforced WFH is important for at least two reasons. Firstly, a substantial number of people are struggling to adjust to WFH, and are experiencing enhanced feelings of social isolation, thereby negatively impacting on their functioning and well-being (Ozcelik & Barsade, 2018; Tuzovic & Kabadayi, 2020). Secondly, enforced WFH has brought new challenges for HRM with managers striving to keep their employees engaged, to provide the right remote work tools, and above all, to ensure that their workforce feels safe during these unpredictable times.

We want to offer a platform for sharing what has been investigated in relation to enforced WFH as precipitated by COVID-19, and, if possible, what lessons can be drawn more generally for HRM and resilience in the organizational context. To support the debate about HRM, COVID-19, and resilience while WFH, the current track invites papers which discuss topics such as:

- How individuals can find and sustain meaningfulness in work while WFH, and in which ways individuals can work on their personal skills and career competences while WFH.
- How organizations can support employees in building mental resilience while WFH, and which tools they can offer to support individuals in experiencing positive outcomes of WFH: specifically, how organizations can achieve coordination, conflict resolution and a sense of community when WFH is the standard.
- The implications of the digitalization of work (e.g., technostress, the effects of screen time, required changes in normal day-time work pattern) on the management of work and the well-being of workers.
- Differential impact of working from home (new/old inequalities) for example, how WFH may have differential outcomes according to gender, occupation, socioeconomic status, and personality.
- How WFH requires new coping skills in employees, for example in relation to digital working, boundary management (e.g., work-family interface), time/spatial job crafting, and self-regulation in general.

Ahrendt, D. et al., (2020). Living, working, and COVID-19. Eurofound report. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

Carnevale, J. B., & Hatak, I. (2020). Employee adjustment and well-being in the era of COVID-19: Implications for human resource management. *Journal of Business Research* (in press).

Rudolph, C.W. et al. (2020). Pandemics: Implications for Research and Practice in Industrial and Organizational Psychology. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice* (in press).

Ozcelik, H and Barsade SG (2018) No employee an island: Workplace loneliness and job performance. *Academy of Management Journal* 61(6): 2343–2366.

Tuzovic, S., & Kabadayi, S. (2020). The influence of social distancing on employee well-being: A conceptual framework and research agenda. *Journal of Service Management*. In press.

15. BUILDING RESILIENT PROFESSIONALS

Jasmijn van Harten¹, Kathleen Stephenson², Ernst Graamans², Paul Boselie¹, Steven Kilroy³, Na Fu⁴, Svetlana Khapova²

¹Utrecht University, ²Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, ³Tilburg University, ³Trinity College Dublin

Professionals, such as medical specialists, nurses, lawyers, teachers, researchers, accountants and many others, are key actors in organizations who address some of society's most challenging problems. The environments in which these professionals work can be described as intensive or turbulent, requiring high levels of resilience from individuals to keep organizations going. In this track, we identify two subthemes which support the debate surrounding the effective management of resilient professionals: (1) the impact of drastic changes on health care professionals' resources and well-being and (2) the impact of extreme overwork and the extended office on professional workers in general.

15.1: The impact of drastic changes on health care professionals' resources and well-being

Organizations which heavily depend on health care professionals are currently facing huge problems in realizing their objectives. For example, the global Covid-19 pandemic, and the expected long-term consequences on work and private domains, have led to a crisis in healthcare organizations with unprecedented demands and workload being placed on virtually all personnel (Muller et al., 2020). This crisis comes on top of developments that were already challenging professional workers, such as the rise of excessive regulation and administration (red tape), which is threatening the autonomy of professionals and consequently their ability to effectively perform and derive satisfaction from their jobs (Tummers and Bekkers, 2014). It is therefore not surprising to learn that the personal and social resources of health care professionals are being significantly stretched, thereby making resilience a topic of significant interest to researchers and practitioners alike. For example, burnout, which is at unprecedented levels among health care professionals, is negatively affecting their well-being while at the same time threatening the quality of patient care (NASEM, 2019). Boosting resilience to sustain employability is critical, given the oftentimes specialized nature of healthcare work (Van Harten et al., 2017).

In accordance with this conference's approach towards developing resilience, we see important research questions that need addressing with respect to proactive and reactive notions of health care professionals' resilience: How can health care organizations manage their professionals and ensure they possess resilience given their increasingly complex environments? How can such workers be equipped for unprecedented and surprising events emanating from the external environment? What role does HRM and leadership play in enabling health care professionals to rebound from disruptive events?

To support the debate about the management of resilient health care professionals, this track invites papers which discuss such topics such as:

- The impact of drastic societal (e.g., Covid-19) and organizational changes on health care professionals' personal resources (especially resilience) and well-being (e.g., burnout risks) and performance
- The leadership styles (e.g., traditional forms, distributed or digital leadership) which are pertinent to building resilience and retaining the services of health care professionals
- Balancing the standardization of work with the professional autonomy and resilience of health care professionals
- Personal resource interventions which foster the resilience of individual health care professionals
- Professional career development issues (e.g., sustainable employability and the future of professional work) in the context of a rapidly changing external health care environment.

Muller, A.E., Hafstad, E.V., Himmels, J.P.W., Smedslund, G., Flottorp, S., Stenand, S.Ø., Stroobants, S., Van de Velde, S., & Vist, G.E. (2020). The mental health impact of the covid-19 pandemic on healthcare workers, and interventions to help them: A rapid systematic review, *Psychiatry Research*, 293.

National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2019). *Taking Action Against Clinician Burnout: A Systems Approach to Professional Well-Being*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. <https://doi.org/10.17226/25521>.

- Tummers, L., & Bekkers, V. (2014). Policy implementation, street level bureaucracy, and the importance Of discretion. *Public Management Review*, 16, 527-547
- Van Harten, J., Knies, E., & Leisink, P. (2017). Dealing with a changing work environment: hospital job type contingencies. *Journal of Health Organization and Management*, 31, 647-664.

15.2: The impact of extreme overwork and the extended office on professionals

The evidence of extreme and overwork of professionals across industries is consistent, staggering, and wrought with negative implications for many facets of HRM such as talent acquisition, gender equity, human sustainability, and long-term productivity (Gascoigne et al., 2015). Although professional bodies, governments, and organizations continue to implement interventions to reduce overwork, these interventions often backfire, suggesting that *overwork* is persistent and its drivers are complex (Blagoev et al., 2018). Addressing overwork is difficult because it stems from desirable organizational outcomes, like commitment and meaningful work, and operates through unobtrusive controls which makes overwork seem self-chosen (Michel, 2011). Overwork is also woven into professional, organizational, and national cultural fabrics, wherein long hours signal the “ideal worker” (Feldman et al., 2020). In addition, overwork has intensified over the past decades, facilitated by communication technologies which extend the office into traditionally non-workspaces (Mazmanian et al., 2013).

In light of the many turbulent changes facing professionals, we call for papers which examine extreme overwork, especially in the context of the growing and widespread extension of the office into employees’ homes. We ask the question: *what can various actors do to manage extreme overwork to ensure human sustainability?* This track aims to provide answers by acknowledging the complex issues at stake, and invites papers which examine the multiple levels, evolving contexts, and unintended consequences of such a scenario.

To support the debate about professionals and overwork, this track invites papers which discuss topics such as:

- What drives professionals in varying situations, industries, and contexts to overwork?
- What are the consequences for professionals and their organizations of overwork?
- Which interventions have individuals, firms, and professional bodies taken to prevent overwork and to ensure human sustainability at a moment when most professionals work from home? What are the consequences of these interventions?
- Which lenses might aid in the theorization of drivers, interventions, and consequences of professional overwork?
- How can HR protect employees from overwork?

Blagoev, B., Muhr, S. L., Ortlieb, R., & Schreyögg, G. (2018). Organizational working time regimes: Drivers, consequences and attempts to change patterns of excessive working hours. *German Journal of Human Resource Management*, 32(3-4), 155-167.

Feldman, E., Reid, E. M., & Mazmanian, M. (2020). Signs of our time: Time-use as dedication, performance, identity, and power in contemporary workplaces. *Academy of Management Annals*, 14(2), 598-626.

Gascoigne, C., Parry, E., & Buchanan, D. (2015). Extreme work, gendered work? How extreme jobs and the discourse of ‘personal choice’ perpetuate gender inequality. *Organization*, 22(4), 457-475.

Mazmanian, M., Orlikowski, W. J., & Yates, J. (2013). The autonomy paradox: The implications of mobile email devices for knowledge professionals. *Organization science*, 24(5), 1337-1357.

Michel, A. (2011). Transcending socialization: A nine-year ethnography of the body’s role in organizational control and knowledge workers’ transformation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 56(3), 325-368.

CRAFTING RESILIENT WORKERS: THE ROLE OF WORKPLACE INTERVENTIONS

Dorien Kooij¹, Marianne van Woerkom¹, Marc van Veldhoven¹, Maria Peeters², Donald Truxillo³
¹Tilburg University, ²Utrecht University, ³University of Limerick

The contemporary workplace is characterized by many challenges, such as an aging workforce, increasing competition, high work pressure, high uncertainty, and increasing numbers of temporary contracts. These challenges require resilient workers who can deal with and adapt to such demanding contexts. We know much about the HR practices and job characteristics which influence resilience, for example in terms of maintaining good levels of person-job fit, work engagement, work ability, and becoming less vulnerable to burnout and depression (e.g., Hartmann et al., 2020). The time has now come to develop and test workplace interventions which help workers to become more resilient. Interventions may be initiated at the organizational level and include Human Resources, work design and leadership interventions; or may be initiated on an individual level and include job crafting, strengths use, vitality management, mindfulness and micro-interventions; or may use a combination of top-down and bottom-up approaches (Kooij et al., 2017; Peeters et al., 2020; Truxillo et al., 2015; Van Woerkom & Meyers, 2019). In addition, interventions may focus on the identification and remediation of dysfunctional behaviours or conditions such as self-undermining behaviour, exhaustion, and depression, but may also build on the positive states and traits of the individual. Expanding the focus from preventing what is problematic to capturing the mechanisms which create positive deviance, may lead to a more complete view of the conditions and processes that contribute to the optimal functioning of people. The effects of these interventions can be tested quantitatively but also more qualitatively (e.g., with a Realist Evaluation approach). Furthermore, boundary conditions and underlying mechanisms can be explored to examine which interventions work for who and when. By testing workplace interventions, researchers can provide evidence-based solutions for organizations and make a concrete impact on society.

To support the debate about the role of workplace interventions, this track invites papers which discuss topics such as:

- Which workplace interventions are effective in enhancing worker resilience, for example in terms of maintaining good levels of person-job fit, job performance, work engagement, work ability, and becoming less vulnerable to burnout and depression?
- Which processes might explain why an intervention would benefit worker resilience?
- Which individual, team or organizational boundary conditions influence the effectiveness of workplace interventions? How heterogeneous are the effects of workplace interventions?
- What are the longer-term effects of workplace interventions on worker resilience?
- How can we better develop and test workplace interventions?

Hartmann, S., Weiss, M., Newman, A., & Hoegl, M. (2020). Resilience in the workplace: A multilevel review and synthesis. *Applied Psychology*, 69(3), 913-959.

Kooij, D. T., van Woerkom, M., Wilkenloh, J., Dorenbosch, L., & Denissen, J. J. (2017). Job crafting towards strengths and interests: The effects of a job crafting intervention on person-job fit and the role of age. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(6), 971.

Peeters, M. C., van Steenbergen, E. F., & Ybema, J. F. (2020). Positive Psychological Micro-Interventions to Improve the Work-Family Interface: Use Your Resources and Count Your Blessings. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 275.

Truxillo, D. M., Cadiz, D. M., & Hammer, L. B. (2015). Supporting the aging workforce: A review and recommendations for workplace intervention research. *The Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 2, 351-381.

van Woerkom, M., & Meyers, M. C. (2019). Strengthening personal growth: The effects of a strength's intervention on personal growth initiative. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 92(1), 98-121.

TRACK 14

HRM DURING CRISIS: BUILDING SUSTAINABLE WORKING LIVES IN CHALLENGING TIMES

*Jessica de Bloom, Joost van de Brake, Laetitia Mulder
University of Groningen*

The COVID-19 pandemic lays bare systemic problems in society and work, and challenges us to rethink how we organize and view work (Manifest, 2020). Neoliberal policies, globalization, and digitalization have led to structural changes in the way work is organized, carried out, and experienced (Green, 2004). In today's "Industry 4.0", characterized by temporary, project and platform-based work, many workers feel that work has intensified, and the pace of life has accelerated (Rosa, 2013). These changes and challenges will remain with us for many years to come.

Certain groups of workers are particularly strained during crises, for example health care workers, and older, chronically ill, or workers with heightened care responsibilities at home. The pandemic has also increased the speed of work flexibilization (Rudolph et al., 2020). Telework, hybrid work and Technology-Assisted Supplemental Work has become "the new norm" as boundaries between work and private life vanish (Eichberger, Derks, & Zacher, *in press*). People's homes are turned into their office, making it hard to mentally disengage once work is over for the day.

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' health, well-being and resilience in challenging times. How do we rethink and redesign HRM to support people in times of crisis? How should work change to ensure meaningful work, under decent working conditions, for everyone?

We hope to receive submissions which provide new perspectives on employees' perception of telework and hybrid work. We particularly look for submissions detailing intervention studies (or plans for intervention studies) designed to buffer adverse effects of a crisis by focusing on lowering psychosocial risk factors, increasing social support, or other measures which help employees to manage high levels of job demands and uncertainty in challenging times.

To support the debate about Sustainable Working Lives in Challenging Times, this track invites papers which discuss topics such as:

- Work intensification and acceleration
- Effects and implications of temporary, project or platform-based work
- Job insecurity
- Virtual teamwork
- Resilience
- Inequality
- Work flexibilization
- Telework and well-being
- Technology-Assisted Supplemental Work and recovery from work
- Work and non-work boundaries and balance.

Eichberger, C., Derks, D., & Zacher, H. (in press). Technology-assisted supplemental work, psychological detachment, and employee well-being: A daily diary study. *German Journal of Human Resource Management*

Green F (2004) Why has work effort become more intense? *Industrial Relations* 43(4): 709–741.

Manifest: vijf voorstellen voor Nederland na corona:

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1CjDgo3mjcxvR_mFZyPY2Ga-P0221sqYk/view (2020)

Rosa, H. (2013). *Social acceleration: A new theory of modernity*: Columbia University Press.

Rudolph, C., Allan, B., Clark, M., Hertel, G., Hirschi, A., Kunze, F., Shockley, K., Shoss, M., Sonnentag, S. & Zacher, H. (2020). *Pandemics: Implications for Research and Practice in Industrial and Organizational Psychology*.

THE IMPLEMENTATION OF RESILIENT HRM: THE ROLE OF MANAGERS IN RESILIENT ORGANIZATIONS

Anna Bos-Nehles¹, Jordi Trullen², Mireia Valverde³
¹University of Twente, ² ESADE, ³Universitat Rovira i Virgili

Previous work has shown the positive relationship between the adoption of particular HRM practices and employee resilience (Cooper et al., 2019), but no matter how well intended HRM policies and practices are, employees are unlikely to become resilient if they do not feel that their immediate supervisors, line managers and co-workers support those practices and care about developing a positive climate within their units. Developing resilience may therefore be as much a product of HRM systems as a product of the leadership behaviours of line managers.

Resilient organizations need resilient managers? Without doubt, managers have the power to make employees engaged, adaptable and fit for the future. We witness great examples of how managers develop teams to perform well, implement innovative HRM solutions effectively, and help employees and the organization develop into future-proof organizations. But we may also need to ask how resilient can organizations be when managers do not implement HRM solutions, when they harm employees' well-being and happiness, or when they create climates of distrust and control? For better or for worse, line managers are likely to play a crucial role in the implementation of resilience-oriented HRM, even when deviating from intended policies or implementing HRM practices differently for different employees (Bos-Nehles & Trullen, 2020; Trullen et al., 2020).

To support the debate about The Implementation of Resilient HRM: The Role of Managers in Resilient Organizations we invite papers that contribute to, and help us to develop actionable knowledge about the following topics:

- The role of managers in resilient HRM interventions
- Managing managers to develop resilient employees
- HRM implementation of resilient (and non-resilient) HRM solutions
- HRM process and HRM implementation process
- Manager agency and HRM differentiation for resilient organizations
- Resilience and HRM system strength.

Bos-Nehles, A., & Trullen, J. (2020). Beyond HRM implementation: New avenues for line managers through HRM differentiation. *Presenter Symposium at the Academy of Management Meeting 2020*, August 7-11, 2020, Vancouver, Canada.

Branicki, L., Steyer, V., & Sullivan-Taylor, B. (2019). Why resilience managers aren't resilient, and what human resource management can do about it. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 30(8), 1261-1286.

Cooper, B., Wang, J., Bartram, T., & Cooke, F. L. (2019) Well-being-oriented human resource management practices and employee performance in the Chinese banking sector: The role of social climate and resilience. *Human Resource Management*, 58: 85-97

Trullen, J., Bos-Nehles, A., & Valverde, M. (2020). From intended to actual and beyond: A cross-disciplinary view of (human resource management) implementation. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 22(2), 150-176.

HOLDING EXECUTIVES ACCOUNTABLE FOR ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE: WHAT CAN THEY REALLY DO?

*Ernst Graamans, Kathleen Stephenson, Omar Solinger and Svetlana Khapova
Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam*

In 2016, the Monitoring Committee Corporate Governance (MCCG) in the Netherlands presented a revision of *The Dutch Corporate Governance Code*. The primary purpose of this Code is to help executives ensure the resilience of their organizations. One of the key directives is for executives to create and communicate an ethical culture which encourages employees to act with integrity. This directive is built on the assumption that culture is shared from the top-down, and that executives can shape behaviour. However, there is limited research proving this link between *ethical leadership* and an *ethical culture* via a simple trickle-down mechanism (e.g., Schaubroeck et al., 2012). Given the ongoing debates defining *culture* and how it is shared, this track seeks to give a critical examination of the effectiveness of this directive.

The notions of culture and resilience can be linked in various ways and studying them in conjunction is recommended (e.g., Bousquet & Mathevet, 2019) with the cautionary note that although paying attention to the underlying mechanisms of resilience is laudable, and the idea of *culture* seems fit for purpose, according to Alvesson (2013) the idea of a ‘managerially-led unitary and unique culture’ is a convenient invention which does not reflect reality. Others argue that in HRM practice, the idea of *culture* has done little to explain resilience or to provide levers for sustainable change (Graamans, Otto, Smit & ten Have, 2017).

Although the notion of culture is ingrained in HRM jargon, there are several unresolved issues. Which social behaviour assumptions provide the basis for our theories of culture? How fair is it to hold executives accountable for any given culture when evidence is limited? Is resilience (defined as rebounding, robustness or sustained adaptability) implicit in the idea of culture itself? And finally, how should we proceed?

To support this debate and question the idea of organizational culture, its uses and misuses, the question of accountability, and its relationship with resilience, this track invites papers (theoretical, quantitative and qualitative) which discuss topics such as, but not limited to:

- How can the idea of culture help HRM to better understand enduring patterns of behaviour, sustainable change, and resilience in all its conceptual richness?
- How can the normativity of *cultural* organizational practices be understood independent of positing organizational values and norms (or *culture* itself) as operational determinants of behaviour, and consequently as a lever for sustainable change?
- How much influence can executives and HRM practitioners exert over their organizational cultures?
- How is the idea of culture related to that of resilience?

Alvesson, M. (2013). *Understanding organizational culture*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Bousquet, F., & Mathevet, R. (2019). Cultural resilience as the resilience of a distinctness. Distinctness from what? For what? In B. Rampp, M. Endreß & M. Naumann (Eds.), *Resilience in social, cultural and political spheres* (pp. 305-321). Wiesbaden, DE: Springer.

Graamans, E., Otto, M., Smit, S., & ten Have, W. (2017). Cultuurverandering is verandering van afstemming [Culture change is recalibrating behavioral coordinations]. *Opleiding & Ontwikkeling*, 1, 28-34.

Monitoring Committee Corporate Governance Code (2016). *The Revised Dutch Corporate Governance Code 2016*. Retrieved from <https://www.mccg.nl/?page=4738>

Schaubroeck, J., Hannah, S., Avolio, B., Kozlowski, S., Lord, R., Treviño, L., Dimotakis, N., & Peng, A. (2012). Embedding ethical leadership within and across organization levels. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(5), 1053-1107.

UNRAVELING THE SYMBIOTIC RELATIONSHIP IN PEOPLE MANAGEMENT: HOW DO LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOURS AND HR PRACTICES COMBINE IN AFFECTING EMPLOYEES?

Mieke Audenaert¹, Adeliën Decramer¹, Beatrice van der Heijden², David Patient³, Dirk Buyens^{1,3}
¹Ghent University, ²Radboud University, ³Vlerick Business School

Despite the much-cited article by Purcell and Hutchinson in 2007, where the term *people management* was introduced to include leadership behaviours and HRM practices issued by the leader, it is only recently that we see a rise in HRM studies which address such leadership behaviours. ‘The twin aspects of FLMs’ people management activities, leadership behaviour and the application of HR practices, imply a symbiotic relationship between them’ (Purcell & Hutchinson, 2007: 3). This symbiotic relationship suggests that leadership and HRM may combine in a multitude of ways: supplementary fit, complementary fit, perceptual filters, etcetera (Leroy et al., 2018). Although research on this topic is growing (e.g., Audenaert, Vanderstraeten, & Buyens, 2017; Bos-Nehles & Audenaert, 2019; Knies, Leisink, & Van De Schoot, 2020), we need further nuanced insights into the combined effect of leadership and HRM on employee motivational processes and outcomes (e.g., employee resilience) which may contribute to a more resilient society. It is crucial to highlight these insights, as leadership behaviours directly affect the well-being, performance, and career success of team members on a daily basis. Additionally, leadership is difficult, even challenging, especially for senior managers of many years, and particularly in relation to the challenge to remain resilient post COVID-19, 2020-2021.

To support the debate about the symbiotic relationship in People Management, this track invites papers which discuss topics such as:

- What is the role of positive leadership behaviours (e.g., Transformational Leadership, Empowering Leadership, Servant Leadership, Authentic Leadership) in influencing change in employee outcomes?
- How do narrow leadership behaviours (e.g., empathic listening) and HRM practices effect employee outcomes?
- How does personality driven leadership behaviour, intervene in the HRM-performance relationship?
- How do destructive leadership behaviours (e.g., Psychopathic Leadership) and HRM combine to effect employee motivational processes and outcomes, such as employee and team resilience?
- How does the quality of the Leader-Member Exchange relationship (LMX) intervene in the motivational process of HRM?
- Research on actionable leadership communication tools, implemented by leaders in HRM conversations, to increase employee resilience.

Audenaert, M., Vanderstraeten, A., & Buyens, D. (2017). When affective well-being is empowered: The joint role of leader-member exchange and the employment relationship. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 28(15), 2208-2227.

Bos-Nehles, A., & Audenaert, M. (2019). LMX and HRM: a multi-level review of how LMX is used to explain the employment relationship. In *Elgar introduction to theories of human resources and employment relations*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Knies, E., Leisink, P., & Van De Schoot, R. (2020). People management: developing and testing a measurement scale. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 31(6), 705-737.

Leroy, H., Segers, J., Van Dierendonck, D., & Den Hartog, D. (2018). Managing people in organizations: Integrating the study of HRM and leadership. *Human Resource Management Review*, 28(3), 249-257.

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.

**ORGANIZATIONAL FEEDBACK CULTURE AND EMPLOYEES' OUTCOMES:
CHALLENGING THE HRM ROLE**

Sabrina El Baroudi¹, Sergey Gorbatov^{1,2}, Svetlana Khapova¹
¹Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, ²IE Business School

A fierce HRM debate is taking place around redesigning performance management (PM): opinions range from blowing it up entirely and doing away with performance ratings (Murphy, 2019) to sticking to the proven ways and shunning the “bright, shiny objects” (Gorbatov et al., 2020). Others seek to redesign PM to foster resilience, creativity and collaboration in companies. There is however agreement on the critical role of feedback in the PM process, increasingly aligned with the concept of feedback as a practice to create a serving and developmental work environment for employees. As a result, there is renewed attention in feedback practices, with new research emerging around such topics as: the sign of feedback (e.g., Kim & Kim, 2019); feedback source and valence (Lechermeier & Fassnacht, 2018); and the role of perspective-taking in feedback seeking. While much research focuses on the benefits of feedback in HR and organisational practices (Gorbatov & Lane, 2018), little research has examined the implications of a transformation from quantitative performance management, to qualitative feedback, on individual performance, career outcomes, and critical behaviours such as *resilience*. Little research to date has focused on the dark side of feedback and its negative consequences; as a result, little is known about how feedback hampers resilience and other employee outcomes.

To contribute to the debate on feedback and employee outcomes, this track invites papers which address the following questions:

- How can leaders create a feedback culture in their organisations?
- What does the shift to the culture of feedback mean for the HRM function? What impact does feedback culture have on the HRM resilience?
- How does context affect effective feedback interventions? How can organizations ensure that employees account for the situational characteristics in seeking and giving feedback?
- What are the implications of feedback on employees' career outcomes compared to the effects of performance evaluations?
- What are the negative consequences of the feedback relationships among employees and between employees and managers? What do we collectively know about feedback interventions today?
- How should PM be redesigned to foster resilience and what is the role of feedback in this process?

References

- Gorbatov, S., & Lane, A. (2018). Is HR Missing the Point on Performance Feedback? *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 59(4), 65–71. <https://sloanreview.mit.edu/article/is-hr-missing-the-point-on-performance-feedback/>
- Gorbatov, S., Lane, A. M., & Richmond, T. J. (2020). Performance Management at AbbVie. In E. D. Pulakos & M. Battista (Eds.), *Performance Management Transformation* (pp. 43–63). Oxford University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190942878.003.0003>
- Kim, Y. J., & Kim, J. (2019). Does Negative Feedback Benefit (or Harm) Recipient Creativity? The Role of the Direction of Feedback Flow. *Academy of Management Journal*, amj.2016.1196.
<https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2016.1196>
- Lechermeier, J., & Fassnacht, M. (2018). How do performance feedback characteristics influence recipients' reactions? A state-of-the-art review on feedback source, timing, and valence effects. *Management Review Quarterly*, 68(2), 145–193. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11301-018-0136-8>
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-020-09689-1>
- Murphy, K. R. (2019). Performance evaluation will not die, but it should. *Human Resource Management Journal*, December 2018, 1748-8583.12259. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12259>

DO RESPONSIBLE ORGANIZATIONS BUILD EMPLOYEE RESILIENCE? AND HOW CAN HRM HELP?

Sabrina El Baroudi¹, Wenjing Cai^{1,2}, Svetlana Khapova¹

¹Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, ²University of Science and Technology of China

No longer do organizations aspire to be solely shareholder driven. In today's world, organizations flourish when creating social good: taking responsibility for providing solutions to current societal, economic and ecological challenges. Indeed, research shows that many organizations have either engaged in transformation into more responsible organizations (Murcia, Panwar & Tarzijan, 2020), or have plans for imminent strategic organizational change (Glavas & Fitzgerald, 2020). Such organizations use HR practices to cultivate responsible employees.

While much research has raised awareness about organizational transformations towards more responsible and sustainable organizations, little research addresses what such transformation means for employees and leaders. During societal crises, such as the Covid-19 pandemic (He & Harris, 2020) and the world-wide Black Live Matters protests, responsible organizations can help employees build resilience, so they can adapt to challenging new circumstances at work, and to societal changes. However, whether, and how responsible organizations build such resilience remains unclear. Limited research exists on the role of HRM in transitioning to and practicing, sustainable and responsible organizational behaviour (Stahl, Brewster, Collings & Hajro, 2020). In addition, little is known about the role of HRM in building employee resilience during societal crises.

We invite papers which examine these topics, specifically, papers which address the following:

- Which leader behaviours are needed to make such organizational strategic shifts, and sustain a responsible organizational future?
- How do responsible organizations build employee resilience? How do they design HR practices for this purpose?
- How do employees contribute to sustainable and responsible organizations? How do employees respond to societal crises in responsible organizations?
- What is the role of HR in the organizational transformation towards more responsible organizations?
- How do responsible organizations respond to societal crises such as the Covid-19 pandemic and Black Lives Matter protests? How do they help employees cope with such crises by for example, helping them build resilience? What is the role of leaders, employees and HRM in this matter?

References

- Glavas, A. & Fitzgerald, E. (2020). The process of voluntary radical change for corporate social responsibility: The case of the dairy industry. *Journal of Business Research*, 110, 184–201.
- He, H. & Harris, L. (2020) The impact of Covid-19 pandemic on corporate social responsibility and marketing philosophy. *Journal of Business Research*, 116, 176-182.
- Murcia, MJ, Panwar, R., & Tarzijan, J. (2020). Socially responsible firms outsource less. *Business & Society*.
- Stahl, G.K., Brewster, C.J., Collings, D.G. & Hajro, A. (2020). Enhancing the role of human resource management in corporate sustainability and social responsibility: A multi-stakeholder, multidimensional approach to HRM. *Human Resource Management Review*, 30(3), 2-16.

STRATEGIC HRM AND ORGANIZATIONAL AGILITY IN UNCERTAIN TIMES

Robin Bauwens¹, Renee De Reuver¹, Jaap Paauwe¹, Anthony Nyberg²
¹Tilburg University, ² University of South-Carolina

Contemporary organizations deal with many unpredictable challenges (e.g., fluctuating financial markets, digital transformation, Brexit, COVID-19) which requires enhanced organizational *agility*, underscoring organizations' dynamic capabilities in continuously and flexibly adapting to a turbulent environment (Nijssen & Paauwe, 2012). Organizational agility is characterized by high adaptability, swift organizational learning, tolerance for uncertainty, and rudimentary planning (Cunha et al., 2020).

Central to organizational *agility* is the importance of a *shared mindset or vision*, which provides organizations and their employees with a general sense of purpose and meaning in uncertain times, yet allows for sufficient freedom when translated into actions and management practices. Therefore, organizational agility shows itself in many guises and can be *witnessed at many levels* throughout an organization (e.g., organizational, team, or individual). Since creating purpose and meaning is one of the core functions of HRM, it could act as a catalyst for agility at these various levels (Teece et al., 2016; Nijssen & Paauwe, 2012). HRM could support the transformation towards more flat, participatory organizations that allow for more immediate responses, or it could create stimulating organizational learning.

On the other hand, organizational agility also challenges HRM for example, aligning employees in 'chaordic' (team) structures or developing employees' skills and competences to work more autonomously, and deal with new demands. Moreover, HRM can be the cause of unwanted rigidity because of an emphasis on written rules and regulations, which remove required flexibility. In this sense HRM systems and practices can act both as enablers and inhibitors allowing agility on multiple levels within an organization.

Therefore, the aim of this track is to better understand the relation between strategic HRM, and organizational agility. To that end, we invite papers which discuss, but are not limited to, the following topics:

The organization level:

- What is the role of HRM (e.g., HPWS, HIWP) in fostering and maintaining organizational agility/dynamic capabilities at different levels in the organization?
- Does HRM enable or rather inhibit organizational agility?

The team level:

- What HR practices, systems or leader approaches foster or hinder team agility?
- What drivers, contextual factors and outcomes stimulate or impede the effectiveness of agile teams?
- How can we realize alignment/fit in agile teams? How can we ensure that efforts are still in line with the shared vision/mindset, and that of the broader organization?

The individual level:

- How do employees perceive and respond to agile ways of working? Think of the current 'scrum' approach.
- Do agile ways of working create more resilient employees? Or rather, does the agile approach to HRM constitute a form of task intensification?
- How does agility relate to employee outcomes such as well-being?

Cunha, M. P., Gomes, E., Mellahi, K., Miner, A. S., & Rego, A. (2020). Strategic agility through improvisational capabilities: Implications for a paradox sensitive HRM. *Human Resource Management Review*, 30(1), 100695.

Nijssen, M., & Paauwe, J. (2012). HRM in turbulent times: how to achieve organizational agility? *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 23(16), 3315-3335.

Teece, D., Peteraf, M., & Leih, S. (2016). Dynamic capabilities and organizational agility: Risk, uncertainty, and strategy in the innovation economy. *California Management Review*, 58(4), 13-35.

TEAM RESILIENCE – SPANNING BOUNDARIES TO DEAL WITH DISRUPTIONS

Thom de Vries¹, Nevena Ivanović¹

¹ *University of Groningen*

Organizational teams are inevitably confronted with a host of adverse events, ranging from malfunctioning equipment to the recent COVID-19 pandemic. Dealing with such disruptions requires collaboration and coordination between teams inside and outside the organization (i.e., boundary spanning). Such boundary spanning enables teams to access external resources and obtain outside assistance for dealing with disruptions, and allows them to discuss, clarify, and align countermeasures. Boundary spanning may thus enable teams to minimize the adverse consequences of disruptions and, as such, ensure team resilience. At the same time, some studies suggest that boundary-spanning activities may also drain the limited time available for core internal team tasks, which can negatively influence a team’s ability to deal with disruptions. Specifically, when teams engage in more and more boundary spanning, they may become overloaded by external requests for support and coordination. Teams may consequently fail to minimize disruptive consequences. Moreover, team members may perceive their boundary-spanning colleagues as “selling out” and “draining valuable resources” from the team (Gibson & Dibble, 2013, p. 710) thereby potentially further reducing the team’s effectiveness at dealing with such disruptions.

To support the debate about team boundary spanning and resilience, this track invites papers which examine:

- Contingencies to the team boundary spanning-resilience relationship related to the characteristics of the disruptions faced by teams. This includes research focused for example, on examining what kind of disruption characteristics may increase (or decrease) the importance of team boundary spanning.
- Contingencies to the team boundary spanning-resilience relationship related to other collaboration and coordination processes, for example, how can within-team collaboration activities and formal coordination procedures within the firm, enable effective team boundary spanning?
- Examples of effective team boundary spanning in a disruptive context. Research focusing on questions such as: when (in which phase of the process) do teams need to engage in boundary spanning; in which circumstances is it particularly beneficial to refrain from boundary spanning; how many or which team members should be involved in the boundary spanning effort; should boundary spanning be executed by team leaders or members; and how can critical knowledge be spread across teams most effectively through boundary spanning?
- Antecedents that can enable team members to engage in effective boundary spanning for dealing with disruptions. Example research questions could include: how can HR professionals and leaders motivate team members’ boundary spanning; and what kind of capacities enable team members to engage in effective boundary spanning?
- Additional outcomes of team boundary spanning beyond resilience.

Gibson, C. B., & Dibble, R. (2013). Excess may do harm: Investigating the effect of team external environment on external activities in teams. *Organization Science*, 24(3), 697–715.

Joshi, A., Pandey, N., & Han, G. (2009). Bracketing team boundary spanning: An examination of task-based, team-level, and contextual antecedents. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 30, 731–759.

Marrone, J. A. (2010). Team boundary spanning: A multilevel review of past research and proposals for the future. *Journal of Management*, 36(4), 911–940.

Quick, K. S., & Feldman, M. S. (2014). Boundaries as junctures: Collaborative boundary work for building efficient resilience. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 24(3), 673–695.

LEARNING, DEVELOPMENT AND TALENT MANAGEMENT IN A RESILIENT SOCIETY

Sasa Batistic¹, Christina Meyers¹, Sanne Nijs¹, Rob Poell¹, Marianne van Woerkom^{1,2}
¹Tilburg University, ²Erasmus University Rotterdam

The development and resilience of a society's workforce largely depends on organizational investment in individual, team and organizational development. Although organizations devote many resources to training and development, the gap between acquired knowledge in training, and actual sustained workplace performance is not easy to bridge. The most important source of learning moreover, is work itself, and interactions with other people in the workplace.

Managers play an important role in stimulating employee development. In doing so, they often focus on the deficits of their employees, aiming at 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 nurturing employee talents. These Talent Management 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. Research is needed on how both foci are related to individual and organizational resilience.

Learning in organizations is both an individual and collective process. Many organizations have adopted team-based structures. Since team members can interact with one another, knowledge and skills gathered by one team member can be transferred to others. Organizational learning processes, which lead to knowledge creation, are important for improving resilience, competitiveness and sustainability.

Environmental and societal change for example, the COVID-19 pandemic, prompt organizations to become more resilient to ensure business survival, and call for a re-evaluation and potential change in current learning and development practices.

In view of the conference theme on HRM for resilient societies, research questions focusing on the societal dimension of learning, development and Talent Management for resilience, are encouraged. We invite high-quality submissions that discuss, but are not limited to, the following topics:

- To what extent do workers have equal access to learning and development opportunities? How can organizations reduce inequalities?
- What is the societal impact of (and mechanism behind) unequal access to learning and development?
- How can organizations design, deliver, and facilitate the transfer of training which contributes to increased performance at an individual, team, and organizational level?
- How can organizations design and facilitate inclusive talent development which contributes towards more sustainable employment?
- Examination of the roles and responsibilities of different stakeholders (employees, employers, governmental agencies) in developing more resilient workers and societies.
- Examination of novel ways to stimulate resilience, agility and learning in virtual teams.

We especially invite contributions exploring the above issues using advanced research designs: multi-source data, multi-level modelling, social network analyses, and others.

THE FUTURE OF PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT IN THE 21ST CENTURY

Adelien Decramer¹, Mieke Audenaert¹, Robin Bauwens², Beatrice van der Heijden³, Eveline Schollaert¹
¹ Ghent University, ² Tilburg University, ³ Radboud University

Performance management, defined as a comprehensive set of practices for developing employees' performance, such as goal setting and performance appraisal, has received a lot of criticism from scholars and professionals over the last decade. Despite being heralded as 'the lynchpin of strategic human resource management' (Tweedie, Wild, Rhodes, & Martinov-Bennie, 2019, p. 76) it seems that performance management systems do not live up to their developmental potential and are prone to unintended side effects such as harming employee well-being, stimulating unethical behaviour, and increasing administrative burdens (Pulakos, Mueller-Hanson, R., & Arad, 2019). New challenges, such as digital transformation, workforce diversity, and the recent COVID-19 pandemic, potentially require further changes to the traditional approach to performance management.

Is performance management still relevant and useful during the COVID-19 crisis?

Resilient organizations thrive despite huge challenges (Lengnick-Hall et al., 2011). What is the role of performance management in resilient organizations? In responding to a rapidly changing environment, organizations might consider more continuous or 'agile' forms of performance management (Yim et al., 2020). Another series of challenges are changes in the expectations of employees and other stakeholders for example, contemporary employees might require more regular performance feedback (Posthuma et al., 2018) or performance feedback with a greater understanding of their unique strengths and talents (Van Woerkom & Kroon, 2020).

Research papers which contribute to our understanding of performance management and employee outcomes in the context of 21st century challenges and changing stakeholder expectations are welcomed. We invite papers which discuss, but are not limited to, the following topics:

- Are performance management systems a necessity for 21st century organizations, or can they be replaced by other HR systems/practices?
- Which performance management practices contribute to developing employee and organizational resilience?
- Does performance management in 'rough times' require a new approach? What can performance management learn from the recent COVID-19 pandemic or other recent crises?
- How do multifaceted distal and proximal contextual features (e.g., organizational, market and cultural) intervene or determine the performance management-employee outcomes linkage?
- What are the implications of continuous performance management systems for career management? How are performance goals reconciled with career goals in a continuous performance management system?
- Which leadership styles fit well with 21st century performance management demands?
- What is the most effective performance management training approach for example, gaming or virtual reality?
- How does digital transformation within an organization affect the delivery and effectiveness of any given performance management system (e.g., electronic performance management, HR analytics, feedback apps or online reviews)?

Lengnick-Hall, C. A., Beck, T. E., & Lengnick-Hall, M. L. (2011). Developing a capacity for organizational resilience through strategic human resource management. *Human resource management review*, 21(3), 243-255.

Pulakos, E. D., Mueller-Hanson, R., & Arad, S. (2019). The Evolution of Performance Management: Searching for Value. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 6, 249-271.

Tweedie, D., Wild, D., Rhodes, C., & Martinov-Bennie, N. (2019). How does performance management affect workers? Beyond human resource management and its critique. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 21(1), 76-96.

Van Woerkom, M., & Kroon, B. (2020). The Effect of Strengths-Based Performance Appraisal on Perceived Supervisor Support and the Motivation to Improve Performance. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 1883.

Yim, J., Sullivan, D. W., Schleicher, D. J., Baumann, H. M., Lucianetti, L., & Koufteros, X. (2020). Performance Management and Innovation: A Human Capital Perspective. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 1, 12318.

TRACK 24

TALENT MANAGEMENT AND EMPLOYER BRANDING DURING AND BEYOND 'ROUGH' TIMES

Greet Van Hoye¹, Eveline Schollaert¹, Sophie De Winne³, Diane Arijs³ & Dirk Buyens^{1,2}
¹Ghent University, ²Vlerick Business School, ³KU Leuven

During the COVID-19 pandemic, organizations underwent drastic changes in the way they communicate with both *potential* applicants and *current* employees (Argenti, 2020), changes further impacted by the digitization of internal HR processes (Carpentier, Van Hoye, & Weijters, 2019); redesigned career paths; and strategic workforce plans in order to adjust to a new normal (Callanan, Perri & Tomkowicz, 2017). In general, turbulence calls for a redesign in the way organizations recruit, select, and develop skills for a new generation of employees in accordance with their needs (Mihalcea, 2017). However, organizations' response to pandemics, economic crises, or dynamic turbulence can affect their attractiveness to both *external* and *internal* target groups. Even companies readjusting to meet current needs, need to remain attractive, in order to retain their most critical and valued talents, and enable talent acquisition in the future.

Talent Management and employer branding remain key HR functions, helping to guide organizations through tough times (Theurer, Tumasjan, Welpe, & Lievens, 2018). In this track, we welcome discussion on how HR processes can help to attract and shape talent as a key human resource, according to company-specific, candidate, and employee resilience needs, during and beyond rough times.

To support the debate about attracting and shaping talent during and beyond rough times, this track invites papers which discuss such topics such as:

- How do crises or pandemics affect organizations' talent acquisition and employer branding processes?
- How does a company's response to 'rough' times affect its image and attractiveness as an employer, for both potential applicants and current employees?
- How can organizations live up to their promise as an employer, and retain their current personnel, even in tough times?
- How can organisations strengthen from within by using internal mobility, and by retaining their high performers?
- What changes can be made to improve recruitment, remote selection and onboarding, and how might these impact candidate/employee experience and wellbeing?
- Which are the most effective talent management and employer branding digital tools in identifying key positions, recruitment, and developing the talent pool?
- Which lessons can be learned from crises or pandemics, and integrated into Talent Management and employer branding processes beyond tough times?

Argenti, P. A. (2020). Communicating through the coronavirus crisis. *Harvard Business Review*, 13-03.

Retrieved from

https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5ea64a6b9614427b0ff93e6d/t/5ea8dfe66ade3c4d2c0d3333/1588125670651/HBR_Comm_Through_Coronavirus.PDF

Callanan, G. A., Perri, D. F., & Tomkowicz, S. M. (2017). Career management in uncertain times: Challenges and opportunities. *The Career Development Quarterly*, 65(4), 353-365.

Carpentier, M., Van Hoye, G., & Weijters, B. (2019). Attracting applicants through the organization's social media page: Signaling employer brand personality. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 115, Article Number 103326.

Mihalcea, A. (2017). Employer branding and talent management in the digital age. *Management Dynamics in the Knowledge Economy*, 5(2), 289-306.

Theurer, C. P., Tumasjan, A., Welpe, I. M., & Lievens, F. (2018). Employer branding: A brand equity-based literature review and research agenda. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 20, 155-179.

IS THERE ROOM FOR EVERYONE'S TALENT? TALENT MANAGEMENT IN ACADEMIA

Milou Habraken¹, Tanya Bondarouk², Jennifer Herek², Kim Huijpen³

¹HIVA-KU Leuven, ²University of Twente, ³VSNU

The type of work we do as scholars is not just intellectual, but also has consequences in terms of our identities and our careers (Fotaki et al., 2020). Teaching and research are typically the ways through which individual academics enhance their identity, but we can also consider aspects like public speaking, mentoring young scholars, writing blogs, and media appearances. Both points stress the relevance of nuances and variety. Consequently, in academia we should strive not for the notion behind the popular slogan: 'a war for talent', but we must create room for *everyone's* talent. In addition, what is needed for a resilient outcome is a balanced approach, one that pays attention to both the organisation and individuals simultaneously: a lens, which thus far appears to be underexposed as there are hardly any interventions aimed at linking talent to organisational and *team* goals (Celant & Veenkamp, 2020). The notion of *teamwork* may facilitate the exploration of a more balanced Talent Management (TM) approach. Yet *teams* in and of itself is also a relevant topic when striving for resilience in TM in academia, especially since academic work is a collective endeavour (Gold et al., 2016). The academic world unites us all: how can our talents be supported, challenged, and promoted?

In this track we call for contributions which seek solutions to support *everyone's* talent in the academic world, a necessity if we are to enhance resilience within society. We are especially interested in showcasing innovative practices of institutional requirements, in managing talent in academia. We welcome innovative concepts of academic "performance" that move beyond a traditional triangle of research, teaching, and knowledge valorisation. Papers which show how academia can promote and diversify talent, and remain critical, while not "running out of steam", are welcome.

To support the debate about a broader approach to talent management in academia, this track invites papers which discuss such topics such as:

- Theoretical approaches to support a balanced approach to TM in academia
- Performance assessment of the academic work
- HRM interventions which link talent to organisational, or team goals in academia
- Talent management practices as a collective academic endeavour
- Non-conventional TM assessment methods.

Celant, J., & Veenkamp, W. (2020). *Duurzaam benutten van talent: hoe doe je dat? Koppeling van talent aan werkactiviteiten en organisatiedoelen*. A publication [e-book] of the Social Innovation research group associated with the Windesheim University of Applied Sciences. Accessible, in July 2020, via <https://www.innovatiefinwerk.nl/nieuw-organiseren-motivatie/2020/05/duurzaam-benutten-van-talent-hoe-doe-je-dat>.

Fotaki, M., Antoni, A., & Islam, G. (2020). On Doing Work That Matters and Leading Meaningful Lives in Academia. Call for submissions to the Sub-Theme 35, EGOS, 2020.

Gold, J., Oldroyd, T., Chesters, E., Booth, A., & Waugh, A. (2016). Exploring talenting: talent management as a collective endeavour. *European Journal of Training and Development*, 40(7), 513-533.