

**Development and fairness of career opportunities and its impact on commitment
and trust**

Krystyna Joanna Zaleska

Lynda Gratton

London Business School

Sussex Place

Regent's Park

London NW1 4SA

UK

Tel: 0044 207 706 6726

Fax: 0044 207 724 83 57

Email: kzaleska@london.edu

Email: Lgratton@london.edu

**Development and fairness of career opportunities and its impact on commitment
and trust**

ABSTRACT

This research examines whether the relationship between the role of different practices in development of employees and their commitment and trust are mediated by perceptions of discrimination and non-performance mobility channels in career opportunities. Using a sample of 1592 employees of different age, gender and tenure from 7 different organisations this study test for mediator effects using hierarchical regression. The results suggest that perceptions of unfairness do not mediate such relationships. Further analyses indicated that older employees were found to be more sensitive to perceived barriers in career opportunities in contrast to younger employees. This implies that for late career employees non-discriminatory procedures of policies of career management are crucial in maintaining their level of organisational commitment and trust.

Key words: career development, fairness, commitment and trust

INTRODUCTION

As organisations continue to flatten and restructure there is a view that career development in these increasingly 'boundaryless' organisations will be associated with lateral transfers, coaching and mentoring rather than the upward promotional advancement of hierarchical organisations (Arthur & Rousseau, 1996). Moreover, it has been proposed that this lateral, boundaryless model has clear advantages since, unlike the fast-tracks associated with hierarchical advancement they offer development opportunities which are more accessible to employees on the basis of their ability, but also in terms of age and tenure (Lawrence, 1990; Arnold, 1997). However, against this optimistic view, studies of organisational reality suggest that the boundaryless system is difficult to build, and that employee themselves are often unable to adjust to the new demands of a career defined in terms of development rather than promotion (Murrell, Frieze & Olson, 1996; Peirpel & Van Der Sluis, 1999). In this paper we examine a range of non-hierarchical career development practices in a sample of contemporary organisations.

We propose that in this relationship an individual's perception of career management practices takes two major forms: first, their opportunity to experience development practices (for example, coaching, secondment, mentoring) and second, by the broader context of equality of opportunity and fairness in which the practice takes place. The second factor is particularly crucial. These aspects are important in non-hierarchical career development since the aspiration in flatter organisations is to develop every employee, not just 'high fliers', thereby offering the opportunities of development for all employees regardless of their

individual differences. However, less formalised career management systems and more fluid career paths leave employees with decreased personal predictability and possibly control, thereby potentially creating more opportunity for discrimination, politics or favouritism.

These issues of changes in the nature of career practices are particularly pertinent since it has been hypothesised that an individual's experiences and attitudes in career practices play a role in the development of their attitude to the company (Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997), and in this the justice and fairness with which they are perceived can be crucial (Moorman, 1991; McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992). In fact, some have gone as far to argue that justice had more impact on career satisfaction than the actual outcome of career management in terms of salary progression or the level in the organisation (Orpen & Andrews 1993; Herriot & Pemberton, 1996). In this paper we are interested in the extent to which employee attitudes of trust and commitment are influenced by their perception of the justice of the career practices they experience.

The broader research findings on the impact of justice and fairness on commitment and trust suggest that organisational fairness impacts employee attitudes toward the organisation and its authorities (McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992; Schaubroeck, May Brown, 1994). But we have less understanding of the relationship between career practices and employee outcomes such as trust and commitment (Kramer & Tyler, 1996; Meyer & Allen, 1998). We believe these are an important variables to consider since attitudes of trust and commitment are crucial in the development of basic relationship between employee and organisation. It is for this reason that the primary aim of this research is to examine the extent of the relationship between career practices and trust and commitment.

In understanding these issues in more detail we involved a wide group of employees as in our sample since the majority of research on specific procedural components of career management systems has been conducted in samples of single organisations or among MBA students at an early stage of their career (Schneer & Reitman, 1997; Hendry & Jenkins, 1997). Very little research has been conducted cross-organisationally and on heterogeneous samples of employees in later career stages. In examining these relationships we believe it is crucial that we consider the experiences of a wide range of employees. Past research has suggested that career attitudes are influenced by demographic factors such as age, gender, education and tenure (Stroth, Brett & Reilly, 1992; Schneer & Reitman, 1995). We also know that employees attitudes, career goals and levels of motivation depend in part on their life-career stages, (Herriot & Pemberton, 1996). Other studies indicate that mobility channels vary among different types of organisation and among different samples of employees (Beehr & Taber, 1993; Murrell, Frieze & Olson, 1996). This suggests that a more sophisticated exploration of individual differences, and perceptions of career development opportunities and organisationally relevant attitudes is required.

HYPOTHESES

The relationship between career practices and commitment and trust

The first group of hypotheses are based on assumption that development in itself does not guarantee the commitment and trust of employees if career progression is still understood in terms of hierarchical advancement and increasing seniority (Schein, 1996). Although, the academic world is calling for redefinition of career success, a traditional career model defined by upward progression and uninterrupted climb up the organisational ladder is still very present and popular among employees (Nicholson, 1996). In particular, development through rotations and lateral mobility maybe regarded as a threat by employees who have desires and expectations of more hierarchical career movement. Even if organisations are able to offer the conditions under which individuals may increase their skills and improve their core competencies, it remains to be seen whether individuals have sufficient faith to embrace this model of career and what are the effects of it in terms of such organisational attitudes as commitment and trust. So it is important to examine how different career practices influence employee commitment and trust. The following hypotheses will be considered:

H-1: Experiences of self-development practices will be positively related to commitment and trust.

H-2: Experiences of secondments will be positively related to commitment and trust.

H-3: Experiences of coaching will be positively related to commitment and trust.

H-4: Experiences of mentoring will be positively related to commitment and trust.

The next two clusters of hypotheses consider the impact of justice and fairness as a potential moderator in the relationship between an individual's experience of career practices and their feelings of trust and commitment towards the organisation. We look at justice in two ways; first, through feelings of discrimination the individual may have, and secondly through the perception of non-performance mobility channels as affecting their career opportunities.

The impact of discrimination on the relationship between career practices and commitment and trust

With regard to discrimination, we are dealing here with discrimination as any individual behaviour or institutional procedures which may deny an individual certain rights because they belong to a specific group. In particular organisational career systems (i.e. procedures of recruitment, selection, transfers and development) which yield to very personal employee outcomes are the most exposed to discrimination (Pettigrew & Martin, 1987; Essed, 1991). These specific personnel management procedures can be discriminatory for the very reason of dealing with decisions concerning individual differences. When specific individuals are denied by virtue of their individual features such as for example age or disability, access to jobs and transfers which they are capable of performing their commitment and trust can be broken. Many organisations have styled themselves as 'equal opportunities employers' but

what this means varies in practice. New analyses have to be undertaken whether organisational practices support this claim. The next four hypotheses will be therefore:

H-5: Discrimination in career opportunities will mediate the relation between self-development practices and commitment and trust.

H-6: Discrimination in career opportunities will mediate the relation between secondments and commitment and trust.

H-7: Discrimination in career opportunities will mediate the relation between coaching and commitment and trust.

H-8: Discrimination in career opportunities will mediate the relation between mentoring and commitment and trust.

The impact of non-performance mobility channels on the relationship between career practices and commitment and trust

In the final cluster of hypotheses we examine the role of non-performance mobility channels in career related attitudes. If boundaryless careers are about lateral moves and mobility, then the criteria upon which allocation of these developmental resources are made can be important determinants to the overall perception of the processes. Studies on non-performance mobility criteria examine the impact of discrimination, luck, favouritism or politics on employee's perception of their career prospects (Landau & Hammer, 1986; Beehr & Juntunen, 1990). For example, Beehr and Taaber (1993) found that satisfaction with promotion, job satisfaction and turnover intention were significantly related to

perceptions of fairness of performance-based mobility criteria versus criteria based on non role-irrelevant personal factors such as gender, race or appearance and factors such as luck or favouritism. If employees can distinguish among mobility channels based on reliable role performance and on non-performance factors such as personal characteristics or luck and favouritism these perceptions have to be analysed in relation to such organisational relevant outcomes as commitment and trust. The final group of hypotheses are therefore:

H-9: Non-performance mobility channels will mediate the relation between self-development practices and commitment and trust.

H-10: Non-performance mobility channels will mediate the relation between secondments and commitment and trust.

H-11: Non-performance mobility channels will mediate the relation between coaching and commitment and trust.

H-12: Non-performance mobility channels will mediate the relation between mentoring and commitment and trust.

METHOD

Sample

This study is a part of larger longitudinal study which focuses on the alignment of HR strategy and HR practices with business goals in seven UK based organisations all of which have undergone a significant amount of downsizing and restructuring in the 1990s. In each organisation we identified one UK based business unit and surveyed a representative sample of its employees. During 1996 and 1997 we sampled 10-20 percent of the total population of each chosen business unit. 1592 completed questionnaires were returned with a response rate of 56 percent. The sample was 50 percent female and 50 percent male. Thirty one percent were under 30 years of age, 40 percent between 31 and 40 years of age, and 28 percent were over 41. With regard to tenure, 26 percent had worked for the company for less than 5 years, 27 percent between six and ten years and 46 percent over 10 years.

Measures

Career development practices. The measures of career management practices were designed to trace any non-hierarchical developmental experiences. Employees were asked: 'Which of the following have played a significant role in your development?' the nine response categories are presented in table 1. All items were rated on a five point rating scale from 1 (Very significant) to 5 (Not at all significant), so that a higher score indicated lower standing on the measure.

Factor analysis of the results of the nine items yielded three factors. Two of these factors formed reliable scales: one that we have defined as development through secondment (Cronbach's alpha coefficient = 0.73) and the other that we have defined as self development (Cronbach's alpha coefficient = 0.70). Only two items fell into the third component (too few to form a scale), so each of these items, relating to coaching and mentoring, were used for further analysis as unique variables.

Insert Table 1

Discrimination. This scale measured barriers in career opportunities in terms of lack of equal opportunities which violate the rule of equality (Deutsch, 1975). In the context of career management the rule of equality was translated into whether all individuals believed they has an equal chance of receiving career opportunities regardless of their individual differences such as age, gender, marital status or disability. The rule of equality was measured by one general item: 'Do you feel your career options are in any way limited within your organisation on the basis of? The seven response categories are presented in table 2.

All items were rated on a five point rating scale from 1 (To a great extent) to 5 (Not at all) and were scored such that a higher score indicated lower standing on the measure.

Non-performance mobility channels. Perceptions of unfairness of career opportunities were manipulated by different non-performance organisational mobility channels. The general question ‘How much are your career opportunities affected by each of the following factors?’ had four response categories presented in Table 2. All items were rated on a five point rating scale from 1 (Greatly) to 5 (Not at all) and were scored such that a higher score indicated lower standing on the measure. Factor analysis of these two scales showed that two measures can be created, discrimination (Cronbach’s alpha coefficient = 0.83), and non-performance mobility channels (Cronbach’s alpha coefficient = 0.71).

Insert Table 2

Dependent variables

Commitment. This attitude was measured using the scale from the Organisational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) (Porter, Seers, Mowday & Boulian, 1974). The original scale comprised of 15 items that tap three elements of commitment; the belief and acceptance of the organisation’s goals and values, a willingness to exert effort on behalf of the organisation and a desire to maintain membership of the organisation. The statistical analysis of the scale revealed a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of 0.90.

Trust. This attitude was measured using the trust scale designed by Gabarro (1978) developed on the basis of trust as a characteristic of three aspects of the working relationships between superiors and subordinates. First, *integrity*, defined as the honesty in the relationship was measured by two items: 'I believe my employer has high integrity' and 'My employer is not always honest and truthful' (scale reversed). Secondly, *motives* defined as the perception of employers' intentions was measured by one response category: 'I general I believe my employer's motives are good'. Finally, *consistency* understood as the reliability and predictability of behaviour was measured by two items: 'I can expect my employer to treat me in a consistent and predictable fashion' and 'I don't think my employer treats me fairly'. The trust scale had a high Cronbach's alpha coefficient (0.81). For both commitment and trust scales all items were rated on a five point rating scale from 1 (Strongly Agree) to 5 (Strongly Disagree) and were scored such that a higher score indicated lower standing on the measure.

Control variables. Each respondent indicated his/her age, gender and tenure. We controlled for all of these variables in the analyses examining commitment and trust. Descriptive statistics for all the study variables are shown in table 3.

To sum up, the main variables in our conceptual model touch on the components of career systems such as various development practices and unfairness influencing career opportunities such as discrimination and non performance mobility channels that are thought to be linked to employee attitudes such as commitment and trust. Figure 1 is presenting this conceptual model which provided a base for our statistical analysis.

Insert Figure 1

RESULTS

H1– H4: The relationship between career experiences and trust and commitment

Hypothesis 1, 2, 3 and 4 suggested that individual experiences of development practices would be positively related to their organisational attitudes of commitment and trust. Specifically, their experiences of self-development practices, secondments, coaching and development. These hypotheses were first tested in the correlation matrix presented in table 3. This shows that all the relationships between the various career development experiences and trust and commitment are significant, with the highest correlation (0.23) between commitment and self-development practices (challenging jobs, own motivation, internal or external training).

Insert Table 3

We further examined this first cluster of hypotheses by computing a hierarchical moderated multiple regression with commitment and trust and dependent variables (presented in table 4). In this procedure the practices associated with the first four hypotheses were added in Step 1. Discrimination and non-performance mobility channels variables were entered on Step 2, and the terms representing the interactions on the final step. This order of entry

allowed the role of career development practices to be examined after statistically controlling for discrimination and non-performance variables mobility channels. The results provided consistent support for hypotheses 1, 2, 3 and 4. The experiences of these four development activities is positively related to trust and commitment and together account for a significant 14 percent of variance in commitment and 10 percent in trust.

Insert Table 4

H5–H12: The mediating impact of discrimination and non-performance mobility

Hypotheses 5, 6, 7 and 8 posited that the relationship between the career development experiences and trust and commitment would be mediated by the individual perception of discrimination. The unitary discrimination scale captured beliefs about discrimination around disability, sexual orientation, ethnicity, gender, marital status, flexibility and age. The beliefs about discrimination was captured on a scale rated from 1 (To a great extent) to 5 (Not at all). The mean score of 4.34 and SD of 0.76 shows that for this group of employees feelings of discrimination are relatively rare. However, those who do report a measure of discrimination are also significantly likely to report that their career opportunities are affected by non-performance mobility channels (correlation coefficient of 0.25). The correlations between perceptions of discrimination and trust and commitment, though low are significant and in the anticipated direction (-0.11 and -0.06 respectively).

The final cluster of hypotheses 9, 10, 11 and 12 proposed that non-performance mobility mediated the relationship between career development experiences and trust and commitment. These mobility channels (the part of the organisation you happen to work in, internal politics, how well you are liked personally by your boss and luck) are highly related to each other. As the mean score of 2.25 on a 5-point scale rated from 1 (Greatly) to 5 (Not at all) presented in Table 3 shows, people are more likely to report non-performance mobility channels than they are discrimination.

The mediatory impact of experiences of discrimination and non-performance mobility on the relationship between career development experiences and trust and commitment are explored through the hierarchical regression analyses presented in table 4. They are added at Step 2, and show an increased R square from .14 to .20 in commitment and .10 to .22 in trust. However, when the terms representing the hypothesised interactions were entered as a set, this set accounted for little additional variance in either commitment or trust (Step 3). On this step, only the interaction between non-performance mobility and specific career development experiences were significant predictors of either commitment (coaching) or trust (self development). Interesting the interaction for the non-performance and coaching was positive, i.e.; people who reported greater perception of non-performance mobility channels also reported more personal coaching. This is understandable as some of the aspects of non-performance; particularly 'How well you are liked personally by your current boss' could indeed be important in attracting a coaching or mentoring relationship.

Table 5 presents the hierarchical regression analyses to test role of control variables. To test these effects career development practices variables were entered on Step 1, discrimination and non performance mobility channels variables were entered on Step 2, and demographic variables were entered on Step 3. Terms representing the hypothesised interactions were entered on the final step. This order of entry allowed the relationship between unfairness in career opportunities and commitment and trust to be examined after statistically controlling for practices of development variables, and the relationship between demographics variables and commitment and trust to be examined after statistically controlling for career development variables and unfairness variables. The multiple regression analysis supported the notion that the demographics account for a significant portion of the variance in commitment and trust orientation beyond that accounted for by the development practices

variables. As a set, the direct effects for demographics predictors accounted for an additional 10 percent of the variance in commitment and 5 percent of the variance in trust beyond that accounted for by development practices and barriers variables (Step 2). On this step, secondments, traditional development, coaching, discrimination, non-performance mobility channels and age were significant predictors of commitment. The same variables were significant predictors of trust. However, when the terms representing the hypothesized interactions were entered as a set, this set accounted for little additional variance 2 percent in commitment and trust (Step 3). On this step, no interactions were found to be significant predictors of commitment and trust.

Insert Table 5

The impact of age

As hierarchical regression analysis indicated only age when interacting with different career development practices was significant in predicting trust and commitment. We have decided to perform further analysis of subgroup variance in order to know how specifically in each sub group of age categories independent variables influenced the commitment and trust scales. These are presented in table 6.

Insert table 6

The heterogeneity of the sample provided us with an opportunity to look beyond the career experiences of MBA students to how these issues and relationships played out in this wider, more representative group of employees. The descriptive statistics presented in table 3 provided some initial insights. With regard to age there are significant correlations between three career development experiences and age (secondment, self-development and coaching), and all four career development experiences and tenure. The positive nature of these correlations shows that greater experiences of these development activities (where a rating of 1 on a 5 point scale indicates very significant experience) is associated with youth (where a coding of 1 indicates up to 30 years of age).

With regard to the experiences of discrimination and non-performance mobility channels these are not significantly correlated with age. With regard to commitment, this attitude is not significantly correlated with age. Trust is not correlated with age, but there is a significant correlation between age and commitment (-.11), again the negative nature of this relationship signifying that older people (coded 1=up to 30, to 4=51 and over) are more committed (where 1 is higher commitment). These broad correlations tell us something about the extent of these relationships, but provide limited details of linearity.

For the youngest people in the sample (aged 30 and below) their attitudes of commitment and trust are influenced by their experiences of self-development (challenging jobs, training programmes) and being coached. Between the ages of 30 and 50 secondments (to another part of the organisation, move abroad or to special projects) begin to play a more significant role in the development of both commitment and trust, whilst self-development activities continue to remain important.

The nature of these relationships shed some interesting light on the impact of developmental experiences and life stages. Activities which are positively related to employee attitudes before the age of 40 have negative connotations post 40. So, whilst having a mentor was not significantly related to attitudes of commitment and trust for the under 40's (although being coached had some impact), for those people who are over 40, it was negatively related to commitment and trust. The same is true of secondments for people over the age of 50. Between the ages of 30 and 50 they are a source of commitment and trust, over 50 they are negatively related to these attitudes.

We also examined the impact of discrimination and non-performance channels on commitment and trust across the age groups in the sample. Feelings of being discriminated against had a negative impact on trust and commitment across all the ages and the extent of this relationship increased with age. The extent of non-performance mobility channels was negatively related to trust and commitment for all the age groups below 50. However, the extent of the relationship was only significant for trust, where the relationship became stronger with age (up to 50).

DISCUSSION

The triangulated findings from this study highlight a complex relationship between the role of career management practices, perceived unfairness in career opportunities and employee attitudes of commitment and trust. We found broad support for the hypothesised relationship between the role of a broad range of career management practices and attitudes of commitment and trust. For many people their experiences of self-development activities and

secondments were positively related to their perceptions of commitment and trust. This runs contrary to other studies which have reported that lateral moves have a negative impact on organisational commitment. (Murrell et al., 1996). This raises some interesting questions about the nature of horizontal career development on employee attitudes of commitment and trust.

Contrary to hypotheses 5 - 12 the role of career management practices in generating commitment and trust was not mediated by perception of unfairness in career opportunities. In tested model, the career management practices variables affected the dependent variables of commitment and trust, and unfairness variables (discrimination and non-performance mobility channels) affected commitment and trust, but career management practices variables did not affect unfairness variables. **These suggest that the variables such as discrimination and non-performance mobility channels operated as effective independent variables in their own right.** Lack of mediating effects of perceptions of unfairness in career opportunities indicates that relationship between the quantity of development and fairness of career processes may be more complex than it was initially conceived to be here.

However, when we examined the specific aspects of development in more detail it became clear that coaching has an interaction with non-performance mobility channels on positively influencing commitment and trust. This points to the importance of coaching in driving positive organisational attitudes, and in particular the role of coaching in overcoming the negative effects of organisational change such as downsizing and restructuring (Cameron, 1994). When politics and favouritism start to play a decisive role in the career opportunities of employees, then coaching emerges as an important tool in coping with organisational turbulence.

In this study we had the opportunity to observe these complex relationships across people of different ages. In doing so we found that age plays an important mediating role in the impact of career experiences on trust and commitment. There are two key areas for further research and discussion.

First, it is clear that developmental experiences play differing roles in the creation of trust and commitment across the career and tenure history of an individual. For example, whilst coaching is related to the creation of trust in the younger age group, for those who are over 40, experiences of mentoring is actually negatively related to both commitment and trust. We can only speculate that possible dysfunctional mentoring relationships within this group may have caused such reactions of employees (Scandura, 1998). Mentoring is associated with younger people, and could actually cause resentment for older people.

Secondly, the mediating role of discrimination and non-performance mobility channels on the relationship between developmental experiences and positive organisational attitudes changes with age. It appears that in the creation of commitment and trust, older employees are particularly sensitive to perceptions of barriers to career opportunities. There are a number of possible explanations for this. It may be that older employees are more vulnerable to the impact of unfairness since their psychological contract will tend to be more relational than transactional (Robinson & Rousseau, 1994). In exchange for their loyalty and years of service they anticipate paternalistic support and fairness to be present in organisational processes. For this age group their relational contract is based on the need of equality (Bierhoff, Cohen & Greenberg, 1986).

In downsizing organisation senior employees are more exposed to violations of organisational rules and have a greater opportunity to be exposed to a history of violations (Bierhoff et al. 1986). These violations occur because decisions are based on job-irrelevant characteristics such as age. This suggests that major transformations such as delaying or mergers and acquisitions challenge the viability of organisational commitment among older employees and in this group both the traditional model of career development and the fairness of career opportunities are central to the generation of trust. Our findings that attitudes such as commitment and trust derive from fair career opportunities supports the group-value theory which advocates that employees are particularly sensitive to treatment that communicates respect to them (Lind & Tyler, 1988; Lind, 1995). In the case of the senior group of employees that sensitivity is even more crucial.

Limitations

Several limitations of the study should be born in mind when interpreting the findings.

With regard to the scales, in the measurement practices of development scales we sought to explain the variation in the *value* and *quality* of development, but not the *quantity* that could moderate the effects of development on attitudes. Our model did not measure the fairness of each development practices in terms of its outcome and procedural fairness that also could have affect the attitudes of commitment and trust. With regard to the statistical analyses, the results of the regression analysis we undertook to determine causality showed some significant results. However, whilst significant, the R-squared values were quite low in some places, indicating that other factors are having an influence. Result might have varied had we measured the actual age and tenure in the organisation rather than having

respondents group their age and tenure in present categories. We are aware that our approach created a loss of variance.

The scales developed by previous research hold up well and are statistically reliable. New scales of career management practices, discrimination and non-mobility channels were created and proved to be reliable. Our heterogeneous sample enhanced the generalizability of our findings. The respondents in this study appeared to be a representative cross-section of employed adults. We were not able to make conclusions in this paper about the industry sectors, what we have reported are organisations going through change process, however the impact of industrial sector is possible and are worthy of future study. This suggests that career attitudes cannot be studied without concurrent study of the industrial setting in which they occur and they are sensitive to variations in the context.

Implications

This study has important implications for career management research since it integrates the study of career management as practices of development with the study of career management as processes in its impact on employee attitudes. Development and mobility are an integral two parts of career management systems whether they are traditional or boundaryless model.

This study sheds light on how commitment and trust can be maintained at mature career stages. In particular, it has allowed a deeper awareness of the role of different career development activities on the creation of trust and commitment for various age groups.

Development opportunities are more important in the creation of trust and commitment for younger employees. Perception of unfairness in career opportunities are more important for commitment and trust in-groups of older employees. This suggests that among older employees, it pays to use fair career management procedures since their commitment towards organisations can be increased by careful attention to procedural concerns and enforcing non-discriminatory policies (McEnrue, 1989; Feldman, 1996).

Based on these results the changing organisation can develop understanding of what development tools are still likely to lead to increased commitment and trust and what barriers are affecting the most the level of these attitudes. Culture which develops commitment and trust of employees through self development has still value both for individuals and organisation. Even if organisations have career management practices which are focused more on providing opportunities for growth and lateral development, they still have to place consideration on fair processes of career mobility. Career mobility channels which are more skill and merit based are better in retaining older employees than those in which networking and political games are flourishing (Cameron, 1994).

REFERENCES

Gabarro, J. J. 1978. The development of trust, influence, and expectations. In A.G. Athos & Gabarro J. J. **Interpersonal behaviour: Communication and understanding in relationships** (pp. 290-303). Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.

Arthur, M. B. & Rousseau, D. M. 1996. **A career lexicon for the 21st century.** *Academy of Management Executive*, 10: 28-39.

Arnold, J. 1997. **Managing careers Into the 21st Century**. Paul Chapman Publishing Ltd.

Baruch, Y. & Rosenstein, E. 1992. Human resource management in Israeli firms. **The International Journal of Human Resource Management**, 3: 477-211.

Beehr, T. & Taber, T. D. 1993. Perceived intra-organisational mobility versus exceptional performance as means to getting ahead. **Journal of Organisational Behaviour**, 14: 579-594.

Beehr, T. A. & Juntunen, D. L. 1990. Promotions and employees' perceived mobility channels: The effects of sex, employee group, and initial placement, **Human Relations** , 43: 455-472.

Bierhoff, H.W.; Cohen, R. L. & Greenberg, J. 1986. **Justice in social relations**. New York: Plenum

Cameron, K. S. 1994. Strategies for successful organisational downsizing. **Human Resource Management**, 33: 189-211.

Deutsch, M. 1975. Equity, equality and need: What determines which value will be used as the basis for distributive justice? **Journal of Social Issues**, 31:137-149.

Essed, P. 1991. **Every day racism: an interdisciplinary theory**. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Feldman, C. & Weitz, B. A. 1992. From the invisible hand to the Glad-hand: Understanding a careerist orientation to work. **Human Resource Management**, 30: 237-257.

Feldman, D. C. 1996. Managing careers in downsizing firms. **Human Resource Management**, 35 : 145-161.

Hall, D. T . 1976. **Careers in organisations** . Scott, Foresman, Glenview. IL

Herriot, P. & Pemberton, C. 1996. Contracting careers. **Human Relations** , 49: 757-790.

Herriot P., Gibbons, P., Pemberton, C., Jackson, P. R. 1994. An empirical model of managerial careers in organisations. **British Journal of Management**, 5 : 113-121.

Hendry, Ch. & Jenkins, R. 1997. Psychological contracts and new deals. **Human Resource Management**, 1: 38-44.

Kanter, E. 1977. **Men and women of the corporation**. New York, NY: Basic Books

Kanter, R. M. 1989. **When giants learn to dance** . New York: Simon & Schuster.

Kramer, R. M. & Tyler, T. R. 1996. **Trust in organisations: Frontiers of theory and research**. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.

Lawrence, B. S. 1990. At the cross-roads: A multiple level explanation of individual attainment, **Organisation Science**, 1: 65-85

Leach, J. 1977. The notion and nature of careers. **The Personnel Administrator**, 22: 53-63.

Lind, E. A. & Tyler, T. R. 1988. **The social psychology of procedural justice**. New York: Plenum

Lind, E. A. 1995. Justice and authority relations in organisations. In R. Cropanzano & Kacmar M. K (Eds). **Organisational politics, justice, and support: Managing the social climate of the workplace** (pp. 83-96). Westport, CT: Quorum Books.

Landau, J. & Hammer, T. H. 1986. Clerical employees' perceptions of intra-organisational career opportunities. **Academy of Management Journal**, 29: 385-404.

Mayo, A. 1991. **Managing careers: Strategies for organisations**. Institute of Personnel Management.

Meyer, J. P. & Allen, N. J. 1997. **Commitment in the workplace. Theory, research and application**. Sage Publications: Thousand Oaks: California.

Murrell, A. J.; Frieze I. H. & Olson, J. E. 1996. Mobility strategies and career outcomes: A longitudinal study of MBAs. **Journal of Vocational Behaviour**, 49: 324-335.

McEnrue, M. P. 1989. The perceived fairness of managerial promotion practices. **Human Relations** , 42: 815-827.

McFarlin, D. B. & Sweeney, P. D. 1992. Distributive and procedural justice as predictors of satisfaction with personal and organisational outcomes. **Academy of Management Journal**, 35: 626-637.

Nicholson, N. 1996. Career systems in crisis: Change and opportunity in the information age, **Academy of Management Executive** , 10:40-51.

Orpen, C. & Andrews, J. 1993. The impact of promotional procedures on career satisfaction, **Recruitment, Selection and Retention**, 2: 18-23.

Peiperl, M., A. & Van Der Sluis, E. C. 1999. The experience of boundarylessness: Job change, extrinsic and intrinsic career success among early-career MBAs. **Working Paper Series** No. 99-02. London Business School: London.

Pettigrew, T. & Martin, J. 1987. Shaping the organisational context for Black American inclusion. **Journal of Social Issues**, 43: 41-87.

Porter, L., Seers, R. M., Mowday R. T. & Boulian, P. V. 1974. Organisational commitment, satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. **Journal of Applied Psychology**, 59: 603-609.

Robinson, S. L. & Rousseau D. M. 1994. Violating the psychological contract: Not the exception but the norm. **Journal of Organisational Behaviour**, 15: 245-259.

Scandura, T. 1998. Dysfunctional mentoring relationships and outcomes. **Journal of Management**, 24: 449-467.

Schaubroeck, J., May, D. R. & Brown, F. W. 1994. Procedural justice explanations and employee reactions to economic hardship: A field experiment. **Journal of Applied Psychology**, 79: 455-460.

Schein, E. 1996; Career anchors revisited: Implications for career development in the 21 century. **Academy of Management Executive**, 10: 80-88

Schneer, J. A. & Reitman, F. 1995. The impact of gender as managerial career unfold. **Journal of Vocational Behaviour**, 47: 290-315.

Schneer, J. & Reitman, F. 1997. The interrupted managerial career path: A longitudinal study of MBAs. **Journal of Vocational Behaviour**. 51: 411-434.

Sparrow, P. R. 1996. Transitions in the psychological contract: Some evidence from the banking sector. **Human Resource Management Journal**, 6: 75-92.

Stroth, L. K. & Brett, J. M. & Reilly, A. H. 1992. All the right stuff. A comparison of female and male managers' career progression. **Journal of Applied Psychology**, 77: 251-260.

Table 1: Factor Analysis of Career Development Practices using Varimax Rotation

	Component		
	1	2	3
<u>Secondments</u>			
Secondment/move to another part of the organisation or other function	.815		
Secondment/move abroad	.788		
Secondment to special projects/teams	.770		
<u>Self development:</u>			
Being faced with challenging jobs		.825	
Your own motivation		.811	
Attending an internal training program		.547	
Attending an external training program		.497	
Coaching by your boss/another person			.834
Having a mentor to guide you			.806

Note: Extraction method = principal components analysis; Rotation method = varimax with Kaiser normalization

Table 2: Factor analysis of diversity and non-performance mobility channels using Varimax Rotation

	Component	
	1	2
<u>Discrimination:</u>		
Disability	.806	
Sexual orientation	.800	
Being a member of an ethnic minority	.737	
Marital status	.721	
Gender	.686	
Being unable to work flexible hours	.643	
Age	.638	
<u>Non-performance mobility channels:</u>		
The part of the organisation you happened to work in		.726
Internal politics		.712
How well you are liked personally by your current boss		.701
Luck: being in the right place when opportunities arise		.690

Note: Extraction method = principal components analysis; Rotation method = varimax with Kaiser normalization

Table 4: Hierarchical Regression Results with Commitment and Trust as the Dependent Variables

Predictors	Commitment									Trust								
	Step 1			Step 2			Step 3			Step 1			Step 2			Step 3		
	$\hat{\alpha}$	R ²	ΔR^2															
Secondment	.11**	.14***	.14	.11**	.20***	.06	-.22	.21**	.01	.09*	.10***	.10	.09**	.22***	.12	-.09	.23**	.01
Self development	.29***			.29**			.35			.17***			.17***			.44*		
Coaching	.08*			.08*			.05			.14**			.14**			.18		
Mentor	.00			.00			.22			.04			.02			.00		
Discrimination				-.19***			-.22						-.21***			-.26		
Non-performance mobility				-.10**			-.22						-.23***			-.05		
Secondment x Discrimination							.27									.19		
Self development x Discrimination							.01									-.05		
Coaching x Discrimination							-.29									-.23		
Mentor x Discrimination							-.04									.13		
Secondment x Non-performance mobility							.18									.03		
Self development x Non-performance							-.10									-.35*		
Coaching x Non-performance mobility							.38*									.22		
Mentor x Non-performance mobility							-.25									-.13		

* - significant at .05 level
 ** - significant at .01 level
 *** - significant at .001 level

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics and Correlations Among All Study Variables

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. Secondment	4.03	0.98	(.73)										
2. Self development	2.57	0.78	.39**	(.70)									
3. Coaching	2.59	1.21	.20**	.36**	-								
4. Mentor	3.40	1.24	.30**	.31**	.49**	-							
5. Discrimination	4.34	0.76	.01	-.02	.00	-.03	(.83)						
6. Non-performance mobility channels	2.25	0.74	.00	.05	-.02	-.05	.25**	(.71)					
7. Commitment	2.98	0.28	.13**	.23**	.09**	.08**	-.06*	.07**	(.90)				
8. Trust	2.84	0.36	.16**	.16**	.08**	.08**	-.11**	-.01	.24**	(.81)			
9. Age	2.02	0.89	.12**	.14**	.20**	.15	-.05	-.02	-.11**	.00	-		
10. Gender	n/a	n/a	.10**	.10**	.01	.00	-.16**	.04	.13**	.05	-.06*	-	
11. Tenure	3.15	0.94	.10**	.13**	.09**	.10**	-.14**	-.07**	.04	.04	.37**	-.08**	-

Note. *N* = 1592. Coefficient alpha reliabilities are reported in parentheses on the main diagonal where appropriate.

Age coded as 1=up to 30, 2=31 to 40, 3=41 to 50, 4=51 or over;

Gender coded as 1=male, 2=female;

Tenure coded as 1=up to 1 year, 2=2 to 5 years, 3=6 to 10 years, 4=over 10 years;

p < .05. ** *p* < .01.

Table 5: Hierarchical Regression Results with Commitment and Trust as the Dependent Variables

Predictors	Commitment									Trust								
	Step 1			Step 2			Step 3			Step 1			Step 2			Step 3		
	$\hat{\alpha}$	R ²	ΔR^2															
Secondment	.11	.20***	.20	.08*	.30***	.10	-.02	.32***	.02	.09**	.22	.22	.07*	.27***	.05	.06	.29***	.02
Self development	.29			.25***			.16			.17***			.16***			-.05		
Coaching	.08			.10**			.42			.14***			.15***			.48*		
Mentor	.00			.04			-.16			.02			.05			-.16		
Discrimination	-.19			-.17***			.11			-.21***			-.21***			-.01		
Non-performance mobility	-.20			-.11***			-.24			-.23***			-.23***			-.14		
													-.14***					
Age				-.13***			-.01						-.05			-.06		
Gender				.05			.31						.06			.31		
Tenure				.02			-.31									-.27		
Secondment x Age							.09									.17		
Development x Age							.14									.17		
Coaching x Age							.10									.03		
Mentor x Age							-.25									-.29		
Discrimination x Age							-.22									-.17		
Non-performance mobility x Age							.01									.01		
Secondment x Gender							-.12									.00		
Self development x Gender							-.17									-.01		
Coaching x Gender							-.07									-.11		
Mentor x Gender							.16									-.01		
Discrimination x Gender							-.27									-.36		
Non-performance mobility x Gender							.21									.08		
Non-performance mobility x Level							-.13									-.28		
Secondment x Tenure							-.06									-.19		
Self development x Tenure							.24									.26		
Coaching x Tenure							-.29									-.15		
Mentor x Tenure							.24									.18		
Discrimination x Tenure							.18									.33		
Non-performance mobility x Tenure							.08									-.03		

* - significant at .05 level
 ** - significant at .01 level
 *** - significant at .001 level

Table 6: Influence of age sub-categories on commitment and trust

COMMITMENT						
	Secondments	Self development	Coaching	Mentoring	Discrimination	Non-performance mobility channels
<i>Age:</i>						
Up to 30	.00	.31***	.16*	.01	-.16**	-.08
31 to 40	.17 **	.20**	.04	.07	-.18**	-.13
41 to 50	.22**	.40***	.16	-.22**	-.25**	-.09
Over 50	-.38*	.50**	.29	.15	-.30*	.08

TRUST						
<i>Age:</i>						
Up to 30	.05	.13*	.17*	.09	-.19**	-.20**
31 to 40	.11*	.17**	.14*	.05	-.21***	-.24***
41 to 50	.18*	.25**	.23**	-.24**	-.21**	-.35***
Over 50	-.15	.28	.19	.31	-.42*	.20

* significant at .05 level
 ** significant at .01 level
 ***significant at .001 level