

2023

Beyond Competing for Talent: An Integrative Framework for Coopetition in Talent Management in SMEs

Stefan Jooss

University College Cork, Ireland

Julia Lenz

Technological University Dublin, Ireland, julia.lenz@tudublin.ie

Ralf Burbach

Technological University Dublin, ralf.burbach@tudublin.ie

Follow this and additional works at: <https://arrow.tudublin.ie/tfschhmtart>



Part of the [Human Resources Management Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Jooss, Stefan; Lenz, Julia; and Burbach, Ralf, "Beyond Competing for Talent: An Integrative Framework for Coopetition in Talent Management in SMEs" (2023). *Articles*. 109.

<https://arrow.tudublin.ie/tfschhmtart/109>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the School of Tourism & Hospitality Management at ARROW@TU Dublin. It has been accepted for inclusion in Articles by an authorized administrator of ARROW@TU Dublin. For more information, please contact arrow.admin@tudublin.ie, aisling.coyne@tudublin.ie, vera.kilshaw@tudublin.ie.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 4.0 International License](#).

Funder: This research received no external funding



Beyond competing for talent: an integrative framework for coopetition in talent management in SMEs

Journal:	<i>International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management</i>
Manuscript ID	IJCHM-04-2022-0419.R2
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	Talent management, Coopetition, SMEs, Hospitality industry, Interorganisational talent pools, Open systems theory

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF
CONTEMPORARY HOSPITALITY MANAGEMENT

Author Response Form

When revising your paper, please prepare this report explaining how you have responded to each reviewer’s comments and suggestions specifically.

REVIEWER 1

Suggestions/comments from the Reviewer	Response from the Author(s)
NA	NA

REVIEWER 2

Suggestions/comments from the Reviewer	Response from the Author(s)
I understand your point that intent to create value might incentivise organisational leaders to develop some shared goals although I am not sure that it is an ‘overriding motivation for organisations to engage in coopetition’. Thank you for adding the explanation of who third parties are in relation to regulation and governance and also for including some examples of common frameworks and responsibilities, although I remain dubious about individual contractual issues. I applaud your call for future research to evaluate your proposed integrative framework and suggest this should be empirically grounded	We have adopted this argumentation from leading coopetition authors who argue that firms coopete because they would like to create value in a particular area - thus, a shared goal in that area can be defined. As part of this revision, we have placed ‘overriding motivation’ in single quotes and added the page number from the Journal of Management editorial piece where this reference was taken from to demonstrate that this was an argument borrowed directly from the extant literature rather than self-developed.
Your explanation of how developing a shared talent pool might address issues of diversity remains a little vague in my view.	We have added an additional sentence to give two examples of how enhancing diversity could be achieved. We now state on page 11: SMEs might target underrepresented groups when co-attracting talent or offer a set of diverse programmes when co-developing talent.
I also question what would prompt SMEs to seek third party governance in relation to talent poaching from the shared pool. However, that is a question to explore further in an empirical study.	Third party governance helps to gain legitimacy. We now state on page 10: SMEs should seek governance and regulation from third parties such as steering groups, hospitality and tourism associations, public institutions, or government agencies to strengthen and regulate the talent management coopetition process and, in doing so, gain legitimacy (Czaron and Czernek, 2016; Hoffmann and Schlosser, 2001).

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CONTEMPORARY HOSPITALITY MANAGEMENT

Author Response Form

The theoretical contribution of this paper has been better clarified however I think you are rather over-stating the case by claiming that you have moved 'the discourse beyond competition for talent'. You have raised an interesting question but have not yet evidenced support for your framework.	We have revised the wording to avoid over-stating our case. We now state in our conclusion section on page 17: From a theoretical perspective, we add to the debate on shifting boundaries in talent management (Vaiman et al., 2021) and initiated a move of the discourse beyond competition for talent.
---	--

REVIEWER 3

Suggestions/comments from the Reviewer	Response from the Author(s)
NA	NA

REVIEWER 4

Suggestions/comments from the Reviewer	Response from the Author(s)
The revised manuscript is thoughtfully revised and all my concerns were addressed. Some more thought on the use of the term 'sustainable' might be required. For example, you refer to sustainable co-opetition, career paths, and talent pools. Given the specific use of the term 'sustainable' in contemporary HRM literature (e.g. Cooke et al, 2022), for example, pertaining to the needs of multiple stakeholders, is this the intended meaning that you want to offer? Is co-opetition sustainable in the sense that it addresses the needs of both employers, employees, and the environment? This is a minor comment, I believe you could clarify the use of the term in your manuscript.	We have removed the term 'sustainable' as sustainable HRM practices as discussed in the sustainability literature is beyond the scope of this paper.
This paper carries important implications for research and practice. It would be useful to consider implications in relation to some of the 17 UN sustainable development goals. How might co-opetition in talent management contribute to the accomplishment of a more democratic, equitable, transparent ecosystem in this context?	Given the central issue relates to talent management, the paper particularly relates to the UN SDG goal 8. While an in-depth engagement of this would move too far away from the focal point of the paper, we now state in our practical implications section on page 18: We assert that SMEs can benefit from talent management coopetition, addressing ongoing talent shortages midst or post Covid-19 and promoting economic growth and employment (UN Sustainable Development Goal 8; United Nations, 2022).

Beyond competing for talent: an integrative framework for coopetition in talent management in SMEs

Abstract

Purpose – This paper unpacks how SMEs can operationalise coopetition in talent management, addressing ongoing talent shortages in the hospitality industry which were intensified during the Covid-19 pandemic.

Design/methodology/approach – Our conceptual paper draws from literature on coopetition and talent management in SMEs. Specifically, we take an interorganisational talent pool lens and develop a framework following the principles of open systems theory.

Findings – We find that the traditional use of talent pools is often impractical for SMEs due to a lack of resources and capabilities. Instead, interorganisational talent pools, through coopetition in talent management, can aid these firms to address talent shortages. We identify potential for SME coopetition at various stages including attraction, development, and retention of talent.

Practical implications – Coopetition in talent management can aid industries in establishing market-thickening pipelines. Through co-attracting, co-developing, and co-retaining talent, SMEs can create interorganisational talent pools. To develop talent management coopetition, a set of prerequisites, catalysts, and potential inhibitors must be analysed and managed.

Originality/value – This paper moves the talent management debate beyond competition for talent, introducing coopetition as a viable alternative. Taking an open systems perspective, we develop an integrative framework for coopetition in talent management in SMEs encompassing input, process, and output components. We reveal the dynamic and complex nature of this coopetition process, highlighting the essential role of coopetition context and illustrating open system principles.

Keywords Talent management, Coopetition, SMEs, Hospitality industry, Talent pipelines, Interorganisational talent pools, Open systems theory

Introduction

Many hospitality organisations have long faced and continue to face challenges in attracting, developing, and retaining talent (Burbach and Brannon, 2021; Jooss *et al.*, 2021a; Kravariti *et al.*, 2022), likely because existing approaches to talent management are insufficient or ineffectively applied in this industry (Baum, 2019). The Covid-19 crisis has served to spotlight the limitations of current talent management approaches, while also unveiling the precarious nature of employment in the industry (Baum *et al.*, 2020). The hospitality industry, perhaps more than other service industries, suffers from the consequences of the Covid-19 crisis (He *et al.*, 2021). The post-pandemic employment market displays signs of increasing talent shortages, largely due to an exodus of many employees to other industries (Baum *et al.*, 2020). To reverse this trend and to strengthen talent pipelines, hospitality organisations need to reimagine their talent management strategies and practices.

Despite the apparent ubiquitousness of large hotel chains, the hospitality industry is characterised by a substantial amount of small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs). According to Smith Travel Research (2015), there exist more than 100,000 individually operated hotel properties with more than seven million rooms globally. For the purpose of this paper, we define SMEs as businesses that have fewer than 250 employees and a maximum turnover of 50 million Euros (European Commission, 2022). We contend that especially SMEs, which likely lack resources, capabilities, and time for dedicated talent management deliberations (Harney, 2021), need to adopt innovative solutions and combine their efforts through coopetition to overcome their talent challenges (Chang and Eberhard, 2021). However, many hospitality organisations tend to drain their common labour pools, instead of establishing talent pipelines for all organisations (Burbach and Brannon, 2021). Thus, it appears that, to date, SMEs have approached talent management from a competition perspective rather than a coopetition perspective.

Coopetition is a neologism of ‘competition’ and ‘cooperation’ (Brandenburger and Nalebuff, 1996; Le Roy *et al.*, 2018). It involves the collaboration of independent companies, even when they compete around broader business activities to combine resources and capabilities (Bengtsson and Kock, 2014; Raza-Ullah *et al.*, 2014). SMEs are more likely to coopete with other SMEs if they can

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

reduce their costs, learn from each other, and are located in the same geographical area (Chiambaretto *et al.*, 2020; Kallmuenzer *et al.*, 2021; Madhavan *et al.*, 2004). However, research on coopetition in talent management is scarce (Van den Broek *et al.*, 2018), and the extant literature offers limited insights into the applicability of common talent strategies and practices to SMEs, particularly in the hospitality industry. Addressing these shortcomings, our conceptual paper unpacks how SMEs can operationalise coopetition in talent management. To do so, we draw on coopetition literature (e.g., Bengtsson and Raza-Ullah, 2016; Fernandez *et al.*, 2018) and talent management in SMEs literature (e.g., Krishnan and Scullion, 2017; Festing *et al.*, 2013). Specifically, we take a talent pool lens to examine how coopetition may enable the development of interorganisational talent pools. Unlike traditionally adopted talent pools (e.g., Jooss *et al.*, 2021b; Mäkelä *et al.*, 2010), which are inward focused, exclusive, and unique to a single organisation, interorganisational talent pools are external, inclusive, and shared among a defined number of coopeting firms (Burbach and Brannon, 2021). In this paper, we inquire: *How can coopetition in talent management be operationalised by SMEs in the hospitality industry?*

Our study presents three primary contributions: First, we add to the debate on shifting boundaries in talent management (Vaiman *et al.*, 2021). Specifically, we move the talent management discourse beyond competition for talent, introducing coopetition as a viable alternative for organisations. We contend that interorganisational talent pools, through coopetition in talent management, can aid hospitality businesses to address talent shortages and develop talent strategically. Second, we build on the extant coopetition literature (Bengtsson and Raza-Ullah, 2016) with an integrative framework for coopetition in talent management in SMEs encompassing input, process, and output components. Taking a systems perspective, our paper reveals the dynamic nature of this coopetition process, highlighting the essential role of the coopetition context (i.e., prerequisites, catalysts, and potential inhibitors) and illustrating open system principles. Third, we answer the call for greater contextualisation of talent management research (Gallardo-Gallardo *et al.*, 2019), providing insights on coopetition in an SME setting within the hospitality industry. In doing so, we identify potential for SME coopetition as part of a talent management system which encompasses co-attracting, co-developing, and co-retaining talent.

Conceptualising talent management in SMEs

The meaning of talent varies in both the talent management and hospitality literatures (Kravariti *et al.*, 2022; McDonnell *et al.*, 2017). While specific definitions depend on organisational contexts, a strong focus is placed on high performers and/or high potentials (Collings and Mellahi, 2009; Jooss *et al.*, 2019). Hospitality organisations may take an inclusive (i.e., entire workforce) or exclusive (i.e., a subset of people in the workforce) perspective when conceptualising talent (Sheehan *et al.*, 2018). Baum (2008) highlights that talent in hospitality organisations encompasses a set of hard and soft skills required to deliver high levels of customer service, which differs among service providers, and which must be adopted to meet the needs of diverse customers. Similarly, other research in the hospitality industry has emphasised the central role of creating customer experiences and fostering service cultures when developing definitions of talent (Bharwani and Talib, 2017; Chung and D'Annunzio-Green, 2018).

In this paper, we define talent management as “the process through which organizations meet their needs for talent” (amended from Cappelli and Keller, 2017, p. 28). This definition captures the inherent ‘need’ for talent given the significant talent shortages in the industry and also highlights talent management as a ‘process’ – a view that we also adopt in this paper. As part of this strategic discourse, the talent management literature has presented a set of three talent routines including pivotal positions, talent pools, and workforce differentiation (Collings and Mellahi, 2009). With the exception of some recent work (e.g., Burbach and Brannon, 2021; Jooss *et al.*, 2021), most research in the hospitality industry has traditionally adopted a broader view on managing talent beyond these three routines. As such, most studies in a hospitality context relate talent management to the attraction, development, and retention of talent (D'Annunzio-Green, 2018; Kravariti *et al.*, 2022; Sheehan *et al.*, 2018). For example, Chen *et al.* (2020) examine the perceptions and preferences of hiring managers, Johnson *et al.* (2019) unpack talent development, and Deery and Jago (2015) reveal how work-life balance and wider working conditions are critical factors impacting retention.

Despite making up 99 per cent of firms in OECD and G20 countries (OECD, 2015), SMEs remain an often neglected research area in talent management (Gallardo-Gallardo and Thunnissen,

2016; Harney and Alkhalaf, 2021). While the importance of people management practices for the success of SMEs has long been recognised (Dundon and Wilkinson, 2009; Krishnan and Scullion, 2017), there has been limited focus on talent management strategies and practices in SMEs (Harney and Alkhalaf, 2021), and even less so in the hospitality industry (Chang and Eberhard, 2021). Valverde *et al.* (2013) outline three characteristics found in people management practices in SMEs: First, they found high similarity across SMEs and suggest homogeneity in people management depending on external (e.g., industry) and internal (e.g., organisational structure) factors. While a common approach to managing people may exist across some firms and industries, Krishnan and Scullion (2017) flag the importance of age, size, and growth of SMEs, influencing their approach to managing their workforce. Second, a high degree of informality and reactivity is common in people management practices in SMEs, which is also commonly observed in the hospitality industry (Chung and D'Annunzio-Green, 2018). Thus, many talent strategies are emergent and ad hoc rather than rational and formulaic (Harney, 2021). Third, the presence of powerful owners influences how practices are developed and implemented (Valverde *et al.*, 2013). The power of key decision makers including CEOs, owners, or human resource (HR) managers was also noted in the hospitality industry (Kravariti *et al.*, 2021).

Given these characteristics, SMEs face unique challenges when attracting, developing, and retaining talent (Festing *et al.*, 2017; Krishnan and Scullion, 2017), particularly if they operate without an HR function or dedicated HR professionals (Chang and Eberhard, 2021; Loufrani-Fedida and Aldebert, 2021). For example, when attracting talent, SMEs often lack proactive recruitment strategies and have scarce resources to invest in talent practices (Festing *et al.*, 2013). As a result, SMEs have a legitimacy disadvantage in that their employer brand is less known in comparison to larger firms, and that limited information is available to job seekers (Krishnan and Scullion, 2017). A particular challenge for SMEs in the hospitality industry relates to the location of the firm. As many hospitality businesses are located in rural areas, these are potentially less attractive for individuals seeking employment. In addition, the Covid-19 crisis has highlighted the precarious nature of the industry, with SMEs facing significant talent shortages (Baum *et al.* 2020). When developing talent, SMEs often apply an ad hoc approach to learning and struggle to integrate formal, high-quality training into their day-to-day

operations (Chung and D'Annunzio-Green, 2018). Finally, when retaining talent, SMEs can only offer few career progression opportunities given the limited number of positions available within the firm (Chung and D'Annunzio-Green, 2018) and often fail to provide competitive working conditions that will reduce employee attrition (Baum, 2019; Deery and Jago, 2015). In the following section, we examine the applicability of talent pools in SMEs to address the ongoing attraction, development, and retention challenges in the hospitality industry.

An interorganisational talent pool lens

A central effort in talent management is the establishment of talent pipelines which can be defined as “the sequenced flow and development of individuals, repeated over time, disproportionately from specific labor sources into particular positions within firms, occupations, and geographies” (Brymer *et al.*, 2019, p. 209). In essence, a pipeline is an ‘intentional supply strategy’ (Brymer *et al.*, 2014, p. 486) and can take three principal forms: internal (i.e., promote from within), external (i.e., facilitate external hiring), and market thickening (i.e., influence educational and occupational choices) (Brymer *et al.*, 2019). In contrast to internal and external pipelines, market-thickening pipelines are not specific to any one firm, can be quite broad in their scope, and involve cooperating firms which might compete around other business aspects. Market-thickening pipelines can provide benefits to participating organisations via disproportionate access to talent (Brymer *et al.*, 2019). For example, organisations that participate in building market-thickening pipelines engage individuals early in their career development and provide career paths in the industry. In doing so, firms influence individuals’ choice to join and remain in an industry. Ultimately, these pipelines aid organisations in feeding talent into talent pools, which can be defined as a group of high-performing and high-potential incumbents (Collings *et al.*, 2019). Thus, talent pools generally relate to a subset of people in the workforce (exclusive approach) but are in some cases treated as synonyms when describing the entire workforce (inclusive approach) (Burbach and Brannon, 2021). Adopting a talent pool routine, which emphasises the ‘flow’ and ‘process’ notions of talent rather than traditional ‘static’ and ‘stock’ associations (Collings *et al.*, 2019), can lead to greater breadth and depth of talent in an organisation (Jooss *et al.*, 2021b). The talent management and, more

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

recently, hospitality literatures have identified multiple talent pools in organisations including, for example, for emerging leaders, executives, technical talent, high potentials, local talent, rising stars, or top talent (e.g., Björkman *et al.*, 2013; Jooss *et al.*, 2021b; Kichuk *et al.*, 2019; McDonnell *et al.*, 2011). These talent pools can be established at various levels in an organisation, refer to functional or leadership aspects, and can be managed centrally or replicated across various geographies (Mäkelä *et al.*, 2010; Jooss *et al.*, 2021b).

In an SME context, the traditional use of talent pools is often impractical given their size, and thus number of employees, and given the flat structures of SMEs (Krishnan and Scullion, 2017). Thus, talent pools at various hierarchical levels are unrealistic and a revised approach to managing talent pools is needed. Burbach and Brannon (2021) propose ‘interorganisational talent pools’ as an alternative to traditional talent pools. Unlike traditionally adopted talent pools (Jooss *et al.*, 2021b; Mäkelä *et al.*, 2010), which are inward focused and unique to a single organisation, interorganisational talent pools are externally focused and shared among a defined number of coopeting firms (Burbach and Brannon, 2021). Such an approach requires a large degree of self-regulation and coordination of resources given the multiple and often conflicting interests among participating stakeholders (Chang and Eberhart, 2021). Interorganisational talent pools are designed to serve several organisations; however, talent remains a scarce resource and its overuse can lead to depletion. For example, if managers seek to recruit talent exclusively into their firms, they deprive their coopetitors of that scarce resource. Thus, a responsible and coordinated use is required to make interorganisational talent pools a successful practice (Burbach and Brannon, 2021; Van den Broek *et al.*, 2018). To establish interorganisational talent pools more firmly in the literature, empirical research as well as conceptual grounding is required. In this paper, we conceptualise the development of interorganisational talent pools through coopetition in talent management. We now move to a discussion of coopetition in SMEs.

Conceptualising coopetition in SMEs

Coopetition, a term that was coined in the 1980s, refers to the “simultaneous pursuit of cooperation and competition by firms” (Bengtsson and Raza-Ullah, 2016, p. 23). Driven by hyper-competition, firms can utilise interorganisational coopetition to overcome resource shortages, drive innovation, gain knowledge, strengthen relationships, and ultimately improve firm performance (Bengtsson and Raza-Ullah, 2016; Gnyawali *et al.*, 2006; Van den Broek *et al.*, 2018). To conceptualise coopetition, the extant literature has focused traditionally on the actors involved in coopetition (e.g., Brandenburger and Nalebuff, 1996; Pathak *et al.*, 2014) and the activities associated with coopetition (e.g., Ho and Ganesan, 2013; Raza-Ullah *et al.*, 2014). Considering the range of actors in coopetition, five levels of coopetition can be differentiated: intra-firm, dyadic, triadic, network, and inter-network (Bengtsson and Raza-Ullah, 2016). Intra-firm coopetition refers to coopetition within the firm, for example, among cross-functional subunits (e.g., Ghobadi and D’Ambra, 2013). Dyadic coopetition relates to a one-to-one relationship between firms, and can include horizontal and vertical relationships (e.g., Fernandez *et al.*, 2014). Triadic coopetition considers coopetition between three interconnected firms (e.g., Thomason *et al.*, 2013). Network coopetition refers to coopetition among multiple firms and can take various forms, such as alliance portfolios, value-chain clusters, or industry eco-systems (e.g., Bengtsson and Johansson, 2014). Finally, inter-network coopetition considers coopetition across distinct networks (e.g., Peng and Bourne, 2009). For the purpose of our study, we focus on network coopetition, encompassing multiple SMEs in the hospitality industry and commonly within a geographical boundary (i.e., region). Coopetition encompasses a broad range of activities. A number of studies focus on the interactions between competing stakeholders, arguing that these stakeholders will compete around some business activities (e.g., supply chain), while competing around other activities (e.g., R&D) (Bengtsson and Raza-Ullah, 2016; Gnyawali and Park, 2009). In our paper, SMEs in the hospitality industry compete around business activities including the provision of accommodation and food and beverage offerings, but seek coopetition in the area of talent management.

In the context of SMEs, the ability to coopete is a critical factor for the competitive positioning of firms, allowing economies of scale, reduction of operational costs, and expansion of markets (BarNir and Smith, 2002; Bengtsson and Johansson, 2014; Gnyawali and Park, 2009). Yet, the coopetition

literature has predominately focused on large firms, with only a few studies explicitly studying SMEs (e.g., Levy *et al.*, 2003; Morris *et al.*, 2007; Robert *et al.*, 2009; Thomason *et al.*, 2013). For example, Morris *et al.* (2007) emphasised the role of coopetition as a deliberate risk management strategy, reducing uncertainty and costs. Similarly, Robert *et al.* (2009) note that governing bodies involved in coopetition can optimise resources more effectively than individual SMEs. Kraus *et al.* (2019) found that SMEs in the brewing industry benefited from coopetition through innovation, market reach, marketing, and firm growth. Particularly for those SMEs that are located in rural areas, like many hospitality businesses, regional network coopetition is more cost-effective and can also strengthen the region's performance as a whole (Chang and Eberhard, 2021). Similar findings were presented by Kallmuenzer *et al.* (2021) who found that Austrian SMEs in the hospitality industry benefited from coopetition, particularly if economic benefits were demonstrable and destination networks were strengthened. Notably, to achieve value in coopetition, SMEs need to manage socially complex, relational, and resource-based aspects, including trust, commitment, and mutual benefit (Thomason *et al.*, 2013). Despite the conceptual development and practical application of coopetition in businesses for almost four decades (Brandenburger and Nalebuff, 1996), there is a dearth of research on the extent of its utilisation in talent management and in the context of the hospitality industry.

An open systems based framework for coopetition in talent management

Having conceptualised coopetition and talent management in SMEs in the hospitality industry, we utilise open systems theory (Katz and Kahn, 1978) to integrate current findings and build a framework for coopetition in talent management in SMEs (see Figure 1). In general terms, open systems theory allows to describe structures and operations of a system (Barabási, 2016). It provides a framework that maps core components and subcomponents of a system and highlights their interrelatedness (Harney, 2018; Nadler and Tushman, 1980). Specifically, open systems theory encompasses a set of internal and external input factors, processes, and outputs (Katz and Kahn, 1978). Building on this, our framework encompasses three components: input factors (i.e., coopetition context), the process of coopetition in

a talent management system, and output factors related to talent management. Subsequently, we discuss the interrelatedness of these components by illustrating five open systems principles.

Insert Figure 1 about here

Inputs

The first aspect in our framework considers the *coopetition context*. Specifically, we distinguish between prerequisites, catalysts, and potential inhibitors. First, *prerequisites* are conditions that likely influence the effectiveness of setting up coopetition in talent management in SMEs. Drawing on work from Devetag (2009), we present trust (people-focused activities) and coordination (task-focused activities) as two central prerequisites. *Coordination* relates to, for example, determining the size of the existing labour pool, evaluating firms' capabilities, gaining third-party legitimacy, and developing a shared agenda (Bouncken *et al.*, 2020; Gnyawali and Park, 2009). Given that many hospitality businesses are located in rural areas and underserved geographies, a critical assessment of the size of the existing labour pool is required. While dyadic coopetition (one-to-one relationship between two firms) can take place, greater economies of scale are achieved through network coopetition, involving multiple firms. Closely evaluating firms' capabilities is particularly important in an SME context, and even more so in the hospitality industry, as many firms lack resources, capabilities, and time for dedicated talent management interventions (Harney, 2021). In addition, SMEs should seek governance and regulation from third parties such as steering groups, hospitality and tourism associations, public institutions, or government agencies to strengthen and regulate the talent management coopetition process and, in doing so, gain legitimacy (Czakoń and Czernek, 2016; Hoffmann and Schlosser, 2001). For example, since 2020, several UK hospitality organisations have joined the Hoteliers' Charter, a third party whose intent is to raise the profile of the hospitality industry and to develop an advanced framework for employment in the industry (Hoteliers' Charter, 2022).

Developing a shared agenda is a foundational prerequisite and relates to the establishment of mutual goals, duties, and rights (Gnyawali and Park, 2009) and the design of a talent management coopetition structure (Hoffmann and Schlosser, 2001). Establishing these mutual goals, duties, and rights is driven by the 'overriding motivation' for organisations to engage in coopetition in the first place - the intent to create value (Gnyawali and Ryan-Charleton, 2018, p. 2513). This value creation intent helps to understand why firms seek mutual pursuits. For example, coopeting partners might face the same opportunities or challenges which they can jointly tackle (Gnyawali and Park, 2011), including ongoing talent attraction and retention challenges. Specifically, we assert that the aim of SMEs in the hospitality industry to coopete in talent management extends beyond the establishment of traditional internal and external pipelines. Instead, establishing market-thickening pipelines (Brymer *et al.*, 2019) allows SMEs to influence actively educational and occupational choices. Ultimately, the purpose of these market-thickening pipelines is to address the industry-wide talent shortages. Given that these talent shortages are experienced across many hospitality firms, market-thickening pipelines are an effort between multiple competing organisations to engage in coopetition, leveraging resources and capabilities to build deeper talent supply across the industry. Specifically, Brymer *et al.* (2019) suggest that such pipelines aid in reaching three objectives: building labour pools with sufficient skills, credentials, and experience; forming labour pools within an underserved geography; and developing labour pools from an underrepresented group to enhance diversity. This can be achieved through, for example, intentionally cultivating a range of pipelines with distinct characteristics. SMEs might target underrepresented groups when co-attracting talent or offer a set of diverse programmes when co-developing talent.

In terms of the second central prerequisite, *trust*, we refer to the importance of changing the mindset of decision-makers, identifying potential partners, involving stakeholders, and developing shared norms and social relations among partners (Devetag, 2009; Gnyawali and Ryan-Charleton, 2018; Kraus *et al.*, 2019). Changing the mindsets of SME owners and managers, who traditionally applied a competition perspective when running their business, is crucial (Czakoń and Czernek-Marszałek, 2021). Coopeting partners can change their mindset and develop trust because of a

reciprocal cooperative intent to create value (Gnywali and Charleton, 2018). However, such a mutual pursuit requires time and resource investments by potential partners and trade-offs between joint and firm value creation (Chiambaretto et al., 2020). Finally, by involving a range of stakeholders to develop shared norms can create a common understanding and commitment and can promote appropriate behaviour among coopetitors, which acts as self-enforcing safeguards to deter firms pursuing self-interest at the expense of mutual pursuits (Gnywali and Charleton, 2018).

Second, *catalysts* comprise firm-level and environmental-level factors that drive coopetition in talent management in SMEs (Bengtsson and Raza-Ullah, 2016). *Firm-level catalysts* refer to an organisation's goals, capabilities, experiences, prospective strategies, and perceived vulnerability to leverage, for example, development, innovation, cost reduction, and access to resources (Bengtsson and Raza-Ullah, 2016; Gnyawali and Park, 2009). SMEs in the hospitality industry are facing severe pressures to innovate given increasing customer expectations and their lack of resources. These SMEs can also gain more influence in existing markets and expand to new markets (BarNir and Smith, 2002; Levy et al., 2003), and, in a talent management setting, widen their labour pool. Setting goals to enhance talent management through coopetition, for example, in relation to employer branding or learning and development opportunities can also improve the often negative perceptions of the hospitality industry. *Environmental-level catalysts* refer to industry characteristics and influential stakeholders (e.g., owners or managers), and might also consider the characteristics of the coopeting partner and the relationship with that partner (Bengtsson and Raza-Ullah, 2016; Ho and Ganesam, 2013). This includes, for example, labour market imperfections, intense competition, limited influence, and uncertain environments. The ongoing talent shortages in the hospitality industry require SMEs to fight the 'war for talent', intensified through increasing competition (Kallmuenzer et al., 2021). SMEs can utilise the power of coopeting partners to widen their influence, for example, by benefiting from the reputation of the coopeting firm (Czakon and Czernek, 2016). Particularly in uncertain environments, SMEs seek coopetition to minimise risk (Levy et al., 2003), for example, the Covid-19 pandemic has brought coopetition considerations to the forefront in many hospitality firms (Hughes and Christensen, 2021).

Third, *potential inhibitors* are those factors that might act as barriers during talent management coopetition, including the dynamic (e.g., Bengtsson and Johnsson, 2014), complex (e.g., Ho and Gamesan, 2013), and managerially challenging (e.g., Fernandez et al., 2014) nature of the process. The *dynamic nature* of the process relates to varying interdependencies and interactions within coopetition networks and the interplay between cooperation and competition (Bengtsson and Raza-Ullah, 2016). As SMEs configure and reconfigure their networks and businesses, some partners will join while others will exit the network. This is particularly relevant in the hospitality industry given the precarious nature of employment and the challenges faced by business owners as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic (Baum et al., 2020). The *complex nature* of the process relates to multifaceted relationships, ambiguity, role conflicts, and potential tensions, for example, because of contradicting demands or mistrust in partnering firms (Hoffmann and Schlosser, 2001; Tidstrom, 2014). Considering the often lacking expertise of SMEs around talent management strategies and practices, the need for education in this context is particularly relevant. Finally, the *managerially challenging nature* of coopetition relates to governance structures, contracts, legal processes, and the management of all stakeholders across the network, ensuring their commitment to coopetition (Bengtsson and Raza-Ullah, 2016). In a talent management context, employment contracts and responsibilities, in particular, are legal aspects that cannot be ignored when developing coopetition (Gnyawali and Park, 2009).

Processes

Following Kravariti et al.'s (2022) conceptualisation of the core talent management practices in the hospitality industry, we argue that the talent management coopetition system in SMEs encompasses three central components: co-attracting, co-developing, and co-retaining talent. First, coopetition in *talent attraction* includes co-creating industry and region branding; co-organising recruitment events and platforms; and co-establishing networks with educational institutions. Through these coopetition practices, SMEs can not only reduce their operational costs, but also reach a wider audience of potential talent, build a stronger employment brand, and establish talent pipelines (Bengtsson and Johansson, 2014). This is potentially of great benefit for individual hospitality firms given the traditionally poor

industry image (Jooss *et al.*, 2021a). For example, since 2021, several firms have joined Hospitality Rising, a collaborative movement which aims to create a large-scale hospitality recruitment advertising campaign (Hospitality Rising, 2022). Second, coopetition in *talent development* encompasses co-developing training strategies, content, and methods; co-investing in upskilling and reskilling of employees; and co-stimulating innovative approaches to learning. For example, where similar training needs have been identified across firms, SMEs can organise a training session for all employees with these needs, which can then also translate into knowledge sharing across SMEs. Firms could also share the costs for course development or e-learning licenses. These cost-sharing initiatives are crucial for hospitality organisations who often have limited financial resources dedicated to talent management (Harney, 2021; Jooss *et al.*, 2021a). Equally, SMEs might jointly design apprenticeship or trainee management programmes, which are commonly adopted approaches to learning and development in the hospitality industry (Johnson *et al.*, 2019). Ultimately, we argue that these co-investment efforts to develop talent will reduce turnover intentions and individuals are more likely to remain in an occupation where they see opportunities to learn, develop, and grow and where they have established a matching skillset (Allen *et al.*, 2010).

Third, coopetition in *talent retention* relates to co-establishing a framework for working conditions; co-designing industry engagement events; and co-facilitating inter-firm rotations and talent sharing. Building a common framework around compensation, benefits, and conditions of work aids to ensure employees are treated and rewarded in an appropriate and attractive way. While government or national associations might design some of these policies in terms of minimum standards, coopeting firms can choose to go beyond these standards in an effort to improve talent management in the industry. For example, coopeting firms might introduce principles around rotas and working hours to improve work-life balance, champion a transparent and fair gratuities system, and offer employee well-being support (Hoteliers' Charter, 2022). This, in turn, reduces attrition rates not least because there is a reduced need for employees to change their employer to improve their working conditions or promotional opportunities, provided they remain employed among the partnering organisations. Thus, staff will also benefit from greater career opportunities through rotation, while SMEs can utilise talent

sharing to manage talent shortages or varying staffing levels in response to changing occupancy rates more effectively. In the face of the often-cited poor working conditions in the hospitality industry, for example, around work-life balance (Deery and Jago, 2015) and the precarious nature of the work (Baum *et al.*, 2020), a common framework could provide some security to employees, while also allowing coopeting firms to learn from each other with regard to talent management. Talent sharing has emerged as a talent practice that firms have adopted in the context of rapid change and faced with unprecedented challenges such as Covid-19, and which has received some traction, mainly by consulting firms (e.g., Mercer, 2021). While large firms utilise internal talent marketplaces to share talent internally, SMEs can share talent through coopetition practices. We argue that temporary talent sharing is not only an effective way to avoid furloughing or laying off talent, but also an important aspect of coopetition in talent management, leading to increased retention of talent.

Outputs

Organisations implement talent management practices to meet their needs for talent more effectively (Cappelli and Keller, 2017). We argue that coopetition in talent management can be a strategy for SMEs to satisfy their talent needs and to establish interorganisational talent pools (Burbach and Brannon, 2021). More specifically, we assert that, through coopetition, SMEs can create stronger talent management systems including co-attraction, co-development, and co-retention practices. Further outputs of coopetition (Bengtsson and Raza-Ullah, 2016) that are relevant to talent management in SMEs include the design of innovative talent management routines, the gaining of knowledge, the strengthening of relationships, and an increase in firm performance among participating firms. Arguably, well-managed interorganisational talent pools will ameliorate the attractiveness of the particular region in which the coopetition takes place, not only for participating SMEs but for the entire region and industry. This, in turn, may aid in the development of market-thickening talent pipelines (Brymer *et al.*, 2019). Finally, we assert that interorganisational talent pools allow SMEs to manage their talent more effectively through the development of relevant knowledge, skills, and abilities and through the development of high performing and high potential talent (Collings and

Mellahi, 2009). We conclude that SMEs can utilise coopetition as a strategy to leverage resources and capabilities to establish interorganisational talent pools in parallel to their ongoing firm-specific talent management strategies.

Open systems theory principles

In addition to input, process, and output factors, open systems theory (Katz and Kahn, 1978) presents several system principles. In our coopetition in talent management framework (Figure 1), we illustrate five principles: congruence, internal interdependence, equifinality, feedback, and adaptation. First, congruence relates to the fit between the system components, i.e., inputs, processes, and outputs (Nadler and Tushman, 1980). A central argument of this principle is that greater strategic fit will result in more effective talent management coopetition (Garavan *et al.*, 2021). For example, this principle helps us to understand whether the coopetition context has been considered appropriately before entering into a coopetition arrangement and when developing talent management coopetition practices around attraction, development, and retention. Second, internal interdependence considers the interconnectedness between the various process components and subcomponents (Kast and Rozenzweig, 1972). In our framework, this relates to the various cooperative practices around talent co-attraction, co-development, and co-retention. Third, equifinality emphasises that the same outputs can be achieved through different means and from different inputs which implies that future discussions of coopetition in talent management should not adopt a universal perspective but encourage configurational thinking (Harney, 2018). Fourth, feedback allows for consideration and adjustments to the talent management coopetition processes based on the reflection of outputs achieved (Garavan *et al.*, 2021). Frequently seeking feedback can, especially in a coopetition context which may encompass a large number of stakeholders with potentially different priorities and interests, provide valuable insights to coopeting SMEs. Fifth, adaptation relates to amendments and quality improvements made to the coopetition process as a result of a changing coopetition context (Schleicher *et al.*, 2018). These principles are reflective of the highly dynamic nature of the coopetition relationships and processes (Bengtsson and Raza-Ullah, 2016).

Conclusions

Theoretical implications

The purpose of this paper was to unpack how SMEs can operationalise coopetition in talent management. From a theoretical perspective, we add to the debate on shifting boundaries in talent management (Vaiman *et al.*, 2021) and initiated a move of the discourse beyond competition for talent. The talent management literature has traditionally focused on the ‘war for talent’, and by using this metaphor emphasised competition between firms. We assert that the future of talent management should encompass a wider perspective that takes cognisance of how firms can coopete rather than compete, to manage and counteract perennial talent shortages, the increasingly complex demands of talent, and the changing nature of employment in the industry (Brannon and Burbach, 2021). This perspective also aligns with Boudreau *et al.*’s (2015, p. 83) view that we are moving ‘beyond employment’ in a single firm to considering how best to complete work. In addition, we also built on the coopetition literature (Bengtsson and Raza-Ullah, 2016) to develop an integrative framework for coopetition in talent management in SMEs comprising input, process, and output components. Using our framework, we conceptualise market-thickening pipelines and interorganisational talent pools as fundamental components of talent management coopetition efforts in SMEs. Our open systems perspective allowed us to highlight the interrelatedness of core framework components and the central role of the coopetition context, including prerequisites, catalysts, and potential inhibitors of coopetition in talent management. Thus, we reiterate the need for contextualising talent management practices in SMEs and in the hospitality industry (Gallardo-Gallardo *et al.*, 2019; Kravariti *et al.*, 2022). We conclude that only considering the process components of talent management coopetition (i.e., attracting, developing, and retaining talent) and neglecting the input factors (i.e., coopetition context), will provide limited and potentially misleading insights into coopetition as a strategy in talent management in SMEs. Furthermore, we suggest that interorganisational talent pools and true coopetition for mutual gain can be realised only if SMEs give due consideration to the coopetition

context, the talent management coopetition system, and open systems theory principles discussed in this paper.

Practical implications

Our paper has several practical implications. First, we assert that SMEs can benefit from talent management coopetition, addressing ongoing talent shortages midst or post Covid-19 and promoting economic growth and employment (United Nations Sustainable Development Goal 8; United Nations, 2022). While SMEs have applied coopetition across many business areas for decades, they have largely neglected its value for talent management. We contend that, in the first instance, SMEs should consider whether their coopetition context is conducive to developing a talent management coopetition system. While coopetition can result in joint value creation and firm value creation, it can also lead to value destruction if the competition-cooperation simultaneity is not balanced and if trade-offs in value creation are not managed (Gnyawali and Charleton, 2018). Second, we identify potential coopetition practices for SMEs as part of a talent management system including co-attracting, co-developing, and co-retaining talent. However, SMEs interested in coopetition are faced with a critical choice; do they only seek short-term wins through individual cooperative talent management practices or are they pursuing a longer-term mutually beneficial arrangement by way of setting up talent management coopetition systems? Third, we identified five system principles which organisations should be conscious of given their central role in impacting the dynamics and potential attainment of the inherent benefits of the coopetition process. Moreover, these principles also assist SMEs in their efforts to achieve greater alignment between talent process components and to improve coopetition processes continuously over time through feedback and adaptation.

Limitations and future research

As with any research, our conceptual paper has some limitations which we see as opportunities for future research. While we grounded our argumentation in the coopetition and talent management literatures, we did not present any empirical findings. Therefore, we call for empirical research, utilising

our integrative framework as a starting point, to gain further insights on coopetition in talent management, including the specific responsibilities and practices as part of the coopetition process. We contend that such empirical research should distinguish further between micro (less than 10 employees), small businesses (10-49 employees), and medium-sized enterprises (50-249 employees), given the likelihood of identifying significant differences in terms of resources, capabilities, and talent management strategies and practices in SMEs (Harney, 2021). Research might also consider the prevalence of coopetition in larger organisations and the variance in coopetition contexts and processes. Longitudinal studies that examine coopetition efforts of SMEs in the hospitality industry would be beneficial to better understand output factors and potential inhibitors along the way. Moreover, we are conscious that the focus of our paper were SMEs in the hospitality industry. Future research should examine other stakeholders' experiences and roles in talent management coopetition. For example, examining employees' experiences and the potential advantages and drawbacks of forming part of a talent management coopetition framework versus a single employer deserve attention. Equally, investigating the role of third-party mediation strategies in the hospitality industry is required to better understand the regulations and policies needed to achieve mutual value and avoid situations where self-interest threatens common interest (Gnyawali and Charleton, 2018). Finally, comparative studies with varying regional foci will offer additional insights into the coopetition context. We hope that our paper will stimulate future research on coopetition in talent management, moving beyond competing for talent.

References

- Allen, D.G., Bryant, P.C. and Vardaman, J.M. (2010), "Retaining talent: replacing misconceptions with evidence-based strategies", *The Academy of Management Perspectives*, Vol. 24 No. 2, pp. 48-64.
- BarNir, A. and Smith, K.A. (2002), "Interfirm alliances in the small business: the role of social networks", *Journal of Small Business Management*, Vol. 40 No. 3, pp. 219-232.
- Barabási, A.L. (2016), *Network Science*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Baum, T. (2008), "Implications of hospitality and tourism labour markets for talent management strategies", *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol. 20 No. 7, pp. 720-729.
- Baum, T. (2019), "Does the hospitality industry need or deserve talent?", *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol. 31 No. 10, pp. 3823-3837.
- Baum, T., Mooney, S.K., Robinson, R.N. and Solnet, D. (2020), "Covid-19's impact on the hospitality workforce: new crisis or amplification of the norm?", *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol. 32 No. 9, pp. 2813-2829.

- 1
- 2
- 3 Bengtsson, M. and Johansson, M. (2014), "Managing coopetition to create opportunities for small
- 4 firms", *International Small Business Journal*, Vol. 32 No. 4, pp. 401-427.
- 5 Bengtsson, M. and Kock, S. (2014), "Coopetition - quo vadis? Past accomplishments and future
- 6 challenges", *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 43 No. 2, pp. 180-188.
- 7 Bengtsson, M. and Raza-Ullah, T. (2016), "A systematic review of research on coopetition: toward a
- 8 multilevel understanding", *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 57, pp. 23-39.
- 9 Bharwani, S. and Talib, P. (2017), "Competencies of hotel general managers: a conceptual framework",
- 10 *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol. 29 No. 1, pp. 393-418.
- 11 Björkman, I., Ehrnrooth, M., Mäkelä, K., Smale, A. and Sumelius, J. (2013), "Talent or not? Employee
- 12 reactions to talent identification", *Human Resource Management*, Vol. 52 No. 2, pp. 195-214.
- 13 Boudreau, J.W., Jesuthasan, R. and Creelman, D. (2015), *Lead the Work: Navigating a World Beyond*
- 14 *Employment*, John Wiley & Sons, New York City, NY.
- 15 Bouncken, R.B., Fredrich, V. and Kraus, S. (2020), "Configurations of firm-level value capture in
- 16 coopetition", *Long Range Planning*, Vol. 53 No. 1, 101869.
- 17 Brandenburger, A. and Nalebuff, B. (1996), *Co-opetition*, Doubleday, New York City, NY.
- 18 Brymer, R.A., Chadwick, C., Hill, A.D. and Molloy, J.C. (2019), "Pipelines and their portfolios: a more
- 19 holistic view of human capital heterogeneity via firm-wide employee sourcing", *Academy of*
- 20 *Management Perspectives*, Vol. 33 No. 2, pp. 207-233.
- 21 Brymer, R.A., Molloy, J.C. and Gilbert, B.A. (2014), "Human capital pipelines: competitive
- 22 implications of repeated interorganizational hiring", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 40 No. 2, pp. 483-
- 23 508.
- 24 Burbach, R. and Brannon, D.W. (2021), "Sustaining hospitality talent pools through a common pool
- 25 resource lens", in Jooss, S., Burbach, R. and Ruël, H. (Eds), *Talent Management Innovations in the*
- 26 *International Hospitality Industry*, Emerald Group Publishing, Bingley, pp. 53-78.
- 27 Cappelli, P. and Keller, J.R. (2017), "The historical context of talent management", in Collings, D.G.,
- 28 Mellahi, K. and Cascio, W.F. (Eds), *The Oxford Handbook for Talent Management*, Oxford University
- 29 Press, Oxford, pp. 23-42.
- 30 Chang, C. and Eberhard, K. (2021), "A regional approach to attracting and retaining employees: a
- 31 chance for small and medium-sized hotels?", in Gardini, M.A., Ottenbacher, M. and Schuckert,
- 32 M. (Eds), *The Routledge Companion to International Hospitality Management*, Routledge, Abingdon, pp.
- 33 401-422.
- 34 Chen, R.Y.S., Hussain, K. and Low, C.K.L. (2020), "Perception and preferences of hiring managers",
- 35 *Worldwide Hospitality and Tourism Themes*, Vol. 12 No. 2, pp. 165-174.
- 36 Chiambaretto, P., Bengtsson, M., Fernandez, A.-S. and Näsholm, M.H. (2020), "Small and large firms'
- 37 trade-off between benefits and risks when choosing a coopetitor for innovation", *Long Range*
- 38 *Planning*, Vol. 53 No. 1, 101876.
- 39 Chung, K.L. and D'Annunzio-Green, N. (2018), "Talent management practices in small- and medium-
- 40 sized enterprises in the hospitality sector", *Worldwide Hospitality Tourism Themes*, Vol. 10 No. 1, pp.
- 41 101-116.
- 42 Collings, D.G. and Mellahi, K. (2009), "Strategic talent management: a review and research agenda",
- 43 *Human Resource Management Review*, Vol. 19 No. 4, pp. 304-313.
- 44 Collings, D.G., Mellahi, K. and Cascio, W.F. (2019), "Global talent management and performance in
- 45 multinational enterprises: a multilevel perspective", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 45 No. 2, pp. 540-
- 46 566.
- 47 Czakon, W. and Czernek, K. (2016), "The role of trust-building mechanisms in entering into network
- 48 coopetition: the case of tourism networks in Poland", *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 57, pp.
- 49 64-74.
- 50 Czakon, W. and Czernek-Marszałek, K. (2021), "Competitor perceptions in tourism coopetition",
- 51 *Journal of Travel Research*, Vol. 60 No. 2, pp. 312-335.
- 52 D'Annunzio-Green, N. (2018), "Cornerstones of talent management as a strategic priority in the
- 53 hospitality", *Worldwide Hospitality and Tourism Themes*, Vol. 10 No. 1, pp. 5-13.
- 54 Deery, M. and Jago, L. (2015), "Revisiting talent management, work-life balance and retention
- 55 strategies", *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol. 27 No. 3, pp. 453-472.
- 56
- 57
- 58
- 59
- 60

- Devetag, M.G. (2009). "Coordination and trust as prerequisites of coopetition: experimental evidence", in Dagnino, G.B. and Rocco, E. (Eds), *Coopetition Strategy: Theory, Experiments and Cases*, Routledge, Abingdon.
- Dundon, T. and Wilkinson, A. (2009), "HRM in small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs)", in Collings, D.G. and Wood, G. (Eds), *Human Resource Management: A Critical Approach*, Routledge, Abingdon.
- European Commission (2022), "SME definition", available at: https://ec.europa.eu/growth/smes/sme-definition_en (accessed 24 March 2022).
- Fernandez, A.-S., Chiambaretto, P., Le Roy, F. and Czakon, W. (2018), "Coopetition: from neologism to a new paradigm", in Fernandez, A.-S., Le Roy, F., Chiambaretto, P. and Czakon, W. (Eds), *The Routledge Companion to Coopetition Strategies*, Routledge, Abingdon.
- Festing, M., Harsch, K., Schäfer, L. and Scullion, H. (2017), "Talent management in small- and medium-sized enterprises", in Collings, D.G., Mellahi, K. and Cascio, W.F. (Eds), *The Oxford Handbook for Talent Management*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 478-493.
- Festing, M., Schäfer, L. and Scullion, H. (2013), "Talent management in medium-sized German companies: an explorative study and agenda for future research", *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 24 No. 9, pp. 1872-1893.
- Gallardo-Gallardo, E. and Thunnissen, M. (2016), "Standing on the shoulders of giants? A critical review of empirical talent management research", *Employee Relations*, Vol. 38 No. 1, pp. 31-56.
- Gallardo-Gallardo, E., Thunnissen, M. and Scullion, H. (2019), "Talent management: context matters", *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 31 No. 4, pp. 457-473.
- Garavan, T.N., McCarthy, A., Lai, Y., Clarke, N., Carbery, R., Gubbins, C., Sheehan, M. and Saunders, M.N.K. (2021), "Putting the system back into training and firm performance research: a review and research agenda", *Human Resource Management Journal*, Vol. 31 No. 4, pp. 870-903.
- Ghobadi, S. and D'Ambra, J. (2012), "Knowledge sharing in cross-functional teams: a cooperative model", *Journal of Knowledge Management*, Vol. 16, No. 2, pp. 285-301.
- Gnyawali, D.R., He, J. and Madhavan, R. (2006), "Impact of co-opetition on firm competitive behavior: an empirical examination", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 32 No. 4, pp. 507-530.
- Gnyawali, D.R. and Park, B.-J. (2009), "Co-opetition and technological innovation in small and medium-sized enterprises: a multilevel conceptual model", *Journal of Small Business Management*, Vol. 47 No. 3, pp. 308-330.
- Gnyawali, D.R. and Ryan-Charleton, T. (2018), "Nuances in the interplay of competition and cooperation: towards a theory of coopetition", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 44 No. 7, pp. 2511-2534.
- Harney, B. (2018), "Systems theory: forgotten legacy and future prospects", in Townsend, J. (Ed), *Introduction to Theories of Human Resources and Employment Relations*, Edward Elgar Publishing, Cheltenham.
- Harney, B. (2021), "Accommodating HRM in small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs): a critical review", *Economics and Business Review*, Vol. 23 No. 2, pp. 72-85.
- Harney, B. and Alkhalaf, H.A. (2021), "A quarter-century review of HRM in small and medium-sized enterprises: capturing what we know, exploring where we need to go", *Human Resource Management*, Vol. 60 No. 1, pp. 5-29.
- He, J., Mao, Y., Morrison, A.M. and Coca-Stefaniak, J.A. (2021), "On being warm and friendly: the effect of socially responsible human resource management on employee fears of the threats of Covid-19", *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol. 33 No. 1, pp. 346-366.
- Ho, H. and Ganesan, S. (2013), "Does knowledge base compatibility help or hurt knowledge sharing between suppliers in coopetition? The role of customer participation", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 77 No. 6, pp. 91-107.
- Hoffmann, W.H. and Schlosser, R. (2001), "Success factors of strategic alliances in small and medium-sized enterprises: an empirical survey", *Long Range Planning*, Vol. 34 No. 3, pp. 357-381.
- Hospitality Rising (2022), "Let's rise together", available at: <https://hospitalityrising.org/> (accessed 04 July 2022).
- Hoteliers' Charter (2022), "Hospitality reimagined", available at: <https://hotelierscharter.org.uk/> (accessed 12 May 2022).

- Hughes, J.C. and Christensen, D.J. (2021), "Talent management innovation in a time of unprecedented disruption: implications for practice and research", in Jooss, S., Burbach, R. and Ruël, H. (Eds), *Talent Management Innovations in the International Hospitality Industry*, Emerald Group Publishing, Bingley, pp. 153-179.
- Johnson, K.R., Huang, T. and Doyle, A. (2019), "Mapping talent development in tourism and hospitality: a literature review", *European Journal of Training and Development*, Vol. 43 No. 9, pp. 821-841.
- Jooss, S., Burbach, R. and Ruël, H. (2021a), *Talent Management Innovations in the International Hospitality Industry*, Emerald Publishing, Bingley.
- Jooss, S., Burbach, R. and Ruël, H. (2021b), "Examining talent pools as a core talent management practice in multinational corporations", *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 32 No. 11, pp. 2321-2352.
- Jooss, S., McDonnell, A., Burbach, R. and Vaiman, V. (2019), "Conceptualising talent in multinational hotel corporations", *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol. 31 No. 10, pp. 3879-3898.
- Kallmuenzer, A., Zach, F.J., Wachter, T., Kraus, S. and Salner, P. (2021), "Antecedents of coopetition in small and medium-sized hospitality firms", *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, Vol. 99.
- Kast, F.E. and Rozenzweig, J.E. (1972), "General systems theory applications for organisations and management", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 15 No. 4, pp. 161-172.
- Katz, D. and Kahn, R.L. (1978), "Organizations and the system concept", in Shafritz, J.M. and Whitbeck, P.H. (Eds), *Classics of Organization Theory*, Moore, Oak Park, IL, pp. 161-173.
- Kichuk, A., Brown, L. and Ladkin, A. (2019), "Talent pool exclusion: the hotel employee perspective", *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol. 31 No. 10, pp. 3970-3991.
- Kraus, S., Klimas, P., Gast, J. and Stephan, T. (2019), "Sleeping with competitors", *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior and Research*, Vol. 25 No. 1, pp. 50-66.
- Kravariti, F., Oruh, E.S., Dibia, C., Tasoulis, K., Scullion, H. and Mamman, A. (2021), "Weathering the storm: talent management in internationally oriented Greek small and medium-sized enterprises", *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance*, Vol. 8 No. 4, pp. 444-463.
- Kravariti, F., Voutsina, K., Tasoulis, K., Dibia, C. and Johnston, K. (2022), "Talent management in hospitality and tourism: a systematic literature review and research agenda", *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol. 34 No. 1, pp. 321-360.
- Krishnan, T.N. and Scullion, H. (2017), "Talent management and dynamic view of talent in small and medium enterprises", *Human Resource Management Review*, Vol. 27 No. 3, pp. 431-441.
- Le Roy, F., Chiambaretto, P. and Fernandez, A.-S. (2018), "From strategizing coopetition to managing coopetition", in Fernandez, A.-S., Le Roy, F., Chiambaretto, P. and Czakon, W. (Eds), *The Routledge Companion to Coopetition Strategies*, Routledge, Abingdon, pp. 36-46.
- Levy, M., Loebbecke, C. and Powell, P. (2003), "SMEs, co-opetition and knowledge sharing: the role of information systems", *European Journal of Information Systems*, Vol. 12 No. 1, pp. 3-17.
- Loufrani-Fedida, S. and Aldebert, B. (2021), "A multilevel approach to competence management in innovative small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs): literature review and research agenda", *Employee Relations*, Vol. 43 No. 2, pp. 507-523.
- Madhavan, R., Gnyawali, D.R. and Jinyh, H.E. (2004), "Two's company, three's a crowd? Triads in cooperative-competitive networks", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 47 No. 6, pp. 918-927.
- Mäkelä, K., Björkman, I. and Ehrnrooth, M. (2010), "How do MNCs establish their talent pools? Influences on individuals' likelihood of being labeled as talent", *Journal of World Business*, Vol. 45 No. 2, pp. 134-142.
- McDonnell, A., Collings, D.G., Mellahi, K. and Schuler, R.S. (2017), "Talent management: a systematic review and future prospects", *European Journal of International Management*, Vol. 11 No. 1, pp. 86-128.
- McDonnell, A., Hickey, C. and Gunnigle, P. (2011), "Global talent management: exploring talent identification in the multinational enterprise", *European Journal of International Management*, Vol. 5 No. 2, pp. 174-193.
- Mercer (2021), *Global Talent Trends: Win With Empathy*, Mercer, New York City, NY.

- Morris, M.H., Kocak, A. and Ozer, A. (2007), "Coopetition as a small business strategy: implications for performance", *Journal of Small Business Strategy*, Vol. 18 No. 1, pp. 35-56.
- Nadler, D.A. and Tushman, M.L. (1980), "A model for diagnosing organizational behavior", *Organizational Dynamics*, Vol. 9 No. 2, pp. 35-51.
- OECD (2015), *Taxation of SMEs in OECD and G20 Countries*, OECD Publishing, Paris.
- Pathak, S.D., Wu, Z. and Johnston, D. (2014), "Toward a structural view of co-opetition in supply networks", *Journal of Operations Management*, Vol. 32 No. 5, pp. 254-267.
- Peng, T.J.A. and Bourne, M. (2009), "The coexistence of competition and cooperation between networks: implications from two Taiwanese healthcare networks", *British Journal of Management*, Vol. 20 No. 3, pp. 377-400.
- Raza-Ullah, T., Bengtsson, M. and Kock, S. (2014), "The coopetition paradox and tension in coopetition at multiple levels", *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 43 No. 2, pp. 189-198.
- Robert, F., Marques, P. and Le Roy, F. (2009), "Coopetition between SMEs: an empirical study of French professional football", *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, Vol. 8 No. 1, pp. 23-43.
- Schleicher, D.J., Baumann, H.M., Sullivan, D.W., Levy, P.E., Hargrove, D.C. and Barros-Rivera, B.A. (2018), "Putting the system into performance management systems: a review and agenda for performance management research", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 44 No. 6, pp. 2209-2245.
- Sheehan, M., Grant, K. and Garavan, T.N. (2018), "Strategic talent management: a macro and micro analysis of current issues in hospitality and tourism", *Worldwide Hospitality and Tourism Themes*, Vol. 10 No. 1, pp. 28-41.
- Smith Travel Research (2015), *Hotel Census Database*, Smith Travel Research, Hendersonville, NC.
- Thomason, S.J., Simendinger, E. and Kiernan, D. (2013), "Several determinants of successful coopetition in small business", *Journal of Small Business and Entrepreneurship*, Vol. 26 No. 1, pp. 15-28.
- Tidstrom, A. (2014), "Managing tensions in coopetition", *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 43 No. 2, pp. 261-271.
- United Nations (2022), "Promote inclusive and sustainable economic growth, employment and decent work for all", available at: <https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/economic-growth/> (accessed 04 July 2022).
- Vaiman, V., Cascio, W.F., Collings, D.G. and Swider, B.W. (2021), "The shifting boundaries of talent management", *Human Resource Management*, Vol. 60 No. 2, pp. 253-257.
- Valverde, M., Scullion, H. and Ryan, G. (2013), "Talent management in Spanish medium-sized organisations", *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 24 No. 9, pp. 1832-1852.
- Van den Broek, J., Boselie, P. and Paauwe, J. (2018), "Cooperative innovation through a talent management pool: a qualitative study on coopetition in healthcare", *European Management Journal*, Vol. 36 No. 1, pp. 135-144

Figure 1. Integrative framework for coopetition in talent management