

## HRM IN PRIVATE AND PUBLIC ORGANIZATIONS IN SERBIA

UDC: 005.96(497.11)  
Original Scientific Paper

Nemanja BERBER<sup>1</sup>, Agneš SLAVIĆ<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Economics, 24000 Subotica, Segedinski put 9-11, Republic of Serbia  
E-mail: [berber@ef.uns.ac.rs](mailto:berber@ef.uns.ac.rs)

<sup>2</sup>University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Economics, 24000 Subotica, Segedinski put 9-11, Republic of Serbia

Paper received: 29.04.2016.; Paper accepted: 25.05.2016.

**Human resource management (HRM) is a management concept which obtains many practices and activities. Although there is a substantial literature on HRM in the private sector, the practice of HRM in the public sector is still scarce. In the private sector, HRM is found as a factor for gaining competitive advantage, especially if HR practices are implemented in the way of high-performing working practice (HPWP). In the public sector, HRM is seen as paternalistic management, with the standardization of employment practices, collective bargaining and working practices that emphasize equal opportunities for employees. The goal of this research is to explore the characteristics and differences between HRM practice in organizations from the private and public sector. The subject of the research is HRM practice (staffing, training and development, compensation and benefits, and industrial relation and communication) in the private and public organizations in the Republic of Serbia. The methodology of the paper includes exploration of the available literature on the theme and statistical analysis of the differences between HR practices in organizations from the private and public sector. The research is based on the HR data gathered in the second CRANET research round in Serbia, performed in 2015.**

**Keywords:** Human resource management, Private sector, public sector, Serbia, Cranet.

### INTRODUCTION

HRM as a concept of managing human capital is widely explored and discussed in private sector organizations. Most of the themes are related to the exploration of HRM activities (HR planning, staffing, training and development, compensation, retention, communication) in large private organizations, where HRM is found as a factor for gaining competitive advantage, especially if HR practices are implemented in the way of 'high performance', 'high commitment', or 'high involvement' practices as they are "thought to release untapped reserves of 'human resourcefulness' by increasing employee commitment, participation and involvement" (Gould-Williams, 2004). On the other side, there is a lack of the literature and empirical research in the area of HRM in small and medium enterprises (Urbano and Yordanova, 2008; Zolak-Poljašević and Petković, 2013; Štangl Šušnjar et al., 2016) and organizations from public sector (Boyne et al.,

1999; Gould-Williams, 2004; Marčetić, 2006; Giauque et al., 2013). In the public sector, in the UK for example, HRM is usually seen as paternalistic management, with the standardization of employment practices, collective bargaining and working practices that emphasize equal opportunities for employees (Boyne et al., 1999; Gould-Williams, 2004).

For the purpose of this paper, we decided to explore the practice of HRM in the public sector organizations in comparison with the HRM in the private sector organizations. The goal of this research is to explore the characteristics and differences between HRM practice in organizations from the private and public sector. The subject of the research is HRM practice (staffing, training and development, compensation and benefits, industrial relation and communication) in the private and public sector organizations in the Republic of Serbia. The methodology of the paper includes exploration of

the available literature on the theme and statistical analysis of the differences between HR practices in organizations from the private and public sector. The research is based on the HR data gathered in the second CRANET research<sup>1</sup> round, performed in Serbia in 2015.

## THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

The main goal of the enterprises from the private sector is a long-term business success and earnings for shareholders. In the case of public sector enterprises, there are two purposes of business: the provision of general public interest and achieving the commercial objectives of the business, i.e. economic benefits (Mijić et al., 2015). Public sector is seen as less successful in comparison with private sector organizations regarding performances and management approaches (Mijić et al., 2015; Caemmerer and Dewar, 2013; Boubakri and Cosset, 1998; Megginson et al., 1994). Today, each and every organization has to manage all its resources in the best way to create new value if it wants to survive. Therefore it was interesting to explore HRM approach in public and private sector since HRM is one of the driving forces for competitive advantages in modern business (Berber and Slavić, 2014; Campbell et al., 2012; Wright and McMahan, 2011).

In the traditional model of the public sector organizations, employment policy was based on bureaucratic practices and principles of rule-governed rational action. "The administrative system was subjected to a bureaucratization of procedures to ensure that decisions and actions were consistent, formalized and systematically addressed activities through a pre-defined application of rules and processes" (Brown, 2008). The employment system in public sector can be described as (Štangl Šušnjar, 2013; Chaston, 2011; Brown, 2008; Marčetić, 2006; Boyne et al., 1999):

- Highly centralized and run by powerful state agencies or ministries that are responsible for all HRM decisions - staffing, training and career development, compensation, retirement.
- Compensation is based on the job position and/or seniority.
- Job positions are narrow, specific task-based and highly routinized, usually outdated.

- Seniority or length in the service was the basis for promotion and career development.
- The influence of trade unions is usually strong.
- Since the main goal of public sector organizations is the provision of public service, in addition to economic, public sector organizations must achieve other legal, democratic and social values.
- Public organizations had significant financial help from local, regional or state level.
- Management and organization of public sector organization are under the pressure of wide range of political and economic factors.

This kind of organizational systems came under strong pressure of the modern business conditions, especially economic recession. The new approach to management in public sector organizations should allow greater flexibility in dealing with HRM issues, which would make the transformation from traditional, transactional HRM to strategic HRM, oriented to the increase of the employees' productivity and organizational outcomes. One possible approach is the New Public Management, described as a more flexible approach to public management in terms of performance-based organization which facilitates innovation and efficiency of public enterprises, and personal responsibility of managers (Štangl Šušnjar, 2013).

Main determinants of the reform of public sector management lie in (Hughes, 2003):

- strategic approach;
- management, not administration;
- focus on results;
- improvement of financial management;
- flexibility in staffing;
- flexibility in the organization;
- the shift to greater competition;
- new contractualism;
- stressing private management styles and practices;
- separation of purchasers and providers;
- re-examination of the role of the government.

Since the transformation of public management is a very complex issue, we decided to explore only one segment of management in private and public sector organizations, HRM practice. Our research hypothesis, based on the above presented theoretical sources and past researches, is:

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.ef.uns.ac.rs/cranet/index.html>

*H1*: Human resource management practice is less developed in public sector than in private sector organizations in Serbia.

## METHODOLOGY

The applied methodology of the survey was formulated and has been developed by the research fellows of CRANET (Cranfield Network on Comparative Human Resource Management) network founded by five countries in 1989. It has become the basis of regular comparative surveys on HR policy and practice in Europe and in an increasing number of countries worldwide. The survey is conducted approximately every four years (Steinmetz et al., 2011) in over 40 countries of the world (Lazarova et al., 2008). The aim of the research is to provide high-quality data for the purposes of academic, public and private sectors, as well as for students of human resource management, and to create new knowledge about human resource management practices in different countries of the world. The questionnaire was divided into six parts/sections: HRM activities in organization, staffing, employee development, compensation and benefits, industrial relations and communication, and organizational details. Despite some methodological limitations, Cranet studies have brought important empirical data since 1990, providing insights into the development of human resource management practices in member countries, whose number is growing steadily, and to the theoretical development of the field of comparative human resource management (Karoliny et al., 2009).

Faculty of Economics in Subotica has performed two cycles of research on the practice of human resource management in Serbia according to the methodology of international Cranet research. As the only member of the international scientific network from Serbia, Faculty of Economics participated in this international examination of the activities of HRM in 2008 for the first time with the 50 analyzed organizations. In the first half of 2015, we examined 160 organizations. This was the second cycle of the Cranet research in Serbia. The answers to the questions gave HR managers in organizations (Leković et al., 2015).

Regarding the sample, the largest share of the sample in Serbia in 2015 was SME sector, 60%. There are 27% of large organizations and 13% of very large, with more than 1000 employees. The sample of explored organizations in Serbia

consisted of public (34%) and private (66%) sector. Around 8% of analyzed organizations are from the agriculture sector, 35% is from industry sector, and 57% of organizations are from the service sector. We examined the main differences in the basic HRM activities (recruitment, selection, training, career development, compensation, industrial relation, and communication) between organizations from private and public sector. We used non-parametric statistical techniques (Spearman's Chi Square test and Mann-Whitney U test). Main techniques of recruitment, selection, training, development, compensation and communication were taken from Cranet database, in the form of variables (dummies and continuous). We used Chi Square test to explore the differences between categorical variables and Mann-Whitney test in case of continuous variables.

## RESULTS

For the analysis of the differences between organizations from private and public sector in the usage of contemporary recruitment and selection techniques, the authors used Spearman Chi Square test. According to the data from table 1, there are statistically significant differences between private and public organizations in the usage of recruitment and selection methods.

Generally, organizations from public sector use modern techniques of recruitment and selection for professional workers less than those from the private sector ( $p < 0.05$ ). This is obvious for all techniques of recruitment, except for internal recruitment, where we found no statistically significant differences ( $p = 0.99$ ). The strengths of the associations between two variables were weak (Phi from 0.217 to 0.429). Similar results are found for the selection techniques. In the case of psychometric, online, and ability tests no statistically significant ( $p > 0.05$ ) differences were found, while other techniques are used in a higher share of organizations from private than from public sector.

We used Mann-Whitney U test to explore the differences between organizations from private and public sector regarding the usage of training techniques. According to the data from table 2 and 3, there are statistically significant differences between private and public sector regarding the number of days spent on training for managers and manual workers. Private sector organizations use more days than public sector organizations for

these two categories of employees. In the case of professional workers and the percentage of payroll

costs used for training, there were no statistically significant differences found.

Table 1: Differences between private and public organizations in recruitment and selection practice

Recruitment					Selection				
	Internal recruitment		Pearson Chi-Square	2,714		Interview panel		Pearson Chi-Square	4,248
	Generally not used	Yes	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	,099		Generally not used	Yes	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	,039
Private sector	39,0%	61,0%	Phi	,131	Private sector	45,7%	54,3%	Phi	,163
Public sector	25,9%	74,1%			Public sector	63,0%	37,0%		
Total	34,6%	65,4%			Total	51,6%	48,4%		
	Word of mouth/employee referral		Pearson Chi-Square	7,487		Psychometric test		Pearson Chi-Square	0,125
	Generally not used	Yes	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	,006		Generally not used	Yes	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	,724
Private sector	41,9%	58,1%	Phi	,217	Private sector	71,4%	28,6%	Phi	,028
Public sector	64,8%	35,2%			Public sector	74,1%	25,9%		
Total	49,7%	50,3%			Total	72,3%	27,7%		
	Social media		Pearson Chi-Square	11,189		Assessment centre		Pearson Chi-Square	7,15
	Generally not used	Yes	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	,001		Generally not used	Yes	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	,007
Private sector	78,1%	21,9%	Phi	,265	Private sector	72,4%	27,6%	Phi	,212
Public sector	98,1%	1,9%			Public sector	90,7%	9,3%		
Total	84,9%	15,1%			Total	78,6%	21,4%		
	Career fairs		Pearson Chi-Square	14,48		Social media profiles		Pearson Chi-Square	9,149
	Generally not used	Yes	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	,000		Generally not used	Yes	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	,002
Private sector	57,1%	42,9%	Phi	,302	Private sector	84,8%	15,2%	Phi	,240
Public sector	87,0%	13,0%			Public sector	100,0%			
Total	67,3%	32,7%			Total	89,9%	10,1%		
	Recruitment agencies		Pearson Chi-Square	9,149		References selection		Pearson Chi-Square	7,59
	Generally not used	Yes	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	,002		Generally not used	Yes	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	,006
Private sector	84,8%	15,2%	Phi	,240	Private sector	24,8%	75,2%	Phi	,218
Public sector	100,0%				Public sector	46,3%	53,7%		
Total	89,9%	10,1%			Total	32,1%	67,9%		
	Vacancy page on company website		Pearson Chi-Square	14,815		Ability tests/ Work sample		Pearson Chi-Square	2,969
	Generally not used	Yes	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	,000		Generally not used	Yes	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	,085
Private sector	40,0%	60,0%	Phi	,305	Private sector	48,6%	51,4%	Phi	,137
Public sector	72,2%	27,8%			Public sector	63,0%	37,0%		
Total	50,9%	49,1%			Total	53,5%	46,5%		
	Vacancies on commercial job websites		Pearson Chi-Square	29,289		Online selection tests		Pearson Chi-Square	0,199
	Generally not used	Yes	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	,000		Generally not used	Yes	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	0,656
Private sector	36,2%	63,8%	Phi	,429	Private sector	90,5%	9,5%	Phi	,035
Public sector	81,5%	18,5%			Public sector	92,6%	7,4%		
Total	51,6%	48,4%			Total	91,2%	8,8%		

Source: Authors' analysis based on Cranet database

We used Mann-Whitney U test to explore the differences between organizations from private and public sector regarding the usage of career management techniques (0=not used to 4=used to a large extent). According to the data from table 4 and 5, there are statistically significant differences between private and public sector regarding several

techniques for career development ( $p < 0.05$ ). Private sector organizations use most of the listed career development techniques in a greater extent than organizations from the public sector (Means). Public sector organizations use modern techniques at very low level.

Table 2: Differences between private and public organizations in training practice

	Sector	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Percentage of the annual payroll costs spent on training	Private sector	83.23	8656.00
	Public sector	72.31	3905.00
	Total		
Approximate number of days Managers receive training	Private sector	81.26	7800.50
	Public sector	65.27	3524.50
	Total		
Approximate number of days Professionals receive training	Private sector	77.53	7520.50
	Public sector	73.25	3955.50
	Total		
Approximate number of days Clericals/Manuals receive training	Private sector	81.63	7918.50
	Public sector	65.88	3557.50
	Total		

Source: Authors' analysis based on Cranet database

Table 3: Mann – Whitney U test and Means for differences between private and public organizations in training practice

Test Statistics <sup>a</sup>				
	Percentage of the annual payroll costs spent on training	Approximate number of days Managers receive training	Approximate number of days Professionals receive training	Approximate number of days Clericals/Manuals receive training
Private sector mean	2.85	7.23	6.65	5.40
Public sector mean	2.31	5.54	5.94	3.65
Total mean	2.66	6.62	6.40	4.77
Mann-Whitney U	2420.000	2039.500	2470.500	2072.500
<b>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</b>	.143	<b>.028</b>	.554	<b>.032</b>

a. Grouping Variable: Sector

Source: Authors' analysis based on Cranet database

Table 4: Differences between private and public organizations in career development practice

	Sector	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks		Sector	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Use of Special tasks	Private sector	83.63	8614	Use of Succession plans	Private sector	86.18	8876.5
	Public sector	70.17	3789		Public sector	65.31	3526.5
Use of Projects to stimulate learning	Private sector	81.11	8273	Use of Planned job rotation	Private sector	87.27	9076.5
	Public sector	73.57	3973		Public sector	62.76	3326.5
Use of Training on-the-job	Private sector	85.44	8800	Use of "High flier" schemes	Private sector	86.19	8877.5
	Public sector	66.72	3603		Public sector	63.56	3368.5
Use of Participation in project team work	Private sector	80.09	8249.5	Use of International work assignments	Private sector	86.59	8919
	Public sector	76.92	4153.5		Public sector	64.52	3484
Use of Formal networking schemes	Private sector	81.18	8361.5	Use of Coaching	Private sector	87.74	9037
	Public sector	74.84	4041.5		Public sector	62.33	3366
					Total		
Use of Formal career plans	Private sector	79.9	8229.5	Use of Mentoring	Private sector	79.38	8255
	Public sector	77.29	4173.5		Public sector	79.74	4306
Use of Development centers	Private sector	82.28	8474.5	Use of e-learning	Private sector	85.14	8769.5
	Public sector	72.75	3928.5		Public sector	67.29	3633.5

Source: Authors' analysis based on Cranet database

Table 5: Mann – Whitney U test and Means for differences between private and public organizations in career development practice

Test Statistics <sup>a</sup>							
	Use of Special tasks	Use of Projects to stimulate learning	Use of Training on-the-job	Use of Participation in project team work	Use of Formal networking schemes	Use of Formal career plans	Use of Development centres
Private sector mean	1.63	1.26	3.07	1.94	1.23	1.24	.77
Public sector mean	1.24	1.09	2.56	1.83	1.07	1.20	.44
Total mean	1.50	1.21	2.89	1.90	1.18	1.23	.66
Mann-Whitney U	2304.000	2488.000	2118.000	2668.500	2556.500	2688.500	2443.500
<b>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</b>	.069	.293	<b>.010</b>	.671	.378	.716	.133
	Use of Succession plans	Use of Planned job rotation	Use of "High flier" schemes	Use of International work assignments	Use of Coaching	Use of Mentoring	Use of e-learning
Private sector mean	1.43	1.26	.99	1.17	1.57	2.79	1.38
Public sector mean	.81	.62	.32	.46	.78	2.81	.74
Total mean	1.22	1.04	.76	.93	1.30	2.80	1.16
Mann-Whitney U	2041.500	1895.500	1937.500	1999.000	1881.000	2795.000	2148.500
<b>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</b>	<b>.004</b>	<b>.001</b>	<b>.001</b>	<b>.001</b>	<b>.000</b>	.960	<b>.012</b>

a. Grouping Variable: Sector

Source: Authors' analysis based on Cranet database

Table 6: Differences between private and public organizations in compensation practice

		Flexible benefits		Pearson Chi-Square	4.177
		Generally not used	Yes	<b>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</b>	<b>.041</b>
Sector	Private sector	82.9%	17.1%	<b>Phi</b>	<b>.162</b>
	Public sector	94.4%	5.6%		
Total		86.8%	13.2%		
		Individual performance related pay		Pearson Chi-Square	.851
		Generally not used	Yes	<b>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</b>	<b>.356</b>
Sector	Private sector	33.3%	66.7%	<b>Phi</b>	<b>.073</b>
	Public sector	40.7%	59.3%		
Total		35.8%	64.2%		
		Bonus based on individual goals		Pearson Chi-Square	22.759
		Generally not used	Yes	<b>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</b>	<b>.000</b>
Sector	Private sector	43.8%	56.2%	<b>Phi</b>	<b>.378</b>
	Public sector	83.3%	16.7%		
Total		57.2%	42.8%		
		Bonus based on organizational goals		Pearson Chi-Square	7.309
		Generally not used	Yes	<b>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</b>	<b>.007</b>
Sector	Private sector	58.1%	41.9%	<b>Phi</b>	<b>.214</b>
	Public sector	79.6%	20.4%		
Total		65.4%	34.6%		
		Non-monetary incentives		Pearson Chi-Square	5.351
		Generally not used	Yes	<b>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</b>	<b>.021</b>
Sector	Private sector	55.2%	44.8%	<b>Phi</b>	<b>.183</b>
	Public sector	74.1%	25.9%		
Total		61.6%	38.4%		

Source: Authors' analysis based on Cranet database

For the analysis of the differences between organizations from private and public sector in the usage of contemporary compensation techniques the authors used Spearman Chi Square test. According to the data presented in table 6, there are statistically significant differences between private and public organizations in the usage of pay for performance methods. Generally, organizations from public sector use modern techniques of rewarding professional workers less than those from the private sector ( $p < 0.05$ ). This is obvious for all techniques of compensation, except

for individual performance based pay, where there were no statistically significant ( $p = 0.356$ ) differences found. The strengths of the associations between these two variables were weak (Phi from 0.162 to 0.378).

We used Mann-Whitney U test to explore the differences between the organizations from private and public sector regarding the trade union practice. According to the data cited in table 7 and 8, there are statistically significant differences between private and public sector regarding the

proportion of employees that are members of a trade union and the extent to which trade unions influence organization ( $p < 0.05$ ). Public sector organizations use trade union participation in a greater extent than organizations from the private

sector (Means). Also, trade unions have greater power (the extent of the influence) in organizations from public ( $M = 3.3$ ) than from private sector ( $M = 1.69$ ).

Table 7: Differences between private and public organizations in trade union practice

	Sector	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Proportion of employees that are members of a trade union	Private sector	66.08	6938.50
	Public sector	107.06	5781.50
Extent to which trade unions influence organization	Private sector	66.72	7005.50
	Public sector	105.82	5714.50

Source: Authors' analysis based on Cranet database

Table 8: Mann – Whitney U test and Means for differences between private and public organizations in trade union practice

Test Statistics <sup>a</sup>		
	Proportion of employees that are members of a trade union (from 1=0%-10% to 7=75%-100%)	Extent to which trade unions influence organization (from 1 to 5)
Private sector mean	3.00	1.69
Public sector mean	4.98	3.30
Total mean	3.67	2.23
Mann-Whitney U	1373.500	1440.500
Wilcoxon W	6938.500	7005.500
Z	-5.488	-5.412
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000

a. Grouping Variable: Sector

Source: Authors' analysis based on Cranet database

Table 9: Differences between private and public organizations in trade union practice

	Sector	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Direct from senior managers	Private sector	80,12	8413,00
	Public sector	79,76	4307,00
Through immediate superior	Private sector	78,84	8199,50
	Public sector	80,77	4361,50
Through trade union representatives	Private sector	69,31	7208,00
	Public sector	99,13	5353,00
Through works council to communicate with employees	Private sector	77,18	8026,50
	Public sector	82,58	4376,50
Through regular workforce meetings	Private sector	87,50	9012,00
	Public sector	62,80	3391,00
Team briefings	Private sector	85,48	8975,00
	Public sector	69,35	3745,00
Electronic communication to communicate with employees	Private sector	87,57	9107,50
	Public sector	63,95	3453,50

Source: Authors' analysis based on Cranet database

Table 10: Mann – Whitney U test and Means for differences between private and public organizations in communication practice

Test Statistics <sup>a</sup>							
	Direct from senior managers	Through immediate superior	Through trade union representatives	Through works council	Through regular workforce meetings	Team briefings	Electronic communication
Private sector mean	2,74	3,36	1,29	,38	2,67	2,22	2,93
Public sector mean	2,81	3,41	2,26	,51	1,89	1,65	2,22
Total mean	2,77	3,37	1,62	,42	2,40	2,03	2,69
Mann-Whitney U	2822,000	2739,500	1748,000	2566,500	1906,000	2260,000	1968,500
<b>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</b>	,961	,769	,000	,311	,001	,031	,001

a. Grouping Variable: Sector

Source: Authors' analysis based on Cranet database

We used Mann-Whitney U test to explore the differences between organizations from private and public sector regarding the communication practice, i.e. how organizations communicate with their employees. According to the data shown in table 9 and 10, there are statistically significant differences between private and public sector regarding communication practice ( $p < 0.05$ ). Private sector organizations use modern communication channels (team briefings, e-communication) to a greater extent than organizations from the public sector (Means). In contrast, public sector organizations use trade unions as a communication channel with their employees more than organizations from the private sector.

## CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the research we can conclude that in Serbia human resource management approach in public sector is less developed than in private sector organization. A smaller share of public sector organizations use modern techniques for recruitment, selection, and compensation. Also, public sector organizations spend less money and days on training programs for their employees. In the case of communication, those organizations usually use traditional channels, direct from supervisors or via trade union representatives. Regarding the level of unionization and the influence of trade unions, as expected, public sector organizations have stronger trade union influence. In comparison with private sector organizations, we found that in Serbia HRM in public sector organization is less developed than in private sector organizations. The results of Spearman's Chi Square test and Mann-Whitney U test showed that smaller share of public sector organizations uses modern techniques of HRM than private sector organizations. These differences are statistically significant, so we can conclude that our hypothesis H1 is confirmed.

In order to improve its organizational performances, in the line with the idea of New Public Management, public sector organizations need to change its view on HRM. According to the results, HRM in public sector is still implemented as transactional practice, not like strategic function. To improve management practice a very important step will be the employment of high qualified HR managers and managers on the other levels in public sector organizations, their continuous

training, and development, and strengthening of their cooperation in order to be successful in the implementation of HR strategies and practices. Generally, this can be seen as managerial professionalization in public management.

## REFERENCES

- Berber, N., & Slavić, A. (2014). The practice of career development in the international human resource management of the European countries. *Journal of Engineering Management and Competitiveness*, 4(1), 21-26.
- Boubakri, N., & Cosset, J. C. (1998). The financial and operating performance of newly privatized firms: Evidence from developing countries. *The Journal of Finance*, 53(3), 1081-1110.
- Boyne, G., Poole, M., & Jenkins, G. (1999). Human resource management in the public and private sectors: An empirical comparison. *Public Administration*, 77(2), 407-420.
- Brown, K. A. (2008). Human resource management in the public sector. In: R.S. Beattie & S.P. Osborne (Ed.), *Human resource management in the public sector*, (pp. 1-7). London: Routledge.
- Caemmerer, B., & Dewar, A. (2013). A Comparison Of Private And Public Sector Performance. *Journal of Applied Business Research*, 29(5), 1451-1458.
- Campbell, B. A., Coff, R., & Kryscynski, D. (2012). Rethinking sustained competitive advantage from human capital. *Academy of Management Review*, 37(3), 376-395.
- Chaston, I. (2011). *Public Sector Management: Mission Impossible?*. London: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Giauque, D., Anderfuhren-Biget, S., & Varone, F. (2013). HRM practices, intrinsic motivators, and organizational performance in the public sector. *Public Personnel Management*, 42(2), 123-150.
- Gould-Williams, J. (2004). The effects of 'high commitment' HRM practices on employee attitude: the views of public sector workers. *Public Administration*, 82(1), 63-81.
- Hughes, O.E. (2003). *Public Management and Administration: An Introduction, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Karoliny, Z., Farkas, F., & Poór, J. (2009). In focus: Hungarian and Central Eastern European characteristics of human resource management - An international comparative survey. *Journal of East European Management Studies*, 14(1), 9-47.
- Lazarova, M., Morley, M., & Tyson, S. (2008). International comparative studies in HRM and performance—the Cranet data: Introduction. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 19(11), 1995-2003.
- Leković, B., Slavić, A., & Berber, N. (2015). Praksa upravljanja ljudskim resursima u Srbiji 2014/2015 - Izveštaj Cranet istraživanja. Subotica: Ekonomski fakultet.



- Marčetić, G. (2006). Upravljanje ljudskim potencijalima u javnoj upravi i novi Zakon o državnim službenicima. *Hrvatska i komparativna javna uprava*, 6(2), 83-118.
- Mijić, K., Jakšić, D., & Berber, N. (2015). The analysis of productivity and profitability in the CEE region: Focus on the private and public sector. *Serbian Journal of Management*, 10(2), 215-224.
- Meggison, W. L., Nash, R. C., & Randenborgh, M. (1994). The financial and operating performance of newly privatized firms: An international empirical analysis. *The Journal of Finance*, 49(2), 403-452.
- Štangl Šušnjar, G. (2013). *Menadžment urbanom sredinom*. Subotica: Ekonomski fakultet.
- Štangl Šušnjar, G., Slavić, A., Berber, N., & Leković, B. (2016). The role of human resource management in small and medium sized companies in Central-Eastern Europe. In J. Ateljević & J. Trivić (Eds.), *Economic Development and Entrepreneurship in Transition Economies - Issues* (pp. 205-229). Switzerland: Springer International Publishing.
- Steinmetz, H., Schwens, C., Wehner, M., & Kabst, R. (2011). Conceptual and methodological issues in comparative HRM research: The Cranet project as an example. *Human Resource Management Review*, 21(1), 16-26.
- Urbano, D., & Yordanova, D. (2008). Determinants of the adoption of HRM practices in tourism SMEs in Spain: an exploratory study. *Service Business*, 2(3), 167-185.
- Wright, P. M., & McMahan, G. C. (2011). Exploring human capital: putting 'human' back into strategic human resource management. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 21(2), 93-104.
- Zolak-Poljašević, B., & Petković, S. (2013). Human resource management in small and medium-sized enterprises: Conceptual framework. *Facta universitatis-series: Economics and Organization*, 10(3), 301-315.

## HRM U PRIVATNIM I JAVNIM ORGANIZACIJAMA U SRBIJI

Menadžment ljudskih resursa (Human Resource Management, HRM) je koncept upravljanja koji obuhvata različite funkcije i aktivnosti. Iako postoje značajni izvori literature o menadžmentu ljudskih resursa u privatnom sektoru, HRM praksa u javnom sektoru je i dalje nedovoljno istražena. U privatnom sektoru HRM se prihvata kao faktor za sticanje konkurentske prednosti, naročito ako HRM sprovodi kroz radne aktivnosti koje vode ka visokim performansama (High Performance Working Practices). U javnom sektoru menadžment ljudskim resursima se shvata kao paternalistički menadžment, sa standardizacijom prakse zapošljavanja, kolektivnog pregovaranja i radnih praksi koje naglašavaju jednake mogućnosti za sve zaposlene. Cilj ovog istraživanja je istraživanje karakteristika i razlika između HRM prakse u organizacijama iz privatnog i javnog sektora. Predmet istraživanja jesu aktivnosti menadžmeta ljudskih resursa (stafing, obuka i razvoj, kompenzacije i beneficije, radni odnos i komunikacija) u privatnim i javnim organizacijama u Republici Srbiji. Metodologija rada obuhvata istraživanje dostupne literature o temi i statističku analizu razlika između HR prakse u organizacijama iz privatnog i javnog sektora. Istraživanje je zasnovano na podacima prikupljenim u drugom CRANET istraživačkom periodu u Srbiji, iz 2015. godine.

**Cljučne reči:** Menadžment ljudskih resursa, Privatni sektor, Javni sektor, Srbija, Cranet.