Talent Management Measurement: A Case of Higher Education Institution in Pakistan

Dr. Imran Warriach[1], Dr. Alia Ahmed[2], Dr. Taseer Salahuddin[3], Ms. Ismat Nasim[4]

[1]Assistant Professor, Bahria University. Pakistan imranwarraich4834@gmail.com
[2]Professor & Dean, School of Business Administration, National College of Business Administration & Economics, Lahore, Pakistan. dralia@ncbae.edu.pk
[3]Assistant Professor, Department of Economics, Government Sadiq College Women University, Bahawalpur, Pakistan. salahuddin.taseer@gmail.com (Corresponding Author)
[4]Lecturer, Department of Economics, Government Sadiq College Women University, Bahawalpur, Pakistan. ismat.nasim@gscwu.edu.pk

Abstract: The Purpose of the study was to explore the measurement and alignment aspects of talent management (TM), so that an effective TM tool/scale could be developed, which could effectively measure the TM efforts in organizations and also align the TM processes to the organizational strategy. In this regard, the concept of TM was explored from multiple dimensions' that includes global view of TM, organizational strategy and performance, big data and agility. After extensive literature review it was noted that all the dimensions of TM have not been considered yet for the purpose of its alignment with the strategy. Likewise, the measurement aspect of TM was also found not to be fully exploited as only survey-based measurement scales were used in the existing research, indicates passive mode of measurement. Different scorecard approaches were studied and finally balanced scorecard (BSC) approach was considered appropriate and the logic of TM Scorecard was adopted from it. Correspondingly, it was empirically tested by collecting data from a higher education institute in Pakistan. The results of the study implicate to the theory and practice for effective TM, which helps the organizations to compete effectively in this era of globalization.

Keywords: Talent Management Measurement, Talent Management Scorecard, Higher Education Institution, Challenges and Opportunities.

1. Introduction

"Developing talent is business's most important task – the sine quo none of competition in knowledge economy."   (Peter Drucker)

In this contemporary age organizations are competing at global level, in order to stay competitive, they are looking for employees with specific capabilities called talent. Competition to acquire these individuals is quite intense, since everyone is looking for these individuals. Furthermore, in the above quote Peter Drucker has rightly pointed out that in the knowledge economy era talent management should be the important task for organizations.

In the same milieu term 'war for talent' introduced by Mckinsey& company further strengthened the need of talented individuals for organizations to compete successfully in the globalized competitive business environment.

2. Literature Review

Presently, TM is one of the burning issues for the organizations and it likely to stay the same in the future (Festing et al., 2017), validated by Collings, Mellahi& Cascio (2018). It is the strategy to drive the talent, which can pursue the strategic intent of the MNEs in global perspective (Lucien, 2017). Contextualization of TM in global context has been explored by Vaiman, Collings & Scullion (2017) by reviewing the best papers presented in the fifth EIASM Workshop on Talent Management, which was hosted in Copenhagen Business School in October 2016. The major inference from the study is that talent is not generic and processes for deployment of talent are required to build organizational capabilities. King (2018) has debated on TM in the national context, discussed the example of Canada, as a nation is continuously involved in talent attraction and development both domestically and internationally, which entailed that Canada has a strength to compete for global and national talent. Makram, Sparrow & Greasley (2017) conducted 50 in-depth interviews to empirically test how TM practices can create value for organizations. it has been highlighted that the right culture and better alignment of talent are the necessary ingredients for the execution of value creating strategies in an organization.

According to van den Broek, Boselie& Paauwe (2017) research, Dutch healthcare system mitigated the issue of increased competition due scarce financial resources and shortage of talented employees through 'Coopetition'. Shared TM pools were developed by four hospitals to solve the numerical issues of talent shortages. The study further entails that the talent pools can also be developed to use for strategic reasons like research & development, knowledge sharing, and co-creation. Furthermore, it has been noted that coopetition is a very innovative dimension to TM and it could be utilized not only to solve the issue of the shortage of talented employees but also to enhance the competitiveness of the SMEs. A holistic approach to win the war for talent has been proposed by Ulrich, (2015), basically he argue that talent and organization both need to be viewed together. By organization he essentially means the culture and proposed that this integration will create sustained competitive advantage. A theoretical study by (King, 2017) entailed 'talent climate construct', it has been stressed that a strong talent system is required to establish right talent climate, in order to achieve required firm performance. Furthermore, as an outcome of the study a theoretical model has been proposed to be tested empirically in different contextual settings.

Globalization has also triggered phenomena of international careers/ global flow of talent, which is fueled by both expatriate assignments and self-initiated international moves. Basically, this situation has posed

different challenges for both MNEs and internationalized SMEs because they have to compete globally for talented individuals. Thus, to survive the globalization and competiveness in the present day world organizations must implement efficient and appropriate TM practices that aimed to successfully attract, retain, and develop talent (Eberz&Gilli, 2018).

A study was conducted in Germany to investigate TM perspectives with 700 Chief Executive Officers CEOs and owners/founders, it was realized that CEOs/ owners had central role in recruitment and hiring decisions (Festing et al. ,2013). It has also been highlighted by Cui et al. (2016) that there is often lack of clarity among managers about the notion of talent. Recently, Sheehan, Grant &Garavan (2018) have noted that the effective implementation of TM in the hospitality and tourism sector to enhance the brand and competitiveness of the organization. They have also asserted that the continuing problem of high labour turnover could also be addressed through TM practices

A case study of Maersk (world's largest container shipping company) has been used by Lucien (2017) to identify the linkage between TM and wider management of organizational capabilities. It has been advocated that 'Strategies define capabilities and capabilities define talent', thereby highlighting the importance of talent to win over competition. For instance, in case of Maersk, it wanted to lead in cost and in shipping business network design is the main capability, which drives the costs and likewise the network designers are key talent. From this argument, it has been learnt that to win over competitors' specific talent is required and organizations can look for particular segment of talent, which could lead them in the market. Keeping the case of Maersk in view, it could be argued that if capital of talent is invested better than competitors, organizations can achieve competitive advantage.

To achieve sustainably effective organizations, Lawler (2018) deliberated that talent should drive business strategy in order to achieve augmented performance. While studying case of Maersk, Lucien (2017) identified linkage between TM and wider management of organizational capabilities. Moreover, it has been advocated that 'Strategies define capabilities and capabilities define talent', thereby highlighting the importance of talent to win over competition. Boston consulting group (BCG) "believes the key to sustainable business performance is tightly linking leadership to talent capability-building and value creation" (BCG, 2108). The argument generated by BCG entails that TM is a strategic capability, which helps in maintaining sustainable performance. Therefore, a question arises here that how we will know that do we have the optimal talent management capabilities to achieve sustainable organizational performance, measurement is the correct answer to this question.

In case of Pakistan TM is a major issue, since no evidence has been found in this regard, limited empirical research is available for effective TM. According to Shamsi, Imtinan&Imtinan (2010), TM in public sector is a new thing in Pakistan, and very few studies have been conducted on TM. Moreover, Zia & Pirzada (2017) argues that due big economic opportunities are attached with the CPEC, Pakistan can stop the brain drain and manage the talent for long term benefits, highlights the scarcity of talent due to that there will be war for talent among organizations in Pakistan. However, Din &Hejratullah (2017) conducted a descriptive study to find out the effect of talent management on private and public banks performance in Peshawar Pakistan, significant positive relationship between TM and banks' performance was established and it was noted that TM contributed to 33 percent increase in return on investment and 35.7 percent increase in

market to book ratio. It shows that TM can singly augment the performance of the organizations. A survey has been conducted by (Aurangzeb & Bhutto, 2018) to measure the effect of TM on organizational performance in service sector companies in Pakistan, results revealed significant effect of TM on overall organizational performance. An inclusive approach to design TM strategy was suggested.

Finally, certain gaps regarding the perceptions of TM have been found in the context of Pakistani organizations such as, no research has been found about the TM awareness in Pakistani organizations. Thereby generates the need to measure the existing position of TM implementation in different organizations in Pakistan. The measurement will identify the gaps and the main focus area required for effective talent management in an organization.

3. Purpose

The Purpose of the study was to explore the measurement and alignment aspects of talent management (TM), so that an effective TM tool/scale could be developed, which could effectively measure the TM efforts in organizations and also align the TM processes to the organizational strategy.

4. Developing the TM Measurement Tool/Scorecard

Different measurement frameworks have been developed by various researchers such as hitherto, Becker, Huselid& Ulrich (2001) developed HR scorecard, which primarily assisted to measure, manage and improve the strategic role of HR department. Similarly, Huselid, Becker & Beatty (2005) developed workforce scorecard that had a different scope. Furthermore, Rampersad (2008) formulated Total Performance Scorecard (TPS) embedded different type of scorecard approaches into one framework. Kaplan and Norton (1996) developed a framework called balanced scorecard (BSC) to measure organizational performance through performance measures (key performance indicators). BSC is an integrated strategic planning and performance management system that Communicates with clarity an organization's vision, mission, and strategy to employees and other stakeholders, aligns day-to-day work to vision and strategy, provides a framework for prioritizing programs and projects and uses strategic performance measures and targets to measure progress. Furthermore, Warraich and Ahmed (2020) suggests that alignment of TM efforts with the strategic elements of the organization could be insured through a scorecard approach, since BSC encompasses all necessary element necessary for holistic performance.

The logic of TM Scorecard has been adopted from BSC, organization mission and vision will be used. A broader template encompassing long range of TM objectives and performance measures have been proposed, which will fit well with different type of organizational settings. Furthermore, the strategic initiatives templates have been formulated, which will be used to enhance TM objectives. The individual tasks & actions will be organization specific, which could be debated once the scorecard will be tested by gathering data from different organizations. Accordingly, deducing from the BSC rationality, the logic of TM Scorecard has been conceived, which is presented in Figure 4.1 below:

Figure 4.1: Logic of TM SCORECARD

As per, the above-mentioned framework, the questions asked regarding mission and vision will be organization specific and answers will be perused accordingly. However, the strategic perspectives are the same, traditional BSC ones. Nevertheless, the themes are totally in commensuration with the TM notion, a broader template encompassing long range of TM objectives and performance measures have been proposed, which will fit in well with different type of organizational settings. Furthermore, the strategic initiatives and tasks & actions will be organization specific, which could be debated once the scorecard will be tested by gathering data from different organizations.

The key performance (KPIs) indicators will be both quantitative and qualitative on nature. They will be used to argument the results of the TM strategy in action. Furthermore, results of KPI's could also be utilized for adjusting/aligning the strategy and objectives with the vision and the mission of the particular organization.

5. Testing and Results

The TM Scorecard was tested for its practicality and effectiveness by collecting data from a higher education institution. The institute was established 28 years ago and it offers different graduate and post-graduate programmes. The results have been presented in the TM dashboard forms below.

Table 5.1TM Dashboard Higher Education InstitutionTalent Identification Theme

Strategic Perspective	Strategic Theme: Talent Identification				
Financial Effectiveness	**Strategic Objective:** *1. Optimize talent identification* *2. Employee goal alignment*				
	Performance Measures:	**Score**	**Target**	**Actual**	**Baseline**
	1. Employee Cost as a % of Total Revenue	8	60%	90%	95 %
	2. % of employees financial increase every year	60	10 %	14 %	20 %
Stakeholders	**Strategic Objective:** *1. Motivated employees* *2. Enhanced public perception*				
	Performance Measures:	**Score**	**Target**	**Actual**	**Baseline**
	1. Employee motivation index	0	8	2	2
	2. Public perception rating of company as a market leader	0	8	2	2
Enabling Processes	**Strategic Objective:** *1. Competitive bench strength* *2. Improve Talent identification process*				
	Performance Measures:	**Score**	**Target**	**Actual**	**Baseline**
	1. % of employees ready to fill key competencies	60	50%	30%	20%
	2. High-performer turnover rate	6	0	75	80
Organizational Capacity	**Strategic Objective:** *1. Encourage employee branding depicting company values* *2. Explore new knowledge areas* *3. Identification for key competencies*				
	Performance Measures:	**Score**	**Target**	**Actual**	**Baseline**
	2. Number of "key knowledge areas" identified and documented	50	100	50	30
	3. Percentage of key competencies to total competencies (by department, company)	0	100 %	30 %	30 %

Table 5.2 TM Dashboard Higher Education InstitutionTalent Acquisition Theme

Strategic Perspective	Strategic Theme: Talent Acquisition
	Strategic Objective:

Financial Effectiveness	1. Optimize cost to hire 2. Reduce cost of vacancy				
	Performance Measures:	**Score**	**Target**	**Actual**	**Baseline**
	1. Financial Impact of Bad Hires	0	< 1M	20M	20M
	2. Cost per hire vs. cost per vacancy	0	0	0.8M	0.8 M
Stakeholders	**Strategic Objective:** 1. Improve customer service 2. Enhanced product development				
	Performance Measures:	**Score**	**Target**	**Actual**	**Baseline**
	1. complaints regarding employees	10	< 10	90	100
	2. Percentage of revenue from new customers / products	12.5	40%	15%	10%
Enabling Processes	**Strategic Objective:** 1. Upgrade talent acquisition process 2. Promote employee advocacy process for hiring talent				
	Performance Measures:	**Score**	**Target**	**Actual**	**Baseline**
	1. Time to Fill talent centric positions	0	3 months	6 months	6 months
	2. % of talent acquired for industry	0	60%	40%	40 %
Organizational Capacity	**Strategic Objective:** 1. EVP developed and implemented 2. Reduce Open talent centric positions				
	Performance Measures:	**Score**	**Target**	**Actual**	**Baseline**
	1. Percentage of recruitment practices relating to EVP	0	100%	0	0
	2. Ratio of number of open talent centric positions to total number of open positions	0	< 0.2	5	5

Table 5.3TM Dashboard higher education institution - Talent Deployment Theme

Strategic Perspective	Strategic Theme: Talent Deployment				
Financial Effectiveness	**Strategic Objective:** 1. Increase share price 2. Enhance Profit per Employee (PBIT)				
	Performance Measures:	**Score**	**Target**	**Actual**	**Baseline**
	1. Share price profit per Employee (PBIT)	0	-	-	-
	2. Return on Investment	0	10 %	3%	3%
	Strategic Objective:				

Stakeholders	1. Customer Satisfaction 2. Reduce customer complaints				
	Performance Measures:	Score	Target	Actual	Baseline
	1. Market Share	0	5%	0.5%	0.5 %
	2. Customer complaints as a proportion of sales	10	< 5%	25	30%
Enabling Processes	Strategic Objective: 1. Pay for performance 2. Link Position goals to business strategy				
	Performance Measures:	Score	Target	Actual	Baseline
	1. Percentage of Total Compensation linked to performance (by position, department, talent 9-box matrix)	20	100%	20%	20%
	2. Percentage of positions with goals linked to business strategy	20	100%	20%	20%
Organizational Capacity	Strategic Objective: 1. Optimal span of control 2. Reduce turnover rate				
	Performance Measures:	Score	Target	Actual	Baseline
	1. Average span of control	0	4	8	8
	2. Employee Turnover Rate (by grade, position, manager, talent 9-box matrix, age, tenure, etc.)	0	0	30%	30%

Table 5.4TM Dashboard Higher Education InstitutionTalent Development Theme

Strategic Perspective	Strategic Theme: Talent Development				
Financial Effectiveness	Strategic Objective: 1. Profitability 2. Increased revenue 3. Enhanced financial performance				
	Performance Measures:	Score	Target	Actual	Baseline
	1. Market value	0	1000M	500M	500M
	2. Profit per employee	2	350000	220000	216000
	3. Net earnings` growth per employee	0	5%	2%	2%
Stakeholders	Strategic Objective: 1. More customers 2. Good customer service				
	Performance Measures:	Score	Target	Actual	Baseline
	1. Product value perception of customers	0	8	4	4
	2. Customers ranking	0	8	2	2

		Score	Target	Actual	Baseline
	3. No. of customers	**0**	6000	3000	3000
Enabling Processes	**Strategic Objective:**				
	1. Key positions identified				
	2. Increase talent Diversity development				
	Performance Measures:	**Score**	**Target**	**Actual**	**Baseline**
	1. % of key positions with identified successors	**0**	80	0	0
	2. Talent diversity index	**0**	100%	30%	30 %
Organizational Capacity	**Strategic Objective:**				
	1. Upgraded Performance				
	2. Talent alignment				
	Performance Measures:	**Score**	**Target**	**Actual**	**Baseline**
	1. % of new potential managers on Leadership training	**0**	90%	5%	5%
	2. % of talent stockholders	**0**	70%	0	0

Table 5.5TM Dashboard Higher Education InstitutionTalent Retention Theme

Strategic Perspective	Strategic Theme: Talent Retention				
Financial Effectiveness	**Strategic Objective:**				
	1. Revenue Growth				
	Performance Measures:	**Score**	**Target**	**Actual**	**Baseline**
	1. Revenue growth per Employee	**0**	5%	2%	2%
Stakeholders	**Strategic Objective:**				
	1. Improve Customer experience				
	2. Talent recognition by customers				
	Performance Measures:	**Score**	**Target**	**Actual**	**Baseline**
	1. Customer repurchase intent	**0**	50%	10%	10%
	2. Percentage of employees recognized by customers for outstanding performance	**0**	50%	4%	4%
Enabling Processes	**Strategic Objective:**				
	1. Improve lead time to promotion process for key positions				
	2. Enhance talent retention				
	Performance Measures:	**Score**	**Target**	**Actual**	**Baseline**
	1. Average lead time to promotion	**50**	05 years	10 years	10 years
	2. Average tenure (by grade, position, manager, talent 9-box matrix, age, etc.)	**50**	05 years	10 years	10 years

	Strategic Objective: 1. Fill up positions with scarce skills 2. Optimize key positions				
Organizational Capacity	Performance Measures:	Score	Target	Actual	Baseline
	1. Number of key positions at risk (incumbent leaving, retiring, etc.)	0	< 05	50	50
	2. Number of key positions with scarce skills	0	< 02	50	50
	3. Percentage of departments with skills needs for the next 24 months identified and quantified	0	100%	5%	5%

Table 5.6TM Report Card

Talent Identification	
Perspectives	Score
Financial Effectiveness	34
Stakeholders	0
Internal Processes	33
Organizational Capacity	25

Talent Acquisition	
Perspectives	Score
Financial Effectiveness	0
Stakeholders	11
Internal Processes	0
Organizational Capacity	0

Talent Deployment	
Perspectives	Score
Financial Effectiveness	0
Stakeholders	5
Internal Processes	20
Organizational Capacity	0

Talent Development	
Perspectives	Score
Financial Effectiveness	1
Stakeholders	0
Internal Processes	0
Organizational Capacity	0

Talent Retention	
Perspectives	Score

Financial Effectiveness	0
Stakeholders	0
Internal Processes	50
Organizational Capacity	0

Legend		
0 – 49 %	50 – 90 %	90 – 100 %

6. Discussion

The study is based on the notion that talent management in a globalised world is gaining more and more importance. (Collings, Mellahi& Cascio, 2019; Glaister et al., 2018; Festing et al., 2017; Lucien, 2017; Chambers et al., 1998). And adequate measurement tool will help in effectively measuring the TM efforts in an organization. (Salasoo et al., 2013; Van den Brink et al., 2012; Tootell et al., 2009). This statement will be manifested after discussion of the findings of the subject study. Therefore, the purpose of the study was to develop an effective TM Scorecard to measure the TM efforts in an organization.

Primarily, TM Scorecard covers all the essentials of a management system, since it covers all strategic features and the performance measures that depicts all the performance areas in totality. Which will be helpful in measuring the progress of strategic goals/objectives indicating adequate alignment of the TM efforts with the organizational strategy. Here it highlighted that it is consistent with the literature that discusses the importance of strategic alignment of TM with the business strategy (Bradley, 2016; Vnoučková, 2016; Ashton and Morton, 2005; Becker, Huselid and Ulrich, 2001).

All the perspectives of TM Scorecard are joined from bottom to top through cause-and-effect logic, the objectives and performance measures in all the themes for organizational capacity and internal processes are mostly focused on the talent side the scorecard and the results in theses perspectives indicates the focus on improving the TM activities.

The TM Scorecard was tested for effectiveness by collecting data from a higher education institution. Generally, results are not encouraging, since the score of all performance measures are below satisfactory levels. Most of the revenue is consumed to run the day-to-day affairs of the institution, which includes employee remunerations and other administrative costs. Issues related to employee motivation is not being addressed and turnover of talented employees is quite high. Here, it is very important to highlight that the performance indicators measuring the goal alignment of employees with the business strategy depicts low scores, it points towards goal setting theory by Locke (1968), which entails that employees peruse their goals for superior performance and if they are aligned with the business strategy the outcome will be in the form of augmented business performance.

Similarly, the expectancy theory by Vroom (1964) necessitates that employees adjust their behaviour for the anticipated satisfaction that will be attained through goals achievement. Thus, if the goals are aligned than the employees will try to achieve their future goals in order to attain satisfaction, which ultimately benefit the organization. Furthermore, strong linkage between TM strategies and organizational goals, basically connects the TM policies and business goals, essentially points towards use of workforce analytics for talent in the implementation of organizational strategy and in creating value. Alignment of the TM efforts with the strategic goals will develop a proper data analysis system ensuring accountability and audit. Finally, the low scores indicate lower employee motivation and minimal focus on talent management in the subject higher education institution.

7. Implications and conclusions

The importance of TM cannot be ignored, best TM strategy implemented in an organization cannot produce desired results without effective measurement of the TM efforts. Therefore, to come up to this conclusion extensive literature regarding the TM was explored. Hence, to solve these issues an effective TM Scorecard has been formulated as an outcome of this study, which aligns the strategic elements of an organization with the TM efforts for effective implementation of talent strategy. Since alignment of the talented employees' goals with the goals of an organization has been considered a road to achieve competitive advantage through effective TM, which could be difficult to imitate by the competitors.

Moreover, the scorecard was empirically tested in a sampled higher education institute to gauge the effectiveness and practicality of the TM Scorecard. The main purpose was to see the practical application of the instrument. Similarly, it has also been noted that for better value proposition for an organization, TM Scorecard could help. In totality, TM Scorecard will facilitate the process of data analysis regarding TM to make better decisions and helps organizations to achieve their strategic goals. Which indicates a paradigm shift in the TM function of an organization thereby to take on a new role as a partner of top management in decision making processes about strategic issues.

References

1.   Al Ariss, A., Cascio, W.F. and Paauwe, J. (2014). Talent management: Current theories and future research directions. Journal of World Business, 49(2), 173-179.

2.   Ashton, C. and Morton, L. (2005). Managing talent for competitive advantage: Taking a systemic approach to talent management. Strategic HR review, 4(5), 28-31.

3.   Auranzeb, B. and Bhutto, S. A. (2016). Influence of talent management in enhancing organization performance: Evidence from service sector companies in Pakistan. Journal of Industrial Engineering Letters, 6(6), 49-55.

4.   Becker, E.B., Huselid, A.M. and Ulrich. D. (2001). The HR scorecard: linking people, strategy, and performance. Boston, MA Harvard Business School Press.

5.   Boston Consulting Group. (2017). Driving Value Through Leadership and Talent Capabilities. Retrieved from, https://www.bcg.com/capabilities/people-organization/leadership-talent-capabilities.aspx.

6.   Chen, S.Y. (2012). A study of strategic talent management–workforce differentiation perspectives (Doctoral thesis). Retrieved from file:///C:/Users/IANM1564/Downloads/etd-1002112-170312.pdf.

7.   Collings, D.G. and Mellahi, K. (2009). Strategic talent management: A review and research agenda. Human Resource Management Review, 19(4), 304-313.

8.   Mellahi, K. and Collings, D.G. (2010). The barriers to effective global talent management: The example of corporate élites in MNEs. Journal of World Business, 45(2), 143-149.

9.   Hughes, J.C. and Rog, E. (2008). Talent management: A strategy for improving employee recruitment, retention and engagement within hospitality organizations. International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 20(7), 743-757.

10.   Collings, D.G. (2014). Toward Mature Talent Management: Beyond Shareholder Value. Human Resource Development Quarterly, 25(3), 301–319. doi:10.1002/hrdq.21198.

11.   Collings, D.G., Mellahi, K. and Cascio, W.F. (2019). Global talent management and performance in multinational enterprises: A multilevel perspective. Journal of Management, 45(2), 540-566.

12.   Collings, D.G. and Mellahi, K. (2009). Strategic talent management: A review and research agenda. Human Resource Management Review, 1(4), 304-313.

13.   Chung, L.K. and D'Annunzio-Green, N. (2018). Talent management practices in small and medium-sized enterprises in the hospitality sector: an entrepreneurial owner-manager perspective, Worldwide Hospitality and Tourism Themes, https:// doi.org/10.1108/WHATT-10-2017-0065.

14.   Chambers, E.G., Foulton, M., Handfield-Jones, H., Hankin, S.M. and Michaels Ill, E.G. (1998). The War for Talent. McKinsey Quarterly, 3, 44–57.

15.   Cui, W., Khan, Z. and Tarba, Y.S. (2016). Strategic Talent Management in Service SMEs of China. Strategic Talent Management in Emerging Markets. 60(1), 1-132. Published online in Wiley Online Library (wileyonlinelibrary.com).

16.   Din, U.S. and Hejratullah. (2017). The effect of talent management on Peshawar-based public and private banks' performance. European Journal of Business and Social Sciences, 5(11), 1-7. URL: http://www.ejbss.com/recent.aspx-/ ISSN: 2235 -767X.

17.   Eberz, F. and Gilli, K. (2018) Career Development of Talent in Different Cultural Contexts - Implications for the Internationalization of SMEs. Interactive Research Development Workshop and Conference. "Internationalization of SMEs New Insights and Future Research Opportunities". ISBN 978-3-00-059929-3.

18. Festing, M., Harsch, K., Schäfer, L. and Scullion, H. (2017). The Oxford Handbook of Talent Management. Oxford University Press. Oxford, United Kingdom.

19. Festing, M. and Scha ̈fer, L. (2013). Value Creation through Human Resource Management and Talent Management in Clusters – A Case Study from Germany. Resources and Competitive Advantage in Clusters, eds.

20. Gabčanová, I. (2012). Human resources key performance indicators. Journal of competitiveness. 4(1), 117-128.

21. Gelens, J., Hofmans, J., Dries, N. and Pepermans, R. (2013). Talent management and organisational justice: employee reactions to high potential identification. Human Resource Management Journal, 24(2), 159–175. doi:10.1111/1748-8583.12029.

22. Harsch, K. and Festing, M. (2020). Dynamic talent management capabilities and organizational agility-A qualitative exploration. Human Resource Management, 59(1), 43-61.

23. Huselid, A.M, Becker, B.E. and Beatty, R.W. (2005). The workforce scorecard: Managing human capital to execute strategy, Harvard Business School Press.

24. Jayaraman, S., Talib, P. and Khan, A.F. (2018). Integrated Talent Management Scale: Construction and Initial Validation. SAGE Open, 8(3), 2158244018780965.

25. Kaplan, R.S. and Norton, D.P. (1996). Using the balanced scorecard as a strategic management system. Harvard Business Review, 35-48.

26. King, K.A. (2017). The talent climate: Creating an organisational context supportive of sustainable talent development through implementation of a strong talent system. Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance, 4(4), 298-314.

27. King, K. (2018). Macro Talent Management in Canada: A Review of the National Context, Competitive Strengths and Future Opportunities to Attract, Develop and Retain Talent. In Macro Talent Management (pp. 40-69). Routledge.

28. King, K.A. and Vaiman, V. (2019). Enabling effective talent management through a macro-contingent approach: A framework for research and practice. BRQ Business Research Quarterly.

doi: 10.1016/j.brq.2019.04.005

29. Lawler, E.E. (2018). Organization Development and Talent Management: Beyond the Triple Bottom-Line. In: Jamieson D., Church A., Vogelsang J. (eds) Enacting Values-Based Change. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.

30. Locke, E. A. Toward a theory of task motivation and incentives. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1968, 3, 157-189.

31.   Lucien Alziari, L. (2017). A chief HR officer's perspective on talent management, Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance, https://doi.org/10.1108/JOEPP-05-2017-0047.

32.   Alziari, L. (2017). A chief HR officer's perspective on talent management. Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance. 4(4), 379-383

33.   Mellahi, K. and Collings, D.G. (2010). The barriers to effective global talent management: The example of corporate élites in MNEs. Journal of World Business, 45(2), 143-149.

34.   Paauwe, J.A.A.P., Boon, C.O.R.I.N.E., Boselie, P.A.U.L. and Den Hartog, D. (2013). Reconceptualizing fit in strategic human resource management: 'Lost in translation?'.

35.   Project Management Institute (2104). PMI Thought Leadership Series: Talent Management - Powering Strategic Initiatives in the PMO. Retrieved from https://www.pmi.org/-/media/pmi/documents/public/   pdf/learning/thought-leadership/talent-management-powering-strategic-initiatives.pdf.

36.   Rampersad, K.H. (2008). The way to a highly engaged and happy workforce based on the Personal Balanced Scorecard, Total Quality Management & Business Excellence, 19(1-2), 11-27,

DOI: 10.1080/14783360701602155.

37.   Sheehan, M., Grant, K. and Garavan, T. (2018). Strategic talent management: A macro and micro analysis of current issues in hospitality and tourism, Worldwide Hospitality and Tourism Themes, 10(1), 28-41, https://doi.org/10.1108/WHATT-10-2017-0062.

38.   Shamsi, U.R., Imtinan, U. and Imtinan, A. (2010). Human resource management and technology advancement in education in Pakistan. In 2010 International Conference on Education and Management Technology (pp. 565-568). IEEE.

39.   Tootell, B., Blackler, M., Toulson, P. &Dewe, P. (2009). Metrics: HRM´s Holy Grail? A New Zealand case study. Human Resources Management Journal, 19(4), 375-392. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-8583.2009.00108.x.

40.   Toulson, P. &Dewe, P. (2004). HR accounting as a measurement tool. Human Resource Management, 14(2), 75-90. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-8583.2004.tb00120.x.

41.   Ulrich, D. and Yeung, A. (2019), "Agility: the new response to dynamic change", Strategic HR Review, Vol. 18 No. 4, pp. 161-167.

42.   Ulrich, D. & Brockbank, W. (2005). The HR value proposition. Massachusetts: Harvard Business School Publishing.

43.   Ulrich, D. (2015). From war for talent to victory through organization, Strategic HR Review, Vol. 14 Iss 1/2 pp. 8 - 12: http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/SHR-01-2015-0004.

44.   Vroom, V. H. (1964). Work and motivation. New York, NY: Wiley & Sons.