Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry (TOJQI)
Volume 12, Issue 5, July, 2021: 3824-3834

Impact of Demographic Factors on Talent Management of Technical Employees in Manufacturing Sector of Uttarakhand

Priyanka Panday
Research Scholar, USB, Chandigarh University
Priyanka.pandey13@gmail.com
Dr. Gagandeep Kaur, Associate Professor, USB, Chandigarh University

Abstract:
In the hypercompetitive environment, the organizations are adopting various pro- employee practices to make them suitable to attract the industry's best talent. It has become challenging for employers to attract and retain talent. Given this restraint, organizations pay great attention to talent management practices and identify the significant factors that help keep talent. Though big multinationals are quite ahead in this race, Small and medium scale companies are finding it extremely difficult to maintain their technical employees.
In some of the cases, it has been observed that they cannot work with their full capacities due to a lack of talented employees.
This study is carried out to find out how demographic variable such as age, gender, and level of work affects the talent management variables and retention of the technical employees in manufacturing units of Uttarakhand. The sample size for the study was 384 technical employees working at various levels of management with diverse backgrounds. The result shows that age, gender, and management level have a significant impact on the effectiveness of talent management. Further, we found that people working in lower caders are less motivated by talent management practices in the manufacturing sector.
Keywords: Talent Management, Manufacturing Sector, SME, Technical employees, Employee Retention

1. Introduction:

It is very essential to invest in humans and create valuable resources for the organization to be sustainable in the business. Talent management can be categorized into two categories; the first deals with coordination of activities and the second deals with strategic objectives. Acquiring a talented workforce is a critical task to achieve business goals as it significantly affects the productivity and business performance of the organization and adds significant value to the organization (Huselid et al. 2005). Talent management is a holistic function that includes talent planning, talent acquisition, performance management, employee relations, and employee retention to name a few. Several theories justified the relation of these variables with the talent management construct. Details of these theories are as follows:

Table 1: Theories related to Talent Management

Built-to-Change Theory	Lawler and Worley 2006	Talent management strategy should be aligned with the core organizational strategy
Egalitarian Theory	Iles, Chuai,&Preece, 2010	Talent management is the overall management of workforce
Elitist Theory	Iles, Chuai,&Preece, 2010	Talent management is specifically for people with the special skillset

Person– Organization Fit Theory	Kim et al.2012	This theory instills the idea of a person misfit due to multiple reasons that make them leave, not the organizational policies. This theory helped in understanding the individual reasons in relation to their retention. It deals with the compatibility of the person and the organization.
Referent Cognitions Theory	Folger, 1986	This theory suggested ways to make talent management effective. They emphasized that if your policies are fair and development-oriented and are being perceived as useful for individuals in making their current situation better than before- it will be taken up wholeheartedly by the employees.
Self-interest Theory	Thibault and Walker, 1975	Self-development is the interest area of any employee. So regular support maximizes the effectiveness of the employees.
Social Capital Theory	Iles et al. 2010	Humans have a natural capacity to consider others, think and act cooperatively and generously. So while identifying talent, managers must include this social structure and its impact on human relationships.
Resource-Based View	Barney, 1986a, 1986b, 1991,2005	Resource-Based Views (RBV) of the company act as a lens to discover and review talent-management practices. It talks about the proper engagement of talented people.
Human Capital Theory	(Axelrod, 2001).	The human capital theory considers the financial view; it takes human capital as investment that gives stakeholders a high return. (Axelrod, 2001).

2. Literature Review: Talent management is defined using seven different variables. All variables are discussed below:

2.1 Talent Identification & Planning: workforce planning is very effective in systematically assessing employees' current and future demands. Workforce planning considers the stock of employees' requirements, potential retrenchment, and exodus and calculating a probable workforce with maximum precision to fill the expected gap (Jacobson, 2010). It is very HR procedure to procure the organization's interest in the long run (Othman et al., 2012).

2.2 Talent Acquisition: Bad hiring can negatively impact the organizational culture, customer loyalty and satisfaction, and organizational performance (Schumacher et al., 2015). Bad recruitments happen due to inadequate job positioning, poor job previews, and informal hiring processes (Ellis et al., 2017), leading to financial and productivity loss to companies (Mahmoud et al. 2019).

2.3 Leadership & Career Development: Leadership development and career planning of employees need to be focus areas to procure the organization's interest at large.It is a process related to career management where employees have defined paths to achieve their career goals in the organization. The organization identifies potential employees and develops them for future demands (Chvostal'ova, 2015; Ali et al., 2019). The opportunity to grow provides a sense of career security and creates work integrity and commitment (Baron & Armstrong, 2007).

2.4 Learning & Motivation: Training is a vital necessity as it enables employees to work as per quality standards, rise within an organization, provide the best services to clients and increase the market value of self and organization

(Obisi, 2011). Training helps organizations mold employees' behavior as per the firm's requirements and develops engagement, a sense of belongingness and security, improves morale, and creates the possibility of attaining diverse goals among employees (Rodriguez & Walters, 2017; Karim et al., 2019).

2.5 Performance Management: Appraisal of performance is the most effective method for evaluating, motivating, and developing an employee's efficiency and effectiveness (Islami & Tariq, 2018). Performance appraisal evokes performance, improves communication and expectation, influences worker's potential, and helps in employee counseling. However, the biased appraisal might aggravate employee dissatisfaction, eventually impacting employee and organizational performance at large (Sharma & Garg, 2017).

2.6 Employee Engagement: Employee engagement is a buzzword in industries as it addresses many organizational challenges such as employee attrition, profitability, customer satisfaction, and loyalty, and overall business performance and productivity (McManus & Mosca, 2015; Popli & Rizvi, 2016). Employee engagement allows employees to harness their physical and psychological skills, which positively impact their performance due to better employment of cognitive, physical, and emotional expressions (Mone and London, 2010; Khan & Afjal, 2016).

2.7 Rewards & Recognition: The primary objective of compensation is to enhance quality performance. Appropriate compensation and reward are essential to motivate people to be productive; a productive employee leads to quality performance .Khudhair et al., 2020 opined that compensation is a reward that can psychologically persuade the workforce to be effective with their jobs. (Wise, 2002; Stewart et al.2010) asserted that profit sharing is crucial for an organization. It adds a sense of belongingness that leads to organizational productivity and people satisfaction and increases their chances of staying for long in the same organization.

2.8 Employee Retention: Talent attraction and retention, as propounded by Botha et al. (2011), found that employers' brand under the influence of group needs, brand consistency, strategy, communications, and human resources plays an essential component in the talent management framework. Talent management is found to have a significant impact on employee retention, and attraction and retention of talent within a reasonable amount of time within the organization is a critical challenge faced by the organization. In a modern economic setup, retention is one of the most significant challenges faced by the organization. Lalitha (2012). Tiwari et al., (2013) suggest that the employee's age and satisfaction from the employee's experience are found to positively impact the practices of talent management, which ultimately leads to increased employee retention. Huang et al. (2006), in their study, found that there are factors that are helpful in job retention and are primarily classified as individual-based, market-based, and firm-based. Taylor (2006) observes several reasons prevailing in the organizational setup, responsible for why a particular employee is retained within an organization. The practical utility of this process of understanding employee retention's core problem is often beneficial for the organization to understand and device retention strategies. These studies revealed that firm-based factors were more significantly influential and profoundly impacted the employees' ultimate decisions compared to the individual-based factors concerning job retention.

3. Research Objective:

Here, an attempt is made to compare whether there are any changes in the level of agreement on Talent identification & Planning, Talent Acquisition, leadership & Career Development, Learning & Motivation, Performance Management, Employee Engagement, Rewards & Recognition, Talent Management, and Employee Retention dimensions across a few demographic aspects of the respondents under the study.

4. Methodology: The descriptive research method was used in this study. Data were analyzed using ANOVA and t-test method. These two methods are primarily used to determine the difference among the group and fulfill the requirement as per research questions. The sample size of 384 technical employees from various industrial units of Uttarakhand, India, was considered to carry out this study. The respondents' profile is given in table 4.

Table 2: Respondents' Demographic Profile

Age	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
Less Than 40	**199**	**51.8**
More than 40	**185**	**48.2**
Gender		
Male	**329**	**85.7**
Female	**55**	**14.3**
Level of Management		
Lower level	**215**	**56**
Middle level	**126**	**32.8**
Higher-level	**43**	**11.2**
Year of Service		
Less Than five years	**143**	**37.2**
5 Years and Above	**241**	**62.8**

5. Data Analysis: As per the literature review, It is firmly rooted that the employee retention aspect is affected (formative path) by seven constructs which are talent Identification and planning, Talent Acquisition, Talent Retention, Learning and Motivation, leadership, and career development, employee engagement, reward and recognition, and Performance Management. Finally, employee retention is influenced by effective Talent management. The following research hypotheses were appropriately tested and analyzed with the best appropriate statistical tool and model:

a. H01: There are no significant differences in mean (average) rating scores on Talent identification & planning, Talent Acquisition, leadership & Career Development, Learning & Motivation, Performance Management, Employee Engagement, Rewards & Recognition, Talent Management, and Employee Retention on level of agreement on dimensions across gender.
b. H11: There is a significant difference in mean (average) rating scores on level of agreement on Talent Identification & Planning, Talent Acquisition, Leadership & Career Development, Learning & Motivation, Performance Management, Employee Engagement, Rewards & Recognition, Talent Management and Employee Retention across gender.

Table 3: Independent t-test results of dimensions of Talent Management and Employee Retention across the Dimension Gender

Dimension	**Gender**	**N**	**Mean**	**SD**	**t- value**	**p-value**
Talent Identification & Planning	Male	329	13.10	3.83	-1.028	0.207
	female	55	13.74	5.07		
Talent Acquisition	Male	329	9.59	3.26	-1.844	0.053**
	female	55	10.5	3.67		
Learning & Motivation	Male	329	11.94	3.6	-1.954	0.133
	female	55	12.8	4.41		
Leadership & Career Development	Male	329	12.84	4.17	-1.546	0.322

	Female	55	13.43	4.79		
Performance Management	Male	329	9.79	3.09	-0.965	0.254
	Female	55	10.36	3.87		
Employee Engagement	Male	329	9.83	2.86	-1.173	0.026*
	Female	55	10.78	3.34		
Rewards & Recognition	Male	329	6.59	1.93	-2.256	0.003*
	Female	55	7.5	2.41		
Employee Retention	Male	329	11.64	3.5	-3.018	0.052**
	Female	55	12.8	4.4		

*Significant at 5 % level

** Significant at 10 % level

5.1 As per Gender: It is evident from the independent t-test in Table 1 that there is no significant difference in the mean agreement score with respect to Talent Identification [t = -1.028, p = 0.207, p > 0.05], learning & Motivation [t= -1.954, p=0.133, p > 0.05], Leadership & Career Development [t= -1.546, p=0.322, p > 0.05] , Performance Management [t= -0.965, p=0.254, p > 0.05] hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

On the contrary, a significant difference in mean rating score is observed as per gender in relation to remaining dimensions of Talent Management. Talent Acquisition [t = - 1.844, p = 0.053, p > 0.05], Employee Engagement [t = - 1.173, p = 0.026, p > 0.05], Rewards & Recognition [t = - 2.256, p = 0.003, p > 0.05] and Employee Retention [t = - 3.018, p = 0.052, p > 0.05]. Hence null hypothesis is rejected at 5% level of significance for Employee Engagement and rewards & recognition and 10 % level of significance for Learning & Motivation and Employee Retention.

Given that, as the mean score is higher (Mean= 12.8) for the female as compared to males (Mean= 11.64), one can draw the inference that males have a better edge over their females' counterparts (lower means indicate better agreement) in related to employee retention. The inference drawn is evident as the difference is quite significant in sample size.

5.2: As per Age Group:

$H_0$2: There is no significant difference in mean Talent identification & Planning, Talent Acquisition, Learning & Motivation, Leadership & Career Development, Performance Management, Employee Engagement, Rewards & Recognition, and Employee Retention dimensions across levels of Age Groups of the employees.

$H_1$2: There is a significant difference in mean Talent Identification & Planning, Talent Acquisition, Learning & Motivation, Leadership & Career Development, Performance Management, Employee Engagement, Rewards & Recognition, and Employee retention dimensions across levels of Age Group of the employees.

Table: 4.1 One-way ANOVA between Age Group and Talent Identification and Planning

Talent Identification and Planning					
	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1.345	2	.673	2.331	.099**
Within Groups	109.960	381	.289		
Total	111.305	383			

* Significant at 10 % level

There is no significant difference (Table 4.1) in mean score of talent identification and planning dimension across levels of age group (F (2,383) = 2.331, p = 0.099, p>0.05). Hence we accept the null hypothesis. It means that the perception of all age groups remains the same across all age groups. It can be accepted at a 10 % significance level.

Table: 4.2 One-way ANOVA between Age Group and Talent Acquisition

Talent Acquisition						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
	Between Groups	3.593	2	1.796	3.348	.036*
	Within Groups	204.392	381	.536		
	Total	207.985	383			

* Significant at 5 % level

There is a significant difference (Table 4.2) in mean score of talent acquisition dimension across levels of age group (F (2,383) = 3.348, p = 0.036, p<0.05). Hence we reject the null hypothesis. It shows that age has an impact on the level of agreement for this dimension of talent management.

Table: 4.3 One-way ANOVA between Age Group and Learning & Motivation

Learning and Motivation					
	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	2.057	2	1.029	1.591	.205
Within Groups	246.341	381	.647		
Total	248.398	383			

There is no significant difference (Table 4.3) in mean score of Learning & Motivation dimension across levels of age group (F (2,383) = 1.591, p = 0.205, p>0.05). Hence we accept the null hypothesis. It means that the perception of all age groups remains the same across all age groups.

Table: 4.4 One way ANOVA between age group and Leadership & Career Development

Leadership & Career Development					
	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	3.751	2	29.06	7.170	0.002*
Within Groups	437.320	381	4.02		
Total	441.072	383			

There is a significant difference (Table 4.4) in mean score of leadership and career development dimension across levels of age group (F (2,383) = 7.170, p = 0.002, p<0.05). Hence we reject the null hypothesis. It shows that age significantly impacts the level of agreement for this dimension of talent management.

Table 4.5: One way ANOVA between Age group and Employee Engagement

Employee Engagement					
	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1.906	2	.953	2.603	.075**
Within Groups	139.473	381	.366		
Total	141.379	383			

**** Significant at 10 % level**

There is no significant difference (Table 4.5) in mean score of Employee engagement dimension across levels of age group (F (2,383) = 2.603, p = 0.075, p>0.05). Hence we accept the null hypothesis. It means that the perception of all age groups remains the same across all age groups.

Table: 4.6 One way ANOVA between Age group and performance Management

Performance Management					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	3.562	2	1.781	3.080	.047*
Within Groups	220.295	381	.578		
Total	223.856	383			

*** Significant at 5 % level**

There is a significant difference (Table 4.6) in mean score of performance management dimension across levels of age group ($F(2,383) = 3.080$, $p = 0.047$, $p<0.05$). Hence we reject the null hypothesis. It shows that age significantly impacts the level of agreement for this dimension of talent management.

Table: 4.7 One way ANOVA between Age group and Rewards & Recognition

Rewards & Recognition					
	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	3.751	2	1.876	1.634	.196
Within Groups	437.320	381	1.148		
Total	441.072	383			

There is no significant difference (Table 4.7) in mean score of rewards & recognition dimension across levels of age group ($F(2,383) = 1.634$, $p = 0.196$, $p>0.05$). Hence we accept the null hypothesis. It means that the perception of all age groups remains the same across all age groups.

Table: 4.8 One way ANOVA between Age group and Employee Retention

Employee Retention					
	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1.487	2	.744	1.952	.143
Within Groups	145.146	381	.381		
Total	146.634	383			

There is no significant difference (Table 4.8) in mean score of talent identification and planning dimension across levels of age group ($F(2,383) = 1.952$, $p = 0.143$, $p>0.05$). Hence we accept the null hypothesis. It means that the perception of all age groups remains the same across all age groups.

5.3 As per Level of Management

For the analysis, the level of management (which was measured in three categories) was grouped into two broad categories of 'Lower level' and 'Higher-level". Middle-level data were also grouped with the higher level.

H03: There is no significant difference in means rating scores on level of agreement on Talent identification & planning, Talent Acquisition, leadership & Career Development, Learning & Motivation, Performance Management, Employee Engagement, Rewards & Recognition, and Employee Retention dimensions between the lower level and higher level.

$H_1$3: There is a significant difference in means rating scores on level of agreement on Talent identification & planning, Talent Acquisition, leadership & Career Development, Learning & Motivation, Performance Management, Employee Engagement, Rewards & Recognition, and Employee Retention between the lower level and higher level.

Table 5.1: One way ANOVA between Level of Management and Talent Identification and Planning

Talent Identification and Planning					
	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.041	2	.020	.037	.963
Within Groups	207.944	381	.546		
Total	207.985	383			

There is no significant difference (Table 4.1) in mean rating score of Talent Identification and Planning dimension across Levels of Management (F (2,383) = .o37, p = 0.963, p>0.05). Hence we accept the null hypothesis. It means that perception related to the talent Identification and Planning related dimension remains the same across all Levels of Management.

Table 5.2: One way ANOVA between Level of Management and Learning and Motivation

Learning and Motivation					
	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	3.982	2	1.991	3.103	.046*
Within Groups	244.417	381	.642		
Total	248.398	383			

There is a significant difference (Table 4.2) in mean score of employee learning & motivation dimension across levels of age group (F (2,383) = 3.103, p = 0.046, p<0.05). Hence we reject the null hypothesis. It shows that level of management has a significant impact on the level of agreement for this dimension of talent management.

Table 5.3: One way ANOVA between Level of Management and Rewards & Recognition

Rewards & Recognition					
	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	16.713	2	8.357	7.503	.001*
Within Groups	424.358	381	1.114		
Total	441.072	383			

There is a significant difference (Table 4.3) in mean score of Employee Learning & Motivation dimension across levels of age group (F (2,383) = 7.503, p = 0.001, p<0.05). Hence we reject the null hypothesis. It shows that the Level of Management has a significant impact on the level of agreement for this dimension of Talent Management.

Table 5.4: One way ANOVA between Level of Management and Leadership & Career Development

Leadership & Career Development					
	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.788	2	.394	1.029	.358
Within Groups	145.846	381	.383		
Total	146.634	383			

There is no significant difference (Table 4.4) in mean rating score of leadership and career development dimension across levels of management (F (2,383) = 1.029, p = 0.358, p>0.05). Hence we accept the null hypothesis. It means that perception related to leadership & career development remains the same across all levels of management remains the same

Table 4.5: One way ANOVA between Level of Management and Employee Engagement

Employee Engagement					
	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.343	2	.172	.463	.629
Within Groups	141.036	381	.370		

Total	141.379	383			

There is no significant difference (Table 4.5) in mean rating score of leadership and career development dimension across levels of management (F (2,383) = .463, p = 0.629, p>0.05). Hence we accept the null hypothesis. It means that perception related to employee engagement remains the same across all levels of management.

Table 4.6: One way ANOVA between Level of Management and Performance Management

Performance Management					
	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.096	2	.048	.082	.921
Within Groups	223.760	381	.587		
Total	223.856	383			

There is no significant difference (Table 4.6) in mean rating score of performance management dimension across levels of management (F (2,383) = .463, p = 0.629, p>0.05). Hence we accept the null hypothesis. It means that perception related to employee performance management remains the same across all levels of management.

Table 4.7: One way ANOVA between Level of Management and Talent Acquisition

Talent Acquisition						
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
	Between Groups	.988	2	.494	1.707	.183
	Within Groups	110.317	381	.290		
	Total	111.305	383			

There is no significant difference (Table 4.7) in mean rating score of leadership and career development dimension across levels of management (F (2,383) = 1.707, p = .183, p>0.05). Hence we accept the null hypothesis. It means that perception related to talent acquisition remains the same across all levels of management.

6. Discussion and Conclusion: For the success of an organization, talent management is seen as the most significant contributing factor. This particular dimension is well acknowledged within the academic setup and industry experts. The component of talent management is influenced by the factors operating within the organization in which the organization's cultural configuration is found to play an influential role. It is imperative to identify the components of talent management to understand the dimensions in which they are operational in the organizational setup and develop policies to calibrate the different parts for its practical manifestation. The ever-changing economic scenario forces us to understand and realize the competitive environment and attract and retain the best of the industry's talent.

References:

1. Ali, Z., Mahmood, B., & Mehreen, A. (2019). Linking succession planning to employee performance: The mediating roles of career development and performance appraisal. *Australian Journal of Career Development, 28*(2), 112-121.
2. Barney, J. B. (1986a). Strategic factor markets: Expectations, luck, and business strategy. Management Science, 32, 1231–1241.
3. Barney, J. B. (1986b). Organizational culture: Can it be a source of sustained competitive advantage? Academy of Management Review, 11, 656–665. Barney, J. B. (1991).
4. Barney, J. B., & Mackey, T. B. (2005). Testing resource-based theory. In *Research methodology in strategy and management*. Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

5. Baron, A., & Armstrong, M. (2007). *Human capital management: achieving added value through people*. Kogan Page Publishers.
6. Botha, A., Bussin, M., & De Swardt, L. (2011). An employer brand predictive model for talent attraction and retention. *SA journal of human resource management*, *9*(1), 1-12.
7. Chlebikova, D., Misankova, M., & Kramarova, K. (2015). Planning of personal development and succession. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, *26*, 249-253.
8. Chuai, X., Preece, D., & Iles, P. 2008, ‘‘Is talent management just "old wine in new bottles"?’’, Management Research Review, Vol.31, No.12, pp.901-911.
9. Ellis, C. (2007), “Telling secrets, revealing lives: relational ethics in research with intimate others”, Qualitative Inquiry, Vol. 13 No. 1, pp. 3-29.
10. Folger, R. (1986). Rethinking equity theory. In *Justice in social relations* (pp. 145-162). Springer, Boston, MA.
11. Huang, C., Lin, H. C., & Chuang, C. H. (2006). Constructing factors related to worker retention. *International Journal of Manpower*.
12. Huselid, M. A., Becker, B. E., & Beatty, R. W. (2005). *The workforce scorecard: Managing human capital to execute strategy*. Harvard Business Press.
13. Iles, P., Chuai, X., & Preece, D. (2010). Talent management and HRM in multinational companies in Beijing: Definitions, differences and drivers. *Journal of world Business*, *45*(2), 179-189.
14. Islam, T., & Tariq, J. (2018). Learning organizational environment and extra-role behaviors: the mediating role of employee engagement. *Journal of management development*.
15. Jacobson, W. S. (2010). Preparing for tomorrow: A case study of workforce planning in North Carolina municipal governments. *Public Personnel Management*, *39*(4), 353-377.
16. Karim, D. N., Baset, M. A., & Rahman, M. M. (2019). The effect of perceived organizational support on intention to stay: The mediating role of job involvement. *The Jahangirnagar Journal of Business Studies*, *8*(1), 21-30.
17. Khan, H. G. A., & Afzal, M. (2016). The Effect of Reward Systems, Organizational Commitment and Experience on Job Satisfaction with respect to Employee's Perceived Performance. *NUML International Journal of Business & Management*, *11*(2), 35-49.
18. Khudhair, H. Y., & Mardani, A. (2021). The Positive Role of the Tourism industry for Dubai City in the United Arab Emirates. *International Journal of Economics and Management Systems*, *6*.
19. Kim, S. (2012). Does person-organization fit matter in the public-sector? Testing the mediating effect of person-organization fit in the relationship between public service motivation and work attitudes. *Public Administration Review*, *72*(6), 830-840.
20. Lathitha, C. (2012). Managing employee attrition-the hr role and challenge. International Journal of Research In Management, Economics And Commerce, 12.
21. Lawler, E. E., & Worley, C. G. 2006, ‘‘Built to change: How to achieve sustained organizational effectiveness’’, San Francisco, CA: JosseyBass.
22. Mahmoud, A. B., Delrosario, K., Reisel, W., & Hack-polay, D. (2019). How Knowledge Management Enhances Employee Performance in the Public Sector.
23. McManus, J., & Mosca, J. (2015). Strategies to build trust and improve employee engagement. *International Journal of Management & Information Systems (IJMIS)*, *19*(1), 37-42.
24. Mone, E. M., & London, M. (2021). Using performance management to drive employee engagement in the public sector. In *Handbook on Performance Management in the Public Sector*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
25. Obisi, C. (2011). Employee performance appraisal and implications of the individual and organisational growth. Australian Journal of Business and Management Research, 1(9), 92–97.
26. Othman, M. F., & Shazali, K. (2012). Wireless sensor network applications: A study in environment monitoring system. *Procedia Engineering*, *41*, 1204-1210.
27. Popli, S., & Rizvi, I. A. (2016). Drivers of employee engagement: The role of leadership style. *Global Business Review*, *17*(4), 965-979.

28. Rodriguez, J., & Walters, K. (2017). The importance of training and development in employee performance and evaluation. *World Wide Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Development*, *3*(10), 206-212.
29. Schumacher, T. (2015). Linking action learning and inter-organisational learning: the learning journey approach. *Action Learning: Research and Practice*, *12*(3), 293-313.
30. Sharma, N., & Garg, P. (2017). Psychological contract and psychological empowerment as employee engagement drivers in Indian IT sector. *International Journal of Applied Business and Economic Research*, *15*(1).
31. Stewart, J. G., McNulty, R., Griffin, M. T. Q., & Fitzpatrick, J. J. (2010). Psychological empowerment and structural empowerment among nurse practitioners. *Journal of the American Academy of Nurse Practitioners*, *22*(1), 27-34.
32. Taylor, C. (2006). Narrating significant experience: Reflective accounts and the production of (self) knowledge. *British Journal of Social Work*, *36*(2), 189-206.
33. Thibaut, J. & Waiker, L. 1975, ‘‘Procedural justice: A psychological analysis’’. Hillsdale. N.J.: Erlbaum.
34. Tiwari, M., Mathur, G., & Awasthi, S. (2019). A study on the effects of glass ceiling & organizational commitment on corporate women's turnover intentions. *Academy of Strategic Management Journal*, *18*(2), 1-10.
35. Wise, R. A. (2002). Brain reward circuitry: insights from unsensed incentives. *Neuron*, *36*(2), 229-240.