

Talent Management in the Public Sector – Empirical Evidence from the Emerging Economy of Romania

Graham Barrington

Babes-Bolyai University, Faculty of Economics and Business Administration, Romania

graham.barrington@econ.ubbcluj.ro

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5287-6739>

Received: 21. 8. 2023

Revised: 6. 3. 2024

Accepted: 23. 4. 2024

Published: 17. 5. 2024

ABSTRACT

Purpose: This paper aims to investigate how talent management is conceptualized and practised within Romanian public sector organizations. Just like their private sector counterparts, public sector organizations need talented employees or high performers to support their operations and enhance public service delivery. However, research on talent management in the public sector, particularly in Eastern European countries, remains limited.

Design/Methodology/Approach: The study was conducted through a series of semi-structured interviews with employees in public sector organizations. The results were analysed using thematic analysis.

Findings: The study reveals that talent management practices in the public sector are still in a nascent state of development. Furthermore, there appears to be a lack of understanding of talent management among HR practitioners, and implementation efforts have yielded less-than-desirable results.

Practical Implications: The results of our study suggest that while talent management practices are widely embraced by a growing number of private sector companies, their conceptualization and implementation in the public sector differ. In the case of Romania, implementation is hindered by the bureaucratic structure of the public sector and the legacy of previous communist regime.

Originality/Value: The study represents one of the initial attempts to investigate the impact of talent management practices in the Romanian public sector, leveraging empirical evidence to support its findings.

Keywords: public sector, talent, talent management, theory of bureaucracy

JEL: O15

1 Introduction

Whether talent management (TM) applies to public sector organizations (PSO) has piqued the interest of many researchers. Coulson-Thomas (2012), posits that TM applies to all organizational types, including those in the public, as well as their private sector counterparts as it can help them become more adaptable and better-performing organizations (Coulson-Thomas, 2012). In line with this premise, researchers like Glen (2012) have argued that since TM advocates a more comprehensive approach to human resource management, it should be relevant to the public service (Glen, 2012). Researchers have long asserted that TM provides organizations with a systematic process for attracting, identifying, developing, retaining and deploying high-potential individuals who can add value to the organization and enhance its performance (Ansar and Baloch, 2018). By stressing the importance of attracting the right talent for the right jobs, the literature argues that TM enhances the performance of individuals, allowing the organizations with whom they are working to better achieve their objectives and gain a competitive advantage in the market place (Valdescu, 2012).

While there has been an increase in the number of studies on TM, several scholars have pointed out that many of these discourses do not explicitly cover the public sector (Berger and Berger 2011; Cappelli, 2008; Boselie and Thunnissen, 2017). This point was underscored by Thunnissen et al. (2013) who noted that TM research has mostly focused on large multinational organizations with limited attention to the different contextual settings in which some organizations operate (Thunnissen et al. 2013). Delbridge and Keenoy (2010) noted that public sector organizations not only operate under different situational contexts, but they cater to differing interests (Delbridge and Keenoy, 2010). Public sector organizations, the authors stated, are driven by different motivations and operate with more rigid rules and norms (Delbridge and Keenoy, 2010). Notwithstanding this, public sector organizations, like their private sector counterparts, also strive to recruit, retain, reward, and develop their employees to enhance organizational performance (Poocharoen and Lee, 2013). This paper adds to the ongoing discourse given the calls to undertake more examination of this construct within the context of the public sector (Buick et al. 2015). Through the lens of the theory of bureaucracy, this study highlights some pertinent barriers and constraints to TM practices in public sector organizations through empirical data from Romania.

In reviewing the work by Buick et al. (2015) that highlighted some challenges of TM in the public sector, we believe this paper will add value to the ongoing discourse given the calls to undertake more research on this construct within the context of the public sector (Buick et al. 2015). While the literature has a limited number of studies on TM in public sector organizations, our search has not unearthed any prior study that examined the construct within the emerging European country of Romania. This study, therefore, seeks to fill the gap in the literature by exploring TM in public sector organizations at the municipal level. This level of the public sector is selected due

to its close proximity to the people in the community and the collaboration that often takes place between entities at this level and researchers. Our approach is carried out in two steps. First, we examine the extant literature on TM in public sector organizations in an effort to glean some insights from prior investigations of the subject. Second, we present findings from an empirical study conducted in several public sector organizations operating in Romania and then articulate some theoretical and practical implications emanating from these findings.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. First, we present our literature review. Second, we discuss the theoretical foundation and highlight some differences that separate TM practices in public and private sector organizations. Third, we outline the methodology that was utilized. Finally, we present the findings and discuss them in light of their theoretical and practical implications.

2 Literature review

The conceptualization of talent management has evolved over the years. Lewis and Heckman (2006) posited that it is a human resource practice that focuses on high performing or the talented employees in an organization (Lewis and Heckman, 2006). Collings and Mellahi (2009) viewed it in terms of human resource development, practices and functions (Collings and Mellahi, 2009). Scullion et al. (2010) regarded it as a systematic process for attracting, identifying, developing and retaining those employees who an organization regards as being talents (Scullion et al., 2010). Thus, Ballesteros (2010), opined that the goal of TM is to boost the performance of organizations through the implementation of HR strategies designed to attract, develop and retain individuals who possess the skills needed to meet the current and future needs of the organizations (Ballesteros, 2010). Meyers et al. (2013) regarded it as a branch of human resource management that focuses on those employees who the organization views as talented (Meyers et al., 2013). Tarique and Schuler (2010) asserted that the focus of TM should be on the identification and development of talents, who they liken to high potential and high performing individuals whom the organization regards as crucial to its success (Tarique and Schuler, 2010).

In elaborating on how an organization identify these talents, Buttiens and Hondeghem (2015) conceptualized talent management as “the systematic attraction, identification, development, engagement/retention and deployment of those individuals who are of particular value to an organization” (Buttiens and Hondeghem, 2015, p. 1186). Gadsen et al. (2017) broaden this conceptualization by suggesting that TM may be summed up as the proactive identification and advancement of employees at all organizational levels to help them realize their maximum potential (Gadsen et al., 2017). But, scholars like Powell et al. (2012) have noted the paucity of studies on the construct within the public sector (Powell et al., 2012).

In regards to TM practices in public sector organizations, one definition that was offered by Kravariti and Johnston (2019), is to regard it as “the implementation of key procedures to ensure public sector employees possess the competencies, knowledge and core values in order to address complex contemporary challenges and fulfill public sector strategic objectives for the common good” (Kravariti and Johnston, 2019, p. 8). The public sector is acknowledged as an important employer of talents in many countries (Vladescu, 2012). They operate largely as non-profit organizations and are generally renowned for the job security offered to workers as well as the long tradition of promoting equality and fostering diversity among their employees (Leisink et al. 2013). While both private and public sector organizations face similar challenges in finding the right talent, TM in PSO has been an area that is understudied (Boselie and Thunnissen, 2017).

Some scholars have argued that operationalizing TM in the public sector faces several obstacles (Rana et al. 2013; Thunnissen and Buttiens, 2017). One obstacle according to Harris and Foster (2010), is that implementing talent management practices that prioritize talented employees may encounter difficulties given the public sector's pursuit of equity and diversity within its ranks (Harris and Foster, 2010). The issue of how talent management is conceptualized in the public sector was another obstacle raised by Rust and Lesego (2012). Another obstacle highlighted by Gregoire et al. (2015), is the disparities in career and personnel development possibilities within the public sector (Grégoire et al. 2015). Other scholars have asserted that these challenges are even more acute in public sector organizations, given the established hierarchical levels and bureaucratic procedures that are characteristic of many public sector entities (Thunnissen and Buttiens, 2017). The authors highlighted some of the problems that have plagued HR practitioners in the public sector, including difficulties finding and hiring the right talents as well as concerns with employees' commitment, engagement, and productivity (Thunnissen and Buttiens, 2017).

Public sector organizations are regarded as being complex in their design, facing distinctive challenges relating to their ownership, and multiple stakeholder interests alongside the influence of government, politics, and the public who they are mandated to serve (Leisink et al., 2013). Delbridge and Keenoy, (2010) posited that they operate under different conditions than their private sector counterparts, and are subject to divergent interests and motives, with their own set of rules, logics, and norms (Delbridge and Keenoy, 2010). Rainey (1991) highlighted distinctive differences in organizational roles, structures, and processes of both public and private sector organizations with consequential impact on how HR functions are executed in each (Harel et al., 2001). Solomon noted differences in management perception about HR procedures in public and private organizations (Rainey, 2009). Gould-Williams (2003) stressed differences in managerial practices (Gould-William, 2003). Milkovich and Newman (1990) pointed to differences in the reward systems, appraisal methods and the compensation benefits offered to employees with similar education and skill levels in both groups (Milkovich and Newman, 1990). Vla-

descu (2012) posited that public sector organizations are often plagued by talent drain and shortage and often experience challenges in securing the right talents that they need. Harel et al. (2001) underscored differences in the recruitment and selection strategies of the two types of organizations. Still, another impediment mentioned by Gadsen et al. (2017) is the absence of a commonly agreed definition of who is a talent in the public sector.

In summing up these differences, Knies et al. (2022) suggested that approaches to HR in the public sector have historically been more focused on the welfare of employees than on management's desire to increase organizational and employee performance (Knies et al., 2022). The authors further explained that public sector organizations have traditionally used HR practices to focus on welfare management and promote equal opportunities, career management, and development, with less focus on performance, compensation and benefits, when compared to private sector organizations (Knies et al., 2022).

One of the central tenets that has dominated the general discourse on TM practices is how do organizations view and treat individuals they regarded as talent (Meyers and Van Woerkom, 2014). Two diverging views have emerged on this, with different scholars viewing talent as either inclusive or exclusive (Iles et al., 2010; Stahl et al., 2012). Supporters of the exclusive TM viewpoint posit that only a select set of employees within an organization have talent and only these employees should be considered as high potential and high performers (Dries, 2013). Proponents of the inclusive TM viewpoint hold that all employees should be regarded as talents, and it's the duty of the organization to develop all its employees so that they can take advantage of the opportunities available (Swales et al., 2014). Researchers have found that while both viewpoints are present in private sector organizations, the exclusive viewpoint seems to predominate in public sector organizations (Swales et al., 2014; Cappelli & Keller, 2014; Anlesinya and Amponsah-Tawiah, 2020).

This difference has been further highlighted by researchers like Gallardo–Gallardo et al. (2013) who have pointed to the different contextual settings of both organizational types (i.e. public or private sector) and have posited that these settings do have an impact and as such should be considered when examining how TM is conceptualized in them (Gallardo –Gallardo et al., 2013). Despite this, in order to improve organizational performance, public sector companies, like their private sector counterparts, also strive to hire, train, reward, and develop their workforce (Poocharoen and Lee, 2013). Given the call for further research on this construct in the context of the public sector from scholars like Buick et al. (2015), this study contributes to the current conversation (Buick et al., 2015). Through the lens of the theory of bureaucracy, this study identifies certain significant impediments and limits to TM practices in public sector organizations through empirical data from Romania. Through the presentation of the findings from this research that was conducted on public sector organizations in Romania, we attempt to close this gap in the literature.

2.1 Talent management in the Romania's public sector

As noted by Bouckaert et al. (2008), Romania is an emerging economy that is located among Central Eastern European (CEE) countries (Bouckaert et al. 2008). Similar to many of the countries in this region of Europe, Romania has emerged from a communist past where remnants of its socialist past continue to strongly influence some of its current HR and labour practices (Stan and Vancea, 2015). While the Romanian state has cast aside the communist system, embraced a market-led economy, and has started to reform and modernize its economy, the government continues to play a central role in the country's economy and remains a large employer of labour at both the municipal and central government levels (Cristescu et al., 2013).

Hesitancy among Romanian public workers about reforming many elements of the Romanian work environment to make it more market-oriented has raised doubt about the capacity of public sector managers to implement the HR reforms needed (Profiroiu et al. 2006). Issues relating to the lack of decentralization reforms leading to duplication of work tasks, administrative bottlenecks, as well as lack of cohesion among staff within different public sector departments leading to inconsistent service delivery to the public were some of the factors highlighted (Baba et al., 2007).

The perceived high level of politicization was also identified as another stumbling block affecting the transformation of the public sector into a more professional sector (Sandor and Tripon, 2008). The authors also pointed to the lack of consistency and coherence in the rollout of new HR approaches along with excessive legalism which they viewed as additional impediments to public sector reforms in the country. (Sandor and Tripon, 2008). Other stumbling blocks highlighted were issues relating to staff motivation, poorly thought-out civil service legislation and the general lack of trust within the civil service (Linder, 2011).

Romania adopted the UN 2030 Agenda for sustainable development goals (SDG) and set itself the aim of reducing the development gaps between itself and other EU members (Firoiu et al., 2019). One critical goal within this plan is the development of its human capital, including programmes for public servants and high performers in the government sector (Madar and Neașu, 2020). While there have been ongoing reforms in the public sector in Romania, questions still remain about the pace of implementation, its impact on staff morale as well as its ultimate impact on service delivery to the public. It is the responsibility of public sector managers to promote standards where responsibility and objectivity are equally important (Dumitrescu, 2014). So, while there have undoubtedly been some strides, there still remain several challenges to TM for public sector organizations in Romania as it relates to attracting, developing, rewarding and motivating the right talents needed to improve services to the citizenry. But, while some researchers have acknowledged that progress has been made, arguing that remnants of its communist past and the long tradition of bureaucracy continue to exert influence on the work environment in the public sector (Lonescu and Robertson, 2016).

3 Theoretical foundation

To better understand how TM is operationalized in different contextual settings, researchers advise that we need to both appreciate the contextual setting in which it takes place and how the actions of critical stakeholders and actors are shaped by existing norms, rules and historical practices (Tyskbo, 2021). For this reason, the Theory of Bureaucracy postulated by German sociologist, Karl Emil Maximilian Weber, more commonly known as Max Weber, in 1921 provides an essential framework to explain operations in the public service as well as an appropriate lens through which to conduct our study. As posited by one researcher, Weber's Theory of Bureaucracy focuses on the organizational structure that divides the organization into hierarchies and creates strong lines of authority and control (Ferdous, 2016).

To the layperson, the word bureaucracy is synonymous with government operations and is often viewed in a less-than-positive light. It conjures negative thoughts of inefficiency, red tape and delays and is often one of the main reasons given for how government works and delivers its services to the public (Goodsell, 2014). But, what is bureaucracy, and how is it relevant to our understanding of how TM is operationalized in the public service? As posited by Im (2016), bureaucracy is not only applicable to government, it also describes the administrative structure of many private-sector companies as well as other non-governmental entities like universities, and hospitals as well as explains how large organizations like the military and police work (Im, 2016). Clegg et al. (2007) noted that bureaucracies have traditionally been thought of as systems created to increase the efficiency of organizational practices and procedures (Clegg et al., 2007). As theorized by Weber, bureaucracy achieves organizational efficiency by enforcing norms and coordination mechanisms that contain instrumental systems intended to rationalize administrative efficiency (Erkoc, 2017). Weber contended that bureaucracy exerts enormous influence over public administration specially and society in general (Im, 2016).

In elaborating on his thesis about bureaucracy, Weber viewed it not as a form of government but as rather as a system of administration carried out continuously by trained professionals according to established rules and regulations (Erkoc, 2017). Weber outlined six commonalities that are characteristic of bureaucratic organizations; (1) hierarchy, (2) division of labour, (3) impersonality, (4) technical qualifications, (5) procedural specifications and (6) continuity (Beetham, 1991). Weber opined that bureaucracies are the ideal organizational type that is rational and efficient, where goals are clear, positions are hierarchically arranged, authority resides in one's position rather than in the office holder and progressively increases higher up the organization (Beetham, 1991). He further noted that staff are recruited based on their qualifications, promotions are largely determined by seniority and performance, and employees strive to provide a continuous and neutral service to the public (Benington and Moore, 2010).

Lonescu and Robertson (2016), noted that for many European countries, bureaucracy is an important phenomenon that has considerable effects on

both public and private sector organizations (Lonescu and Robertson, 2016). The authors acknowledged the negative connotation normally associated with bureaucracies but argued that an efficient bureaucracy helps prevent disasters and inconveniences to the public due to the stability and certainty that its rules and structures provide. This they argue, is especially crucial for countries transitioning from a socialist to a market-led economy (Lonescu and Robertson, 2016). As noted by Page and Jenkins (2005), bureaucrats performed a pivotal role in policy formulation by first supplying legislators with the crucial information needed for making new laws and once enacted, taking responsibility for the execution and enforcement of these laws (Page and Jenkins, 2005). This point was stressed by Coyne, (2008), who noted that the development of modern society involves overlapping public bureaucratic structures which he argued is necessary for the proper functioning of government (Coyne, 2008).

In summarizing this discourse on bureaucracy, the following conclusions can be drawn from the literature. First, we posit that the theory of bureaucracy impacts how TM is operationalized in public sector organizations and as such, it is crucial to a better understanding of the dynamics of how and why employees act in relation to certain HR practices (Thunnissen and Buttiens, 2017). Second, TM strategies typically flow from an organization's business strategies, which in the case of bureaucracies would emanate through the hierarchy down to employees, which is a key tenet of Weber's Theory of Bureaucracy (Mahmood et al. 2012; McNamara, 2010). Third, despite decades of ideological and structural reforms in the public sector, bureaucracy has survived both in concept and practice and has thus proven its durability due in part to the obedience of civil servants to conform to its organizational rules (Jackson, 2001). Finally, although the literature on TM practices in public sector organizations is still an understudied area, many tenets of the theory of bureaucracy have been co-opted by other management practices, and thus practices such as written rules, paperwork, punishment, and reward systems are well accepted (Sow, 2019). Additionally, we argue that the public administration model in Romania has several traits common to bureaucratic organizations, including a strict hierarchy, a clear division of labour, and the regular and ongoing performance of these tasks. (Ghindar, 2009). As a result, this lens offers a useful prism through which to view TM practices in public sector organizations.

3.1 Research questions

For this research on TM in the Romanian public sector, we attempted to address four research questions as follows:

- Research Question 1 (RQ1): What philosophical approach to TM predominates among public sector organizations?
- Research Question 2 (RQ2): What effects does TM have on employees' responsibilities and performance?

- Research Question 3 (RQ3): How do public sector organizations identify, select and recruit, the talents they need?
- Research Question 4 (RQ4): How do public sector organizations identify and develop the talents they need?

4 Methods

To arrive at the answers to the research questions, we followed the guidelines recommended by Eisenhardt (1989). The grounded theory approach proposed by Glaser and Strauss (1967) when compared to Eisenhardt's (1989) proposition differ primarily in that the latter calls for a more meticulous preparation of the research questions and assumptions regarding the state of the knowledge (i.e., constructs and relationships) as well as the various forms of data analysis that are carried out (Glaser and Strauss, 1967; Strauss and Corbin, 1997).

We have chosen this approach, as while the TM discipline is fairly new, its impact and influence in public sector organizations remain an understudied area (Thunnissen and Buttiens, 2017). Additionally, we believe it may produce biases that could undermine the findings of the grounded theory technique. Thus, in our investigation, we adhered to the highly structured Eisenhardt (1989) approach, which is still related to the grounded theory proposed by Glaser and Strauss (1967).

The process of developing a theory begins with a straightforward research topic. In this case, our focus is on TM practices in public sector organizations. The next stage was to identify relevant and suitable organizations or departments in the public sector where components of TM practices can be studied. In Romania, we selected a mix of public sector departments and organizations that operated at the municipal level for our case studies. Respondents were employees drawn from a wide cross-section of public administration in Romania. One hundred and thirty-nine employees were surveyed from municipal offices, social care services, statistical offices and the mayor's office across multiple cities in Romania.

These entities were selected on purpose to cover as many facets of TM as possible, but with a focus on organizations that operate at the municipal level. These local entities were selected for a number of reasons. First, we wanted to first assess TM conceptualization at the municipal (local level), given the paucity of studies at this level of the public sector. Second, it was convenient to contact the organizations due to their proximity. Third, the management team of each entity was receptive to the idea of participating in the survey. Forth, and final, most of the organizations have reported varying levels of familiarity with TM practices and few had incorporated aspects of it within their broader HR practices. Consequently, we theoretically selected the organizations in a manner that satisfies Eisenhardt's (1989) prescription.

The third phase involves creating a research questionnaire on TM in public sector organizations based on our literature review. As a result, we were able to undertake the research and collect the data using open-ended, semi-

structured interviews. To triangulate the data and thoroughly analyze the results, we asked respondents to record their responses using already-existing documents in this step. For each organization, the respondents interviewed were either department heads, supervisors, or line employees with extensive knowledge of the organization's strategies, policies, and practices, especially regarding HR. Each interview was taped, and the information was transcribed into Word documents.

The transcribed information served as the foundation for a two-step qualitative analysis that was subsequently undertaken. First, we coded the transcripts by giving codes to different textual components. Second, we carefully examined individual cases to determine the TM practices, along with the HR policies and procedures for each entity for those instances where TM may still be relatively new to the staff. Thirdly, we analyzed the results to identify trends and differences between cases. This exercise served as the foundation for the arguments we put forward in the paper's concluding section.

The process's conclusion involved comparing the research findings to what was already known about TM in public sector organizations and gleaned from the literature. The conclusion of the investigation assumes a critical review of the theory, and the study is complete when newly discovered findings cannot be fully explained by prior evidence. To ensure theoretical soundness, respondents from the organizations were re-contacted in cases where the data received was incomplete or where we needed to better understand their knowledge of TM practices.

5 Results

Based on our research questions, the following responses were received from respondents and we added the subsequent discussion as follows.

Research Question 1 (RQ1): What philosophical approach to TM predominates among public sector organizations?

"Based on the analysis of the responses received, generally, most organizations appear to embrace an inclusive TM approach. Employees reported that they largely receive equitable treatment from management with little to no discrimination shown between employees. This they explained extends further, with no differentiation shown either between the high-performing employees and those rated as average performers".

The revelation that many of the public sector organizations embrace the inclusive philosophical approach to TM is probably not unexpected. This situation could be a side effect of Romania's socialist/communist past, which emphasized the equalitarian principles and equality between individuals (Irimie, 2014). Chun and Rainey (2005) argued that an exclusive philosophical approach that regards only some employees as being talents may be less acceptable in public sector organizations due to its perception of being elitist and the perceived inequalities that it may create among employees (Chu-

nand Rainey, 2005). Poocharoen and Lee (2013) suggested that the inclusive approach to TM better aligns with the egalitarian culture that exists in the public sector and which seeks to foster common values among employees (Poocharoen and Lee, 2013). This has prompted some scholars to argue that given concerns about potentially discriminatory practices and the possibility of workforce differentiation among employees, the concept of inclusive talent strategies appears more suited to public sector organizational contexts (Ford et al., 2010; Powell et al., 2012).

Research Question 2 (RQ2): What effects does TM have on employees' responsibilities and performance?

"People are strongly focused on implementing the duties according to the prescribed procedures and regulations, and in the deadline time frame. They are not at all encouraged to innovate or to do things differently. They are afraid of doing things wrong, so they expect to get procedures or clear legislation for each duty they get".

Innovation is an essential asset of an organization that can enhance its competitiveness and give it a sustained advantage in the marketplace (Marin-Garcia et al., 2011). One crucial ingredient for innovation to take place is the competencies of its workforce, a factor alluded to by Fernandez and Moldogaziev (2013) and Marin-Garcia et al. (2011). Another critical requirement according to Goffin and Mitchell, (2010) is the right environmental setting (Goffin and Mitchell, 2017). Innovation outcomes are influenced by factors such as organizational structure and culture (Goffin and Mitchell, 2017). Innovation in public sector organizations is not a fully understood topic since employees have to traverse between the practices and norms that are expected of organizations that operate under strong institutional settings (Vickers et al., 2017).

Furthermore, according to Jackson (2001), the hierarchical structure that is characteristic of bureaucracy ensures that the employees who manage the regulations and rules have clearly defined tasks (Jackson, 2001). This chain of command allows public sector managers to closely monitor the organization's performance and effectively address problems that arise (Coyne, 2008). It is generally accepted that TM can help organizations identify and develop the competencies of its employees so that they assist the organizations to meet the current and future demands for their services (Hayton and McEvoy, 2006; Camps and Luna-Arocas, 2012). But, given a situation where TM practices are not implemented, then it is likely that this may have a negative impact on the innovative output of staff within the organizations (Vickers et al., 2017).

"Employees seemed to be motivated by the good working conditions, regular working programmes, and respected days off that their department offered."

Some features of bureaucratic organizations may explain this. Weber submits that in a properly functioning bureaucracy, there must be duties, roles or functions for every worker and each worker must be clear about their duties, and job function and know to whom they have to report (McNamra, 2010). In addition to these prerequisites, it has been suggested that effective TM prac-

tices can aid in the development of the skills and competencies that workers need to improve their performance (Dixit and Arrawatia, 2018). Carpenter (2019) argued that motivation can be a crucial factor in helping employees to improve their performance (Carpenter, 2019). Tella (2016) supported this assertion as they view motivation as an important ingredient that can align the employee's action to his performance (Tella, 2016). The author noted that motivation is a person's drive or desire to perform a task of his own volition (Tella, 2016). But, motivation is multidimensional, a point highlighted by Damarasri and Ahman (2020) who asserted that a person's motivation is enhanced if his work environment is conducive and if he feels some sense of belonging to the organization (Damarasri and Ahman, 2020).

Some theories on motivation operate on the premise that by offering employees the right opportunities and applying the appropriate stimulation, individuals will perform well and to the satisfaction of the organization (Yagyagil, 2015). Herzberg's theory of motivation posits that a person's motivation is composed of motivators and hygiene factors (Herzberg et al., 1959). Damarasri and Ahman (2020) explained that motivators are personal factors relating to a sense of achievement, job interest as well as the level of responsibility and scope for advancement. Whereas, hygiene factors relate to the conditions within which the persons work and the factors that influence the work environment. Damarasri and Ahman, (2020) list the eight hygiene factors as; 1) company policy, 2) working conditions, 3) job security, 4) salary and benefit, 5) job status, 6) job security, 7) office and personal life, and 8) supervision and autonomy (Damarasri and Ahman, 2020). While Tella (2016) suggested that motivation can be viewed a solution to drive higher level of performance from employees, the relationship between TM and motivation is multidimensional and a far more complex one (Tella, 2016). As such, a deeper analysis of the relationship between both constructs falls outside the scope of this research.

Research Question 3 (RQ3): How do public sector organizations identify, select and recruit, the talents they need?

When recruiting, organizations do not aim to attract the best candidates on the market. Respondents stated that the purpose is to find candidates who meet the minimum requirements and who are willing to accept the low salary that comes with the job. They stated organizations follow the legislation when advertising job vacancies, but do not put extra effort into attracting the right candidates.

Recruiting the right talent is a critical step in the TM practice of an organization. When organizations fail to exercise due care in their recruitment, they can encounter problems such as selecting unsuitable talents, poor job performance, excess cost and high levels of attrition (Cole and Kelly, 2011). While this is true for all organizations, it is especially relevant to public sector organizations that face major challenges in attracting talents due to their inability to offer competitive salaries to lure qualified candidates (Okeke-Uzodike and Subban, 2015). The authors highlighted what they saw as a trending away from the principle of meritocracy in recruitment in public sector organizations due to political considerations (Okeke-Uzodike and Subban, 2015). Ber-

man et al. (2010) underscored the point that the effective delivery of government services requires that they hire, reward and manage good people (Berman et al. 2021). Kumar et al. (2010) asserted that good HR practices can have a positive impact on the performance of an organization (Kumar et al. 2010). McCourt (2007) echoed similar sentiments, pointing out the beneficial impact on organizations when they hire people with the right skills (McCourt, 2007). This point was emphasized by Okeke-Uzodike and Subban (2015) who noted that when executed, effectively, staff recruitment is critical to the “performance and achievement of organizational goals” (Okeke-Uzodike and Subban, 2015, p. 27).

Research Question 4 (RQ4): How do public sector organizations identify and develop the talents they need?

“The promotion system does not differentiate the best employees. The term talent is not used in the organizations that were surveyed. Instead, the universal term used is “high-performing employees”. Respondents reported that no matter the performance, each employee may move to a higher level of their job every 3 years. But, they get a higher payment (very small increase), but not increased responsibilities and no increased decision-making power. The high-performing employees get more work to do but are not rewarded accordingly for their extra work. Plus, there are no differentiating benefits for the more hard-working employees”.

One of the fundamental premises of TM is that talent must be identified, cultivated, and placed in key positions that are crucial to the operations of a company (Boudreau and Ramstad, 2005). Hartmann et al. (2010) were more pointed, in positing that organizations need to first discover and identify its talent before engaging in TM (Hartmann et al., 2010). Wiblen (2016) advised that organizations must have a clear grasp of who and what constitutes talent to do this effectively (Wiblen, 2016). The essence of talent identification is that it allows organizations to funnel their scarce resource to attract, choose, develop, and keep high-potential employees who are more productive than non-high-potential employees (Farndale et al., 2022). While some scholars have debated whether an employee should be classified as a talent, proponents of TM generally agree that talent identification can have beneficial effects on the organization (Cappelli, 2008; Guthridge et al., 2008). Bjorkman et al. (2013) found that talent identification can increase employees’ affective attachment to the organization and motivate them to work harder at their job (Bjorkman et al., 2013). Meyers et al. (2013) reported similar findings, stating that individuals designated as talent by an organization generally exhibit more positive work attitudes and display a higher commitment to the organization (Meyers et al., 2013).

However, researchers like Davis and Frolova (2017) urged caution, noting that the job of identifying talents in an organization is not easy (Davis and Frolova, 2017). Dries (2013) suggested that one of the dangers in identifying talent is that subject reviews such as performance appraisals that are often used can lead to bias (Dries, 2013). Rowland (2011) argued that this method is problematic and can result in charges of unfairness and elicit resentment from

staff (Rowland, 2011). Bjorkman et al. (2013) highlighted the issue of unfavourable reactions from those employees who were not identified as talent or high performers (Bjorkman et al., 2013).

Most studies on the subject have taken place in private-sector companies and the topic thus remains understudied in the public sector (McDonnell et al., 2017). Thunnissen and Buttiens (2017) underscored this point and noted that the idea of public sector talent is in its infancy, in contrast to private sector talent (Thunnissen and Buttiens, 2017). Kravariti and Johnston (2019) offered a possible explanation for this, positing that public sector talent is conceptualized with a greater emphasis on the contextual setting and the guiding principles that view public service as serving the public good (Kravariti and Johnston, 2019).

Given the infancy of talent identification in the public sector generally and the communist past of Romania, it is probably not surprising that talent identification and designation remain underdeveloped areas. One of the features of communism in Romania was to promote an egalitarian work environment where all workers were treated as equals (Catana and Catana, 2012). Remnants of this legacy seemed to have remained and continue to influence the work environment in the public sector.

Weber theorized bureaucracy as being indispensable to the workings of modern society and public administration with its characteristically hierarchical structures and rational controls (Cole, 2004). He viewed bureaucracies as being the most successful kind of organizational type because they possess specialized expertise, certainty, continuity, and unity of purpose (Page and Jenkins, 2005). But, he cautioned that unfettered bureaucracy could threaten individual liberties by enclosing people in an “iron cage” of impersonal, unreasonable, and strict regulations.

Lonescu and Robertson (2016) echoed similar sentiments, noting that many European countries have experienced the negative effects of bureaucracy at multiple levels of public management, many documents, corruption in the public sector, and lack of transparency because useful information is sometimes lost in multiple forms and paperwork (Lonescu and Robertson, 2016). Lonescu (2012) asserted that Romania has a legacy of a socialist economy and an outdated bureaucracy that has hindered or slowed attempts to modernize the public service (Lonescu, 2012). It is not surprising that examples of these were unearthed in our findings.

6 Conclusion

The findings show that TM practices in the Romanian public sector are at a stage of infancy with many of its elements largely underdeveloped. These findings are not surprising since they mirror the results that researchers in other countries have found (Al Jawali et al., 2022; Ananthan, 2019; Thunnissen and Buttiens, 2017). While several of the respondents and organizations reported some familiarity with the tenets of TM, the information unearthed suggests

that the conceptualization and operationalization of TM in the public sector has a far way to go. Various factors can be advanced for this state of affairs. However, based on the reading of the literature and the data we analyzed, we posit two central propositions for the low infusion of TM in the public sector.

Proposition 1: First, as a number of earlier scholars have mentioned, the institutional context of the public sector, which is embedded in its institutional setting and bounded by multiple institutional logics, serves as a barrier to the introduction of new HR concepts and practices, like those advocated by TM (Vandenabeele et al., 2014; Kehoe and Wright, 2013).

Proposition 2: Second, efforts to modernize and change the public sector in Romania are hindered by some lingering cultural traditions from the country's socialist and communist past. As a result, new HR practices like TM may find it difficult to establish a strong foothold (Dixit and Arrawatia, 2018). Longley (2021) argued that due to the rigid structure that exist in bureaucracies, they offer limited flexibility to employees to deviate from these rules (Longley, 2021). The author further argued that bureaucracies are often slow to embrace new practices and adapt to changing social conditions, which may explain why new HR practices like TM have a long gestation period in civil services like those in Romania.

As attractive and beneficial TM is to many organizations, some scholars have questioned aspects of the practice and its suitability to public sector organizations. Swailes (2013) questioned whether the ethics of TM in focusing only on a small proportion of relatively high-performing employees aren't at variance with the policies of many public sector organizations that often promote inclusiveness and equality among all its employees (Swailes, 2013).

7 Practical contribution

This paper contributes to the under-researched field of TM in public sector organizations. The results generated from this study may have some useful insights and implications for researchers, policymakers, and HR practitioners in other countries with a similar history to Romania. Much has been written about the beneficial effects of TM, but HR professionals and public sector managers may well encounter some of the same barriers to its implementation. Attracting, developing and retaining talent remain a challenge for many public sector organizations in Eastern Europe. This is against the urgent need to reform and modernize the public service to make it more efficient in the delivery of services to the public. Talent management has proven beneficial to many private sector companies and may do the same for the public service if properly implemented and operationalized. For the public sector to be transformed, it will need talented workers who are committed to service, motivated to serve the public and eager to assist the organization in delivering on its mandate. For workers, it highlighted several deeply held beliefs that they have and which may stand in the way of improving their output and embracing a new mode of working. For HR practitioners and public sector

managers, it highlighted the barriers that they will need to overcome to implement TM and get worker buy-in.

8 Limitations and research

This study has some limitations. First, only public servants in municipal administrations were surveyed. We surveyed no public servants attached to the national civil service, and it is possible that their inclusion could have generated different results. Second, there may be diversity among the different municipal administrations which was not accounted for in the study. Third, being a qualitative study done in Romania, the findings are not intended for transferability to other countries where different cultural and institutional settings may exist. Finally, the study can be considered exploratory and the sampling chosen was based on convenience. We also opted to focus on how TM is conceptualized and impacts employees at the municipal level. As such further research is required to explore it at the central government level as well as to probe reasons for some of the insights that we unearthed and to compare the extent to which these findings are mirrored by public servants in central government in other similar countries in Europe. Similarly, researchers need to investigate the benefits of TM to different stakeholders in the public sector.

References

- Al Jawali, H. et al. (2022). Talent management in the public sector: empirical evidence from the Emerging Economy of Dubai. *The International Journal of human resource management*, 33(11), pp. 2256–2284.
- Ananthan, S. S. et al. (2019). The Development of Talent Management in Malaysian Public Sector: Comprehensive Review.
- Ansar, N. and Baloch, A. (2018). Talent and talent management: definition and issues. *IBT Journal of Business Studies (JBS)*, 1(2).
- Baba, A. (2007). Impactful serviciilor deconcentrate ale ministerelor or asupra politicilor publice locale (Impact of Deconcentrated Services of the Ministries on Local Public Policy), Bucharest: Soros Foundation Romania.
- Ballesteros R. S. (2010). Talents: the Key for Successful Organizations.
- Beetham, D. (1991). Max Weber and the legitimacy of the modern state. *Analyse and Kritik*, 13(1), pp. 34–45.
- Benington, J. and Moore, M. (2010). *Public value: Theory and practice*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Berger, L. A. and Berger, D. R. (2011). *The talent management handbook: Creating a sustainable competitive advantage by selecting, developing, and promoting the best people* (No. 273113). McGraw-Hill.
- Berman, E. M. et al. (2021). *Human resource management in public service: Paradoxes, processes, and problems*. CQ Press.
- Björkman, I. et al. (2013). Talent or not? Employee reactions to talent identification. *Human Resource Management*, 52(2), pp. 195–214.
- Boselie, P. and Thunnissen, M. (2017). *Talent management in the public sector: Managing tensions and dualities*.
- Bouckaert, R. R. et al. (2008). *Weka manual for version 3-6-0*. University of Waikato, Hamilton, New Zealand.
- Boudreau, J. W. and Ramstad, P. M. (2005). Talentship, talent segmentation, and sustainability: A new HR decision science paradigm for a new strategy definition. *Human Resource Management: Published in Cooperation with the School of Business Administration, The University of Michigan and in alliance with the Society of Human Resources Management*, 44(2), pp. 129–136.
- Buick, F. et al. (2015). Can enhanced performance management support public sector change? *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 28(2), pp. 271–289.
- Buttiens, D. and Hondeghem, A. (2015). Strategic choices regarding talent management in the Flemish public sector. *Society and Economy*, 37(1), pp. 49–72.
- Camps, J. and Luna-Arocas, R. (2012). A matter of learning: How human resources affect organizational performance. *British Journal of Management*, 23(1), pp. 1–21.
- Catana, D. and Catana, G. A. (2012). Continuity and change in Romanian societal culture dimensions. *Journal for East European Management Studies*, pp. 226–249.
- Cappelli, P. (2008). Talent management for the twenty-first century. *Harvard business review*, 86(3), p. 74.
- Carpenter, C. J. (2019). Cognitive dissonance, ego-involvement, and motivated reasoning. *Annals of the*

- International Communication Association, 43(1), pp. 1–23.
- Chun, Y. H. and Rainey, H. G. (2005). Goal ambiguity and organizational performance in US federal agencies. *Journal of public administration research and theory*, 15(4), pp. 529–557.
- Clegg, S., Johnston, J. and Shearer, C. (2007). Bureaucracy and public sector governmentality. *The Blackwell encyclopedia of sociology*, pp. 1–4.
- Cole, G.A. and Kelly, P. (2011). *Management Theory and Practice* (7th ed), Singapore, South-Western Cengage Learning.
- Collings, D. and Mellahi, K. (2009). Strategic Talent Management: A Review and Research Agenda, *Human Resource Management Review*, 19(4), pp. 304–313.
- Coulson-Thomas, C. (2012). Talent management and building high performance organisations. *Industrial and commercial Training*.
- Coyne, C. J. (2008). “The Politics of Bureaucracy” and the Failure of Post-War Reconstruction. *Public Choice*, pp. 11–22.
- Cristescu, A., Stanilă, L. and Andreica, M. E. (2013). Motivation of the public employee in Romania in the context of the economic crisis. *Theoretical and Applied Economics*, 20(10), pp. 49–64.
- Dan, S. and Pollitt, C. (2015). NPM Can Work: An optimistic review of the impact of New Public Management reforms in central and eastern Europe. *Public Management Review*, 17(9), pp. 1305–1332.
- Davis, P. J. and Frolova, Y. (2017). Toward an understanding of the failure of talent identification initiatives in the African public sector. *Journal of Management Policy and Practice*, 18(1), pp. 102–113.
- Damarasri, B. N. and Ahman, E. (2020). Talent management and work motivation to improve performance of employees. *Dinasti International Journal of Education Management and Social Science*, 1(4), pp. 490–498.
- Delbridge, R. and Keenoy, T. (2010). Beyond managerialism? The international journal of human resource management, 21(6), pp. 799–817.
- Dixit, S. and Arrawatia, M. A. (2018). The Impact of Talent Management on Job Satisfaction and Employee Performance in Public Sector Banks of Rajasthan. *International Journal of Creative Research Thoughts* (IJCRT).
- Dries, N. (2013). Talent management, from phenomenon to theory. *Human Resource Management Review*, 23(4), pp. 267–271.
- Dumitrescu, A. (2014). The Role and importance of governance for the public sector. Case study for Romania. *Revista de Management Comparat International*, 15(4), pp. 505–513.
- Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989). Building theories from case study research. *Academy of management review* 14(4), pp. 532–550.
- Erkoc, T. E. (2017). Bureaucracy and Efficiency. *Global Encyclopedia of Public Administration, Public Policy, and Governance*, pp. 1–7.
- Farndale, E., Agarwal, P. and Budhwar, P. (2022). Outcomes of talent identification in economically liberalized India: Does organizational justice matter? *Journal of Business Research*, 144, pp. 740–750.
- Ferdous, J. (2016). Organization theories: From classical perspective. *International Journal of Business, Economics and Law*, 9(2), pp. 1–6.
- Fernandez, S. and Moldogaziev, T. (2013). Using employee empowerment to encourage innovative behavior in the public sector. *Journal of public administration research and theory*, 23(1), pp. 155–187.

- Firoiu, D. et al. (2019). Achieving sustainable development goals (SDG): Implementation of the 2030 Agenda in Romania. *Sustainability*, 11(7), p. 2156.
- Ford, J., Harding, N. and Stoyanova Russell, D. (2010). Talent management and development. An overview of current theory and practice.
- Gallardo-Gallardo, E., Dries, N. and González-Cruz, T. F. (2013). What is the meaning of 'talent' in the world of work? *Human Resource Management Review*, 23(4), pp. 290–300.
- Gadsen, V. L., Arzubia, A. A. and Davis, J. E. (2017). AERA annual meeting theme.
- Ghindar, A. (2009). *Why go democratic? Civil service reform in Central and Eastern Europe*. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Glaser, B.G., and Strauss, A.L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Glenn, T. (2012). The state of talent management in Canada's public sector. *Canadian Public Administration*, 55(1), pp. 25–51.
- Goffin, K. and Mitchell, R. (2017). *Innovation management*. London, UK: Red Globe Press.
- Goodsell, C. T. (2014). *The new case for bureaucracy*. CQ press.
- Gould-Williams, J. (2003). The importance of HR practices and workplace trust in achieving superior performance: a study of public-sector organizations. *International journal of human resource management*, 14(1), pp. 28–54.
- Grégoire, D. A. et al. (2015). The Mind in the Middle: Taking Stock of Affect and Cognition Research in Entrepreneurship. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 17(2), pp. 125–142.
- Guthridge, M., Komm, A. B. and Lawson, E. (2008). Making talent a strategic priority. *McKinsey Quarterly*, 1, p. 48.
- Harel, G. H. and Tzafir, S. S. (2001). HRM practices in the public and private sectors: Differences and similarities. *Public Administration Quarterly*, pp. 316–355.
- Harris, L. and Foster, C. (2010). Aligning talent management with approaches to equality and diversity: Challenges for UK public sector managers. *Equality, diversity and inclusion: an international journal*, 29(5), pp. 422–435.
- Hartmann, E., Feisel, E. and Schober, H. (2010). Talent management of western MNCs in China: Balancing global integration and local responsiveness. *Journal of world business*, 45(2), pp. 169–178.
- Hayton, J. C. and McEvoy, G. M. (2006). Competencies in practice: An interview with Hanneke C. Frese. *Human Resource Management: Published in Cooperation with the School of Business Administration, The University of Michigan and in alliance with the Society of Human Resources Management*, 45(3), pp. 495–500.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B. and Snyderman, B. B. (1959). *The Motivation to Work*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Im, T. (2016). *Public organizations in Asia*. Routledge.
- Irimie, R. C. (2014). Everyday life under communism. The case of Romania. *SEA– Practical Application of Science*, 2(3), pp. 266–283.
- Jackson, P. M. (2001). Public sector added value: can bureaucracy deliver? *Public Administration*, 79(1), pp. 5–28.

- Kehoe, R. and Wright, P. (2013). The Impact of High-Performance Human Resource Practices on Employees' Attitudes and Behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 39(2), pp. 366–391.
- Kiruja, E. K. and Kabare, K. (2013). Linking work environment with employee performance in public middle level TIVET institutions in Kenya. *International journal of advances in management and economics*, 2(4), pp. 83–91.
- Knies, E. et al. (2022). The distinctiveness of public sector HRM: A four-wave trend analysis. *Human resource management journal*, 32(4), pp. 799–825.
- Kravariti, F. and Johnston, K. (2019). Talent management: a critical literature review and research agenda for public sector human resource management. *Public Management Review* 22, pp. 75–95. doi: 10.1080/14719037.2019.1638439
- Kumar, N., Garg, P. and Pvt, A. C. S. (2010). Impact of online recruitment on recruitment performance. *Asian journal of management research*, 1(1), pp. 327–336.
- Linder, V. (2011). Balancing between the Career and Position-Based Systems. Some Aspects of Recent Developments in Civil Service Legislation in Hungary. *Acta Juridical Hungarian*, 52(1), pp. 64–72.
- Leisink, P. et al. (2013). *Managing social issues: A public values perspective*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Lewis, R. E. and Heckman, R. J. (2006). Talent management: A critical review. *Human resource management review*, 16(2), pp. 139–154.
- Lonescu, L. (2012). Principles and Hypothesis on Bureaucracy and Corruption Phenomena, Postdoctoral Research, Romanian Academy.
- Lonescu, L. and Robertson, K. (2016). Efficient Bureaucracy in the Public Sector for Safe Environment in Romania. *Annals of Spiru Haret University, Economic Series*, 3.
- Longley, R. (2021). What Is Bureaucracy and Is It Good or Bad? ThoughtCo.
- Mahmood, Z., Basharat, M. and Bashir, Z. (2012). Review of classical management theories. *International journal of social sciences and education*, 2(1).
- Madar, A. and Neaşu, N. A. (2020). Tourists' vision about the implementation of sustainable development practices in the hospitality industry in Romania. In: *Proceedings of the international conference on business excellence*, 14(1) pp. 769–779.
- Marin-Garcia, J. A. et al. (2011). Innovation types and talent management for innovation. *WPOM-Working Papers on Operations Management*, 2(2), pp. 25–31.
- McCourt, Willy. *Development Success: Statecraft in the South*. Springer, 2007.
- McDonnell, A. et al. (2017). Talent management: A systematic review and future prospects. *European Journal of International Management*, 11, pp. 86–128. doi:10.1504/EJIM.2017.10001680.
- Meyers, M. C., Van Woerkom, M. and Dries, N. (2013). Talent—Innate or acquired? Theoretical considerations and their implications for talent management. *Human Resource Management Review*, 23(4), pp. 305–321.
- McNamara, M. W. (2010). Collaborative Environmental Management within a Traditionalistic Political Culture. *Speaking Green with a Southern Accent: Environmental Management and Innovation in the South*, 129.
- Nhema, A. G. (2015). Relevance of classical management theories to modern public administration: a review. *Journal of public administration and governance*, 5(3), pp. 165–179.

- Okeke-Uzodike, O. E., and Subban, M. (2015). Public sector recruitment policies: efficiency, effectiveness and consequences. *Problems and perspectives in management*, 13(1), pp. 26–34.
- Page, E. C. and Jenkins, B. (2005). *Policy bureaucracy: Government with a cast of thousands*. OUP Oxford.
- Poocharoen, O. O. and Lee, C. (2013). Talent management in the public sector: A comparative study of Singapore, Malaysia, and Thailand. *Public Management Review*, 15(8), pp. 1185–1207.
- Powell, M. et al. (2012). *Talent management in the NHS managerial workforce. Final report*, National Institute for Health Research, pp. 1–216.
- Profiroiu, M. and Profiroiu, A. (2006). Decentralization process in Romania. *Transylvanian Review of Administrative Sciences*, 2(16), pp. 115–123.
- Rainey, H. G. (2009). *Understanding and managing public organizations*. John Wiley and Sons.
- Rana, A. S., Reddy, G. P. and Sontakki, B. S. (2013). Perceived service quality of agricultural organizations comparative analysis of public and private sector. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Management and Social Sciences*, 2(1), pp. 286–295.
- Rowland, M. (2011). How to cement a diversity policy: The key role of talent development? *Human Resource Management International Digest*, 19(5), pp. 36–38.
- Rust, A. A. and Lesego, P. K. (2012). Perceived challenges to talent management in the South African public service: An exploratory study of the City of Cape Town municipality
- Șandor, D.S. and Tripon, C.R. (2008). Citizens' Perceptions about Public Administration Reforms in Romania. *Transylvanian Review of Administrative Sciences*, 24E, pp. 111–122.
- Scullion, H., Collings, D.G. and Caligiuri, P. (2010). Global talent management. *Journal of World Business*, 45(2), pp. 105–108.
- Sorin, D. A. N. (2015). The New Public Management is Not That Bad After All: Evidence From Estonia, Hungary and Romania. *Transylvanian Review of Administrative Sciences*, 11(44), pp. 57–73.
- Sow, F. (2019). *Economic growth determinants and public administration institutions. A Cross-National Analysis of TFP, AP and Weberianess* (Master's thesis).
- Stan, L. and Vancea, D. (Eds.). (2015). *Post-communist Romania at twenty-five: Linking past, present, and future*. Lexington Books.
- Strauss, A. and Corbin, J. M. (1997). *Grounded theory in practice*. Sage.
- Swales, S. (2013). The ethics of talent management. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, 22(1), pp. 32–46.
- Tarique, I. and Schuler, R. S. (2010). Global talent management: Literature review, integrative framework, and suggestions for further research. *Journal of world business*, 45(2), pp. 122–133.
- Tella, A. (2016). Work Motivation, Job Satisfaction, and Organizational Commitment of Library Personnel in Academic and Research Libraries in Oyo State, LPAP, 50, pp. 1–16.
- Thunnissen, M. and Buttiens, D. (2017). Talent management in public sector organizations: A study on the impact of contextual factors on the TM

- approach in Flemish and Dutch public sector organizations. *Public Personnel Management*, 46(4), pp. 391–418.
- Thunnissen, M., Boselie, P. and Fruytier, B. (2013). Talent management and the relevance of context: Towards a pluralistic approach. *Human resource management review*, 23(4), pp. 326–336.
- Tyskbo, D. (2021). Conceptualizing talent in public sector municipalities. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*.
- Vandenabeele, W., Brewer, G. A. and Ritz, A. (2014). Past, present, and future of public service motivation research. *Public Administration*, 92(4), pp. 779–789.
- Vickers, I., Lyon, F., Sepulveda, L. and McMullin, C. (2017). Public service innovation and multiple institutional logics: The case of hybrid social enterprise providers of health and wellbeing. *Research Policy*, 46(10), pp. 1755–1768.
- Vlădescu, A. (2012). The possibility of implementing talent management in the public sector. *Management and Marketing*, 7(2).
- Weber, M. (2013). *Economy and society* two volume set, with a new foreword by Guenther Roth.
- Whelan, E. and Carcary, M. (2011). Integrating talent and knowledge management: where are the benefits? *Journal of knowledge management*.
- Wiblen, S. (2016). Framing the usefulness of eHRM in talent management: A case study of talent identification in a professional services firm. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences/Revue Canadienne des Sciences de l'Administration*, 33(2), pp. 95–107.
- Yagyagil, M. (2015). Article Information: Constructing a Typology of Culture in Organizational Behavior. *IJOA*, 23(4). <https://dx.doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-03-2013-0650>.