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Abstract

Literature on talent management did not provide a clear direction to the business leaders for facing the contemporary challenges of retaining talent and fostering innovative behavior among their managers. Datta & Bhargava (2008) identified four measures of talent development (TD) and three measures of talent development practices (TDPs) to address this challenge. This study has made an attempt to further examine the inter-relationships between TD and TDPs, and their effect on innovative work behavior as well as intention to stay. Managers (N=307) responded to a structured questionnaire and data was analyzed. Results clearly showed the inter-relationships between the TDPs and TD. Medialional analysis further revealed the power of TD in predicting the organizational outcomes.
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Rapid changes in the business environment and technological advancements have made talent development a growing concern for organizations. Talent development in organizations focuses on development and application of one’s specialized abilities leading to long term personal and professional (London & Smither 1999; Noe 1999; Simmering, Noe, Colquitt & Porter 2003) as well as organizational growth (Benson & Rutigliano 2003; Rothwall & Khazanis 2003). Traditionally, training has been playing a key role in organizations for talent development (Sugrue 2003). For adapting to turbulent markets however, managers have to undertake personal responsibility for acquiring new knowledge, continuous learning and self development (Davenport & Prusak 1997; Senge 1990) for which organizations need to augment their training strategies for achieving desired outcomes. There is an urgent need therefore to identify factors which facilitate development of capacities of people and enhance organizational performance. Many of these factors might act as predictors of firm performance viz. higher job satisfaction, higher organizational commitment and retention (Lund & Borg 1999; Kaye & Jordan-Evans 2000).
THEORETICAL OVERVIEW AND HYPOTHESES

Talent development and its practices

In this study talent has been operationalized as one’s specialized set of abilities, in a given context, to achieve superior outcome. Historically, talent has been conceptualized in relation to psychology of individual differences in performance (Benbow & Stanley 1996; Gagne 1995; Simonton 1999; Snow 1996) which encompasses assessment of abilities (Ackerman 1996; Gardner 1983; Robinson & Clinkenbeard 1998; Sternberg & Kaufman 1998), personality (Lubinski 2000) and vocational interest (Dawis 1992) with special emphasis on their real world significance.

Talent development has been used synonymously with employee development (Maurer, Pierce & Shore 2002; Maurer & Tarulli 1994; Maurer, Weiss & Barbeite 2002; Noe & Wilk 1993; Simmering et al. 2003), technical updating (Kozlowski & Farr 1988), individual development (Ackerman 1996; Ericsson & Charness 1995; Simonton 1999; Simonton 2001; Sternberg 1997) and talent development in the field of gifted education (Robinson & Clinkenbeard 1998; Renzulli 2005) which have been explained by applying multiple theoretical approaches (McCaulley & Hezlett, 2001). Literature on employee development suggests that participation in activities that include setting goals for skill improvement, undergoing formal training, taking up challenging job assignments, undergoing assessment and participating in facilitative interpersonal relationships facilitate development of one’s abilities and skills (Birdi, Allan & Warr 1997; Noe 1999; Simmering et al. 2003).

While there is compelling anecdotal evidence that talent development is of critical importance for improving organizational performance and gaining competitive advantage (Barney 1991; Bennet & Bell 2004; Rothwell & Kazanas 2003; Schuler & Jackson 1987; Ulrich 1998; Wright & McMahan 1992), very little is known about its components and measurement. Against this background, Datta & Bhargava (2008) conducted a study and identified four factors of talent development based on factor analysis viz. inner strength, seeking feedback, sharing knowledge and career progression.

Talent development in organizations is possible only when effective strategies and suitable practices are applied. Some of the practices for individual or employee development in organizations as proposed in
literature are viz. Long term formal and informal mentoring programs, long-term formalized transfer or exchange programs across organizations, divisions, departments, work units, or jobs, short-term rotation programs, special job assignments, action learning projects, field trips, professional conferences, behavior modeling, 360 degree feedback, think tank experiences, communities of practice etc. (Maurer, Mitchell & Barbeite 2002; McCauley & Hezlett 2001; Rothwell & Kazanas 2003). Practices such as mentoring, training, opportunities to use variety of skills and competencies, facilitate competence and technical updating (Aggarwal, Datta & Bhargava 2007; Kozlowski & Farr 1988) and are likely to lead to better organizational outcomes (Baugh, Lankau & Scandura 1996; Lankau & Scandura 2002).

Notwithstanding the voluminous literature on practices for developing individuals, it was still not explicitly clear as to which practices can be exclusively and distinctly considered as talent development practices. To address this gap, Datta & Bhargava (2008) also studied talent development practices in organizations and identified three factors based on factor analysis viz. opportunities for personal professional development, challenging tasks assigned by the boss and feedback from external stakeholders. There is a further need now to examine the predictive powers of these practices. This study aims therefore to develop an integrative framework in which the relationship between the factors of talent development practices and those of talent development can be examined systematically.

Individual’s perception of talent development essentially relates to one’s talent being utilized, developed and nurtured by the talent development practices of the organization. Individuals in an organization who perceive the talent development practices of their organization positively are likely to experience a positive sense of developing their talent (Kozlowski & Farr 1988). Therefore,

**Hypothesis 1:** There will be positive relationship between the talent development practices (opportunities for personal development, challenging tasks assigned by the boss and feedback from external stakeholders) and talent development (inner strength, feedback seeking, knowledge sharing and career progression).

Literature suggests that employee and individual development practices viz. setting goals for skill improvement, undergoing formal training, taking up challenging job assignments, undergoing assessment
and participation in facilitative interpersonal relationships (Birdi et al. 1997; Noe, 1999; Simmering et al. 2003). lead to perceptions of career progression, non-job benefits, talent utilization, achieving one’s potential, organization commitment, work-role flexibility, learning orientation etc. (Birdi et al., 1997; Noe & Wilk 1993; Lund & Borg 1999, Kaye & Jordan-Evans 2000). Organizations apply many strategies and interventions to face the challenges related to talent development including training, culture building, external facilitation and they all require significant investments in terms of time and money. Little is known however about the predictive powers of the practices applied as a consequence of these strategic interventions. Therefore:

Hypothesis 2a: Opportunities for personal and professional development will predict inner strength, feedback seeking, knowledge sharing and career progression.

Hypothesis 2b: Challenging tasks assigned by the boss will predict inner strength, feedback seeking, knowledge sharing and career progression.

Hypothesis 2c: Feedback from external stakeholders will predict inner strength, feedback seeking, knowledge sharing and career progression.

Talent development and organizational outcomes

Firms need to innovate for long term survival and competitive advantage (Tidd, Bessant & Pavitt 2001; Simon, Elango, Houghton & Savelli 2002) and consequently there is growing interest among researchers to investigate the cognitive and motivational factors that drive innovative work behavior (Amabile 1988; Anderson, DeDreu & Nijstad 2004; Jansson 2000; DeVanna & Tichy 1990; Kanter 1988; Shalley 1995; West &Farr 1990; Woodman, Sawyer & Griffin 1993; Van Gundy 1987). It’s been widely established that managers and knowledge workers often driven by self-enhancement (Chen & Aryee 2007; Korman 2001) are responsible for innovating new products (Drazin & Rao 2002, Smith, Collins & Clark, 2005). It is hypothesized therefore:

Hypothesis 3a: Inner strength will predict innovative work behavior.

Hypothesis 3b: Seeking feedback from stakeholders will predict innovative work behavior.

Hypothesis 3c: Sharing knowledge will predict innovative work behavior
Hypothesis 3d: Career progression will predict innovative work behavior.

In today’s competitive skill market it is critical for organizations to retain their talented employees. Employees who feel that they are growing and developing in an organization are more likely to stay (Scott 2003; Benson 2003, 2006; Baugh, Lankau and Scandura 1996; Lankau & Scandura 2002, Kozlowski & Farr 1988; Kozlowski & Hult 1987; Noe & Wilk 1993; Severt, Xie, & DiPietro 2007). Thus,

Hypothesis 4a: Inner strength will predict intention to stay.

Hypothesis 4b: Seeking feedback from stakeholders will predict intention to stay.

Hypothesis 4c: Sharing knowledge will predict intention to stay

Hypothesis 4d: Career progression will predict intention to stay

Mediating role of talent development

Talent development practices have been related to development of talent among managers (Birdi et al.1997; Noe & Wilk 1993). Such practices have also been related to higher level of organizational outcomes viz. innovative work behaviors and higher intention to stay (Lankau & Scandura 2002). At the same time some of the measures of talent development viz. inner strength and feedback seeking have been associated with innovative work behavior (Barron & Harrington 1981; Patterson 1999) and intention to stay (Baugh, Lankau & Scandura 1996; Lankau & Scandura 2002). These organizational outcomes have been achieved by organizations by applying various talent development practices but little is known about the effect in absence of actual development of talent. It is therefore proposed,

Hypothesis 5 : Talent development will mediate the relationship between talent development practices and innovative work behavior

Hypothesis 6 : Talent development will mediate the relationship between talent development practices and intention to stay.

METHODS

Sample and procedure

Respondents in the field study were managers working in four well established organizations from the private sector, located in and around the city of Mumbai, the financial capital of India. With the purpose
of having a representation of old and new economy industry, the organizations selected for conducting the study were - the manufacturing unit of a tyre producing company, two manufacturing units of a decal and doming labels producing company, three divisions of a business process outsourcing firm, and three business verticals of an IT company.

Once permission to conduct research in these organizations was obtained, with assistance from the human resource department the target group was intimated about the study in advance. Out of the 360 questionnaires distributed, 85.2% were usable. As given in table 1, the sample well represented the different hierarchical levels of management, both genders as well as various levels of educational qualification. While analyzing the data in this paper, the effects of background variables have not been taken into consideration. The respondents on an average took between 30 minutes to 45 minutes to complete the questionnaire.

**Table 1: Profile of the Respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Work Experience</th>
<th>Gender (%)</th>
<th>Qualification (%)</th>
<th>Mgmt Level (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Grad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company A</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>41.00</td>
<td>9.59</td>
<td>17.57</td>
<td>9.53</td>
<td>93.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company B</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>33.75</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company C</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>29.07</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>7.39</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>71.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company D</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>29.99</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>6.87</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>72.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>307</td>
<td>32.26</td>
<td>7.88</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>78.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measures**

*Talent development*

Four measures of talent development as identified by Bhargava and Datta (2008) have been considered in this study for measuring this construct. First factor, “inner strength” (Cronbach $\alpha = 0.82$) represented by six items such as, passionate about one’s job, self-confidence, inner strength, flexibility, sense of responsibility and enthusiasm about learning. Second factor, “seeking feedback from stakeholders”
(Cronbach $\alpha = 0.75$) includes six items namely, seeking feedback from superiors, seeking feedback from team members, seeking feedback from customers, decision making, team building and technical updating. Third factor of “sharing knowledge” (Cronbach $\alpha = 0.62$) is represented by three items, job goal achievement, executing challenging tasks and sharing knowledge. The fourth factor, “career progression” (Cronbach $\alpha = 0.65$) is denoted by three items such as, my job performance impacts organizational performance, my career progression has been in line with my talent development and my job role appropriately utilizes my talent. Score for each factor will be determined by taking an average of all the items included in it.

**Talent development practices**

Three factors of talent development practices as identified by Bhargava and Datta (2008) have been used in this study. Factor 1, “opportunities for personal and professional development” (Cronbach $\alpha = 0.90$) is represented by twelve items namely, mentoring, receptivity to ideas from employees, professional conferences, sponsored higher education, recognition for creativity, open sharing of knowledge, awareness about benefits of development, communities of practice, training for competency development, freedom to implement ideas, communication of organization vision, organization demands superior performance. Second factor, “challenging tasks assigned by the boss” (Cronbach $\alpha = 0.88$) includes six items such as, performance feedback from supervisors and team members, supervisor sets challenging goals, exposure to diverse areas, supervisor takes interest in team member’s professional development, jobs with novel problems, job roles aligned to one’s interest. The third factor, “receiving feedback from external stakeholders” (Cronbach $\alpha = 0.41$) is denoted by three practices namely, employees receive feedback from customers, employees receive feedback from suppliers, vendors or associates, employees get global exposure as part of their job. Score for each factor will be determined by taking an average of all the items included in it.

**Innovative work behavior**

We measured this construct using a nine items scale by Janssen (2000). The scale measures the extent to which an employee engages in innovative work behaviors anchored with 1= ‘never’ and 5=’always’.
Sample items of the scale are ‘I engage in searching out new work methods, techniques or instruments’ and ‘I engage in mobilizing support for innovative ideas’. Alpha coefficient obtained for the scale was 0.91.

**Intention to stay**

Intention to stay with the organization was measured by a two item scale developed for this study. The items are ‘I make no plan to work anywhere else’ and ‘I plan to stay here for a long time’. The reliability coefficient obtained was 0.75.

**RESULTS**

Table 2 presents the means, standard deviations and Pearson’s correlation indices among the study variables. As evident from the table, there is significant positive correlation among the factors of talent development practices (opportunities for personal and professional development, challenging tasks assigned by the boss and feedback from external stakeholders) and those of talent development (inner strength, seeking feedback from stakeholders, sharing knowledge and career progression). Hypothesis 1 therefore stands supported.

**Table 2 : Mean, Standard deviations and Correlations among study variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Opportunities for personal &amp; prof devp</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Challenging tasks assigned by boss</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Feedback from external stakeholders</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Inner strength</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Seeking feedback from stakeholders</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Sharing knowledge</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Career progression</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Innovative work behavior</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Intention to stay</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlation coefficient of .20 or greater are significant at p < .01 and Correlation coefficient of .16 or greater are significant at p < .05

Table 3 presents the results of linear regression analysis that examined the predictive power of the talent development practices of talent development. As evident from the table, opportunities for personal and professional development is significantly related to sharing knowledge ($\beta = .27$, $p < .01$) and career progression ($\beta = .41$, $p < .01$). Hypothesis 2a is therefore partly supported. Challenging tasks assigned by
the boss is significantly related to seeking feedback from stakeholders ($\beta = .26, p < .05$) thus provided partial support for hypothesis 2b. Feedback from external stakeholders is significantly related to seeking feedback from stakeholders ($\beta = .13, p < .05$) thus providing partial support for hypothesis 2c.

**Table 3 : Results of regression Analysis for examining relationship between factors of TDPs and those of TD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Inner strength</th>
<th>Seeking feedback from stakeholders</th>
<th>Sharing knowledge</th>
<th>Career progression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for personal &amp; prof devp</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.27**</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging tasks assigned by boss</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.26*</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback from external stakeholders</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.13*</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$ and ** $p < .01$

Table 4 presents the results of linear regression analysis that examined the effect of TD on innovative work behavior and intention to stay. The results reveal that inner strength and seeking feedback from stakeholders are both significantly related to innovative work behavior ($\beta = .18, p < .05 \& \beta = .37, p < .01$ respectively) thus supporting hypothesis 3a and 3b. The results further revealed that career progression alone is significantly related to intention to stay ($\beta = .27, p < .01$) thus giving support hypothesis 4d.

**Table 4 : Results of regression Analysis for examining relationship between factors of TD and organizational outcomes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Innovative Work Behavior</th>
<th>Intention to Stay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inner strength</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeking feedback from stakeholders</td>
<td>0.37**</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing knowledge</td>
<td>0.10**</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career progression</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.27**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$ and ** $p < .01$
Table 5 also presents the results of the hierarchical regression analysis that examined the mediating influence of talent development on the relationship between talent development practices and each of the outcome variables of innovative work behavior and intent to stay. For simplicity of analysis and presentation, consolidated scores i.e. averaging the sum of all the factors for both talent development practices as well as talent development have been considered here. As predicted (Model 1, direct effects), talent development practices are positively related to talent development ($\beta = .49; p < .01$). Furthermore the results show that talent development practices are related to both innovative work behavior ($\beta = .29; p < .01$) and intention to stay ($\beta = .27; p < .01$). As is evident from the table (model 1, direct effects), talent development is significantly related to both the organizational outcomes of innovative work behavior ($\beta = .24, p < .01$) and intention to stay ($\beta = .55, p < .01$). Pertaining to the mediated hypotheses 5 & 6, model 2 further revealed that the previously significant relationship between talent development practices and innovative work behaviors ceased to be significant in the absence of the mediator that is talent development, thereby fully supporting hypotheses 5. However hypothesis 6 was only partially supported, since the effect of the predictor which is talent development practices, continued to have some effect on the intention to stay in absence of the mediator.

**Table 5 : Results of Regression Analysis for Mediation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Talent development</td>
<td>Innovative work behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDPs</td>
<td>.49 **</td>
<td>.29 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TD</td>
<td>.24 **</td>
<td>.24 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta R^2$(TDP)</td>
<td>.24 **</td>
<td>.08 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta R^2$(TD)</td>
<td>.31 **</td>
<td>.31 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediating effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDP</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.21 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td>.00 **</td>
<td>.03 **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05 and ** p < .01
DISCUSSION

As hypothesized, from the results of the study, talent development practices have emerged as powerful predictors of talent development in organizations. The study has, in line with literature established that talent development practices are positively associated with development of talent. The significant relationship between challenging tasks assigned by the boss and feedback from external stakeholders, found in the study has made significant contribution in terms of highlighting the importance of leadership and external feedback in facilitating the feedback seeking aspect of talent development. Significant relationship of opportunities for personal and professional development with sharing knowledge and career progression draws attention to the culture building aspect of organizational practices where openness in exchange of ideas leads to sharing of knowledge and therefore better utilization of talent with commensurate responsibilities. The non-significant relationship of any of the talent development practices with inner strength indicate that this particular aspect of talent relates to individual difference characteristics among the managers and is at the inner core of their individual talent and hence is difficult to impact through external means. However, due to it’s positive correlation with the other dimensions of talent development, inner strength will be indirectly impacted.

The findings of the study have also revealed the power of talent development in predicting organizational outcomes such as innovative work behaviors and intention to stay. Significant relationship between inner strength as well as seeking feedback from stakeholders and innovative work behavior suggests that individuals who are in a position to develop their inner strength and also develop a habit of seeking feedback from stakeholders are likely to indulge in innovative work behaviors. Significant relationship between career progression and intention to stay highlights the importance attached to fulfillment of career aspirations by the managers with respect to their stay with the organization.

The mediation effect of talent development on the relationship between talent development practices and organizational outcomes reveals the strategic importance of talent development in the context of innovative work behavior and intention to stay. In other words, no matter how much an organization
invests in applying strategies to develop talent, it will not achieve organizational outcomes unless it achieves individual outcome of actual talent development.

Overall, the findings by examining the antecedent practices, correlates and outcomes of talent development in organizations have provided a new direction for studying talent development beyond the traditionally studied frameworks under the umbrella of employee and individual development.

**MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS AND LIMITATIONS**

The study has demonstrated that organizations have to extend their developmental strategy beyond their individual centered framework and also include performance and external stakeholder orientation. This means that those organizations which are focusing on philosophy of developing individual employees who are talented, within the tested parameters of organization, are not being able to contribute for overall organizational performance if efforts have not been made for developing leadership wherein managers take cognizance of external feedback and integrate it while setting difficult and challenging goals for their subordinates. The study has re-affirmed the need to have a development oriented culture that will foster open sharing of knowledge leading to better utilization of talent and consequent career growth. The findings of the study have far reaching implications to suggest that even if organizations take care in developing individual and performance driven leadership culture, they will not be able to retain talent and foster innovative behavior among their managers unless they focus on developing their feedback seeking behavior, open sharing of knowledge, providing talent based career growth based and re-enforcing their inner strength.

A limitation of the study is that the data obtained was based on self-report which raises the possibility that common source method variance might have produced inflated correlations (Lankau & Scandura 2002; Crampton & Wagner 1994). Another limitation is that only three types of industries viz. IT, BPO and manufacturing have been covered in this study.
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