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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research is to examine the influence of talent development (TD) on talent engagement (TE) and self-efficacy (SE). Data were collected through a questionnaire from the trainees of Bangladesh Institute of Human Resource Management (BIHRM). Two hypotheses were developed and tested on the collected data. Structural equation modeling (SEM) is performed which includes both measurement model and structural model. Average variance extracted (AVE), Cronbach’s alpha (α), composite reliability (CR) and factor’s loading have been shown under the measurement model whereas path diagram is used to present the relationship among the constructs under the structural model. The results of the study support that talent development has significant impact on both talent engagement and self-efficacy of talented employees. The outcome of the study is highly consistent with the previous literature and the results have strong logical argument. The research implies that organizations should emphasize to improve knowledge and abilities of the talents which foster more attachment and conviction towards jobs as well as enhance the level of talents’ self-efficacy.

Contribution/Originality: This study contributes to the existing literature by developing a unique model which connects talent development, talent engagement and self-efficacy together. Moreover, this study is one of very few studies which have empirically investigated to assess the impact of talent development on talent engagement and self-efficacy using SEM.

1. INTRODUCTION

Talent development is an inseparable element of talent management which is an evolving concept and area of research in the field of human resource management. Talent development improves the knowledge, abilities, skills and competencies of talents which are highly interconnected with talent engagement (Isa, Ibrahim, Jaaffar, & Baharin, 2018). The career path of talents improves through the proper learning and development which inspire them to involve more in the assigned tasks (Ali, Hossain, & Ahmed, 2018; Mehdiabadi & Li, 2016). Being a source of non-monetary benefit and instrument for employee motivation, talent development increases the appeal for the organization making employees engaged to their assigned jobs (Ali, 2020; Ali & Guha, 2018). Several talent development programmes, aimed at achieving psychological skills to tackle the challenges of the 21st century,
transform the potential talents or gifted people into exceptional performer (Olszewski-Kubilius, Subotnik, & Worrell, 2016). To overcome talent shortages in this dynamic era of globalized and technology-driven world, organizations should focus intensively on in-house talent development through providing continuous learning opportunities (Obeidat, Al-Khateeb, Abdallah, & Masa'deh, 2019).

As an indispensable part of talent management, talent engagement appears to be an important indicator to predict the success rate of organizations. Talent engagement is the inclination and involvement of the talented employees with their job role in order to achieve organizational goals (Ali & Guha, 2018; Ellis & Sorensen, 2007). Modern flat and high-performance organizations are incorporating talent engagement as defining characteristics for them. Investment in talent engagement has proven to be a successful strategy to capitalize on human capital using adequate extrinsic and intrinsic rewards to keep them motivated (Delaney & Royal, 2017). Talent development activities are comprehensively undertaken in many organizations to engage talented employees for improved organizational performance.

On the other hand, self-efficacy is one of the few personality traits that attracted profound attention from the researchers in the field of human resource management. Self-efficacy, a term coined by Bandura (1977) referred to the one’s belief about his/her capacity to execute a job with expected outcomes or accomplishing a task successfully. Individuals’ level of self-efficacy has dormant capacity to make their effort either successful or futile. In recent research, it has been identified that talent development programmes in various professional fields emphasize self-efficacy level of participants (Strickland-Davis, Kosloski, & Reed, 2020; Torkzadeh & Koufteros, 1994). As a result, self-efficacy became an important trait to be assessed for measuring and predicting the performance of employees in the organization. Considering this, talent development programmes should be developed in such a way that alleviates the self-efficacy of employees.

This research is significant as most of the employees in different sectors are focusing to improve their skills through various training and development programs. But whether their development has any influence on their intention to perform the job with due devotion and confidence, needs to be tested. Through the current study, practitioners, trainers and academicians would understand the impact of talent development on the extent of engagement and self-efficacy. A good number of studies (Ali, Phulpoto, Umran, & Abbas, 2015; Ali & Guha, 2018; Bümen, 2009; Chami-Malaeb & Garavan, 2013; Chandani, Mehta, Mall, & Khokhar, 2016; Coutinho, Mesquita, & Fonseca, 2016; Delaney & Royal, 2017; Islam, Ali, & Hasan, 2020; Luthans & Peterson, 2002; Mehdiaibadi & Li, 2016; Olszewski-Kubilius et al., 2016; Olszewski-Kubilius & Thomson, 2015; Shuck & Wollard, 2010; Wang & Neihart, 2015; Yoon & Kayes, 2016; Yuen, Gysbers, Chan, Lau, & Shea, 2010) have been done previously on TD, TE and SE but none of the studies focused on the three constructs together. Besides, insignificant numbers of empirical studies have been performed on TD, TE and SE in the context of Bangladesh. Considering the contextual and literature gap, this paper investigates the impact of talent development on talent engagement and self-efficacy.

The next section of this study provides detailed literature review on talent development, talent engagement and self-efficacy as well as sheds light on the association of talent development with talent engagement and self-efficacy. Exploring the findings of previous researchers, two hypotheses have been developed. The third section presents the methodology of the research. Fourth section includes results whereas section five covers discussion. Section six discusses theoretical and managerial implications. Limitations and future research direction are presented in section seven. Finally, section eight talks about the conclusion.

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND HYPOTHESES

Talent engagement is an important strategy of talent management. Ali and Guha (2018) defined talent engagement as a favourable outlook of the employees in the organization towards organizational values and performance. According to their findings, talent engagement has remarkable contribution in this disruptive, digital,
post-industrial economy where innovation, flexibility and speed of the employees play a vital role in any market winning business. Talent engagement aids organizations in reducing job turnover attitude by keeping employees motivated at work. Talent engagement increases productivity, customer satisfaction and profitability of the organizations (Ellis & Sorensen, 2007). Therefore, talent engagement involves evoking a flourishing energy into people by directing them on the way to achieving organizational goals (Ahmed et al., 2015). As cognitive, emotional and behavioral energy, employee engagement results in excellent organizational performance (Shuck, Twyford, Reio, & Shuck, 2014). Talent engagement ties up employees with their organization in a way which ensures wholehearted involvement and participation in their job roles (Ahmed et al., 2015; Kahn, 1990). Besides, talent self-efficacy is significantly higher in organization where talents are emotionally and cognitively attached.

Self-efficacy can be defined as the level of conviction of an individual regarding the success of the assigned job with desired outcomes (Bandura, 1977). Self-efficacy contributes to the development of organizational theory (Chen, Gully, & Eden, 2001). As per social cognitive theory, the degree of self-efficacy is differentiated by three dimensions- task difficulty, strength and generality (Bandura, 1991). Self-efficacy drives the level of self-motivation which is essential to enable people performing unfamiliar tasks vigorously (Torkzadeh & Koufteros, 1994). However, Marsh et al. (2019) pointed out a distinctive character of self-efficacy which helps to compare the intended motivation to perform a target behavior versus self-perceptions of capacities to demonstrate the behavior. Human personality traits influence the extent of self-efficacy, but it is not restricted to defined boundaries of traits; rather it gets changed through experience, confrontation of challenges, mastery of skills, learning, persuasion and physiological/psychological sensations (Stajkovic, Bandura, Locke, Lee, & Sergent, 2018). Undertaking an interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA), Wang and Neihart (2015) found that people with low self-efficacy were disposed to failures whereas experience of success fosters high degree of self-efficacy. Socialization tactics employed by organizations are mediated by self-efficacy which were exhibited in their role and personal outcomes (Jones, 1986). Psychological state of mind, precisely self-efficacy, has a mediating effect between management efficiency and employee engagement (Luthans & Peterson, 2002). Both cognitive and emotional engagement of the employees are being influenced by manager’s self-efficacy that ultimately determine the effectiveness of the managers. Hence, self-efficacy determines individual’s ability to overcome challenges and adapt to changing environment with higher level of self-conviction about inner strength.

Talent development is a continuous process, especially regarding the formation of career and self-efficacy which needs to be nourished by knowledgeable personnel through comprehensive guidance programmes (Yuen et al., 2010). It refers to those activities that are related to performance management, capacity and competency building. Three stages of talent development programmes-initiation, development and perfection stage play a vital role in changing the psychological behavior of the participants, especially in the field of arts, science, sports and music (Coutinho et al., 2016). Talent development is a deliberate process of cultivating psychological skills in a specific domain (Olszewski-Kubilius & Thomson, 2015). Aguenza and Som (2018) found that talent development prepares employees for the future job role which acts as a motivating factor to retain employees in the organization. Consequently, by retaining talented employees in the organization talent development helps organizations to reduce operational and other costs associated with acquisition of new employees. Moreover, talent development can engage the valued employees in their work.

2.1. Talent Development and Self-Efficacy

Examining the structural relationship in the Korean workforce, Song, Chai, Kim, and Bae (2018) recognized that talent development gave a raise to self-efficacy of participants in the learning organization which has a positive affinity towards work engagement and job performance. Furthermore, self-efficacy played a mediating role on the task performance of the trainees. Trainees’ sense of self-efficacy is significantly improved when formal training is provided along with increasing experiences day by day (Duffin, French, & Patrick, 2012). When trainee starts
experiencing success through competency development, it increases their level of self-efficacy (Torkzadeh & Koufteros, 1994). Talent development programs such as professional development project taken for the trainees of Turkey has shown outstanding positive contribution to the development of the level of self-efficacy (Bümen, 2009). Talent development programs enhances confidence of the talents giving rise to the levels of self-efficacy (Islam et al., 2020). Strickland-Davis et al. (2020) used self-efficacy level as a determinant of the success factor of faculty development program and according to their opinion, there exists notable differences on self-efficacy level between before and after training period, indicating a positive association between self-efficacy and behaviour-persistency, innovativeness and risk taking attitude. Yoon and Kayes (2016) found that employees’ individual-level self-efficacy is positively related with their learning perception. Training has significant impact on individual’s self-efficacy that leads to better performance (Mathieu, Martineau, & Tannenbaum, 1993). In the field of counselling, in addition to knowledge, skill and experience development, significant attention is provided to the development of self-efficacy of the counsellor during the preparation time. The preparation program enhances the self-efficacy of the counsellors by different course works as a part of developing their expertise in professional life (Mullen, Uwamahoro, Blount, & Lambie, 2015). Irrespective of age and experience, self-efficacy is positively correlated with development when talents were empowered (Veisi, Azizifar, Gowhary, & Jamalinesari, 2015). Therefore, based on the outcome of the previous studies, the current research develops the following hypothesis.

**Hypothesis 01:** Talent development is positively associated with self-efficacy.

### 2.2. Talent Development and Talent Engagement

Talent development generates employee value proposition (EVP) through continuous talent involvement and engagement. Most of the researchers concluded that talent development and talent engagement are positively related. Talent development initiatives identical to this programme, play a significant role in engaging trainees into their assigned task in a positive way. This engagement takes place when one feels emotionally and mentally connected to others and to their jobs. When talents find the meaning of their work that derived from the clear understanding of their job expectations, they are likely to get engaged more. Pandita and Ray (2018) emphasized on the synchronization of talent management strategies and employee engagement which in turn results in improved organizational performance by reducing employee turnover. Analysing the cost associated with talent retention, to their empirical argument, employee engagement has been proved to be the most efficient strategy. In the study of Rurkkhum and Bartlett (2012) organizational citizenship behavior is found positively associated with employee engagement in Thailand. This engagement reshaped the desired employee attitudes towards organizational outcomes. Chandani et al. (2016) stressed the need for a model that includes all variables associated with employee engagement and variations of those factors generate different individual and organizational outcomes. Talent development is such a factor that accelerated talent engagement. Similarly, Anand (2011) exploring the organization wide talent development practice of Bharati Airtel, illustrated that talent development opportunities enhance the rate of talent engagement and simultaneously reduce the attrition rate. Shuck et al. (2014) found that human resource development (HRD) significantly contributes to enhance employee engagement and to reduce the intention of switching job. HRD climate is an important determinant of employee engagement and it significantly improves employee performance (Chaudhary, Rangnekar, & Barua, 2011). However, Shah and Beh (2016) found that no mediating relationship of job engagement existed between the motivation enhancing practices and turnover intentions in the hotel industry of Kuala Lumpur. Since most of the previous literature supported a positive relation between talent development and talent engagement, the relationship is hypothesized in this paper in the following way.

**Hypothesis 02:** Talent development is positively associated with talent engagement.
3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. Sample

In the current study, the sample size is 94 and respondents were the trainee of Bangladesh Institute of Human Resource Management (BIHRM) who are serving in different organizations at various rank and file including officers, senior officers, assistant managers, managers and directors. Such respondents were selected because they have more clear idea about the state of the training and its influence on self-efficacy and work engagement. The demographic profile of the respondents is given in Table 1. Judgemental sampling has been used as the respondents have been chosen based on two arguments: first, who are currently serving in any organization and receiving the training also; second, who have at least one year of service experience. Data were collected using a printed copy of questionnaire through proper channel. The questionnaire was sent to BIHRM authority and they distributed it to the trainees. After one week, the questionnaire was returned by the respondents. Total 100 questionnaires were distributed and 94 were returned with a response rate of 94%.

3.2. Instrument

A structured questionnaire in five-point Likert scale has been used ranging from 1=strongly disagree to 5= strongly agree to collect data. The questionnaire is comprised of two sections. First section includes the major three variables including talent development, talent engagement and self-efficacy and second section covers the demographic information of the respondents. Seven items were adapted to measure talent development which were developed by Chami-Malaeb and Garavan (2013). Researchers have also adapted eight items for talent engagement which were developed by Bakker and Schaufeli (2003). The New General Self-Efficacy (NGSE) scale developed by Chen et al. (2001) has been adapted to measure the self-efficacy which includes eight items.

Table 1. Demographic profile of the respondents.

| Characteristics       | Frequency (N=94) | Percentage |
|-----------------------|------------------|------------|
| **Gender**            |                  |            |
| Male                  | 74               | 78.7       |
| Female                | 20               | 21.3       |
| **Designation**       |                  |            |
| Officer/Executive     | 22               | 23.4       |
| Senior Officer/Executive | 23           | 24.5       |
| Asst. Manager         | 24               | 25.5       |
| Manager               | 21               | 22.3       |
| Director and above    | 4                | 4.3        |
| **Education**         |                  |            |
| Bachelor              | 24               | 25.5       |
| Master                | 68               | 72.3       |
| PhD                   | 2                | 2.1        |
| **Age**               |                  |            |
| Above 20              | 4                | 4.3        |
| Above 25              | 17               | 18.1       |
| Above 30              | 33               | 35.1       |
| Above 35              | 18               | 19.1       |
| Above 40              | 12               | 12.8       |
| Above 45              | 8                | 8.5        |
| Above 50              | 2                | 2.1        |
| **Experience**        |                  |            |
| Below 1               | 8                | 8.5        |
| Above 1               | 10               | 10.6       |
| Above 3               | 14               | 14.9       |
| Above 5               | 17               | 18.1       |
| Above 7               | 12               | 12.8       |
| Above 9               | 33               | 35.1       |
3.3. Data Analysis Techniques and Tools

In the current study, three variables have been used among which talent development is considered as exogenous variable and talent engagement and self-efficacy are endogenous variables. Descriptive statistics (mean score and standard deviation) was used to measure the extent of agreement of the respondents for each of the item. Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) was employed to assess the relationship of the variables which covers measurement and structural model. SEM is a prominent technique to measure causal relation of the endogenous and exogenous variables and it serves to determine both direct and indirect effect of coefficients of variables (Choo & Mokhtarian, 2007). AVE, CR and α were used to measure the validity and reliability of the data. Factor analysis was performed to present the factors’ loading and to measure the convergent validity. Under the structural model, path diagram was presented to show the direction and significance of relationship of the constructs. SPSS version 20 and AMOS version 21 were used to analyse the data.

4. RESULTS
4.1. Structural Equation Modeling

SEM is a widely used second generation technique to measure the relationship of multiple variables together and it simultaneously measures the relationship between observed and latent variables and the association among the latent variables (Ko & Stewart, 2002). It includes measurement model and structural model. Measurement model shows validity and reliability whereas structural model presents the path diagram of the constructs. In other words, measurement model defines the variables whereas structural model defines the association of the variables.

4.2. The Measurement Model

Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) has been performed to present the relationships of the observed indicators to the latent constructs as it should be evaluated before examining measurement and structural model simultaneously (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988).

| Construct                        | Items   | Loadings | Mean | SD   |
|----------------------------------|---------|----------|------|------|
| Talent Development (AVE= 0.588, α= 0.867, CR=0.869) | TD1     | 0.731    | 4.13 | 0.88 |
|                                  | TD2     | 0.759    | 3.98 | 0.90 |
|                                  | TD3     | 0.675    | 3.89 | 0.82 |
|                                  | TD4     | 0.663    | 3.53 | 0.89 |
|                                  | TD5     | 0.649    | 3.60 | 0.96 |
| Talent Engagement (AVE= 0.585, α= 0.817, CR= 0.824, R²=0.78) | TD6     | 0.725    | 3.86 | 0.89 |
|                                  | TD7     | 0.560    | 3.77 | 0.97 |
|                                  | TE1     | 0.322    | 3.47 | 0.97 |
|                                  | TE2     | 0.571    | 3.68 | 0.91 |
|                                  | TE3     | 0.614    | 3.80 | 0.96 |
|                                  | TE4     | 0.706    | 3.79 | 0.90 |
|                                  | TE5     | 0.637    | 3.93 | 0.86 |
| Self-efficacy (AVE=.539, α= 0.796, CR= 0.799, R²=0.98) | TE6     | 0.878    | 3.86 | 0.95 |
|                                  | TE7     | 0.657    | 3.59 | 0.81 |
|                                  | TE8     | 0.389    | 3.70 | 0.85 |
|                                  | SE1     | 0.486    | 3.77 | 0.93 |
|                                  | SE2     | 0.395    | 3.52 | 0.94 |
|                                  | SE3     | 0.667    | 4.03 | 0.90 |
|                                  | SE4     | 0.647    | 3.96 | 0.83 |
|                                  | SE5     | 0.675    | 3.84 | 0.96 |
|                                  | SE6     | 0.628    | 4.11 | 0.80 |
|                                  | SE7     | 0.652    | 3.99 | 0.91 |
|                                  | SE8     | 0.438    | 3.53 | 0.97 |
AVE, CR and $\alpha$ are mostly used to measure the reliability and validity of the constructs (Hair, Black, Babin, Anderson, & Tatham, 2010). AVE should be more than 0.5 and the AVE of all the constructs are above 0.50. The minimum value of CR should be 0.70 (Hair, Black, Babin, & Anderson, 2019) and the range of CR is 0.799 to 0.869 which is more than the lower limit. Cronbach’s alpha of all constructs is 0.8 and above which indicates that the internal consistency of the items is good (George & Mallery, 2003). No item has been deleted as it is suggested to delete item if the alpha value is less than 0.50 (Joreskog, 1993). Therefore, it can be claimed that the study satisfies the reliability and validity criteria.

Descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation) has been presented in Table 2 that shows almost all the values are above 3 that indicates the consistency of the response. Value of the factors’ loading is good as all the factors are highly loaded except TE1, TE8 and SE2. The study outcome shows that convergent validity is satisfactory as the value of factors’ loading is greater than 0.5 (Ali & Himel, 2019; Malhotra & Dash, 2011).

4.3. The Structural Model

Under the structural model, the path coefficient is estimated using the maximum likelihood method. Path diagram presents relationship of the constructs and the direction of the relationship. The goodness of fit of the model ($\chi^2 = 342.296$, df= 228, $\chi^2$/df= 1.50, GFI=0.767, CFI=0.872, RMR=0.059, RMSEA=0.073, TLI=0.858, IFI=0.876) reflects that the model is acceptable and the probability level is 0.00 which indicates that the departure of the data from the model is significant at the 5% level of significance. Besides, there is a rule of thumb that if the ratio of $\chi^2$ statistics and degree of freedom is less than 2, the model has a good fit (Hui & Zheng, 2010; Schermelleh-Engel, Moosbrugger, & Müller, 2003). The $\chi^2$/df in this model is 1.50 and it qualifies the benchmark. Hence, the model is stable and acceptable for further analysis. Total seven items were used for exogenous variables and 16 items (8 for self-efficacy and 8 for talent engagement) were used for endogenous variables in this model. Figure 1 presents the standardized estimates of the direct effect of the exogenous and endogenous variables through observed and latent variables.
The path coefficients are statistically significant. Hence, the study fails to reject the hypotheses. The path coefficient between talent development and self-efficacy is 0.991 that denotes a strong positive relationship between the two constructs. *P* value presented in Table 3 shows that the relationship of TD and SE is highly significant and as a result, first hypothesis is supported by the outcome of the research. The association between talent development and talent engagement is also significant at 5% level of significance as the *p* value (0.006) is less than 0.05 and the direction of the relationship is positive as the path coefficient of them is 0.882. Finally, second hypothesis is also supported. Therefore, the result reveals that the extent of talent engagement and their self-efficacy is directly linked with talent development.

| Hypotheses | Unstandardized Estimate | Standardized Estimates | S.E. | C.R. | *P* | Decision |
|------------|-------------------------|------------------------|------|-----|-----|----------|
| SE. <--- TD | 0.941                   | 0.882                  | 0.144| 6.541| ***| Supported |
| TE. <--- TD | 1.069                   | 0.991                  | 0.137| 7.818| ***| Supported |

5. DISCUSSION

The present study investigates the impact of talent development on talent engagement and self-efficacy. The hypothesized relationship of the constructs was tested using SEM and the results demonstrate that talent development has significant positive impact on self-efficacy. Similar outcome was also found by past studies (Bümen, 2009; Islam et al., 2020; Song et al., 2018; Strickland-Davis et al., 2020). This result asserts that when an organization ensures the proper development of the employees that leads to improve the current level of self-efficacy of talents and talent development activities instils a sense of positive feelings of self-worth into trainees which remarkably boost their level of confidence.

New capabilities enhance talents’ level of self-efficacy. Talent development programmes mainly emphasize on the talented employees who are exceptionally good at something or have calibre to carry out arduous task creatively within shortest possible time. When they are exposed to different development activities, they discover their hidden possibilities. Through the professional development programme, as demonstrated in Turkey by Bümen (2009) self-efficacy of the trainees has risen. Consequently, in this study it is revealed that they felt confident about their skills to tackle future challenges. Being conscious of their past and present achievements, they became self-driven to accomplish newer tasks vigorously and got engaged in their present job roles with rejuvenated energy.

Consistent with the previous studies (Anand, 2011; Pandita & Ray, 2018) the current study also supports that talent development has significant positive impact on talent engagement. Following the results, it is evident that talent development activities not only increase capacity of the trainees but also develop a positive attitude of employees towards organization. The more an employee feels that his/her talent is being nurtured for development, he/she engages more in the assigned tasks. Likewise, talent development programmes of Bharati Telecom (Anand, 2011) talent development programmes were found to be capable of engaging talents positively with their jobs. Therefore, it is logical to claim that talents who get opportunities to participate in the development programmes tend to engage more in the work.

6. THEORETICAL AND MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS

The first implication of this study is the systematic attempt to find out the impact of talent development on talent-engagement and self-efficacy together for the first time to best of our knowledge. Second, the study presents a new framework of relationship between talent development, talent engagement and self-efficacy and it is an obvious contribution to talent management literature. The findings of study are important to identify the crucial factors to develop successful development programmes. It also provides basis to the measurement standards of training and development from the perspective of talent engagement and self-efficacy. Thus, the relationship between talent development, talent engagement and self-efficacy aids managers to devise new competitive business
strategies. Strong self-efficacy is necessary for every talented employee to make the best version of themselves with consistency in performance and innovativeness. Moreover, self-efficacy also increases employee participation and employee morale. When these factors are taken into consideration, it enhances business viability by keeping employees motivated, empowered and updated within organization which eventually increases business sustainability and productivity. Talent development, thus, facilitates the opportunity for talent engagement which at the same time influences the level of self-efficacy of the employees.

In the context of Bangladesh, a significant number of people are not highly skilled, even though, they are educated but their job-related knowledge is not satisfactory. Therefore, focusing on their development is very crucial both from the perspective of organization and employee. Required number of training and development programmes can enhance their current level of performance. If organizations cannot arrange talent development program, they should impart opportunities to the employees to participate in different development programs outside of the organization. The current study will stimulate to emphasize on the talent development so that talents can contribute to the organization with high engagement in work through higher-level of self-efficacy. When employees can learn through development programmes, their confidence level boost up and they like to engage more to play the assign role and perform to achieve organizational objectives.

7. LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTION

Though the current study is designed very carefully, it has some limitations. First, the study covered a limited number of samples and the background of the respondents is highly diversified. Therefore, to produce better outcome, it is suggested to focus on a particular sector like pharmaceutical, RMG, telecommunication, construction, baking, non-banking financial institutions, insurance, etc. Second, only two dependent constructs have been used to determine the impact of TD on them whereas more constructs (talent retention, employee innovative behaviour, talent attraction, organizational citizenship behaviour, employee performance, etc.) could be included. In this field, more research can be conducted relating transactional and transformational leadership with talent development. Besides, the current research can be continued to determine the association between talent development, talent retention and employee’s knowledge sharing behaviour. Future research can also be performed focusing on the relationship of development programs, self-efficacy and job performance.

8. CONCLUSION

The aim of the study is to identify the effect of talent development on employee engagement and self-efficacy in the organization. The current study incorporated SEM where talent development has been found to have significant association with talent engagement and self-efficacy. The development programmes at BIHRM contributes to enhance trainees’ self-efficacy and their engagement propensity to the work. Previous studies were supported by the findings of this research filling the existing gap in the literature and this study emphasizes to shift trainers’ focus on the issues of engaging talents and self-efficacy of the trainees in evaluating the success and effectiveness of any training and development programme initiated to develop employees. The outcome of the study will encourage the practitioners to understand the importance of development of the talented employees to involve them in a best possible way to perform better and improve the extent of self-confidence to overcome the difficulty of the assigned tasks.
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