

Merging Strategy and Talent Management: Challenges and Practical Applications

Joy Noree Maramba

performance requirements in the past and defining standards from there, rather than the classical top-down approach of predetermining job requirements from a theoretical point of view. If one wants to know, for instance, what competencies are needed from a good software developer, he or she will need to observe, interview, document and analyze behaviors related to key performance indicators of a software developer who has previously delivered above-average performance. Picture sports analysts doing a playback on Simone Biles while she performs a signature move during the recent Olympics. This approach has brought forth insights on the ideal body mass and proportions needed to complete a unique and complicated physical feat. Theoretically, it follows more of an inductive rather than deductive approach to defining constructs.

Competency requirements are defined based on the knowledge, skills and attitudes that have been found to be beneficial for the employee in achieving superior performance under the unique physical, social and environmental conditions of the job. In some instances, some personality traits that are predictive of certain attitudes or behaviors emerge as part of this exercise. Because each position in an organization evolves over time as requirements change, competency profiles—unlike personality profiles that are relatively stable over time—will tend to change every three to five years, some within one to two years depending on the volatility and complexity of the business environment.

New jobs, position titles and roles are continuously being created to adapt to social, economic, technological, and even political changes. New positions such as User Interface Designer, Interactive Media Buyer, Innovation Officer, Social Media Strategist, and Email Marketing Manager are just some positions in the industry today that may not have been relevant ten years ago. In creating competency profiles for such positions, managers will need a combination of deductive, inductive or empirical approaches to describe the behaviors and constructs that lead to success.

For the purpose of this paper, I'd like to zero in on the emerging need for innovation, which has been critical for business

will need to have mechanisms by which to measure: What kind of talent do I need for my organization's environment? With such

tendency, the halo effect, the recency bias, and other issues related to comparison biases such as leniency and anchoring. Although it is known that these biases can still occur regardless of age, experience or intelligence, an awareness that they exist has been helpful to managers in reexamining the accuracy of their decisions.

Building Competencies and Organizational Capabilities

Once competency assessments are done, from a strategic perspective, organizations can generate valuable information on the gaps in its internal capabilities for knowledge, skills and attitudes needed to drive overall performance. This allows leaders to prioritize resource allocations in learning and growth strategies by either building on employee strengths further or focusing on filling weaknesses. For instance, a customer-focused organization with service delivery platforms may find the need to focus on developing marketing and communication skills among its managers if this is seen as a common gap. These decisions are influenced, as mentioned in the balanced scorecard, by the

acknowledgment, there is limited ownership of activities leading to development. Individual growth in the work setting appears to be anchored on a realistic concept of self, and a preservation of the individual's autonomy to decide and seek for situations and challenging work assignments that stimulate that growth. When such opportunities arise, the process of positive behavior toward repeated exposure tends to produce the enactive mastery required.

Because self-awareness is key to understanding personal weaknesses and moving toward developing strengths, it is important for an organization to put necessary mechanisms in its performance management system or organizational development framework to allow for reflection and autonomy. For instance, in performance appraisal, employees should be allowed to assess themselves first in terms of their outcomes and behaviors based on agreed upon and communicated standards before finalizing ratings. This voice should be recognized and given value in the process, which may come in the form of due acknowledgement or even points in the final rating. In this discussion, employees are asked to describe their current performance and the challenges they encounter based on their perspectives.

Performance target setting must also come from an interactive and consultative process by which the employee is asked how they feel about and plan to achieve goals. Each phase in planning, execution and evaluation of performance is a collaboration that starts with employee input, and ends with an agreement of employee contributions and organizational support. In this model, performance management is focused on employee experiences rather than the manager's, because the employee is recognized as the primary contributor to performance.

Metrics must measure and reward both outcome and behaviors or actions in order for the organization to ensure performance and motivate individual aspirations. In order to work, however, this framework must extend to all levels in the organization, including leaders and top management, who need to be open to, and accept, feedback coming from peers,

daily lives of the working class. After all, they say, work is not just about what you get—but the kind of person it makes you become.

REFERENCES

- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum.
- Kaplan, Robert S., & Norton, D. P. (1992). The balanced scorecard