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ABSTRACT
This work examined the effect of talent management on employee productivity in selected banks in Anambra State. The study reviewed relevant conceptual, theoretical and empirical literatures. It was anchored on management process approach and human capital theory. Talent Retention, performance management systems, training and development and talent attraction were employed as the explanatory variables while employee productivity was the dependent variable. The study adopted survey research design. The population of the study comprised 353 staff of the selected banks in Anambra State. The sample size was 353(using the entire population). Questionnaire was employed as the main instrument of data collection. The data generated were analyzed using frequency, percentage analysis, descriptive statistics, correlation analysis and multiple regression analysis. The study found that talent retention had a significant influence on employee productivity. Performance management systems had a significant effect on employee productivity. Training and development had a significant influence on employee productivity and talent attraction had a significant effect on employee productivity. The study concluded that talent management had a significant effect on employee productivity. The study therefore recommended that management should establish talent retention strategies and make them known to all employees. Management and employees should be involved in the entire process of performance appraisal. To enhance employee productivity, it is imperative that the organization focuses on training and development programs that are not only essential but enhance employees’ competitiveness. Programs should be designed by both managers and employees. Talent attraction such as competitive salary packages and rewards should be established as a policy in every organization.

Introduction
Talent management procedures change over time in response to the influence of both internal and external factors in the workplace (Frank & Taylor, 2004). Globalization and workplace reform and changes in the demographic composition of the workforce have affected how talent needs to be managed (Nankervis, Compton & Baird, 2005). Globalization has led to increased competition and pressure on organizations to use human capital as effectively and productively as possible (Hiles & Bunnell, 2006). The growth potential of organizations worldwide depends on the ability of organizations to have the right people, in the right place at the right time. Employers are forced to compete to attract and retain an increasing pool of talented individuals in order to achieve their objectives (Hiles & Bunnell, 2006). Companies with effective talent management practices deliver better results for shareholders (Huselid, 2005). Effective talent management practices can create enduring competitive advantage and enhance organizational performance.

Gardener (2002) posits that unmet need in many organizations leading to negative employee outcomes. Over the years, creation and preservation of knowledge has become a key tool in accelerating competitiveness and enhancing organizational capabilities to respond to market changes where employees’ skills and personalities are appropriately deployed to optimize performance. This is a critical and difficult task (Bryan, 2004). Gardner (2002) notes that talent management is a major global challenge confronting most organizations in the world. Due to scarcity of talent, organizations around the world are competing for the same pool of talents to acquire and retain talents in order to maintain their operations and continue to grow in terms of service and profitability. Most assets of an organization such as, products, technologies and strategies may be replicated easily, but human capital takes great deal of time to develop and considered as a key asset to manage and adapt to the organizational needs (Chuai, 2010).

Talent management is an important activity to enable organizations to have the right people with the skills and expertise to meet the immediate and future needs of the firm. The process covers activities such as selection, development, succession and performance management (Wellins, Smith & Erker, 2009). Talent management is one of the primary management tools for 21st century human assets management because the significant resource for firms competing in this century is no longer land, capital, and other tangible assets, but the human capital necessary to adapt (Cappelli, 2008). Talent management has been a top priority in the developed countries for decades now as expressed in literature for
countries such as the UK, USA, France, China, and Australia (Coullson-Thomas, 2012, Chugh & Bhattacharya, 2011, Egerová, 2013, Lewis & Heckman, 2011). These studies show that the concern and search for talent is universal.

Talent management focuses on how people come into the organization and grow (Sayyasi, 2011). Today, organizations have realized that in order to be successful in complicated world economic system and durable in the business environment, they require the best talents. At the same time to the need to recruit, develop and retain talents, organizations have found that their talents are critical resources that for achieving the best results require management (Maali and Tajaddin, 2008). The basic notion around the scramble for talent is employee performance. As such, every sector has also discovered that attracting and retaining talented employees does not only enhance employee productivity itself, but organization performance as a whole. (Smith, 2007). It is therefore a deliberate approach undertaken to attract, develop and retain people with the aptitude and abilities to meet current and future organizational needs.

Statement of the Problem

Managing talent is a challenge to all organizations in the context of globalization, irrespective of the country. Moreover, the concern about scarcity of talent is almost universal, (Gardner, 2002). Organizations around the world are competing for the same pool of talents and this is seen as a global labour market for talents. Trend of global integration shows organizations’ standardizations in talent recruitment, development and management, to ensure their competitive position and consistency. Despite knowledge of talent management strategies, many organizations are failing to put in place the kind of human capital development and retention strategies that will bear appropriate outcomes (Cappelli, 2009). The determinants of talent management include talent attraction; performance management systems; talent retention; employee training and career management. The problem of this study focused on the effects of talent attraction, talent retention, employee training and career management as independent variables and employee productivity as dependent variables with special reference to employee productivity. Gibbons (2006) states that talent management is a system that addresses competency gaps by implementing and maintaining programs to attract, acquire, develop, promote, and retain quality talent that must be adopted by all future oriented organizations to gain competitive advantage.

Several scholars have conducted studies on talent management, including Koranteng (2014) study on talent management as a tool for employee retention, using a case study of Procredit Savings and Loans Limited Kumasi. The study revealed the adoption of major talent management practices including motivation, regular training and development of employees. Koketso and Rust (2012) conducted an exploratory study on the perceived challenges to talent management in the South African Public Service, using the case of Cape Town Municipality. Kambabazi (2012) examined talent management, organization culture and employee engagement using the case of National Water and Sewerage Corporation in Uganda. The findings indicate that both talent management and organization culture predict employee engagement and therefore performance.

Wambui (2012) studied talent management practices in commercial state corporations while Lyria (2013) examined the role of talent management on organization performance in companies listed in Nairobi Security Exchange. These studies revealed the existence of a strong positive correlation between talent management and employee performance. However, these studies did not examine whether this correlation still holds true for companies and in particular, in the Nigeria context. Therefore, this study seeks to fill the existing gap in literature by providing empirical data on effects of talent management on employee productivity in the financial sector.

Objectives of the Study

The broad objective of the study is to examine the effect of talent management on employee productivity. The specific objectives are to:

1. To what extent does talent retention affect employee productivity in selected banks in Anambra State?
2. To what extent does talent attraction affect employee productivity in selected banks in Anambra State?
3. To what extent does training/development influence employee productivity in selected banks in Anambra State?
4. To what extent does talent attraction affect employee productivity in manufacturing firms in the South-East?

Hypotheses

Ho1: Talent retention has no significant influence on employee productivity
Ho2: Performance management systems have no significant effect on employee productivity
Ho3: Training /development has no significant influence on employee productivity
Ho4: Talent attraction has no significant effect on employee productivity

Significance of the Study

The study could be valuable to a number of stakeholders including management, policy makers, government, researchers and academics.

Review of Related Literature

Talent Management

Aston and Morton (2005) note that there is not a single consistent or concise definition of talent management. Tansley (2011) defines talent as "an essential giftedness, which is regarded as a gift". It is also a natural ability and aptitudes. Wikstrom, Oberwittler, Treiber and Hardie (2012) note that talent represents greater mastery of developed abilities and knowledge systematically in the field of human endeavour. Stockley (2007) asserts that talent management is defined as the conscious, deliberate approach undertaken to attract, develop and retain people with the aptitude and abilities to meet current and future organizational needs. According to Stockley (2007)’ perspective, talent management deals with the recruitment, selection, identification, retention, management, and development of personnel considered having the potential for high performance. Talent management simply refers to an organized process of attracting, selecting, hiring, engaging, training and developing, retaining and utilizing top talents to
an organization’s best advantage (Lockwood, 2006). It aims at ensuring the right job placements at the right time, in the right positions for the right candidates to deliver their best and remain committed to the organization. Although talent management is organization-specific, the focus is on developing and optimizing high potentials or talents of individuals within the organization more quickly than ever to enhance competitiveness (Zhang, et al, 2012). Talent is one of the critical resources for organizations to attain competitive advantage. Talent management will fail without top management commitment to retaining its workforce (Izwar & Aerni, 2014). Effective talent management endears talented employees to an organization as employees begin to see themselves as part of the organization, add value to the organization and remain glued to it. It ensures that employees remain professional at all times in their business practices, serve meritoriously, have the right people made up of seasoned professionals who have excelled in their various professions, possessing the requisite integrity, skills and experience.

Collings and Mellahi (2009) define talent management as “activities and processes that involves the systematic identification of key positions. Those contribute to the organization's sustainable competitive advantage, the development of a talent pool of high potential and high performing incumbents to fill these roles, and the development of a differentiated human resource architecture to facilitate filling these positions with competent incumbents, and to ensure their continued commitment to the organization. Garrow and Hirsh (2008) opine that talent management is about doing things for your best people, investing in developing them, building their potential and assisting people to make the best use of their strengths. Howard (2008) asserts that the purpose of talent management is to ensure that a supply of talent is available to align with the right people at the right time in the right job using measureable, predictable, and actionable skills that serve as a key to organizational success. Talent audits are a worthwhile tool in that process based on strategic business objectives.

Employee Productivity

The term productivity was applied for the first time by François Quesnay, the mathematician and economist who was an adherent of physiocracy school. He believes authority of any government is based on increasing productivity in the agriculture sector by proposing the economic table. Another French man in 1853 called Littère defined productivity as knowledge and technology of production. Fredrick Venislo, Taylor and Frank and Lilian Gilbert conducted studies about labor division, improving the methods and determining the standard time in order to enhance efficiency simultaneous with the beginning of scientific management movement period at the beginning of 1900 (Darvish, 2008).

Productivity means achieving maximum possible profit from the labor force, power, talent and human force skill, land, machine, money, equipment of time, place, to enhance welfare of the society such that increase of it is considered a necessity towards enhancement of humans' living standard and society (Darvish, 2008). Mathis and Jackson (2000) define productivity as a measure of the quantity and quality of work done, considering the cost of the resource it took to do the work. Employee Productivity refers to the real output per unit of labor. It is a powerful driver of international capital flows. Meneze (2006) define productivity as the employees’ ability to produce work or goods and services according to the expected standards set by the employers, or beyond the expected standards. Productivity is calculated by comparing total amount of output to the total amount of input used to produce this output (Bojke et al., 2012). Amah (2006) defined employee productivity as the measure of how efficiently and effectively resources (inputs) are brought together and utilized for the production of goods and services (out puts) in line with the quality needed by society in the long term. This implies that productivity is a combination of performance and economic use of resources by employees. High productivity indicates that resources are efficiently and effectively utilized, and waste is minimized in the organization. Productivity measurement indicates areas for possible improvements and shows how well improvement efforts are faring. It helps in the analysis of efficiency and effectiveness. It can stimulate improvement and motivate employees (Prokopenko, 1987). Chase and Aquilano (1995) note that productivity is measured in terms of outputs per labour hour. However this measurement does not ensure that the firm will make money (for example when extra output is not sold but accumulates as inventory). To test whether productivity has increased, the following questions should be asked: “Has the action taken increased output or has it decreased inventory. Has the action taken decreased operational expense? This would then lead to a new definition which is: Productivity is all the actions that bring a company closer to its goals.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework of this study is anchored on Management Process Approach by Henry Fayol.

Henry Fayol, a French industrialist, developed the theory of management. According to him, managerial excellence is a technical ability, and can be acquired. He developed theories and principles of management which are universally accepted, and make him universalistic. Henry Fayol (1916) offered fourteen principles of management which include: division of Work; Authority and Responsibility; Discipline; Unity of Command; Unity of direction; Subordination of individual interests to general interests; Fair Remuneration to employees; Centralization and Decentralization; Scalar chain; order; equity; Stability of use of personnel; Initiative; Spirit of Co-operation Management Process Approach, like Scientific Management, takes productivity, economical efficiency and rationalism as the basis (Şimsek, 2009). Fayol (1916) claims that workers, instead of the ability to manage, have the desire to be managed and generally avoid taking responsibility, hence the necessity of carrying out penal sanctions. He has established bases of a management concept organizationally by applying new and holistic terms and earned principles like division of labor and specialization, authority and responsibility, discipline, organizational benefits which are indispensable principles in every step of scientific management and the principle that organizational benefits are above individual benefits which make up the base of Quality Management.

This study builds on Fayol’s twelfth principle of stability of use of personnel. Principle of stability is linked with long tenure of personnel in the organization (Fayol, 1916). An efficient management always builds a team of good workers. If the members of the team go on changing, the entire process of production is disturbed. It is always in the interest of the enterprise that its trusted, experienced and trained employees do not leave the organization. Stability of job creates a sense
of belongingness among workers who with this feeling are encouraged to improve the quality and quantity of work. An organization should therefore adopt an efficient talent management system which ensures that skilled human capital is maintained in the organization.

**Empirical Review**

Talent management has been studied by various authors, but in different aspects and directions. Khezri, Niknafs, Aidnlou, Alian, and Eslamlou, (2016) examined the impact of talent management on productivity of Bank Mellat of West Azerbaijan province. The population was 850 people of employees of Bank Mellat of West Azerbaijan province. The sample size was 265, determine via the Morgan table. For data analyzing Pearson correlation test was used. The results showed that there was a significant positive exited relationship between talent management and employees of Bank Mellat southern province of Western Azerbaijan. Also results indicated that significant and positive relationship between components of talents management with productivity of employees of Bank Mellat of West Azerbaijan province.

Knott (2016) examined the effect of talent management practices on employee performance. The study adopted a descriptive survey research design. The population of the study was 95 employees of Suraya Property Group Limited. It adopted a stratified sampling technique to select a sample size of 76 respondents. Data was presented using tables and figures. The findings revealed a statistically significant relationship between training and development of employees and employee performance. The findings also showed that there was a statistically significant relationship between talent retention strategy and employee performance. Finally the study revealed that there was a statistically significant relationship between performance management systems and employee performance, and concluded that talent management had positive significant effect on organizational productivity.

Onwuka, Ugwu and Kekeocha (2015) investigated talent management and employees performance in selected public sector firms in Delta State, Nigeria. Sample size was determined using Taro Yamani’s statistical technique. 364 copies of the questionnaires were distributed to respondents, out of which 273 copies of the questionnaire were returned. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was conducted using SPSS-20. The study found that F-calculated value (73.166) was greater than F-tabulated (2.53) value at 5% significant level in the selected public sector firms. Hence, the null hypothesis was rejected. Study concluded that there was an existence of strong relationship between talent management and employees performance in selected private sector organizations.

Wuim-Pam (2014) investigated the impact of effective talent management on employee core competencies in Plateau State University, Bokkos. Using a non-empirical approach, the result revealed that the skills, knowledge and abilities of employees had impact on job descriptions and performance management. The study concluded that tying core competencies with talent management is a win-win proposition as it provides organizations with a means of upgrading and retaining their valuable workforce.

Gichuhi, & Waititu (2014) examined the role of talent management on competitiveness of public universities in Kenya. Survey research design was employed. Factor analysis revealed that all the 16 items used had a loading value above 0.4 as recommended, hence they were all included in the analysis. Data analysis revealed a positive relationship R = 0.498 (p-value < 0.05), indicating a significant linear relationship between talent management and competitiveness.

Oladapo (2014) carried out a study on the impact of talent management on retention in Strayer University. This study sought to understand the challenges and successes of talent management programs and the reasons some companies choose not to have a program. This study also tested the predictive power of job security, compensation and opportunity on retention rates. Findings revealed that for the organizations sampled with a talent management program, (69% of those studied), participants overwhelmingly recognized the strategic value of an effective talent management program despite significant challenges to implementation. The study further revealed that job security, compensation, and opportunity for advancement were not found to have predictive value for employee retention rates.

Karuri and Nahashon (2015) investigated the effect of talent management on employee outcomes at the Central Bank of Kenya. The independent variables were talent attraction, talent retention, employee training and career management while the dependent variable was employee outcomes; i.e. teamwork, job satisfaction and employee engagement. The sample for the study was 130 staff drawn from the population of about 700 staff at CBK’s head office. The study adopted a descriptive survey of the staff of Central Bank of Kenya. Regression model was used to predicting the relationship between employee outcomes and various aspects of talent management. The descriptive statistical analysis of this study’s findings revealed that employee outcomes (in this case teamwork, job satisfaction and employee engagement) are significantly influenced by talent attraction, retention, employee training and career management at CBK.

Nzewi, Chiekezie and Ogbeta (2015) assessed the relationship between talent management and employee performance in selected commercial banks in Asaba, Delta State. Descriptive survey design was adopted. Hypotheses were tested with Pearson Product Moment Correlation coefficient. Regression technique was used to analyze the data collected. The findings revealed a positive relationship existed between talent management and employee performance. The study concluded that talent management was significantly related to employee performance.

**Methodology**

This study adopted survey research design. It was carried out in Anambra State. Five banks selected from each of the zones that make up Anambra State were studied. The banks include First Bank of Nigeria Plc, Zenith Bank of Nigeria Plc, Fidelity Bank Plc, Union Bank of Nigeria Plc and Key Stone Bank. The population was 353. The entire population was used as the sample size. The source of data was primary data. Questionnaire was used as the instrument of data collection. The study used face and content validity. Thus, the study employed Cronbach’s alpha to verify the internal consistency of each construct in order to achieve reliability. The analysis of data was performed using SPSS package. This involved descriptive analysis. Data were cleaned before analysis to ensure that they were correctly captured from source documents. Multiple regression analysis was used to assess the effect of talent management on organizational productivity.

**Data Presentation and Analysis**

In this section, the data generated from the employee of the sampled banks were presented, analyzed and interpreted. A total of three hundred and fifty three (353) copies of the
questionnaire were distributed to the respondents, out of which three hundred and thirty two were properly filled and found relevant to the study. 21 copies were not properly filled. The analysis in this section was based on the three hundred and thirty two relevant copies.

Descriptive Characteristics of the Variables

| Table 1. Descriptive Statistics. |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                              | N               | Minimum | Maximum | Mean  | Std. Deviation |
| OP                           | 332             | 11      | 27      | 21.33 | 3.307          |
| TR                           | 332             | 8       | 25      | 17.86 | 4.245          |
| PMS                          | 332             | 11      | 27      | 13.30 | 3.952          |
| TD                           | 332             | 10      | 25      | 18.71 | 4.036          |
| TA                           | 332             | 8       | 24      | 17.91 | 3.699          |
| Valid N (listwise)           | 332             |         |         |       |               |

Source: Author’s Compilation from SPSS Version 21.0

Table 2. Correlation Matrix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OP</th>
<th>TR</th>
<th>PMS</th>
<th>TD</th>
<th>TA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>-.790</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.654</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>-.057</td>
<td>-.238</td>
<td>-.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.775</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.790</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>-.841</td>
<td>-.841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMS Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>-.790</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>.546</td>
<td>.323</td>
<td>.323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>-.057</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TD</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>.546</td>
<td>.323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.554</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sigma (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.841</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.673</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlation Analysis

Here, Pearson correlation was employed to measure the strength and relationship between independent variables. The Pearson correlation coefficient is a measure of the strength of a linear association between two variables, and is denoted by r. Table 2 below shows the summary of correlation coefficient.

The correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The table above shows the extent of association between the dependent and independent variables used in the study. The correlation between Talent retention and employee productivity shows the value of 0.005, which indicates that Talent retention has a positive weak effect on organizational productivity. Performance management systems recorded a correlation coefficient of .790 with organizational productivity which shows that Performance management systems have a negative moderate effect on employee productivity.

Furthermore, the correlation between training /development and employee productivity recorded a correlation coefficient of .000. This indicates that training /development has a positive moderate effect on employee productivity. Also, Talent attraction recorded a correlation coefficient of .554 with employee productivity. This shows Talent attraction has a positive strong effect on employee productivity. Finally Talent attraction recorded a correlation coefficient of .000 with employee productivity. This shows Talent attraction has a negative strong effect on employee productivity.

Multiple Regression Analysis

Multiple regression result was employed to test the effect of independent or explanatory variables on the dependent variables. The result of the multiple regression analysis is presented in the tables below.

The result of the multiple regression formulated in chapter three is presented in the tables below.

Table 3. Summary of the Regression Result.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Variables Entered</th>
<th>Variables Removed</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TR, PMS, TD, TR</td>
<td></td>
<td>Enter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: EP
b. All requested variables entered TA, PMS, TD, TR,

Table 4 shows that R² which measures the strength of the effect of independent variable on the dependent variable have the value of .686. This implies that 69% of the variation in employee performance is explained by variations in talent retention, performance management systems, training and development and talent attraction. This was supported by adjusted R² of .572.

In order to check for autocorrelation in the model, Durbin-Watson statistics was employed. Durbin-Watson statistics of 1.875 in table 4 shows that the variables in the model are not autocorrelated and that the model is reliable for predictions.

The f-statistics value of 6.151 in table 4 with f-statistics probability of 6.151 shows that the independent variables have significant effect on the dependent. This shows that Talent retention, Performance management systems, Training and development and Talent attraction can collectively explain the variations in employee productivity in the selected manufacturing firms.

Table 6 shows the coefficient of the individual variables and their probability values. Talent retention has regression coefficient of .123and probability value of .004. This implies that talent management associated with talent retention has a positive but insignificant effect on employee productivity. Performance management systems have a regression coefficient of -.085 with a probability value of .005, implying that performance management systems have a negative and significant effect on employee productivity.

Furthermore, Training and development has a regression coefficient of .171 with a probability value of .176. This implies that training/development has a negative and significant effect on employee productivity. On a similar note, Talent attraction has a coefficient value of .007 and a probability value of .009. This shows that Talent attraction has a positive and significant effect on employee productivity.

Table 4. Model Summary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of Estimate</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.294</td>
<td>.686</td>
<td>.572</td>
<td>3.185</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), TA, PMS, TD, TR,
b. b. Dependent Variable: EP
Table 5. ANOVA Result.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>312.052</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62.410</td>
<td>6.151</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Residual</td>
<td>3307.502</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>10.146</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3619.554</td>
<td>331</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. a. Dependent Variable: EP
d. b. Predictors: (Constant), TA, PMS, TD, TR.

Table 6. Coefficients of the Model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistic’s</th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
<th>VIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>18.916</td>
<td>1.918</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>9.863</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>.930</td>
<td>1.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>2.870</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMS 1</td>
<td>-.085</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>2.923</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.996</td>
<td>1.004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TD</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>2.097</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.978</td>
<td>1.023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>2.562</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.941</td>
<td>1.063</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: EP

Test of Hypotheses

Here, the four hypotheses formulated in chapter one were tested using t-statistics and significance value of the individual variables in the regression result. The essence of this is to ascertain how significant the effect of individual independent or explanatory variables are on the dependent variables. The summary of the result is presented in the table below.

Table 7. T-Statistics and Probability Value from the Regression Result.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>9.863</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMS</td>
<td>2.923</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TD</td>
<td>-2.562</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>1.901</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.562</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors' Compilation from the Regression Result

Hypothesis One
Ho: Talent retention has no significant influence on employee productivity.
H1: Talent retention has a significant influence on employee productivity.

In testing this hypothesis, the t-statistics and probability value in table 7 is used. Talent retention has a t-statistics of 2.923 and a probability value of .005 which is statistically significant. Therefore, we reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypotheses which states that talent retention has a significant influence on employee productivity.

Hypothesis Two
Ho: Performance management systems have no significant effect on employee productivity.
H1: Performance management systems have a significant effect on employee productivity.

Performance management systems have a t-statistics of -2.562 and a probability value of .009 which is statistically significant. Therefore, we reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypotheses which state that performance management systems have significant effect on employee productivity.

Hypothesis Three
Ho: Training and development has no significant influence on employee productivity.
H1: Training and development has a significant influence on employee productivity.

Training and development has a t-statistics of 1.901 and a probability value of 0.007 which is statistically significant. Therefore, we reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis which state that training and development has a significant influence on employee productivity.

Discussion of Findings

The main objective of this study is to examine the effect of talent management on employee productivity in selected banks in Anambra State. The data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, correlation and multiple regression analysis. The result of the multiple regression analysis shows that talent retention has a significant influence on employee productivity. This finding is consistent with that of Agrela (2008) who noted that talent strategies enable an organization to pursue high productivity and improved results through talent management. Agrela, (2008) argued that talent strategies enable organizations to focus on factors that affect employee retention leading, to growth and success of organizations as employee performance is enhanced through talent programs within the organizations. This finding agrees with the organizations. Guthridge, Harttig, Komn and Lawson (2010) who noted that the primary role of talent retention is to enhance easy identification of future talents which are needed at all organizational levels. The talent retention process endeavors to obtain an optimal talent positioning level that refers to having the correct talent at both the right time and place. Tunje (2014) noted that there existed a relationship between retention practices and employee production.

The study found that performance management systems have a significant effect on employee productivity. This finding tallies with the findings of Byars and Rue, (2008) where they argued that performance management systems were directly tied to an organization and employee productivity since performance systems helped employees work diligently and creatively toward achieving organizational objectives. The findings agrees with Gommans and Kihiko (2013) that revealed that firms that endeavor to adopt various performance management practices that entail worker selection, goal setting and placement as well as performance appraisals do enhance employee productivity. These findings are in line with Agutu (2013) who sought to explore the perceived influence of performance appraisal criteria on employee job productivity and the level of employee involvement.

The study also revealed that training and development has a significant influence on employee productivity. This finding conforms to that of Cascio (2010) who had observed that organizations that did promote efficient learning training programs had higher levels of employee performance compared to those that did not. This corroborates the view of Rothwell and Kazanas (2003) who found out that talent training requires not only formal classroom training, but also other approaches such as mentoring and autonomous learning. Equally, Wright, Gardner and Moinihan, (2003) had argued that in as much as most organizations use training and development as a psychological connection between the company and the employee, the end goal is actually to
enhance employee performance. This is in line with Aswathappa’s (2008) argument that training and development improves current or future employee performance by improving an employee’s ability to perform through learning, usually by changing attitudes or increasing skills and knowledge. This finding is confirmed with Cheboi (2014) argument that employee training generates an improvement in performance related benefits for both the organization and the employee.

Finally, the study found that talent attraction has a significant effect on employee productivity. This finding agrees with the findings of Ballesteros (2010). Employer branding includes development of an organization’s image, good enough to attract employees. In order to attract the best, organizational branding is a useful strategy. Organizations that manage their corporate brands effectively, gains advantage in the highly competitive global market place. Tanuja, (2007) noted that top rated companies have one characteristic in common, that is they give clear and consistent messages about themselves and this translates into a strong pull on talents. Oehley, (2007) agrees with the findings that employees measure value proposition based on the challenge the job possesses, work environment, training opportunities, flexibility and reputation of the organization.

**Summary of Findings**

The data analyzed shows that:
1. Talent retention has a significant influence on employee productivity.
2. Performance management systems have a significant effect on employee productivity.
3. Training and development has a significant influence on employee productivity.
4. Talent attraction has a significant effect on employee productivity.

**Conclusion**

From the analysis, the study discovers that talent retention has a significant influence on employee productivity. Performance management systems have a significant effect on employee productivity. Training and development has a significant influence on employee productivity and talent attraction has a significant effect on employee productivity. The study therefore concludes that talent management has a significant effect on employee productivity.

**Recommendations**

The following are recommendations based on the findings of the study.
1. Management should establish talent retention strategies and make them known to all employees. This is to ensure that employees are aware that the organization is making necessary effort to enhance their productivity. Equally, each of the talent strategies should be used in a targeted manner for each employee.
2. Management-employee involvement in the entire process of performance appraisal should be made mandatory. The more employees are involved in designing a performance management system that will be used to evaluate them, the more they will want to support the system.
3. To enhance employee productivity, it is imperative that the organization focuses on training and development programs that are not only essential but enhances employees’ competitiveness. Programs should be designed by both managers and employees. Employees are a critical component that determine the success or failure of an organization’s training and development programs, therefore, should not be ignored.
4. Talent attraction such as competitive salary packages and rewards should be established as a policy in every organization. The study further established that attraction through attractive packages motivate the employees.

**References**


Chaudhary, N & Sharma, B. (2012). Impact of employee motivation on performance (productivity) in private


Puvitayahaphan A. (2008), Talent management practices in selected companies listed on the stock exchange of Thailand (SET); Educational Journal of Thailand 2, (1).


