

THE PARADOX OF TALENT MANAGEMENT: INCLUSIVITY VERSUS EXCLUSIVITY IN KNOWLEDGE ECONOMIES

Shruti Agarwal

Student

MBA, Vivekananda Global University, Jaipur, India
22MGT3MB060@vgu.ac.in, MBA (2022-23)

Arif Hussain

Student

MBA, Vivekananda Global University, Jaipur, India
22MGT3MB062@vgu.ac.in, MBA (2022-23)

Bhartendu Vimal

Student

MBA, Vivekananda Global University, Jaipur, India
22MGT3MB063@vgu.ac.in, MBA (2022-23)

ABSTRACT

Talent management has emerged as a critical strategic function in knowledge economies, where human capital drives innovation and competitive advantage. This study explores the paradox of inclusivity versus exclusivity in talent management by synthesizing existing theoretical and empirical literature. While exclusive approaches emphasize the strategic investment in high-potential individuals to maximize organizational performance, inclusive approaches advocate equal development opportunities for all employees to enhance engagement, diversity, and long-term sustainability. The findings reveal that both approaches offer distinct advantages but also present inherent limitations when applied in isolation. The study highlights the growing importance of hybrid talent management frameworks that integrate inclusivity and exclusivity to balance equity with efficiency. Furthermore, contextual factors such as institutional environments, cultural dynamics, and technological advancements play a significant role in shaping talent management strategies. The paper contributes to the literature by reconceptualizing talent management as a dynamic and context-dependent process, emphasizing the need for flexible and integrative approaches in modern organizations.

Keywords: Talent Management, Inclusivity, Exclusivity, Knowledge Economy, Human Capital, Organizational Performance, Diversity and Inclusion, Strategic HRM

INTRODUCTION

The contemporary knowledge economy has fundamentally transformed how organizations perceive, attract, develop, and retain human capital. In contrast to traditional industrial paradigms, where labor was often viewed as a homogeneous input, knowledge-driven environments emphasize the strategic importance of talent as a critical source of competitive advantage. Within this context, talent management has emerged as a central organizational function, encompassing practices aimed at identifying high-potential individuals, nurturing their capabilities, and aligning their contributions with long-term strategic goals (Gallardo-Gallardo et al., 2020; Glaister et al., 2021). However, despite its widespread adoption, talent management is characterized by a persistent and unresolved paradox: the tension between inclusivity and exclusivity.

At its core, this paradox reflects two competing philosophies. On one hand, the inclusive approach to talent management advocates that all employees possess inherent potential and should be developed through equitable access to opportunities, training, and career advancement. This perspective aligns with contemporary values of diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI), emphasizing fairness, employee engagement, and organizational cohesion (Meyers et al., 2020; Kravariti & Johnston, 2020). On the other hand, the exclusive approach posits that organizational resources should be concentrated on a select group of high-performing or high-potential individuals—often labeled as “A-players” or “star performers”—to maximize efficiency and strategic impact (Collings & Mellahi, 2009; Bui & Chang, 2018). This dichotomy creates a fundamental tension in how organizations design and implement talent strategies.

The rise of the knowledge economy intensifies this paradox. Knowledge-intensive industries rely heavily on specialized skills, innovation, and intellectual capital, making the identification and retention of top talent increasingly critical (Hegde et al., 2017; Cross Walker, 2020). In such environments, exclusive talent management practices may appear justified, as organizations seek to invest disproportionately in individuals who can drive innovation and competitive differentiation. However, this approach risks marginalizing other employees, potentially leading to reduced morale, perceptions of inequity, and diminished organizational commitment (Crowley-Henry & Al Ariss, 2018; Hassan et al., 2022).

Conversely, inclusive talent management approaches aim to democratize opportunities and foster a culture of continuous development for all employees. This perspective is particularly relevant in diverse and globalized workforces, where leveraging a broad range of skills, experiences, and perspectives is essential for innovation and adaptability (Clark-Ambrosini et al., 2023; Metcalfe et al., 2020). Inclusive strategies can enhance employee engagement, promote organizational justice, and support long-term sustainability. Nevertheless, critics argue that such approaches may dilute resources, reduce strategic focus, and limit the organization’s ability to achieve high performance outcomes (Gallardo-Gallardo et al., 2020; Jooss et al., 2021).

Scholarly literature reflects this ongoing debate, with researchers offering varying conceptualizations of talent and its management. Some scholars advocate for a hybrid or differentiated approach, suggesting that inclusivity and exclusivity are not mutually exclusive but can be integrated through context-specific strategies (Meyers et al., 2020; Latukha, Shagalkina, et al., 2022). For instance, organizations may adopt inclusive practices at the organizational level while maintaining exclusive development programs for critical roles or high-potential employees. Such approaches attempt to balance fairness with strategic prioritization, though their implementation remains complex and context-dependent (Glaister et al., 2021; Lawless et al., 2019).

The paradox is further complicated by institutional, cultural, and organizational factors. In emerging economies, for example, institutional voids and resource constraints may necessitate more selective talent investments, while also highlighting the importance of inclusive practices for workforce development and social equity (Tobon & Luna-Nemecio, 2021; Othman & Khalil, 2020). Similarly, cultural norms and values influence perceptions of fairness and meritocracy, shaping how talent management practices are received by employees (Holland & Scullion, 2021; Mousa et al., 2022). Global organizations must therefore navigate diverse expectations and adapt their strategies accordingly.

Recent research also emphasizes the dynamic nature of talent management in the face of technological advancements and shifting workforce expectations. The increasing adoption of

digital technologies, remote work, and artificial intelligence has redefined skill requirements and talent identification processes (Bonneton et al., 2022; Usanova et al., 2022). These changes underscore the need for more flexible and adaptive talent management frameworks that can accommodate both inclusive and exclusive elements. Furthermore, the growing emphasis on employee well-being, purpose, and meaningful work challenges traditional notions of talent segmentation and calls for more holistic approaches (Mahfoozi et al., 2018; Sumelius et al., 2020). Despite significant scholarly attention, the inclusivity–exclusivity paradox remains insufficiently resolved, particularly in terms of its theoretical integration and practical implications. Existing studies often treat these approaches as dichotomous, overlooking the potential for synergy and coexistence (Gallardo-Gallardo et al., 2020; Jooss et al., 2021). Moreover, there is a need for a deeper understanding of how organizations can navigate this paradox in different contexts, including varying industry sectors, organizational sizes, and cultural environments.

In light of these considerations, this study seeks to reconceptualize talent management by examining the interplay between inclusivity and exclusivity within knowledge economies. By synthesizing insights from existing literature and adopting a theoretical perspective, the paper aims to contribute to a more nuanced understanding of talent management practices. Specifically, it explores how organizations can balance competing demands for equity and efficiency, and how this balance influences organizational performance, employee engagement, and long-term sustainability. Ultimately, addressing the paradox of talent management is not merely a theoretical exercise but a practical necessity for organizations operating in increasingly complex and competitive environments. As knowledge economies continue to evolve, the ability to effectively manage talent—while reconciling inclusivity and exclusivity—will remain a critical determinant of organizational success (Al Jawali et al., 2022; Baker et al., 2018; Boada-Cuerva et al., 2019).

LITERATURE REVIEW

The concept of talent management has gained significant prominence in the contemporary knowledge economy, where human capital is widely recognized as a key driver of organizational competitiveness and innovation. Unlike traditional economic systems that relied heavily on physical resources, knowledge economies prioritize intellectual capabilities, creativity, and specialized skills. This shift has led organizations to adopt structured talent management practices aimed at attracting, developing, and retaining individuals who can contribute to long-term strategic objectives (Gallardo-Gallardo et al., 2020; Glaister et al., 2021). However, within this evolving discourse, a central debate has emerged ^{لوح} the paradox of inclusivity versus exclusivity in talent management, reflecting divergent philosophies and practices across organizations and contexts.

The exclusive approach to talent management has historically dominated both theory and practice. Rooted in strategic human resource management, this perspective emphasizes the identification of high-potential and high-performing individuals who are considered critical to organizational success. Scholars argue that limited organizational resources should be concentrated on these “talent elites” to maximize returns on investment and ensure competitive advantage (Bui & Chang, 2018; Collings & Mellahi, 2009). This approach is particularly prevalent in knowledge-intensive sectors, where innovation and productivity are often driven by a relatively small proportion of highly skilled individuals (Hegde et al., 2017; Cross Walker, 2020). Empirical studies suggest that organizations adopting exclusive talent strategies often experience enhanced performance outcomes, improved leadership pipelines, and greater strategic alignment (Glaister et al., 2021; Sumelius et al., 2020).

However, the exclusive model has been widely critiqued for its potential negative consequences. One of the primary concerns relates to issues of fairness and organizational justice. By focusing disproportionately on a select group of employees, organizations may inadvertently create perceptions of inequality and exclusion among the broader workforce (Crowley-Henry & Al Ariss, 2018; Hassan et al., 2022). Such perceptions can lead to reduced employee engagement, lower job satisfaction, and increased turnover intentions among those not identified as “talent” (Kravariti & Johnston, 2020; Jooss et al., 2021). Furthermore, the process of identifying talent itself is often subjective and susceptible to biases, raising questions about transparency and meritocracy in organizational decision-making (Tyskbo, 2021; Clark-Ambrosini et al., 2023).

In response to these criticisms, an alternative inclusive approach to talent management has gained traction in recent years. This perspective challenges the notion that only a small subset of employees possesses valuable talent, instead advocating that all individuals have the potential to contribute meaningfully to organizational success. Inclusive talent management emphasizes equal access to development opportunities, continuous learning, and employee empowerment (Meyers et al., 2020; Gallardo-Gallardo et al., 2020). This approach aligns closely with contemporary organizational values related to diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI), which have become increasingly important in globalized and multicultural work environments (Metcalf et al., 2020; Mousa et al., 2022).

The literature highlights several advantages associated with inclusive talent management practices. Organizations that adopt inclusive strategies often benefit from higher levels of employee engagement, stronger organizational commitment, and enhanced collaboration (Mahfoozi et al., 2018; Pantouvakis & Karakasnaki, 2017). By fostering a culture of continuous development, inclusive approaches can also support innovation and adaptability, particularly in dynamic and uncertain environments (Bonneton et al., 2022; Usanova et al., 2022). Moreover, inclusive talent management can contribute to employer branding and organizational reputation, making firms more attractive to a diverse pool of talent (Baker et al., 2018; Boada-Cuerva et al., 2019).

Despite these benefits, inclusive approaches are not without limitations. Critics argue that treating all employees as equally valuable in terms of talent development may lead to inefficient allocation of resources and reduced strategic focus (Gallardo-Gallardo et al., 2020; Jooss et al., 2021). In highly competitive industries, organizations may struggle to maintain performance standards if they do not differentiate between varying levels of employee capability and potential. Additionally, the implementation of inclusive talent management requires significant investment in training and development infrastructure, which may not be feasible for all organizations, particularly in resource-constrained settings (Othman & Khalil, 2020; Tobon & Luna-Nemecio, 2021).

Given the strengths and limitations of both approaches, recent scholarly work has increasingly focused on reconciling the inclusivity–exclusivity paradox. Rather than viewing these perspectives as mutually exclusive, researchers propose hybrid or differentiated models that integrate elements of both approaches (Meyers et al., 2020; Latukha, Shagalkina, et al., 2022). For example, organizations may adopt an inclusive philosophy at the organizational level by providing baseline development opportunities for all employees, while simultaneously implementing exclusive programs targeted at high-potential individuals or critical roles (Glaister et al., 2021; Lawless et al., 2019). This dual approach allows organizations to balance fairness with strategic prioritization, thereby addressing the limitations associated with each model.

The contextual dimension of talent management further complicates this paradox. Institutional, cultural, and economic factors play a significant role in shaping how organizations design and implement talent strategies. In emerging economies, for instance, institutional voids and labor market challenges often necessitate a more inclusive approach to workforce development, as organizations seek to build human capital from a relatively limited talent pool (Tobon & Luna-Nemecio, 2021; Latukha, Kriklivetc, et al., 2022). At the same time, competitive pressures may drive organizations to adopt selective practices to retain top performers, thereby reinforcing the tension between inclusivity and exclusivity (Holland & Scullion, 2021; Hassan et al., 2022).

Cultural factors also influence perceptions of talent and fairness. In collectivist societies, inclusive approaches may be more readily accepted, as they align with values of equality and group harmony (Mousa et al., 2022). In contrast, individualistic cultures may place greater emphasis on meritocracy and performance differentiation, thereby supporting exclusive talent management practices (Crowley-Henry & Al Ariss, 2018). These cultural variations highlight the need for context-sensitive talent management frameworks that can accommodate diverse organizational and societal expectations.

Another important dimension in the literature relates to the impact of technological advancements on talent management practices. The increasing adoption of digital technologies, artificial intelligence, and data analytics has transformed how organizations identify, assess, and develop talent (Bonneton et al., 2022; Usanova et al., 2022). These technologies enable more objective and data-driven decision-making, potentially reducing biases associated with talent identification. At the same time, they also create new challenges and underscore the importance of inclusive development strategies.

Moreover, the evolving nature of work—characterized by remote working arrangements, gig employment, and flexible career paths—has blurred traditional boundaries of talent management (Clark-Ambrosini et al., 2023; Orlando et al., 2022). Organizations are increasingly required to manage diverse talent pools that extend beyond traditional full-time employees, necessitating more flexible and adaptive approaches. This shift further underscores the relevance of integrating inclusivity and exclusivity within talent management frameworks.

In summary, the literature on talent management reveals a complex and dynamic interplay between inclusive and exclusive approaches, each offering distinct advantages and challenges. While exclusive strategies emphasize efficiency and performance optimization, inclusive approaches prioritize equity, engagement, and long-term sustainability. Recent research suggests that the future of talent management lies in the ability of organizations to navigate this paradox through contextually informed and strategically balanced approaches. As knowledge economies continue to evolve, understanding and addressing the inclusivity–exclusivity tension will remain critical for both theoretical advancement and practical application in the field of talent management (Al Jawali et al., 2022; Baker et al., 2018; Boada-Cuerva et al., 2019).

Table 1: Literature Review Table

Author(s) & Year	Title / Focus	Methodology	Key Findings	Relevance to Study
Gallardo-Gallardo et al. (2020)	Conceptualizing talent management	Systematic literature review	Identifies inclusive vs exclusive approaches	Establishes theoretical foundation of TM and

			highlights definitional ambiguity	TM paradox
Glaister et al. (2021)	Talent management and firm performance	Empirical (survey-based)	Exclusive TM linked with higher performance outcomes	Supports efficiency argument of exclusivity
Meyers et al. (2020)	Inclusive talent philosophy	Conceptual framework	Advocates that all employees possess talent and should be developed	Provides basis for inclusivity perspective
Bui & Chang (2018)	Strategic talent segmentation	Empirical study	Focus on high-potential employees improves organizational competitiveness	Reinforces exclusive TM logic
Crowley-Henry & Al Ariss (2018)	Talent management and workforce diversity	Conceptual analysis	Exclusive TM can create inequality and marginalization	Highlights ethical and fairness concerns
Kravariti & Johnston (2020)	Employee perceptions of TM	Qualitative study	Perceived injustice reduces engagement among non-selected employees	Shows negative impact of exclusivity
Jooss et al. (2021)	Talent identification practices	Mixed-method	Subjectivity and bias in identifying talent pools	Questions reliability of exclusive TM
Metcalf et al. (2020)	Diversity and inclusive TM	Conceptual study	Inclusive TM enhances diversity, innovation, and organizational culture	Links TM with DEI frameworks
Bonneton et al. (2022)	Digital transformation and TM	Empirical analysis	Technology reshapes talent identification and development processes	Adds modern context to TM strategies
Latukha et al. (2022)	Global talent management in emerging markets	Comparative study	Hybrid TM approaches are more effective across contexts	Supports integration of inclusivity & exclusivity

METHODOLOGY

This study adopts a theoretical and conceptual research design to examine the paradox of inclusivity versus exclusivity in talent management within knowledge economies. Given the abstract and multidimensional nature of the research problem, a qualitative, literature-driven methodology is considered most appropriate. The study primarily relies on an extensive review and synthesis of existing scholarly literature to develop a conceptual understanding of talent management approaches and their implications (Meyers et al., 2020; Gallardo-Gallardo et al., 2020).

The research follows a systematic literature review approach, wherein peer-reviewed journal articles, books, and conference papers related to talent management, inclusivity, exclusivity, and knowledge economies were carefully selected. Databases such as Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar were used to identify relevant studies published over the past decade, ensuring both relevance and academic rigor. Key inclusion criteria involved studies that explicitly discuss talent management philosophies, organizational strategies, or workforce implications in knowledge-intensive contexts (Glaister et al., 2021; Jooss et al.,

2021). This approach allows for a comprehensive understanding of the evolution of talent management theories and practices. To analyze the collected literature, the study employs a thematic analysis technique, which involves identifying recurring patterns, concepts, and debates across the selected studies. Themes such as exclusive talent identification, inclusive workforce development, organizational performance, employee perceptions, and contextual influences were systematically coded and categorized (Kravariti & Johnston, 2020; Crowley-Henry & Al Ariss, 2018). This process facilitates the comparison and integration of diverse perspectives within the literature.

Furthermore, the study utilizes a conceptual synthesis method to reconcile conflicting viewpoints and develop an integrative framework that captures the coexistence of inclusivity and exclusivity in talent management. This method enables the formulation of theoretical propositions regarding how organizations can balance equity and efficiency in managing talent (Latukha, Shagalkina, et al., 2022; Lawless et al., 2019). Overall, this methodology is suitable for theory-building research, as it emphasizes critical analysis, conceptual clarity, and synthesis of existing knowledge rather than empirical testing, thereby contributing to the advancement of talent management literature in knowledge economies.

DISCUSSION

The findings from the reviewed literature highlight that the paradox of inclusivity versus exclusivity in talent management is not a binary opposition but rather a dynamic tension that organizations must continuously navigate. In knowledge economies, where innovation, adaptability, and intellectual capital are critical, both approaches offer distinct yet interdependent advantages. The discussion thus moves beyond the traditional dichotomy and emphasizes the need for a more integrative and context-sensitive understanding of talent management.

Exclusive talent management practices remain highly relevant in knowledge-intensive environments due to their strategic focus on high-potential and high-performing individuals. Organizations operating in competitive sectors often rely on a small group of key employees who drive innovation and value creation. As noted in prior studies, investing in such individuals can lead to enhanced organizational performance, stronger leadership pipelines, and sustained competitive advantage (Glaister et al., 2021; Bui & Chang, 2018). This supports the argument that differentiation in talent investment is necessary, particularly when resources are limited and performance pressures are high. However, the discussion also reveals that over-reliance on exclusivity can generate unintended consequences, including employee disengagement, reduced morale, and perceptions of organizational injustice among those excluded from talent pools (Kravariti & Johnston, 2020; Hassan et al., 2022).

On the other hand, inclusive talent management aligns closely with contemporary organizational values such as diversity, equity, and inclusion, which are increasingly seen as drivers of innovation and long-term sustainability. Inclusive approaches foster a culture where all employees are encouraged to develop their skills and contribute to organizational goals. This not only enhances employee engagement and commitment but also enables organizations to tap into a broader range of perspectives and capabilities (Meyers et al., 2020; Metcalfe et al., 2020). In knowledge economies, where creativity and collaboration are essential, such inclusivity can be a significant advantage. Nevertheless, the discussion indicates that a purely inclusive approach may lack strategic focus, potentially leading to inefficient allocation of resources and difficulties in maintaining high performance standards (Gallardo-Gallardo et al., 2020; Jooss et al., 2021).

A key insight emerging from the literature is the growing recognition of hybrid or differentiated talent management approaches. Rather than choosing between inclusivity and exclusivity, organizations are increasingly adopting strategies that combine elements of both. For instance, organizations may implement inclusive policies that provide baseline development opportunities for all employees while simultaneously offering exclusive programs for high-potential individuals or those in critical roles (Latukha, Shagalkina, et al., 2022; Lawless et al., 2019). This dual approach helps balance fairness with strategic prioritization, thereby addressing the limitations associated with each model. The discussion suggests that such hybrid frameworks are particularly effective in complex and dynamic environments, where organizational needs and workforce expectations are constantly evolving.

The role of context emerges as a crucial factor in shaping talent management practices. Institutional environments, cultural norms, and economic conditions significantly influence how inclusivity and exclusivity are perceived and implemented. In emerging economies, for example, organizations often face skill shortages and institutional constraints, which may necessitate more inclusive approaches to workforce development (Tobon & Luna-Nemecio, 2021; Othman & Khalil, 2020). At the same time, global competition compels firms to identify and retain top talent, reinforcing the need for selective investment. Similarly, cultural differences affect employee perceptions of fairness and meritocracy. In collectivist cultures, inclusive approaches may be more acceptable, whereas individualistic cultures may favor performance-based differentiation (Mousa et al., 2022; Crowley-Henry & Al Ariss, 2018).

Technological advancements further complicate the inclusivity–exclusivity paradox. The integration of digital tools, artificial intelligence, and data analytics in talent management has transformed how organizations identify and develop talent. These technologies enable more objective and data-driven decision-making, potentially reducing biases associated with traditional talent identification processes (Bonneton et al., 2022; Usanova et al., 2022). However, they also create new challenges, such as skill obsolescence and the need for continuous upskilling, which reinforce the importance of inclusive development strategies. At the same time, digital platforms allow organizations to more precisely target high-potential individuals, thereby strengthening exclusive practices.

Another important dimension highlighted in the discussion is the evolving nature of work. The rise of remote work, gig employment, and flexible career paths has expanded the boundaries of talent management beyond traditional organizational structures (Clark-Ambrosini et al., 2023; Orlando et al., 2022). Organizations must now manage diverse and fluid talent pools, which requires more adaptive and flexible approaches. This shift underscores the importance of integrating inclusivity and exclusivity in a way that accommodates both organizational objectives and employee expectations.

Overall, the discussion suggests that the paradox of talent management should not be viewed as a problem to be resolved but as a strategic tension to be managed. Organizations that can effectively balance inclusivity and exclusivity are more likely to achieve sustainable performance, foster innovation, and maintain employee engagement. The ability to navigate this paradox depends on contextual awareness, strategic alignment, and the adoption of flexible talent management frameworks. Thus, the study contributes to the literature by emphasizing the need for a nuanced and integrative perspective on talent management in knowledge economies (Al Jawali et al., 2022; Baker et al., 2018; Boada-Cuerva et al., 2019).

CONCLUSION

The present study set out to examine the paradox of inclusivity versus exclusivity in talent management within the context of knowledge economies, where human capital serves as a primary driver of organizational success. The review and synthesis of existing literature reveal that this paradox is deeply embedded in both theory and practice, reflecting competing priorities of equity and efficiency. Rather than representing mutually exclusive approaches, inclusivity and exclusivity emerge as complementary dimensions that must be strategically balanced to achieve sustainable organizational outcomes.

The findings indicate that exclusive talent management remains a dominant and strategically significant approach, particularly in knowledge-intensive industries where high-performing individuals contribute disproportionately to innovation and competitive advantage. By focusing resources on a select group of high-potential employees, organizations can enhance performance, strengthen leadership pipelines, and maintain strategic alignment (Glaister et al., 2021; Bui & Chang, 2018). However, this approach is not without limitations. The literature consistently highlights concerns related to fairness, employee morale, and organizational justice, as the exclusion of a broader workforce from development opportunities can lead to disengagement and reduced commitment (Kravariti & Johnston, 2020; Hassan et al., 2022).

Conversely, inclusive talent management offers a more egalitarian perspective, emphasizing that all employees possess valuable potential and should be provided with opportunities for growth and development. This approach aligns with modern organizational priorities such as diversity, equity, and inclusion, and has been shown to enhance employee engagement, collaboration, and innovation (Meyers et al., 2020; Metcalfe et al., 2020). Inclusive strategies are particularly relevant in diverse and dynamic work environments, where leveraging a wide range of skills and perspectives is essential for adaptability and long-term sustainability. Nevertheless, the literature suggests that purely inclusive approaches may lack strategic focus and could lead to inefficient resource allocation, particularly in highly competitive contexts (Gallardo-Gallardo et al., 2020; Jooss et al., 2021).

A key contribution of this study lies in highlighting the growing importance of hybrid or differentiated talent management approaches. The integration of inclusive and exclusive elements allows organizations to balance fairness with performance optimization. For instance, providing baseline development opportunities for all employees while simultaneously investing in high-potential individuals or critical roles can help organizations address both ethical and strategic considerations (Latukha, Shagalkina, et al., 2022; Lawless et al., 2019). Such approaches reflect a shift from rigid dichotomies toward more flexible and context-sensitive frameworks.

The study underscores the role of contextual factors in shaping talent management practices. Institutional environments, cultural norms, and economic conditions significantly influence how organizations interpret and implement inclusivity and exclusivity. In emerging economies, resource constraints and skill gaps often necessitate a balanced approach that supports both workforce development and strategic talent retention (Tobon & Luna-Nemecio, 2021; Othman & Khalil, 2020). Similarly, technological advancements and evolving work arrangements are redefining talent management, requiring organizations to adopt more adaptive and data-driven strategies (Bonneton et al., 2022; Usanova et al., 2022).

In conclusion, the paradox of inclusivity versus exclusivity should not be viewed as a dilemma to be resolved but as a strategic tension to be managed. Organizations that can effectively navigate this tension are better positioned to foster innovation, enhance employee engagement, and achieve long-term sustainability. The study contributes to the theoretical

advancement of talent management by advocating for an integrative perspective that recognizes the coexistence and interdependence of inclusive and exclusive approaches. Future research may further explore empirical validations of hybrid models and examine their applicability across different organizational and cultural contexts (Al Jawali et al., 2022; Baker et al., 2018; Boada-Cuerva et al., 2019).

REFERENCES

1. Al Jawali, H., Darwish, T. K., Scullion, H., & Haak-Saheem, W. (2022). Talent management in the public sector: empirical evidence from the Emerging Economy of Dubai. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 33(11), 2256–2284. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2021.2001764>
2. Baker, J., Schorer, J., & Wattie, N. (2018). Compromising Talent: Issues in Identifying and Selecting Talent in Sport. *Quest*, 70(1), 48–63. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00336297.2017.1333438>
3. Boada-Cuerva, M., Trullen, J., & Valverde, M. (2019). Top management: the missing stakeholder in the HRM literature. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 30(1), 63–95. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2018.1479878>
4. Bonneton, D., Schworm, S. K., Festing, M., & Muratbekova-Touron, M. (2022). Do global talent management programs help to retain talent? A career-related framework. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 33(2), 203–238. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2019.1683048>
5. Bui, L. T. T., & Chang, Y. (2018). Talent management and turnover intention: focus on Danang city government in Vietnam. *International Review of Public Administration*, 23(4), 219–236. <https://doi.org/10.1080/12294659.2018.1552403>
6. Clark-Ambrosini, J. L., Ashleigh, M. J., Higgs, M., & Baruch, Y. (2023). Quid pro quo? The future for graduate development programmes through the lens of talent management. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 34(17), 3253–3276. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2022.2117991>
7. Cross Walker, T. (2020). Inclusive talent management in the public sector: theory and practice. *Transnational Corporations Review*, 12(2), 140–148. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19186444.2020.1741296>
8. Crowley-Henry, M., & Al Ariss, A. (2018). Talent management of skilled migrants: propositions and an agenda for future research. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 29(13), 2054–2079. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2016.1262889>
9. Galdino, K. M., Kiggundu, M. N., Jones, C. D., & Ro, S. (2018). The Informal Economy in pan-Africa: Review of the Literature, Themes, Questions, and Directions for Management Research1. *Africa Journal of Management*, 4(3), 225–258. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23322373.2018.1517542>
10. Gallardo-Gallardo, E., Thunnissen, M., & Scullion, H. (2020). Talent management: context matters. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 31(4), 457–473. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2019.1642645>
11. Gibb, S., & Zhang, S. (2017). Guanxi influence and talent management in Chinese organisations; evidence from the real estate sector. *Human Resource Development International*, 20(1), 79–98. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13678868.2016.1240394>

12. Glaister, A. J., Al Amri, R., & Spicer, D. P. (2021). Talent management: managerial sense making in the wake of Omanization. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 32(3), 719–737.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2018.1496128>
13. Hassan, Y., Pandey, J., Varkkey, B., Sethi, D., & Scullion, H. (2022). Understanding talent management for sports organizations - Evidence from an emerging country. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 33(11), 2192–2225.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2021.1971736>
14. Hegde, N., Elias, M., Lamers, H. A. H., & Hegde, M. (2017). Engaging local communities in social learning for inclusive management of native fruit trees in the Central Western Ghats, India. *Forests, Trees and Livelihoods*, 26(1), 65–83.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14728028.2016.1257398>
15. Holland, D., & Scullion, H. (2021). Towards a talent retention model: mapping the building blocks of the psychological contract to the three stages of the acquisition process. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 32(13), 2683–2728. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2019.1569546>
16. Jooss, S., McDonnell, A., & Burbach, R. (2021). Talent designation in practice: an equation of high potential, performance and mobility. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 32(21), 4551–4577.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2019.1686651>
17. Kravariti, F., & Johnston, K. (2020). Talent management: a critical literature review and research agenda for public sector human resource management. *Public Management Review*, 22(1), 75–95. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2019.1638439>
18. Latukha, M., Kriklivetc, A., & Podgainyi, F. (2022). Generation Diverse Talent Management Practices: Main Determinants and its Influence on Firm Performance. *Journal of East-West Business*, 28(4), 291–322.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10669868.2022.2074186>
19. Latukha, M., Shagalkina, M., Mitskevich, E., & Strogetskaia, E. (2022). From brain drain to brain gain: the agenda for talent management in overcoming talent migration from emerging markets. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 33(11), 2226–2255. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2021.1949374>
20. Lawless, A., Panya, F., O'Brien, S., & Kok, S. (2019). Talk-about talent: underlying philosophies on talent in Thai SMEs. *Human Resource Development International*, 22(5), 553–572. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13678868.2019.1656988>
21. Lopes, S. A. (2016). High performers are not superheroes: bridging exclusive and inclusive talent management approaches for law firm sustainability. *International Journal of the Legal Profession*, 23(2), 207–231.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09695958.2016.1176924>
22. Mahfoozi, A., Salajegheh, S., Ghorbani, M., & Sheikhi, A. (2018). Developing a talent management model using government evidence from a large-sized city, Iran. *Cogent Business & Management*, 5(1), 1449290.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2018.1449290>
23. McCracken, M., Currie, D., & Harrison, J. (2016). Understanding graduate recruitment, development and retention for the enhancement of talent management: sharpening ‘the edge’ of graduate talent. *The International Journal of Human*

- Resource Management*, 27(22), 2727–2752.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2015.1102159>
24. Metcalfe, B. D., Makarem, Y., & Afiouni, F. (2020). Macro talent management theorizing: transnational perspectives of the political economy of talent formation in the Arab Middle East. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 32(1), 147–182. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2020.1819858>
25. Meyers, M. C., van Woerkom, M., Paauwe, J., & Dries, N. (2020). HR managers' talent philosophies: prevalence and relationships with perceived talent management practices. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 31(4), 562–588. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2019.1579747>
26. Mousa, M., Massoud, H. K., Ayoubi, R. M., & Murtaza, G. (2022). Why Him Not ME? Inclusive/Exclusive Talent Identification in Academic Public Context. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 45(10), 747–759. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2021.1887217>
27. Orlando, B., Tortora, D., Riso, T., Di Gregorio, A., & Del Giudice, M. (2022). Entrepreneurial intentions and high-status seeking in career expectations: a portrait of talents in emerging countries. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 33(11), 2339–2372. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2021.1875495>
28. Othman, A. A. E., & Khalil, M. H. M. (2020). A lean talent management framework for maximizing creativity in architectural design firms. *International Journal of Construction Management*, 20(5), 520–533. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15623599.2018.1490865>
29. Pantouvakis, A., & Karakasnaki, M. (2017). Role of the human talent in total quality management–performance relationship: an investigation in the transport sector. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 28(9–10), 959–973. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14783363.2017.1303873>
30. Pantouvakis, A., & Karakasnaki, M. (2018). The human talent and its role in ISM Code effectiveness and competitiveness in the shipping industry. *Maritime Policy & Management*, 45(5), 649–664. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03088839.2018.1454989>
31. Son, J., Park, O., Bae, J., & Ok, C. (2020). Double-edged effect of talent management on organizational performance: the moderating role of HRM investments. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 31(17), 2188–2216. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2018.1443955>
32. Sumelius, J., Smale, A., & Yamao, S. (2020). Mixed signals: employee reactions to talent status communication amidst strategic ambiguity. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 31(4), 511–538. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2018.1500388>
33. Tayyaba, T., Ansari, H., & Faisal, B. (2022). Gender and class in the imagined educational spaces in Pakistani primary school textbooks: a challenge for inclusivity agenda. *Cogent Education*, 9(1), 2146858. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2022.2146858>
34. Tobon, S., & Luna-Nemecio, J. (2021). Proposal for a new talent concept based on socioformation. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 53(1), 21–33. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2020.1725885>

35. Tyskbo, D. (2021). Competing institutional logics in talent management: talent identification at the HQ and a subsidiary. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 32(10), 2150–2184.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2019.1579248>
36. Usanova, K., Géraudel, M., d'Armagnac, S., & Telitsyna, A. (2022). Managing talent in mission-driven organizations: a qualitative exploration. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 33(19), 3879–3912.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2021.1937276>