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Abstract

Purpose – This paper focuses on 3 Egyptian public business schools in an attempt to explore the effect of inclusive/exclusive talent management on the organizational downsizing of academics and the mediating role of responsible leadership.

Design/ methodology/ approach – A total of 330 academics were contacted and given a set of questionnaires. After three follow ups, a total of 240 responses were collected with a response rate of 72.73 percent. Multiple regressions were employed to show how much variation in organizational downsizing can be explained by inclusive/exclusive talent management and responsible leadership.

Findings – The findings highlighted a very weak statistical association between academics’ inclusive talent management and organizational downsizing, whereas a strong statistical association has been discovered between exclusive talent management and organizational downsizing. Statistical analysis showed that responsible leadership has no role in mediating the relationship between inclusive/exclusive talent management of academics and their downsizing.

Research limitations/ implications – The authors have focused on only 3 Egyptian public business schools, the matter that may limit opportunities to generalize the results of this study to private business schools and other faculties in Egypt. Future research could use a double source method.

Practical implications – By preparing a set of academic competences, business schools will be able to classify their academic staff into talented and non-talented, and accordingly they can initiate their tailored downsizing strategies. Furthermore, undertaking a responsible strategy of downsizing, which includes and is not limited to justifying the need to decrease academic staff numbers to guarantee post-redundancy care practices for laid-off academics may alleviate many of the negative psychological, societal and economic consequences of downsizing.

Originality/ value – This paper contributes by filling a gap in HR management and higher education literature, in which empirical studies on the relationship between talent management and academics’ organizational downsizing have been limited until now. This may create better research opportunities for cross-disciplinary papers that should be done by HR, higher education and leadership scholars.
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Introduction

Today’s work-life has become flexible, dynamic and unpredictable. Accordingly, many public and private organizations have paid full attention to their people and considered them the main capital they can utilize for the betterment of their present and future (Brown et al., 2003; Nilson & Ellstrom, 2012). Florida (2005) indicates that the main condition for organizational survival is securing talented employees, who have the expertise to track market changes and serve their various stakeholders. Therefore, talent acquisition managers have become real organizational partners in current local and global business environments (Alvesson & Karreman, 2007).
In his study, Sennett (2006) highlights that ongoing advancement in information technology and innovation are considered the main reasons behind the prompt calls for talents which have gradually contributed to the emergence of the concept “intensive war of talents”. Hendriks, Ligthart & Schoutenten (2016) indicated that the constitution of very specialized centers and industry-related units in many sectors has supported this war of talents. This matter that asserts a need for collaboration between international organizations, national authorities, academics and social actors to spot, recruit, hire, develop and retain talented figures who can positively affect the competitiveness of their organizations, their local economy, and international peace (Peeters, Denoij & Friele, 2014).

Academically, a growing interest in talent management has been noticed over the past decade. However, there is what looks like a scarcity of empirical studies conducted on this topic even though the concept “talent” is not new (Collings, 2014). Hughes & Rog (2008) highlights that the importance of talent management derives from its role not only in recruiting and retaining calibers who have the necessary competences needed for an organization’s growth but also in enhancing employee engagement which is “an emotional and intellectual connection an employee has for his/her job, organization, manager, or co-workers that in turn influences him/her to apply additional discretionary effort to his/her work” (Gibbons, 2006, p. 5). According to, previous literature on talent management can be classified into 3 main categories (Fegley, 2006; Lewis & Heckman, 2006; Tansley et al., 2006). The first considers talent management as part of traditional HR practices which mainly involve recruiting, selecting, hiring, developing, deploying, assessing and retaining personnel. The second category pays attention to a constitution of a pool of talented employees to guarantee the continuous supply of exceptional employees. The third category focuses on identifying the key competencies that an organization needs to sustain its survival and growth. However, Burbach & Royle (2010) question which is more beneficial to organization: making or buying talented staff. Tettey (2010) asserts that managing talented personnel is a cost-cutting strategy as recruiting others who have the same level of expertise from outside the organization may yield an unbearable cost.

In another perspective and for their survival and continuity, many organizations adopt various strategies that entail considerable adaptability to both their internal and external surrounding environments (Sutton, 2009). Downsizing is considered one of the main strategies different organizations have undertaken over the past two decades (Tsai & Yen, 2008). Farrell and Mavondo (2005) elaborate that downsizing has been developed as a significant component of strategic management and draws its importance from the effect it has on several organizational outcomes such as innovation efforts, productivity, financial costs and firm reputation (Datta et al., 2010). Downsizing can be defined as a cost-controlling strategy adopted to increase organizational efficiency and avoid potential bankruptcy (Gandolfi, 2004). Macky (2004) considers that mergers and acquisitions, technological shifts, cost reductions and environmental changes such as competition, privatization, legalization demands and the dominance of foreign direct investments are the main driving forces behind any downsizing decisions. It is worth mentioning that little attention has been paid to the topic of downsizing among management scholars (Datta et al., 2010). Moreover, the rarity of studies on this topic in Middle-Eastern organizational contexts has also been noted (Dalen & Henkens, 2013).

Based on the aforementioned, this paper seeks to fill in a gap in both HR and higher education literature by exploring the effect of inclusive/exclusive talent management on academics’ organizational downsizing with and without the mediating the role of responsible leadership in an unresearched context.
The impetus of this research derives from its focus on academics in the Egyptian public business schools which provides the lowest quality for management education globally according to 2017’s global competitiveness report (http://www3.weforum.org). The remainder of this paper is structured as follows: the authors start first by the literature review, followed by methodology, then results and end by discussion and implications.

1. Literature review

1.1 inclusive/exclusive talent management and organizational downsizing

In academic arenas, Martins (2010) indicates that academics are considered talented as they possess knowledge, experience, skills, and other exceptional capabilities that can be used for the betterment of both their organization and society. Drucker (2001) and Dube & Ngulube (2013) label academics as golden workers because of the valuable and irreplaceable credentials and experience they have. Abu Said, Rosdi, Abu Samh, Silong & Sulaiman (2015) clarify that the main areas academics should contribute to are: supervising students, publishing, consulting, and engaging in commercialization activities on behalf of their universities. Winefield et al. (2003) elaborate that in academia, job responsibilities generate feelings of work stress more than in any other profession. This subsequently affects academics’ performance, job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Accordingly, academics’ perception of both written and unwritten obligations of their universities is so important in determining their work attitude and the continuity of their employment relationships (Shen, 2010). Dries (2013) and Collings (2014) consider that talented members’ level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the talent management strategy of their organization is impacted by the psychological contract they have with their organization and that closely moderates members’ loyalty, citizenship behavior and turnover intentions.

Like other sectors across the nation, the higher educational sector is currently facing the challenges of an ageing population, increased immigration and financial cuts (Caiazza & Volpe, 2015a; Caiazza, 2016; Van den Broek et al., 2018). Hendriks, Ligthart and Schoutenten (2016) add that the emergence of cross-disciplinary academic units and ongoing advancements in information technology are also considered challenges that promptly and continuously need a kind of collaboration between public officials, academics and social actors to strike a balance between academic affairs and socially responsible behavior. Martin et al. (2016) and Caiazza and Ferrara (2016) consider academics as talented personnel as they possess competencies and exceptional capabilities that can be utilized for the betterment of their universities and societies. The same has been highlighted by Drucker (2001) who asserts that academics fit into the golden worker category as they supervise students, do and publish research, provide consulting services and contribute to their universities’ academic rank. As a result, they constantly suffer from more work stress than those who hold traditional positions. Abu Said et al. (2015) also confirm that an academician’s work of increasing the number of Master’s and PhD holders, supporting graduates’ capabilities and providing business consultation when needed constitutes an effective basis for classifying him or her as a “talented or elite member”.

According to Scullion et al. (2010), talent management is the systematic identification, selection, hiring, developing and retaining of talents. Tansley (2011) highlights that talent management has 2 approaches. The first is the inclusive approach which targets and absorbs the talents of all employees within a particular organizational context. The second is the exclusive approach which selects a specific group of employees who play a major role in deciding their organization’s current and future achievements. The studies of Cross & Thomas (2008) and Vaiman & Vance (2008) indicate that talent management is
located within the domain of HR functions. Based on the aforementioned, The exclusive approach narrows the scope of organizational training, support and learning to only elite/high performers who constitute at most 20% of the organization’s staff whereas, the egalitarian inclusive approach treats all organization’s staff as talents and prioritizes a detailed set of competences for them to learn and experience. The decision to adopt either exclusive or inclusive approaches on talent management is mostly based on organizational cultural context and the subsequent tensions that may come as a result to this decision (Brewster, 2004).

Furthermore, in order to have a more comprehensive view of talent management practices, it is preferable to consider that stakeholder theory organizes the relationship between organizational leaders and stakeholders including employees, and hence provides a more comprehensive understanding of talent management practices. According to stakeholder theory, business leaders try to build and maintain sustainable relationships with various stakeholders including employees. Accordingly, any organizational decision-making process should consider the needs of its various stakeholders. This theory explains why organization’s leaders devote considerable attention towards organizational inclusion, organizational justice and workplace equality (Maak and Pless, 2006).

In another perspective organizational downsizing as a strategy appeared in the late 1980s and has more recently become one of the most preferred mechanisms for improving organizational efficiency particularly in times of economic downturn (Minda, 1997). Downsizing is defined as a “planned set of organizational policies and practices aimed at workforce reduction with the goal of improving firm performance (Datta et al., 2010, p. 282). It can also be referred to as practices an organization may use to reduce the size of its workforce in a specific organizational setting (Drumea, 2017). Downsizing mostly aims to alleviate organizational costs, improve work productivity or prepare a specific organization for an acquisition, merger or for liquidation. In addition, downsizing decisions entail the ethical problems associated with deciding who is to leave? Based on what criteria does the organization select who to cut and who to keep? How to make downsizing decisions and at the same time care about the psychological feelings of those who will be laid-off? And how to absorb the reactions and/or other related consequences for both the victims and the survivors?

Downsizing decisions are difficult in private sector organizations. However, these decisions could be even more challenging in universities due to their particular nature (e.g. organizational structure, financial mechanism, work culture, nature of services and societal role). Due to the negative social, psychological and economic impact on laid off employees and their families, some scholars have researched responsible downsizing strategies (Porter, 1980; Cameron, 1994; Shah, 2000; Fisher & White, 2000 and Cascio, 2002) and the various ways these affect both the laid-off and the survivors. Appelbaum and Putton (2002) have reflected that both negative or positive outcomes of downsizing decisions rely mostly on the planning period or behaviour the organization undertakes before implementing the intended downsizing strategy. In the case of public universities, the situation is even more difficult because they mostly rely on public funding in addition to other financial sources such as tuition fees and donations (Appelbaum & Putton, 2002). Therefore, downsizing or similar economic decisions directly affect the general public. To the best of the authors’ knowledge, no previous studies have addressed the relationship between inclusive/exclusive talent management and organizational downsizing. Accordingly, the following are the first 2 hypotheses.

1A: Inclusive talent management affects academics’ organizational downsizing.
1B: Exclusive talent management affects academics’ organizational downsizing.
As a result to 2008’s global economic crisis and its subsequent corporate scandals, many management thinkers and even Western governments have tended to actively evaluate the practices of middle, senior and executive managers in several big companies in an attempt to rebuild the missing trust in leaders (Edelman, 2012). This also was also accompanied by stages of changing the values of Western communities (Inglehart, 2008). Accordingly, businesses have lately started to absorb their social desired roles and responded to their surrounding societal needs (Carrasco, 2007). The matter that becomes material not only because of the many illegal acts and irresponsible behavior exhibited by companies like Enron, WorldCom and Tyco but also because of seeing business leaders as amoral and corrupt (Fry & Slocum, 2008). Consequently, business leaders find themselves with no option but to engage in more social responsible behavior, extending their in-out organization’s relationships, paying more attention to the concept “ethics” in their daily and strategic dealings and showing more interest in resolving general public related challenges such as alleviating poverty, safeguarding human rights, sponsoring public hospitals, caring more about environmental protection and etc. (Maak, 2007; Choi & Aguilera, 2009; Voegtlin et al., 2011; Spreitzer et al., 2012; Tanimura & Okamoto, 2013). The aforementioned may justify, to a big extent, the development and later utilization of the concept “responsible leadership” in both business and organizational settings over the past decade.

Authors like Aguilera et al. (2007); Puffer et al., (2010); Voegtlin et al., (2012); Husted et al. (2012); Wang et al. (2015); Caiazza and Volpe (2015b); Antunes and Franco (2016) and Witt & Stahl (2016) consider ethics to be the essence or maybe forefront of responsible leadership thought and practices. Furthermore, engaging in socially responsible exercises has a positive impact on firm’s environmentally awareness plans (Aguilera et al., 2007), corporate financial performance (Wang et al., 2015) and companies’ reputation and rebranding (Turban & Greening, 1997). Brown & Trevino (2006) and Waldman (2011) indicate that the concept ‘responsible leadership’ represents a combination of ethics, CSR and leadership, and it focuses more on leaders’ acts at higher levels of organization while ethical leadership addresses leaders-followers relationships and the effect of their interactions on followers’ behavior, satisfaction, loyalty, performance and etc. The context of responsible leadership involves both internal and external stakeholders. Therefore, the social obligations of an organization are constantly difficult to be defined particularly because defining and later fulfilling societal obligations assume a trade-off between the shareholders’ wealth maximizing behavior and other stakeholders’ desired requests (Henriques & Richardson, 2012; Pless et al., 2012; Miska et al., 2014). This illustrates why the scope of socially responsible behavior differs from one firm to another and also from a leader to another.

For Brown & Trevino (2006); Waldman & Galvin (2008); Cameron (2011), Mousa (2017) and Mousa (2018 a, b) responsibility means capabilities, skills and obligation to act correctly. Therefore, responsible leaders should have authority and resources to build trusted relationships with their organization’s stakeholders and subsequently work closely with them to create a shared set of societal purposes. The studies of (Den Hartog, 2008; Kolk, 2008; Morgan et al., 2009; Kok & Pinkse, 2010; Asif et al., 2011; Mousa & Alas, 2016 a, b) assert that responsible leadership includes an overlap of legitimate and ethical practices that leaders and stakeholders share when fulfilling some predetermined social obligations that would increasing the welfare of their shared society. Accordingly the second two hypotheses are the following.

- **2A**: Responsible leadership mediates the relationship between inclusive talent management and academics’ organizational downsizing.
2B: Responsible leadership mediates the relationship between exclusive talent management and academics’ organizational downsizing.

2. Methodology

The conceptual framework of the present quantitative study was drawn from previous literature conducted separately on talent management, responsible leadership and organizational downsizing. To the best of the authors’ knowledge, the relationship between talent management, responsible leadership and organizational downsizing has not been addressed before particularly within the context of higher education. The study was conducted in 3 Egyptian public business schools located in Upper Egypt and the main reason for choosing these 3 schools was the authors’ relationships with a number of assistant lecturers and lecturers who work there. Moreover, the authors were motivated to deeply penetrate the Egyptian public business schools’ setting when touching on the low level of quality these schools provide. According to 2017’s global competitiveness report, an annual world economic forum, the quality of Egyptian management schools is the worst worldwide (http://www3.weforum.org ). Noticeably, in Egypt, management schools are known as business schools or faculties of commerce and the total number of Egyptian public business school is 24.

As elaborated, the authors targeted all academic members in the chosen schools and decided to employ a hierarchical multiple regression. In March 2018, they distributed 330 questionnaire forms and successfully collected 240 completed questionnaires in August 2018. And after four follow-ups, before distributing their questionnaire forms, the authors decided to rely on comprehensive count sampling in which a questionnaire form was handed to every member of the academic staff of the chosen schools. The authors only addressed three business schools. The choice of comprehensive count sampling secures that every academic is contacted and represented in the collected sample, and this reduces any possibility for bias. Moreover, the breakdown of the participants targeted to fill in the questionnaires is as follows: 32 full professors, 49 assistant professors, 84 lecturers, 110 assistant lecturers, and 55 teaching assistants. The authors managed to collect 240 out of the 330 distributed questionnaires. All distributed forms were in Arabic to match the abilities of all participants, and the authors took the responsibility of translating the collected material from Arabic into English. Moreover, comprehensive count sampling guarantees that every academic is contacted and represented in the collected sample, and this reduces any possibility of a bias.

Concerning the measures, the authors of this paper used Mousa’s (2018b) model of responsible leadership to prepare responsible leadership’s part of the questionnaire. Mousa’s (2018b) model has been developed based on a qualitative study by Antunes and Franco (2016) and includes the following four dimensions (the aggregate of virtues, stakeholders’ involvement, the model of leader’s roles and the principles of ethical values). Notably, the author did not need to change any of the items included in the model because it was originally adapted to fit the Egyptian context. For the second two variables: talent management and organizational downsizing, the authors found that they had not been previously researched and to the best of authors’ knowledge, there is no generally accepted model for them. Accordingly, the authors themselves had to develop their own models. However, the authors used the studies of (Cappelli, 2008; Scullion et al., 2010; Festing & Schafer, 2014) to design the scales of inclusive and exclusive talent management. Moreover, the authors prepared their model of organizational downsizing based on the
studies of (Cameron, 1994; Gandolfi, 2008; Cascio, 2010; Bragger et al., 2015). The following are the two models prepared by the authors.

The authors used Preacher & Hayes (2008) to employ responsible leadership as a mediator between talent management and the decision of organizational downsizing. According to Preacher & Hayes (2008) involving only one mediating variable to establish and/or activate the relationship between the independent and the dependent variable is known as simple mediation.

**Talent management**

**Inclusive talent management approach**

1) My school appreciates all academics regardless of their differences.
2) My school respects the uniqueness of academics.
3) My school treats all academics as insiders.
4) I did not feel any discrimination while working at my school.
5) My school recruits and develops all academics based on their qualifications.
6) Equality, tolerance and sameness are the main features of my school.

**Exclusive talent management approach**

1) My school includes only a few of its staff members (identified as talents) in training.
2) My school categorizes us as talents and non-talents.
3) My school offers its financial and non-financial benefits only to those recognized as talented staff.
4) My school supports only those who are identified as talented staff.
5) My school seeks to retain only those who are recognized as talented staff.
6) My school does not secure equality to all of its academic staff.

**Organizational downsizing**

1) My school considers laying off academic members as a source of income.
2) My school thinks that firing some of its staff members may enhance its academic quality.
3) My school does not see its academic staff members as an intellectual capital/asset.
4) My school is considering making its academic members work on a part time basis instead of full-time one.
5) My school encourages its academic members to retire early.
6) My school abuses me (cuts my wage, treats me unequally) to leave my position.

For all variables, a five-point likert scale of questions was formulated. Knowingly, in five-point likert scale 5 means strongly agree, 4 is agree, 3 is neutral, 2 is disagree and 1 is strongly disagree. Following is the reliability analysis for talent management, responsible leadership, and organizational downsizing using Cronbach’s alpha. The Cronbach Alpha is used to assess the internal consistency of each of the variables used in the study. As depicted in Table 1, all variables have adequate levels of internal consistency and meet the acceptable standard of 0.60.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1 Reliability Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For all variables, a five-point likert scale of questions was formulated. Knowingly, in five-point likert scale 5 means strongly agree, 4 is agree, 3 is neutral, 2 is disagree and 1 is strongly disagree. Following is the reliability analysis for talent management, responsible leadership, and organizational downsizing using Cronbach’s alpha. The Cronbach Alpha is used to assess the internal consistency of each of the variables used in the study. As depicted in Table 1, all variables have adequate levels of internal consistency and meet the acceptable standard of 0.60.
3. Results

The purpose of this study is to understand how much variation in organizational downsizing can be explained by inclusive/exclusive talent management and responsible leadership. For this purpose, multiple regressions were used in order to understand the unique contribution of both inclusive and exclusive talent management approaches with and without the mediation of responsible leadership in predicting organizational downsizing. However, using multiple regressions requires the following assumptions presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Assumptions for the multiple regression analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assumption No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assumption 1</td>
<td>Independence of observation: There is no autocorrelation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumption 2</td>
<td>Linearity: There is a linear relationship between the dependent variables and each of the independent variables; and the dependent variables and the independent variables collectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumption 3</td>
<td>Homoscedasticity: the variance along the line of best remain similar as you move along the line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumption 4</td>
<td>No multi-collinearity: When 2 or more independent variables are highly correlated with each other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assumption 1, the Durbin-Watson test, a measure of significant residual autocorrelation and ideally ranges between 1.5 to 2.5, is used, and the results are as follows:

Table 3. Durbin-Watson test indicator values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>Dependent variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational downsizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive talent management</td>
<td>1.961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusive talent management</td>
<td>1.740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible leadership</td>
<td>1.939</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For assumptions 2 and 3, a Chart Builder was used to determine whether there is a registered linear relationship between Organizational downsizing (the dependent variables), Talent Management aspects collectively and Responsible Leadership (the independent ones) or not. Partial regression plots were made between each independent variable and the dependent variable to find out whether a linear relationship exists between the dependent variable and each one of the independent variables or not. The chart does show a linear relationship; a matter that urges the use of hierarchical multiple regressions.

Figure 1. The Chart Builder graph for the investigated relationship

Assumption 4, highlights the fact that any existence of multi-collinearity, which occurs if two or more independent variables are highly correlated with each other, yields technical difficulties in adopting a multiple regression model. If tolerance values are less than 0.01 then, the researcher cannot proceed with hierarchical multiple regressions, which is not the case here as indicated in Table 4 below.

Table 4. Correlation coefficient and tolerance between independent variables
Given the previous validation of the hierarchical multiple regression analysis, testing the research hypotheses is as follows. As said, the purpose of this study is to understand how much variation in organizational downsizing can be explained by inclusive/exclusive talent management and responsible leadership. For this purpose, multiple regressions were used in order to understand the unique contribution of both inclusive and exclusive talent management approaches with and without the mediation of responsible leadership in predicting organizational downsizing. Obviously, the authors used two scenarios with 2 models each.

In the first scenario, the first model (1A) the independent variable is Inclusive talent and the Organizational downsizing which will be used as dependent variables one by one. In the second model (2A), the independent variables are Inclusive talent and Responsible Leadership. As can be seen, the second Model is not a completely separate model but is a variation on Model 1A with one variable added. In the second scenario, the first model (1B) the independent variable is Exclusive talent and the Organizational downsizing which will be used as dependent variables one by one. In the second model (2B), the independent variables are Exclusive talent and Responsible Leadership. As can be seen, the second Model is not a completely separate model but is a variation on Model 1A with one variable added.

Each model is a standard multiple regression procedure with the variables in that model entered simultaneously. Therefore, each model has measures that show how well that particular model fits the data, and these are presented in Table 5 below.

Table 5. Summary of the Regression Analyses of the Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig. F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.49693</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>6.545</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.49441</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>4.349</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>.929</td>
<td>.863</td>
<td>.863</td>
<td>.18560</td>
<td>.863</td>
<td>2070.120</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B</td>
<td>.929</td>
<td>.864</td>
<td>.863</td>
<td>.18568</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.729</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>.394</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The measure of most importance when interpreting a hierarchical multiple regressions is $R^2$, which represents the variation in the dependent variable explained by the independent variables. These results indicate that each model explains a greater amount of the variation in the dependent variable as more variables are added. Essentially, the models here get better at predicting the dependent variable.

- In the case of the first scenario (A) Model 1A where Inclusive talent management $R^2$ is 0.020, with statistical significance of $p<0.05$. This shows a very weak relationship between Inclusive
talent management and Organizational downsizing. Due to the inclusion of Responsible Leadership as an additional independent variable, R² increased by .013, and this increase is statistically significant (p < .0005) and F increased to 64.349. In other words, Inclusive talent adds a minimal statistical significance to the prediction of Organizational downsizing. In summary, the addition of Responsible Leadership to the prediction of Organizational downsizing (Model 2A) doesn’t change too much in R² of .864 and F(1, 227) = 4.349, p < .0005.

- In the case of the first scenario (B) Model 1B, in which Exclusive talent is used alone, R² is 0.863, with statistical significance of p<0.05. This shows a very strong relationship between Exclusive talent management and Organizational downsizing. Due to the inclusion of Responsible Leadership as an additional independent variable, R² increased by .001, and this increase is statistically significant (p < .0005), and F increased to .729. In other words, Exclusive talent adds a maximal statistical significance to the prediction of Organizational downsizing. In summary, the addition of Responsible Leadership to the prediction of Organizational downsizing (Model 2B) doesn’t change too much in R² of .032 and F(1, 227) = .729, p < .0005.

### Table 6. Hierarchical Multiple Regression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>ΔF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1A</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.701</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>6.545</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>6.545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inclusive talent management</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2A</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.273</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>4.349</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>4.349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inclusive talent management</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responsible Leadership</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 1B</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.648</td>
<td>.863</td>
<td>2070.120</td>
<td>.863</td>
<td>2070.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exclusive talent management</td>
<td>.617</td>
<td>.929</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2B</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.711</td>
<td>.864</td>
<td>.729</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exclusive talent management</td>
<td>.618</td>
<td>.932</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inclusive talent management</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=240; p<0.05

### 4. Discussion

The results showed a very weak statistical relationship between inclusive talent management and organizational downsizing. As indicated by some scholars, (Brewster, 2004; Browaeys & Price, 2011; Valverde et al., 2013) inclusive talent management approach, which considers all organizational staff (academicians in this case) as talents, means that business schools distribute both tangible benefits (financial remuneration, training opportunities, promotion chances) and intangible benefits (informal gatherings, recognition) to all academicians alike. Accordingly, academicians feel that their school avoids any preferential selection, bias and discrimination when making decisions. This makes academicians view any downsizing decision, despite its economic, cultural and psychological consequences, as matters beyond the school’s control (e.g. economic difficulties, restructuring decisions, privatization, merger, etc.) (Drumea, 2017). Even if these downsizing decisions have come to be more challenging in universities/business schools due to the nature of their services, work culture and organizational...
hierarchies, academicians see themselves as valuable assets given the distinguished treatment they all receive from their schools. They believe their workplaces may lay them off only because of external urgent threats as explained. Accordingly, it seems reasonable to find a very weak relationship between inclusive talent management and downsizing decisions.

The results also uncovered that responsible leadership has no role in mediating the relationship between inclusive talent management and organizational downsizing. As highlighted by (Maak, 2007; Voegtlin et al., 2011; Spreitzer et al., 2012), responsible leadership entails paying attention to stakeholders’ engagement, safeguarding human rights and promoting socio-ethical practices. In the case of adopting inclusive talent management, business schools’ leadership/administration focuses on the betterment of academicians as they are perceived to be a main stakeholder in the educational process. Accordingly, adopting responsible leadership within the domain of inclusive talent management not only secures business schools’ leaders to act correctly in utilizing academicians’ skills but also fosters schools to fulfill its societal obligations towards its staff. This enables academicians to feel secure and to trust their workplaces (Brown & Trevino, 2006). It is also reasonable to assert that within this climate of trusted relationships, both inclusive talent management and responsible leadership have no statistical relationship with organizational downsizing.

As seen in the results exclusive talent management has a significant statistical relationship with academicians’ downsizing. Collings & Mellahi (2009) and Tarique & Schuler (2010) assert that adopting exclusive talent management entails a focus only on 10-20% of the staff whom their organization (business school in this case) believe in their competences in creating a better future for it. Therefore, the organization devotes all its touchable and untouchable benefits to this small percentage of its total workforce. Meanwhile, organizational leaders consider other staff members as traditional performers whom produce little and consume a lot. This may justify why academicians in the chosen business schools believe that adopting exclusive talent management (in which schools evaluate 90% of the total academicians as traditional employees) may motivate their schools to undertake downsizing plans. accordingly, academicians believe that undertaking exclusive talent management encourage their schools to retain, empower and deploy only those evaluated as talented academicians.

The results demonstrated that responsible leadership does not have any role in mediating the relationship between exclusive talent management and academicians’ downsizing. Focusing only on talented academicians who constitute 10-20% of the total academic staff means that business schools do not effectively engage in and/or absorb its total workforce (Miska et al., 2014). Consequently, school’s work and social obligations towards its academicians are difficult to be defined and fulfilled. It is challenging for academicians in the case of exclusive talent management to note something except the irresponsible role their workplaces exercise in managing them. Therefore, academicians could not touch on any role for responsible leadership in mediating the relationship between exclusive talent management and organizational downsizing.

Results of this study come in line with the findings of Pyszka & Gajada (2015) who theoretically demonstrate that the set of practices companies undertake in recruiting, hiring, developing and retaining talents is constantly affected by these companies’ CSR activities or in other words commitment to improving community well-being. Furthermore, the results discovered in this paper remotely touch on the results of Lin & Liu (2017) who asserted a role for ethical leadership, which is narrower in scope than
responsible leadership in moderating the relationship between companies’ CSR practices and their talented members’ work engagement. Moreover, the results come in agreement with Doh et al. (2011) who elaborate that companies’ responsible leadership practices are strongly associated with employees’ retention in the Indian organizational context.

5. Conclusion and implications

This paper has filled a gap in both HR and higher education literature by exploring the relationship between inclusive/exclusive talent management, responsible leadership and academicians’ downsizing in the context of Egyptian higher education (public business schools in this case). The results showed a very weak statistical relationship between inclusive talent management and academicians’ downsizing whereas a strong statistical relationship has been discovered between exclusive talent management and academicians’ downsizing. Furthermore, the statistical results demonstrated no role for responsible leadership in mediating the relationship between inclusive/exclusive talent management and academicians’ downsizing.

The authors think that the results seem very reasonable/logic given the scope of the addressed variables. For instance, the adoption of inclusive talent management entails a reflection that the addressed business schools consider all their academicians as talents. Hence, any plan for academicians’ downsizing would be the result of an external sudden change such as privatization, decrease of public funding and etc. Thus, inclusive talent management does not have a role in predicting or motivating academicians’ downsizing. The opposite could be said in case of exclusive talent management, in which the business schools consider the majority of its academicians as non-talented, so undertaking exclusive talent management may foster academicians’ downsizing.

As a limitation to this paper, the authors have focused only on 3 Egyptian public business schools, the matter that may limit opportunities to generalize the results of this study to private business schools and other faculties in Egypt. However, and as implications to theory, the authors suggest that other researchers test the same research hypotheses in other Egyptian and non-Egyptian public business schools. Moreover, addressing private business schools may also be considered a chance to yield the same results. Finally, the authors think that the main advantages of this paper are not only in the novelty of its idea and context but also in creating better research opportunities for cross-disciplinary and/or trans-disciplinary studies that should be conducted by HR management, HR development and higher education scholars.

As implications for the administration of the chosen business schools particularly after decreeing the civil service law in the Egyptian parliament, the authors of this paper recommend preparing a set of competences through which business schools can classify their academic staff into talented and non-talented before initiating downsizing strategy. This is seen by the authors of this paper as a priority especially after evaluating the quality of management schools in Egypt as the worst globally in the year’s 2017 report of global competitiveness (http://www3.weforum.org). The authors suggest the administrations of the addressed business schools undertake the responsible strategy of downsizing. However, schools should justify why they have to decrease the size of their academicians and secure post-redundancy care practices for laid-off academicians. This may include funded training opportunities besides job search aids.
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