

Organizational Climate and Human Talent Management in Public Transport Sector Companies

Clima organizacional e gestão de recursos humanos nas empresas do setor dos transportes públicos
El clima organizativo y la gestión de recursos humanos en las empresas del sector del transporte público

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.57188/rieca.2026.002>

María Fernanda Moya Puente * ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5824-9939>

César Barrionuevo De La Rosa * <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3876-6859>

Universidad de Guayaquil, Facultad de Ciencias Administrativas.

How to cite:

Moya, M. y Barrionuevo, C. (2026). Organizational Climate and Human Talent Management in Public Transport Sector Companies. RIECA, 1(1). e-002. <https://doi.org/10.57188/rieca.2026.002>

ABSTRACT

This study examined the relationship between organizational climate and human talent management in public transport sector companies, with the objective of determining the extent to which employees' perceptions of the work environment predict the effectiveness of talent management processes. A quantitative, non-experimental, cross-sectional approach was adopted, with a sample of 291 employees surveyed using structured Likert-scale questionnaires. SPSS software was used for data analysis, applying descriptive statistics, the Friedman test, simple linear regression, and ANOVA. The results showed that organizational climate explains 76.1% of the variability in human talent management ($R^2 = 0.761$; $F = 918.284$; $p < 0.001$), with a very strong positive correlation ($R = 0.872$) and a near-unit regression coefficient ($B = 0.979$). Among the dimensions of organizational climate, leadership and interpersonal relationships emerged as strengths ($M = 4.18$), while recognition was the most critical dimension ($M = 3.97$). In human talent management, retention and satisfaction represented the greatest strength ($M = 3.99$), whereas talent planning recorded the lowest mean ($M = 3.88$). Performance evaluation was the dimension with the greatest explanatory power ($F = 79.690$). It is concluded that both variables are closely linked and that their integrated management is essential for institutional strengthening.

Keywords: Organizational Climate; Human Talent Management; Public Sector; Transportation; Leadership; Recognition; Performance Evaluation; Employee Retention.

JEL Codes: M12, M54, J24, L91

RESUMO

Este estudo examinou a relação entre o clima organizacional e a gestão de talentos em empresas do setor de transporte público, com o objetivo de determinar em que medida as percepções dos funcionários sobre o ambiente de trabalho permitem prever a eficácia dos processos de gestão de talentos. Foi adotada uma abordagem quantitativa, não experimental e transversal, com uma amostra de 291 funcionários pesquisados por meio de questionários estruturados na escala de Likert. O software SPSS foi utilizado para a análise de dados, aplicando-se estatísticas descritivas, o teste de Friedman, regressão linear simples e ANOVA. Os resultados mostraram que o clima organizacional explica 76,1% da variabilidade na gestão de talentos humanos ($R^2 = 0,761$; $F = 918,284$; $p < 0,001$), com uma correlação positiva muito forte ($R = 0,872$) e um coeficiente de regressão próximo da unidade ($B = 0,979$). Entre as dimensões do clima organizacional, a liderança e as relações interpessoais emergiram como pontos fortes ($M = 4,18$), enquanto o reconhecimento foi a dimensão mais crítica ($M = 3,97$). Na gestão de talentos humanos, a retenção e a satisfação representaram o maior ponto forte ($M = 3,99$), enquanto o planejamento de talentos registrou a menor média ($M = 3,88$). A avaliação de desempenho foi a dimensão com maior poder explicativo ($F = 79,690$). Conclui-se que ambas as variáveis estão intimamente ligadas e que sua gestão integrada é essencial para o fortalecimento institucional.

Palavras-chave: Clima Organizacional; Gestão De Talentos; Setor Público; Transportes; Liderança; Reconhecimento; Avaliação De Desempenho; Retenção De Funcionários.



INTRODUCTION

In the current context of state transformation and public service modernization, organizations in the transport sector face increasing pressure to improve their institutional performance. New public management requires state entities to incorporate results-oriented strategic approaches in which human capital occupies a central place as a determining factor in efficiency and service quality (Osborne & Gaebler, 1992; Hood, 1991). Within this scenario, two variables are especially relevant: organizational climate and human talent management. Both constitute fundamental pillars for operational efficiency and the quality of service these entities provide to citizens (Jawali et al., 2021; Kravariti & Johnston, 2019). Globalization and the increasing complexity of public services have intensified the need for work environments that promote employee well-being, commitment, and continuous development, recognizing that a healthy organizational climate not only improves individual performance but also constitutes a sustainable institutional advantage (Chiavenato, 2009; Brunet, 2011).

The organizational climate in public transport companies faces specific challenges that affect their functioning and employee satisfaction. Litwin and Stringer (1968) early identified that perceptions of the work environment condition motivation and performance; subsequent studies have confirmed that these dynamics are intensified in the public sector, where economic incentives are limited and the relational environment carries greater weight (Dessler, 2001; Gonzalez-Roma & Peiro, 2014). The main causes that negatively affect the work environment include deficient communication, which generates misunderstandings and lack of alignment with institutional objectives; inadequate leadership, which produces demotivation and resistance to change; low employee motivation, associated with monotony and the perception that effort is not valued; deteriorated interpersonal relationships, which affect team cohesion; and the absence of recognition for work well done, which reduces organizational commitment (Calvachi & Angeles, 2017; Lopez et al., 2021; Novac & Bratanov, 2014; Sinha, 2024).

In parallel, human talent management in the public transport sector presents structural deficiencies that limit its capacity to attract, develop, and retain competent personnel. Collings and Mellahi (2009) define talent management as the systematic identification of key positions and the development of a differentiated human resource architecture that enables these positions to be filled by high-performing employees. However, the public sector often lacks the formal mechanisms required to implement this approach (Thunnissen et al., 2013). Talent planning is usually insufficient and short-term oriented; recruitment and selection processes lack transparency and meritocracy; training and professional development do not respond to strategic plans; performance evaluation systems are not sufficiently objective; and retention and job satisfaction strategies are scarce, leading to high turnover among qualified staff (Gandi & Saurombe, 2025; Enwereji & Emmanuel, 2022; Kravariti & Johnston, 2019). These structural weaknesses directly affect the quality of service delivered to citizens and the institution's ability to adapt to changing environments (Chiavenato, 2009; Boxall & Purcell, 2016).

The specialized literature shows a close relationship between organizational climate and human talent management. A positive work environment facilitates personnel retention, development, and satisfaction processes, whereas deficiencies in talent management generate demotivation and internal conflicts that deteriorate the institutional climate (Jawali et al., 2021; Kravariti & Johnston, 2019). However, empirical research examining this interrelationship in public organizations in developing countries, and particularly in the transport sector, remains scarce, which constitutes a significant gap in the literature (Enwereji & Emmanuel, 2022; Gandi & Saurombe, 2025). This study aimed to examine

the relationship between these two variables in public transport sector companies, based on the perceptions of 291 employees, in order to provide empirical evidence to support organizational improvement strategies.

METHODOLOGY

2.1. Design and approach

The study followed a quantitative, non-experimental, cross-sectional, descriptive-correlational approach. This design was adopted because the main objective was to measure employees' perceptions at a specific point in time and establish the statistical relationship between both variables without manipulating either of them. According to Hernandez-Sampieri et al. (2014), non-experimental cross-sectional designs are the most appropriate when the aim is to describe variables and analyze their interrelationship within a population at a single point in time. Creswell (2014) notes that the quantitative approach is especially useful when propositions are tested through numerical measurement and statistical analysis, with a view to generalizing results to a broader population. The correlational scope seeks to identify the degree of association between variables without establishing definitive causality, thereby providing evidence on relational patterns that may guide future interventions (Bernal, 2010).

2.2. Population and sample

The population consisted of employees from public transport sector companies. The sample included 291 participants, corresponding to the total number of valid surveys collected and ensuring representation of the different functional areas and hierarchical levels. Hernandez-Sampieri et al. (2014) emphasize that, in studies of this type, it is essential to ensure that the sample captures the variability of the target population so that the results adequately reflect the diversity of existing perceptions. Information was collected digitally, with informed consent from all participants and a guarantee of confidentiality, in compliance with ethical principles established for research involving human beings (Bernal, 2010).

2.3. Variables and instruments

Two variables were operationalized: organizational climate (independent variable), with five dimensions - communication, leadership, motivation, interpersonal relationships, and recognition - and human talent management (dependent variable), with five dimensions - talent planning, recruitment and selection, training and development, performance evaluation, and retention and satisfaction. Both were measured using structured questionnaires on a five-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly disagree; 5 = Strongly agree). The Likert scale is one of the most widely used measurement instruments in organizational research because of its ability to capture the intensity and direction of attitudes and perceptions (Likert, 1932; Hernandez-Sampieri et al., 2014). Content validity was evaluated through expert judgment, following the criteria proposed by Escobar-Perez and Cuervo-Martinez (2008). Instrument reliability was excellent (Cronbach's alpha = 0.972), far exceeding the 0.70 threshold recommended for social science research and the 0.90 threshold that George and Mallery (2003) classify as excellent reliability. Nunnally and Bernstein (1994) establish Cronbach's alpha as the psychometric standard



par excellence for assessing the internal consistency of instruments with ordinal-scale items. Statistical processing was performed using SPSS v.25, applying descriptive statistics, the Friedman test, simple linear regression, and ANOVA.

RESULTS

3.1. Descriptive analysis of organizational climate

The descriptive analysis of the five organizational climate dimensions revealed an overall positive perception among the 291 employees, with means ranging from 3.97 to 4.18 on the 1-to-5 scale (Table 1).

Table 1

Descriptive statistics for organizational climate dimensions (n = 291)

Dimension	Mean	Std. dev.	Mode	Interpretation
Communication	4.05	0.927	5	Good
Leadership	4.18	0.956	5	Good - Strength
Motivation	4.12	0.961	5	Good
Interpersonal relationships	4.18	0.930	5	Good - Strength
Recognition	3.97	1.055	5	Fair-Good - Critical dimension

Note. Source: SPSS. Authors' own elaboration.

Leadership and interpersonal relationships shared the highest mean (4.18), consolidating them as organizational climate strengths, with more than 100 observations at the maximum scale value. Recognition emerged as the most critical dimension ($M = 3.97$; $SD = 1.055$), with the highest dispersion among all the variables analyzed, showing that a significant fraction of employees considers performance valuation practices insufficient. Communication and motivation occupied intermediate positions, with positive but heterogeneous perceptions across areas and hierarchical levels.

3.2. Descriptive analysis of human talent management

The five dimensions of human talent management showed predominantly positive perceptions, with means between 3.88 and 3.99 and a mode of 5 in all cases (Table 2).

Table 2

Descriptive statistics for human talent management dimensions (n = 291)

Dimension	Mean	Median	Mode	Interpretation
Talent planning	3.88	4	5	Positive - Weakest dimension
Recruitment and selection	3.95	4	5	Positive
Training and development	3.96	4	5	Positive - Strength
Performance evaluation	3.95	4	5	Positive
Retention and satisfaction	3.99	4.20	5	Positive - Greatest strength

Note. Source: SPSS. Authors' own elaboration.

Retention and satisfaction recorded the highest mean (3.99) and the highest median (4.20), with 101 responses in the “Strongly agree” category, positioning it as the greatest strength of human talent management. Talent planning obtained the lowest mean (3.88), reflecting weaknesses in the strategic projection of personnel needs. Performance evaluation and recruitment and selection presented similar means (3.95), with intermediate groups expressing doubts about the objectivity and transparency of these processes.

3.3. Linear regression model

To examine the predictive capacity of organizational climate (MCT) on human talent management (MGT), a simple linear regression model was estimated, obtaining the following equation:

$$\text{MGT} = -0.049 + 0.979 \times \text{MCT}$$

Table 3 presents the model indicators and the associated ANOVA.

Table 3

Linear regression model summary and ANOVA (Dependent variable: MGT)

Indicator	Value
R (correlation)	0.872
R ² (coefficient of determination)	0.761
Adjusted R ²	0.760
Standard error of the estimate	0.503
B (constant)	-0.049
B (MCT - organizational climate)	0.979
Standardized beta	0.872
T	30.303
F (ANOVA)	918.284
Sig. (p)	< 0.001

Note. Source: SPSS. Authors' own elaboration.

The model explained 76.1% of the variability in human talent management ($R^2 = 0.761$), with an adjusted R^2 of 0.760 confirming its stability. The very strong positive correlation ($R = 0.872$) indicates that the more favorable the perception of organizational climate, the higher the assessment of human talent management. The coefficient $B = 0.979$ indicates a near-proportional relationship: for each additional point in organizational climate, human talent management increases by 0.979 units. The F statistic = 918.284 ($p < 0.001$) confirms that the model is highly significant.

3.4. Explanatory power of the dimensions of human talent management

The ANOVA analysis applied individually to each dimension of human talent management as a predictor of the global variable made it possible to establish its relative explanatory power. All values were statistically significant ($p < 0.001$), as shown in Table 4.

Table 4*ANOVA F value by human talent management dimension (p < 0.001 in all cases)*

Dimension	F	Explanatory hierarchy
Performance evaluation	79.690	1st - Greatest explanatory power
Retention and satisfaction	66.337	2nd
Training and development	65.180	3rd
Recruitment and selection	48.010	4th
Talent planning	39.137	5th - Lowest explanatory power

Note. Source: SPSS. Authors' own elaboration.

Performance evaluation consolidated itself as the dimension with the greatest explanatory power ($F = 79.690$), followed by retention and satisfaction ($F = 66.337$) and training and development ($F = 65.180$). Talent planning, although significant, recorded the lowest relative weight ($F = 39.137$), suggesting that the strategic vision of personnel is the aspect most pending development in the institutions analyzed.

DISCUSSION

The results of this study confirm that organizational climate is a robust and highly significant predictor of human talent management in public transport sector companies ($R^2 = 0.761$; $F = 918.284$; $p < 0.001$). This finding is consistent with international evidence highlighting the dynamic interdependence between the two variables: organizations with favorable climates implement talent management processes more effectively, while deficiencies in the work environment translate into structural difficulties in attracting, developing, and retaining qualified personnel (Jawali et al., 2021; Kravariti & Johnston, 2019).

The very strong positive correlation ($R = 0.872$) and the near-unit regression coefficient ($B = 0.979$) support the arguments of Calvachi and Angeles (2017) and Sinha (2024) that organizational climate dimensions have a direct impact on levels of motivation, commitment, and personnel performance, variables that in turn condition the effectiveness of training, evaluation, and talent retention processes. This result positions organizational climate not as a complementary factor, but as a structuring condition of human talent management.

Leadership and interpersonal relationships emerged as the main strengths of organizational climate ($M = 4.18$), in line with Novac and Bratanov (2014) and Lopez et al. (2021), who state that participatory leadership and positive labor relations are key predictors of institutional commitment. Recognition, with the lowest mean ($M = 3.97$) and the greatest dispersion ($SD = 1.055$), consolidated itself as the most critical dimension, confirming Sinha's (2024) findings on the central role of recognition in the intrinsic motivation of public employees. The high dispersion in this dimension suggests perceived inequities among areas and hierarchical levels that erode organizational cohesion.

In human talent management, retention and satisfaction emerged as the greatest strength ($M = 3.99$; $F = 66.337$), which is consistent with Gandi and Saurombe (2025), who emphasize that job stability and trust in the organizational environment are prior conditions for the effective implementation of talent management strategies. Talent planning, with the lowest mean ($M = 3.88$) and the lowest explanatory power ($F = 39.137$), reflects the historical weaknesses of the public sector in strategic personnel projection, as noted by Jawali et al. (2021) and Enwereji and Emmanuel (2022).

Performance evaluation emerged as the dimension with the greatest explanatory power ($F = 79.690$), highlighting the importance of objective, participatory evaluation systems linked to real development and promotion decisions. Coculova and Tomcikova (2021) and Shi (2023) point out that formalistic systems disconnected from improvement plans generate distrust and demotivation, negatively affecting staff retention and organizational climate. This finding suggests that investing in the improvement of evaluation processes would have a multiplier effect on the other dimensions of human talent management.

Overall, the results show that interventions focused exclusively on only one of the two areas are insufficient to produce sustainable improvements. The near-proportional relationship identified implies that strengthening organizational climate - especially recognition - would have a direct and proportional impact on improving human talent management; and that strengthening performance evaluation and strategic talent planning would, in turn, help consolidate a more equitable and motivating organizational climate.

CONCLUSIONS

This study empirically confirms that organizational climate is a strong and significant predictor of human talent management in public transport sector companies, explaining 76.1% of its variability. The near-proportional relationship identified ($B = 0.979$) shows that improving the work environment has a direct, consistent, and proportional impact on institutional talent development and retention processes.

Regarding organizational climate, leadership and interpersonal relationships consolidated themselves as the main strengths, with a mean of 4.18 out of 5. Recognition emerged as the most critical and most dispersed dimension ($M = 3.97$; $SD = 1.055$), showing that performance valuation practices are perceived as insufficient and inequitable by a significant fraction of employees.

In human talent management, retention and job satisfaction positioned themselves as the greatest strength ($M = 3.99$). Talent planning recorded the lowest mean ($M = 3.88$) and the lowest explanatory power in the model ($F = 39.137$), indicating that the strategic projection of personnel needs is the weakest and highest-priority dimension for intervention. Performance evaluation was the dimension with the greatest explanatory power ($F = 79.690$), confirming that the way staff performance is measured and feedback is provided is determinant in the overall perception of human talent management.

It is concluded that both variables are closely linked and that their integrated management - si-



multaneously addressing work environment conditions and talent development processes - is indispensable for the institutional strengthening of public transport companies. The following actions are recommended: (1) implement clear and equitable institutional recognition systems; (2) transform performance evaluation processes into strategic tools linked to development plans; (3) develop long-term strategic human talent planning; (4) strengthen training programs linked to identified competency gaps; and (5) adopt an integrated people management model that simultaneously addresses organizational climate and talent processes. Future research should expand the analysis to other variables, such as innovation, institutional culture, and organizational commitment.

Declaration of Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest in relation to the preparation and publication of this article.

Author Contributions

Author 1: conceptualization, methodology, statistical analysis, and writing of the original draft.
Author 2: literature review, data curation, review, and final editing.

ARTÍCULO DE INVESTIGACIÓN



REFERENCES

- Andrade Salazar, J. A. , Mendoza Vergara, M. F. , Zapata Castrillón, K. T. , & Sierra Monsalve, L. . (2020). Relación entre conflictos de la adolescencia y habilidades sociales en adolescentes de una Institución Educativa de Risaralda. *Pensamiento Americano*, 13(25), 52-61. <https://doi.org/10.21803/pensam.13.25.385>
- Antilogova, L., & Lazarenko, D. V. (2021). Talent management in the conditions of public service. Professional Education in the Modern World. <https://doi.org/10.20913/2224-1841-2021-3-17>
- Antúnez, A. M. C., Morales, C. E. B., & Araujo, D. R. S. (2019). La sostenibilidad global en una empresa de transporte urbano de viajeros en autobús: Estudio de caso. In *Memorias del III Congreso internacional en administración de negocios internacionales (CIANI): Retos y oportunidades del desarrollo sostenible en los negocios internacionales* (pp. 28-42). Universidad Pontificia Bolivariana.
- Arrieta, L. E., & Morales, C. E. B. (2024). Necesidades sociales y dimensiones del capital social: análisis de beneficiarios de Familias en Acción. *Telos: Revista de Estudios Interdisciplinarios en Ciencias Sociales*, 26(2), 388-407.
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands-resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(3), 309-328. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940710733115>
- Barrera, M. B., & Morales, C. E. B. (2025). Análisis de la percepción de la cultura tributaria en Colombia durante el periodo pospandemia. *Dictamen Libre*, (36), 2.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership. Sage Publications.
- Bernal, C. A. (2010). Research methodology (3rd ed.). Pearson Educacion.
- Borja-Barrera, M., & Barragán-Morales, C. (2025). Perception analysis of tax culture in Colombia during the post-pandemic period. *Dictamen Libre*, (36).
- Boxall, P., & Purcell, J. (2016). Strategy and human resource management (4.^a ed.). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Brunet, L. (2011). The work climate in organizations: definition, diagnosis, and consequences. Trillas.
- Calvachi, O., & Angeles, G. de los. (2017). Measurement and proposal for improving the work climate in a public company, during the period from April 2016 to February 2017. <https://consensus.app/papers/medición-y-propuesta-de-mejoramiento-del-clima-laboral-en-calvachi-angeles/e4c6b-4095df951c69dd5f64bd25816b9/>
- Chiavenato, I. (2009). Human talent management (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill.



- Cocuřová, J., & Tomčıková, L. (2021). Innovative human resource management practices for the talent management implementation. *Marketing and Management of Innovations*. <https://doi.org/10.21272/mmi.2021.4-04>
- Collings, D. G., & Mellahi, K. (2009). Strategic talent management: A review and research agenda. *Human Resource Management Review*, 19(4), 304–313. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2009.04.001>
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4.^a ed.). Sage Publications.
- Dessler, G. (2001). *Personnel administration* (8th ed.). Pearson Educacion.
- Enwereji, P., & Emmanuel, U. (2022). Talent management practices in the South African public service. *Khazanah Sosial*. <https://doi.org/10.15575/ks.v4i3.19708>
- Escobar-Perez, J., & Cuervo-Martinez, A. (2008). Content validity and expert judgment: An approach to its use. *Avances en Medicion*, 6(1), 27-36.
- Espitia-Arrieta, L., Tatiana Prestan-Gómez, S., & Barragán-Morales, C. (2022). Programas de transferencias monetarias condicionadas: una comparación en América Latina frente a Familias en Acción. *Dictamen Libre*, (31).
- Gandi, E. A., & Saurombe, M. (2025). Talent management practices for minimising talent turnover in a public sector organisation. *South African Journal of Economic and Management Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajems.v28i1.6135>
- George, D., & Mallery, P. (2003). *SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference* (4.^a ed.). Allyn & Bacon.
- González-Romá, V., & Peiro, J. M. (2014). Climate uniformity: Its influence on team communication quality, task conflict, and team performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 99(6), 1042–1058. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037868>
- Hernandez-Sampieri, R., Fernandez-Collado, C., & Baptista-Lucio, P. (2014). *Research methodology* (6th ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Hood, C. (1991). A public management for all seasons? *Public Administration*, 69(1), 3–19. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9299.1991.tb00779.x>
- Jawali, H. A., Darwish, T. K., Scullion, H., & Haak-Saheem, W. (2021). Talent management in the public sector: Empirical evidence from the emerging economy of Dubai. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 33, 2256–2284. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2021.2001764>
- Kravariti, F., & Johnston, K. (2019). *Talent management: A critical literature review and research*

agenda for public sector human resource management. *Public Management Review*, 22, 75–95. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2019.1638439>

Likert, R. (1932). A technique for the measurement of attitudes. *Archives of Psychology*, 22(140), 1–55.

Litwin, G. H., & Stringer, R. A. (1968). *Motivation and organizational climate*. Harvard Business School Press.

Lopez, R. R., Camus, C. E. R., Vasquez, J. G., Ayay, N. T. T., Coral, J. C., & Alvarado, G. (2021). Organizational climate in local governments. *Ciencia Latina Revista Científica Multidisciplinar*, 5, 1198-1208. https://doi.org/10.37811/CL_RCM.V5I1.321

Morales, C. E. B., Guarín-García, A. F., Chang-Muñoz, E. A., Villanueva-Vásquez, A., Gálvez, J. F. E., Delgado, N. A. G., & Bracho, O. C. (2025). Fuzzy-Set Qualitative Comparative Analysis to Corporate Social Responsibility Components: A Case Study from Media Print Companies in Atlántico Department of Colombia. *Procedia Computer Science*, 257, 1148-1153.

Morales, C. E. B., De Moya, F. E. M., Vélez, N. S., & Vargas, E. C. (2023). Innovación social: Una aproximación desde su relación con la responsabilidad social empresarial en tiempos del COVID 19. In *Investigación y Desarrollo* (pp. 137-150). Fondo Editorial CIIDIES.

Morales, C. E. B., Mendoza, A. P., Barrera, M. B., & Osorio, F. M. (2024). Transformational leadership and decision-making in organizations of the Colombian Caribbean. *Dictamen Libre*, (34), 167-178.

Mudarra-Fernández, A. B., Barragán-Morales, C. E., & González-Beleño, C. (2023). La eficiencia de las empresas con marca en los hoteles de las Ciudades Patrimonio de la Humanidad consolidadas de España. *Revista Ibérica de Sistemas e Tecnologías de Informação*, (E60), 624-636.

Noe, R. A., Hollenbeck, J. R., Gerhart, B., & Wright, P. M. (2019). *Human resource management: Gaining a competitive advantage* (11.^a ed.). McGraw-Hill.

Novac, C., & Bratanov, C. (2014). The impact of the leadership style on the organizational climate in a public entity. *Management Dynamics in the Knowledge Economy Journal*, 2, 155–180.

Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3.^a ed.). McGraw-Hill.

Osborne, D., & Gaebler, T. (1992). *Reinventing government: How the entrepreneurial spirit is transforming the public sector*. Addison-Wesley.

Quintero Núñez, H., Cano García, M., Gaspar Cartagena, D., & Martín, R. (2022). Validación de la escala FoMOs (Fear of Missing Out scale) en el contexto colombiano. *Pensamiento Americano*, 15(30), 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.21803/penamer.15.30.490>

Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2017). *Organizational behavior* (17th ed.). Pearson Educacion.



Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., González-Romá, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3(1), 71–92. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1015630930326>

Shi, S. (2023). The reform of human resource system in the public sector under the new public management system. *SHS Web of Conferences*. <https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/202315401007>

Sinha, N. (2024). How organizational climate affects the job satisfaction. *International Journal of Scientific Research in Engineering and Management*. <https://doi.org/10.55041/ijsem32312>

Thunnissen, M., Boselie, P., & Fruytier, B. (2013). A review of talent management: Infancy or adolescence? *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 24(9), 1744–1761. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2013.777543>

Turizo, J. M., Bracho, O. C. C., & Morales, C. B. (2026). General and differential mechanisms of citizen participation: Prior consultation and victims' participation boards. *Pensamiento Americano*, 19(39).