INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY, POLICY AND LAW (IJOSPL)
Volume: 02 Issue: 04 August 2021 E-ISSN: 2774-2245

Managing Employee Retention in Mergers and Acquisitions: A Systematic Review

Yustisia Kristiana[1], Andry Panjaitan[2], Vasco A. H. Goeltom[3], Agustian Budi Prasetya[4]

[1234]*Universitas Pelita Harapan, Indonesia*

Corresponding Email: yustisia.kristiana@uph.edu

Abstract *— Start-ups are companies that focus on problem solving through innovation. Mergers and acquisitions (M&A) are one of the development methods used to achieve growth. People who work in start-ups do so because they want to be part of a business that is entrepreneurial. When this is acquired, it may conflict with the preferences held. The purpose of this article is to assess the efficacy of start-up acquisition as a strategy, the relationship between psychological ownership and employee retention, and the human resource model for the integration stage in the context of M&A transactions. This systematic review demonstrates that each chosen recruitment strategy has its own set of challenges, requiring each organization to assess its own strengths and weaknesses. Psychological ownership is positively related to employee retention in the company which is obtained through direct and mediating effects of employee commitment and involvement. The integration stage as the most complex stage and determines the success of mergers and acquisitions needs attention for organizations engaged in the start-up sector.*

Keywords — *employee retention, integration stage, mergers and acquisitions, psychological ownership, start-up*

I. Introduction

Organization keeps on changing to be able to compete in a dynamic environment. The attitude of a firm toward changes and positioning is a critical determinant in its progress and success. In this setting, mergers, and acquisitions (M&A) have emerged as one of the most essential techniques for achieving business growth, with benefits such as increased market share, synergy, and innovation (Lupina-Wegener, 2013). M&A success remains a challenge for companies (Gomes et al. 2013; Weber, Tarba, & Öberg, 2014). M&A often signal higher turnover rate, especially from the acquired company (Ahammad et al., 2012; Hambrick & Cannella, 1993; Krug & Aguilera, 2005; Zhang et al., 2015). According to Kim (2010) in the first year of a company acquisition, 33 percent of acquired workers will leave the company.

The term start-up has recently emerged in the business realm. Start-ups are businesses that focus on solving problems through innovation. That explains why start-ups generally consist of highly creative people who can adapt to a fast-paced work rhythm and in small teams (Robehmed, 2013). This business model has an impact, start-ups often get funding through significant investments from crowdfunding, venture capitalists, and angel investors (Kedia, 2019) resulting in changes to the ownership structure. People working in start-ups join for a reason, the most important of which is the desire to be in an organization that is very entrepreneurial. But when acquired by a large company, it is in direct conflict with the preferences they have.

Previous studies have explored how companies can profit by hiring and retaining human capital (Castanias & Helfat, 1991; Hatch & Dyer, 2004; Campbell, Coff, & Kryscynski, 2012). Most focus on recruiting individuals from the labor market. An alternative to bringing in a new workforce is to acquire another company that has an experienced workforce. Commonly known as acqui-hiring, this practice is very common among start-ups because the most valuable and often only asset is human resources (Selby & Mayer 2013; Chatterji & Patro 2014). However, there is a limited understanding of how the two recruitment methods, namely acqui-hiring and traditional hiring, retain new employees. The decision to hire individuals or acquire teams is a strategic choice for companies with complex uncertainties coupled with human assets. This is unlike other assets such as physical capital; talent cannot be owned directly because individuals can voluntarily leave the company (Coff, 1997).

Furthermore, when it comes to M&A, most companies focus on legal or formal ownership, forgetting the psychological aspects of exercising control and making critical decisions like keeping acquired firm workers, increasing total value creation, and boosting performance (Degbey, 2015; Degbey & Ellis, 2017, 2019; Degbey & Hassett, 2016; Gomes et al., 2011; Krug & Shill, 2008). Employee psychological ownership is a valuable asset of the acquired company that has the potential to affect employee commitment and involvement.

M&A experience has taught the corporation that strategy should be assessed in three stages: planning, integration, and implementation (Neira Fontela & Castro Casal, 1994). The most difficult stage is integration, which decides whether a merger or acquisition will succeed. Up to 80% of M&As that fail to appropriately manage this stage will fail to meet their profitability targets (Charman, 1999). This is because M&A has traditionally been viewed as a process that ends when the agreement is signed, with the remaining stages being ignored. According to Datta (1991), an effective integration plan does not happen by itself, and creating synergy is dependent on how management is led. Within three years of signing the agreement, poorly planned or managed integration processes can result in diminished productivity or employee satisfaction (Anon, 2000).

Because of an insufficient understanding of the psychological reasons that cause turnover in M&A, M&A performance suffers as a result of high turnover. While technology capabilities and knowledge-based start-ups are valuable sources of human capital, it is uncertain whether recruiting is a cost-effective method of talent acquisition. Several issues arise because of this explanation: are start-up acquisitions beneficial as a relative approach in recruiting when compared to traditional hiring? Is there a link between psychological ownership and employee retention when it comes to mergers and acquisitions? What is the human resource model for the M&A integration stage?

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. *Hiring Strategy*

Today, effective recruitment is critical. This is due to a significant shift in which the phenomenon of a labour shortage has emerged in response to the company's requirements. In the past, as technology has advanced, there has been a greater demand for highly qualified individuals than there has been supply. This pattern is expected to persist. According to Alan Guarino, Vice Chairman, CEO, and Board Services, Korn Ferry, companies require people with creativity, emotional intelligence, diplomacy, and negotiating abilities to navigate the modern workplace (Alan Guarino, 2018), thus the correct recruiting strategy is required Depending on the sort of employment, certain hiring procedures are scored higher than others. Furthermore, the breadth of the problem area and recruitment rules will determine the success of recruitment (Dessler, 2011). In general, there are two methods for attracting talent: (1) recruiting individuals from the traditional labor market, and (2) acquiring teams (Selby & Mayer 2013; Chatterji & Patro 2014).

Acqui-hiring is a relatively new phenomenon in the technology industry in which a company's purchasing strategy focuses on recruiting and acquiring employees, while the company's purchased products become secondary goals and may even be discontinued post-acquisition because the product is not as successful as expected, the acquisition motivated not by the product itself but by target assets or R&D efforts, or the elimination of potential competitive threats (Gautier & Lamesch, 2020). The main difference between acquisition and acqui-hiring is that in a traditional acquisition, the main purpose is to get ownership of the company's assets, whether tangible (e.g., property, plant, and equipment) or intangible (e.g., intellectual property) (e.g., intellectual property, client lists, and goodwill). The acquiring firm, on the other hand, places little or no value on the target firm's assets in an acqui-hire transaction. The acquirer, on the other hand, is primarily interested in hiring some or all the target company's employees (Venkatesh, 2019). Acqui-hiring is a smart talent acquisition technique since it saves time and money. This is a quick and easy way to find the top talent in huge numbers (Awate, 2018). In the five years between 2015 and 2017, Google, Amazon, Facebook, Apple, and Microsoft (GAFAM) purchased 175 companies (Gautier & Lamesch, 2020).

The key advantage of acqui-recruiting over traditional hiring is the opportunity to hire a full team in one transaction. For a variety of reasons, team-based hiring is advantageous. For starters, the acquirer can take advantage of the complementarity of the teams that have been pooled through time. When a team disbands, this team-specific complementarity may be lost (Jaravel, Petkova, & Bell, 2018; Choi et al., 2019). Second, acquiring employees had no trouble inferring individual contributions to group outcomes. Given the difficulties in identifying and locating the top personnel, startup acquisitions can improve hiring efficiency by bringing in the complete team. By acquiring, the company gains a team of highly experienced individuals with a good working relationship, while employees who have been doing the same job for several years gain valuable exposure and the opportunity to start working for a new company. Big businesses might benefit from having a well-established workforce, which saves time (Fantasia, 2016).

Furthermore, hiring a full team has the advantage of allowing the acquiring firm to boost employee retention by providing stronger employment contracts following the purchase. Employment contracts used in start-up acquisitions typically include stock incentives with a three- to four-year vesting timeline, as well as restrictive clauses such as non-compete agreements. Other benefits of acquisitions include the ability to access new markets and the ability for new personnel to come up with fresh ideas that might be very beneficial to the firm. Acquihire can also be viewed as an investment that boosts a company's productivity and turnover. For huge corporations, most acquisitions are not expensive (Dev, 2021).

The acquisition procedure is outside the scope of the acquired employee in the acquisition of an important feature. Unlike ordinary employees who choose to work for a new company on their own, acquired employees have no say in who owns their company. This is because multiple major stakeholders, usually the founders and other board members, decide whether the target company should be acquired. Non-founding personnel, in other words, are often excluded from pre-acquisition discussions, regardless of their willingness to work for the purported acquirer.

Organizational mismatch is highly common in startup acquisitions because the target and acquirer are essentially different sorts of companies. Organizational incompatibility typically emerges when these two types of organizations are united through acquisitions, as evidenced by organizational structure (Hannan and Freeman 1984; Sorensen 2007), as well as norms and routines (Stuart & Sorenson 2003; Turco 2016). Both factors prompted Daniel Kim (Kim, 2020) to conduct research to determine whether acquired workers have a higher turnover rate than regular employees who voluntarily join the same acquiring company, and whether organizational mismatch causes higher turnover among employees, but not among regular workers.

B. Psychological Ownership

When an object has a close link with the individual, psychological ownership reflects the individual's relationship with the thing (material or immaterial) (Furby, 1978). Psychological ownership, in accordance with Pierce, Kostova, and Dirks (2002), is a complex state with cognitive and affective components. Although possessiveness implies not only a sense of belonging (Pierce et al., 1991, 2001), but also concern and a sense of cognizance for a specific goal, including a company or corporation (O'Reilly, 2002; Parker et al., 1997), possessiveness underpins the conceptual core of psychological ownership. Psychological ownership, according to Avey et al. (2009), is the feeling of employees who have the obligation to make long-term decisions. Psychological ownership refers to a person's awareness, thoughts, and beliefs concerning firm ownership.

As a result, psychological ownership provides an answer to the question of what someone considers to be his or her own. Psychological ownership describes the relation in the midst of the individual and the target (e.g., material, and immaterial items), that the target is perceived as possessing an imminent relationship with the individual (Furby, 1978; Litwinski, 1942) and becomes a portion of the expanded self (Belk, 1988). Psychological ownership, according to Pierce et al. (2003), is a multidimensional condition with cognitive and emotive foundations. Individuals' awareness, attitudes, and thoughts concerning the target of ownership are reflected cognitively. Feelings of belonging are thought to bring joy to people on an emotional level (Beggan, 1992; Furby, 1978; Porteous, 1976).

The feeling of possession or ownership is inherently human, according to Pierce et al. (2001), (2) the feeling of belonging can arise both to material and immaterial objects, (3) the feeling of having a significant emotional influence, and the effect of attitudes and behavior on individuals who experience ownership. Controlling the objective, growing to be familiar with the target well, along with engaging oneself in the target are the three primary characteristics of psychological ownership that have been recognized as procedures in the concept of psychological ownership builds up (Pierce et al., 2001). Psychological ownership can be called as a comparatively recent concept of organizational behavior in organizational and management study (Pierce et al., 2001; 2003; Van Dyne & Pierce, 2004). As a result, a lot of conversations regarding psychological ownership in businesses have been written, but there aren't a lot of empirical investigations (Avey et al., 2009; Pierce et al., 2004; Van Dyne & Pierce, 2004) person awareness, attitudes, and beliefs about the company's ownership.

C. Employee Retention

One of the most essential factors in retaining a company's best personnel is employee retention. Employee retention, according to Sumarni (2011), refers to a company's ability to keep potential employees loyal to the company. According to Zineldin (2000), retention is defined as the obligation to do business or exchange information with a specific company on a regular basis. Employees that are pleased and content with their employment are more dedicated to their work, according to Denton (2000), and always endeavor to improve customer satisfaction in their firm.

Fitz-enz (1990) claims that employee engagement and retention are influenced after a few factors rather than a single issue. Prior research has identified several parameters linked to employee retention (Brown et al., 2002).

Compensations and rewards for completed labor, determination of challenging job, promotion and cultivation opportunities, interesting organizational environment, connections with coworkers, work-life stability, communications (Walker, 2001), as well as control and surveillance are all factors that are frequently mentioned (Naqvi & Bashir, 2015). Compensation and benefits, training opportunities, equitable and commensurate treatment, and corporate culture are all included as retention variables by Ghapanchi and Aurum (2011). On the other hand, Allen and Shanock (2013) place a stronger focus on socializing connections with employees.

Management and leadership styles, according to Andrews and Wan (2009), can help organizations retain employees (Andrews & Wan, 2009). According to a group of researchers led by Loan-Clarke et al. (2010), autonomy, work schedule flexibility, also community services or welfare works assist companies maintain their workers for a great period of time. George (2015) highlights eight retention variables: management, friendly atmosphere, social support and development opportunities, autonomy, compensation, created workload, and work-life balance. According to Jamrog (2004), the best people aren't driven or remain for the money. They can survive because they are interested and pushed by work that improves their skills, and they want to work for more than simply a paycheck.

D. HR in the Integration Phase

A merger, according to Hitt (2001), is a business strategy in which two organizations agree to combine their operational activities on a generally balanced basis because they have the resources and competencies to produce a bigger competitive advantage when they work together. Consolidation is the process of merging two or more organizations to produce a new corporation with assets, liabilities, debts, and business operations (Godbole, 2013). The process through which the acquiring company obtains a controlling interest in the acquired company's share capital is known as acquisition. The purchased company's management changes because of the acquisition, but the two companies retain their respective legal identities (Godbole, 2013).

Organizational integration occurs after the M&A is announced, the deal is signed, and the amount of interaction and coordination between the two organizations involved in the M&A is specified (Schuler & Jackson, 2001). The use of strategic interdependencies across enterprises is enabled by the integration and coordination of people (Haspeslagh & Jemison, 1993). There are four themes to consider when analyzing integration: leadership (Schuler and Jackson, 2001) and team integration (Weber & Tarba, 2010); change (Lin et al., 2006) and restructuring processes (Ashkenas et al., 1998); personnel resistance (Lupina-Wegener, 2013); and retention of valuable personnel (Siegenthaler, 2011).

III. METHOD

Before conducting a review, identification of the topic to be selected is carried out. Then formulate research questions and identify keywords that will be used in the reference search. A systematic approach through article review was carried out to determine the effectiveness of start-up acquisition as a relative strategy in recruitment compared to traditional hiring, the relationship of psychological ownership with employee retention, and the human resource model for the integration stage in the context of companies conducting M&A. The article inclusion criteria were publications published between 2018 and 2020 on the topics of mergers and acquisitions and employee retention, with the exclusion criteria being research articles that could not be fully accessed. Articles that satisfied the requirements for inclusion were gathered and evaluated in detail. Three items were identified to meet the inclusion and exclusion criteria throughout the search process.

IV. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

A. Result

After reviewing the study's quality, the three papers can be classified as good, and data extraction can begin. The data is extracted by analyzing it based on the author, title, journal, purpose, study technique, and outcomes. The article's summary may be found in Table 1.

TABLE I
SUMMARY OF THE ARTICLES

No.	Author and Year	Title	Journal	Purpose	Method	Result
1	Kim, J. Daniel (2020)	Startup Acquisitions as a Hiring Strategy: Worker Choice and Turnover	SSRN	To investigate the effectiveness of start-up acquisition as a recruitment strategy	Quantitative	Acquired employees are significantly less likely to be retained than employees with traditional methods, even after accounting for employee and company-specific traits that may affect retention outcomes.
2	Rodríguez-Sánchez, J-L., Ortiz-de-Urbina-Criado, M., & Mora-Valentín, E-M. (2019)	Thinking about people in mergers and acquisitions processes	International Journal of Manpower	Propose a human resource management model for the integration phase of a merger and acquisition	Qualitative	The findings highlight the significance of human resource management in a successful M&A. Identified the most important human resource initiatives that contributed to the M&A process' success.
3	Degbey, W. Y., Rodgers, P., Kromah, M. D., & Weber, Y. (2020)	The impact of psychological ownership on employee retention in mergers and acquisitions	Human Resource Management Review	To construct a psychological model of employee ownership of the acquired company vs employee retention through mediation of employee commitment and involvement in M&A transactions	Quantitative	Employee retention in the organization is positively related to psychological ownership, which is achieved through direct and indirect impacts of employee dedication and involvement.

B. Discussion

1. Effectiveness of Startup Acquisitions as a Hiring Strategy

Because employees are one of the most essential variables that determine an organization's ability, strategic execution, and competitive advantage, acquiring the proper talent will serve as the basis for organizational success. There are also significant costs associated with recruiting, such as direct hiring fees and company costs associated with poor hiring selections. Employee expenditures account for nearly 35 percent of the entire cash burn rate for some of the leading start-up companies, according to industry analysts (Basu & Sengupta, 2016). Startups must evaluate and design their own hiring strategy, considering their strengths and weaknesses. According to existing research, talent acquisition encompasses more than just standard recruiting and involves strategic factors. Nowadays, start-ups are hiring not just for open positions, but also for positions that will open soon to support their business plans and objectives (Kaushik & Girotra, 2017). This is something that companies like Facebook do. "Facebook never bought a startup for the company itself," Mark Zuckerberg claimed in 2010, when Facebook acquired Instagram. We buy businesses to hire outstanding people." (Hindman, et al., 2010). Acquihire makes buying a bright and skilled group of people to manage their business simple and stress-free. With solid brands, decent intentions, and staff talents, this is a wonderful method for mass talent acquisition (Mahapatro, 2020).

The top five motivations for acquihire, according to Venkatesh (2019), are reducing time for innovation, enabling the acquirer to quickly acquire new competencies, being easier to integrate into the acquiring organization, being a pre-emptive strategy against competitors, and being a low-cost means of innovation. So, the successes of the five things above can be used to determine the effectiveness of acquihire.

According to Daniel Kim's research, acquired workers are significantly more likely than regular employees to leave the acquirer company in the first three years, even after controlling for important employee traits like income and age, but differences in retention between these groups will be much smaller over time. Employees with higher salaries are less likely to depart. This is in line with prior research, which has found a link between higher compensation and increased exit risk, owing to higher opportunity costs (Coff, 1997; Zenger, 1992; Campbell, Coff, & Kry, 2012). High-income employees, on the other hand, have a higher proclivity to depart, which appears to be costly to the acquiring organization. While organizational mismatch is the primary cause of increased employee turnover, according to Daniel Kim's research, acquired workers who suffer organizational dissonance are significantly more likely to depart the company, this is not the case for regular employees.

Despite the obvious advantages of hiring entire teams rather than individuals, these findings demonstrate the difficulties and limitations of startup acquisition as a hiring strategy. Companies, on the other hand, appear to be able to improve their talents in acquiring start-ups (Cohen & Levinthal, 1990). According to research on serial acquirers, prior experience in acquiring start-up companies enables the acquirer to effectively address organizational mismatch issues, allowing the acquired team to remain together. There are two forms of learning that can be done. Dynamic capabilities are defined as a company's ability to (1) sense and (2) seize new possibilities, according to Teece (2007). First, the acquirer can learn to "sense" and avoid purchasing a startup that will result in a mismatch in organizational structure. Second, the acquirer can improve its ability to "catch" and retain the acquired personnel. As a result, the human resources department must be ready to lead and manage the human aspect of the merger or acquisition integration on a proactive basis.

2. The Psychological Ownership-Employee Retention Relationship in Mergers and Acquisitions

Psychological ownership benefits organizations because it makes employees feel responsible for the organization's goals and demonstrates commitment. This can assist enterprises in retaining talent and influencing competent individuals' intentions to stay with their companies. Employee behavior can be influenced by ownership, according to Buchko (1993), primarily through the effect on employees' intentions to stay with the company. Organizations must evaluate how to keep their top employees, especially considering the significant expenses involved when key people leave. When employees leave an organization, they frequently take with them the valuable knowledge and skills they've gained through their work (Olckers & Plessis, 2012).

Psychological ownership possesses a strong and absolute bond with affective responsibility to the company (Van Dyne & Pierce, 2004; Pierce et al., 1991; Vandewalle et al., 1995). To illustrate it, Van Dyne & Pierce (2004) revealed a high connection among psychological ownership and organizational affective commitment. Hereinafter, subsequent to enumerating the demographic factors which conclude age, education level, gender, and years of service, it was shown that psychological ownership can predict the variance explained in organizational commitment. O'Driscoll et al. (2006) later discovered, psychological ownership of labor and organization was associated to workplace structure (e.g., autonomy, participatory decision-making) and many employees job-related behaviors, including organizational commitment, in a separate study. According to O'Driscoll et al. (2006), workers who work in surroundings that allow for greater autonomy and participatory decision-making exert increased individual control, have a better grasp of the job and the organization, and are more inclined to invest fully in their work.

In the context of mergers and acquisitions, several studies have discovered a link in the midst of the organizational commitment and employee retention (e.g., Ahammad et al., 2012; Hassett, 2012; Cartwright et al., 2007; Amiot et al., 2007). On the other side, recent research has begun to focus on the central of the psychological phenomena that may influence M&A results (e.g., Reus, 2015; Kusstatscher & Cooper, 2005; Sinkovics et al., 2011). Given M&A's continually contradictory and counterintuitive impacts, it's clear that more attention should be paid to how psychological and human resource concerns influence M&A. With a growing focal point on the human resource party, M&A highlights the benefits of employee interaction, participation, and dedication. Human resources play an important part in the efficacious execution of M&A in this situation, authorizing workers to feel entitled and in charge, and thus having an absolute impact on employee behavior (Vasilaki et al., 2016).

Keeping important workers from the acquired firm is critical, and one method to do so is to let them in early within the M&A process (Krug & Nigh, 1998; Schuler et al., 2004). Employee involvement enables a better familiarization with the company and to contribute in the employee commitment during the post-acquisition stage, according to Bartels et al. (2006). Patchen (1970) suggested that engagement (i.e., feelings of solidarity and belonging) might lead to commitment, meaning that employee engagement and commitment are linked. Teerikangas (2012) discovered that, contrary to most M&A research, there were more positive comments from employees during the merger and acquisition process. Six of the eight purchases elicited inspiration rather than apprehension from employees, who saw the acquisition as an opportunity rather than a threat. According to the study, the level of corporate executive participation attained during the pre-deal stage had the greatest predictive influence on employee sentiments.

When M&A is viewed as a chance or opportunity in lieu of a danger, the acquired company's leadership takes proactive steps to complete the transaction. As a result, acquiring a company leader may be a clear incentive to ensure that peers in the acquired firm are actively involved and interested in the purchase. The

M&A procedure can be utilized to acquire enough talent to win the market in the context of start-ups. This is because start-ups are made up of creative teams with unique skills. As a result, it is critical for businesses to pay attention to psychological ownership to achieve employee retention.

3. Model for the Integration Stage of Mergers and Acquisitions

The following factors are considered by the model produced for the integration step. The leadership and integration team are the first. Leadership's purpose is to help the restructuring process go more smoothly and gain the trust of both firms' human resources (Antila, 2006). Employees will be driven to implement the integration process if the leader has sufficient autonomy and employees perceive that the leader has control over the decisions made (Weber & Tarba, 2010). In the integration process, the leader is crucial. Employees must understand that integration helps the entire company to maintain and improve a solid market position. Team leaders are highly trained individuals with managerial and decision-making authority over work groups. In the context of the organization's welfare and development processes, each team leader tries to clarify needs. Team integration is essential for the growth of the integration process (Marks & Mirvis, 2000). This team must avoid issues like disagreements with HR due to ambiguous responsibilities (Rizvi, 2011) and lessen tensions by implementing adaption exercises (Zhou et al., 2008). Selecting various leaders from the target companies to carry out the integration process is a crucial decision. Employee participation in integration activities can help to create team integration unity and consistency.

Second, there is the process of transition and restructuring. The responsibility of managing the transformation process is difficult for leaders and their teams (Aguilera & Dencker, 2004). Decisions on new structures, functions, and relationships with employees should be proclaimed, realized, and implemented as soon as possible after the agreement is signed (Lin et al., 2006). Leaders deliberately and explicitly plan the transition process. The operation of the new structure and the compatibility of human resources were the outcome of a successful study. This strategy is emphasized to avoid market knowledge leakage, which might result in competitive or union action, a rise in operating prices, and employee insecurity. The degree of restructuring and modification necessary is determined by the sort of merger and acquisition, and human resource management must also be altered (Bower, 2001). Quick restructuring is essential to reduce uncertainty.

Personnel resistance is the third factor to consider. Personnel resistance to change is one of the challenges in the restructuring process. This opposition can be overt (voluntary turnover) or covert (absence or disobedience) (Lucenko, 2000). Because of the misalignment of the two companies' employees' expectations for the future in the new structure, the M&A process creates stress (Hambrick & Cannella, 1993; Lupina-Wegener, 2013). As a result, it is critical for leaders to demonstrate flexibility when it comes to team integration. Individual (psychological) or group (political) resistance can be studied (organizational culture). The target company must be able to adapt to the parent company's cultural features.

The fourth point to consider is employee retention. To accomplish the intended results, it is critical to retain great individuals; however, many firms do not know how to do it in practice (Habeck et al., 2000). To decide who is required in the current conditions and place them in the most appropriate employment positions, human resource attributes and capacities must be analyzed (Kay & Shelton, 2000). The parent business must remove personnel with remarkable skills and abilities from the target company to generate long-term competitiveness and synergies (Weber & Tarba, 2010). It is recommended that two-way communication be developed for M&A to be successful. Employees can thus ask inquiries and share their feelings (Castro Casal & Neira Fontela, 2002). For this, a satisfaction survey, workshop, or group presentation is recommended (Bastida, 2007). To establish synergies for stronger value generation, firms in the start-up sector should consider this integration stage.

V. CONCLUSION

When compared to regular employees, acquired personnel are much more likely to leave the acquiring organization. Employees with higher salaries are less likely to depart. Employees experiencing organizational dissonance are considerably more likely to leave the company among acquired workers, but this is not the case for regular employees, according to organizational mismatch as the key mechanism underlying the increase in turnover rate among workers obtained through acquihire. Additionally, psychological ownership is linked to employee retention in the workplace, which is achieved through the direct and indirect effects of employee dedication and involvement. The most challenging step of the merger and acquisition, the integration stage, should focus on leadership and team integration, change and restructuring procedures, employee resistance, and the retention of valued personnel.

The three articles' limitations are that the first, the underlying data, does not capture each other's work within the company. To overcome this limitation, it is necessary to describe the nature of the work that has been assigned to individuals. Second, the offered moderation mediation model is still insufficient. Variables such as cultural fit and contextual ambidexterity can be added in future research. The third is a study carried out during the integration stage. Further research can be conducted for the merger and acquisition process's planning and implementation stages, with the goal of presenting a complementary model of HR management in the merger and acquisition process.

REFERENCES

Ahammad, M.F., Glaister, K.W., Weber, Y., & Tarba, S.Y. (2012). Top management retention in cross-border acquisitions: the roles of financial incentives, acquirer's commitment, and autonomy. *European Journal of International Management*, *6*(4), 458-480.

Allen, D. & Shanock, L. (2013). Perceived organizational support and embeddedness as key mechanisms connecting socialization tactics to commitment and turnover among new employees. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *34*(3), 350-369.

Amlot, C.E., de la Sablonnière, R., Terry, D.J., & Smith, J.R. (2007). Integration of Social Identities in the Self: Toward a Cognitive-Developmental Model. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 11*(4), 364-388.

Andrews, D. & Wan, T.T.H. (2009). The importance of mental health to the experience of job strain: An evidence-guided approach to improve retention. *Journal of Nursing Management, 17*(3), 340-351.

Anon (2000). *Performance Measurement During Mergers and Acquisitions Integration*. New York: The Conference Board.

Antila, E. (2006). The role of HR managers in international mergers and acquisitions: a multiple case study. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *17*(6), 999-1020.

Aguilera, R.V. & Dencker, J.C. (2004). The role of human resource management in cross-border mergers and acquisitions. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *15*(8), 1355-1370.

Ashkenas, R.N., DeMonaco, L.J., & Francis, S. (1998). Making the deal real: how GE capital integrates acquisitions. *Harvard Business Review*, *76*(1), 165-178.

Avey, J.B., Avolio, B.J., & Crossley, C.D., & Luthans, F. (2009). Psychological ownership: Theoretical extensions, measurement, and relation to work outcomes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 30*(2), 173-191.

Bartels, J., Douwes, R., De Jong, M., & Pruyn, A. (2006). Organizational Identification During a Merger: Determinants of Employees' Expected Identification with the New Organization. *British Journal of Management, 17*(1), 49-67.

Bastida, M. (2007). La gestión del capital humano como activo intangible en las fusiones y adquisiciones. *Harvard Deusto Finanzas y Contabilidad*, *78*, 20-31.

Basu, S. D., & Sengupta, D. (2016, April 27). *Thrifty Indian startups eye local talent [Startups]*. Retrieved from The Economic Times: https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/small-biz/startups/thrifty-indian-startups-eye-local-talent/articleshow/5

Beggan, J.K. (1992). On the social nature of nonsocial perspection: The mere ownership effect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *62*(2), 229-237.

Belk, R.W. (1988). Possessions and the Extended Self. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *15*(2), 139-168.

Bower, J. L. (2001). Not all M&As are alike and that matters. *Harvard Business Review*, *79*(3), 92-101.

Brown, L.K., Schultz, J.R., Forsberg, A.D., King, G., Kocik, S.M., & Butler, R.B. (2002). Predictors of retention among HIV/haemophilia health care professionals. *General Hospital Psychiatry, 24*(1), 48-54.

Buchko, A.A. (2007). The effects of employee ownership on employee attitudes: An integrated causal model and path analysis. *Journal of Management Studies, 30*(4), 633-657.

Campbell, B. A., Coff, R., & Kry, D. (2012). Rethinking Sustained Competitive Advantage from Human Capital. *Academy of Management Review 37 (3),* 376–95.

Campbell, B.A., Ganco, K., Franco, A.M., & Agarwal, R. (2012). Who leaves, where to, and why worry? Employee mobility, entrepreneurship, and effects on source firm performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, *33*(1), 65–87.

Canina, L., & Kim, J-Y. (2010). Commentary: Success and failure of mergers and acquisitions. In C. Enz (Ed.), The Cornell School of Hotel Administration handbook of applied hospitality strategy (pp. 655-671). Los Angeles, CA: SAGE Publishing.

Castanias, R.P. & Constance E. Helfat, C.E. (1991). Managerial resources and rents. *Journal of Management*, *17*(1), 155–71.

Castro Casal, C. & Neira Fontela, E. (2002). Retención de recursos humanos y transferencia de conocimiento en fusiones y adquisiciones de empresas. *Estudios Financieros. Revista de Trabajo y Seguridad Social: Comentarios, Casos Prácticos: Recursos Humanos*, *46*(233-234), 135-175.

Charman, A. (1999). *Global Mergers and Acquisitions: The Human Resource Challenge. International Focus.* Alexandria, VA: Society for Human Resource Management.

Chatterji, A. & Patro, A. (2014). Dynamic Capabilities and managing human capital. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, *28*(4), 395–408

Choi, J., Goldschlag, N., Haltiwanger, J., & Kim, J. D. (2019). Founding Teams and Startup Performance. *SSRN Scholarly Paper ID 3481850. Rochester, NY.* Retrieved from https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=3481850.

Coff, R. W. (1997). Human assets and management dilemmas: Coping with hazards on the road to resource-based theory. *The Academy of Management Review*, *22*(2), 374–402.

Cohen, W. M., & Levinthal, D. A. (1990). Absorptive Capacity: A New Perspective on Learning and Innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly 35*(1*)*, 128–52.

Datta, D.K. (1991). Organizational fit and acquisition performance: effects of post-acquisitions integration. *Strategic Management Journal*, 12(4), 281-297.

Degbey, W.Y. (2015). Customer retention: A source of value for serial acquirers. *Industrial Marketing Management*, *46*, 11-23.

Degbey, W.Y. & Hassett, M.E. (2016). Creating value in cross-border M&As through strategic networks. In Tuselmann, H., Buzdugan, S., Cao, Q., Freund, D. and Golesorkhi, S. (eds), I*mpact of International Business: Challenges and Solutions for Policy and Practice* (pp. 158–177). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Degbey W.Y. & Ellis, K.M. (2017). Africa: An Emerging Context for Value Creation with Cross-Border Mergers and Acquisitions. In: Marinova S., Larimo J., Nummela N. (eds), *Value Creation in International Business: An MNC Perspective* (Vol. 1, pp. 163-195). UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Degbey, W.Y. & Ellis, K.M. (2019). Diaspora Networks in Cross-Border Mergers and Acquisitions. In: Elo M., Minto-Coy I. (eds), *Diaspora Networks in International Business. Contributions to Management Science* (pp. 407-421). Cham: Springer.

Degbey, W. Y., Rodgers, P., Kromah, M. D., & Weber, Y. (2020). The impact of psychological ownership on employee retention in mergers and acquisitions. *Human Resource Management Review*, 100745.

Denton, J. (2000). Using Web-based projects in a systems design development course. *Journal of Computer Information Systems*, *40*(3), 85-87.

Dev, A. (2021). *"Acquihire": A Journey for Startup?* Oslo: University of Oslo.

Fantasia, R. (2016). Acquihiring: A new process for innovation and organizational learning, information and communication technologies in organizations and society. *Springer*, 205-214.

Faulkner, D., Teerikangas, S., & Joseph, R.J. (2012). The Handbook of Mergers and Acquistions. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.

Fitz-enz, J. (1990). Getting and Keeping Good Employees. *Personnel Review, 67,* 25-29.

Furby, L. (1978). Possession in humans: An exploratory study of its meaning and motivation. *Social Behavior and Personality*, *6*(1), 49-65.

George, C. (2015). Retaining professional workers: What makes them stay? *Employee Relations*, *33*(1), 102-121.

Ghapanchi, A.H. & Aurum, A. (2011). Antecedents to IT Personnel's Intentions to Leave: Systematic Literature Review. *Journal of Systems and Software*, *84*(2), 238-249.

Godbole, P.G. (2013). *Mergers, Acquisitions and Corporate Restructuring*. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House.

Gomes, E., Angwin, D.N., Weber, Y. & Tarba, S.Y. (2013). Critical Success Factors through the Mergers and Acquisitions Process: Revealing Pre- and Post- M&A Connections for Improved Performance. *Thunderbird International Business Review*, *55*(1), 13-35.

Gomes, E., Weber, Y., Brown, C., & Tarba, S.Y. (2011). *Mergers, Acquisitions and Strategic Alliances: Understanding the Process*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Habeck, M. H., Kroger, F., & Trum, M. R. (2000) *After the Mergers: Seven Rules for Successful Post-merger Integration*. New York & London: Prentice Hall Financial Times.

Hambrick, D.C., & Cannella, A.A. (1993). Relative standing: A framework for understanding departures of acquired executives. *Academy of Management Journal*, *36*(4), 733-762.

Haspeslagh, P.C. & Jemison, D.B. (1993). Managing acquisitions: creating value through corporate renewal. *The Academy of Management Review*, *18*(2), 370-374.

Hassett, M.E. (2012). Organisational Commitment in Acquisitions. *Advances in Mergers and Acquisitions, 10,* 19-38.

Hatch, N.W. & Dyer, J.H. (2004). Human capital and learning as a source of sustainable competitive advantage. *Strategic Management Journal*, *25*(12), 1155–78.

Hindman, N. C. (2010). *Mark Zuckerberg: 'We Buy Companies To Get Excellent People', 2010.* THE HUFFINGTON POST. Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2010/10/19/mark-zuckerberg-we-buy-co_n_767338. html.

Hitt, M. A., Harrison, J. S., & Ireland, R. D. (2001). *Mergers and acquisitions: a guide to creating value for stakeholders*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press

Jamrog, J. (2004). The Perfect Storm: The Future of Retention and Engagement. *Human Resource Planning, 27*(3), 26-33.

Jaravel, X., Petkova, N., & Bell, A. (2018). Team-Specific Capital and Innovation. *American Economic Review 108*(4–5), 1034–73.

Kaushik, T., & Girotra, R. (2017). Person-Organization Fit: Important Aspect of Talent Acquisition for Start-ups. *Elk Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resource Management and Organisational Behaviour, 4(1),* 1-13.

Kay, I.T. & Shelton, M. (2000). The people problems in mergers. *The McKinsey Quarterly*, *4*, 29-37.

Kedia, S. (2019, June 10). *What is the Difference Between SME and Start-up*? *Marketingmind.* https://www.marketingmind.in/what-is-the-difference-between-sme-and-startup/

Kim, J. D. (2020). Startup Acquisitions as a Hiring Strategy: Worker Choice and Turnover. *SSRN*. Retrieved from https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3252784

Krug, J.A. & Nigh, D. (1998). Top management departures in cross-border acquisitions: Governance issues in an international context. *Journal of International Management, 4*(4), 267-287.

Krug, J.A. & Aguilera, R.V. (2005). Top management team turnover in mergers and acquisitions. In C. L. Cooper & S. Finkelstein (Eds.). *Advances in Mergers & Acquisitions*, *4*, 123-154.

Krug, J.A., & Shill, W. (2008). The big exit: executive churn in the wake of M&As. *Journal of Business Strategy*, *29*(4), 15-21.

Kusstatscher, V. & Cooper, C.L. (2005). Managing Emotions in Mergers and Acquisitions. Cheltenham, United Kingdom: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Lin, B.W., Hung, S.C. & Li, P.C. (2006). Mergers and acquisitions as a human resource strategy: evidence from US banking firms. *International Journal of Manpower*, *27*(2), 126-142.

Litwinski, L. (1942). Is there an instinct of possession? *British Journal of Psychology*, *33*, 29-39.

Loan-Clarke, J., Arnold, J., Coombs, C.R., Hartley, R., & Bosley, S. (2010). Retention, turnover, and return: A longitudinal study of allied health professional in Britain. *Human Resource Management Journal, 20*(4), 391-406.

Lucenko, K. (2000). Strategies for growth. *Across the Board*, September, p. 63.

Lupina-Wegener, A.A. (2013). Human resource integration in subsidiary mergers and acquisitions: evidence from Poland. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, *26*(2), 286-304.

Mahapatro, S. (2020, November 10). *Acquire vs Acquihire*. Retrieved from https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/acquire-vs-acquihire-shailesh-mahapatro/?trk=public_profile_article_view

Marks, M. L. & Mirvis, P. H. (2011). A framework for the human resources role in managing culture in mergers and acquisitions. *Human Resource Management*, *50*(6), 859-877.

Naqvi, S.M.M.R. & Bashir, S. (2015). IT-Expert Retention through Organizational Commitment: A Study of Public Sector Information Technology Professionals in Pakistan. *Applied Computing and Informatics, 11*(1), 60-75.

Neira Fontela, E. & Castro Casal, C. (1994). Los procesos de fusión/adquisición de empresas: razones, fuentes de información e importancia de los recursos humanos. *Boletín de Estudios Económicos*, *49*(152), 267-284.

O'Driscoll, M.P., Pierce, J.L., & Coghlan, A. (2006). The psychology of ownership: Work environment structure, organizational commitment, and citizenship behaviors. *Group and Organization Management, 31*, 388-416.

Olckers, C. & Du Plessis, Y. (2012). The role of psychological ownership in retaining talent: A systematic literature review. SA *Journal of Human Resource Management*, *13*(1), 1-18.

O'Reilly, C.E. (2002). The wrong kind of ownership. *Across the Board, 39*(5), 19-20.

Parker, S.K., Wall, T.D., & Jackson, P.R. (1997). "That's not my job": Developing flexible employee work orientations. *Academy of Management Journal*, *40*, 899-929.

Patchen, M. (1970). Participation, achievement, and involvement on the job. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentince Hall.

Pierce, J.L., Kostova, T., & Dirks, K.T. (2001). Toward a Theory of Psychological Ownership in Organizations. *The Academy of Management Review, 26*(2), 298-310.

Pierce, J.L., Kostova, T., & Dirks, K.T. (2003). The State of Psychological Ownership: Integrating and Extending a Century of Research. *Review of General Psychology*, *7*(1), 84-107.

Porteous, J.D. (1976). Home: The territorial core. *Geographical Review, 66*, 383-390.

Quirant Espinosa, A. & Ortega Giménez, A. (2006). El cambio organizacional: la importancia del factor humano para lograr el éxito del proceso del cambio. *Revista de Empresa*, *18*, 50-63.

Rizvi, Y. (2011). Human capital development role of human resource (HR) during mergers and acquisitions. *African Journal of Business Management*, *5*(2), 261-268.

Rodríguez-Sánchez, J-L., Ortiz-de-Urbina-Criado, M., & Mora-Valentín, E-M. (2019). Thinking about people in mergers and acquisitions processes. *International Journal of Manpower*, *40*(4), 643-657.

Robehmed, N. (2013, December 16). What is A Start-up. *Forbes*. https://www.forbes.com/sites/natalierobehmed/%202013/12/16/what-is-a-startup/

Schuler, R.S. & Jackson, S. (2001). HR issues and activities in mergers and acquisitions. *European Management Journal*, *19*(3), 239-253.

Schuler, R.S., Tarique, I., & Jackson, S.E. (2004). Managing human resources in cross-border alliances. *Advances in Mergers and Acquisitions*, *3*, 103-129.

Selby, J. & Mayer, K. (2013). Startup Firm Acquisitions as a Human Resource Strategy for Innovation: The Acqhire Phenomenon. Working Paper.

Siegenthaler, P.J. (2011). What role HR during mergers and acquisitions? *Human Resource Management International Digest*, *19*(1), 4-6.

Sinkocivs, R.R., Zagelmeyer, S., & Kusstatscher, V. (2011). Between merger and syndrome: The intermediary role of emotions in four cross-border M&As. *International Business Review*, *20*(1), 27-47.

Sumarni, M. (2011). Pengaruh Employee Retention terhadap Turnover Retention dan Kinerja Karyawan. *AKMENIKA* UPY*, 8*, 20-47.

Teece, D. J. (2007). Explicating Dynamic Capabilities: The Nature and Microfoundations of (Sustainable) Enterprise Performance. *Strategic Management Journal, 28*(13), 1319–50.

Teerikangas, S. (2012). Dynamics of Acquired Firms Pre-Acquisition Employee Reactions. *Journal of Management*, *38*, 599–639.

Van Dyne, L. & Pierce, J.L. (2004). Psychological ownership and feelings of possession: Three field studies predicting employee attitudes and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 25*(4), 439-459.

Vandewalle, D., Van Dyne, L., & Kostova, T. (1995). Psychological Ownership: An Empirical Examination of its Consequences. *Group & Organization Management*, *20*(2), 210-226.

Vasilaki, A., Tarba, S., Ahammad, M.F., Glaister, A.J. (2016). The Moderating Role of Transformational Leadership on HR Practices in M&A Integration. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *27*(20), 1-17.

Venkatesh, B. (2019, September 18). *Elements of an Acqui-Hire*. Retrieved from https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/elements-acqui-hire-balaji-venkatesh/

Walker, J.W. (2001). Perspectives. *Human Resource Planning*, *24*(1), 6-10.

Weber, Y. & Tarba, S.Y. (2010). Human resource practices and performance of mergers and acquisition in Israel. *Human Resource Management Review*, *20*(3), 203-211.

Weber, Y., Tarba, S.Y., & Öberg, C. (2014). *A comprehensive guide to mergers & acquisitions: Managing the critical success factors across every stage of the M&A process*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson & Financial Times Press.

Zenger, T. R. (1992). Why Do Employers Only Reward Extreme Performance? Examining the Relationships Among Performance, Pay, and Turnover. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *37(2)*, 198–219.

Zhang, J., Ahammad, M.F., Tarba, S., Cooper, C.L., Glaister, K.W., & Wang, J. (2015). The effect of leadership style on talent retention during merger and acquisition integration: Evidence from China. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *26*(7), 1021-1050.

Zhou, J., Shin, S. J., & Cannella, A. A. (2008). Employee self-perceived creativity after mergers and acquisitions: interactive effects of threat opportunity perception, access to resources, and support for creativity. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *44*(4), 397-421.

Zineldin, M. (2000). *TRM: Total Relationship Management.* Lund, Sweden: Studentlitteratur.