

Strategic Human Resource Development in the Digital Era: Fostering Agility, Continuous Upskilling, and Organizational Resilience

1. **Dr. Rupali Tukaram Rathod**

Associate Professor Government Women's First Grade College, Kalaburgi, Karnataka

DOI: doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23105761

Abstract

Digital technologies such as artificial intelligence, automation, cloud platforms and data analytics are reshaping the work, skills and structures of organizations at a pace that challenges traditional approaches to workforce development. This article examines Strategic Human Resource Development (SHRD) as a means of aligning learning and development with an organization's long-term strategy in the digital era. Drawing on dynamic capabilities theory, the resource-based view, organizational learning theory and the literature on organizational resilience, it develops an integrative conceptual framework in which three interlinked outcomes, namely agility, continuous upskilling and resilience, are treated as mutually reinforcing rather than separate goals. The article argues that SHRD contributes to competitive advantage when it moves from episodic training towards a continuous learning architecture that is embedded in work, supported by psychological safety and informed by carefully governed workforce analytics. Implementation barriers, including ethical concerns about algorithmic tools, unequal access to learning and the difficulty of evaluating impact, are discussed with reference to the Indian context. The article concludes with implications for practice and directions for empirical research.

Keywords: Strategic human resource development; digital transformation; organizational agility; up skilling; organizational resilience; dynamic capabilities; learning organization

Article Information

Article Type:
Research Article

Received:
01 February 2026

Accepted:
15 February 2026

Published:
28 February 2026

INTRODUCTION

The past decade has witnessed an acceleration in the adoption of digital technologies that is altering not only how organizations produce goods and deliver services but also what work consists of and who performs it. Artificial intelligence, robotic process automation, cloud computing, platform business models and pervasive data analytics have moved from experimental pilots to core operating infrastructure in many sectors (Vial, 2019). Scholars of technology and labour have long argued that such technologies tend to reorganize tasks rather than simply eliminate jobs, automating some activities while raising the value of others that complement machines (Autor, 2015; Brynjolfsson & McAfee, 2014). For organizations, the practical consequence is that the shelf life of many skills is shortening, and the capacity to learn has become a strategic asset in its own right. Human resource development (HRD) is the organizational function most directly concerned with this capacity. Yet in many organizations HRD continues to operate as a calendar of classroom programmes, loosely connected to strategy and evaluated by attendance and satisfaction scores. Such an approach is poorly matched to an environment in which required competencies can change within a single planning cycle. Research on digital transformation points in the same direction.



Copyright © 2026, Authors retain copyright. Licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/> (CC BY 4.0 deed)

Kane et al. (2019) argue, on the basis of survey and interview evidence, that organizations succeed in digital transformation less because of the technologies they adopt than because of their culture, talent practices and readiness to learn, a claim they summarize as the "technology fallacy".

This article examines strategic human resource development (SHRD) as a response to these conditions. It asks how SHRD can be designed to foster three interdependent outcomes: organizational agility, continuous upskilling and organizational resilience. The article is conceptual and integrative. It synthesizes literature from HRD, strategic management and organizational studies, proposes a framework linking the three outcomes, and outlines implementation challenges and research directions. The central argument is that the outcomes should be treated as a system: upskilling supplies capabilities, agility governs how quickly those capabilities are redeployed, and resilience determines whether the organization can absorb shocks and emerge stronger.

2. Conceptual and Theoretical Foundations

Garavan (1991) offered one of the earliest formulations of SHRD, describing it as the strategic management of training, development and learning so that they contribute to organizational goals and help to shape, rather than merely follow, strategy. McCracken and Wallace (2000) later refined the concept by identifying features such as top-management support for learning, integration of HRD into strategy formulation, environmental scanning and partnership between HRD professionals and line managers. The common thread is a shift in the role of HRD from a reactive provider of courses to a proactive contributor to strategic direction. In the digital era this contribution is particularly important because technological choices and workforce capability are tightly coupled: an analytics strategy cannot be executed without analytically literate employees, and the workforce cannot be prepared without early sight of the strategy.

Three theoretical lenses help to explain why SHRD matters. First, the resource-based view holds that sustained competitive advantage derives from resources that are valuable, rare, inimitable and non-substitutable (Barney, 1991). Human capital, when developed through firm-specific learning and embedded in organizational routines, can meet these conditions (Becker, 1964; Ployhart&Moliterno, 2011). Wright and McMahan (1992) extended this reasoning to strategic human resource management, and Lepak and Snell (1999) showed that different types of human capital call for different development and employment arrangements, an insight that is useful when firms must decide which digital skills to build internally and which to source externally.

Second, dynamic capabilities theory addresses the problem that valuable resources can quickly become obsolete in fast-changing environments. Teece, Pisano and Shuen (1997) define dynamic capabilities as the ability to integrate, build and reconfigure internal and external competences, and Teece (2007) disaggregates them into sensing opportunities and threats, seizing opportunities, and transforming the organization. SHRD contributes to each element. Environmental scanning and skills forecasting support sensing; rapid mobilization and reskilling of talent support seizing; and leadership development and cultural change support transformation.

Third, organizational learning theory distinguishes between single-loop learning, which corrects errors within existing assumptions, and double-loop learning, which questions the assumptions themselves (Argyris & Schön, 1978). Senge (1990) popularized the idea of the learning organization, and Marsick and Watkins (2003) operationalized it through dimensions such as continuous learning, inquiry and dialogue, collaboration, embedded systems and strategic leadership. Digital disruption frequently demands double-loop learning, since it challenges the underlying business logic of established firms and not merely their procedures.

3. The Digital Era as Strategic Context

Three features of the digital environment shape SHRD priorities. The first is skills disruption. The World Economic Forum (2023) reports that employers expect a large share of workers' core skills, in the region of forty per cent, to change within five years, and that around six in ten workers will

need training before 2027, with analytical thinking, creative thinking and technological literacy among the priorities. A McKinsey Global Institute analysis of the United States and Europe similarly projected sizeable growth in demand for advanced technological, social and emotional skills by 2030, alongside declining demand for basic cognitive and manual skills (Bughin et al., 2018).

The second feature is the diffusion of artificial intelligence into managerial and knowledge work. Davenport and Ronanki (2018) observe that the most practical organizational uses of AI have centred on process automation, cognitive insight and cognitive engagement, and that value depends on integrating these applications with existing work. This places demands on employees' ability to interpret and act on machine outputs. Skills such as data interpretation, critical evaluation of algorithmic recommendations and human-machine collaboration thus become part of ordinary job requirements rather than specialist niches.

The third feature is the changing role of HR itself. Ulrich and Dulebohn (2015) argue that HR must increasingly create value through capability building, analytics and a focus on stakeholder outcomes, while Tambe, Cappelli and Yakubovich (2019) caution that data-driven HR tools raise challenges of measurement validity, employee reaction and fairness. Learning professionals therefore work in an environment that offers unprecedented data and tools but also demands greater care about ethics and evidence.

4. Fostering Organizational Agility

Organizational agility refers to the ability to sense environmental change and respond quickly and effectively, reconfiguring resources without prohibitive cost. Doz and Kosonen (2010) identify strategic sensitivity, collective commitment and resource fluidity as the meta-capabilities on which strategic agility depends. Each has a human development dimension.

Strategic sensitivity depends on the quality of attention that leaders and employees pay to weak signals. SHRD can develop it by broadening exposure through cross-functional projects, external partnerships, customer immersion and structured horizon-scanning routines, so that employees do not view the environment solely through the lens of their own function. Collective commitment relates to the leadership team's ability to make bold decisions quickly without political deadlock. Leadership development that emphasizes dialogue, conflict handling and shared sense-making, rather than only individual competencies, is the relevant SHRD instrument. Resource fluidity concerns how easily people, budgets and attention can be redeployed. Here, practices such as job rotation, internal talent marketplaces, modular role design and cross-training reduce the friction of moving talent to emerging priorities.

Agility also depends on decision rights and team design. Digital-era firms frequently adopt cross-functional, iterative ways of working, such as product teams and short experimentation cycles, that place greater responsibility for judgement and coordination at lower levels of the organization. These structures work only if employees have the skills to use them: facilitation, prioritization, data-informed experimentation and comfort with ambiguity. Without deliberate development, agile labels can mask traditional hierarchies. SHRD should therefore treat agility as a capability to be learned and rehearsed, not simply as a structure to be announced.

Finally, agility requires psychological conditions in which people feel able to try, fail and report. Edmondson (1999) showed that psychological safety, the shared belief that a team is safe for interpersonal risk taking, is associated with learning behaviour in work teams, and later work has extended this argument to innovation and open discussion of error (Edmondson, 2018). Leaders who model curiosity and treat failed experiments as sources of information make rapid adaptation considerably more likely.

5. Continuous Upskilling as a Strategic Capability

Upskilling in the digital era differs from traditional training in its speed, granularity and integration with work. The training research literature offers useful guidance. Bell et al. (2017), reviewing a century of training and development research, conclude that effectiveness depends on learner characteristics, design features and, critically, the work environment that supports or inhibits the transfer of learning. Sitzmann and Weinhardt (2018) likewise emphasize that engagement in training is shaped by the interplay of individual, team and organizational factors, and Noe, Clarke and Klein (2014) describe a workplace in which learning is increasingly self-directed, informal, technology-mediated and socially embedded.

Four design principles follow from this literature. First, upskilling should rest on a strategy-linked skills architecture. This begins with an explicit skills taxonomy, derived from strategic priorities and updated regularly, that identifies critical skills, current supply and gaps. Analytics can support the process, but Marler and Boudreau (2017) find that the evidence for the organizational impact of HR analytics remains limited and that its value depends on data quality and managerial use, so skills data should inform judgement rather than replace it.

Second, learning should occur in the flow of work. Microlearning, digital platforms, mentoring, communities of practice and stretch assignments allow learning to take place close to the point of application, which improves transfer. Adult learning theory has long held that adults are motivated by problem-centred and immediately relevant learning (Knowles, 1984). Third, learning should offer personalization and learner agency. Adaptive platforms and transparent career pathways allow employees to choose routes that meet both their aspirations and organizational needs. Sousa and Rocha (2019) argue that digital learning for digital transformation should develop not only technical competence but also soft skills such as communication, collaboration and adaptability.

Fourth, line managers must be enabled as learning partners. Managers determine whether employees have the time, encouragement and opportunities to apply new skills. Where managers treat learning as a distraction from targets, formal offerings will have little effect, a point consistent with the emphasis on the transfer climate in the training literature (Bell et al., 2017).

Three cautions apply. Upskilling should not be confused with technical skills alone. As automation absorbs routine tasks, distinctly human capabilities such as judgement, ethical reasoning, creativity and collaboration are likely to grow in relative importance (Autor, 2015; World Economic Forum, 2023). Access must also be equitable. If digital learning resources are captured mainly by employees who are already advantaged, for example those with more time, better connectivity or more supportive managers, upskilling may widen internal inequalities. Finally, the assumption that more training is always better should be resisted. Learning investments should be targeted, evaluated and connected to real opportunities to use new skills, or they risk producing frustration and turnover.

6. Building Organizational Resilience

Organizational resilience has been defined in several ways. Williams et al. (2017), in a broad review, treat resilience as the process by which organizations absorb adversity and either maintain positive adjustment or recover and grow, whereas Ducheck (2020) conceptualizes it as a capability with anticipation, coping and adaptation stages. Hamel and Välikangas (2003) argued that resilience means the ability to reinvent strategies and business models before circumstances force change. Weick and Sutcliffe (2007), drawing on studies of high-reliability organizations, highlight preoccupation with failure, reluctance to simplify, sensitivity to operations, commitment to resilience and deference to expertise.

Human capabilities sit at the heart of these accounts. Sutcliffe and Vogus (2003) argue that resilience is built from individual competence, relationships and shared practices that enable people to make sense of and respond to unexpected events. SHRD contributes in several ways. Cross-training and broad skill portfolios create redundancy, so that operations can continue when key

people are unavailable. Simulation-based and scenario-based learning gives leaders and teams practice with crises before they occur, building the improvisational competence emphasized by high-reliability scholars. Leader development that fosters transparent communication and empathy sustains trust during disruption. Attention to employee wellbeing and workload matters as well, because a workforce exhausted by constant change has limited capacity to adapt.

Digital technologies both create and mitigate vulnerabilities. Cloud infrastructure and remote collaboration tools allow many organizations to keep operating during disruptions, but only where employees have the digital fluency, and managers the competence, to use them effectively. Conversely, dependence on digital systems raises exposure to cyber incidents and system failures, which makes security awareness and contingency drills a legitimate component of resilience-oriented HRD. Importantly, resilience should be understood not as a return to the previous state but, in line with Williams et al. (2017) and Hamel and Välikangas (2003), as an ongoing capacity for adjustment and renewal.

7. An Integrative Framework

Drawing these threads together, this article proposes that SHRD in the digital era operates through a cycle. Strategy-linked sensing informs skills priorities; continuous upskilling builds capabilities; agile structures and practices deploy those capabilities; and reflective learning from disruption and experimentation feeds back into strategy. Resilience is both an outcome of this cycle and a condition that sustains it, because organizations that recover from shocks with their learning intact retain the ability to keep adapting. The cycle draws on the dynamic capabilities sequence of sensing, seizing and transforming (Teece, 2007) and on the distinction between single-loop and double-loop learning (Argyris & Schön, 1978).

Table 1 links each outcome to core SHRD levers, theoretical foundations and illustrative indicators. The indicators are suggestions for evaluation rather than validated measures, and organizations should adapt them to their own context.

Table 1. *Integrative SHRD framework for the digital era*

Outcome	Core SHRD levers	Theoretical foundation	Illustrative indicators
Agility	Cross-functional learning networks; job rotation and stretch assignments; distributed decision rights; rapid experimentation	Dynamic capabilities; strategic agility	Time taken to redeploy talent; speed of adopting new tools; internal mobility rate
Continuous upskilling	Skills taxonomy and gap analysis; modular and micro-learning; learning in the flow of work; credentialing	Human capital theory; adult learning; training effectiveness research	Coverage of critical skills; learning transfer; participation across job levels
Resilience	Psychological safety; cross-training; scenario-based simulation; leader development; wellbeing support	Organizational learning; resilience capability	Recovery time after disruption; retention during change; quality of error reporting

Three propositions follow that can guide empirical testing. Proposition 1: SHRD practices that link learning to strategy and embed it in work are positively associated with organizational agility, and the relationship is mediated by resource fluidity and breadth of employee skills. Proposition 2: the effect of formal upskilling investment on performance is moderated by manager support for transfer and by psychological safety. Proposition 3: organizations that combine broad skill portfolios, cross-training and psychologically safe cultures recover more quickly from disruption and are more likely to benefit from it.

8. Implementation Challenges and the Indian Context

Several challenges complicate implementation. Measurement is the first. Linking learning investments to strategic outcomes is difficult, and reliance on participation and satisfaction metrics reveals little about genuine capability change (Bell et al., 2017). Second, ethical and privacy concerns arise when analytics and AI are used to assess skills or recommend learning paths; Tambe et al. (2019) note risks of bias, opacity and employee distrust. Transparent data governance, human oversight and employee involvement in designing such systems are important safeguards. Third, cultural and structural inertia may persist: hierarchical organizations can resist distributed decision-making and open error reporting, undermining the conditions for agility and learning. Fourth, resource constraints, especially in smaller firms and public institutions, limit the scope for sophisticated platforms, although low-cost measures such as mentoring, communities of practice and job rotation remain feasible.

The Indian context illustrates both the scale of the opportunity and the difficulty. Budhwar and Varma (2011) describe how liberalization and globalization pushed Indian organizations towards more strategic, performance-oriented human resource management, while noting persistent variation between multinational, private and public-sector practices. India's large and young workforce, the growth of its services and technology sectors, and policy initiatives to expand skills and digital learning create favourable conditions for upskilling. The National Education Policy 2020, for instance, emphasizes multidisciplinary learning, vocational integration and technology-enabled education (Ministry of Education, 2020), which could help build the foundations on which employers' SHRD systems depend. At the same time, disparities in digital access, uneven quality of vocational and higher education, and the coexistence of formal and informal employment mean that SHRD strategies must be sensitive to varied starting points. Educational institutions face the same imperatives: faculty and administrative staff must continually update digital, pedagogical and research competencies, and institutional SHRD must balance academic autonomy with strategic direction.

9. Implications and Directions for Future Research

For practitioners, the analysis suggests several priorities. HRD leaders should participate in strategy discussions early enough to anticipate skill needs and should build and maintain a skills architecture linked to strategic priorities. Investment should shift from one-off programmes to continuous, work-embedded learning, supported by line managers who are equipped as learning enablers. Leaders should cultivate psychological safety through their everyday behaviour, and resilience-oriented practices such as cross-training and scenario simulation should be built into routine development. Policymakers and institutions can support these efforts through incentives for workplace learning, recognition of micro-credentials and investment in digital infrastructure and inclusion.

For researchers, several gaps remain. Much of the evidence on digital transformation and workforce development comes from large firms in advanced economies, and studies of small enterprises, public institutions and emerging economies are needed. Longitudinal and multi-level designs are required to test whether SHRD practices cause improvements in agility and resilience rather than merely accompanying them. The consequences of generative AI for learning, skill formation and job design are still emerging and deserve sustained attention, including the possibility that heavy

reliance on AI assistance may weaken the development of underlying expertise. Finally, better measures are needed for constructs such as organizational learning agility and resilience-oriented capability.

10. Conclusion

Digital technologies have made the ability to learn and re-learn a core strategic resource. This article has argued that SHRD, when positioned strategically, can build that resource by fostering agility, sustaining continuous upskilling and strengthening resilience, and that these outcomes are best understood as a mutually reinforcing system. The theoretical foundations of resource-based reasoning, dynamic capabilities and organizational learning converge on the point that competitive advantage in turbulent conditions rests less on any particular stock of skills than on the organization's capacity to renew them. Realizing that capacity requires investment not only in platforms and content but also in leadership, culture, equitable access and rigorous evaluation. Organizations that treat HRD as a strategic partner in digital transformation, rather than a support service, are likely to be better prepared for the disruptions that lie ahead.

Article Publication Details

This article is published in the **Globenix Multidisciplinary Journal**, ISSN 3139-0870 (Online). In Volume 2, Issue 4 (July - August) – 2026. The journal is published and managed by **Globenix Publisher**.

Copyright © 2026, Authors retain copyright. Licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/> (CC BY 4.0 deed)

Acknowledgements

We sincerely thank the editors and the reviewers for their valuable suggestions on this paper.

Funding

The authors declare that no funding was received for this work.

References

1. Argyris, C., & Schön, D. A. (1978). *Organizational learning: A theory of action perspective*. Addison-Wesley.
2. Autor, D. H. (2015). Why are there still so many jobs? The history and future of workplace automation. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 29(3), 3–30.
3. Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17(1), 99–120.
4. Becker, G. S. (1964). *Human capital*. Columbia University Press.
5. Bell, B. S., Tannenbaum, S. I., Ford, J. K., Noe, R. A., & Kraiger, K. (2017). 100 years of training and development research: What we know and where we should go. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(3), 305–323.
6. Brynjolfsson, E., & McAfee, A. (2014). *The second machine age: Work, progress, and prosperity in a time of brilliant technologies*. W. W. Norton.
7. Budhwar, P. S., & Varma, A. (2011). Emerging patterns of HRM in the new Indian economic environment. *Human Resource Management*, 50(3), 317–331.
8. Bughin, J., Hazan, E., Lund, S., Dahlström, P., Wiesinger, A., & Subramaniam, A. (2018). *Skill shift: Automating the future of work*. McKinsey Global Institute.
9. Davenport, T. H., & Ronanki, R. (2018). Artificial intelligence for the real world. *Harvard Business Review*, 96(1), 108–116.
10. Doz, Y., & Kosonen, M. (2010). Embedding strategic agility: A leadership agenda for accelerating business model renewal. *Long Range Planning*, 43(2–3), 370–382.
11. Duchek, S. (2020). Organizational resilience: A capability-based conceptualization. *Business Research*, 13(1), 215–246.

12. Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(2), 350–383.
13. Edmondson, A. C. (2018). *The fearless organization: Creating psychological safety in the workplace for learning, innovation, and growth*. Wiley.
14. Garavan, T. N. (1991). Strategic human resource development. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 15(1), 17–30.
15. Hamel, G., & Välikangas, L. (2003). The quest for resilience. *Harvard Business Review*, 81(9), 52–63.
16. Kane, G. C., Phillips, A. N., Copulsky, J. R., & Andrus, G. R. (2019). *The technology fallacy: How people are the real key to digital transformation*. MIT Press.
17. Knowles, M. S. (1984). *Andragogy in action*. Jossey-Bass.
18. Lepak, D. P., & Snell, S. A. (1999). The human resource architecture: Toward a theory of human capital allocation and development. *Academy of Management Review*, 24(1), 31–48.
19. Marler, J. H., & Boudreau, J. W. (2017). An evidence-based review of HR analytics. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 28(1), 3–26.
20. Marsick, V. J., & Watkins, K. E. (2003). Demonstrating the value of an organization's learning culture: The dimensions of the learning organization questionnaire. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 5(2), 132–151.
21. McCracken, M., & Wallace, M. (2000). Towards a redefinition of strategic HRD. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 24(5), 281–290.
22. Ministry of Education. (2020). *National Education Policy 2020*. Government of India.
23. Noe, R. A., Clarke, A. D. M., & Klein, H. J. (2014). Learning in the twenty-first-century workplace. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1, 245–275.
24. Ployhart, R. E., & Moliterno, T. P. (2011). Emergence of the human capital resource: A multilevel model. *Academy of Management Review*, 36(1), 127–150.
25. Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. Doubleday.
26. Sitzmann, T., & Weinhardt, J. M. (2018). Training engagement theory: A multilevel perspective on the effectiveness of work-related training. *Journal of Management*, 44(2), 732–756.
27. Sousa, M. J., & Rocha, Á. (2019). Digital learning: Developing skills for digital transformation of organizations. *Future Generation Computer Systems*, 91, 327–334.
28. Sutcliffe, K. M., & Vogus, T. J. (2003). Organizing for resilience. In K. S. Cameron, J. E. Dutton, & R. E. Quinn (Eds.), *Positive organizational scholarship: Foundations of a new discipline* (pp. 94–110). Berrett-Koehler.
29. Tambe, P., Cappelli, P., & Yakubovich, V. (2019). Artificial intelligence in human resources management: Challenges and a path forward. *California Management Review*, 61(4), 15–42.
30. Teece, D. J. (2007). Explicating dynamic capabilities: The nature and microfoundations of (sustainable) enterprise performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 28(13), 1319–1350.
31. Teece, D. J., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18(7), 509–533.
32. Ulrich, D., & Dulebohn, J. H. (2015). Are we there yet? What's next for HR? *Human Resource Management Review*, 25(2), 188–204.
33. Vial, G. (2019). Understanding digital transformation: A review and a research agenda. *Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, 28(2), 118–144.
34. Weick, K. E., & Sutcliffe, K. M. (2007). *Managing the unexpected: Resilient performance in an age of uncertainty* (2nd ed.). Jossey-Bass.
35. Williams, T. A., Gruber, D. A., Sutcliffe, K. M., Shepherd, D. A., & Zhao, E. Y. (2017). Organizational response to adversity: Fusing crisis management and resilience research streams. *Academy of Management Annals*, 11(2), 733–769.
36. World Economic Forum. (2023). *The future of jobs report 2023*. World Economic Forum.
37. Wright, P. M., & McMahan, G. C. (1992). Theoretical perspectives for strategic human resource management. *Journal of Management*, 18(2), 295–320.

GLOBENIX PUBLISHER remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations. The statements, opinions, and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of GLOBENIX PUBLISHER and/or the editor(s). GLOBENIX PUBLISHER disclaims responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions, or products referred to in the content.