

Evolving talent management patterns and challenges in Russia and Kazakhstan: Investigating employer perspective

Khoreva, V. & Kostanek, E.

Author post-print (accepted) deposited by Coventry University's Repository

Original citation & hyperlink:

Khoreva, V & Kostanek, E 2019, 'Evolving talent management patterns and challenges in Russia and Kazakhstan: Investigating employer perspective' *Baltic Journal of Management*, vol. (In-press), pp. (In-press).
<https://dx.doi.org/10.1108/BJM-09-2018-0340>

DOI 10.1108/BJM-09-2018-0340

ISSN 1746-5265

Publisher: Emerald

Copyright © and Moral Rights are retained by the author(s) and/ or other copyright owners. A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge. This item cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the copyright holder(s). The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

This document is the author's post-print version, incorporating any revisions agreed during the peer-review process. Some differences between the published version and this version may remain and you are advised to consult the published version if you wish to cite from it.



**Evolving talent management patterns and challenges in
Russia and Kazakhstan: Investigating employer perspective**

Journal:	<i>Baltic Journal of Management</i>
Manuscript ID	BJM-09-2018-0340.R1
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	Talent management, Emerging markets, Human resource management, Qualitative research

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

EVOLVING TALENT MANAGEMENT PATTERNS AND CHALLENGES IN RUSSIA AND KAZAKHSTAN: INVESTIGATING EMPLOYER PERSPECTIVE

Abstract

Purpose. We investigate the evolving patterns and challenges of talent management (TM) in the emerging markets of Russia and Kazakhstan from the employer perspective. Increasing our understanding of how TM is recognized from the employer perspective may better equip us to address how to effectively manage and lead the available talents in these and other emerging markets.

Design. We conducted a qualitative study comprising 50 semi-structured interviews, with 37 business leaders from Russian subsidiaries, and 13 from Kazakh subsidiaries, in all cases of Nordic Multinational enterprises (MNEs).

Findings. Our study supports the object approach to TM in the emerging markets of Russia and Kazakhstan. We reveal that the exclusive and developable talent philosophy is predominant in these emerging markets, where TM faces the challenges of fierce competition for talents and an insufficient supply, so business leaders tend to be reluctant to inform employees of their talent pool membership. Our results demonstrate that MNEs do not act independently of context, thus supporting calls for consideration of the local institutional context.

Originality. TM is still a somewhat novel idea in many emerging economies, and challenges related to managing talents are believed to be far more complex in such settings. Furthermore, to the best of our knowledge, no studies have investigated the notion of talent and TM conceptualization in the emerging markets from an employer perspective.

Introduction

Talents: the hardest to get, the hardest to keep. Certainly, talent management (TM) research has attracted a remarkable degree of academic and practitioner interest (Cascio and Boudreau, 2016; Collings and Isichei, 2018; Gallardo-Gallardo and Thunnissen, 2016; Krishnan and Scullion, 2017; McDonnell *et al.*, 2017; Vaiman *et al.*, 2017; Van den Broek *et al.*, 2018). TM has become a vital component of the world's most influential academic and practitioner-oriented conferences (e.g., Academy of Management Annual Meeting). Furthermore, several prominent academic journals have devoted special issues to this research domain (e.g., *Employee Relations* in 2016). TM also continues to be a priority for companies worldwide (Cascio and Boudreau, 2016; Meyers and van Woerkom, 2014). Some actors say they bet on people, not strategies, i.e. the strategy has little value to it unless executed through people. Indeed, companies are fully aware they need to attract, develop and retain talents to succeed in the current hyper-competitive and increasingly complex global economy.

TM has become one of the fastest growing areas of academic work in the management field over recent decades (Collings *et al.*, 2015; Sidani and Al Ariss, 2014). In terms of theory, the emerging body of literature has a distinctly Westernized perspective (Schuler *et al.*, 2011), with research mostly conducted in the context of developed countries (Björkman *et al.*, 2013; Gooderham and Nordhaug, 2011; Skuza *et al.*, 2013). For instance, Al Ariss *et al.* (2013) suggest that greater sensitiveness to societal contexts would enable a better understanding of TM dynamics. Academics have recently started to contextualize TM by investigating it in specific business sectors, small and medium-sized companies (Festing *et al.*, 2013; Krishnan and Scullion, 2017), as well as emerging markets (Ahammad *et al.*, 2018; Ambrosius, 2018; Cui *et al.*, 2018; Latukha, 2018; Nayak *et al.*, 2018; Tansley and Kirk, 2018), demonstrating that “context is everything” (Sparrow and Makram, 2015, p. 249). TM is still a somewhat novel idea in many emerging economies, and it is believed that challenges related to managing talents

1
2
3 are far more involved in such settings (Sparrow *et al.*, 2014). Furthermore, to the best of our
4
5 knowledge, no studies have investigated the notion of talent and the TM conceptualization in
6
7 the emerging markets from an employer perspective. This is critical since failing to understand
8
9 the *employer* perspective in the emerging markets can lead to a breakdown in the
10
11 implementation of recommended TM practices in these markets (Khilji *et al.*, 2015; Sidani and
12
13 Al Ariss, 2014). Notably, the rapid economic, social and political transformation in Russia and
14
15 Kazakhstan has led to the need for more updated knowledge of TM in these markets, since
16
17 most of the existing evidence is based on anecdotal or limited information from organizational
18
19 reports (Latukha, 2018).
20
21
22

23
24 Guided by these observations, we consider it timely to investigate from the employer
25
26 perspective the evolving patterns and challenges of TM in the emerging markets of Russia and
27
28 Kazakhstan. We believe this research gap merits further attention and can offer a platform for
29
30 future conceptual and empirical studies. By increasing our understanding of how TM is
31
32 recognized from the employer perspective in Russia and Kazakhstan, we may be better
33
34 equipped to address how to effectively manage and lead the talents available in these and other
35
36 emerging markets. In addition, many TM studies have targeted HR practitioners as their key
37
38 respondents (Jones *et al.*, 2012). Although they may have a profound understanding of the HR
39
40 strategy and TM practices in place, they embody mainly the interpretations of HR
41
42 professionals, which may be different to those of organizational decision makers. To fulfil our
43
44 objectives, we conducted a qualitative study comprising 50 semi-structured interviews, with
45
46 37 business leaders from Russian subsidiaries, and 13 from Kazakh subsidiaries, in all cases of
47
48 Nordic Multinational enterprises (MNEs).
49
50
51
52
53

54
55 We offer the following contributions to the current TM research. First, we explore the voices
56
57 of business leaders who are believed to be the most knowledgeable about their employees,
58
59 particularly talents, and whose perspective might be distinct from the opinions of the talents
60

1
2
3 themselves. Second, in choosing an inductive inquiry and retrospectively interpreting the data,
4
5 we identify evolving patterns and challenges of TM in the emerging markets of Russia and
6
7 Kazakhstan.
8
9

10 11 **Conceptual background**

12
13
14 This section brings together several streams of the TM literature and paves the way for the
15
16 empirical study. First, we review the recent TM approaches and philosophies. Second, we
17
18 investigate the recent TM literature related to the talent identification process and its evaluation
19
20 criteria. Finally, drawing on the social exchange perspective, we discuss the concept of talent
21
22 identification transparency.
23
24
25

26 27 *Talent and Talent Management Approaches*

28
29
30 In exploring the broader literature on TM, a separate line of research has reviewed who is
31
32 regarded as a talent (Gallardo-Gallardo *et al.*, 2013; Meyers *et al.*, 2013). Talent can be
33
34 considered in terms of being an object or a subject alongside the extent to which an inclusive
35
36 or exclusive perspective is adopted (Gallardo-Gallardo *et al.*, 2013). The subject approach sees
37
38 all employees as talents (inclusive), whereby organisations should utilise every employee's
39
40 strengths for the organisation's benefit (e.g., Becker *et al.*, 2009; Dries and Pepermans, 2008;
41
42 Silzer and Church, 2010). The object or elite approach sees a subset of the workforce as
43
44 somewhat more vital than everyone else concerning the value those employees add to
45
46 organizational performance. The object approach highlights individual characteristics of talents
47
48 such as ability, competence, performance, and behaviour (e.g., Hough and Oswald, 2000;
49
50 Ulrich and Smallwood, 2012). From this perspective, talent can refer to natural ability or
51
52 innateness, the mastery of particular competencies, possessing the organizational commitment
53
54 and fit to the specific context, as an employee may not perform in the same way across every
55
56 situation or context (Gallardo-Gallardo *et al.*, 2013).
57
58
59
60

Talent Management Definition and Talent Identification Process

The most cited definition to date of TM relates to an object, or in other words the elite approach to TM with a focus on particular segments of the workforce. Thus, Collings and Mellahi (2009, p. 304) define TM as “activities and processes that involve the systematic identification of key positions which differentially contribute to the organization’s sustainable competitive advantage, the development of a talent pool of high potential and high performing incumbents to fill these roles, and the development of a differentiated human resource architecture to facilitate filling these positions with competent incumbents and to ensure their continued commitment to the organization”. Collings and Mellahi (2009) emphasize that the focus of TM should be on the identification of key roles (or positions) that add to the organization’s competitive advantage. Therefore, before focusing on talents, organizations need to establish where those personnel can have the greatest impact on organizational outcomes. A key challenge for organizations is then to identify the pivotal or strategic roles, which are often located outside senior leadership (which are key by nature) (Huselid and Becker, 2011; McDonnell *et al.*, 2016). Performance management and appraisal commonly play a crucial function in these decisions. However, many HR practitioners continue to struggle with constructing an effective performance management process. For example, during 2015, more than 50 major US employers including Netflix, Microsoft, Accenture, and Deloitte, revealed that they rigorously update their performance management processes, including in many cases removing the traditional annual performance “rating” (Buckingham and Goodall, 2015). Nonetheless, while researchers have long acknowledged the challenges surrounding the accuracy of performance evaluations, a shift away from the use of formal performance evaluations in the talent identification process raises essential concerns for TM.

Talent Identification Transparency

Once the organization identifies critical roles that add to its competitive advantage, and ‘spots’ the talents best suited to those roles, the question arises as to whether or not the management should inform employees of their talent pool membership. This dilemma, or better yet, concept, has been entitled talent identification transparency, and is defined as the practice of informing employees of their talent pool membership (Khoreva *et al.*, 2018).

Several studies have investigated attitudinal and behavioural outcomes of employees being informed of their talent pool membership (Björkman *et al.*, 2013; King, 2016; Marescaux *et al.*, 2013; Swailes and Blackburn, 2016). They tend to react by displaying, for instance, enhanced commitment, job satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviour (Anand *et al.*, 2010; Hornung *et al.*, 2010), increased performance, and reduced turnover intentions (Björkman *et al.*, 2013). Besides, the differential treatment of employees based on their talent potential creates a ‘continuous tournament’, where employees are motivated to develop and apply the skills and qualities the organization requires (Höglund, 2012).

Talent identification transparency may be reasonable from a strategic perspective, since it reflects positive organizational expectations of employee capability to achieve future performance and advancement. However, many organizations consider this transparency risky because today’s employer-employee relationship is supposedly less about loyalty and long tenure, and more about self-managed careers and finding a better deal (Dries, 2013). Besides, talent identification transparency may promote inequality among employees, making it a sensitive matter (Gelens *et al.*, 2013). Human resources are, after all, human beings, who may react emotionally, both cognitively and behaviourally, when treated differently from others (Paauwe, 2004).

1
2
3 In line with the social exchange perspective, Khoreva *et al.* (2018) argued that talents informed
4 of their talent pool membership may view the acquired rank as an indication of the employer's
5 higher expectations of them, which may, in turn, raise their hopes and ambitions. If these
6 aspirations are not fulfilled promptly, the newly appointed talents may face stress, job
7 dissatisfaction, and anxiety, and consequently may start seeking job opportunities elsewhere.
8 Furthermore, the scholars argued that once organizations inform the talents of their
9 membership, those talents may closely monitor how the employer delivers on its promises. If
10 the employer does not precisely fulfil all its promises, the psychological contract is likely to be
11 violated, which may subsequently lead to various adverse attitudinal and behavioural
12 outcomes. Next, the scholars discussed the negative consequences of talent identification
13 transparency for those employees not identified as talents. Reportedly, there can be negative
14 consequences attached to designating someone a talent, because other employees may interpret
15 that to mean everyone else is talentless, which can, in turn, promote feelings of unfairness. As
16 noted by Larsen *et al.* (1998), the more attention and resources top managers invest in talents,
17 the more others become jealous. Following the social exchange perspective, Khoreva *et al.*
18 (2018) thus proposed that those not identified as talents may suffer from demotivation and
19 dissatisfaction, and view their 'non-talent status' negatively, not feeling appreciated by the
20 employer. As such, it can cause increased stress levels, frustration, lower confidence and self-
21 esteem, resulting in poorer performance and increased turnover intentions.

22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 **Talent management in Russia and Kazakhstan**

49
50
51 Who do employers see as talents in the emerging markets of Russia and Kazakhstan? Do
52 employers favour mostly a subject or object oriented approach to TM in these markets? How
53 do they spot talents? Is it all about talents' high performance, level of seniority, or something
54 else? Do employers inform talents of their talent pool membership to boost the talents' well-
55 being and productivity? What about those employees not identified as talents, are they
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 informed of their ‘non-talent’ status or do they remain ignorant of the fact? It is crucial to
4
5 review the current literature on Russia and Kazakhstan to depict the current TM patterns and
6
7 challenges in these markets.
8
9

10
11 Both Russia and Kazakhstan are members of the Commonwealth of Independent States and
12
13 both countries are characterised by a dynamic, turbulent, highly competitive and extremely
14
15 volatile environment. For instance, Ralston *et al.* stated that “Russia, once the heart of the
16
17 superpower USSR, is a prime example of a socialistic Western culture that is showing great
18
19 potential – as well as growing pains – in its quest to become once again a global economic
20
21 power” (2008, p. 14). Kazakhstan is also developing a transparent and effective business
22
23 culture that is attractive to foreign investment (Mouraviev and Kakabadse, 2017). Its authorities
24
25 realize the need to implement economic reforms; however, new laws and regulations that
26
27 should improve the business environment are often incorrectly applied at the local level.
28
29
30

31
32 Both countries have benefitted from the institutional transition from a highly centralized
33
34 planned economy to a market-oriented system. The latter expands the efficiency of resource
35
36 allocation and enhances the productivity concealed in the former. Yet, foreign investors and
37
38 local organizations criticize the burdensome regulations that often reflect a way of doing
39
40 business that is reminiscent of the Soviet Union. Challenges remain in Russia and Kazakhstan
41
42 in terms of addressing issues related to competitiveness and economic diversification, over-
43
44 reliance on the extractive industries sector, continued corruption, the need for the increased
45
46 rule of law, and concentration of political power (Mouraviev and Kakabadse, 2017).
47
48
49

50
51 The growth of former Soviet countries has created excessive demand for a distinctive type of
52
53 managerial talent that can operate successfully in culturally complex and geographically distant
54
55 markets (Latukha, 2017). This has, in turn, activated the development of uniquely qualified
56
57 human resources in Russia and Kazakhstan, initiating increasing competition for talents.
58
59
60

1
2
3 Organizations in Russia conduct TM mostly on an individual basis; companies tend not to have
4 any formalized policies or procedures (Latukha, 2018). Furthermore, although Russian
5 organizations aim to adopt a strategic approach to TM, the HR department's role is still lacking
6 a strategic focus on TM, assigning priority to short-term planning (Latukha, 2015). To date, six
7 prominent factors that provide Russian style TM with its distinctive character have been
8 identified: Russia's authoritarian rule, a mistrust of institutions, rooted 'bossiness', the
9 persistence of 'Soviet mental software', negative selection, and a limited tradition of
10 empowerment (Holden and Vaiman, 2013).
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 Overall, even though there is a high demand for talents in both Russia and Kazakhstan, the lack
23 of managerial education decelerates the development of strategic TM in the two countries. At
24 the same time, expanding career opportunities and a growing number of MNEs create retention
25 issues among talents in both Russia and Kazakhstan.
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 Due to the limited number of empirical studies on TM in Russia and Kazakhstan (with the
33 notable exceptions of Holden and Vaiman, 2013; and, Latukha, 2015-2018), we followed the
34 principles of grounded theory (Beyer and Hannah, 2002), which falls within the constructivist
35 paradigm (Yazan, 2015). Thus, we decided not to put forward any propositions related to the
36 TM approach, talent identification process, or talent identification transparency, in the
37 emerging markets of Russia and Kazakhstan. Instead, we chose to follow a constructivist
38 variant of grounded theory analysis, to ensure methodological congruence and leave enough
39 space to discuss the evolving patterns and challenges of TM in the emerging markets of Russia
40 and Kazakhstan.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Methodology

Data Collection

Due to the limited number of both conceptual and empirical studies on TM in Russia and Kazakhstan, we decided not to make any propositions related to the TM approach. A qualitative method was deemed most appropriate to examine the opinions and experiences of the business leaders of the Russian and Kazakh subsidiaries of Nordic MNEs, who might, on the one hand, be the most knowledgeable about their talents, and, on the other, about the global TM strategies in place in the MNEs. By selecting an inductive inquiry and retrospectively interpreting the data, our intention was to explore the voices of business leaders and identify emerging TM patterns and challenges, as well as their likely consequences.

Data for this study were collected through in-depth semi-structured interviews¹ within a large-scale project addressing international HRM. The initial stage of data collection was to identify the largest Finnish and Swedish MNEs that had subsidiaries in Russia and/or Kazakhstan, and adhered to corporate TM practices. The project comprised 47 MNEs (three had subsidiaries in both Russia and Kazakhstan) representing a variety of industries and ranging in size from 2,750 to 58,411 employees. According to the interviewed business leaders, all of the MNEs sought to realise a corporate-wide TM system, though none had an explicit policy of informing talents about their status. While access to research in Russia and Kazakhstan may be difficult to secure without a prior relationship, the participants of this study proved to be very open and thorough

¹ The primary goal of the project was business-oriented. Particularly, the examined MNEs collaborated with Hanken & Stockholm School of Economics Executive Education with the intention to receive corporate reports from both their own enterprises and their countries in general (i.e. 'Talent Management 2020 in Kazakhstan'). Therefore, while some project members participated in data collection, others performed data analysis. The lead author of this study was a member of the corporate project and granted permission to utilize the data for academic purposes.

1
2
3 in their responses. This is perhaps due to their prior experience of cooperating with Hanken &
4
5 Stockholm School of Economics Executive Education.
6
7

8
9 37 business leaders from the Russian subsidiaries, and 13 from the Kazakh subsidiaries, chose
10
11 to participate in the project. Thus, we collected, recorded (except one interview) and
12
13 transcribed 50 semi-structured interviews (see Table 1). To assure anonymity, we refer to our
14
15 respondents later in the study by the respective labels: 'Russia' and 'Kazakhstan'. The
16
17 respondents were asked to address the following questions during the interviews: What are the
18
19 specific patterns of TM in your company and in your country? How do you spot talents? How
20
21 does your company minimise the biases and challenges of traditional performance evaluation
22
23 systems? How does your company communicate TM decisions to employees? What are the
24
25 challenges of TM in your company and in your country? During the interviews, the respondents
26
27 were able to illustrate, expand or digress from the interview guide questions.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1. Interviewee profile

Category	%
<i>Country</i>	
Russia	74
Kazakhstan	26
<i>Organization size</i>	
< 5,000 employees	32
5-20,000 employees	44
>20,000 employees	24
<i>Industry</i>	
Construction	8
Consumer products	16
Engineering	16
Industrial machinery and services	24
IT/telecommunications	8
Logistics	8
Manufacturing	4
Retail	16
<i>Gender</i>	
Male	92
Female	8

We conducted interviews in four languages – English (37), Finnish (1), Swedish (1), and Russian (11). Later, we translated all the collected interviews into English. To ensure accuracy (Yin, 2016), we performed a back translation to check the adequacy of the translation process

Data Analysis

Our analytical procedure started with an examination of the raw data and resulted in theoretical interpretations. We employed coding to develop a template through which to interpret the textual data set. Next, we divided the detailed encoding into two iterative stages, starting with the interview questions. These served as higher-order codes (King, 2004) and comprised three broad categories: perceptions of who a talent is, opinions on how to spot a talent, and perceptions of how companies communicate TM decisions. In the second stage, we developed more interpretative second-level codes based on a detailed reading of interview transcripts.

1
2
3 We included several kinds of quality check to advance the quality and reliability of the results
4 (Yin, 2016). First, one of the project members coded the data sample, then another member
5
6 reviewed the coding template, after which the project team adjusted the initial template. We
7
8 repeated this iterative process several times and the project team re-read the interviews many
9
10 times to confirm the analysis was free of any misinterpretation of the interview content. Finally,
11
12 once all the transcripts were coded, the whole process was repeated to avoid potential overlaps
13
14 and excessive usage of codes (Yin, 2016).
15
16
17
18
19

20 Our approach also incorporates the principles of reflexivity so that the researcher evaluates
21
22 his/her interpretations of the research questions, and the research theme and how it influences
23
24 the findings (Yin, 2016). The nature of the research theme can be personal and a profound
25
26 individual engagement may bias research statements and conclusions. It is impossible to
27
28 achieve total objectivity in qualitative studies because our experiences may affect the
29
30 investigation. It is thus crucial to be aware of your values and ensure they do not permeate and
31
32 control the study performance (Bryman and Bell, 2011). In addition to considering interview
33
34 credibility, it is vital to consider their authenticity. Consequently, to avoid any bias and provide
35
36 an adequate, fair and most accurate picture of what we examined, the research team reviewed
37
38 the coding process, template building, and theme development, all independently of each other.
39
40
41
42
43

44 **Findings**

45
46
47 We now present an overview of the study results in line with the primary research objectives.
48
49

50 *Who is a talent?*

51
52
53 All the respondents were aware of the 'talents' concept and mentioned outstandingly high
54
55 performance as an essential differentiating trait of talents:
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *“Talents are the ones who perform better than the rest and show more potential*
4 *... they are exceptionally well-performing individuals who will in time move to*
5 *key strategic positions that will determine the course of action for the whole*
6 *company.” [Russia 1]*
7
8
9

10
11
12
13 *“A talent is the one who reaches his goals and immediately finds other goals...*
14 *he’s a model for his colleagues and subordinates. He has high ethical standards.*
15 *He makes the world even better.” [Kazakhstan 1]*
16
17
18
19

20
21 Besides high performance, the respondents defined talents in terms of intelligence, personality,
22 cognitive abilities, and motivation. They frequently mentioned personality traits such as
23 sociability, dominance, emotional stability, and career ambition:
24
25
26
27

28
29 *“Talent is not only about a set of KPIs ... talent is a generator of ideas.”*
30 *[Kazakhstan 2]*
31
32

33
34 *“Talents are simultaneously skilful and ambitious people.” [Kazakhstan 3]*
35
36

37 *“Talents are the ones who are international, communicative, ready to make big*
38 *changes, good with languages, good at making decisions, team players and*
39 *professional experts in some area.” [Russia 2]*
40
41
42
43

44
45 *“Talents are the ones who are ready to take on new challenges. For instance,*
46 *during the interview, if someone demands a clear view and description of what*
47 *the job looks like then he’s not the right talent ... a degree of novelty and risk-*
48 *taking is needed.” [Russia 3]*
49
50
51
52
53

54
55 The respondents argued that talents are not necessarily successful leaders, for which you need
56 the relevant expertise, skills and abilities to become influential. So, according to our
57 respondents, although talent is a stable unit, it could also be developed:
58
59
60

1
2
3 *“Not all talents become leaders. In order to become a leader, you need to possess*
4 *charisma and not all talents have charisma. It’s impossible to create charisma in*
5 *yourself, you can change yourself a bit with the help of additional knowledge,*
6 *self-control, you can increase willpower, but you’re either charismatic or not.”*

7
8
9
10
11
12 *[Kazakhstan 4]*

13
14
15 *“A talented manager is not always a leader. Something serious has to happen for*
16 *a talented manager to become a leader, like losing your job or some other critical*
17 *situation.” [Russia 4]*

18
19
20
21
22
23 *“You need to develop employees with potential.” [Russia 5]*

24
25
26 The majority of the respondents considered talents a rarity in their subsidiary, and not everyone
27 possessed talent. The respondents advocated the object TM approach, directed at only a limited,
28 elitist share of employees, the so-called A-players, high potentials or strategically important
29 employees (Collings & Mellahi, 2009):

30
31
32
33
34
35
36 *“A company has a natural desire to find talents, or stars, those people who are*
37 *capable of managing a business. Therefore, those who know how to do their job*
38 *will reveal themselves as talents, so HR’s function in identifying talents is of no*
39 *use. If an employee is a talent, he will be noticed, because he wants to be seen ...*
40 *talent emerges just as a natural issue.” [Kazakhstan 3]*

41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49 The respondents classified as talents those employees they expected to occupy top management
50 positions in the long term. This TM approach had a strong strategic focus, since companies
51 offered the identified talents developmental opportunities to prepare them for further
52 responsibilities within the subsidiaries:
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *“Our talents are further developed to fill strategically important organizational*
4 *positions as well as mission-critical positions.” [Russia 3]*
5
6
7

8
9 None of the respondents prevented talents from being promoted or intended to ‘get rid of’ them
10 as was mentioned in an empirical study of talents in Poland (Skuza *et al.*, 2013, p. 463).
11
12

13
14 On the contrary, most of the respondents expressed positive attitudes regarding the value of
15 developing the ‘soft’ skills of talents through training, that talents demand flexibility,
16 challenging duties and opportunities for development. They appreciated career advancement
17 based on performance rather than seniority and the number of personal networks. We thus
18 noticed a distinct shift away from the practices of the communist era:
19
20
21
22
23

24
25 *“Those employees classified as talents are put through a program (educational*
26 *training, workshop) to acquire new skills. Others who are not classified as talents*
27 *don’t know about those who are.” [Kazakhstan 1]*
28
29
30
31

32
33 *“Talent management is a part of our leadership program. Everyone within this*
34 *program has a career plan.” [Russia 3]*
35
36
37
38

39 ***How to spot a talent?*** 40

41
42 Irrespective of the definition of talent and TM approaches, scholars advocate that MNEs should
43 identify key positions within their enterprise (Collings & Mellahi, 2009). Researchers have
44 recognized talent identification as crucial to ensuring that the ‘right’ employees are placed in
45 strategically pivotal positions (McDonnell, 2011). Studies perceive talent identification as an
46 investment in a long-term and stable relationship with an employee. Scholars tend to agree that
47 talents should know they have been identified by their company as ‘talent’ (Björkman *et al.*,
48 2013). The favoured employees recognize an investment in the development of their talent and
49 career, and receive an indication that their contributions are valued (Festing & Schäfer, 2014).
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 In return for the investment made in talents, and the trust given by their enterprises, talents may
4 wish to stay with the company and try to give something in return (Mayo, 2003). Talent
5 identification may thus assist in retaining talents and reducing staff turnover. Furthermore,
6 talent identification has been found to be associated with attitudinal outcomes, such as
7 identification with the enterprise, and increased motivation and satisfaction, as well as
8 organizational outcomes such as higher performance and greater support for strategic priorities
9 (Björkman *et al.*, 2013).

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20 Most of the respondents were positive about the process of talent identification:

21
22
23 *“Of course, talented people have to be identified. You can identify them when you*
24 *allow them to be in a non-standard situation, and you can then see how they*
25 *behave and decide on who is a talent and who’s not.” [Russia 1]*

26
27
28
29
30
31 *“We have already noticed our talents. We are observing them.” [Russia 7]*

32
33
34 The interviewees mentioned they had programs specifically designed to train and develop
35 talents. Since most of the examined Russian and Kazakh subsidiaries followed the exclusive
36 and developable talent philosophy (Meyers and van Woerkom, 2014), companies provided
37 training and developmental opportunities only for those employees who showed potential:
38
39
40
41
42

43
44 *“We identify talents and set the guidelines for how they should develop towards*
45 *becoming successful leaders through participation in leadership programs,*
46 *competence development, screening” [Kazakhstan 1]*

47
48
49
50
51
52 There were several differences in the criteria applied by subsidiaries in Russia and Kazakhstan
53 in selecting employees for talent pool membership. First, the respondents tended to rely on
54 performance appraisals as the basic criterion for talent identification:
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *“We have a clear process of talent identification based on performance*
4 *evaluations. We follow the corporate system in spotting talents. Those selected*
5 *are not informed, only the CEO and the HR director know.” [Russia 1]*
6
7

8
9
10
11 *“Figures never lie. We thus believe in performance evaluation.” [Russia 3]*
12

13
14 According to Western standards, talent identification should be based not only on performance
15 appraisals, but also on the assessment of personal skills such as the ability to learn,
16 communication skills, flexibility, adaptability to change, and entrepreneurship (Björkman *et*
17 *al.*, 2013; Skuza *et al.*, 2013). Our respondents repeatedly noticed that to be identified as talents,
18 employees needed to be capable of assembling teams around them, be inspiring and
19 encouraging towards others. Overall, in identifying talents in both Russian and Kazakh
20 subsidiaries, personal and leadership skills were given priority over experience and expertise:
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30
31 *“Intuition is important in spotting a talent. Does chemistry occur?” [Russia 4]*
32

33
34 *“Managers in Russia are afraid of making mistakes and this paralyses them ...*
35 *the best way to spot a talent is to look for managers who are not afraid to think,*
36 *make their own decisions and take responsibility for them.” [Russia 4]*
37
38

39
40
41
42 *“Talent does not equate to high performer, so performance evaluation is not the*
43 *only criterion ... Talent means a person is able to demonstrate himself today very*
44 *well in terms of performance, attitude and approach.” [Kazakhstan 2]*
45
46
47
48

49 Remarkably, with a few exceptions, most of the respondents mentioned that the talent
50 identification process in their subsidiary was informal:
51
52

53
54
55 *“The talent identification process is not a formalized process. It’s more of an*
56 *open discussion.” [Russia 1]*
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *“Talent management is somewhat chaotic ... We have a list of high potentials.*
4 *People know if they are on the list ... and then we look to see whether or not they*
5 *are trying to develop and push further It’s evident when a person wants to*
6 *move up.” [Russia 5]*
7
8
9
10
11
12

13 ***How to communicate talent management decisions?***

14

15
16 Only a few of the respondents were transparent with all personnel in their TM decisions:
17

18
19 *“Our talent management system is transparent, so we explain to personnel why*
20 *one is part of a future management program and another isn’t.” [Kazakhstan 6]*
21
22
23
24

25 In fact, the majority of respondents were rather sceptical about the positive impact of talent
26 identification transparency on various employee attitudinal and organizational outcomes. The
27 respondents reported that talents, whether or not informed of their talent pool membership,
28 were less committed to their enterprise than expected. Furthermore, according to the
29 respondents, both the informed and uninformed talents were largely more concerned about
30 their social status and monetary rewards than about the status of being a talent pool member:
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 *“People’s stupidity makes me nervous, so I won’t say they’re talents unless it’s*
40 *true.” [Russia 6]*
41
42
43
44

45 *“We identify as talents those who are also interested in something other than*
46 *money.” [Russia 1]*
47
48
49

50 *“It’s hard to find a talented, motivated person. Everyone just wants to get their*
51 *salary and do only their own duties.” [Russia 5]*
52
53
54
55

56 Interestingly, even though our interviewees did not express any immense problems in spotting
57 talents, many felt uncomfortable communicating to employees that they were not part of the
58
59
60

1
2
3 enterprise's talent pool. The respondents felt it would have a negative impact on the motivation
4
5 of those not in the pool:
6
7

8
9 *"Others, those who are not identified as talents, don't know about those who*
10
11 *are."* [Kazakhstan 1]
12

13
14 *"We value equality, respect and modesty. We don't say to some that they are a*
15
16 *talent and then to the rest that they are nothing."* [Kazakhstan 5]
17
18

19
20 Some of the respondents mentioned that they did not inform talents of their talent pool
21
22 membership, in order not to boost their confidence in finding job opportunities elsewhere.
23
24 Companies reported high annual turnover rates among talents as a major challenge in Russian
25
26 and Kazakh units. The interviewees continually mentioned the overheated talents' market in
27
28 both countries. They found it difficult to retain talents within the enterprises:
29

30
31
32 *"Russians are fatalists, they don't make long-term plans. Key personnel are thus*
33
34 *continually leaving."* [Russia 1]
35
36

37 **Discussion**

38
39
40 Research in the TM domain has been criticized for its lack of attention to contextual factors
41
42 (Gallardo-Gallardo *et al.*, 2017; Thunnissen, 2016). Indeed, considering environmental,
43
44 organizational and cultural traits is crucial to designing and implementing an appropriate TM
45
46 system (Collings, 2014; Gallardo-Gallardo and Thunnissen, 2016). In this study, we looked to
47
48 fill that research gap by investigating from the employer perspective the evolving patterns and
49
50 challenges of TM in the emerging markets of Russia and Kazakhstan. We contributed to the
51
52 research on TM internationally and provided evidence from contexts unfamiliar to the well-
53
54 researched Western setting.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Our study supports the object approach to TM in the emerging markets of Russia and
4 Kazakhstan. This approach states that a subset of the workforce is comparatively more
5 important than everyone else with regard to the value they add to organizational performance
6 (Gallardo-Gallardo *et al.*, 2013; Meyers *et al.*, 2013). In the emerging markets of Russia and
7 Kazakhstan, companies characterize talents by the following characteristics. First, outstanding
8 performance is the prerogative of talents. Next, respondents emphasized talents' individual
9 attributes, such as charisma, sociability, dominance, emotional stability, career ambition, and
10 drive. Finally, companies expect to see an interest in something other than purely financial
11 security as an essential criterion to consider employees as talents.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 Next, our study reveals that the exclusive and developable talent philosophy is predominant in
26 the emerging markets of Russia and Kazakhstan. According to this philosophy (Meyers and
27 van Woerkom, 2014), talent is conceptualized as a potential, implying that it represents the
28 possibility that individuals can become something more than what they currently are' (Silzer
29 and Church, 2009, p. 379). Hence, talents are not directly equivalent to successful leaders, but
30 may become so in due course. In line with this philosophy, our study highlights the idea that
31 talents can become successful front-runners only when they develop. Our research, thus,
32 supports theories on person-environment interactions, which posit that an optimal fit between
33 initial conditions (individual potential) and stimulating environmental factors (training and
34 developmental opportunities) produces a chain of synergistic or multiplicative person-
35 environment interactions that lead to disproportionate gains in a given skill or ability (Meyers
36 and van Woerkom, 2014).
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 Furthermore, our study does not provide any empirical evidence that organizations depart from
54 performance management ratings when identifying talents. Even though the companies in the
55 emerging markets of Russia and Kazakhstan recognize the challenges surrounding the accuracy
56 of performance evaluations, the intuition of business leaders and personal chemistry between
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the leaders and talents continue to go hand-in-hand with the performance management systems
4
5 when identifying talents.
6
7

8
9 Finally, our study reveals the fierce competition for and insufficient supply of talents as the
10
11 evolving challenges of TM in the emerging markets of Russia and Kazakhstan, and this is why
12
13 business leaders tend to be reluctant to inform employees of their talent pool membership. In
14
15 not telling talents of their membership, the employers are looking to prevent arrogance and
16
17 higher expectations of the employers themselves, and avoid feeding motivation to look for a
18
19 job elsewhere. Overall, even though most of the employers are positive about the talent
20
21 identification process, the process itself is somewhat informal and unclear, in order not to
22
23 precipitate an atmosphere of destructive internal competition that could, in turn, demotivate
24
25 those employees not identified as talents, and discourage the development of overall
26
27 organizational spirit. Thus, we reason that the positive side of talent identification transparency
28
29 is relevant only from the employee perspective, and especially in the case of those identified
30
31 as talents.
32
33
34
35

36
37 Since our study investigated local Russian and Kazakh subsidiaries of Nordic MNEs, it is
38
39 relevant to discuss global TM matters. While there is some evidence of common global TM
40
41 tendencies, we find no evidence of the dominance of a coherent universal TM system reflecting
42
43 the global distribution of best practices. Our study highlights the fact that both Russia and
44
45 Kazakhstan continue to share a distinctive feature, namely the capacity to survive and control
46
47 inconsistencies. The subsidiaries' business leaders seem to unite a range of practices adjusted
48
49 by institutionally embedded opportunities and pressures operating in the host country. Our
50
51 results demonstrate that MNEs do not act independently of context. This is in line with the
52
53 suggestion of Brewster *et al.* that "the strength of the duality thesis which reflects the persistent
54
55 effects of institutional realities: the fact that regulations specific to country of origin or domicile
56
57 do not have a dominant effect would underscore the nested nature of institutions, moulding the
58
59
60

1
2
3 practices of firms at supra-national, national and sub-national levels” (2008: 335). We reason
4 that what Nordic MNEs do in Russia and Kazakhstan characterizes not just the product of a
5 local context, but trade-offs and compromises between competing pressures and influences.
6
7 Thus, our study supports sceptical voices pointing out the limitations of a universal approach
8 to TM, and calls for attention to the critical role played by the local institutional context.
9
10
11
12
13

14 15 **Limitations and Suggestions for Further Research**

16
17 Like all research, this study is not free from limitations. First, we do not focus on identifying
18 the differences in TM between the Russian and Kazakh markets. While each business market
19 is indeed unique, instead of differentiating the two markets we looked to identify emerging TM
20 patterns and challenges in both Russia and Kazakhstan. Future research may build on our study
21 and concentrate on each market separately.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30
31 Second, our study focused on the perceptions of business leaders of Russian and Kazakh
32 subsidiaries of Nordic MNEs. These business leaders were selected because they were willing
33 to participate in the project. However, line managers, HR managers, business leaders at HQ,
34 and the talents themselves might have different perspectives on TM. Furthermore, the story
35 may look different for local private companies and companies operating in the public sector.
36 Thus, we call for future studies employing larger and more representative samples,
37 incorporating multi-level and multi-actor analyses. It would also be of value to study and
38 compare TM practices of MNEs and local companies.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 Finally, it is important to note that these emerging countries have different institutional,
51 cultural, and educational characteristics (Tymon *et al.*, 2010). Hence, the data we collected and
52 discussion we presented are not intended to deliver generalizable conclusions but to develop
53 an evidence base to support further theorizing in the field of TM in emerging markets.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Longitudinal studies on how TM evolves in an emerging market context would be particularly
4
5 welcome to examine the links between strategy, corporate culture, and TM practices.
6
7

8 **Managerial Relevance**

9
10
11 The results of this study should be of interest to practitioners. First, we identified two
12
13 significant TM challenges in Russia and Kazakhstan – the overheated market for talents and
14
15 low commitment among the talents themselves. These challenges need to be addressed by
16
17 MNEs and local companies operating in the markets, specifically those that aim to advance
18
19 their competitive advantage by leveraging talents. It seems these challenges will remain in
20
21 place in the immediate and near future. Hence, companies that do not have systems to identify,
22
23 develop, and retain talents might be at a clear disadvantage compared to those with well-
24
25 established transparent TM systems. Companies should, thus, continue to promote the
26
27 commitment of talents, and build reliable, stable long-term employment relationships with
28
29 them. That involves long-term investment through offering talents participation in decision-
30
31 making, empowerment, career development, mentoring and coaching programs, as well as
32
33 extensive 360-degree feedback. By investing in talents, MNEs enhance their commitment and
34
35 motivation, and reduce the likelihood of them leaving the enterprise.
36
37
38
39
40

41
42 We found MNEs vary in how they define talents, and recommend companies communicate
43
44 clearly and effectively with all the employees they consider talents. Irrespective of whatever
45
46 definition of talent MNEs may apply, agreement and clarity are needed on who is considered
47
48 a talent. We found evidence of a relatively large number of MNEs informally identifying their
49
50 talents, but strongly encourage a more formalized system of talent identification. This would
51
52 enable the proper application of key talent throughout company operations and assist in
53
54 allocating resources to the best-performing, highest-potential employees.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Additionally, we suggest that MNEs should not underestimate the importance of local contexts,
4 since they exercise a strong influence on business development. We advocate that due to the
5 changing global situation over time, MNEs should be flexible in their talent strategies,
6 processes, and practices, to be able to adapt to the evolving TM patterns and challenges.
7
8
9

10
11
12
13 Finally, while both Russian and Kazakh business markets are unique in cultural dimensions,
14 institutional settings, and legal environments, this study may be relevant to other emerging
15 markets. As MNEs from developed economies view emerging markets as arenas for economic
16 development, and MNEs from the emerging markets have been expanding of late, business
17 leaders and HR professionals should recognize that TM systems must fit the local contexts,
18 which tend to be more complex and multidimensional than assumed. MNEs need to move away
19 from an ethnocentric, headquarters mindset. The polycentric approach should not be taken too
20 seriously by the subsidiaries, either. Undertaking TM locally is likely to lead to a silo mentality,
21 with local units working too strictly towards their agendas. Focusing on recognizing and
22 harmonizing the different cultural values would be a far more favourable strategy than
23 struggling to force-fit them into a universal global TM system.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

- Ahammad, M.F., Glaister, K.W., Sarala, R.M., and Glaister, A.J. (2018), “Strategic Talent Management in Emerging Markets”, *Thunderbird International Business Review*, Vol 60, pp. 5–8.
- Al Ariss, A., Cascio, W., and Paauwe, J. (2014), “Talent management: Current theories and future research questions”, *Journal of World Business*, Vol 49, pp. 173-179.
- Al Ariss, A., Vassilopoulou, J., Özbilgin, M., and Game, A. (2013), “Understanding career experiences of skilled minority ethnic workers in France and Germany”, *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 24 No. 6, pp. 1236-1256.
- Ambrosius, J. (2018), “Strategic Talent Management in Emerging Markets and Its Impact on Employee Retention: Evidence from Brazilian MNCs”, *Thunderbird International Business Review*, Vol. 60, pp. 53–68.
- Anand, S., Vidyarthi, P.R., Liden, R.C., and Rousseau, D.M. (2010), “Good citizens in poor-quality relationships: Idiosyncratic deals as a substitute for relationship quality”, *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 53 No. 5, pp. 970-988.
- Becker, B.E., Huselid, M.A., and Beatty, R.W. (2009). *The differentiated workforce: Transforming talent into strategic impact*. Harvard Business Press: Boston, MA.
- Beyer, J.M. and Hannah, D.R. (2002), “Building on the past: Enacting established personal identities in a new work setting”, *Organization Science*, Vol. 13, pp. 636-652.

- 1
2
3 Björkman, I., Ehrnrooth, M., Mäkelä, K., Smale, A., and Sumelius, J. (2013), “Talent or not?
4 Employee reactions to talent identification”, *Human Resource Management*, Vol. 52
5
6 No. 2, pp. 195-214.
7
8
9
10
11 Blau, P.M. (1964), *Exchange and power in social life*, Wiley: New York.
12
13
14 Bryman, A. and Bell, E. (2011), *Business research methods*. Oxford University Press: Oxford.
15
16
17
18 Buckingham, M. and Goodall, A. (2015), “Reinventing Performance Management: How one
19 company is rethinking peer feedback and the annual review, and trying to design a
20 system to fuel improvement”, *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 93 No. 4, pp. 40-50.
21
22
23
24
25
26 Cascio, W. and Boudreau, J. (2016), “The search for global competence: From international
27 HR to talent management”, *Journal of World Business*, Vol. 51 No. 1, pp. 103–114.
28
29
30
31
32 Collings, D. and Mellahi, K. (2009), “Strategic talent management: a review and research
33 agenda”, *Human Resource Management Review*, Vol. 19 No. 4, pp. 304-313.
34
35
36
37 Collings, D., Scullion, H., and Vaiman, V. (2015), “Talent management: Progress and
38 prospects”, *Human Resource Management Review*, Vol. 25, pp. 233-235.
39
40
41
42 Collings, D.G. (2014) “Integrating global mobility and global talent management: Exploring
43 the challenges and strategic opportunities”, *Journal of World Business*, Vol. 49, pp.
44 253-261.
45
46
47
48
49
50 Collings, D.G. and Isichei, M. (2018), “The shifting boundaries of global staffing: integrating
51 global talent management, alternative forms of international assignments and non-
52 employees into the discussion”, *International Journal of Human Resource*
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Management, Vol. 29 No. 1, pp. 165 -187.

- 1
2
3 Cui, W., Khan, Z., and Tarba, S.Y. (2018), “Strategic Talent Management in Service SMEs of
4
5 China”, *Thunderbird International Business Review*, Vol. 60, pp. 9–20.
6
7
8
9 Dries, N. (2013), “The psychology of talent management: A review and research agenda”,
10
11 *Human Resource Management Review*, Vol. 23, pp. 272-285.
12
13
14 Dries, N., and Pepermans, R. (2008). “‘Real’ high potential careers: An empirical study into
15
16 the perspectives of organizations and high potentials”, *Personnel Review*, Vol. 37 No.
17
18 1, pp. 85–108.
19
20
21
22 Festing, M. and Schäfer, L. (2014), “Generational challenges to talent management: A
23
24 framework for talent retention on the psychological-contract perspective”, *Journal of*
25
26 *World Business*, Vol. 49, pp. 262-271.
27
28
29
30 Festing, M., Schäfer, L., and Scullion, H. (2013), “Talent management in medium-sized
31
32 German companies: An explorative study and agenda for future research”, *The*
33
34 *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 24 No.9, pp. 1872-1893.
35
36
37
38 Gallardo-Gallardo, E. and Thunnissen, M. (2016), "Standing on the shoulders of giants? A
39
40 critical review of empirical talent management research", *Employee Relations*, Vol. 38
41
42 No. 1, pp. 31-56.
43
44
45
46 Gallardo-Gallardo, E., Dries, N. and Gonzalez-Cruz, T.F. (2013), “What is the meaning of
47
48 ‘talent’ in the world of work?” *Human Resource Management Review*, Vol. 23, pp. 290-
49
50 300.
51
52
53
54 Gallardo-Gallardo, E., Thunnissen, M., and Scullion, H. (2017), “Special issue of International
55
56 *Journal of Human Resource Management*. A contextualized approach to Talent
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Management: Advancing the field”, *The International Journal of Human Resource*
4
5 *Management*, pp. 1-4.
6
7

8
9 Gelens, J., Dries, N., Hofmans, J., and Pepermans, R. (2013), “The role of perceived
10
11 organizational justice in shaping the outcomes of talent management: A research
12
13 agenda”, *Human Resource Management Review*, Vol. 23, pp. 341-353.
14
15

16
17 Gooderham, P. and Nordhaug, O. (2011), “One European model of HRM? Cranet empirical
18
19 contributions”, *Human Resource Management Review*, Vol. 21 No.1, pp. 27–36.
20
21

22
23 Höglund, M. (2012), “Quid pro quo? Examining talent management through the lens of
24
25 psychological contracts”, *Personnel Review*, Vol. 41 No. 2, pp. 126-142.
26
27

28
29 Holden, N. and Vaiman, V. (2013), “Talent management in Russia: not so much war for talent
30
31 as wariness of talent”, *Critical Perspectives on International Business*, Vol .9 No. ½,
32
33 pp. 129-146.
34
35

36
37 Hornung, S., Rousseau, D.M., Glaser. J., Angerer, P., and Weigl, M. (2010), “Beyond top-
38
39 down and bottom-up work redesign: Customizing job content through idiosyncratic
40
41 deals”, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 31, pp. 187-215.
42
43

44
45 Hough, L. M., and Oswald, F.L. (2000), “Personnel selection: Looking toward the future —
46
47 Remembering the past”, *Annual Review of Psychology*, Vol. 51, pp. 631–664.
48
49

50
51 Huselid, M.A. and Becker, B.E. (2011), “Bridging micro and macro domains: Workforce
52
53 differentiation and strategic human resource management”, *Journal of Management*,
54
55 Vol. 37 No. 2, pp. 421–428.
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Jones, J., Whitaker, M., Seet, P., and Parkin, J. (2012), "Talent management in practice in
4
5 Australia: individualistic or strategic? An exploratory study", *Asia Pacific Journal of*
6
7 *Human Resources*, Vol. 50 No. 4, pp. 399–420.
8
9
10
11 Khilji, S., Tarique, I., and Schuler, R. (2015), "Incorporating the macro view in global talent
12
13 management", *Human Resource Management Review*, Vol. 25, pp. 236-248.
14
15
16 Khoreva, V., Vaiman, V., and Kostanek, E. (2018), "Talent identification Transparency: An
17
18 alternative perspective", *European Journal of International Management*, forthcoming.
19
20
21
22 King, K. (2016), "The talent deal and journey: Understanding how employees respond to talent
23
24 identification over time", *Employee Relations*, Vol. 38 No. 1, pp. 94 – 111.
25
26
27
28 King, N. (2004), "Using templates in the thematic analysis of texts", in Cassell, C. and Symon,
29
30 G. (Eds.), *Essential guide to qualitative methods in organizational research*, Sage
31
32 Publications: London, pp. 256-270.
33
34
35
36 Krishnan, T.N. and Scullion, H. (2017), "Talent management and dynamic view of talent in
37
38 small and medium enterprises", *Human resource Management Review*, Vol. 27 No. 3,
39
40 pp. 431-441.
41
42
43
44 Larsen, H.H., London, M., Weinstein, M. and Raghuram, S. (1998), "High-flyer management
45
46 development programs: Organizational rhetoric or self-fulfilling prophecy?",
47
48 *International Studies of Management and Organization*, Vol. 28 No. 1, pp. 64-90.
49
50
51
52 Latukha, M.O. (2015), "Talent management in Russian companies: domestic challenges and
53
54 international experience", *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol.
55
56 26 No. 8, pp. 1051 -1075.
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Latukha, M.O. (2017), “Talent Management and Global Value Creation: How Do Russian
4 Companies Do This?”, *Value Creation in International Business*, pp. 383-405.
5
6
7
8
9 Latukha, M.O. (2018), “Can Talent Management Practices Be Considered as a Basis for
10 Sustainable Competitive Advantages in Emerging-Market Firms? Evidence from
11 Russia”, *Thunderbird International Business Review*, Vol. 60, pp. 69–87.
12
13
14
15
16
17 Marescaux, E., De Winne, S., and Sels, L. (2013), “HR practices and affective organizational
18 commitment: (When) does HR differentiation pay off?”, *Human Resource Management
19 Review*, Vol. 23 No. 4, pp. 329-345.
20
21
22
23
24
25 McDonnell, A. (2011), “Still fighting the ‘war for talent’? Bridging the science versus
26 practice gap”, *Journal of Business and Psychology*, Vol. 26, pp. 169-173.
27
28
29
30
31 McDonnell, A., Collings, D.G., Mellahi, K., and Schuler, R. (2017), “Talent management: a
32 systematic review and future prospects”, *European Journal of International
33 Management*, Vol. 11 No. 1, pp. 86-128.
34
35
36
37
38 McDonnell, A., Gunnigle, P., Lavelle, J., and Lamare, R. (2016), “Beyond managerial and
39 leadership elites: ‘key group’ identification and differential reward architectures in
40 multinational companies”, *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*,
41 Vol. 27, pp. 1299-1318.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48 Meyers, M. and van Woerkom, M. (2014), “The influence of underlying philosophies on talent
49 management: Theory, implications for practice, and research agenda”, *Journal of World
50 Business*, Vol. 49, pp. 192-203.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Meyers, M.C., van Woerkom, M., and Dries, N. (2013), “Talent – Innate or acquired?
4
5 Theoretical considerations and their implications for talent management”, *Human*
6
7 *Resource Management Review*, Vol. 23, pp. 305 -321.
8
9
- 10
11 Mouraviev, N. and Kakabadse, N. (2017), *Public–Private Partnerships: Policy and*
12
13 *Governance Challenges Facing Kazakhstan and Russia*, Palgrave Macmillan: London.
14
15
- 16
17 Nayak, S., Bhatnagar, J. and Budhwar, P. (2018), “Leveraging Social Networking for Talent
18
19 Management: An Exploratory Study of Indian Firms”, *Thunderbird International*
20
21 *Business Review*, Vol. 60, pp. 21–37.
22
23
- 24
25 Paauwe, J. (2004), *HRM and performance: Achieving long-term viability*, Oxford University
26
27 Press Inc: New York.
28
29
- 30
31 Ralston, D., Holt, D., Terpstra, R., and Kai-Cheng, Y. (2008), “The impact of national culture
32
33 and economic ideology on managerial work values: a study of the United States, Russia,
34
35 Japan, and China”, *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 39, pp. 8-26.
36
37
- 38
39 Schuler, R., Jackson, S., and Tarique, I. (2011), “Global talent management and global talent
40
41 challenges: Strategic opportunities for IHRM”, *Journal of World Business*, Vol. 46
42
43 No., pp. 506–516.
44
45
- 46
47 Sidani, Y. and Al Ariss, A. (2014), “Institutional and corporate drivers of global talent
48
49 management: Evidence from the Arab Gulf region”, *Journal of World Business*, Vol.
50
51 49, pp. 215-224.
52
53
- 54
55 Silzer, R. and Church, A. (2009), “The Pearls and Perils of Identifying Potential”, *Industrial*
56
57 *and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 2, pp. 377-412.
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Silzer, R. and Church, A. H. (2010), "Identifying and assessing high-potential talent: Current
4 organizational practices", in Silzer, R., and Dowell, B.E. (Eds.) *Strategy-driven talent*
5 *management: A leadership imperative*, Jossey-Bass: San Francisco, CA, pp. 213–279.
6
7
8
9
10
11 Skuza, A., Scullion, H., and McDonnell, A. (2013), "An analysis of the talent management
12 challenges in a post-communist country: the case of Poland", *The International Journal*
13 *of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 24 No 3, pp. 453-470.
14
15
16
17
18
19 Sparrow, P.R. and Makram, H. (2015), "What is the value of talent management? Building
20 value-driven processes within a talent management architecture", *Human Resource*
21 *Management Review*, Vol. 25 No. 3, pp. 249-263.
22
23
24
25
26
27 Sparrow, P.R., Scullion, H., and Tarique, I. (2014), "Strategic talent management: future
28 directions", in Sparrow, P.R., Scullion, H., and Tarique, I. (Eds.), *Strategic talent*
29 *management contemporary issues in international context*, Cambridge University
30 Press: Cambridge, pp. 278-302.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37 Swailes, S. and Blackburn, M. (2016), "Employee reactions to talent pool membership",
38 *Employee Relations*, Vol. 38 No. 1, pp.112-128.
39
40
41
42
43 Tansley, C. and Kirk, S. (2018), "You've Been Framed—Framing Talent Mobility in Emerging
44 Markets", *Thunderbird International Business Review*, Vol. 60, pp. 39–51.
45
46
47
48 Thunnissen, M. (2016), "Talent management: For what, how and how well? An empirical
49 exploration of talent management in practice", *Employee Relations*, Vol. 38 No. 1, pp.
50 57-72.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Tymon, W.G., Stumpf, Jr., S.A., and Doh, J.P. (2010), "Exploring talent management in India:
4 the neglected role of intrinsic rewards", *Journal of World Business*, Vol. 45, pp. 109-
5
6 121.
7
8
9
10
11 Ulrich, D. and Smallwood, N. (2012), "What is talent?", *Leader to Leader*, Vol. 63, pp. 55–61.
12
13
14 Vaiman, V., Collings, D.G., and Scullion, H. (2017), "Contextualising talent management",
15
16 *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance*, Vol. 4, No. 4, pp.
17 294-297.
18
19
20
21
22 Van den Broek, J., Boselie, P. and Paauwe, J. (2018), "Cooperative innovation through a talent
23 management pool: A qualitative study on coopetition in healthcare", *European Journal*
24
25 *of Management*, Vol. 36 No. 1, pp. 135-144.
26
27
28
29
30 Yazan, B. (2015), "Three approaches to case study methods in education: Yin, Merriam, and
31 Stake", *The Qualitative Report*, Vol. 20, pp. 134-152.
32
33
34
35
36 Yin, R.K. (2016), *Qualitative Research from Start to Finish* (2nd ed.), The Guilford Press: New
37
38 York.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60