

# 1. Smart talent management: the productive fusion of talent and knowledge management

**Vlad Vaiman, Charles M. Vance and Ling Ju**

---

## INTRODUCTION

Nearly 15 years ago saw the release of the first edition of this book—one of the first beginning to examine talent management as distinct from traditional human resource management. And particularly unique in the growing discussion of talent management was our assertion, which we still hold today, of the value of combining talent management (TM) and knowledge management (KM) to form a powerful conceptual and practical amalgamation contributing to an organization’s success in our competitive global marketplace. For want of a more precise and scientific label, we call this combination simply ‘smart talent management.’ Among other major outcomes of the recent COVID-19 pandemic, where employees have been physically absent due to remote work requirements and forcing the focus upon knowledge contribution, an organization’s human talent is seen more clearly as possessing key knowledge that requires effective management.

Following our first edition there have been several important publications that examine the KM/TM combination paradigm related to knowledge management and strategic HRM, leadership support and managerial involvement, organizational learning, human capital, and KM integration with individual HR functions (e.g., see Khaligh & Ranjbarian, 2022; Rezaei, Khalilzadeh, & Soleimani, 2021; Antunes & Pinheiro, 2020; Pellegrini et al., 2020; Sumarsi, 2020; Muhammed & Zaim, 2020; Nisar, Prabhakar, & Strakovaa, 2019; Shujahat et al., 2019; Milton & Lambe, 2019; Whelan & Carcary, 2011). We hope that this second edition of our book will continue to prompt further examination of the benefits of this combined attention to talent and knowledge management, focusing not only on the establishment of useful definitions, but also on the development and empirical exploration of the smart talent management paradigm. Just like in our first edition, therefore, we define our concept

of smart talent management as the combined use of the distinctly different concepts of knowledge management and talent management to resolve human performance problems and to achieve organizational objectives.

There is one important distinction between our previous conceptualizations and current thinking on talent management, however, that somewhat augments our understanding of smart talent management. This change is prompted by an explosive development of the field of talent management in the past decade. In the previous edition of the book, smart talent management (STM) referred to the effective (i.e., 'smart') integration of knowledge management into the TM paradigm, where STM meant the smart or effective management of *all human resources*, who embody an organization's knowledge capital and capability in generating, acquiring, storing, transferring, and applying knowledge in support of company goals and objectives (competitive advantage). The more recent developments in the area of TM demonstrated that this approach is just 'one color' on a full spectrum of different approaches to TM.

TM is currently a rapidly growing discipline with an increasing consensus on TM definitions, theoretical frameworks, and levels of analysis. Among several important themes in the TM literature, the debate on *exclusive* versus *inclusive* TM approaches has received a significant amount of attention. This discussion revolves around the question of whether TM efforts in an organization should concentrate on all employees or only on those select few identified as talent, i.e., individuals who possess unique skills or show the highest potential for superior performance and organizational contribution. In more detail, the exclusive approach is aimed at *key employees in key positions* (organizational elite, so to speak), and it helps to (1) better differentiate TM from HRM, (2) support workforce differentiation and disproportionate investment (given the reality of limited resources) in individuals with high levels of human capital, (3) and ensure competitive advantage.

On the other hand, the inclusive approach is focused on *all employees*, where management believes that everyone in the organization has potential to create added value; it promotes increased diversity and heterogeneity of talent pools and requires a different understanding of the meaning of 'talent.' While this debate in both academia and practice still presses on, most experts (e.g., Daubner-Siva et al., 2018; Thunnissen and Gallardo-Gallardo, 2017; Gallardo-Gallardo & Thunnissen, 2016) agree that the exclusive approach is prevailing in contemporary TM studies. However, we submit that one should not look at this exclusive vs. inclusive dichotomy as an irreconcilable divide but rather as a continuum, where some organizations undoubtedly use an 'exclusive extreme' that is characterized by a disproportionate investment in highly talented individuals, with a greater focus on talent attraction and acquisition, while others utilize an 'inclusive extreme' embodied by an equal resource allocation and investment in low performers to balance up perfor-

mance, with a greater concentration on talent development and retention. Most companies, however, operate somewhere in between these two extremes and do their best to invest in all levels of human capital development (Morris, Snell, & Bjorkman, 2016). So, as opposed to accepting a fully inclusive approach in this book, we will treat TM as a more complex phenomenon.

Despite changes in our understanding of TM, ‘Smart’ in STM still corresponds to our emphasis of the strategic role of knowledge management in today’s organizations, and particularly within TM, which is part of strategic human resource management (SHRM) efforts of an organization. Our continued use of ‘knowledge assets’ in our book’s title provides an explicit reference to the essential role of knowledge management tied to the human factor, building upon the past use of ‘human capital’ as a strategic tool for competitive advantage.

Thus, the overarching purpose of our book is to present a valuable fusion of two important areas of emphasis for current research and practice in management: talent management and knowledge management. The significance of knowledge management to competitive advantage and organizational success in our rapidly changing global knowledge-based economy is immense (Islam et al., 2022; Rialti et al., 2020; Paoloni et al., 2020). The generation/acquisition of ideas and knowledge, their internal transfer and application throughout the organization and across its various operations, cross-border transfer of knowledge, and so on, have all become an integral and important part of contemporary management, both domestic and international. But what many knowledge management scholars have missed in their predominantly theoretical perspective is the fact that effective knowledge management in practice is largely dependent upon the management of human talent, and especially upon such practical components as recruitment of talent, training, facilitated knowledge sharing, coaching and mentoring, performance management, succession planning, development of global leadership competencies, global alignment, and retention management, among others.

Talent management is quite different in the world of practice, especially when it comes to multinational enterprises (MNEs). As Vaiman and Collings (2015) have noted, one of the most important roles of the global talent function in practice relates to facilitating knowledge creation and knowledge sharing in the MNE, which is increasingly seen as a critical source of competitive advantage on the global stage. On the other hand, despite a tremendous increase in existing scholarly publications on talent management, most fail to adequately recognize human talent as repositories of potentially valuable knowledge—both tacit and explicit. This shortcoming of current academic perspectives in talent management is evident in a recent remark by a TM executive of a large US defense contractor, who indicated that their organization emphasizes retention efforts within the overall TM strategy, since a lot of valuable knowledge

is unfortunately leaving the company due to inadequate attention to effective knowledge management.

## TALENT MANAGEMENT: STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS

With our conceptual admixture in ‘smart talent management,’ this second edition updates our novel look at human talent in organizations, with employees at all levels representing potentially key agents of knowledge management in acquiring, transferring, and applying important knowledge for competitive advantage. Like ‘human capital’ and the more broad, generic term ‘human resource management,’ talent management is grounded predominantly in resource-based theory of organizations (Collins, 2021; Barney, 1991), where organizations can gain competitive advantage to the extent that their assets and resources with which they compete and pursue organizational objectives are valuable, rare, and difficult to imitate. Organizations that are able to attract human talent consistently and effectively, as well as develop and update, deploy where needed, obtain commitment to organization goals, build social capital, elicit ideas for ongoing improvement, and retain this talent will fare well in the long term in the global marketplace compared with other organizations that neglect such attention to human talent. As mentioned above, in the past 15 years since the release of the first edition of this book, there have been quite a few developments in the area of talent management, both in academia and practice. However, many of the same challenges that were identified early on have either persisted or reemerged after the 2007–2009 global recession, including tight labor markets, more complex talent demands in terms of incumbents’ knowledge, skills, and ability, more complex technology and organizational structures, and increasing job mobility (Vaiman, Collings, & Cascio, 2021). Another major challenge that has surfaced rather recently is TM in times of crisis. This has been brought about by the COVID-19 pandemic, which caused not only human suffering on a massive global scale, but also major disruptions that resulted in profound changes in the way individuals and organizations live, work, and function. From a talent perspective, there is definitely a silver lining, as this challenge created multiple opportunities in terms of more flexible working arrangements, which are associated with increased employee satisfaction, productivity, and retention (Wang & Heyes, 2020; Baeza, Gonzalez, & Wang, 2018), and the potential to access more geographically diverse talent pools.

Another trend emerging from the COVID-19 pandemic is that many people have experienced remote work and have been quite successful after the initial set-up period. Consequently, organizations are talking about keeping many of their normally office-bound employees working from their homes or in

a hybrid format (i.e., letting them work sometimes from home and the rest on-site). This is not only happening in the domestic setting but globally—for example, McKinsey (2021) estimates that up to 25% of the workforce in the developed world and about 10% in developing countries will continue working from home even after the pandemic. The increase in online and hybrid work has facilitated employee connections globally, reducing the need for physical global mobility in the ‘new normal’ following the pandemic. As the pandemic subsides, many employers are getting ready to welcome their employees back to in-person presence. Most understand, however, that there is no going back to ‘business as usual,’ and that the ‘new normal’ will be hybrid, requiring greater remote work arrangement flexibility. The question for organizations is how to manage and prosper from these developments. As work becomes increasingly remote and hybrid, talent management strategies need to adjust in line with this approach, creating dispersed rather than concentrated talent pools, shifting the best talent into most critical roles, moving away from a traditional performance management system, and creating the best employee experience possible, among other actions.

Importantly, many remote and hybrid employees are experiencing burnout, which they also attribute to a lack of open and sometimes unambiguous communication on the part of their management. Both anxiety and burnout usually lead to voluntary turnover, which may immediately affect both organization’s availability of talent and TM strategy. To effectively address these serious issues, organizational leadership should develop clear policies that deal with communication technology, working hours, expectations for collaboration, available support, among many other factors. These guidelines, approaches, and expectations should be communicated clearly and frequently, and HR experts need to help managers to facilitate and reinforce these messages. There is still much work to do on this front, as apparently, most organizations are only starting to develop the specifics of hybrid working arrangements. As mentioned above, with the post-pandemic trend of increasing remote work flexibility, there is growing awareness of the need to focus less upon physically present employee performance management and more upon employee knowledge management—the knowledge assets that employees hold or should acquire.

In the world of academia, five key conceptualizations of TM have been revealed in the past 15 years. The first three have been identified by Lewis and Heckman (2006). First was about simply replacing the label HRM with TM, which did not go well with fellow academics who started looking at TM as just a new moniker for the existing function. The second conceptualization helped to shift the succession planning discussion from a somewhat static organizational chart-based approach to a more dynamic one based on predicting staffing needs and developing corresponding talent pools to meet these

needs in the future (Cappelli and Keller, 2014). The third theme focused on the management of so-called ‘A’ players, i.e., employees who consistently demonstrated higher performance in comparison to ‘B’ (average performers) and ‘C’ (poor performers) players. The chief idea behind this was to reward A-players, while forcing C-players ‘up or out.’ Even though this approach had its own proponents (not least of whom was Jack Welch of GE), the idea of forced distribution upon which this approach was based garnered quite a lot of criticism, due to its negative effect on employees involved, cooperation and teamwork, organizational culture, etc. (Collings, Vaiman, & Scullion, 2022). The fourth theme has been brought up in 2009 by Collings and Mellahi, who identified an important direction in TM literature premised on the differentiation of key (or critical, pivotal) job roles in organizations. These roles are differentiated by their ability to generate a disproportional value—expressed in both quantity and quality of output—that contributes to the strategic intent (i.e., mission, vision, strategy, etc.) of the organization. Collings (2017) noted that this literature stream helped to shift the debate on differentiation in TM from employee inputs to outputs, which was a significant change in TM theorization. A later, fifth theme that emerged in the conceptualization of TM focused on the role of big data and people analytics in making more informed decisions on investments in talent (see Vaiman, Collings, & Scullion, 2012).

As mentioned earlier in this chapter, the academic literature has evolved mainly along two paths in terms of TM’s conceptual foundations. The first, most prevailing focus is undoubtedly on *exclusive TM* which underscores the disproportionate contribution of high performing and high potential individuals often employed in critical roles. In line with this approach, Collings and Mellahi (2009) define talent management as ‘activities and processes that involve the systematic identification of key positions which differentially contribute to the organisation’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 organisation’ (Collings & Mellahi, 2009: 305). Even though the above is not the only acceptable definition of TM in the literature, it is by far the most cited and used, emphasizing the tendency of academics to prefer a more exclusive approach to TM.

The second focus is on a more *inclusive approach* to TM, which accentuates the strengths (in terms of knowledge, skills, ability, expertise, etc.) that individual employees bring to the workplace and how organizations can build upon those strengths (Swales, 2013, 2020). Inclusive TM is conceptualized as the understanding and acceptance that all employees in an organization should be viewed as talent, that everyone is capable of contributing something important to their organization, and that each and every employee should

be provided with the opportunity to develop and be deployed in positions in which they may benefit their organization the most. Unlike the exclusive approach, this focus does not over-emphasize individual performance, which may be beneficial to collaboration and team-based contributions. Although this approach has its definite benefits and supporters among TM scholars, it remains somewhat more aspirational, both in academia and practice.

There is no doubt that TM as a discipline is as important and relevant now as it was when it first surfaced from the world of management consulting in early 2000s (see Michaels, Handfield-Jones, & Axelrod, 2001) in response to persistent challenges which companies around the world were facing in attracting and retaining key employees. Despite some critical issues—some of which were discussed above—talent shortages remain a critical issue for organizations globally, and global leaders continue to cite talent challenges as the most important issue that impacts their ability to deliver on both short- and long-term organizational objectives (Collings, Vaiman, & Scullion, 2022).

## KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT: STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS

Besides the distinctly different emphases that we place on the term ‘talent,’ our addition of the conceptual discipline of knowledge management to the picture takes talent management to a more strategic level, where the human talent at all levels represents potentially important sources, transmitters, and implementers of knowledge essential to competitive advantage. Consistent with the maxim ‘knowledge is power,’ the competitive advantages of organizations are derived from core competencies, capabilities, and ‘know-how’ that are developed within them over time (Rehman, Mohamed, & Ayoup, 2019; Prahalad & Hamel, 1990). This collective knowledge is held explicitly within the set of documented policies, practices, directions, instructions, and so on, and implicitly or tacitly within developed routines of organizational life, as well as the conscious and unconscious experience base of employees at all levels (Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995).

To a significant extent, employees embody the knowledge in use within the organization. According to the knowledge-based view of the firm (Grant & Phene, 2022; Grant, 1996), this employee know-how that greatly contributes to a firm’s human core competencies potentially provides a strategic resource to assist the firm in adapting and competing in its market environments (Haesli & Boxall, 2005). Clearly, when all employee talent (including both regular and contingent employees) are seen as current and potential sources and purveyors of knowledge and know-how for beneficial application and utilization within the firm, the perceived role of human resource management policies and practices to attract, develop, motivate, facilitate knowledge exchange interactions

within the organization, and retain this talent grows dramatically in importance (Zaim, Muhammed & Tarim, 2019). Besides increasing the perceived importance of HR policies and practices to the organization, knowledge management also provides a common, unifying purpose and link to integrate and coordinate these policies and practices more effectively within the various HR functions.

Despite the valuable potential contributions of knowledge management, there are potential shortcomings that limit its value and utility in improving organizational performance. Many efforts in knowledge management have focused on hardware and software database applications (e.g., expert systems) with apparently little regard for human dimensions affecting both the entry and retrieval of experience-based knowledge and information, which can become even more problematic due to cultural differences within our global organizations (Paik & Choi, 2005). Much work that does focus on human organizational issues in knowledge management remains at a rather abstract, theoretical, and fairly macro level, with little reference to specific HR policies, practices, and procedures for guiding and bringing knowledge management to the micro level of local firm operations (Cohen & Levinthal, 1990; Gupta & Govindarajan, 2000; Bhagat et al., 2002).

Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995) presented the concept of the ‘knowledge spiral,’ which examines four modes of knowledge transformations, involving knowledge creation and transfer between tacit knowledge (i.e., know-how or experience-based knowledge that is difficult to document) and explicit knowledge (i.e., more easily communicated or shared) at different levels within the firm. Hansen, Nohria, and Tierney (1999) provide a simpler way of envisioning links between knowledge management and the human dimension by distinguishing major approaches of knowledge management: the ‘personalization’ and ‘codification’ of knowledge. In the personalization approach, tacit or experience-based knowledge remains closely tied to the individuals who create or discover it from external sources and transmit this knowledge primarily through person-to-person contact. In contrast, the codification approach attempts to make knowledge more explicit and facilitate its transfer through entry onto databases and into operations manuals and employee training plans for wider company dissemination. The application of the personalization knowledge management approach appears to work most favorably in unique, novel situations, while the codification approach works best in situations involving fairly predictable conditions and routine organizational practices. However, despite their contributions to theory development, these approaches to knowledge management still fail to make a close link to specific HR functional practices for guiding local operations—such as in specific staffing, training and development, and various communications efforts and activities for creating and moving both explicit and tacit knowledge through the organization. There is still a relatively limited understanding of specific ways in



which knowledge management and human resource practices may interact to support competitive advantage (Jyoti & Rani, 2017; Donate & Guadamillas, 2011). More details and recommendations promoting this productive interaction are a major contribution of this book.

Another limitation of knowledge management and related management of knowledge workers is the predominant focus on cerebral and cognitive, intellectual processes, and more impersonal big data and technical systems (Shujahat et al., 2019). There continues to be relatively little attention directed at individual learning and skill development in areas critical for individual, group, and organizational performance within the affective (e.g., feelings, emotions) and psychomotor (e.g., skills) domains (Malik, 2021; Rashid, Tout, & Yakan, 2021; Yang, Zheng, & Viere, 2009). Although discussions about implicit or tacit knowledge can relate to the largely unconscious and internalized knowledge aspects of the psychomotor domain, again they tend to lack sufficient detail about how this form of knowledge can be effectively developed.

Considerable work in emotional intelligence, creativity, and nonlinear thinking also points to the need to look beyond strictly cognitive dimensions of rational data-gathering and logical analysis of knowledge and information for achieving and maintaining high levels of performance (Groves & Vance, 2015; Kahneman, 2013). In a departure from the nearly complete focus on the cognitive domain, past work analyzing individual learning benefits of knowledge-sharing groups (both within and across organizations) has identified important forms of learning in the affective domain, such as increased confidence in problem solving, reduced anxiety caused by feelings of isolation, or an increased awareness of and accompanying sense of urgency in addressing a potential future problem (Vance et al., 1991).

## VALUE OF THE TALENT/KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT HYBRID

A combined conceptualization of talent management and knowledge management in smart talent management considers that which employees can bring of value to the organization (i.e., their personal talent attributes) as extending far beyond only the cognitive domain. The power of the concept of talent includes its relevance to other essential domains of human development and performance besides an individual's store of rational information and cerebral knowledge. The concept of valued skills and competencies held by an experienced employee provides a more vivid picture, and strengthens the meaning of deep, hard to articulate, tacit knowledge, thereby directing it closer to the influence of specific HR practices for identifying, surfacing and capturing, and spreading this tacit knowledge within the organization. The valued personal

attribute of talent also reaches into the affective domain, such as with emotional intelligence and the ability to read and manage one's own feelings in a constructive fashion, and to influence others in doing the same (Goleman, 1995, 1998).

We can see very successful global organizations today operating with the TM/KM hybrid model. One such organization is igus, GmbH of Germany, a leading manufacturer of energy chain systems that support industrial automation and robotics. The active involvement of all managers at all levels in HR practices in combining TM and KM is quickly apparent in a visit to the headquarters manufacturing facility in Cologne. As symbolized by the lower-case letters in its name, igus promotes a strong culture of humility, continuous learning, empowerment, and equality. With operations in 35 countries, the company heavily invests in training and talent development worldwide. Its open office space and furniture design supports an egalitarian atmosphere and facilitates the sharing of information. Everyone can contact anyone else in the company directly. A good example of this combined TM/KM smart talent management model in action, which here merges an empowerment approach with knowledge management, is the igus common maxim: 'First decide, then inform.'

As another good example, the multinational giant Procter & Gamble has been extremely successful in attracting, developing, and retaining its managerial talent worldwide. P&G's combined TM/KM effectiveness in disseminating key knowledge, skills, and abilities throughout its worldwide operations has resulted in the distinct competitive advantage of decision-makers who share a common mindset and alignment that supports an integrated and coordinated global business strategy. This TM/KM merger affecting specific HR practice is evident in the work of P&G's one East Asia regional senior HR executive called 'knowledge-based leadership.' The purpose of P&G's knowledge-based leadership approach is to enable all employees to perform at their peak by ultimately providing opportunities to make decisions in their area of responsibilities. In implementing knowledge-based leadership, P&G employees participate in various forms of training and development to master their three critical areas of knowledge/understanding: (1) the specific technical expertise involved in their work, (2) successful P&G business strategies and approaches, and (3) the Procter & Gamble PVP model that makes up the core fabric of their culture: *purposes* (e.g., company mission), *values* (e.g., core personal and interpersonal values held by each employee such as integrity, trust, passion for success, ownership), and *principles* of business practice linked to company success (e.g., 'mutual interdependency is a way of life,' 'innovation is the cornerstone of our success'). Once employees demonstrate that they have gained sufficient knowledge and clear understanding (including internalized commitment—learning in the affective domain) in these three primary

areas, they are fully empowered to make decisions on their own to accomplish their work performance objectives.

The TM/KM hybrid merges the strengths of each individual approach, yet in combination is also able to surmount the limitations of each. From the above discussion we can summarize the distinct strengths of the combined TM/KM model in smart talent management as follows:

1. With its merger with knowledge management, talent management becomes much more than just a catchy euphemism to replace ‘human resource management,’ and is clearly raised to a strategic level of vital consideration, where employees are seen as holders of critical knowledge for the organization. The care and retention of such human talent are of great importance, for employee loss through turnover also can involve the loss of priceless tacit and transferable knowledge and social capital, including loss of future knowledge acquisition through terminated external professional networks.
2. Knowledge management provides a common purpose and focus to help unify and integrate HR functional efforts and activities and broaden the link with HR and organizational strategy.
3. The term ‘talent’ has a potent meaning that may convey the current or potential value of each employee within the organization—including contingent employees. Thus, the acquisition, development, deployment, and retention of such talent gains a greater investment imperative for the organization.
4. Following a more inclusive path, the TM/KM model has sound theoretical grounding, yet is positioned within the realm of specific HR functional practices, where all managers and supervisors perceive they have an important, central role.
5. The broad view of talent extends knowledge management beyond primarily a conscious, cognitive dimension to include deeper tacit and affective dimensions.

The intent of this book is to present the TM/KM conceptual hybrid, smart talent management, as a valuable multi-faceted direction for managerial action leading to organizational improvement and enhanced competitiveness. However, the idea of building a stronger connection between knowledge management and key HR practices is still in its infancy. We hope that our selection of papers will serve to enhance our understanding of this potentially powerful union and spur further theoretical and applied developments.

## OVERVIEW OF THIS BOOK

Following this first (introductory) chapter, this book comprises nine exemplary contributions from top international scholars working in the areas of talent and knowledge management. In the second chapter, titled ‘Conceptualizing and Operationalizing “Inclusive” Talent Management: Four Different Approaches,’ the authors Françoise Cadigan, Nicky Dries, and Anand van Zelder identify four different approaches to inclusive TM—a concept that is advocated more and more for by both academics and practitioners, and which has thus far lacked conceptual clarity and practical actionability. The four approaches are (1) focusing on potential and strengths rather than talent, (2) increasing the size of the talent pool, (3) defining a broader range of talent domains, and (4) top-grading the entire organization. The authors propose that exclusive and inclusive TM (co)exist on a continuum rather than as dichotomies and develop a decision tree for organizations and researchers to determine which custom approach might best fit their talent philosophy.

The third chapter, authored by Thomas Garavan, Cliodhna MacKenzie, and Colette Darcy and called ‘In the War for Talent: Just Who is Worthy of Development? Talent Development in Organizations,’ explores talent development as a critical pillar of the firm’s overall talent management strategy. The authors position talent development as an inclusive process of developing all organizational talent that works synergistically with talent acquisition and retention to enhance employee and organizational outcomes. They specifically explore current debates within talent development including its contribution to knowledge management, the types of development strategies that organizations can use, the significance of generational differences for talent development, the role of cross-cultural factors, and the use of high potential development programs.

In the following chapter, ‘Accelerated Development of Organizational Talent and Executive Coaching: A Knowledge Management Perspective,’ Konstantin Korotov explores the practice of executive coaching as an instrument of accelerated talent development in organizations. Executive coaching, following a more exclusive TM perspective, has become a popular stand-alone developmental intervention or an enhancer in other efforts to develop employees. This chapter considers coaching as an intervention guiding an individual executive’s efforts in obtaining tacit knowledge, turning implicit organizational knowledge into explicit for the executive concerned, and developing insights into reasons for various events happening in the organization. The chapter provides an opportunity to look at a particular coaching intervention example by exploring coaching notes from an accelerated development intervention. It further elaborates on how coaching helps an executive develop knowledge

about job expectations, stakeholder landscape, organizational culture, self and identity, and group functioning.

The fifth chapter of our book is titled ‘Employee Learning and Development from the Perspective of Strategic HRM,’ and its authors Saba Colakoglu, Yunhyung Chung, and Ying Hong develop conceptual arguments suggesting that HR systems targeted at enhancing employees’ ability, motivation, and opportunities for learning and knowledge creation (that are part of TM systems) are critical for effective knowledge management. Based on the assumption that the knowledge base of an organization lies within the minds of its talent pool, the authors argue that effective talent and HR management processes facilitating employee learning and development can create social climates for knowledge management, which in turn impact individual-level learning, organizational-level knowledge depositories, and consequently critical firm outcomes such as innovation and performance. This chapter offers practical talent management recommendations such as the need to identify learning-related skills and attributes among talent and ensuring talent management processes target those qualities, as well as assessing the social climate regularly to ensure it is conducive for effective knowledge management.

In the subsequent chapter ‘Talent Staffing Systems for Effective Knowledge Management,’ Mark L. Lengnick-Hall and Andrea R. Neely discuss the role of knowledge management and its impact on talent management. The authors provide their conceptualization of talent, include a discussion of knowledge management and how it applies, discuss talent staffing systems and how they impact both processes. Then, Lengnick-Hall and Neely describe the role of talent staffing systems and how they relate specifically to knowledge management systems, followed by the conversation about artificial intelligence as an emerging trend in talent and knowledge management. Finally, they use the Mayo Clinic as an example of talent and knowledge management integration. Although there are significant challenges given the dynamic environment, the authors contend that knowledge management should be incorporated with talent management for the well-being of all stakeholders.

Chapter 7 is titled ‘Leveraging Firms’ Absorptive Capacity by Talent Development.’ The authors, Marina Latukha and Maria Laura MacLennan, discuss the interplay between talent development and a firm’s absorptive capacity in different country-specific settings by focusing on the largest emerging markets: Russia (pre-Ukraine invasion), Brazil, and China. They elaborate on how talent development may increase the overall level of absorptive capacity (AC), namely knowledge acquisition, assimilation, transformation and exploitation, and how the context may impact the intensity and scale of this effect. The authors show how emerging market contexts shape a diverse organizational environment, whereas talent development acts as a booster for AC. They suggest the necessary conditions for talent management, specifically

for talent development, to leverage acquisition, assimilation, transformation and exploitation of knowledge.

The eighth chapter of our book ‘Employee Knowledge Hiding: The Roles of Protean Career Orientation, HR System and Relational Climate’ by Anne Roefs, Saša Batistič, and Rob F. Poell is dedicated to an overlooked but critical human dysfunction of knowledge hiding. The authors contend that despite various efforts to encourage knowledge sharing among talented employees in organizations, hiding knowledge from peers still occurs. Therefore, to ensure success of their talent management efforts, organizations need to understand why and when their workers hide knowledge. Roefs, Batistič, and Poell identify three categories of reasons why knowledge hiding happens: (1) organization-related reasons; (2) job-related reasons; and (3) inter- and intra-personal reasons. The consequences of knowledge hiding can be substantial, as besides financial implications, it also brings risks of damaging relationships and causing distrust among employees. The chapter addresses specifically how personal characteristics as well as organizational practices (e.g., talent system and relational climate) can affect the incidence of knowledge hiding.

In the ninth chapter called ‘The Unrealized Value of Global Workers: The Need for Global Talent Management,’ Anthony McDonnell, Stefan Jooss, and Kieran M. Conroy highlight the pivotal positions that many global workers play. Specifically, they unpack the role of global workers as key boundary spanners, navigating relational, knowledge, and cultural boundaries across the organization. The chapter also argues that the full value of global workers remains unrealized given the lack of planning and integration of these workers in terms of knowledge management processes, talent management strategies, and global mobility functions. Specifically, the authors point to the lack of strategic and practical oversights from corporate HR functions and how this may be impacting upon both global workers’ experiences and organizational efforts to maximize value.

The final chapter of the book entitled ‘Upward Global Knowledge Management: A Review and Preliminary Field Validation of the Host Country National Local Liaison Role Model’ and authored by Charles M. Vance, Marian van Bakel, Torben Andersen, and Vlad Vaiman examines five key role components and talent management practices of a proposed host-country national liaison (HCNL) model affecting foreign subsidiary knowledge management namely, (1) cultural interpreter, (2) communication manager, (3) information resource broker, (4) talent manager, and (5) internal change agent. The authors then present their preliminary field research to begin to validate this model before making recommendations for further research in understanding and employing appropriate talent management practices involving HCNLs for improved KM and organizational performance.

We hope you will enjoy this new edition of *Smart Talent Management!*

## REFERENCES

- Antunes, H.J.G. & Pinheiro, P.G. (2020). Linking knowledge management, organizational learning and memory. *Journal of Innovation and Knowledge*, **5**(2): 140–149.
- Baeza, M.A., Gonzalez, J.A. & Wang, Y. (2018). Job flexibility and job satisfaction among Mexican professionals: A socio-cultural explanation. *Employee Relations*, **40**(5): 921–942.
- Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, **17**(1): 99–120.
- Bhagat, R.S., Kedia, B.L., Harveston, P.D. & Triandis, H. (2002). Cultural variations in the cross-border transfer of organizational knowledge: An integrative framework. *Academy of Management Review*, **27**(2): 204–221.
- Cappelli, P. & Keller, J.R. (2014). Talent management: Conceptual approaches and practical challenges. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, **1**(1): 305–331.
- Cohen, W.M. & Levinthal, D.H. (1990). Absorptive capacity: A new perspective in learning and innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, **35**(1): 128–152.
- Collings, D.G. (2017). Workforce differentiation. In Collings, D.G., Mellahi, K., and Cascio, W.F. (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Talent Management*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 299–317.
- Collings, D.G. & Mellahi, K. (2009). Strategic talent management: A review and research agenda. *Human Resource Management Review*, **19**(4): 304–313.
- Collings, D.G., Vaiman, V. & Scullion, H. (eds) (2022). *Talent Management: A Decade of Developments*. Bingley: Emerald Publishing.
- Collins, C.J. (2021). Expanding the resource based view model of strategic human resource management. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, **32**(2): 331–358.
- Daubner-Siva, D., Ybema, S., Vinkenbug, C.J. & Beech, N. (2018). The talent paradox: Talent management as a mixed blessing. *Journal of Organizational Ethnography*, **7**(1): 74–86.
- Donate, M.J. & Guadamillas, F. (2011). Organizational factors to support knowledge management and innovation. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, **15**(6): 890–914.
- Gallardo-Gallardo, E. & Thunnissen, M. (2016). Standing on the shoulders of giants? A critical review of empirical talent management research. *Employee Relations*, **38**(1): 31–56.
- Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional Intelligence: Why it Can Matter More Than IQ*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Goleman, D. (1998). *Emotional Intelligence at Work*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Grant, R. (1996). Towards a knowledge-based theory of the firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, **17**(Winter special issue): 109–122.
- Grant, R. & Phene, A. (2022). The knowledge-based view and global strategy: Past impact and future potential. *Global Strategy Journal*, **12**(1): 3–30.
- Groves, K.S. & Vance, C.M. (2015). Linear and nonlinear thinking: A multidimensional model and measure. *Journal of Creative Behavior*, **49**(2): 111–136.
- Gupta, A.K. & Govindarajan, V. (2000). Knowledge flows within multinational corporations. *Strategic Management Journal*, **21**(4): 473–496.

- Haesli, A. & Boxall, P. (2005). When knowledge management meets HR strategy: An exploration of personalization-retention and codification-recruitment configurations. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, **16**(11): 1955–1975.
- Hansen, M.T., Nohria, N. & Tierney, T. (1999). What's your strategy for managing knowledge? *Harvard Business Review*, March–April: 106–116.
- Islam, T., Zahra, I., Rehman, S.U. & Jamil, S. (2022). How knowledge sharing encourages innovative work behavior through occupational self-efficacy: The moderating role of entrepreneurial leadership. *Global Knowledge, Memory and Communication*, forthcoming.
- Jyoti, J. & Rani, A. (2017). High performance work system and organisational performance: Role of knowledge management. *Personnel Review*, **46**(8): 1770–1795.
- Kahneman, D. (2013). *Thinking, Fast and Slow*. New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux.
- Khaligh, G. & Ranjbarian, R. (2022). The effect of organizational talent and knowledge management on job satisfaction. *Journal of Human Capital Empowerment*, **4**(4): 275–287.
- Lewis, R.E. & Heckman, R.J. (2006). Talent management: A critical review. *Human Resource Management Review*, **16**(2): 139–154.
- Malik, S. (2021). The nexus between emotional intelligence and types of knowledge sharing: Does work experience matter? *Journal of Workplace Learning*, **33**(8): 619–634.
- McKinsey & Company (2021). Grabbing hold of the new future of work. Organizational Practice. <https://www.mckinsey.com/capabilities/people-and-organizational-performance/our-insights/grabbing-hold-of-the-new-future-of-work>.
- Michaels, E., Handfield-Jones, H. & Axelrod, B. (2001). *The War for Talent*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Milton, N. & Lambe, P. (2019). *The Knowledge Manager's Handbook: A Step-by-Step Guide to Embedding Effective Knowledge Management in Your Organization*. London: Kogan Page.
- Morris, S., Snell, S. & Björkman, I. (2016). An architectural framework for global talent management. *Journal of International Business Studies*, **47**: 723–747.
- Muhammed, S. & Zaim, H. (2020). Peer knowledge sharing and organizational performance: The role of leadership support and knowledge management success. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, **24**(10): 2455–2489.
- Nisar, T.M., Prabhakar, G. & Strakovaa, L. (2019). Social media information benefits, knowledge management and smart organizations. *Journal of Business Research*, **94**: 264–272.
- Nonaka, I. & Takeuchi, H. (1995). *The Knowledge-Creating Company*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Paik, Y. & Choi, D. (2005). The shortcomings of a standardized global management system: The case study of Accenture. *Academy of Management Executive*, **19**(2): 81–84.
- Paoloni, M., Coluccia, D., Fontana, S. & Solimene, S. (2020). Knowledge management, intellectual capital and entrepreneurship: A structured literature review. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, **24**(8): 1797–1818.
- Pellegrini, M.M., Ciampi, F., Marzi, G. & Orlando, B. (2020). The relationship between knowledge management and leadership: Mapping the field and providing future research avenues. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, **24**(6): 1445–1492.
- Prahalad, C.K. & Hamel, G. (1990). The core competence of the corporation. *Harvard Business Review*, May–June: 79–91.



- Rashid, A.S., Tout, K. & Yakan, A. (2021). The critical human behavior factors and their impact on knowledge management system-cycles. *Business Process Management Journal*, **27**(6): 1677–1702.
- Rehman, S., Mohamed, R. & Ayoup, H. (2019). The mediating role of organizational capabilities between organizational performance and its determinants. *Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research*, **9**(1): 1–23.
- Rezaei, F., Khalilzadeh, M. & Soleimani, P. (2021). Factors affecting knowledge management and its effect on organizational performance: Mediating the role of human capital. *Advances in Human-Computer Interaction*, 2021: 1–16.
- Rialti, R., Marzi, G., Caputo, A. & Mayah, K.A. (2020). Achieving strategic flexibility in the era of big data: The importance of knowledge management and ambidexterity. *Management Decision*, **58**(8): 1585–1600.
- Shujahat, M., Sousa, M.J., Hussain, S., Nawaz, F., Wang, M. & Umer, M. (2019). Translating the impact of knowledge management processes into knowledge-based innovation: The neglected and mediating role of knowledge-worker productivity. *Journal of Business Research*, **94**: 442–450.
- Sumarsi, S. (2020). Role of servant leadership, talent management, knowledge management and employee performance. *International Journal of Social and Management Studies*, **1**(1): 123–133.
- Swales, S. (2013). The ethics of talent management. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, **22**(1): 32–46.
- Swales, S. (ed.) (2020). *Managing Talent: A Critical Appreciation*. Bingley: Emerald Publishing.
- Thunnissen, M. & Gallardo-Gallardo, E. (2017). *Talent Management in Practice: An Integrated and Dynamic Approach*. Bingley: Emerald Publishing.
- Vaiman, V. and Collings, D. (2015). Global talent management. In Collings, D., Wood, G. T., and Caligiuri, P. (eds), *Routledge Companion to International Human Resource Management*. London: Routledge, pp. 210–225.
- Vaiman, V., Collings, D. & Cascio, W. (2021). The shifting boundaries of talent management. *Human Resource Management*, **60**(2): 253–257.
- Vaiman, V., Collings, D. & Scullion, H. (2012). Talent management decision making. *Management Decision*, **50**(5): 925–941.
- Vance, C.M., Boje, D.M., Mendenhall, M.E. & Kropp, H.R. (1991). A taxonomy of learning benefits from external knowledge-sharing meetings. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, **2**(1): 25–35.
- Wang, W. & Heyes, J. (2020). Flexibility, labour retention and productivity in the EU. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, **31**(3): 335–355.
- Whelan, E. & Carcary, M. (2011). Integrating talent and knowledge management: Where are the benefits? *Journal of Knowledge Management*, **15**(4): 675–687.
- Yang, B., Zheng, W. & Viere, C. (2009). Holistic views of knowledge management models. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, **11**(3): 273–289.
- Zaim, H., Muhammed, S. & Tarim, M. (2019). Relationship between knowledge management processes and performance: Critical role of knowledge utilization in organizations. *Knowledge Management Research & Practice*, **17**(1): 24–38.