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INTRODUCTION
Organizations worldwide have realized that talented employees drive competitive advantage (Piansongnern et al, 2008). McKinsey & Co. first identified the importance of a structured search for talent in the late 1990s in their article ‘The war of talent’ (Chambers et al, 1998). Since the publication of this article organizations make common use of the instrument of talent management (TM) (Hartmann et al, 2010). Meanwhile Beechler & Woodward (2009) consider TM as a critical factor for organizational success. TM is further strategically important, because organizations are through this able to manage downsizing, expansion and structural alignment. This also helps them to prepare for growth in the future (Garavan, 2012).

Insight in TM contributes to an effective application of TM on a national and global scale. This is important because a good working system of TM enables international firms to gain and sustain a global competitive advantage (Schuler et al, 2011; Aljamal, 2013).

In this paper a literature review is provided of the role of TM in organizational performance of a global organization.

Talent management has become an important issue for organizations worldwide in the recent years (Lewis & Heckman, 2006; Collings & Mellahi, 2009). MNCs face challenges in how to implement their GTM strategies (McDonnell et al, 2010). That is why a clear insight into the role of TM on a global scale is needed. Next to that, a good insight is needed due to the increasing use of social media that will change the landscape for TM in the next five or ten years (Beechler & Woodward, 2009). With effective use of TM globalized organizations are able to easily attract people from all over the globe (Al Ariss, Cascio, & Pauwue, 2014).

Therefore the goal of this paper is to explore the role of global talent management in organizational performance.

The paper is structured as follows. (i) The next session makes clear the structure of the literature review. (ii) After that the findings of the definition (global) talent management is identified and the differences and similarities appointed. (iii) OP will be identified (iv) Then a contingency model will be made. (v) This paper closes with a discussion and conclusion section in which the findings are summarized and managerial implications and limitations are made.

STRUCTURED LITERATURE REVIEW
2.1 Research strategy
In this research is chosen for a literature review. This review describes, summarizes and evaluates field literature. This review differs from other researches, like Hartmann et al (2010) specifying on the different research streams concerning talent management, because of the broad view on GTM.

The advantage of this research strategy is that next to information a review gives an identification and articulation of relationships between the different articles (Boote & Beile, 2005).

This provides a clear vision on the status quo of the role of TM in organizational performance of globalized organizations.

2.2. Selection of the articles
In the first stage of the literature review specific keywords were defined to search in various databases: Global Talent Management, “Global Talent Management”, role of Global Talent Management, “role of Global Talent Management” and “war for talent”.

With the different search terms in the various databases (see figure 1) and after reading the abstracts, a total of 28 relevant articles were found.

The primary inclusion and exclusion criteria were based on the primary aim of the review. Inclusion criteria were:

1. Empirical based articles: This included articles with quantitative and qualitative data to review;
2. Academic articles: Only articles that were published in academic journals are used within this review. There were no specific journals selected for this inclusion. The only criterion was that the article had been published in an academic article.

Exclusion criteria were:
1. Not in Dutch, English or German: Articles in another language are excluded from the research;
2. Unobtainable references: Articles that could not be obtained by the library, searching online or purchasing are excluded from this review.

The second stage of the review was a thorough look at the abstract of the different articles which resulted, in consensus with another researcher, in eliminating irrelevant articles. After we marked the articles we thought were important for the review we agreed to eliminate 7 irrelevant articles. Two articles where left to doubt about. After rereading the abstracts of the two articles on which we differed. I decided to follow the opinion of the other researcher and eliminated those articles.

The elimination criteria were:
1. The articles cannot be too specific about global talent management regarding a single organization or only a limited field of GTM;
2. The academic articles where backed up with partial empirical data.

After the discussion with the other researcher and applying the elimination criteria there were left 19 articles to analyze.

The literature was analyzed based on the following criteria. A table was made with six variables to subject the literature to:
The definition of Scullion et al (2010) defines this culture difference within their definition of GTM. That is why the following definition of Scullion et al (2010) will be used as the leading definition in this research:

‘Global talent management includes all organizational activities for the purpose of attracting, selecting, developing and retaining the best employees in the most strategic roles (those roles necessary to achieve organizational strategic priorities) on a global scale’. They continue: ‘Global talent management takes into account the differences in both organizations, global strategic priorities as well as the differences across national contexts for how talent should be managed in the countries where they operate’ (Scullion, Collings, & Caligiuri, 2010, p. 4).

**FINDINGS**

The review table (appendix 1) shows that the goal of majority of the articles is to determine global talent management and the internal and external challenges and practices of this phenomenon. Some articles are focusing in particular on corporate human resources (Sparrow et al, 2013; Scullion et al, 2011; Farndale et al, 2010).

To achieve their goal they make use of three different research strategies. Some base their findings solo on existing literature (Schuler et al, 2011; Scullion et al, 2011; Farndale et al, 2010; Malaeb, 2010; Scullion, Collings, & Caligiuri, 2010; Huges et al, 2008), other report on case studies and interviews (Iles et al, 2010; Piansoonnern et al, 2008; Garavan, 2012; Kabwe, 2011; Sidan et al, 2014). There are articles that only base their findings on in-depth interviews (Stahl et al, 2012; Hartmann et al, 2010; Sparrow et al, 2013; Chambers et al, 1998; Ingram, 2013; Aljanal, 2013; Farndale et al, 2014; Beechler & Woodward, 2009).

Different issues stood out in the articles. GTM is strategically important because it gives firms ‘the opportunity to simultaneously manage, downsizing, expansion and structural alignment, and it helped them to prepare for growth in the future’ (Garavan, 2012, p. 2428). But to even get started with GTM you have to attract employees to subject them to GTM. It is not easy to attract talented employees due to increasing use of social media that will change the landscape of GTM (Beechler & Woodward, 2009). To attract employees organizations have to make use of a structured search. Piansoonnern et al (2008, p. 70) identified, after a literature review and data triangulation with 18 key informants that answered semi-structured interviews, the following steps to search for talented employees:

1. Creating awareness of benefit of having talented employees among leader;
2. Initiating a concept of talent centric organization;
3. Researching organization’s talent demand for middle to long-term operation;
4. Strategic talent recruitment;
5. Creating obvious career path for both new and current talents;
6. To provide coaching and mentoring;
7. Evaluating those behaviors and rewarding leaders for coaching and mentoring activities with talented employees;
8. Measuring the effectiveness of the coaching and mentoring.

These steps are almost similar to the steps that Chambers et al (1998, p. 1) identified in their article ‘The war of talent’. The following steps are a result of a research with surveys taken within 77 large US companies in different industries:

1. Elevate talent management to a corporate priority;
2. Attract and retain people by refining and creating employee value;
3. Employee involvement;
4. Attention to how to recruit talent;
5. Development is the keyword.

Piansoonnern et al (2008) and Chambers et al (1998) say that it is essential to create awareness for GTM and increase it to central corporate priority. After that strategic recruitment of employees is needed. At last mentoring the development of recruited employees is needed to create a bigger competitive
advantage. Following these steps and making TM key priority has according to the literature a positive effect on OP.

After attracting talented employees to the organization managers have to manage those employees. The review shows that there are four Corporate Human Resource (CHR) roles (Sparrow et al, 2013; Scullion, Collings, & Caligiuri, 2010; Farndale et al, 2010) that are important in global talent management. Where Sparrow et al (2013) identified those roles after 26 interviews in two different MNEs. Identify Scullion, Collings & Caligiuri (2010) and Farndale et al (2010) those roles based on existing literature. Those roles are:

1. Champion in processes: developing and monitoring GTM practices and policies, strategy and tools; ensuring these are implemented across the firm; monitoring GTM processes and improving coordination of tools, techniques and processes internally across functions;

2. Guardian of culture: ensuring a culture of mobility across the organization; incorporation values and system in organizational strategies and activities to support global mobility of individuals and breaking down silo mentalities that can exist between business divisions and geographic regions;

3. Manager of internal receptivity: encouraging the in- and outflow of key talent across business entities; active management of key talent to ensure individuals are looked after; encouraging receiving units to manage diversity, careers, integration and work-life balance; and encouraging sending units to share their talent for the goodness of the firm as a whole;

4. Network intelligence and leadership: developing appropriate networks inside and outside the organization to support the GTM process; being aware of developments in the internal and external labor market; mobilizing appropriate talent both internally and through external provider; and a sense of timing and context’ (Sparrow et al, 2013, p. 1779).

These four different CHR roles should be in good balance. The alignment between those roles contributes with a positive effect OP. Alignment between those roles is not the only alignment there should be to improve the relation between GTM and OP.

Internal alignment is the keyword for a positive relation between GTM and OP. According to Stahl et al (2012, p. 2) “[c]ompetitive advantage comes not primarily from designing and implementing best practices but rather from proper internal alignment of various elements of a company’s talent management system.” By best practices is meant recruitment, staffing and succession planning or training and development or retention management. These practices are not the key to competitive advantage but they have to align closely with the various elements of TM system, like business strategy, leadership philosophy and value system of the firm. This was found after two phases of research. Phase 1 was interviewing 312 senior executives, line managers and HR professionals in 20 companies and 21 countries. Phase 2 was a web-based survey of 263 HR professionals in 20 companies in 36 different countries.

That internal alignment is important for a positive relation between GTM and OP is also found in the article of Hartmann et al (2010). The findings of this article stand in line with the findings of Stahl et al (2012). Stahl et al (2012) focuses as mentioned earlier on different companies in different countries. Hartmann et al (2010) on the other hand focuses on western Multinationals (MNCs) in China. After in-depth interviews he concluded that they transfer their talent management without many changes and mainly focus on internal orientated variables like organizational culture.

According to Schuler et al (2011) it is also the organizational culture in the form of strategic needs and directions of the firm that is a important characteristic to design a talent management strategy. This was found after analyzing existing literature. Next to strategic needs and directions is organizational history, financial condition of the company and the characteristics of the employees important for the internal alignment within a company (Ingram, 2013). Ingram (2013) identified these variables trough open-interview at three large companies (>1000 employees) located in Poland. Without (senior) management understanding and commitment internal alignment can be difficult to achieve (Hudges et al, 2008). Internal alignment is the key competitive advantage (Aljamal, 2013). Hudges et al (2008) made in contrast to Aljamal (2013) use of existing literature to achieve that finding. Aljamal (2013) made use of a questionnaire with a sample of 235 employees within 10 different firms in Jordan.

The literature analysis has shown several external contingencies effecting GTM. Different trends in the economy and the competition on the market are together with the conditions at the labor market and the national culture externally effecting GTM (Ingram, 2013).

After analyzing the variables that effect GTM the key variable that effects GTM is internal alignment. Internal alignment is effectd by different generic contingency factors like corporate culture, organizational structure, organizational strategy, leadership philosophy and firm finances (table 1). If these factors are aligned, in accordance to the scholars, GTM will be improved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contingency factor</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Culture</td>
<td>Farndale et al (2014); Ingram (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Structure</td>
<td>Ingram (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Philosophy</td>
<td>Ingram (2013); Stahl et al (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm Finances</td>
<td>Ingram (2013); Stahl et al (2012)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE

Organizational performance as an outcome variable is common within management research searching for causal explanations. Surprisingly, the definition ‘organizational performance’ is an open question with a few studies using a well-defined and structured, justified definition (Richard et al, 2009). Some definitions of Organizational Performance look like:

- ‘[t]he accumulated results of all the organization’s work processes and activities’ (Boddy, 2011, p. 635);
- ‘[t]he extent to which an organization achieves a set of pre-defined targets that are unique to its mission. These targets will include both objective (numerical) and subjective (judgmental) indicators’ (Albrecht, 2011, p. 8);
• ‘[o]rganizational performance encompasses three specific areas of firm outcomes: (1) financial performance (profits, return on assets, return on investment, etc.); (2) market performance (sales, market share, etc.); and (3) shareholder return (total shareholder return, economic value added, etc.’ (Richard et al, 2009, p. 5).

As to be noticed from above Boddy (2011) defines organizational performance in a broader way. Albrecht (2011) specifies it to achieving pre-defined targets. This definition is more specific than Boddy (2011) because of the targets that are set. The third definition is the best and is used in this paper as a leading definition because it gives a clear insight in organizational performance due to the three specific outcomes mentioned in the definition. This definition reads as follows:

‘[o]rganizational performance encompasses three specific areas of firm outcomes: (1) financial performance (profits, return on assets, return on investment, etc.); (2) market performance (sales, market share, etc.); and (3) shareholder return (total shareholder return, economic value added, etc.’ (Richard et al, 2009, p. 5).

To measure organizational performance an organization has to first envision performance outcomes. The literature gives various outcomes to measure organizational performance: quality, flexibility, profit and effectiveness of personnel (table 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Example of performance outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of personnel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unexpectedly, these outcomes differ from the outcomes announced in the general definitions of OP. This is because OP studies identify these outcomes as outcomes that fit within GTM. GTM studies on the other hand do not identify specific outcomes. Literature shows that they just identify performance as creating competitive advantage or obtaining goals.

TOWARDS A CONTINGENCY MODEL
This model describes the relation between GTM and OP (figure 2). To increase the relation between GTM and OP good internal alignment within GTM is needed. Scholars argue that business strategy effects the relation between GTM and OP (Ingram, 2013; Stahl et al, 2012). If an organization wants to follow a specific strategy, like as being as flexible as possible or to create the highest quality standard in the market, GTM and the type of leadership has to adapt to that. Sparrow et al (2013) identified four different roles of Corporate Human resources for GTM. Two roles (champion in processes and guardian of culture) are viewed as the most important regarding ensuring the business strategy outcomes (quality and flexibility) and OP.

To secure the quality of organizational outputs, scholars claim that good GTM is needed. They recommend focusing on the ‘champion in processes’ role as it monitors the process of GTM policy, strategy and tools (Sparrow et al, 2013). The processes are implemented across the whole organization. This improves the consistency within the firm whereby quality of the output increases.

DISCUSSION
In this discussion there are two points to address. (1) The limitation of this study and (2) notes for future research. The existing literature regarding GTM in this review does not identify specific performance outcomes that are resulted due to good GTM. That is why in this study performance outcomes of OP studies are used. GTM studies used in this review are also lacking in clearing the consequences of good or bad use of GTM.

Future research has to keep in mind that the time of GTM is changing rapidly. So, articles that have been written a couple of years ago could be irrelevant to the subject of investigation.

Conclusion
In this paper we explored the role of GTM in OP by offering a contingency model for future research that integrates different aspects that have influence on the relation between GTM and OP.
After analyzing the articles and their different findings we may conclude that internal alignment creates a positive effect between different aspects of GTM and the relation with OP. This leads to competitive advantage. This internal alignment can differ from internal alignment of practices strategy, culture and external environment (Stahl et al, 2012). To internal alignment between the four identified CHR roles champion in processes, guardian of culture, manager of internal receptivity and network intelligence and leadership (Sparrow et al, 2013; Scullion, Collings, & Caligiuri, 2010; Farndale et al, 2010).

Next to internal alignment there are various things effecting the relation between GTM and OP. As the contingency model shows that business strategy or organizations size effect this relation. Due to adapting GTM in the right way it a positive relation between GTM and OP and improves OP.

The role of GTM in OP can be defined as GTM gives the ability to create competitive advantage through internal alignment, which results in the improvement of OP.

**MANAGERIAL RELEVANCE**

Many of the challenges that organizations face are connected to (global) talent management. These challenges arise due to the changing business environment. Organizations can easily attract talented people from all over the globe because of the technological advantages nowadays. The advantage of easily attracting talented employees creates for organizations the possibility to balance their talent needs for short- and long term. This advantage enables organizations to adapt easily to an changing environment like growing markets or technological innovations. This paper contributes to this all by giving managers a clear insight in the role of GTM in OP. It makes the importance of GTM in combination with OP clear and tells managers how to optimize GTM. When managers of organizations understand the importance of GTM, competitive advantage is created and this will have a positive effect on organizational performance.
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### Appendix 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Main purpose</th>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Contingency Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stahl et al (2012)</td>
<td>Six principles of effective global talent management</td>
<td>Determine how leading companies in North America, Europe and Asia can develop and sustain strong talent pipelines.</td>
<td>Phase 1: A case study by interviewing 312 senior executives, line managers, and HR professionals in 20 companies and 21 countries Phase 2: A web-based survey of 263 HR Professionals in 20 companies out of 36 countries</td>
<td>Competitive advantage doesn’t come primarily from designing and implementing best practices, but rather from the proper internal alignment across practices, strategy, culture and external environment.</td>
<td>Good / bad internal alignment will have a positive / negative effect on the relation between GTM en OP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartmann et al (2010)</td>
<td>Talent management of western MNCs in China: Balancing global integration and local responsiveness</td>
<td>Examine the talent management of western MNCs in China, and explore which institutional and/or cultural talent management practices influence the transfer of talent management practices from the headquarters to the foreign subsidiary.</td>
<td>Qualitative data based on seven case studies. Whereby the data was collected through in-depth qualitative interviews.</td>
<td>- MNCs transfer their talent management practices to China without many changes, focusing specifically on the development of talented employees and the creation of an organizational culture. -Integrated and strategic talent management strategies have not yet been fully implemented.</td>
<td>- Non- / Systematically selected and coordinated HR policies an practices have a positive / negative effect on the relation between GTM en OP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schuler et al (2011)</td>
<td>Global talent management and global talent challenges: Strategic opportunities for IHRM</td>
<td>Describing several global talent challenges and strategic opportunities presented to firms and propose implications for the firm and field.</td>
<td>Making use of the existing literature.</td>
<td>For a list of the findings see appendix 2.</td>
<td>- TM is not essentially different from HRM; - TM is integrated HRM with a selective focus; - TM is organizationally focused competence development through managing flows of talent through the organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iles et al (2010)</td>
<td>Talent Management and HRM in Multinational companies in Beijing: Definitions, differences and drivers</td>
<td>Filling the gaps and omissions of theoretical and empirical development regarding to talent management.</td>
<td>- Literature review - Structured interviews of MNCs in Beijing.</td>
<td>- TM is not essentially different from HRM; - TM is integrated HRM with a selective focus; - TM is organizationally focused competence development through managing flows of talent through the organization.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparrow et al (2013)</td>
<td>An empirical study of the role of the corporate HR function in global talent</td>
<td>Expanding the knowledge of the role of corporate human resource in global talent management.</td>
<td>Data is collected through in-depth interviews at two different MNEs. In total there were 26 interviews.</td>
<td>Four CHR roles are important in GTM. - Champion of processes role</td>
<td>- More / less monitoring and control will have a positive / negative effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scullion et al (2011)</td>
<td>Global Talent Management: New Challenges for the Corporate HR Function in Global Recession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examine the challenges faced by the CHR function via discussion of the changing role of the corporate HR function in managing talent on a global basis and expand upon these emergent roles for the function.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on existing literature.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Guardian of culture role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Manager of internal receptivity role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Network intelligence and leadership role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- More / less social will have a positive / negative effect on the relation of GTM and OP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Good / Bad management and talent flow will have a positive / negative effect on the relation of GTM and OP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Good / Bad resource access and intelligence flow will have a positive / negative effect on the relation of GTM and OP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investigate strategy, process, and current situations of managing high potential or talented employees in European hi-tech corporations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Phase 1 literature review.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Phase 2 Data triangulation with 18 key informants that participated. Data collected through semi-structured interviews.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Talented employees help drive competitiveness, but it is difficult to acquire them because of the war for talent in the particular field.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Eight-step approach: (1) creating Non- / Talented employees will have a negative / positive effect on the relation between GTM and OP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- More / less monitoring and control will have a positive / negative effect on the relation of GTM and OP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Good / Bad management and talent flow will have a positive / negative effect on the relation of GTM and OP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Good / Bad resource access and intelligence flow will have a positive / negative effect on the relation of GTM and OP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s) (Year)</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farndale et al (2010)</td>
<td>The role of the corporate HR function in global talent management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garavan (2012)</td>
<td>Global talent management in science-based firms: an exploratory investigation of the pharmaceutical industry during the global downturn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chambers et al (1998)</td>
<td>The war for talent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabwe (2011)</td>
<td>The conceptualization and operationalization of talent management: The case of European internationally operated businesses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaeb (2010)</td>
<td>Talent Management DNA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Study Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scullion et al (2010)</td>
<td>Global Talent Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingram (2013)</td>
<td>Talent management contingencies: Empirical research results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aljamal et al (2013)</td>
<td>Talent Management and competitive advantage: The moderating effect of knowledge integration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farndale et al (2014)</td>
<td>Balancing individual and organizational goals in global talent management: A mutual-benefits perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidani et al (2014)</td>
<td>Institutional and corporate drivers of global talent management: Evidence from the Arab Gulf region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudges et al (2008)</td>
<td>Talent management: A strategy for improving employee recruitment, retention and engagement within hospitality organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beechler et al (2009)</td>
<td>The global “war of talent”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2:

- The success of firms today is dependent on how effectively they identify and manage the many global talent challenges they confront, and adapt to them as they evolve and develop;
- In order to capture the strategic opportunities offered by the many global talent challenges facing firms today, in-depth knowledge and understandings of the major environmental forces and shapers of them is essential;
- Firms need to systematically select from the many HR policies and practices in order to: (a) manage through the current environment of economic and financial crises; (b) position themselves for the period of recovery after the crises; and (c) operate more competitively on a day-to-day basis in a highly competitive world;
- Systematically selected and coordinated HR policies and practices taken to address these global talent challenges can enable a multinational firm to gain and sustain a global competitive advantage. This is the essence of global talent management;
- Identification of a firm’s GTCs is the basis for the systematic composition of the appropriate HR policies and practices that will enable the firm to be successful in managing its global talent challenges;
- The appropriateness of HR policies and practices depends on the nature of the GTCs and on numerous characteristics of the firm;
- HR Professionals need to know the strategic needs and directions of the firm and the important characteristics of the firm in order to craft a talent strategy, i.e., a strategy that identifies the important global talent challenges and identifies the global talent management initiatives that will effectively manage them;
- Firms that successfully develop and institutionalize their global talent management capabilities position themselves to attain many results in several aspects of talent positioning and balancing, bench strength, global competitive advantage, multiple EVPs and an attractive employer brand;
- Firms that successfully develop and institutionalize their global talent management capabilities must also be able to overcome the many barriers that exist in implementing their global talent management initiatives (Schuler et al, 2011).
Figure 2: internal and external contingencies (Ingram, 2013)