Talent Management and Knowledge Management: toward a Critique and Theoretical Integration


Cindy Wang-Cowham
Nottingham Business School

Ken Kamoche
Nottingham Business School

Carole Tansley
Nottingham Business School

Paul Iles
Salford Business School

Abstract

This paper sets out to explore the connection between the two research domains, talent management and knowledge management. When reviewing the existing literature on both subjects, it becomes apparent that the both subjects share a common underpinning. How talent is regarded in talent management as a valuable resource to the organization could be perceived as knowledge workers in knowledge management. What talent possesses could be construed as the crucial knowledge, explicit or tacit, that knowledge workers possess. It appears that researchers in both areas investigate similar topic but examining it from different angles, from which numerous outcomes have been generated in each domain. By joining the two research domains together, it offers the new research avenues and can shed new light and extend our current knowledge on talent management and knowledge management.
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1 INTRODUCTION

The recent reports on talent management by CIPD (Tansley, Turner, Harris, Foster, & Stewart, 2009a; 2009b, 2009c), the 2010 Journal of World Business special issue on global talent management (Scullion, Collings, & Caligiuri, 2010), and white paper on talent management by Sparrow, Hird and Balain (2011) have captured the heated debate on talent management and its practices worldwide. Developing and managing talent has become a challenging and critical task for HR managers (Farndale, Scullion, & Sparrow, 2010). The pressure instigated by the national and global talent shortage has led both scholars and practitioners to seek to understand these challenges and seek solutions (Sparrow et al., 2011). On the other end of spectrum, what has been seen as another management ‘fashion’, knowledge management, continues to evolve as a distinctive discipline in organization and management studies. Recent knowledge management research explores the role of individuals in knowledge management in terms of appropriation and participation (Rechberg & Syed, 2011), scholars have raised questions such as how knowledge is appropriated, who appropriates and how divergent interests impinge on these processes (Kamoche, 2006), and the wider application of knowledge sharing/transfer activities (Bonache & Zarraga-Oberty, 2008; Matsuo & Easterby-Smith, 2008; Miao, Choe, & Song, 2011). Scholars such as Jakubik (2011) also called for a shift from IT and IS assisted knowledge management research to human-action focused participative knowledge management research. The work of Levy (2011) on knowledge retention of retiring employees highlights another area that has not been looked upon and in deed requires some attention.

While literature in both domains continues to evolve independently, the interconnectedness of some theoretical constructs in both domains have caught the attention of scholars including Whelan and his colleagues. Their recent work includes exploring talent management in knowledge-intensive firms using the gatekeeper theory (Whelan, Collings, & Donnellan, 2010) and on exploring the idea of incorporating talent management principles and practices in knowledge management practices (Whelan & Carcary, 2011). However, research investigating the connection between talent management and knowledge management is still scarce. Our research intends to address this gap by continuing on this line of enquiry. Our primary objectives are to develop and introduce an integrated theoretical framework, in an attempt to establish a researchable link between the two and offer recommendations to enhance organizational practices in both knowledge management and talent management activities. As the research is still work in progress, this paper will report the early thoughts of theoretical development on the subject. Specifically, the paper will critically examine the foundation of both talent management and knowledge management research, i.e. the meaning of talent and talent management in organizations, and the meaning of knowledge and knowledge workers, and the associated most researched phenomenon in both domains, to reveal the connection that could link the two subjects together and develop a researchable agenda.

The remaining paper begins with two sections of literature review on talent management and knowledge management, then an analytical section on developing an integrated theoretical framework. After that, implications of the framework on further empirical research and organizational practices are discussed in conclusions.
TALENT MANAGEMENT

Talent management literature has grown rapidly since the term, War for Talent, was used in a McKinsey report (Michaels, Handfield-Jones, & Beth, 2001) in responding to the challenge of talent shortage across the globe. There has been a significant amount of publication, including special issues of several journals on talent management (see 2010 special issue of JWB on global talent management). Talent has been described as a complex amalgam of employees’ particular skills, knowledge, cognitive ability and potential (Tansley et al., 2009c). Talent management process involves the activities of talent identification, talent recruitment, and talent nurturing/development/management, performance measurement, and talent retention. Successful talent management requires it to be integrated with other HR practices such as performance review, training and development activities (Sparrow et al., 2011). To deal with the rising challenges from the ongoing national and global talent shortage, more and more organizations emphasize talent attraction via employer branding (Jiang & Iles, 2011) for example, and identifying and nurturing talent internally. Successful talent management needs organizations to build suites of practices, activities, and processes that sharpen and align the focus of functional activity, ensure that it serves to help calibrate different parts of the organization (Sparrow et al., 2011).

In an international context, there is much variation in approaches to global talent management in different types of MNC and at different stages of the internationalization process. Scullion and Collings (2006) have observed that talent management approaches may vary across three distinctive HR forms of international firms: centralized, decentralized and transitional. Global firms wanting greater coordination and integration may prioritize greater central control over international manager/high-potential careers and mobility, whilst decentralized MNCs may pursue multi-domestic strategies with less coordination, centralization or integration (Farndale et al., 2010; Scullion & Collings, 2006). This may make the coordination of mobility across borders more problematic, as there may be greater tension between the short-term operational needs of the businesses and the long-term strategic plans of the company as a whole. A major issue for global talent management is how talent is defined, and who among the internal pool is defined as ‘talent’. Mäkelä et al (2010) have developed a two-stage model involving both experience-based (on-line) performance appraisals and cognition-based (off-line) managerial decision-making in a Finnish MNC. They draw attention to such factors as cultural and institutional distance between the locations of decision-makers and potential members of a talent pool. McDonnell and Collings (2011) on the other hand discuss some of the key challenges over the identification and evaluation of global talent, focusing on leadership talent and the tools that might be employed in talent management in ensuring a balanced approach between internal and external labor markets. On the identification of internal and external potential talent, it is crucial in strategically aligning the talent criteria with critical organizational capability (Haskins & Shaffer, 2010), also simplifying the identification criteria and process (Evans, Smale, Bjorkman, & Pucik, 2011). Organizations also look into enhancing the development of talent through e-learning and remote learning, as found in the case of Lafarge (Martin, 2011).

In addition to the attention on the progress of global talent management, there were considerably less nationally focused publications, though growing (Hartmann, Feisel, & Schober, 2010; Holland, Sheehan, & Cieri, 2007). Talent shortages have hit hard especially for a fast growing economy such as China. Chinese firms including MNC’s subsidiaries and privately-owned firms have to compete with each other for the best
management talent (Manpower, 2010). In many Chinese privately-owned firms, performance appraisal is becoming a key talent management practice, but less attention has been given to talent development, partly due to fears of poaching (Cooke, 2011). Additionally, to combat the national talent shortage, the Chinese government has intervened and introduced a number of talent attraction policies such as the 3000 talent plan in 2008. Research is also seen to have developed fast in the UK. The Chartered Institute for Personnel and Development has led a number of projects on developing talent management policies, strategies and practices (Tansley et al., 2009b, 2009c).

Other challenges facing organizations concerning talent management relate to 1) sourcing potential talent, caused by the scarcity of management talent in the labor market; 2) the design of talent development programs falls short of integrating talent’s specific needs and focusing too much on skill development rather than developing adaptive and integrative managerial and leadership skills (Hirsh, 2011); and 3) the practical difficulties when implementing talent development programs, caused by the boundary-less career pattern and high talent flows (Zhao & Zhou, 2008). Lack of clear conversations about talent management strategies at the board level and lack of clear communication with those identified as talented in terms of their future including promotion opportunities in the organization. Talent retention thus becomes a vexing challenge to many organizations (Wang-Cowham, 2011).

The growing literature on talent management on the one hand indicates the acceptance of the impact of talent management on organizational performance, on the other hand shows that organizations have been concentrating on dealing with ad-hoc issues associated with managing, developing and retaining talent to meet immediate talent demand. There is less research which investigates the strategic issues, such as the talent needed to meet the long term business plan, how to capitalize on the talent they have already. To find out answers for these questions, we need to first understand the meaning of talent, and talent management strategies.

2.1 Meaning of talent and talent management

The meaning of talent in organizations has multi-dimensional perspectives. There is no agreed and consented definition (Tansley, 2011). Iles, Chuai and Preece (2010) were amongst the earliest to explore the meaning of talent in talent management context. They found that in practice, talent management requires HR professionals to understand how they define talent, who they regard as ‘the talented’; however, in practice, organizations often derive their own conceptualization of what talent is, rather than accepting a universal or prescribed definition (Iles et al., 2010). Tansley’s (2011) work endorses their view and she further argues that because organizations are operating in a fluid and dynamic business environment, highly influenced by the type of industry, different levels of individual and group working, and changing organization/business priorities, it is rather tricky to have a one-size-fits-all definition of talent. At the organizational level, CIPD researchers found that organizations define talent closely related to the nature of their business. For example, Gordon Ramsay Holdings emphasizes creative flair; Google describes Googler as being confident, a person who thinks outside the box (CIPD, 2007; Tansley, 2011). Consequently, for large MNCs, different business units in different subsidiaries would draw different definitions of talent according to the required skills, knowledge and the levels of competence. These definitions in different subsidiaries may not be highly connected (Tansley, 2011).
In practice, most organizations are found to only focus on a selected number of employees, either in groups or individually (Sparrow et al., 2011). At the group level, organizations tend to characterize certain types of talent in groups, such as leadership talent and core talent. Talent pools are used to describe collective talented employees who have been identified as talents with potential (Iles et al., 2010). Some of them may be further characterized according to managerial levels or job specificity such as executive level and marketing.

When looking at the characteristics of the talent individually, talent has certain behavioral aspects such as a ‘can-do’ attitude, expertise, skills and competencies and cognitive capability (Tansley, 2011). Individual talents can be further identified as talent as high performer and talent with high potential. Talent with high potential can be someone with the ability, engagement and aspiration to rise and succeed in more senior, more critical positions. Their behavioral aspects, expertise, and skills can be deconstructed in different elements and reshaped. On the other hand, talent as high performers are those who already possess those associated characteristics such as high levels of expertise, leadership behavior, creativity, and self belief (Iles et al., 2010; Tansley, 2011). These individual talents are often highlighted as a ‘star talent’ in talent management literature.

With regard to talent management strategies, Iles et al (2010) suggested four perspectives: i.e. exclusive-people; exclusive-position; inclusive-people; social capital. The variation of talent management approaches corresponds to the meaning of talent that the organization stands. Exclusive-people and position perspectives reflect that the organization only focuses on a selected number of employees including ‘star talent’. The inclusive people and social capital perspective indicates that the organization perceives all employees as talented and intends to manage and develop the complete workforce (Iles et al., 2010; Tansley, 2011). As revealed in recent research by Sparrow et al (2011), the majority of talent management strategies adopted by organizations are based on a ‘critical people’ philosophy, or exclusive-people perspective (Iles et al., 2010). Presumably, organizations want to obtain from these star talents not only what they have achieved in the past and their expertise, but also the greater ‘potential’ of certain competences and cognitive capability could bring to the firms. These brilliant behavioral features could assist in identifying innovative ideas that profit the organizations in the long term while ordinary employees cannot. To minimize the risk, organizations can provide a suitable environment to harness the talents and expertise. That environment could mean forming a likeminded community around the star talents, and/or providing firm support, be it in financial terms, equipment or additional labour, on testing the unconventional ideas. Furthermore, risks associated with this strategy could be over-emphasizing a few ‘labeled as star talents’ and neglecting the rest, who may be left feeling their role is of little value to the organization (Whelan & Carcary, 2011). This could result in de-motivation and de-moralization within the workforce. There is also no guarantee of talent on return on investment as we have seen the cases that highly regarded talent such as CEOs who failed to deliver the performance (Sparrow et al., 2011). However, given repeated cost cutting exercises and limited available resources in the current economic climate, the inclusive people and social capital talent management approaches do not appear to be a viable option at the present time.
3 KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT

The criticism that knowledge is too difficult to manage has long dogged the knowledge management domain (Alvesson & Karreman, 2001), but knowledge management continues to attract much attention, mostly about the challenges of managing and transferring it, but increasingly about the complex question of appropriation (Kamoche & Maguire, 2011). Research on knowledge sharing has highlighted various means for facilitating knowledge sharing in the workplace through communities of practices (Wenger, McDermott, & Snyder, 2002), internal and external learning networks (Hansen, Mors, & Lovas, 2005), cross-cultural collaboration (Kanzler, 2010) and so forth. This strand of research stresses the importance of social interaction as a catalyst for tacit-explicit knowledge conversion in the workplace. Other knowledge management research exploring the factors that influence the process of knowledge sharing/transfer could help understand the social interaction between talents and their colleagues. Conversely, Jakubik (2011) stated that amongst the current literature, there are too many publications on IT and IS assisted knowledge management (about 80%) and only 20% on human-action focused publications. We therefore need more participative research involving both scholars and practitioners. Talent management sits in the domain of HRM, which is a practice-based research subject and has the strength of investigating employee actions. Connecting talent management with knowledge management research could contribute to the research gap and emerge a new area of research (Whelan et al., 2010).

Before exploring the connection of talent management and knowledge management, it is important to review the meaning of knowledge, the underlying theoretical construct of knowledge management literature, and knowledge worker (or actor), who carries knowledge.

3.1 The meaning of knowledge

If we take it as a starting point that knowledge is created in the first instance at the level of individuals, this makes the tacit component as defined by Polanyi (1967) a very ‘personal’ experience (Bowman & Swart, 2007; Grant, 1996). Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995) present tacit knowledge as having two dimensions: the technical and cognitive dimensions. The technical dimension provides for the ‘know how’ or informal skills. The scientific or technical principles behind what is known are often difficult to articulate. The cognitive dimension consists of often taken for granted schemata, heuristics, mental models, beliefs, and perceptions and they inform our world view. Boisot (1998, cited in Styhre, 2004) suggests that there are three ‘quite distinct variants of tacit knowledge: (1) ‘Things that are not said because everybody understands them and takes them for granted’; (2) ‘Things that are not said because nobody fully understands them. They remain elusive and unarticulated; and (3) ‘Things that are not said because while some people understand them they cannot costlessly articulate them.’

It has been argued that tacit knowledge needs to be codified so it can then understood by a broad audience. The codification process can be characterized as the relationship between knowledge and action (Cook & Brown, 1999; Davenport & Prusak, 2000; Tsoukas & Vladioumiou, 2001). Davenport and Prusak (2000) support the linkage between knowledge and action when they suggest that, ‘knowledge is a fluid mix of framed experience, values, contextual information, and expert insight that provides a framework for evaluating and incorporating new experiences and information.'
Knowledge stored in the mind of knowledge workers is a tremendous capital asset (Drucker, 2002). It originates and is applied in the minds of knowers. Tsoukas and Vladimirou (2001) also stress the relationship between knowledge and action, but rather than focusing on the role of the individual, where ‘knowledge is the individual’s ability to draw distinctions within a collective domain of action, based on an appreciation of context or theory or both’. In talent management literature, the behavioral features of talents can be construed as knowledge, explicit and tacit, that knowledge management literature refers to here.

Cook and Brown (1999) recommended the term of epistemology of possession, meaning knowledge as someone’s possession, and the term of ‘epistemology of practice’, drawing the fact that knowledge is generated through our interaction with the social and physical world. We believe that this generative dance between knowledge and knowing is a powerful source of organizational innovation. Harnessing this innovation calls for organizational and technological infrastructures that support the interplay of knowledge and knowing. Jakubik (2011) further explained that from the epistemological point of view, for people believe that knowledge can be acquired, shared, knowledge is explicit (knowledge is more objective concept); for people believe that knowledge needs to be personally experienced, knowledge is ‘tacit’ (knowledge is a more subjective concept). Most recently, Jakubik (2011) promotes a becoming epistemology towards a more participative research paradigm with an emphasis on practice and social interaction and situation-based research. She proposes a ‘becoming to know’ framework connecting learning, knowing and becoming together and main elements of which are engaging, exploring, experiencing, emerging, enabling, and evolving. Her becoming epistemology stresses the active and dynamic nature of knowledge creation stimulated through a series of knowledge sharing activities, including engaging, exploring, experiencing, interpreting, etc. Her becoming to know framework is in effect exploring the interplay between and amongst knowledge workers.

3.2 Knowledge workers

Since the term knowledge worker was introduced by Peter Drucker (1999) over a decade ago, a number of scholars including Davenport and his colleagues continue researching on knowledge workers. All jobs demand some knowledge but state that most people would define knowledge workers as individual possessing ‘high levels of education and expertise whose primary task is the creation, distribution, or application of knowledge (Hartmann et al., 2010). The success of knowledge workers builds on not only their specialized industrial expertise, but also their social capital. High performing knowledge workers develop rich, extensive social networks than enable them to carry their work to a superior level (Cross, Devenport, & Cantrell, 2003). Acsente (2010) discovered a number of characteristics of knowledge workers. A preference for autonomy in her view is the defining characteristic. Knowledge workers require a physical or virtual, independent or communal space to be creative and innovative. Innovative and creative are thus common characteristics of knowledge worker. Other attributes that are prominent in the literature describing knowledge workers include flexibility, adaptability, and intrinsic motivation, desire for interesting and challenging work, collaboration and social networking.

The key to capitalizing on knowledge is recognizing that knowledge resides in people. The tacit knowledge they accumulate through experience needs to become diffused, adopted and embedded into organizational routines. The organization needs to support and provide a context for key knowledge workers to create new knowledge (Whelan &
In order to capitalize on the talent of knowledge workers, a work environment and culture built on trust, respect, and empowerment is critical. It encourages and supports professional autonomy, innovation, creativity, self-direction, intrinsic motivation, teamwork and knowledge-sharing, learning and dynamic change (Acsente, 2010). It also enhances the productivity of this select elite group and provides a company with a decisive competitive advantage (Acsente, 2010). The meaning of elite group runs parallel with the meaning of selected talent groups or talent pools.

The knowledge workers inherent in the codification or conversion process related to capability - that is, how easy or difficult it is to codify or express the knowledge possessed by the talents and enable it to be understood by a broad audience. Talent management is the means by which those responsible for talent in the organization know how to design and harness the talent development process for the benefit of knowledge management in the organization. The need to pay more critical attention to knowledge within the HR context is underscored by the fact that the conversion of personal knowledge into organizational knowledge remains highly problematic (Tsoukas, 1996; Tsoukas & Vladimirou, 2001), which means that such knowledge readily satisfies the conditions of scarcity and inimitability. However, there is a tendency in the literature to assume that organizations can ‘capture’ knowledge and only have to contend with problems like stickiness and unwillingness to share, problems which, it is assumed, can be addressed through suitable motivational and other HR practices (Szulanski, 2000). This also assumes that organizations have an automatic right to the knowledge of their employees which they seek to appropriate/capture regardless of the views of the talents.

We have come to learn that a small number of key employees/talent or knowledge workers hold the critical knowledge that could add value to the business operation. That knowledge can be shared and transferred throughout social interplay between talents or between the knowledge workers. The fusion of talent management and knowledge management therefore holds important competitive implications for modern organizations as the successful generation, transfer, and the exploitation of knowledge is heavily dependent upon the effective management of human talent (Vaiman & Vance, 2008). Specifically, in this paper we argue that organizations need to broaden the horizon of talent management practices and strategies by integrating the key constructs of knowledge management to harness the tacit and explicit knowledge of those identified talents or talent pools. The notion of talents and what they construe as the knowledge they have and the notion that organizations know how and when to harness that knowledge are the foundation for a theoretical integration.

4 A THEORETICAL INTEGRATION

By ‘talent’ we are referring to the selected few or talent pools; following exclusive-people or critical people approach, the one most commonly adopted talent management strategy. However, this does not mean that we are endorsing such a strategy. To the contrary, we believe that it would be more beneficial for the organization to adopt a talent management strategy that combines the merit of all talent management perspectives so that it is more adaptive to the organizational development needs. What we intend to do in this section is to draw relevant aspects from both talent management and knowledge management literature and underline the aspects that could
connect the both, then envisage a pursuing angle for further research. It follows the research approach illustrates in Figure 1.

**Figure 1: Theoretical Integration of TM and KM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TM Literature Review</th>
<th>Theoretical Underpinning</th>
<th>Research Angle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The meaning of talent</td>
<td>Talent is regarded as a valuable resource to the organisation.</td>
<td>Talent as a special form of knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM strategies</td>
<td>Organisation to exploit key behavioral features of the talent.</td>
<td>Integrating KM theories in TM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KM Literature Review</th>
<th>Theoretical Underpinning</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The meaning of knowledge</td>
<td>Knowledge is perceived as possession of individual knowledge workers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge workers</td>
<td>Organisation to exploit (share, transfer, etc.) the knowledge of knowledge workers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above literature review, we could see that talent management, being a practice-based research subject, has been relatively under-theorized. The difficulty in defining talent has certainly contributed to the lack of theoretical underpinning for talent management. The majority of talent management research has been on how organizations both nationally and internationally deal with the talent shortage with an emphasis on talent management processes drawing from various HRM practices such as recruitment, succession planning and leadership development. Therefore, there is lack of theory development in talent management. Knowledge management on the other hand as a discipline has extensive theoretical underpinning with a number of scholars researching the meaning of knowledge (Cook & Brown, 1999; Jakubik, 2007, 2011), and a number of theories such as communities of practices (CoPs), gatekeeper theory and social exchange theory, etc. developed or linked to knowledge sharing, transfer, generation and creation. Therefore, it seems reasonable to look into the literature in both domains and develop an argument about the management of talent with reference to the management of knowledge.

When examining certain developments in the existing literature of both domains, it becomes apparent that the underlining motive for talent management and knowledge management research is somewhat similar. In talent management literature, talent is regarded as a valuable resource to the organization; it is the expertise, skills and other attributes (referred as key behavior features) of the talent that the organization needs to exploit and turn it into competitive advantages. In knowledge management literature, knowledge is perceived as possession of individual knowledge workers and generated through social interplay between knowledge workers; it is the crucial tacit knowledge that is embedded in individual knowledge workers and the new knowledge created through social exchanged activities in designated CoPs or volunteering CoPs that the organization emphasizes and seeks to exploit and internalize in the organizational practices. It is this underpinning that the organizations share that we intend to connect talent management and knowledge management and build upon.
4.1 Talent as a special form of knowledge

Talent is a special form of knowledge which resides in individuals (knowledge workers and talent) who are recognized as adding value to the business operation. These talented knowledge workers, be it in talent pools or labeled as star talent, possess a special set of skills, experiences and attributes. Their knowledge does not have to be specialized as long as it can generate/cultivate new innovative ideas. To harness knowledge from the talented knowledge workers, current talent management research has sufficiently developed a wide range of policies and practices to deal with talent management issues in organizations, although considerably less on talent retention (Wang-Cowham, 2011). Knowledge management research can assist organizations in capitalizing their knowledge, retaining them, rewarding them adequately, managing them effectively, etc. by drawing from knowledge management developments. A significant amount of research on knowledge sharing was generated with well-adopted concepts including CoPs, gatekeeper theory, and social exchange theory. While our understanding on these concepts become more and more comprehensive, we can activate these concepts in practice to harness or create new knowledge, specifically targeted at those identified talented knowledge workers. Talent management could also benefit from strengthening its theory development by building on the knowledge management theories.

Although talent management and knowledge management as a joint research topic has only just begun, early research by Whelan and Carcary (2011) stressed the need for more research in this area. Their research explores the way how talent management principles can assist in achieving knowledge management objectives on developing knowledge competences, facilitating knowledge sharing, and enhancing knowledge retention (Whelan & Carcary, 2011). Our research on the other hand focuses on how knowledge management can assist organizations in achieving talent management objectives.

5 CONCLUSIONS

This paper sets out to explore the connection between the two research domains, talent management and knowledge management. When reviewing the existing literature on both subjects, it becomes apparent that the both subjects share a common underpinning. How talent is regarded in talent management as a valuable resource to the organization could be perceived as knowledge workers (actors) in knowledge management. What talent possesses could be construed as the crucial knowledge, explicit or tacit, that knowledge workers possess. It appears that researchers in both areas investigate similar topic but examining it from different angles, from which numerous outcomes have been generated in each domain. By joining the two research domains together, it offers the new research avenues and can shed new light and extend our current knowledge on talent management and knowledge management. It is well established that organizational knowledge are critical to competitive success. The strategic value of organizational knowledge embedded in individual know-how, actions and collective experiences and expertise. It suggests that effectively managing the top performing knowledge workers/talent is necessary for enhancing organizational performance and competitiveness. Regardless of the views of organizational knowledge or communal knowledge, tacit knowledge (the most influential cognitive aspect of knowledge) is embedded in an individual’s mind, being it knowledge or labeled as talent. Both talent management and knowledge management researcher could complement each other to
strengthen the development and management of talent and the harvest of influential knowledge in organizations.

As noted at the beginning of this paper, our research is still a work in progress. Future research will concentrate on what knowledge management theories can do to assist talent management in organizations if talent is perceived as a special source of organizational knowledge.
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