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Introduction

Currently, talent management is the topic of heated discussions not only in business but also in the scientific world. Interest in this phenomenon has been steadily growing in the academic field over the last seven years, and the stage of talent management development in science is characterized by scholars as a stage of growth (Gallardo-Gallardo et al., 2015).

The relevance of talent acquisition is confirmed by global demographic and social trends, observed both in Russia and in the world. According to the Deloitte research "Human capital trends-2017", the problem of providing companies with talented employees took the third place in importance from the point of view of managers (Deloitte, 2017). A similar confirmation of the importance of this was found in the CIPD study, according to which only 6% of organizations recognize their talent management systems effective, while 15% of organizations described them as ineffective (CIPD, 2012).

Despite talent management being a new term in the lexicon of Russian business, a vast majority of leading Russian industrial companies implement TM programs. These companies have Soviet roots and may replicate a Soviet-type personnel policy (Muratbekova-Touron et al., 2018). At the same time, many knowledge-intensive firms were created after the USSR collapse, so that they did not inherit Soviet tradition of HRM. Despite the differences in business models, both types of companies operate in competitive international markets and it is quite a challenge for them to attract “A-players”. The authors assume that contextual factors (type of industry, business models that have differences in the pace of changes, labour characteristics and job requirements) combined with historical factors influence the way companies identify talents and further attract and select them.

This paper aims to identify differences and similarities in talent acquisition in two groups of companies, belonging to different economic sectors in the context of emerging market. The main research question of the paper can be summarized as follows: what practices of talent acquisition are applied in traditional Russian industrial and new knowledge-intensive companies in accordance with talent categories and contextual factors?

Data were collected using a method of deep semi-structured interviews with 20 experts, which were specialists from human resource management departments of companies belonging to both traditional industries and the knowledge economy.
This paper consists of three sections. The theoretical background of the research sets out an overview of approaches to the interpretation of the terms "talent" and "talent management", as well as modern research directions in the field of talent acquisition. The methodology and sample of the study are described in the second part of the paper. The third section presents the main results of the research, which touch on the features of talent acquisition in industrial companies and in the enterprises that belong to knowledge economy.

**Theoretical background**

Currently talent management is undergoing the growth stage of its scientific development. This is evidenced by a rapid increase in the number of publications over the past 5 years and the formation of a scientific community around this topic. At the same time, it is noted that empirical studies on talent management have limitations due to their cross-sectional design, and the theories and concepts used in them are not consistent with the research methodology (Gallardo-Gallardo et al., 2015). Theoretical approaches to talent management stem from a variety of fields, which are economics, sociology, psychology, organizational behavior, management.

The most common basis for classifying approaches to talent definition is the subject-object dichotomy. Proponents of the subject approach imply the specific characteristics of workers under the talent, whereas in the object approach talent refers to people themselves who are carriers of cognitive characteristics (Gallardo-Gallardo et al., 2013).

If we turn to the object approach to talent, its definition goes back to cognitive psychology. For decades, scientists have been discussing the relationship between the inherent and acquired cognitive properties of talent (Meyers, Woerkom, Dries, 2013). One camp of researchers recognizes a genetically determined and indestructible talent (Hinrichs, 1966, p.11 cited by Gallardo-Gallardo et al., 2013), while other scientists empirically proved that talent is a function of experience and learning (Howe et al., 1998).

TM in emerging markets has recently become a pertinent area of research (Sparrow et al., 2015; Tatoglu, 2016; Latukha, 2016). Scholars paid attention to TM in a great number of developing and post-soviet regions such as Eastern Europe, the Middle East, South-East Asia, the Gulf region, China, India, the BRIC region, (Skuza et al., 2013, Vaiman, Holden, 2013; Egerova, 2015; Latukha, 2015; Tatoglu, 2016; Muratbekova-Touron et al., 2018). However, there is still a lacuna in our knowledge of TM in Russia, and its maturity level is described as “low” (Latukha, 2018).

Managing talent supply is a complex system that should be considered from the standpoint of several theoretical approaches. At the present moment the leading paradigm in personnel management is the resource approach, in which workers are regarded as the most valuable asset of the organization. Consequently, the general theoretical framework for talent management in this
paper will be precisely this approach, which could be divided into two directions. The first of them is human capital approach, according to which workers are seen as an object for investment that are done in order to obtain the maximum return on investment (ROI). The second approach considers talent management only in relation to key positions in the organization that bring the company the maximum competitive advantage. The resource approach is inseparably linked with the strategic approach, which connects talent management not only with the company's general strategy, but also with global trends of the external environment.

Taking into account that talents are the most valuable resource for the organization, it is necessary to analyze supply and demand risks for a comprehensive understanding of all talent management processes in the internal and external labor market. In particular, to describe talent management processes Cappelli (2008) suggests usage of an adapted model of supply chain management (Cappelli, 2008). Hassini, Surti, Searcy (2012) proposed a sustainable supply chain model that includes such stages as resource extraction and production, delivery, value proposition, consumer use and disposal. The undoubted advantage of this model is its complexity: it considers all elements of the supply chain, from the transformation of raw materials into commodities and ends with its utilization. However, for application to the topic of talent management, this model needs considerable adaptation. Such an attempt was made by Schiemann (2014). The author proposed a model of talent management life cycle, which consists of attraction, selection, adaptation, training, maximizing efficiency, development and promotion, retention.

All types of talent management practices that listed above complete each other, but this list lacks an extremely important element that is communication management. For example, information about who is included in the talent pools and the very form of its presentation can significantly affect the attitudes of workers, as well as the results they show (Björkman et al., 2013, Swailes, Blackburn, 2016).

Recently, companies have been the main agent making decisions about talent attraction and selection. But fresh data indicate that organizations experience a significant increase in costs associated with recruitment and selection. The cost of one hiring in the United States increased by 7% in 2015 compared to 2014, and the average job closing time increased by 4 days compared to 2011 (Staffing Industry Analysts, 2015 cited by Phillips-Wren et al., 2016). According to the report "Human capital trends-2017" (Deloitte, 2017), the problem of providing companies with talents was the third most significant issue for managers.

The most pertinent dilemma of talent acquisition is whether to attract a candidate from the external labor market or to invite a candidate from the internal labor market. In other words, it is the so-called "make or buy" dichotomy. In Bidwell’s study (2011) it was found that the productivity of candidates hired from the external labour market was lower than among colleagues
hired from within in the first two years of work, but the wages of "newcomers" were higher at 18%. Cappelli (2008) proposed a talent-on-demand framework, which would mitigate risks from both the supply side and the demand side. The model assumes such measures as balancing of internal and external hiring, division of development programs into short blocks, completion of additional tasks by employees in exchange for training and maintaining a balance in the employee-employer relationship.

Research papers that are devoted to the topic of talent acquisition focus mainly on cross-cultural issues of talent attraction (Baum & Kabst, 2013; Cooke et al., 2014; Egerova et al., 2015), digital talent selection practices (Ližbetinová & Hitka, 2016; Chamorro-Premuzic, 2017) and talent acquisition of particular talent categories (McCracken et al., 2016; Deters, 2017; Muratbekova-Touron et al., 2018).

Turning to talent acquisition in knowledge-intensive companies, it was found that Indian and Chinese IT-recruiters use such state-of-the-art practices as Boolean search and headhunting and apply them to various channels to find talents (Limin, 2010; Riemsdijk, 2013). At the same time, there are negative external contextual factors that influence Chinese and Indian IT TM systems such as low quality of education, bureaucracy and poor economic conditions (Rovai, 2008; Riemsdijk, 2013).

Consequently, despite the fact that firms in emerging markets that belong to knowledge intensive economy are negatively influenced by external contextual factors, they actively use modern recruitment tools to win the “war for talents”. The same trend is seen in talent recruitment in industrial companies, where such harsh internal contextual factors as high turnover rates and poor working conditions make it problematic to hire “A-players” (Egerova, 2015). Interestingly, there are sophisticated tools not only in the quaternary sector of the economy, but also in the secondary one. Ližbetinová & Hitka (2016) offered a talent selection model for furniture manufacturing industry in the Czech Republic, which is based on Saaty’s method that considers contextual factors as well.

There are few papers devoted to talent acquisition in both industrial and knowledge-intensive firms across emerging countries, while no signs of typologies of TM systems or their comparisons in accordance with industry type were found. However, Bolander et al. (2017) offer a proper framework for identifying similarities and differences in talent acquisition systems, which could be applied to comparison of knowledge-intensive and industrial companies.

**Methodology**

This study is based on a qualitative methodology. The data were collected through in-depth semi-structured interviews with 20 HR-managers from industrial (energy, FMCG, mechanical engineering) and knowledge-intensive (IT, consulting, telecom, pharmaceutical
industry) Russian companies (one respondent per company). Such division is based on the fact that in these two groups of companies the way of achieving a competitive advantage differs substantially, which also affects the entire TM system (Powell, Snellman, 2004).

The main criteria for the selection of companies and the selection of respondents were the following:

- talent management presence in the company (staff reserve, high-potential and high-performance employees);
- ensuring the diversity of companies by industry, type of capital ownership (first of all, the presence or absence of foreign capital);
- the respondent's job title: a specialist in work with personnel, a recruiter, talent acquisition manager, recruitment manager, HR-specialist, etc.

Table 1. Main features of companies and their representatives that took part in the study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>№</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Capital origin</th>
<th>Number of staff</th>
<th>Work experience</th>
<th>Job title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K1</td>
<td>IT-consulting</td>
<td>Russian-owned</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>8 years</td>
<td>HR Business Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1</td>
<td>FMCG</td>
<td>Foreign-owned</td>
<td>20 000</td>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>Talent Acquisition Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I2</td>
<td>Nuclear power</td>
<td>Russian-owned</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>20 years</td>
<td>Head of performance department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I3</td>
<td>FMCG</td>
<td>Foreign-owned</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>8 years</td>
<td>HR Business Partner &amp; Talent Acquisition Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I4</td>
<td>Production and distribution of appliances</td>
<td>Foreign-owned</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>Head of recruitment, learning &amp; development department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I5</td>
<td>Energy management and automation</td>
<td>Foreign-owned</td>
<td>12 000</td>
<td>9 years</td>
<td>Talent Acquisition Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 K – a knowledge intensive company; I – an industrial company; I+K – a company that belongs to both traditional industrial economy and knowledge economy
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>Employees</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K2</td>
<td>Telecommunication</td>
<td>Russian-owned</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Head of recruitment and employer brand department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K3</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Russian-owned</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Talent Acquisition Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4</td>
<td>Pharmaceuticals and medical devices</td>
<td>Foreign-owned</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Talent Acquisition Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K5</td>
<td>Pharmaceuticals and medical devices</td>
<td>Foreign-owned</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Recruiter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I6</td>
<td>Power engineering</td>
<td>Russian-owned</td>
<td>73,782</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Deputy head of administration and personnel development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K6</td>
<td>Telecommunications</td>
<td>Russian-owned</td>
<td>142,500</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Head of talent acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I+K</td>
<td>Power engineering, oil &amp; gas, healthcare, transport engineering</td>
<td>Foreign-owned</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Talent Acquisition Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K7</td>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>Foreign-owned</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Senior Recruitment Associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K8</td>
<td>Pharmaceuticals, ophthalmology</td>
<td>Foreign-owned</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Head of Talent Management and OD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K9</td>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>Foreign-owned</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Chief of Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I7</td>
<td>FMCG</td>
<td>Foreign-owned</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Global Talent Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K10</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Russian-owned</td>
<td>2,174</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Specialist in personnel assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K11</td>
<td>Pharmaceuticals, healthcare</td>
<td>Foreign-owned</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>HR Business Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I8</td>
<td>Manufacturing and distribution of cosmetic products</td>
<td>Foreign-owned</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Talent Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the data collection stage, it was possible to observe a set of sampling criteria, namely, diversity, which follows from *Table 1*:
• Industries - representatives from 13 different industries took part in the study;
• Size of companies - the minimum size of the company was 120 employees, the maximum - 142,500 employees;
• Respondents work experience - the minimum experience of respondents was 5 years, the maximum - 20 years;
• The level of the respondents' position - interviews were conducted both with specialists (recruiter, personnel assessment specialist) and top managers (head of the staff selection and employer's brand, chief of staff), one respondent held a global leadership position (global talent manager).

To collect empirical data, an interview guide was developed, based on the research questions listed below. The structure of the guide and the formulation of questions addressed to the respondents were edited as a result of pilot testing.

In total, 20 semi-structured interviews were conducted, which were recorded on the recorder with the permission of the respondents, and then transcribed. The texts of the interview were analyzed using the following procedure. At the first stage, interview transcripts were analyzed using open coding and condensation of meanings, so that the main categories of phenomena were identified. At the second stage of the analysis, by means of axial coding, interconnections between the selected categories were established.

The main research question: what practices of attracting and selecting talented employees are applied in Russian organizations, depending on the categories of such employees and contextual conditions?

Research sub-questions:
• How is the talent management system built in the company?
• How do HR specialists define the term "talented employee"?
• What are the categories of talented employees that are distinguished by HRM specialists?
• What practices of talent attraction and selection are applied by HR specialists?

Results
In terms of differences between industrial and knowledge-intensive firms, all knowledge-intensive companies managed successfully both internal and external talent pools and none of them relied only on internal talent pool. Conversely, the vast majority of industrial companies put the highest priority on internal talent pools, and only few companies developed external talent pools. This result could be explained by the fact that companies that belong to the quaternary sector
of the economy act in extremely competitive and fast evolving environment, where it is of high importance to balance between two strategies - "make or buy?" (Cappelli, 2008; Cappelli, Keller, 2014). As for industrial companies in Russia, they traditionally focused mainly on internal talent pools that were intended to provide a company with sustainable pipeline of managers.

In many companies, management of the internal talent pool is reduced to succession planning: If we have an open position, and we have some inner talent. And in this process, his or her managers are necessarily involved. And they determine how much they are willing to promote that employee (I5).

In a number of companies there are special development programs or personnel reserve, which prepare talents for occupying a pool of positions. In company K3, individualized work with graduate talents and talents-employees was revealed. In other words, for each group of talents in this company, an individual talent management system was built:

There are talents-schoolchildren, there are talents-trainees, talents can be a qualified specialists and managers. And they are all talents. And the system of working with each of this talent type is completely different (K3).

A notable practice of working with an external talent pool is talent mapping, when the company builds a map of potential external candidates: We must have mapping of our main rivals, and we just know the names of particular talents who occupy critical positions in these companies (K11).

Turning to differences in talent acquisition practices, it is necessary to highlight that knowledge-intensive companies actively used such recruitment tools as employer branding and proactive talent search on various sources (social media, job boards, referral system). On the contrary, only one industrial company included employer branding in the set of TM practices and none of them used proactive search of talented candidates. Such finding perfectly shows that knowledge-intensive companies are doing their best to supply themselves with A-players, using strong employer brand to attract talents and, simultaneously, searching proactively for them with the help of online and offline tools.

The most frequently used practices of attracting graduate talents were events at universities and social networks management. On the contrary, in the group of talent-specialists there was a tendency of switching to online tools and referral programms. In the group of top-talents, referral programs were used twice as often as in the previous group of talents.

Based on the analysis of talent attraction practices, it was possible to identify four selection architectures.

1) Systems that focus on a single group of attraction practices. In this category, there were companies that focused only on one practice of talent attraction. For example,
the companies I+K and I5 used only online practices: *It can be candidates who are independently applied to us through the career page, it can be a headhunter and social networks (I5)*

2) Systems that focus on attraction of certain talent groups. Companies I2, I6, K9 and K10 built all practices around attracting young talents using a set of tools. For example, the respondent of company K9 clearly characterizes such a system: *For the most part, we hire students, i.e. we use various channels for this, including lectures at universities, social networks, but the main channel is internships (K9)*

3) The attraction systems focused on several groups of practices. This group of systems is the largest one, it includes nine companies. A distinctive feature of such complex systems is the diversity of the use of practices without focusing on a certain group of talents: *Headhunter or LinkedIn, we have a lot of active search. If we talk about executive roles, we do not work with agencies, we do everything ourselves, with employees we try to communicate, learn, ask for recommendations. Trainees, we post these jobs, we are talking about them in social networks (I+K Interview)*

4) Complex systems, combining their own practices of talent attraction and work with talent agencies. Companies I4, K6, I7 and K11, used the services of recruitment agencies and executive search agencies along with their own practices. For example, the company I7 actively works with both, and with other partners: *If we are talking about the complex roles, here we can not manage without expertise in this field, which can be provided to us by specialized agents. If we talk about top management, then we work with certain headhunters (I7).*

The factors that influenced the choice of various practices of attraction could be divided into three groups: individual, organizational, and environmental factors.

For graduate talents, talent-specialists and top-talents there were in the first place in terms of frequency such selection practices as an interview with an HR specialist and a hiring manager. If trainee talents were more often used to test abilities, then for talent-specialists, professional testing was more relevant. As for top-talents, a number of companies attracted partners to organize selection procedure.

All the factors that affected the design of the selection system could be divided into three categories: organizational factors, properties of practices and institutional factors.

It was also possible to identify three selection systems: monoarchitecture, multi-architecture and flexible architecture, individual for each position. Selection systems were
classified using the following criteria: diversity / uniformity of selection tools for different talent categories.

1) Monoarchitecture of the talent selection. For this class of selection systems, the application of the same set of practices to certain talent categories is typical, which do not differ depending on the function in which the candidate is employed. Noteworthy is the fact that the selection system was built precisely on this basis for all industrial companies. A typical monoarchitecture system of talent selection is observed in the company I5: *We do not have any categories or positions, to which we work in different ways. In general, we have all the recruitment proceeds according to the classical interview method (I5).*

2) Multi-architecture of talent selection. Knowledge-intensive companies used a matrix selection system that differed depending on the hierarchical level of the position, as well as on the function where talent is employed. A typical division of the selection system into the main business process and the back office can be observed in company K3: *Let's talk about the development. We will certainly check trainees, developers and managers for the ability to write code and solve algorithmic problems. Managers also will be checked for managerial skills. At the same time, we can give home task for product owners, marketers, financiers, lawyers, HRs, the results of which must be shown to us (K3).*

3) The flexible architecture of the talent selection. This class of selection systems is the most difficult in its execution, since the set of sampling practices is designed individually depending on each position. Like the multi-architecture of selection, this system was also found only in companies of the knowledge economy. Here is how the respondent of company K4 characterizes the flexible system of selection: *No, there is no formalized approach, we are discussing all points with managers. And we discuss selection process specifically for each position (K4).*

All industrial companies used common practices for all talent categories – we defined this approach as monoarchitecture of talent selection. Conversely, all knowledge-intensive companies implied both multi-architecture with different selection practices for different talent groups and flexible architecture, in which practices are selected individually for each position. In other words, knowledge-intensive companies are extremely careful in their recruitment decisions, because after attraction the best candidates they select the crème of the crop in order to make complex businesses thrive.

Speaking of similarities, both industrial and knowledge-intensive firms used either one criteria or two criterion to categorize talents, which are hierarchical position, functional role, result, potential, learning agility.
Interestingly, it should be noted that eight representatives of foreign-owned companies said that there was no division of talents into categories. However, during the interview, all respondents who initially denied the categorization of talents, named them either when discussing attraction practices, or when talking about selection. Let us compare the answer of the respondent K4 to questions about talent categories and talent attraction practices. First, the respondent states that there is no division of talents into categories: “It’s unlikely that there were any categories” (K4). And when asked about the practices of attraction, the representative of the company gives a clear formulation of the various categories of talents and the corresponding practices: "There are more activities. We did them mainly in order to attract a person of a director level or a middle or senior specialist. But for trainees - it's better to do mass mailing on social networks "(K4). In the block of questions about the talent selection, the respondent led another categorization of talents - depending on the business process, but graduate talents were also mentioned: "If this is a medical representative, then this is an interview on competencies. Then, if we are talking about the medical department, then this is an express assessment center. As for everyone else, here is another interview on competencies. And cases. <...>. And the trainees had 2 tasks. It's like a puzzle more”.

Analysis of talent definitions showed that all companies, except for company K2, adhere to the object approach to talent definition, when talent refers to set of professional and personal qualities. It should be emphasized that five respondents noted that talent is primarily understood as competence: A high-potential employee for us is the employee who has the best competencies, who shows involvement and ability. That is to say, he or she has desire and ability to develop and shows loyalty (I5).

**Theoretical contribution**

The paper discusses the issue of TM heterogeneity in the context of an emerging economy. TM scholars paid attention mainly to demographic trends, national institutions and culture as external factors that explain characteristics of TM in various countries. However, there is a shortage of studies on differences in TM practices between companies attributed to external factors at the national level.

The authors argue that the structural characteristics of an emerging economy and their historical dynamics are important factors that may determine heterogeneity of talent management systems within a country. Using the example of talent acquisition practices, we show that in the traditional industrial sector, dominated by large, vertically integrated companies, the definition of talent categories, talent attraction and selection are heavily influenced by Soviet experience and
they are aimed at maintaining stability. The main characteristics of talent acquisition in knowledge-intensive firms are proactivity, flexibility and diversity. According to the analysis of interview, all companies, whose TM system was focused only on internal talent pool that consists of managers only, belong to traditional industries, where large enterprises with developed internal labour markets dominate.

We also learnt that knowledge-intensive companies focus on employer branding and proactive talent search, which was not typical of industrial companies. In terms of selection, we propose three systems of talent selection for external labor market: monoarchitecture, multi-architecture and flexible architecture.

It turned out that flexible architecture and multi-architecture is a typical feature of knowledge-intensive companies. We also found two similarities with industrial companies, which are the same approach to talent categorization and the usage of both formal selection tools and interviews.

**Practical implications**

The analysis of transcripts showed that a number of foreign companies apply a latent categorization of talents. It was initially asserted that the company does not divide talents into categories, whereas in discussing specific practices, respondents described a clear structure of practices depending on the categories of talents. Such implicit differentiation of practices can lead to difficulties in managing talent supply for companies, so companies are encouraged to reconsider the approach to categorizing talents and choose either an approach with common practices for all talents or differentiate them depending on the categories.

**Limitations of the study and directions for future research**

In view of the qualitative and cross-sectional design of the research, it is not possible to establish the causal relationship between the application of particular architectures of the practices of attracting and selecting talents, and the type of industry 1, so the study describes only the identified trends. Also in this study there is a regional restriction, and its results can not be transferred to all business organizations in Russia, since the survey involved only the city of Moscow. Moreover, the results of the study may not be relevant for other national cultures.

The study could be considered as the basis for further quantitative and qualitative longitudinal studies that will establish significant relationships between the use of talent attraction and selection practices and contextual factors. Also, a promising continuation of this study is the expansion of the coverage of talent management practices (adaptation, development, motivation and retention of talented employees) for empirical verification of the existence of differences depending on whether the companies belong to either traditional industries or the knowledge economy, which in practice can be expressed in various talent management strategies. A promising
avenue for research is also the study of the environment supporting the development of talents (King, 2017), at the macro, micro and individual levels, which will allow us to study more deeply the factors of the effectiveness of introducing talent management strategies in Russian companies.
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