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Abstract: The main purpose, Model The relationship between the components of the approach is the choice of successor. Managers have an important role in determining organizations success or failure. This is sensitive enough that nearly all successful institutions and organizations seeking to create serious and sustained programs for training future managers and leaders. The population for this study consist LG Service Goldiran. The purpose of this study is among the research and the methodology, Descriptive – analytic. In this study, the two main methods used for data collection Library and field methods (Delphi) are used.

Keywords: talent management, branding, training.

1. Introduction

As a result of the change in post-modern social sciences during the 1980s, the objective world changed into the mental world of work and changes in the social – economic environment resulted in significant changes in the concept of career and career management, and this has been led to the development of new models of career management. Leadership channel is one the models applied in the process of staff being replaced. About the importance of replacement in the successor organizations, Lavinga says: the successor can be as a major factor that is crucial and completely vital and should be associated with its strategic objectives and the strategy to be taken directly to involve line managers. He also believes Management succession is the second important issue that the organizations are facing today. (Lambertides, 2009).

Early 1997, Mackenzie and Partners considered the word “War” for talent to describe the challenges facing employers to find candidates with the very high skills (Michaels, 2001). They believed that few managers are prepared to contribute to play a leadership in organization. Thus the companies around the world are struggling to find talents; they find themselves engaged in competition with others. The organizations should be able to recognize talented people, provide them the necessary training and have maintained long-term value for employees (McAuley, 2006). Talent management has economic benefits and these benefits are well proven for companies and individuals.

The talent management process would not complete during the 3 months or a year. And the HR department's has not the only responsibility for it because it will make the talent management difficult and time consuming, but makes it very valuable (Heinen, 2004).

Barney (1998) says: organizations can achieve sustainable competitive advantage; only through methods which are (RBV) based on approach and is difficult for other competitors to imitate. Traditional sources such as natural resources, technology and ... All are available very quickly and lose their value as a competitive advantage. But human resources as a strategic asset can create added value if it upgrades the organization's ability in confrontation with a risky environment. In fact, in today's complex and competitive environment, has transformed the role of human resources (Tuker, 2005).

Based on my research on 1 October 2006 on almost 33 000 employees from 23 countries, Shows that organizations are dramatically facing with the problem of filling key positions. 40% of managers complain of lack of work force in the market for filling the posts. Mackenzie in 1997 proposed the so-called the “War” on talents. They expressed the challenges of managers in finding key personnel. Talent management will be more important and dramatic each day, because organizations and managers will face more losses and problems by retiring or losing experts (Hand field, 1997).

Companies despite massive investment on talent management systems are still struggling to fill key posts and by limited ability walk through development route. According to a 2005 survey of corporate human resource managers throughout the world, they were believed that the people with high potential ability to fill strategic management roles include a very small amount. (Ready, 2007). For public sector organizations, young power gradually declined and hand labor is old. For example, in some developed countries like the United Kingdom government, 31% of personnel are over 50 and this will lead to loss of essential skills and experiences of the next generation of next decade when they will retire. Since 2000, the number of young people reach working age has declined 60,000 per year. This trend projections conducted by the Department of Labor National Skills of Great Britain in 2010 about the shortage of two million employees (Marcus, 2008). On this basis Managers believe
that acting in this way as an island and lack of cooperation between the organizations can create serious problems. Even the managers think that the succession planning rearing and career development path is inadequate and inefficient and talent management processes and systems should be used.

The survey results show that the main obstacles to the realization that talent management programs to achieve business value to prevent are all related to human resource. According to a recent survey, half of the executives expressed that top managers are aligned with their organization's talent management. (Guthridge, 2006).

Talent management is a successful commercially strategy for organizations that it’s have Imagine of it as a long-term commitment. “Talent management” has emerged as the latest “it” word in the human resource management (HRM) lexicon. The constructs of job satisfaction and organizational commitment have been consistently found to influence employee turnover and have underpinned studies by Tutuncu and Kozak (2007), Robinson and Barron (2007) and Carbery et al. (2003). it can be argued that rapid changes in the global competitive environment mean that more flexible forms of global staffing will be progressively used as alternatives to traditional expatriate assignments (Collings et al., 2007; Mayrhofer et al., 2012). There has been a shift from a commodity-based economy to a knowledge-based economy, in which an increasing proportion of organizational assets are intangible. This knowledge-based economy is generating new structures and new and continuously changing demands and challenges in the world of work (Barnett, 2000; Brown et al., 2003; Sennett, 2006).

2. Materials and Methods

The main goal of talent management of the company is to prepare a list of needs in relation to human abilities and skills - Determination of the status quo in terms of abilities and skills and all deficiencies and needs - The ability to measure and monitor existing abilities And its distance with the desired skills and abilities Through educational programs.

This study that a conceptual model using science references and data from the view sample tested, the aim of one study can be applied. To gather information, various tools can be exploited by researchers to measure and measurement tools that can help analyze the information needed and investigate the process of discovering the truth finally be collected. This study has two main methods used for data collection. Library and field methods (Delphi) are used.

3. Results and Discussion

To fit the data from the Delphi method, Business Excellence Model and the Friedman test is used. In this research, expert opinion about the Dimension, Components and parameters of the model from the Experts, The final consensus is achieved. Also for measuring the dimensions of the logical relations between, Model of variable and components used from the method used Spearman.

Research Question

Q1: What are dimensions, factors and variables related to succession planning?

Many effective components in design model have been identified by study and comparison the considered results and viewpoints in research literature and also use of experts and the banking network strategic beneficiaries and these are explaining as follows.

Table 1: Cronbach alpha coefficient of the model dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demotions</th>
<th>Number of demotion</th>
<th>Cronbach alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The substitute</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.967</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: The frequency distribution of index components based on the substitute

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rows</th>
<th>Management deal</th>
<th>Percentage trivial</th>
<th>Percentage low</th>
<th>Percentage relatively significant</th>
<th>Percentage significant</th>
<th>Percentage very significant</th>
<th>Percentage unanswered</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Learning of the ranks</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Job priority groups</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Individual performance evaluation system</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Identify and assess the potential of individuals, organizations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the results of the descriptive statistics show the following succession planning - Component elected successor index "professionals prioritize" the highest average importance (22/4) and "index system of evaluating individual performance," the lowest average importance (77/3) holds.

Table 3: Ranking frequently surrogate markers 4-fold

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management deal</th>
<th>Average of rank</th>
<th>Priority of indices</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Working squares</th>
<th>Degrees of freedom</th>
<th>The significance level</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning of the ranks</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Null hypothesis is rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job priority groups</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual performance evaluation system</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and assess the potential of individuals, organizations</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the results table at 95 percent significance level of the test is equal to 0.000, smaller than the error rate of 5% (05/0 = α) is, thus confirming the hypothesis H0 is rejected and H1 is assumed. In other words, it can be stated with 95% confidence that the average ranking of 4 multiple choice of successor indices are significantly different. The table above shows the successor selection prioritized indicators 4-fold.
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