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Abstract
Researches on the effective leadership reveal that principals in high performing schools are successful in improving schools outcomes through who they are, the strategies they use, as well as the specific combination and timely implementation and management of these strategies as a result of the unique contexts in which they work. The present research work tries to explore and confirm the talent management factors (TMFs) responsible for developing teacher leadership talent (TLT). The proposed TMFs were tested and validated through a sample of 400 teachers of High Performing School in Malaysia using Amos 19. Hypotheses were tested at a 95% confidence level and the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA), Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI) and Comparative Fit Index (CFI) were used to test the structural equation model of talent management. The obtained RMSEA value was 0.049, TLI value was 0.942 and CFI value was 0.962 which indicated a good model fit and appropriateness. Analysis of the results demonstrated that the level of implementation of talent management falls into the range of being very good and has a significant relationship with a teacher leadership talent development of the organization in the studied population. This study is one of very few studies to provide an integrative perspective of TMFs for developing TLT in high performing school; it adds to the extremely limited number of empirical studies that have been conducted to investigate talent management in the education sector and how teacher leaders start as individual contributors and move up into management and leadership roles.
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INTRODUCTION
In the twenty-first century, there's a growing realization that the principal is really a specialist occupation that needs specific preparation. The excess responsibilities imposed on school leaders,
as well as the greater complexity from the external environment, increase the necessity for principals to get effective preparation for their demanding role. Getting qualification limited to the very different job of classroom teacher is not appropriate (Bush, 2008). Together with the government's focus on enhancing and strengthening the teaching profession and improving school leadership to further improve school achievement and produce quality students; more attention needs to be given to the function played by school principals in improving the standard of education to quality education of international standard.

Principals’ impact on his or her schools is frequently affected greatly by his or her predecessors and successors. Whether they understand that, principals stand on the neck of those whom went before these people and put the muse for individuals who will track. Sustainable and significant progress will depend on knowing and managing this after some time (Hargreaves, 2005). Unfortunately, education system so far, still chooses and appoints thousands of ineffective principals. Though the curriculum and instruction in the classroom are critical parts of increasing the impact of schooling, the abilities in teaching this curriculum, along with the talent in managing school systems, will also be critical, plus much more strategic talent management merely has recently stepped on the education policy and use agenda stage (Odden, 2011). Yet, the field of education will be the least likely to engage in talent management practices (Behrstock, 2010). Actually, there is no system to attract, train and support their very best talent to stay in the area of education (Olson, 2008).

To date, Talent Management Factors (TMFs) in education sector have not been systematically investigated. Existing studies have derived their TMFs from different perspectives. However, there is still no research evidence exploring the relationship between TMFs and TLT. Through a detailed analysis of the literature, this research identifies three constructs of TMFs for developing TLT in high performing school.

High Performing School in Malaysia

High Performing School (SBT) is defined as schools with ethos, character and a unique identity in all aspects of education. This school has a tradition of high culture and excellent with the national human capital that develops holistic and sustainable competitive on the international stage. The rational to appreciate and give recognition to the SBT in the education system is to raise the quality of the best schools, producing brilliant students and bridge the gap between schools in the system. To be recognized as SBT, elections will be made by the selection committee, chaired by the Director General of Education. The candidate for the recognition consists of all primary and secondary schools which are in Band one based on a composite score that takes into account the Average Grade (GPS) and the decision of the School Self Rating (SMEs) based on the Quality Standard of Education (SQEM).
Talent Management

Talent management is becoming a vital priority in business organizations. This idea has attracted a lot of the researchers’ attention lately but little studies have been carried out in this area of talent management in education sector. However some studies have paid attention on this area in higher education sector (Riccio, 2010; Behrstock et al., 2010). Little is understood regarding how talent management will influence to other strategic objectives such as developing a high performance learning environment and adding value towards the academy brand (Davies and Davies, 2010) such as a high performing school.

In accordance with Charan et al. (2001), talent management is defined as the process of leadership succession in organizations or process by which organizations ensure leadership development and also the crucial skills in the future through the establishment of leadership pipeline. But talent management in the context of this study is the process by which school develop a teacher leadership talent pool by choosing the most qualified teachers through a strategic implementation of talent management factors.

Best practice shows that a talent management process needs to be established as a way to track and encourage talent at 'abnormal' amounts inside the organization particularly where retention is a concern and talent pools to fill senior positions are drained. In the schools sector, it is obvious that the foundation for effective school leadership depends on being a highly effective teacher. This argues for resources being targeted in improving individual classroom practices, before embarking on leadership development activities. However, for a few outstanding new teachers, they might be fast-tracked into leadership roles within a couple of year’s admission to the profession. In smaller schools the crucial is definitely to utilize the talents of all teachers at the earliest possible time to ensure that these leadership efforts are taken care of (Hartle and Thomas, 2003). Meeting the expectation that all students will learn to high standards will need a change in the ways in which our education system attracts, prepares, supports, and develops talented teachers who can teach in more compelling ways (Darling-Hammond, 2007).

The outstanding performance of potential teachers is not achieved by chance. The talent management requires an effort of a school principals and this effort is shaped by the investment required to the activities to develop talents and also the time to plan the strategy and to execute it.

Talent Management and Identifying Teachers’ Potential Talent

Talent management commences with identifying the best individuals within the organization that could eventually bring about the organization with an ongoing basis (Hartmann et al., 2010) that is to recognize talent employees who potentially have to be effective within the role in the future, usually with wider responsibilities and at a higher level within the hierarchy (Silzer and Church, 2009). Little studies have been conducted about the identification of leadership talent in the education sector. Similarly, the fundamental features observed in the identification of talent, little has been mentioned or explored in the context of research as the relative significance of those
characteristics; the way they are assessed, as well as how it is disclosed and understood by principals, middle leaders and teachers (Rhodes et al., 2008).

The findings produced by the Center for Creative Leadership from October 2007 until May 2008 indicated that 77 percent of participants in the study agreed that formal recognition as a high-potential employees is vital. The study also revealed that individuals formally identified were more likely to consider themselves as having potential than those who were not formally identified. Official recognition of identity seems to encourage high-potential leaders within the individual. Without this recognition, the best individual may doubt their capability or interest on the organization (Campbell and Smith, 2014).

Strong leadership is the cornerstone associated with school success and achievements, and identifying future leader from the pool of potential teachers is crucial in order to nurturing the success. In a competitive environment and fast-changing global conditions, schools must implement process designed to identify the best teachers to efficiently build up a pipeline of teacher leadership talent who can eventually be the high performing principal and take the reins of leadership.

Talent management and Activities to Develop Talent

As yet there has been little evidence of systematic personalized career/leadership development in school level (Hartle and Thomas, 2003). Learning and skills development are the most important capability for the talent-focused organization. A powerful organization may have well-established process for the professional learning of staff, which can be effectively, associated with other processes for example performance management (Davies and Davies, 2010). The belief that specific preparation is important to the caliber of school leadership is underpinned by research on the expertise of new principals (Bush, 2008). Evidence from different sources reveals that school leader need specific training to reply to broaden roles and responsibilities. Strategies need to highlight developing and strengthening skills associated with improving school outcomes and offer room for contextualization (OECD, 2012).

The talented teachers are very ambitious and they expect an increased growth and development of their career and they also demand the assistance of the school principals to do this development. Hence, they will stay in the school as long as the organization gives them every chance to develop their potential.

Talent Management and Retaining Talent

Among the critical issues faced by the education system in Malaysia recently is how to encourage experienced and qualified teachers to remain in the teaching profession. The success and effectiveness of school organization is extremely determined by the organization's capability to attract and retain quality teachers to stay within the same school during their service. Education scenario in Malaysia shows that there are no one standard of competency in the area of teaching
and teacher education programs within the country, therefore has arisen the issue of service, job stress, role conflict, role ambiguity, insufficient support system from principals and colleagues. The consequences of such problems have caused many teachers to resign or retire early and burnout among teachers (Saedah and Mohammed Sani, 2012).

When teachers leave their school, they are going to take along their pedagogical skills and expertise in the subject being taught/being trained and the collective knowledge and expertise in the school will end up weaker (Loeb et al., 2005). Research indicates that in order to increase the likelihood that teachers remain in the profession, they need opportunities to participate in decision making at the school and district level; a positive and supportive school culture which fosters teamwork and effective lines of communication; professional opportunities that include collaboration and technology; in-depth feedback and support from administrators and colleagues; time set aside for regular collaboration; and fair pay and a differentiated pay structure which includes rewarding outstanding performance, acquiring new knowledge and skills, and assuming new roles and responsibilities (Behrstock and Clifford, 2009).

Effectively managing retention in school keeping talented teachers on board and overcome the issue of struggling to retain high potential teachers. This can be achieved by aligning teachers’ needs with the working environment and fulfilling the requirement needed to boost teachers’ potential.

**Teacher Leadership Talent Development**

In each and every good school, you will find teachers whose vision spreads beyond their very own classrooms, even beyond their very own teams or departments. Such teachers notice that students' experiences depend not merely on interaction with individual teachers, but also on the complex systems available through the entire school and district. This consciousness stimulates these teachers to wish to influence change. They experience professional agitation what some have referred to as the leadership itch. In several settings, the only method for any teacher to increase their influence is to become an administrator. Today more than ever before, numerous interconnected factors claim for the need of teacher leadership in schools (Danielson, 2007). Developing teacher leadership talent in this study refer to a process of building and strengthening leadership, instructional and interpersonal competencies of teachers who are potentially assume the leadership tasks and management of the school in the absence of the principal, whereas, teacher leadership in the context of this study refer to the teachers who equipped with knowledge and skills (leadership, instructional and interpersonal skill), to assume the duties of leadership and management of the school in the absence of the principal.

To accept a leadership role, they might need proficiency in curriculum planning, assessment design, data analysis, and so on. They might also need to grow the abilities to listen actively, facilitate meetings, have a group discussion on track, determine a strategy, and monitor progress (Danielson, 2007). Principals should actively inspire teachers with leadership talents to participate in leadership roles within the schools (Pounder and Crow, 2005). Authorizing teachers
as leaders has been seen as a means to retain good teachers in schools, attract new teachers, and foster teachers’ professional identity as curriculum makers and change agents. Building leadership capacity is really a reform strategy utilized by school leaders committed to the assurance of sustainable school improvement (Mullen and Jones, 2008). To fully achieve their potential as change agents, teacher leaders must be supported within the school and beyond (Johnson and Donaldson, 2007). They must be motivated to try new skills, make decisions and ask questions without feeling as if they are going to be punished for making a mistake. Additionally, they need to possess some influence around what job tasks are assigned to them and recognize how it will assist them reach their career objectives (Mallon, 2010).

RESEARCH METHODS

Purpose of the Study

This study aims to explore the effects of talent management factors (identifying teachers’ potential talent, activities to develop teachers’ talent and retaining teachers’ talent) on teacher leadership talent development in high performing school.

Objectives of the Study

1. To identify the level of implementation of the three elements of talent management, namely identifying teachers’ potential talents, activities to develop teachers’ talent and retaining teachers’ talent by the principal in High Performing School.
2. To identify the level of implementation of the elements of teacher leadership talent development by the principal in High Performing School.
3. To identify whether there is a significant relationship between the elements in talent management with the elements of teacher leadership talent development in the High Performing School in Malaysia.

Conceptual Framework

The elements of talent management in schools used in this study encompass identifying teachers’ potential talent, activities to develop talent and retaining talent was adapted from talent management model of Malaysia Government Linked Company (GLC) by The Putrajaya Committee on GLC High Performance (PCG) 2006 (see Figure 1). The application of the model helps to understand the principals’ duty to nurture the character and capability of their teachers, to inspire them personally and professionally, and to make sure that their knowledge and talents are used and developed to their fullest potential.

Based on the literature and the model, the researchers conceptualized the talent management factors to have a significant and direct effect on the teacher leadership talent
development, which towards the end will provide a high performing principal who can truly transform school and deliver breakthrough performance.

**Figure 1:** The conceptual framework for the study (adapted from PCG, 2006).

### Method

The questionnaire was designed and developed by the researchers by adopting from the literature specifically for this study. The content validity of the questionnaire was determined according to the clarity, relevancy, simplicity and consistency of each question from 3 experts in the field of talent management (2 persons) and high performing school (1 person). They examined the questionnaire for important omissions or inappropriate choice of items. Regarding the Item Content Validity Index (I-CVI), the experts believed that item is desirable/completely desirable and was calculated and expressed as percent. The Scale Content Validity Index (S-CVI) for clarity, relevancy, simplicity, and consistency was calculated as the average of items which our experts believed that were completely desirable.

A total of 410 teachers from 35 High Performing Schools (HPS) in Malaysia participated in the survey. Data were collected using stratified cluster sampling where this approach incorporated a combination of stratified and cluster sampling methods. The survey was administered in April 2014. The final sample consisted of 400 teachers after 407 responded and 7 respondents with missing values on items within each scale were excluded. The teachers were asked to rate the level of implementation of three elements of talent management and the element of developing teacher leadership talent by the principal at the HPS in Malaysia. They responded to items on a 10-point Likert-type scale between the categories poor and excellence.

EFA was done for data reduction and grouping the related variables in conceptually similar and statistically related groups. The extraction method was a maximum likelihood components analysis, the promax rotation method, and extracted factors based on an Eigenvalue larger than 1 and scree plot graph. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy and Bartlett’s test of sphericity were used and the cut off point for loading on each factor was 0.5. Cronbach’s coefficient was calculated to measure the scale reliability and internal consistency of collected data. AMOS Structural Equation Modelling (Amos-SEM) was utilized and validity assessment was evaluated through confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). The final questionnaire consisted of four parts where the first part consists of six questions about developing teacher leadership talent, the second part consists of nine questions about identifying teachers’ potential talent, the third part...
consists of four questions about activities to developing teachers’ talent, and the last part consists of five questions about retaining teachers’ talent (see Table 1).

**Table 1:** Constructs and indicators used in the study

| Construct | Indicator | Symbol |
|-----------|-----------|--------|
| Developing Teacher Leadership Talent (DTLT) | The principal supports innovation in teaching. | KG1 |
| | Teachers participate in professional learning. | KG2 |
| | The principal facilitates discussions that promote change. | KG3 |
| | The principal compliments teachers who perform well. | KG4 |
| | The principal encourages teacher to create time for collaboration. | KG5 |
| | The principal encourages teacher to create time for reflective thinking. | KG6 |
| | The principal encourages teachers to collaborate external networks to gain new ideas and perspectives to share with their colleagues at the school site. | KG7 |

**Table 1 (continued)**

| Construct | Indicator | Symbol |
|-----------|-----------|--------|
| Identifying Teachers’ Potential Talent (ITPT) | There is a process/activity to identify teachers who possess pedagogical skills needed for effective teaching. | BI1 |
| | There is a process/activity to identify teachers who have in-depth knowledge of the subject-content that they teach. | BI2 |
| | There is a process/activity to identify teachers who have skills to diverse the teaching methods. | BI3 |
| | There is a process/activity to identify teachers who able to influence others. | |
| | There is a process/activity to identify teachers who able to challenge status quo. | BK1 |
| | There is a process/activity to identify teachers who possess decision making skills. | BK2 |
| | There is a process/activity to identify teachers who possess skills to develop rapport with students. | BP1 |
There is a process/activity to identify teachers who possess skills to develop appropriate relationships with others in schools.

There is a process/activity to identify teachers who possess communication skill.

| Activities To Developing Teachers’ Talent (ADTT) | There is a constructive feedback mechanism to actively promote the development of the talent. | BB1 |
|--------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
|                                                  | The principal encourages teacher to take challenging jobs.                        | BB2 |
|                                                  | There is training/course/programme to develop instructional talent at school or district level. | BB3 |
|                                                  | There is training/course/programme to develop leadership talent at school or district level. | BB4 |
|                                                  | There is training/course/programme to develop interpersonal talent at school or district level. | BB5 |

| Retaining Teachers’ Talent (RTT) | The principal mobilizes support to help in achieving school goals. | KB1 |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
|                                 | The principal creates a positive working environment that support teachers’ competencies development. | KB2 |
|                                 | The principal has the ability to do what is planned.              | KB3 |
|                                 | The principal creates a culture that honors teachers who step outside their traditional roles and take on leadership projects. | KB4 |
|                                 | Successes are celebrated with teachers by the principal.          | KB5 |
RESULTS

Content Validity
Of 39-items, those with CVI over 0.75 remained and the rest were discarded resulting to 26-item scale. According to Stewart and Haswell (2013), the acceptable values of I-CVI are 0.8 and above, while the value of 0.90 and above indicate the outstanding face validity. The tool was found to have good content validity with an overall score of S-CVI of 0.880, exceeding the acceptable index of 0.8.

Descriptive Analysis
Mean scores as well as standard deviations for all items of the variables are shown in Table 2. From the table, it can be observed that the level of implementation of talent management and teacher leadership talent development fall into the range of being very good.

Table 2: Mean scores and standard deviation of the items

| Construct                                 | Item | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|-------------------------------------------|------|------|----------------|
| Teacher Leadership Talent Development     | 7    | 7.572| 1.078          |
| Identifying Teachers’ Potential Talent    | 9    | 7.471| 1.040          |
| Activities To Developing Teachers’ Talent | 5    | 7.498| 1.030          |
| Retaining Teachers’ Talent               | 5    | 7.610| 1.057          |

Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA)
In this study, EFA was not used to explore the number of factors for research constructs, but rather to address and examine the unidimensionality of the constructs prior to the application of CFA. According to Norman and Streiner (2008) and Hair et al. (2010), the measure of sampling adequacy (MSA) is measured by the value of Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) and the factorability of the correlation matrix is assumed if the Bartlett’s test of sphericity (BToS) is statistically significant (p < 0.001) and the KMO value is greater than 0.7. The sample size for the EFA was 26 items with 200 subjects. All construct were tested with KMO and BToS.

The KMO measure of sampling adequacy results for all the constructs were higher than 0.7 which indicates the partial correlation among variables are small. The KMO values were 0.808, 0.753, 0.794 and 0.749 for identifying teachers’ potential talent, activities to developing teachers’ talent, retaining teachers’ talent and teacher leadership talent development respectively. All BToS value had shown small values which were less than 0.001 which indicated that there were significant relationships among variables. A loading cut off of greater than 0.50 was adopted. According to Hair et al. (2010), although factor loadings of ±0.30 to ±0.40 are minimally
acceptable, value greater than ±0.50 is considered necessary for practical significance. The values of loading for all indicators were above 0.50. Thus all factors will be included into further analysis.

**Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA)**

CFA is similar to EFA in certain respects, but philosophically it is different. Thus, rather than allowing the statistical method to ascertain the quantity of factors and loadings as in EFA, CFA statistics inform us just how well our theoretical specification in the factors matches the actual data. In a way, CFA is often a tool that allows us with the idea to "confirm" or "reject" our preconceived theory (Hair et al., 2010). SEM can perform estimation of a few inter-relationships among latent construct simultaneously within a model. In fact, SEM is regarded as the most efficient method to handle CFA for measurement models, analyze the causal relationship within a structural model, estimate their variance and covariance, and test the hypotheses (Zainudin, 2013).

| Table 3: The CFA results summary |
|----------------------------------|
| No | Construct | Original Item | SEM-CFA |
|----|------------|----------------|---------|
|    |            |                | Item | No of Item |
|    |            |                | Discarded | Discarded | Item | No of Item |
|    |            |                |      | Remained | Remained |
| 1  | ITPT       | B11, B12, B13, BK1, BK2, BK3, BP1, BP2, BP3 | - | - | All | 9 |
| 2  | ADTT       | BB1, BB2, BB3, BB4, BB5 | BB2 | 1 | BB1, BB3, BB4, BB5 | 4 |
| 3  | RTT        | KB1, KB2, KB3, KB4, KB5 | - | - | All | 5 |
| 4  | DTLT       | KG1, KG2, KG3, KG4, KG5, KG6, KG7 | KG3 | 1 | KG1, KG2, KG4, KG5, KG6, KG7 | 6 |

**The Measurement Model**

An assessment of the measurement model consists of unidimensionality, convergent validity, discriminant validity and composite reliability. The unidimensionality requirement of the measurement model is achieved when the factor loading for all items are above 0.6. According to Zainudin (2013), for a newly developed scales, the factor loading for an item should be 0.5 and above. The assessments of fitness indexes are based on the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), comparative fit index (CFI), Tucker-Lewis index (TLI) and chisq/df. The standard criteria chisq/df < 5.0; TLI and CFI > 0.95; and RMSEA < 0.05 were used for a good fit, and the criteria p > 0.05, TLI and CFI > 0.90, and RMSEA < 0.08 for acceptable fit between the model and the data (Zainudin, 2013; Kline, 2005). According to these criteria and the values
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of RMSEA = 0.049, TLI = 0.942, CFI = 0.962 and chisq/df= 1.959, the measurement model provided an acceptable fit to the data (see Table 4).

Table 4: Fitness of a measurement model of talent management

| ChiSq  | df  | chisq/df | CFI   | TLI  | RMSEA |
|--------|-----|----------|-------|------|-------|
| 767.776| 392 | 1.959    | 0.962 | 0.942| 0.049 |

Meanwhile the assessments of validity are based on convergent validity, construct validity and discriminant validity; whereas the assessments of reliability are based on internal reliability, composite reliability (CR) and average variant extracted (AVE). According to Zaaiudin (2013), the requirement for convergent validity is achieved when AVE ≥ 0.50, construct validity achieved when all fitness indexes for the model meet the required level; and discriminant validity achieved when all redundant items are either deleted or constrained, and the correlation between exogenous constructs is equal and less than 0.85. Discriminant validity is also achieved when the square root of the AVE value for each variable was larger than the correlation coefficients between variables. On the other hand, the standard criteria Cronbach’s Alpha ≥ 0.70; CR ≥ 0.60 and AVE ≥ 0.50 are used for the assessment of reliability.

The results of composite reliability ranged from 0.751 to 0.901 (greater than 0.70) and the reliability tested by Cronbach alpha of each construct was higher than 0.70 which ranged from 0.761 to 0.882, thereby indicating high internal construct validity. The AVE values ranged from 0.504 to 0.628 (greater than 0.5) exceeding the level values for acceptable convergent validity. Thus, the fitness indexes, validity and reliability requirement for the TMFs model meet the required level. According to these criteria and the confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) results reporting for the measurement model in Table 4 and Table 5, the issues of unidimensionality, validity and reliability had been addressed and the researcher will then proceed to modeling the structural model. Table 5 and Table 6 show the CFA results for the measurement model and the CFA results summary for discriminant validity respectively.

Table 5: CFA results for the measurement model

| Construct                                | Item   | Factor Loading | Cronbach alfa | CR   | AVE  |
|------------------------------------------|--------|----------------|---------------|------|------|
| Identify Teachers’ Potential Talent      | BI1    | 0.60           | 0.882         | 0.901| 0.511|
|                                          | BI2    | 0.66           |               |      |      |
|                                          | BI3    | 0.84           |               |      |      |
|                                          | BK1    | 0.81           |               |      |      |
|                                          | BK2    | 0.62           |               |      |      |
|                                          | BK3    | 0.51           |               |      |      |
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| Construct                            | ITPT  | ADTT  | RTT  |
|-------------------------------------|-------|-------|------|
| BG1                                 | 0.56  | 0.60  | 0.59 |
| BB1                                 | 0.71  | 0.761 | 0.865| 0.628|
| BB3                                 | 0.93  |       |      |
| BB4                                 | 0.51  |       |      |
| BB5                                 | 0.94  |       |      |
| KB1                                 | 0.54  | 0.821 | 0.840| 0.516|
| KB2                                 | 0.61  |       |      |
| KB3                                 | 0.70  |       |      |
| KB4                                 | 0.90  |       |      |
| KB5                                 | 0.77  |       |      |
| KG1                                 | 0.52  | 0.849 | 0.855| 0.504|
| KG2                                 | 0.61  |       |      |
| KG4                                 | 0.71  |       |      |
| KG5                                 | 0.86  |       |      |
| KG6                                 | 0.79  |       |      |
| KG7                                 | 0.61  |       |      |

Table 6: The CFA results summary for discriminant validity

The Structural Model
Based on the results in the measurement model, the analysis of the structural model commenced. The structural model is the path model, which relates independent to dependent variables. In such situations, theory, prior experience, or other guidelines enable the researcher to distinguish which independent variables predict each dependent variable (Hair et al., 2010). The main focus of the structural model is the influences of independent variables (TMFs) on teacher leadership talent.
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development. The structural model output also presenting the correlational relationships among talent management variables and teacher leadership talent development. The estimated covariance, standard error, critical region and probability value is presented in Table 7. As can be seen in Table 7, there is a direct and significant effect (relationship) between TMFs and TLD.

**Table 7:** The maximum likelihood regression weight between TMFs and TLD

| Construct | TMFs | Estimate | S.E. | C.R. | P   | Results |
|-----------|------|----------|------|------|-----|---------|
| TLTD      | <--- | ITPT     | .102 | .050 | 2.043 | .041 | Significant |
| TLTD      | <--- | ADTT     | .123 | .047 | 2.629 | .009 | Significant |
| TLTD      | <--- | RTT      | .631 | .108 | 5.846 | ***  | Significant |

*** indicate a highly significant at < 0.001

As shown in Table 8, the standardized beta estimate for effect of Identifying Teachers’ Potential Talent on Teacher Leadership Talent Development is 0.352; the standardized beta estimate for effect of Activities to Develop Teachers’ Talent on Teacher Leadership Talent Development is 0.500; while the standardized beta estimate for effect of Retaining Teachers’ Talent on Teacher Leadership Talent Development is 0.297.

**Table 8:** The variances of talent management factors

| TMFs | Estimate | S.E. | C.R. | P   |
|------|----------|------|------|-----|
| ADTT | 0.500    | 0.076 | 6.562 | *** |
| RTT  | 0.297    | 0.067 | 4.404 | *** |
| ITPT | 0.352    | 0.069 | 5.073 | *** |

*** indicate a highly significant at < 0.001

The result revealed that Identifying Teachers’ Potential Talent had significance impact and was positively correlated with Teacher Leadership Talent Development. Thus, R square value between these two variables was equal to 0.352, indicated that 35% of the variation in Teacher Leadership Talent Development was influenced by Identifying Teachers’ Potential Talent. The result indicated that Activities to Develop Teachers’ Talent had significance impact and was positively correlated with Teacher Leadership Talent Development. Hence, R square value between these two variables was equal to 0.500, indicated that 50% of the variation in Teacher Leadership Talent Development was influenced by Activities to Develop Teachers’ Talent. Lastly, the result showed that Retaining Teachers’ Talent had significance impact and was positively correlated with Teacher Leadership Talent Development. Thus, R square value between these two variables was equal to 0.297, indicated that 30% of the variation in Teacher Leadership Talent Development was influenced by Retaining Teachers’ Talent. Figure 1 indicated the contribution of talent management variables in estimating the teacher leadership talent development construct was 63%.
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**Figure 2**: A structural model (N=400)

Note: Mengenalpasti Bakat = Identifying Teachers’ Potential Talent (ITPT); Bangun Bakat = Activities to Develop Teachers’ Talent (ADTT); Kekal Bakat = Retaining Teachers’ Talent (RTT); KpmpnnGuru = Teacher Leadership Talent Development (TLTD)

**DISCUSSION**

Research shows that schools do not pay enough attention to the process of leadership succession, although the study found that high-performing organizations identify their potential leaders early and have a specific mechanism to develop their talents over time (Barber et al, 2010). The response obtained from the SBT teachers in reply to the questionnaire and the answers given by the SBT principals during the interview in this study shows that talent management processes actually exist in SBT and implemented by the SBT principals in Malaysia, which provides evidence that school also has a mechanism to develop teacher leadership skills for the leadership succession process.

The most important purpose of this study was to explore the effects of TMFs (identifying teachers’ potential talent, developing teachers’ talent and retaining teachers’ talent) on TLT
development in high performing school by developing a structural equation modeling (SEM) model to examine the factors of talent management that affect teacher leadership talent development in school. As the main finding of this study, it shows that identifying teachers’ potential talent, activities to develop teachers’ talent and retaining teachers’ talent had influences on teacher leadership talent development of those teachers who had been included in the talent pool of teacher leader.

The paper reveals that talent management contributed approximately 63 percent and had a direct and significant effect on teacher leadership talent development of those teachers who had been included in the talent pool. Identifying teachers’ potential talent was positively related to teacher leadership talent development. An important inference is that school principals need to view individual teachers’ potential talent based on three criteria namely leadership talent, instructional talent and interpersonal talent.

The finding shows that the training/course/program on leadership, instructional and interpersonal development significantly influenced and positively related to teacher leadership talent development. The results are consistent with the previous study by Bush et al. (2006) that had shown that leadership development contributes to modified leadership and management practice, to produce more effective leader and enhance school and student outcomes.

Our study also shows that retaining teachers’ talent was positively associated with teacher leadership talent development. School leadership may contribute to increasing teachers’ retention by valuing the teachers with compliment for performing well. The second most important driver of retention in the study was the principals encouraged teachers to collaborate with external networks to gain new ideas and perspectives to share with their colleagues at the school site and the last one driver was the principals’ support for innovation in teaching.

Implications
In this study, we show that identifying teachers’ talent, activities to develop teachers’ talent, and retaining teachers’ talent are antecedents of teacher leadership talent development. Therefore, the results of this study also have significant implications for education sector especially school. First, school should recognize that merely possessing excellent teachers is not enough to obtain benefits from it. It is about how school that aspires to sustain high performance can go about creating that depth of leadership talent because the keys to successful school such as a high performing school are identifying, developing, and retaining internal candidates for leadership positions. Secondly, in order to portray the actual potential of the teachers, school must pay close attention to the fact that developing teachers’ talent can make the most of their natural talents and when teachers are matched with work that is in sync with their passions, leadership talent increases.

Finally, we believe that this research has important implication for education sector, since Malaysia Ministry of Education (KPM) can design policy and programs that foster high performing teachers and principals in every school to improve and sustain schools’ result. Such policies and program will encourage schools to grow their own leaders by strategically selecting potential teachers to be included in the talent pool within the organization and grooming those
teachers through leadership developmental experiences that will give them the skills they need to meet the future demands of education system and improving school performance.

CONCLUSION
The results support the main tenets of talent management model adapted from PCG, namely, talent management factors (identifying teachers’ talent, activities to develop teachers’ talent, and retaining teachers’ talent) are important for developing teacher leadership talent. This article contributes to our understanding and knowledge on the implementation of talent management in High Performing Schools; and functions as a starting point that will stimulate further research exploring the contextual aspects of TMFs in education sector.
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