

Abstract

Despite being viewed as a major construct at the heart of HRD, considerable complexity, confusion and ambiguity exists regarding the conceptualisation of development. The notion of development has attracted interest from a wide array of fields including HRD, adult education, psychology, management studies and organization theory. As a result, there is little consistency in how development is understood, conceptualised or tested. This paper examines the current body of knowledge and understanding on development in order to develop a typology to focus future research and investigations. A typology of development is proposed and four development types are identified. The paper then articulates the underlying theories, primary antecedents and outcomes associated with each of the four development types. Finally recommendations and avenues for future research arising from the typology are specified.

Keywords: Development, Antecedents, Typology

Reclaiming the “D” in HRD: A Typology of Development Conceptualisations, Antecedents and Outcomes

Nearly eighty years have passed since Levinson (1920-1994) proposed that the concept of development was associated with aspirations, which he called “the dream” and the task of development is both to define and realise that dream (Levinson 1986, p. 4).

Researchers in the interim have embraced multiple notions of development and the concept has attracted interest in a wide array of fields – from adult education (Knowles, 1984), management and organization studies (Van de Ven & Poole, 1995), psychology (Jung, 1971) and organization theory (Weick & Quinn, 1999). As HRD finds its roots in all of these fields, the concept of development has emerged as a central and important process for enhancing individual potential and effectiveness (Kuchinke, 2014). For example, HRD scholars have utilised the concept to analyse personal development in education (Edmunds & Richardson, 2009) to study development within mentoring relationships (Lankau & Scandura, 2002) to explore notions of development in the context of leadership development (Mabey, 2013) and to understand the processes of development in organizations (Van de Ven & Poole, 1995).

While interest in development has increased over the years, there is considerable ambiguity and disagreement regarding the theoretical nature of the construct (Wilson 2006). This diversity of research related to the development concept has led to confusion concerning its precise meaning (Kuchinke 2014). While on the one hand, theoretical pluralism has been useful in developing alternative approaches and perspectives, it can also be argued that differences in theoretical interpretation have created compartmentalisation and isolated lines of research. For some commentators, ambiguity is an important condition of HRD, indicating the vast complexity inherent within the concept (McLean 1998), whilst for others, ambiguity has resulted in a lack of consistency in theory building and testing as substantive meanings of

the construct vary across disciplines (McGuire and Kissack 2015). Thus, we acknowledge and endorse the multifaceted nature of HRD, but warrant that to date, there have been surprisingly few conceptual and/or theoretical contributions that compare different notions of development and how generalisable these concepts are across disciplines and contexts.

In this paper, we specify, substantiate and extend the development construct by proposing a typology that emphasises two primary dimensions that differentiate various uses of the development concept found in the literature. Specifically, from our review we identify both a structural dimension (independent vs. interdependent) and a process dimension (planned vs. emergent) which when combined yield four fundamental development types. We then explore and evaluate the salient theoretical underpinnings, antecedents and outcomes associated with each type of development.

Our typology and its application to the extant literature is an attempt to conceptualise and explicate the various conceptualisations of development towards a broader, more holistic understanding of what is a multifaceted construct. Hence, our goal in this paper is not to arrive at a singular conceptualisation of development, but to recognise the complex nature of development and to help both researchers and practitioners in situating their discourse and practice of development. Through specifying both antecedents and outcomes, the typology seeks to move beyond Lee’s (2001) more metaphorically-oriented conceptualisation of development and provide evidence for four specific types of development. Philosophically, we adopt a neo-empiricist stance, underpinned by a critical realist ontology and epistemology, locating our typology in the space between post-positivism and constructivism-interpretivism (Alvesson and Deetz 2000; Hamlin, Ellinger and Beattie 2008). For the purposes of our typology, we assume that there is such a thing as development in terms of both a conceptual and organizing frame. As a conceptual frame the concept allows us to make sense of multiple manifestations of development. As an organizing frame, we

argue that the concept allows us to link phenomena at different levels of analyses into a single concept of development. We begin by outlining the review method utilised to prepare the paper. We then review current conceptualisations of development followed by a proposed multifaceted typology of development. Finally we trace the implications of our typology, raising a number of questions for future research.

Method

Following Callahan (2010), this paper examines a broad literature base in order to draw connections and examine the underpinning foundations of the development concept. It is hoped that through this conceptual paper, new insights, questions and provocative challenges can be posed, helping us to arrive at a more detailed understanding of the development concept and a new typology for development. For this purpose, a broad range of theoretical and empirical papers addressing the concept of development from a scholarly viewpoint was examined. Kuchinke (2014) argued that since the literature on development is extremely diverse, each discipline provides multiple approaches and competing explanations of the development process itself. To this end, we conducted searches for relevant research within the fields of business, management, adult education, human resource management, human resource development, psychology and organization behaviour. Seven major databases were consulted which comprised of EBSCO, Business Source Premier, Psych Info, Proquest, ABI Inform Global, Emerald and Google Scholar. As Örténblad (2010) highlighted, management and HRD terms are frequently packaged in the form of labels consisting of two or more words; hence we selected the keywords ‘development’, ‘adult development’, ‘team development’, ‘organization development’, ‘career development’ and ‘societal development’. While each of these keywords relates to distinct concepts, the goal of development is the core underpinning philosophy at the heart of each concept. Of the resulting 156 scholarly works which were published between 1964 (the year of the original

definition of HRD by Harbison and Myers) and 2015, we utilised four criteria to decide to retain or discard literature from our analysis. First, the literature source had to address the construct of development rather than related concepts such as training, learning or adult education. Following Torraco (2005), relevancy was thus a key factor in the screening of publications. The second criterion for selecting literature was that the source had to examine development at one or more levels of analysis (individual, team/group, organizational, societal) (Garavan, McGuire, & O’Donnell, 2004). Third, the literature had to take the form of refereed scholarly papers appearing in peer-reviewed journals or book chapters from specialist readers and handbooks targeting a specific research audience. We therefore excluded literature found in practitioner journals, technical reports and independent research reports. Finally, we focused on literature that conceptualised development or conducted significant empirical investigations and reported on antecedents, correlates and consequences of developmental activity. In order to analyse and synthesise the literature, the constant comparative method (Glaser and Strauss 1967; Guba and Lincoln 1994) was adopted. Marsick and Watkins (1997) argued that this approach encourages researchers to continuously reflect upon the meaning and significance of data, comparing new information to existing themes and explanations and identifying similarities and differences. It allowed us to first trace the history of the development concept and then through an iterative process derive the four dimensions of our typology (acquisitive; autonomous; dialogic; networked). After the four dimensions of the typology had been identified from an analysis of approximately 20% of the scholarly works, the remaining research contributions were analysed and allocated to one of the four dimensions accordingly.

Historical and Current Conceptualisations of Development

The concept of development has a long history and early writings primarily emphasised a person-centred conceptualisation of development. Aristotle (384BC – 322BC),

for example, defined personal development as *phronesis* or practical wisdom which leads to human flourishing or living well (Noel 1999). In contrast to the western tradition, eastern philosophy, in particular Confucius (551BC – 479B), provided an exposition of the nature of personal development in his great learning. He emphasised cultivation of the individual with a focus on the heart, thought and knowledge (Tseng 1973). Kuchinke (1999) argued that the concept of person-centred development in contemporary writings and research has its roots in psychology and in particular humanistic psychology. Adler (1870-1937) focused on personal aspirations and an individual’s characteristic approach to facing problems. Jung (1875-1961) proposed the concept of individuation which he defined as an individual’s desire to achieve both wholeness and balance of the self (Dirkx 2006).

The notion of a person-centred approach to development flourished in the early writings on psychology and education. In the psychological context the writings of Maslow and Rogers are particularly influential. Maslow’s (1970) ubiquitous hierarchy of needs has as its foundations the notion of a latent developmental sequence. He proposed that actualisation of the self as the goal of development. Maslow’s ideas have been extended by other theorists to include concepts such as transcendence, cognitive and moral development. Rogers was another influential humanistic psychologist who has informed our notions of development in the personal, organizational and educational spheres. He proposed that people have the capacity to choose their own behaviour (Rogers, Lyon, & Tausch 2013) and that the process of development leads to people who are fully functioning. More recent developments within positive psychology have taken on board many of these ideas, particularly the emphasis on the concept of ‘flourishing’ and that development is ultimately about the optimal functioning of individuals, teams and institutions (Gable & Haidt, 2005). Csikszentmihalyi (1990) proposed the notion of ‘flow’ or ‘absorption’ in an activity to the exclusion of everything else.

Within the sphere of education the person-centred notion of development has a very long tradition. Early education psychologists such as Piaget and Vygotsky argued that individuals have a developmental orientation. Piaget (1953) argued that education has the potential to enrich and provide opportunities for development. Vygotsky (1978) also argued that education can lead to development. He proposed the concept of “the zone of proximal development” (p. 76) and he opened up the notion that development is a socially constructed rather than an independent process. However many scholars have considered the zone of proximal development as something which is internal to the individual rather than something which is socially created (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988).

Contemporary notions of development also reinforce the idea that development is an independent process. Chickering and Reisser (1993), for example, proposed that personal development consists of characteristics such as identity, emotions, competence, purpose and autonomy. They however also stipulated that development possesses an interdependent character. Clegg and Bradley (2006) argued that notions of development in education have traditionally emphasised issues such as reflection, goal-setting and developmental planning and have evolved into concepts such as life-long development, continuing professional development and continuous professional development. These ideas emphasise a development concept that unfolds in a continuous rather than discontinuous fashion. However, the overriding impression one derives from discussions about the concept of development in the field of education is, to summarise Fry, Davenport, Woodman, & Pee (2002), “ill-defined and often used with multiple meanings. (p. 108)” Scholars have therefore begun to challenge rational, autonomous notions of development (Merriam & Brockett, 2007) and to propose an alternative narrative of development that emphasises characteristics such as transformation, embodied, socially constructed and performative (Sandlin, Wright, & Clark 2011).

In the organizational theory realm we find notions of development that are both person- and production-centred (Kuchinke, 2014). HRD has embraced both assumptions and there is an abundance of literature supportive of these notions. The production-centred approach emphasises economic and competitive issues and envisages the needs of the organization and society as paramount. Concepts such as ‘team development’, ‘organizational development’ and ‘workforce development’ propose a notion of development that is purposeful, planned, deliberate and involves the acquisition of knowledge and skill (Wilson, 2012). Production-centred development concepts emphasise the interdependent nature of development through the formation and growth of organizations, communities and societies (Kuchinke, 2014).

Our brief review highlights the multidimensional nature of the development concept. Consistent with the arguments proposed by Kuchinke (2014) multiple forms of development exist and the concept is characterised by considerable complexity. However, we detect a number of theoretical biases in existing conceptualisations. The notion of development as a positive, growth-fulfilling process continues to pervade the literature (Pace 2000), yet we acknowledge recent critical contributions that question this assumption (Mabey, 2013). The emphasis on progressive change in individuals, organizations and society is given particular primacy in current conceptualisations (Matusov, De Palma & Drye, 2007). It is also assumed that development can be achieved or realised through the adoptions of socio-technical systems approaches (Dirkx, Swanson, Watkins, & Cseh 2002; Jacobs 1989). Development is assumed to be directional (Rogers 1951). Scholars have also emphasised both normative and practical assumptions and these are particularly reflected in the strategic HRD and leadership development literatures (Garavan, Carbery, & Rock, 2012; Callahan, Whitener, & Sandlin, 2007). Increasingly there is an acknowledgment of different units or levels of development

and that the concept of development can be compared across these levels (Garavan *et al.*, 2004). In the next section we present our typology.

A Multifaceted Typology

In constructing our typology, we first explain the need for and value of a multifaceted typology of development. We then go on to define development and identify two distinct overarching dimensions that underlie its various conceptualisations in the literature.

The need for a typology arose from the multiple conceptualisations of development within the literature and a perceived latent desire to structure and classify in an ordered fashion the theoretical and empirical outputs of studies examining different aspects of development. A typology of development is therefore a useful mechanism in human resource development for capturing the antecedents, processes and outcomes associated with development and enabling more comprehensive theory-building and theory-testing. As a device, it is valuable in framing discourse on development and it is hoped that the typology will help guide researchers in future empirical studies. The typology also identifies sets of developmental relationships and more effectively matches generalisations to specific development constructs. Furthermore, it is hoped that the typology will reduce the level of confusion and ambiguity surrounding the development concept currently characterizing the literature and will permit a more lucid refinement of discussions related to the efficacy and value of development.

Building on the extant literature we define development as *an unfolding process of growth that occurs in various ways along multiple trajectories at different levels of analysis, influenced by context and leading to a range of positive outcomes*. The definition highlights two essential characteristics: (1) Development as an unfolding process, (building upon the work of Pace (2000)) and (2) Development as pursued in independent or interdependent ways

involving the autonomous individual or interdependently the team, organization, community or society.

The first dimension of our typology therefore refers to how development unfolds and whether it unfolds in a planned or emergent way. The unfolding dimension captures the distinction between development that is considered planned, rationalistic, goal-focused and continuous and development that is emergent, holistic, tentative and ambiguous in nature (Lee 2001). The second dimension – structural – captures whether development is realised within individuals or within interdependent units (Baldwin and Magjuka 1997). Where development is pursued by individuals it is considered to be structurally independent, however where it involves collectives, such as teams, organizations, communities or societies, it is considered to be interdependent. By juxtaposing these dimensions in Figure 1 we present a two-by-two typology that differentiates four types of development. We posit that each of these dimensions captures various approaches to development found in the literature. We acknowledge, in formulating this typology, that concepts of development found in the HRD field have become something of an umbrella term that is often meaningless (Mankin, 2001). In proposing this typology we acknowledge the need to move beyond the narrow remit ascribed to the concept of development by Holton and Naquin (2004) that it focuses primarily on “increasing knowledge or skills” (p58). Below we discuss the theoretical grounding, antecedents and outcomes of each development type to further justify each one as well as contribute to aligning the extant literature on development. We believe there is value in typologies as a form of theorizing. Doty and Glick (1994) pointed out that typologies represent a special form of theorizing in that they allow researchers to organise complex ideas. Delbridge and Fiss (2013) proposed that typologies represent a “particularly attractive form of theorizing” (p329) and suggested that some of the most significant contributions to the field of management have been in the form of typologies. Snow and Ketchen (2014) are

supportive of the general attractiveness of typologies as a form of theorizing and they emphasise that typologies can perform a number of functions, in terms of clarifying concepts, accounting for multiple casual relationships and reducing complexity in theoretical and methodological terms.

A typology allows for a more focused and systematic investigation of the development concept. Prior efforts to understand the origins and outcomes of development have been curtailed by the lack of a holistic theoretical framework to distinguish between development types and guide future research. Having identified the dimensions of our typology we now review and categorise the existing literature to demonstrate that each type is sustainable as a distinct category and evaluate the theoretical underpinnings, antecedents and outcomes of each. We acknowledge, that while prior research has focused on investigating some of the types we propose, very little attention has been paid to some types (co-emergent) and there is significant knowledge gaps in our understanding of the outcomes associated with each type.

Acquisitive development.

Definition. The acquisition type envisages development as an individual human process of developing new knowledge, skill and behaviours that contribute to personal, professional job or organizational resources (Nafukho, Hairston, & Brooks, 2004). Various conceptualisations of this development type are found in the literature such as professional development (Sankey & Machin, 2014; Blau, Andersson, Davis, Daymony, Hochner, Koziara, Portwood, & Holladay 2008) or organizationally-focused development (Maurer Lippstreu, & Judge, 2008). A particular preoccupation of strategic HRD concerns how to draw out and use developed knowledge and skill to enhance organizational performance (Garavan, 2007). This development type is conceptualised as a planned and purposeful activity, deliberately entered into (Garavan, Hogan, & Cahir-O'Donnell, 2009) and it has a

continuous character (Irving & Williams, 1999). It also assumes that the source of development comes from inside the individual.

Theoretical grounding. Acquisitive development is grounded in the literature on cognitive development theory, theories of expertise, behaviourism, theories of skill acquisition and social learning theories. At a philosophical level, (Kitchenham, 2008) the acquisitive type is supported by a notion of development that is goal focused and involves a repetitive sequence of goal formulation, implementation and modification of goals based on learning outcomes. Development is essentially an entity that moves an individual towards a final state (Van de Ven & Poole, 1995).

The acquisitive type draws heavily from individual learning theory. Piaget (1953), for example proposed that the key to development is the mutual interaction of accommodation (changing mental concepts based on experience) and assimilation (integrating experience into existing mental concepts). For his part, Kolb (1984) argued that development takes place as individuals engage in a four stage process – experience, reflection, conceptualisation and planning. Theories of expertise development are also relevant to the acquisitive type. These theories emphasise the integration of conceptual knowledge and practical knowledge as fundamental to expertise development (Tynjälä, Välimaa, & Sarja, 2003). They proposed that formal knowledge is transformed into expertise through problem solving. The extent of problem solving is considered a mediating tool for the integration of conceptual and practical knowledge. Revans (1985) also highlighted this problem solving dimension within action learning in that acquisitive development starts from questions raised by a problem, leading to hypotheses, experimentation, verification and review. Revans was keen to emphasise that the essence of acquisitive development is real life work problems. Other theoretical approaches that emphasise this perspective include problem-based learning (Dochy, Segers, Van den Bossche, & Gijbels, 2003), project-based learning (Helle, Tynjälä, & Olkinuora, 2006) and

problem-based project work learning (Illeris, 2003). Schön (1983; 1987) has likewise emphasised reflection in action and on action as an essential component of professional development. Mezirow (1991) similarly underlined the importance of the transformative development process and the extent to which learners challenge and questions existing assumptions and thinking. A process of critical reflection leads to the development of new meanings and assumptions.

Finally theories from the domain of professional development also have relevance to the acquisitive type. Desimone (2009) proposed a path model incorporating five core features for effective professional development: content focused, active learning, coherence, duration and collective participation. Clarke and Hollingsworth (2002) suggested a non-linear model incorporating four domains (personal, external, practice and consequence). They maintained that professional development is complex and involves multiple growth pathways between these domains.

Antecedents. The literature highlights a multiplicity of antecedents relevant to the acquisitive type. Individual antecedents include self-efficacy (Maurer & Tarulli, 1994), employee perceptions of their capabilities (Noe, Wilk, Mullen, & Wanek, 1997), learning motivation (Birdi, Allen, & Warr, 1997) and professional commitment (Culpin, Eichenberg, Haywalk, & Abraham, 2014). Other studies have highlighted the important role of work attitudes as antecedents including organizational commitment (McEnrue, 1989), job satisfaction (Blau, Paul, & St. John, 1993) and organizational career satisfaction (Van Emmerick, 2004). Job characteristics have also been emphasised. Skule and Reichborn (2002) identified several antecedent conditions that are job-focused. These include: managerial responsibility, significant external professional contacts, opportunities for feedback, support and encouragement and the high possibility that the job knowledge and skills developed will be rewarded. Ellström (2001) also identified the development potential

of tasks, opportunities for feedback, evaluation and reflection on outcomes, the formulation of work processes, the extent of participation by learners in developing work processes and the availability of learning resources as important antecedents to acquisitive development.

Noe *et al.* (1997) suggested climate as an important organizational antecedent of acquisitive development. Dimensions emphasised included support from supervisors and co-workers, situational constraints such as lack of time resources (Noe & Wilk, 1993) and levels of job uncertainty (Spreitzer & Mishra, 2002). Kraimer, Seibert, Wayne, Liden, & Bravo (2011) highlighted the important role of organizational support for development such as information exchange, rewards and resources for development, challenging roles and professional assignments and organizational support for updating skills and professional competencies. Garofano and Salas (2005) and Carbery and Garavan (2007) in their models highlighted the role of the organizational environment and placed particular salience on the extent of development benefits, the availability of learning materials and opportunities for acquisitive development outcomes.

Outcomes. Based on the available research, acquisitive development is more strongly associated with expertise development outcomes, professional development outcomes, job and role performance outcomes and individual outcomes such as enhanced competency and self confidence and career progression (Burke & Hutchins, 2008). Scholars have also highlighted that the enhancement of work performance may also lead to organizational outcomes (Noe & Colquitt, 2002). Maurer, Weiss, & Barbeite (2003) identified a range of outcomes such as a more rounded and better individual, enhanced potential and flexibility to perform effectively in a multiplicity of roles and professions.

Autonomous development.

Definition. The autonomous type envisages development as a process that is centred on the autonomous individual. The focus is on developing individuals rather than producing skills that are of value to jobs and organizations (Jacobs & Washington, 2003). Autonomous development can be conceptualised or understood as an individual’s ability to develop independently by processes determined by the learner or it may be viewed as an individual psychological characteristic where there is a capacity to act independently and direct development processes (Merriam & Caffarella, 1999). Autonomous development involves personal initiative, persistence in development, resourcefulness (Ponton, Carr and Confessore, 2000) and can sometimes be characterised by discontinuous development activities. A central feature of autonomous development is the notion that the learner is the author of his/her development. As a consequence development is considered organic and amorphous rather than planned. The process is open-ended and perceivable only in retrospect. Donati and Watts (2005) suggested that the focus of development is personal growth or becoming a certain kind of individual.

Theoretical grounding. Humanistic psychology plays a dominant role in our understanding of the autonomous development type. There are multiple manifestations of this theory including self-directed learning (Rogers, 1983) andragogy (Knowles, 1984) and Mezirow’s (1991) theory of transformational learning (Kitchenham, 2008). Boud (1981) identified Rogers as the seminal figure in the emergence of self-directed development. His ideas reinforced the notion that development is essentially about personal growth and self-actualisation. Development is about the discovery of personal learnings. Other theoretical traditions relevant to this development type include: lifespan theories of development (Baltes, Staudinger, & Lindenberger, 1999), theories of psychosocial development (Erickson, 1963), life structure models (Levinson, 1978) and the life transitions model (Schlossberg, 1987). Self determination theory is also a useful theoretical underpinning with its emphasis on self

regulation, life goals and aspirations and universal psychological needs (Deci & Ryan, 2008).

The majority of humanistic perspectives on development emphasise constructivism.

Cognitive constructivism stresses the individual dimension of development and that development occurs through the individual - the internal construction of knowledge with new knowledge modifying or changing existing knowledge structures (Billett, 1998).

Antecedents. Several antecedents of autonomous development have been widely acknowledged in the literature. A cornerstone of this development type is the role of aspirations or life-goals. Kasser and Ryan (1996) differentiated intrinsic aspirations from extrinsic ones. The former include life-goals such as personal development whereas the latter include wealth, fame and attractiveness. Lifespan and cognitive models give primacy to the role of individual agency as a basis for moving through the various stages of development. Mezirow (2000) placed particular emphasis on the role of critical reflection. He characterised ideal critical reflection as complete information, the ability to evaluate arguments objectively and freedom from coercion. The development of a learner’s self-regulatory capacity is also considered important. Boekaerts (1996) found that self-regulated learners can develop more effectively because they utilise both cognitive and motivational regulatory strategies. More recently, researchers have investigated the role of mindfulness, an open awareness and interested attention to what is happening within and around oneself (Brown & Ryan, 2003). Mindfulness is therefore theorised to be a central element of autonomous development and the development of an autonomous orientation (Deci & Ryan, 2008).

Outcomes. Despite the interest in autonomous development research on its outcomes is quite limited and fragmented. However the emerging evidence suggests that this type of development will be closely associated with individual development outcomes such as more sustained goal-directed behaviour, goal attainment, employee intentions to engage in self directed or autonomous development, the pursuance of self-concordant outcomes or goals

that are consistent with inherent core values and developing interests (Vansteenkiste, Simons, Lens, & Sheldon, 2004) and intrinsically driven self improvement activities (Gagné & Deci, 2005).

Dialogic development.

Definition. The dialogic type envisages development that is emergent, involves co-participation, mutual constitution and sensemaking. Both individual and context are emmeshed and development occurs through social participation (Tempest & Starkey, 2004). Learners socially construct organizational reality through dialogue and interaction with each other (Cummings & Cummings, 2014). Ellsworth (1988) proposed that development does not occur in a linear or straightforward way: this type envisages development as unpredictable and occurring within a set of emerging relationships. The development of the individual transpires in relation to others and taking into account their unique characteristics and context. Kemmis (2009) suggests that development is co-constructed, socially situated and embodied. Individuals engage in a generative process of “inquiring about their organizational realities” (Cummings & Cummings, 2014, p150). Johnson and Boud (2010) characterised this type as development that evolves over time and over contexts. New challenges require new ways of thinking and development is therefore unanticipated and unpredictable. A fundamental consequence from this development type is that it is necessarily contextualised and cannot be understood away from the setting in which it occurs (Boud & Brew, 2013).

Theoretical grounding. The dialogic type may be viewed as a post-modernist notion of what constitutes development. In terms of theoretical grounding it draws heavily on interpretive approaches to social science. Given the social and sensemaking nature of this type, situated learning theorists have emphasised the role of communities of practice on development (Brown, Collins, & Duguid, 1989; Wenger, 1998). They argued that it is not

sufficient to consider development in terms of individual cognition. Communities of practice form units of action in which individuals construct their identities, understandings and shared practices (O’Donnell, Porter, McGuire, Garavan, Heffernan, & Cleary, 2003). Socio-cultural theories emphasise the role of authenticity, suggesting that development should take place in contexts that are real-life. This type draws heavily on social-constructionist theories and argues that to consider development as a planned individual activity is misguided (Popper and Lipshitz 1993). Gherardi, Nicolini, & Odella (1998) posited that people and groups create knowledge and negotiate meaning in terms of words, actions, situations and artefacts (p274). Social constructivism stresses the importance of interactions between individual and context. Context shapes the development process, it involves self-reflection and working with others. This theoretical perspective is particularly useful in understanding the social arrangements that provide the context for development. Collectives create knowledge and attribute meaning to particular words and actions (Brown & Duguid, 1991).

Other theories that help us to understand the dialogic type include collective learning theory (Capello, 1999), complexity (Hazy, Goldstein, & Lichtenstein, 2007; Fenwick, 2010) and actor network theory (Fenwick, 2010). Theories of collective learning emphasise that development is cumulative, interactive and public. It is socially determined and it is emergent (Cooperrider, Whitney, & Stavros, 2008). Complexity theory highlights emergence and the role of self-organization. Fenwick (2010) emphasised that a central premise of complexity theory is that the person and the context are inseparable and that development occurs through an intentional tinkering of one with the other. She also stressed that knowledge and action are a continuous cycle of invention and exploration and come about through relations among structural dimensions, objects, identity, action and interaction. Complexity theory therefore focuses on the relationship between learners and the environment. Cultural-historical activity theory (Engeström, 2001; Fuller & Unwin, 2004) is also appropriate in understanding

dialogic development. This theory examines socio-material interactions and how a system emerges. It underlines the role of contradictions inherent in organizations and suggests that development occurs when contradictions are questioned. Development is viewed as a collective expansion of the objectives and practices of a system.

Actor-network theory considers development as a joint exercise of relational strategies within networks. This theory has the potential to explore more fully development processes and account for non-human elements such as technology, texts and objects and the role they play in development (Bell, 2010). It also has value in revealing assumptions that are taken for granted and actors who may be marginalised or powerless. Fundamentally it brings to the fore the importance of networks for development and how they are in constant motion (Heeks & Stanforth, 2014). Membership, interests, identities and discourse change over time and actor-network theory highlights how these changes come about (Whittle & Spicer, 2008).

Antecedents. To date relatively few studies have investigated the dialogic type. Given that the dialogic type emphasises discourse, emergence and generativity (Bushe & Marshak, 2014) a number of antecedent conditions can be highlighted. Leadership is a particularly important antecedent. Therefore the extent to which leaders demonstrate behaviours such as listening, respecting, voicing and suspending (Isaacs, 1999) will be important. Other researchers suggest that leaders need to create spaces for and facilitate opportunities for dialogic development (Syvänen, Kasvio, Loppela, Lundell, Tappura, & Tikkamäki, 2012). Antecedents such as collaboration, the sharing of knowledge, employee participation and organizational learning are also emphasised (Syvänen & Tikkamäki, 2013).

The requirement for participation is given particular significance in the context of dialogic development. Wenger (2003) defined participation “as action, the gained experiences, relations and interactions with others” (p26). Without participation there will be no development. This participation will have a particular character, with an emphasis on

activeness, voicing, giving and receiving and engaging (Tomer, 1988). Knowing is highlighted as another proximate antecedent condition. Orlikowski (2002) defined knowing as an ongoing socially constructed process; it is interactive in nature and it consists of competence and knowledge in practice. Blackler (1995) highlighted specific dimensions of knowing such as embracing, embodying, encoding, enculturing and embedding. Researchers have underscored the importance of social interaction, support and reflection as important antecedents to the dialogic type. Taylor, Templeton, & Baker (2010) suggested that social interaction is facilitated through a commitment to participation and willingness to demonstrate dialogue competencies. Social support is helped by the skills of actors to conduct dialogue and commitment to participation (Tikkamäki, 2013). Reflection requires individual capabilities such as self-directedness, self-awareness, the willingness to reflect and carry out reflective dialogue (Hiloden & Tikkamäki, 2013). Boud and Brew (2013) highlighted the importance of productive reflection where there is consideration of time and space for reflection.

Outcomes. Given the lack of research on dialogical development little is known about its outcomes and in particular its performance effects. The majority of studies imply the use of a dialogical approach, rather than explicitly investigate it. Sveningsson and Larsson (2006) found that individuals’ participation in developmental activities contributed to identity work through developing an idealised managerial vision of the future and developing fantasies of leadership. Clarke (2006) investigated dissonance between individual needs and organizational boundaries and how over time they blurred the boundaries and considered themselves to be ‘the organization’. Carroll and Levy (2010) also found dialogic development led to the crafting of selves that were fluid, overlapping and sometimes contradictory.

Networked development.

Definition. Whereas the acquisitive and autonomous types emphasise individual-level development and the dialogic stresses co-emergent development, the networked type highlights development that focuses on organizational and inter-organizational relationships. Teams, or the organization as a whole, are the focus of development, which is formally designed with specific goals and timelines, rather than emerging through communities of practice (Brown & Duguid, 2001; Leitch, McMullan, & Harrison, 2013). The developmental process associated with this type is considered purposeful. Development processes are interdependent “comprised of purposeful actions, discovered consequences, implications, reassessments and further action” (Knapp, 2010; p288). Cummings and Cummings (2014) suggested that the networked type is illustrated in organization development where the focus is on enhancing competence “to solve problems, adapt to change and improve” (p144). Inter-organizational dimensions of this type include development processes that occur within strategic alliances, networks of organizations and its partners and development as part of collaborative relationships.

Theoretical grounding. The networked type draws heavily from positivist social science where organizations are considered tangible entities that can be objectively assessed. A variety of team, organizational and inter-organizational theories have relevance at the level of the team. Lynham, Chermack, & Noggle (2004) suggested that team-building theory represents a cluster of theories that explain how teams develop. Zuckman’s stage theory is one particular example. Team development theories emphasise issues such as role analysis, role negotiation, relationships, processes and task accomplishment. Yeager and Nafukho (2011) highlighted a cluster of relevant theories including social comparison theory (Festinger, 1954), social identity theory and mental models (Van Knippenberg & Schippers,

2007; Van den Bossche, Gijsselaers, Segers, Woltjer, & Kirschner, 2011), intergroup contact theory (Pettigrew, 1998) and cultural mosaic theory (Chao & Moon, 2005).

A number of organizational level theoretical perspectives that help us to understand the networked type include: explorative theory (March, 1991), single-loop/adaptive, double-loop/generative learning (Argyris & Schön, 1978) organizational learning theory (Huber, 1991) and higher and lower level learning theory (Fiol & Lyles, 1985). Open systems theory emphasises the role of context or environmental factors in the incremental nature of development processes (Lynham *et al.*, 2004). For his part, McLean (2009) pointed to the contribution of action research and the need for a system focus in framing developmental interventions.

Antecedents. Several antecedents of the networked type are identified in the literature. The environment in which an organization operates will have a significant impact on the development process. Antecedents such as wider societal and institutional factors will affect the development process in very specific ways (Lam, 2000). A number of internal factors will also act as antecedents. An important antecedent of this development type is a clear statement of strategic intent and vision for the development unit (team, organization or strategic partnership). Important senior management team antecedents include their skills to manage information and knowledge, the existence of transformational leaders, matrix-type structures, conflict resolution mechanisms and the existence of human resource development practices that encourage collaboration, flexibility and teamwork (Dvir, Eden, Avolio, & Shamir, 2002; Carmeli, Atwater, & Levi, 2011).

The organization’s culture will act as an antecedent: in particular cultures that promote trust, cross-functional networks and risk-taking will support networked development (Weick, 1996). Learning culture is also considered an important antecedent to networked development. Characteristics of learning culture that are particularly salient include the

opportunities to question and challenge assumptions, opportunities to share knowledge and resources (Reagans & McEvily, 2003) and the promotion of social interaction and communication at individual and team levels. Vince and Saleem (2004) argued that the existence of a blame culture will impact communication and sharing processes and maintain that strong sub-cultures will impede development across the organization.

Structural characteristics highlighted include decentralised, informal structures with an emphasis on informality. Hierarchical structures may also impede development (Lord & Hall 2005). Absorptive capacity (Van den Bosch *at al.*, 2005) will impact the extent of network development. Aspects of absorptive capacity that are relevant include long-term planning, efforts to acquire and integrate knowledge and the encouragement of experimental learning.

Outcomes. Despite the considerable interest in the networked type, research on its outcomes is limited. However the existing evidence suggests that this type of development is closely associated with organizational performance, innovation and financial performance (Lopez, Peón, & Ordás, 2005). Very few studies have systematically investigated the outcomes of networked development or have determined whether these development processes produce these results.

Promising Directions and Recommendations

Turning now to the implications of our typology for future research, we examine areas in theoretical grounding (including methodological), antecedents and outcomes (see Table 1). We do not seek to be all inclusive and exhaustive but rather to present a number of paths that will enhance future research. How development is conceptualised is fundamental to HRD. Kuchinke (2014) argued that the conceptualisation of development will shape dialogue and

research. Our typology suggests four development types that vary in how they unfold; their structure and their antecedents and outcomes.

The reality is that relatively little is known about the characteristics of each type. This has arisen due to the interdisciplinary and fragmented nature of research on development and the broad base of theories that are used as foundation for such research. Each of the four types have distinct theoretical underpinnings, however we acknowledge that some theories may be relevant to one or more types. The mechanisms through which the four types of development take place are primarily drawn from the individual literatures with great scope to tap into the organizational and institutional literatures.

There are also a number of significant methodological challenges. In particular the study of development types that are conceptualised as more dynamic, unfolding and emergent (autonomous and dialogic) require an approach to research that moves beyond traditional cross-sectional research designs. Cross-sectional methods are considered to be a poor fit when studying development processes that are dynamic, unfold along multiple trajectories and are temporal in nature (Cohen and Manion 1980). We suggest the need for more innovative and context-specific approaches. Researchers have suggested concepts such as localised interpretation, contextual rationality and polyphony (Nolan and Garavan 2012). These three ideas are informed by social constructivist ideas and focus on how social experience is created and given meaning by actors in an organizational setting. Localised interpretation emphasises the notion of development as a socially constructed construct and helps to capture the dynamics of emergence (Potter and Wetherell 1987). Contextual rationality gives salience to the role by context in explaining development (Townley, 2008). Polyphony (Bakhtin, 1984) emphasises that development be understood as a polyphonic phenomenon if different discourses on development are to be accommodated.

We also suggest that several of the development types we propose require a longitudinal approach, the use of qualitative research designs and multiple methods of data collection. Qualitative designs are better at capturing the dynamic development types – they have the potential to provide more fine-grained theoretical understandings of both antecedents and outcomes. Wang & Chugh (2014) emphasised the value of what they call ‘qualitative, phenomenon-driven’ research. They viewed this type of research to be particularly effective in addressing “how” and “why” in less explored areas, such as dialogic development where there is an absence of empirical evidence.

Antecedents

Our knowledge base is generally weak on all four development types. There is a particular paucity of research on the antecedents of dialogic and networked development types. Insights on these types are scant. Research on development has largely focused on explorations of acquisitive development and to a lesser extent autonomous development. Future research must focus more on theory building on dialogic and networked development types. We therefore need to understand the antecedent conditions that facilitate dialogic development. Specifically, what organizational conditions (cultural, environmental and structural) promote or facilitate dialogic development? We need more theoretical insights into how dialogic development occurs within development units and how it evolves over time? Are there unique development arenas, spaces and tools that enable dialogic development? Scholars have highlighted that structural and professional boundaries can inhibit the emergence process that characterises dialogic development (Nicolini, Powell, Conville, & Martinez-Solano, 2007) suggesting the need to conduct research on how these factors influence sensemaking processes.

The networked type has a central characteristic: the notion that development is planned and initiated which contrasts with the dialogic type. The networked type postulates

that organizations can create development processes that enhance organizational effectiveness. There is scope to gain further insights into a variety of cultural factors such as: commitment to development, the role of systems to support development and the investment of employees in networked development. Other researchers have emphasised the potential role of policies that promote networked development (Taylor *et al.*, 2010) and the importance of organizational leadership style and mental models. We therefore suggest further research on leader and manager engagement with development processes and the role of attitudes towards development. We have identified research gaps in our understanding of planned development in teams, organizations, strategic alliances and other relationships. What are the interventions that facilitate networked development? What is the influence of organizational and management support, rewards systems and procedural justice? These are just some of the research questions on antecedents that can be explored.

We have scope to enhance our understanding of the autonomous development type. The notion of the autonomous self is, however, not particularly prevalent in discussions of development within HRD. Therefore research gaps remain around how the autonomous self is expressed in development processes. What are the limitations of intrapersonal development? What are the trigger events that stimulate autonomous development? How does personal history and accumulated life experiences trigger autonomous development? What role do personal values play? Does emotional intelligence influence autonomous development, and in what ways? These are just a sample of the antecedents where major research gaps exist.

The acquisitive development type provides important opportunities for the research of antecedents. Questions that can be usefully explored include: What role do intrinsic and extrinsic factors have in triggering acquisitive development? How do job professional and environmental factors facilitate and or constrain acquisitive development?

Outcomes

Research is needed that examines the differential outcomes associated with each development type. We propose that this type of research will provide us with more fine-grained and nuanced understandings of the relationships between development types and outcomes. The limited research suggests that different types of development can lead to both positive and negative outcomes. However whether these outcomes are directly or indirectly impacted by development is contested. Further research should study both short and long term outcomes. Researchers need to develop more multidimensional notions of outcomes to capture the complexity of the dialogic type. Do different development types require unique conceptualisations of outcomes? Outcomes research should examine the full range from intrapersonal, interpersonal, team, organizational, financial and innovative outcomes.

We need to move beyond the situation where there is an absence of evidence to either support or refute relationships between the four types of development and performance. HRD is replete with assertions or assumptions that development leads to performance gains. A recent review of the leadership development literature highlights the paucity of the evidence supporting performance improvement claims (Garavan, O’Brien, & Watson, 2014). There is therefore a need to develop methods that sensitively measure and capture outcomes. The development of such measures will significantly enhance the case for development in multiple organizations and contexts.

Conclusions

Our understanding of development has come a long way since the concept was firstly identified as central to HRD. Much has been learned from previous research on development, but the topic is ripe for further investigation. To this end, we believe that our review, typology and discussion of four development types will help set the stage for new research avenues. We therefore encourage researchers across disciplines to shed light on development

as a construct and to use the typology to better understand this important and complex organizational phenomenon. From a practice perspective, we agree with Kuchinke (2014) that HRD practice is enhanced where practitioners can respond to different notions of development in their day to day practice. We believe that practitioners can use the typology as an analytical and diagnostic framework or tool to create conditions for the four types of development and select the development type most suited to their context and circumstances.

Limitations

While Doty and Glick (1994) have acknowledged that typologies represent conceptually derived sets of ideal types, with each construct representing a unique set of attributes linked to a particular relevant outcome, they also argued that the ideal types are theoretical abstractions and accentuations of a particular point of view. They go on to suggest that ideal types represent organizational forms that might exist, but for which empirical examples are expected to be rare. In practice, development processes in organizations are often driven by multiple motivations and agendas, whereby HRD practitioners are tasked with meeting the expectations of a number of stakeholders. As a result, it is possible that development in organizations falls across more than one of the dimensions specified and is designed to achieve several valued outcomes.

Second, although we have worked hard to reduce researcher bias, this cannot be fully eliminated. As the research approach adopted involved both interpretation and comparison of scholarly works, unconscious bias may have entered the analysis in terms of the value and significance we attached to particular scholarly works or indeed the manner in which we describe or articulate the four dimensions of the typology (Robinson and Bennett 1995). We strongly urge future researchers to consider adopting more quantitative approaches to confirm the four dimensions of development established in this paper.

Finally, we acknowledge that approaches to development are continually evolving and that our typology must remain fluid to encompass new avenues for developing individuals, groups and organizations. Emerging research in the areas of positive psychology and mindfulness continues to awaken interest in stimulus-based approaches to attitudinal and behavioural change (George 2014) and considerable emphasis has been placed in recent years on more effective ways of developing talented employees (Collings 2014; Garavan *et al.*, 2012). Hence any typology of development must recognise new and emergent approaches to development and identify the theoretical underpinnings, antecedents and outcomes associated with such practices.

Figure 1: A Typology of Development

		Where is Development Pursued	
		Independent	Interdependent
How Development Unfolds?	Emergent	Autonomous	Dialogic
	Planned	Acquisitive	Networked

Table 1: Development Types: Researching Antecedents and Outcomes

Key Development Type	Definition	Research Questions		
		Antecedents	Outcomes	Methodology Issues
Autonomous	Development is a process centred on intrapersonal development rather than producing skills of value to values and organizations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the individual-level predictors of autonomous development? • What self-directed characteristics drive autonomous development behaviour? • How do self-regulatory processes impact autonomous development? What influence does development orientation play? • How does organizational and development climate influence autonomous development? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do autonomous development outcomes endure? • How does autonomous development enhance self-awareness, future development behaviour and well-being? • Does autonomous development lead to performance outcomes? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop measures of outcomes unique to autonomous outcomes. • Need to capture autonomous development in different contexts • Use of qualitative and in particular innovative methodologies to capture nuance and unique outcomes
Acquisitive	The development of knowledge, skills and behaviours that contribute to personal, professional, job and organizational resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What intrinsic and extrinsic motivational factors drive acquisitive development? • What particular organizational and environmental antecedents influence acquisitive development? • What influence do characteristics of the job or professional selling have on acquisitive development? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the short and long term outcomes of acquisitive development? • Do individual outcomes of acquisitive development influence organizational outcomes? • How does acquisitive development impact human capital outcomes? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop objective measures of outcomes • Pay more attention to sample selection and the use of experimental and control groups • Encourage longitudinal studies and generate samples that enable investigation of internal and external context.

Dialogic	Development is emergent and involves co-participation, mutual consultation and sensemaking. Individual and context are enmeshed as development occurs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What organizational conditions facilitate/inhibit dialogic development? • How does individual and context influence each other • How does dialogic development occur within an organization or community? • What kinds of participatory development arenas, spaces and tools facilitate dialogic development? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How does dialogic development shape an organization or community? • How does dialogic development evolve over time? • What types of outcomes (if any) are unique to dialogic development? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make greater use of ethnographic methodologies such as close-observational and participative research • Utilise methodological approaches such as localised interpretation, contextual rationality and polyphony • Utilise research designs that explore the “how” and “why” of dialogic development • Develop measures of outcomes unique to dialogic development
Networked	Planned development processes that focus on teams, organizations, relationships between organizations, development as an interdependent intentional process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How does planned development occur in teams, organizations, strategic alliances and other relationships • What types of HRD interventions facilitate network development? What role do organizational and environmental influences have on networked development? • What is the influence of organizational and management support, reward systems and procedural justice have on networked development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the outcomes of networked development unique to teams, organizations and strategic relationships? • What are the short and long term outcomes of networked development? • Does networked development lead to unanticipated or negative outcomes? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop more objective measures of networked development • Utilise longitudinal studies that track outcomes over time • Use multiple perspectives on outcomes • Broaden the organization types and contexts which networked development is studied

References

- Alvesson, M. & Deetz, S. (2000). *Doing critical management research*. London: Sage.
- Argyris, C., & Schön, D. A. (1978). *Organizational learning: A theory of action perspective*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Bakhtin, M. (1984). *Problems of Dostoevsky's poetics* (C. Emerson, Trans). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Baldwin, T. T., & Magjuka, R. J. (1997). Training as an organizational episode: Pretraining influences on trainee motivation. In J.K. Ford, S.W.J. Kozlowski, K. Kraiger, E. Salas, & M.S. Teachout (eds.), *Improving training effectiveness in work organizations* (pp. 99–127). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Baltes, P. B., Staudinger, U. M., & Lindenberger, U. (1999). Lifespan psychology: Theory and application to intellectual functioning. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 50(1), 471-507. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.50.1.471
- Bell, F. (2010). Connectivism: Its place in theory-informed research and innovation in technology-enabled learning. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 12(3), 98-118.
- Billett, S. (1998). Understanding workplace learning: Cognitive and sociocultural perspectives. *Current Issues and New Agendas in Workplace Learning*. Leabrook, SA: NCVET Ltd, 43-59.
- Blackler, F. (1995). Knowledge, knowledge work and organizations: an overview and interpretation. *Organization Studies*. 16(6), 1021-1046. doi: 10.1177/017084069501600605
- Blau, G., Andersson, L., Davis, K., Daymony, T., Hochner, A., Koziara, K., Portwood, J., & Holladay, B. (2008). The relation between employee organizational and professional development activities. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 72(1), 123-142. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2007.10.004
- Blau, G., Paul, A., & St. John, N. (1993). On developing a general index of work commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*. 42(3), 298-314. doi: 10.1006/jvbe.1993.1021
- Birdi, K., Allen, C., & Warr, P. (1997). Correlates and perceived outcomes of four types of employee development activity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(6), 845-857. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.82.6.845

- Boekaerts, M. (1996). Self-regulated learning at the junction of cognition and motivation. *European Psychologist, 1*(2), 100-112. doi: 10.1027/1016-9040.1.2.100
- Boud, D. (1981). *Developing student autonomy in learning*. London: Kogan Page.
- Boud, D., & Brew, A. (2013). Reconceptualising academic work as professional practice: Implications for academic development. *International Journal for Academic Development, 18*(3), 208-221. doi: 10.1080/1360144X.2012.671771
- Brown, J. S., Collins, A., & Duguid, P. (1989). Situated cognition and the culture of learning. *Educational Researcher, 18*(1), 32-42. doi: 10.3102/0013189X018001032
- Brown, J. S., & Duguid, P. (1991). Organizational learning and communities-of-practice: Toward a unified view of working, learning, and innovation. *Organizational Science, 2*, 40-57. doi: 10.1287/orsc.2.1.40
- Brown, J. S., & Duguid, P. (2001). Knowledge and organization: A social-practice perspective. *Organization Science, 12*(2), 198-213. doi: 10.1287/orsc.12.2.198.10116
- Brown, K. W., & Ryan, R. M. (2003). The benefits of being present: Mindfulness and its role in psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 56*(2), 267-283. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.84.4.822
- Burke, L. A., & Hutchins, H. M. (2008). A study of best practices in training transfer and proposed model of transfer. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 19*(2), 107-128. doi: 10.1002/hrdq.1230
- Bushe, G. R., & Marshak, R. J. (2014). The dialogic mindset in organization development. *Research in Organizational Change and Development, 22*, 55-97. doi: 10.1108/S0897-301620140000022002
- Callahan, J. L. (2010). Constructing a manuscript: Distinguishing integrative literature and conceptual and theoretical articles. *Human Resource Development Review, 20*(10), 1-5.
- Callahan, J. L., Whitener, J. K. & Sandlin, J. A. (2007). The art of creating leaders: Popular culture artifacts as pathways for development. *Advances in Developing Human Resources, 9*(2), 146-165. doi: 10.1177/1523422306298856
- Capello, R. (1999). Spatial transfer of knowledge in high technology milieu: Learning versus collective learning processes. *Regional Studies, 33*, 353-365. doi: 10.1080/00343409950081211
- Carbery, R., & Garavan, T. N. (2007). Conceptualizing the participation of managers in career-focused learning and development: A framework. *Human Resource Development Review, 6*(4), 394-418. doi: 10.1177/1534484307307552

- Carmeli, A., Atwater, L. & Levi, A. (2011). How leadership enhances employees' knowledge sharing: the intervening roles of relational and organizational identification. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 36(3), 257-274. doi: 10.1007/s10961-010-9154-y
- Carroll, B., & Levy, L. (2010). Leadership development as identity construction. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 24, 211-231. doi: 10.1177/0893318909358725
- Chickering, A. W., & Reisser, L. (1993). *Education and identity* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Chao, G., & Moon, H. (2005). The cultural mosaic: A metatheory for understanding the complexity of culture. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(6), 1128-1140. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.90.6.1128
- Clarke, S. (2006). The relationship between safety climate and safety performance: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 11(4), 315-322. doi: 10.1037/1076-8998.11.4.315
- Clarke, D., & Hollingsworth, H. (2002). Elaborating a model of teacher professional growth. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 18(8), 947-967. doi: 10.1016/S0742-051X(02)00053-7
- Clegg, S., & Bradley, S. (2006). Models of personal development planning: Practice and processes. *British Educational Research Journal*, 32(1), 57-76. doi: 10.1080/01411920500402003
- Cohen, L., & Manion, L. (1980). *Research methods in education*. London: Croon Helm.
- Collings, D. G. (2014). Toward mature talent management: Beyond shareholder value. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 25(3), 301-319.
- Cooperrider, D. L., Whitney, D., & Stavros, J. M. (2008). *Appreciative inquiry handbook* (2nd ed.) Brunswick, OH: Crown Custom Publishing.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). *Flow: The psychology of optimal experience*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Culpin, V., Eichenberg, T., Haywalk, A., & Abraham, P. (2014). Learning, intention to transfer and transfer in executive education. *International Journal of Training and Development*, 18(2), 132-147. doi: 10.1111/ijtd.12033
- Cummings, T. G. & Cummings, C. (2014). Appreciating organization development: A comparative essay on divergent perspectives. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 25(2), 141-153. doi: 10.1002/hrdq.21186

- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2008). Self-determination theory: A macrotheory of human motivation, development, and health, *Canadian Psychology*, 49(3), 182-185. doi: 10.1037/a0012801
- Delbridge, R., & Fiss, P. C. (2013). Styles of theorizing and the social organization of knowledge. *Academy of Management Review*, 38(3), 325-331. doi: 10.5465/amr.2013.0085
- Desimone, L. M. (2009). Improving impact studies of teachers' professional development: Toward better conceptualizations and measures. *Educational Researcher*, 38(3), 181-199. doi: 10.3102/0013189X08331140
- Dirkx, J. M., Swanson, R. A., Watkins, K. E. & Cseh, M. (2002). *Design, Demand, Development, and Desire: A Symposium on the Discourses of Workplace Learning. Innovative Session*. Presented at the Academy of Human Resource Development (AHRD) Conference, Honolulu, Hawaii, February 27th – March 3rd.
- Dirkx, J. M. (2006). Engaging emotions in adult learning: A Jungian perspective on emotion and transformative learning. *New directions for adult and continuing education*, (109), 15-26. doi: 10.1002/ace.204
- Dochy, F., Segers, M., Van den Bossche, P., & Gijbels, D. (2003). Effects of problem-based learning: A meta-analysis. *Learning and instruction*, 13(5), 533-568. doi: 10.1016/S0959-4752(02)00025-7
- Donati, M., & Watts, M. (2005). Personal development in counsellor training: Towards a clarification of inter-related concepts. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling*, 33(4), 475-484. doi: 10.1080/03069880500327553
- Doty, D. H., & Glick, W. H. (1994). Typologies as a unique form of theory building: Toward improved understanding and modelling. *Academy of Management Review*, 19(2), 230-251. doi: 10.2307/258704
- Dvir, T., Eden, D., Avolio, B. J. & Shamir, B. (2002). Impact of transformational leadership on follower development and performance: A field experiment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(4), 735-744. doi: 10.2307/3069307
- Edmunds, R., & Richardson, J. T. (2009). Conceptions of learning approaches to studying and personal development in UK higher education. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 79(2), 295-309. doi: 10.1348/000709908X368866
- Ellström, P. E. (2001). Integrating learning and work: Problems and prospects. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 12(4), 421-435. doi: 10.1002/hrdq.1006

- Ellsworth, E. (1988). Why doesn't this feel empowering: Working through the repressive myths of critical pedagogy. *Harvard Educational Review*, 59(3), 297-324. doi: 10.17763/haer.59.3.058342114k266250
- Engeström, Y. (2001). Expansive learning at work: Toward an activity theoretical reconceptualization. *Journal of Education and Work*, 14(1), 133-156. doi: 10.1080/13639080020028747
- Erickson, E. H. (1963). *Childhood and society*. Stanton, New York: Norton.
- Fenwick, T. (2010). Re-thinking the 'thing': Sociomaterial approaches to understanding and researching learning in work. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 22(1/2), 104-116. doi: 10.1108/13665621011012898
- Festinger, L. (1954). A theory of social comparison processes. *Human Relations*, 7(2), 117-140. doi: 10.1177/001872675400700202
- Fiol, C. & Lyles, M. (1985). Organizational learning. *Academy of Management Review*, 10(4), 803-813. doi: 10.2307/258048
- Fry, H., Davenport, E., Woodman, T., & Pee, B. (2002). Developing progress files: a case study. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 7(1), 97-111. doi: 10.1080/13562510120100418
- Fuller, A., & Unwin, L. (2004). Expansive learning environments: Integrating personal and organisational development. In Rainbird, H., Fuller, A. and Munro, A. (eds) *Workplace Learning in Context* (pp. 126-134). London: Routledge.
- Gable, S. L., & Haidt, J. (2005). What (and why) is positive psychology? *Review of General Psychology*, 9(2), 103-110. doi: 10.1037/1089-2680.9.2.103
- Gagné, M., & Deci, E. L. (2005). Self-determination theory and work motivation, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26(4), 331-362. doi: 10.1002/job.322
- Garavan, T. N. (2007). A strategic perspective on human resource development. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 9(1), 11-30. doi: 10.1177/1523422306294492
- Garavan, T. N., Hogan, C., & Cahir-O'Donnell, A. (2009). *Developing managers and leaders: Perspectives, Debates and Practices in Ireland*. Dublin: Gill & Macmillan Limited.
- Garavan, T. N., O'Brien, F., & Watson, S. (2014). Leadership development and organizational success. In K. Kraiger, J. Passmore, N.R. dos Santos & S. Malvezzi (eds.) *The Wiley Blackwell Handbook of the Psychology of Training, Development, and Performance Improvement* (pp. 354-397). Boston: MA, Wiley-Blackwell.

- Garavan, T. N., Carbery, R., & Rock, A. (2012). Mapping talent development: Definition, scope and architecture. *European Journal of Training and Development*, 36(1), 5-24. doi: 10.1108/03090591211192601
- Garavan, T. N., McGuire, D., & O'Donnell, D. (2004). Exploring human resource development: A levels of analysis approach. *Human Resource Development Review*, 3(4), 417-441. doi: 10.1177/1534484304271669
- Garofano, C. M., & Salas, E. (2005). What influences continuous employee development decisions?. *Human Resource Management Review*, 15(4), 281-304. doi: 10.1016/j.hrmr.2005.10.002
- George, B. (2014). Developing mindful leaders for the C-suite. *Harvard Business Review*, Available at: <https://hbr.org/2014/03/developing-mindful-leaders-for-the-c-suite> (accessed 10th July 2015).
- Gherardi, S., Nicolini, D. & Odella, F. (1998). Toward a social understanding of how people learn in organizations. *Management Learning*, 29(3), 273-297. doi: 10.1177/1350507698293002
- Glaser, B. & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory*. Hawthorne, NY: Aldine.
- Guba, E. G. & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (eds.) *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 105-117). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hamlin, R. G., Ellinger, A. D. & Beattie, R. S. (2008). The emergent ‘coaching industry’: A wake-up call for HRD professionals. *Human Resource Development International*, 11(3), 287-305. doi: 10.1080/13678860802102534
- Harbison, F., & Myers, C. A. (1964). *Education, manpower and economic growth*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Hazy, J. K., Goldstein, J., & Lichtenstein, B. B. (2007). *Complex systems leadership theory: New perspectives from complexity science on social and organizational effectiveness*. Mansfield, MA: ICSE Pub.
- Heeks, R., & Stanforth, C. (2014). Understanding development project implementation: An actor-network perspective. *Public Administration and Development*, 34(1), 14-31. doi: 10.1002/pad.1671
- Helle, L., Tynjälä, P., & Olkinuora, E. (2006). Project-based learning in post-secondary education—theory, practice and rubber sling shots. *Higher Education*, 51(2), 287-314. doi: 10.1007/s10734-004-6386-5

- Hiloden, S., & Tikkamäki, K. (2013). Reflective practice as a fuel for organizational learning. *Administrative Sciences*, 3(3), 76-95. doi: 10.3390/admsci3030076
- Holton, E. F. III, & Naquin, S. S. (2004). New metrics for employee development. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, 17(1), 56-80. doi: 10.1111/j.1937-8327.2004.tb00302.x
- Huber, G. P. (1991). Organizational learning: The contributing processes and the literatures. *Organization Science*, 2(1), 88-115. doi: 10.1287/orsc.2.1.88
- Illeris, K. (2003). Workplace learning and learning theory. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 15(4), 167-178. doi: 10.1108/13665620310474615
- Irving, J., & Williams, D. (1999). Personal growth and personal development: Concepts clarified. *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, 27(4), 517-526. doi: 10.1080/03069889908256287
- Isaacs, W. (1999). Taking flight: Dialogue, collective thinking, and organizational learning. *Organizational Dynamics*, 22, 24-39. doi: 10.1016/0090-2616(93)90051-2
- Jacobs, R. (1989). Systems theory applied to human resource development. In R. Swanson & D. Gradous (Eds.), *Systems Theory applied to Human Resource Development* (pp. 27-60). Alexandria, VA: ASTD.
- Jacobs, R., & Washington, C. (2003). Employee development and organizational performance: a review of literature and directions for future research. *Human Resource Development International*, 6(3), 343-354. doi: 10.1080/13678860110096211
- Johnson, M., & Boud, D. (2010). Towards an emergent view of learning work. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 29(3), 355-368. doi: 10.1080/02601371003700683
- Jung, C. G. (1971). *Collected Works of C. G. Jung (Vol. 6): Psychological Types*. G. Adler & R. F. C. Hull (ed. & trans.), Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Kasser, T., & Ryan, R. M. (1996). Further examining the American dream: Differential correlates of intrinsic and extrinsic goals. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22(3), 280-287. doi: 10.1177/0146167296223006
- Kemmis, S. (2009). Understanding professional practice: A synoptic framework. In B. Green (Eds.), *Understanding and Researching Professional Practice* (pp. 19-38). Rotterdam: Sense.
- Kitchenham, A. (2008). The evolution of John Mezirow's transformative learning theory. *Journal of Transformative Education*, 6(2), 104-123. doi: 10.1177/1541344608322678

- Knapp, R. (2010). Collective (team) learning process models: A conceptual review. *Human Resource Development Review*, 9(3), 285-299. doi: 10.1177/1534484310371449
- Knowles, M. S. (1984). *Andragogy in action: Applying modern principles of adult learning*. New York: Jossey-Bass.
- Kolb, D. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as a source of learning and development*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Kraimer, M. L., Seibert, S. E., Wayne, S. J., Liden, R. C., & Bravo, J. (2011). Antecedents and outcomes of organizational support for development: The critical role of career opportunities. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(3), 485-500. doi: 10.1037/a0021452
- Kuchinke, P. K. (1999). Adult development towards what end? A philosophical analysis of the concept as reflected in the research theory, and practice of human resource development. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 49(4), 148-162. doi: 10.1177/074171369904900402
- Kuchinke, P. K. (2014). Perspectives on the concept of development for HRD. In N. E. Chalofsky, T. S. Rocco & M. L. Morris (eds.) *Handbook of Human Resource Development*, (pp 112-125). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Lam, A. (2000). Tacit knowledge, organizational learning and societal institutions: an integrated framework. *Organization Studies*, 21(3), 487-513. doi: 10.1177/0170840600213001
- Lankau, A. J., & Scandura, A. T. (2002). An investigation of personal learning in mentoring relationships: content, antecedents, and consequences. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(4), 779-790. doi: 10.2307/3069311
- Lee, M. L. (2001). A refusal to define HRD. *Human Resource Development International*, 4(3), 327-341. doi: 10.1080/13678860110059348
- Leitch, C. M., McMullan, C., & Harrison, R. T. (2013). The development of entrepreneurial leadership: the role of human, social and instructional capital. *British Journal of Management*, 24(3), 3047-366. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8551.2011.00808.x
- Levinson, D. (1986). A conception of adult development. *American Psychologist*, 41(1), 3-13. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.41.1.3
- Levinson, D. (1978). *The seasons of a man's life*. New York: Knopf.
- Lopez, S. P., Peón, J. M. M., & Ordás, C. J. V. (2005). Organizational learning as a determining factor in business performance. *The Learning Organization*, 12(3), 227-245. doi: 10.1108/09696470510592494

- Lord, R. G. & Hall, R. J. (2005). Identity, deep structure and the development of leadership skill. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16(4), 591-615. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.06.003
- Lynham, S. A., Chermack, T. J., & Noggle, M. A. (2004). Selecting organization development theory from an HRD perspective. *Human Resource Development Review*, 3(2), 151-172. doi: 10.1177/1534484304265484
- Mabey, C. (2013). Leadership development in organisations: Multiple discourses and diverse practice. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 15(4), 359-380. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2370.2012.00344.x
- Mankin, D. P. (2001). A model of human resource development. *Human Resource Development International*, 4(1), 65-85. doi: 10.1080/13678860121714
- March, J. (1991). Exploration and exploitation in organizational learning. *Organizational Science*, 2(1), 71-87. doi: 10.1287/orsc.2.1.71
- Marsick, V. J. & Watkins, K. E. (1997). Case study research methods. In R. A. Swanson & E. F. Holton III (eds.) *Human Resource Development Research Handbook: Linking Research and Practice*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- Maslow, A. H. (1970). *Motivation and Personality* (2nd ed.) New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Matusov, E., DePalma, R., Drye, S. (2007). Whose development? Salvaging the concept of development within a sociocultural approach to education. *Educational Theory*, 57(4), 403-421. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-5446.2007.00265.x
- Maurer, T. J., Lippstreu, M., & Judge, T. A. (2008). Structural model of employee involvement in skill development activity: The role of individual differences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 72(3), 336-350. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2007.10.010
- Maurer, T., & Tarulli, R. (1994). Investigation of perceived environment, perceived outcome and person variables in relationship to voluntary development activity by employees. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79(1), 3-14. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.79.1.3
- Maurer, T., Weiss, W., & Barbeite, F. (2003). A model of involvement in work-related learning and development activity: The effects of individual, situational motivational, and age variables. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 27(3), 432-444. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.88.4.707
- McEnrue, M. (1989). Self-development as a career management strategy. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 34(1), 57-68. doi: 10.1016/0001-8791(89)90064-X
- McGuire, D. & Kissack, H. C. (2015). *Towards a Model of Stratified Development*. Presented at the 2015 Academy of Human Resource Development Conference, St. Louis. Feb. 19-22.

- McLean, G. N. (1998). HRD: A three-legged stool, an octopus or a centipede? *Human Resource Development International*, 1(4), 375-377. doi: 10.1080/13678869800000048
- McLean, G. N. (2009). Anthropology: A foundation for human resource development. In C.D. Hansen, and Y. Lee (eds.) *The Cultural Context of Human Resource Development*, (pp. 3-20). New York: Palgrave.
- Merriam, S. B., & Caffarella, R. S. (1999). *Learning in Adulthood* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Merriam, S. B., & Brockett, R. (2007). *The Profession and Practice of Adult Learning: An Introduction*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Mezirow, J. (1991). *Transformative Dimensions of Adult Learning*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Mezirow, J. (2000). *Learning as Transformation: Critical Perspectives on a Theory in Progress*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Nafukho, F. M., Hairston, N., & Brooks, K. (2004). Human capital theory: Implications for human resource development. *Human Resource Development International*, 7(4), 545-551. doi: 10.1080/1367886042000299843
- Nicolini, D., Powell, J., Conville, P., & Martinez-Solano, L. (2007). Managing knowledge in the healthcare sector: A review. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 10(3), 245-263. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2370.2007.00219.x
- Noe, R., & Colquitt, J. A. (2002). ‘Planning for training impact: principles of training effectiveness’, in K. Kraiger (Ed.), *Creating, Implementing, and Managing Effective Training and Development: State-of-the-arts Lessons For Practice* (pp. 53-79). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Noe, R., & Wilk, S. (1993). Investigation of factors that influence employees’ participation in development activities. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 78(2), 291-302. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.78.2.291
- Noe, R., Wilk, S., Mullen, E., & Wanek, J. (1997). Employee development: Issues in construct definition and investigation of antecedents. In J. Ford, S. Kozlowski, K. Kraiger, E. Salas, & M. Teachout (Eds.), *Improving Training Effectiveness in organizations* (pp. 153-189). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum Associates.
- Noel, J. (1999). On the varieties of phronesis. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 31(3), 273-289.

- Nolan, C. & Garavan, T.N. (2012). *Lost in translation? Critiquing the HRD discourse in the small firm*. Presented at the 13th International Conference on HRD Theory and Practice Across Europe, 5th-7th June, University of Luisade, Portugal.
- O'Donnell, D., Porter, G., McGuire, D., Garavan, T. N., Heffernan, M. & Cleary, P. (2003). Creating intellectual capital: a Habermasian community of practice (CoP) introduction. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 27(2/3/4), 80–87. doi: 10.1108/03090590310468903
- Orlikowski, W. J. (2002). Knowing in practice: Enacting a collective capability in distributed organizing, *Organizational Science*, 13(3), 249-273. doi: 10.1287/orsc.13.3.249.2776
- Ortenblad, A. (2010). Odd couples or perfect matches? On development of management knowledge packaged in the form of labels. *Management Learning*, 41(4), 443-452. doi: 10.1177/1350507609356664
- Pace, W. (2000). Thinking seriously about human resource development. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 2(3), 44-48. doi: 10.1177/152342230000200306
- Pettigrew, T. F. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 49(1), 65-85. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.49.1.65
- Piaget, J. (1953). The origins of intelligence in children. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 17(6), 467-472. doi: 10.1037/h0051916
- Ponton, M. K., Carr, P. B., & Confessore, G. J. (2000). Learning conflation: A psychological perspective of personal initiative and resourcefulness. *Practice & Theory in Self-directed Learning*, 65-82.
- Popper, M. & Lipshitz, R. (1993). Putting leadership theory to work: A conceptual framework for theory-based leadership development. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 14(7), 23-27. doi: 10.1108/01437739310047001
- Potter, J. and Wetherell, M. (1987). *Discourse and Social Psychology: Beyond Attitudes and Behaviour*. Sage: London.
- Reagans, R., & McEvily, B. (2003). Network structure and knowledge transfer: The effects of cohesion and range. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 48(2), 240-267. doi: 10.2307/3556658
- Revans, R. (1985). Any more unmeeting twains?: Or action learning and its “Practitioners” in the 1980s. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 17(5), 8-11. doi: 10.1108/eb004012
- Robinson, S. L. & Bennett, R. J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(2), 555-572. doi: 10.2307/256693

- Rogers, C. R., Lyon, H. C., & Tausch, R. (2013). On becoming an effective teacher. *Person-centred teaching, psychology, philosophy, and dialogues with Carl R. Rogers*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Rogers, C. R. (1983). *Freedom to learn for the eighties*. Ohio: Merrill.
- Rogers, C. R. (1951). *Client-centered therapy: Its current practice, implications, and theory*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin
- Sandlin, J. A., Wright, R. R., & Clark, C. (2011). Reexamining theories of adult learning and adult development through the lenses of public pedagogy. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 63(1), 3-23. doi: 10.1177/0741713611415836
- Sankey, K. S., & Machin, M. A. (2014). Employee participation in non-mandatory professional development – the role of core proactive motivation processes. *International Journal of Training and Development*, 18(4), 241-255. doi: 10.1111/ijtd.12036
- Schlossberg, N. K. (1987). Taking the mystery out of change. *Psychology Today*, 21(5), 74-75.
- Schön, D. A. (1983). *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action*. New York: Basic Books.
- Schön, D. A. (1987). *Educating the Reflective Practitioner: Toward a New Design for Teaching and Learning in the Professions*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Skule, S., & Reichborn, A. (2002). *Learning-Conductive Work: A Survey of Learning Conditions in Norwegian Workplaces*. Luxembourg: CEDEFOP.
- Snow, C. C., & Ketchen, D. J. (2014). Typology-driven theorizing: A response to Delbridge and Fiss. *Academy of Management Review*, 39(2), 231-233. doi: 10.5465/amr.2013.0388
- Spreitzer, G. M., & Mishra, A. K. (2002). To stay or to go: Voluntary survivor turnover following an organizational downsizing. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(6), 707-729. doi: 10.1002/job.166
- Sveningsson, S. & Larsson, M. (2006). Fantasies of leadership: Identity work. *Leadership*, 2(2), 203-224. doi: 10.1177/1742715006062935
- Syvänen, S., & Tikkamäki, K. (2013). Dialogic leadership and ICT-intensive work places: How to enhance learning potential. In A Tatnall *et al.* (Eds.), *Open and Social Technologies for Networked Learning*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer.
- Syvänen, S., Kasvio, A., Loppela, K., Lundell, S., Tappura, S., & Tikkamäki, K. (2012). *Dialogic Leadership of Creativity as a Transformational Factor*. In M. Virkajärvi

- (Ed.), proceedings of the 10th Work Research Conference, Tampere: University of Tampere.
- Taylor, G. S., Templeton, G. F., & Baker, T. L. (2010). Factors influencing the success of organizational learning implementation: A policy facer perspective. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 12(4), 353-364. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2370.2009.00268.x
- Tempest, S., & Starkey, K. (2004). The effects of liminality on individual and organizational learning. *Organizational Studies*, 25(4), 507-527. doi: 10.1177/0170840604040674
- Tharp, R. G., & Gallimore, R. (1988). *Rousing Minds to Life*. Cambridge University Press.
- Tikkamäki, K. (2013). *Communities of learning at work: making the invisible visible*. Presented at the 8th International Conference on Researching Work and Learning, Stirling, Scotland, June 2013.
- Tomer, J. (1988). Worker participation: Paths to higher productivity and well-being. In Shlomo Maital (ed.), *Applied Behavioral Economics*, Vol. 2 (p. 637–49). New York: New York University.
- Torraco, R. (2005). Writing integrative literature reviews: Guidelines and examples. *Human Resource Development Review*, 4, 356-367. doi:10.1177/1534484305278283
- Townley, B. (2008). *Reason's Neglect: Rationality and Organizing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tseng, W. S. (1973). The concept of personality in Confucian thought. *Psychiatry*, 36(2), 191-202.
- Tynjälä, P., Välimaa, J., & Sarja, A. (2013). Pedagogical perspectives on the relationships between higher education and working life. *Higher Education*, 46(2), 147-166. doi: 10.1023/A:1024761820500
- Van De Ven, A. H., & Poole, M. S. (1995). Explaining development and change in organisations. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(3), 510-540. doi: 10.2307/258786
- Van den Bosch, F., Van Wijk, R., & Volbreda, H. (2005). Absorptive capacity: antecedents, models and outcomes. In Easterby-Smith, M., & Lyles, M.A. (Eds), *Handbook of Organizational learning and Knowledge Management* (pp. 12-141). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Van Den Bossche, P., Gijselaers, W., Segers, M., Woltjer, G., & Kirschner, P. (2011). Team learning: Building shared mental models. *Instructional Science*, 39(3), 283-301. doi: 10.1007/s11251-010-9128-3

- Van Emmerick, I. (2004). More you can get better: Mentoring constellations and intrinsic career success. *Career Development International*, 9(6), 578-594. doi: 10.1108/13620430410559160
- Van Knippenberg, D., & Schippers, M. (2007). Work group diversity. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 58(1), 515-541. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.58.110405.085546
- Vansteenkiste, M., Simons, J., Lens, W. & Sheldon, K. M. (2004). Motivating learning, performance and persistence: The synergistic effects of intrinsic goal content and autonomy-supportive contexts. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87(2), 246-60. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.87.2.246
- Vince, R. & Saleem, T. (2004). The impact of caution and blame on organizational learning. *Management Learning*, 35(2), 133-154. doi: 10.1177/1350507604043022
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Boston, CT: Harvard College.
- Wang, C. L., & Chugh, H. (2014). Entrepreneurial learning: Past research and future challenges. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 16(1), 24-61. doi: 10.1111/ijmr.12007
- Weick, K. E. (1996). Drop your tools: An allegory for organizational studies. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41, 301-313. doi: 10.2307/2393722
- Weick, K. E., & Quinn, R. E. (1999). Organizational change and development. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 50(1), 361-386. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.50.1.361
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Wenger, E. (2003). Communities of practice and social learning systems. In D. Nicolini, S. Gherardi and D. Yanow (Eds.), *Knowing in organizations. A practice-based approach* (pp. 77-99), New York, Sharpe,
- Whittle, A., & Spicer, A. (2008). Is actor network theory critique? *Organization Studies*, 29(4), 611-629. doi: 10.1177/0170840607082223
- Wilson, J. P. (2006). *Human resource development: Learning and training for individuals and organisations*. London, England: Kogan Page.
- Wilson, J. P. (2012). *International Human Resource Development: Learning, Education and Training for Individuals and Organizations* (3rd ed.). London: Kogan Page.
- Yeager, K. L., & Nafukho, F. M. (2011). Developing diverse teams to improve performance in the organizational setting. *European Journal of Training and Development*, 36(4), 388-408. doi: 10.1108/03090591211220320