THE MOST INFLUENTIAL LITERATURE OF

HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT: AN

EXPLORATORY DESCRIPTIVE STUDY

By

JENNIFER ANNETTE PEACOCK

Bachelor of Science
Southwest Missouri State University
Springfield, Missouri
1995

Master of Science
Southwest Missouri State University
Springfield, Missouri
1997

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
August 2003

THE MOST INFLUENTIAL LITERATURE OF

HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT: AN

EXPLORATORY DESCRIPTIVE STUDY

Thesis Approved:

Catherine M. Sleezer
Thesis Advisor

Gary J. Conti

Robert E. Nolan

K. Kelley

Timothy J. Pettibone
Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The Emerging Field of Human Resource Development

Human Resource Development (HRD) is an interdisciplinary field that focuses on the learning and performance improvement of individuals, groups, and organizations (McLagen, 1989; Russ-Eft, Preskill, & Sleezer, 1997; Sleezer & Sleezer, 1997). Many disciplines have contributed to the field of HRD, including education, economics, psychology, ethics, sociology, engineering, human resources, organizational development, general systems theory, organizational behavior, and management science (Hatcher, 1999; Jacobs, 1989, 1990; Swanson, 1996; Wimbiscus, 1994).

Because HRD, as a discipline, is not well understood by its own professional membership, some HRD scholars have advocated that collectively HRD professionals should adopt the goal "to identify who we are, what we stand for and what we can do for those we serve" (Ruona, 2000; p.2) as well as investigate the advocacy or resistance of moving toward a single definition of HRD (Russ-Eft, 2000).

Some scholars have risen to the challenge of researching the core belief systems of HRD. Roth (2000) asserted that these efforts were good to emulate. Swanson

1

(2000) offered his definition of core beliefs: "the beliefs that reflect our view of truth—are at the root of articulating visions and missions (p. 35)". Swanson (2000) further noted that raising core beliefs to a conscious level is not a natural human activity. However, discourse over theoretical and philosophical issues can deepen the shared professional interest and contribute to better understanding the state of the discipline (Chalofsky, 2000; Roth, 2000; Ruona, 2000).

Exploring these theoretical and philosophical issues help bind HRD as a unique discipline. Some specific issues being considered by HRD scholars include ethics, values, philosophical beliefs, and such external influences as politics and economics (Ruona, 2000; Russ-Eft, 2000).

One particular issue that needed consideration by the HRD profession is the literature that binds the field. A mature field has a recognized body of knowledge and literature that provides a basis for theory, research, and practice (Donald, 1995; Jacobs, 1989; Sleezer & Sleezer, 1997).

A solid literature and knowledge base provides a foundation for a discipline (Dorlean, 1988). Guralnik (1986) found that disciplines are defined epistemologically by the study (or theory) of origins, methods, and limits of

knowledge. Consequently, a field's process of knowledge acquisition is critical to defining a discipline; particularly knowledge validation and truth criteria (Donald, 1995). In turn, the identification of a body of knowledge for a discipline reflects the perceptions of the experts who identify the literature nominations. Of course, this unique, recognized body of knowledge must be tested and understood through criteria drawn from both theory and practice (Jacobs, 1989). For example, the pattern and frequency of citation use provides descriptive information about the discipline.

Baldwin (2000) noted that HRD is fragmented with no recognition of the existing literature base. Moreover, HRD practitioners may have placed more emphasis in the past on the how-tos and not given sufficient attention to the conceptual base that enables the field (Nadler & Nadler, 1989; Gilbert, 1978).

The Problem Statement

The discipline of HRD lacks a recognized comprehensive list of the literature contributions that are foundational to the field. HRD scholars have bemoaned the use of flavor-of-the-month resources (Sleezer & Kunneman 1999; Leimbach, 1999; Swanson, 1995). Rather than flavor-of-the-month resources, HRD needs a useful list of seminal works that

3

have contributed greatly to the field. This list of HRD's underpinning literary works could help bound the HRD discipline. Such a list could also benefit faculty members who design curriculum for HRD programs and new entrants into the HRD field.

A list of the *most influential* resources differs from a list of the *best* resources. Clawson (1998) explained in *Required readings: Sociology's most influential books*, that a list of most influential works is not a claim about the quality or merit of the resources, but rather a claim about the state of the discipline.

For example, in a rich, complex and diverse field, scholars cannot claim to entirely encapsulate a single volume of *classics* for a field (Enis & Cox, 1991; Shafritz & Ott, 1992). It is possible, however, to identify and provide a representative sample of a discipline's most influential, significant works (Shafritz & Hyde, 1987).

A representative sample of HRD's most influential literature can provide a snapshot of one aspect of the HRD field; the literature as identified by leading HRD experts. Furthermore, such a snapshot can be examined to determine the pattern and the frequency with which the *Top Tier* pieces of influential HRD literature are cited.

Many studies of the foundational works in various disciplines can be found in the literature. Some researchers called their findings the *classics*; others chose *core* literature, and some suggested *required readings* or *most influential works*.

Unofficial and unpublished HRD bibliographies may exist. An agreed upon list of citations has not been developed for the HRD field. In the information boom of the 21st century, HRD practitioners and scholars searching for potentially applicable HRD materials and sorting through them to weigh their quality face a daunting task (Sleezer & Sleezer, 1997).

All professions have thought leaders, theorists, and practitioners who build frameworks for their disciplines (Varney, 1990). The field of HRD does formally recognize a group of scholars and thought leaders. The Academy of Human Resource Development (AHRD) originated a Scholar Hall of Fame dating back to 1993 that recognizes individuals who have influenced the field of HRD. However, the award is global in nature, honoring a person's career contributions over time, rather than designating value to specific works. It is interesting to note that many recipients of this honor have come from outside the practicing field of HRD.

The Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this exploratory descriptive study is two-fold: First, to explore whether a most influential literature list exists in the HRD field based on the use of expert surveys and citation analysis. Second, to gain insight into the level of influence that the various pieces of most influential literature have had on recent HRD research.

One result of the study will be a snapshot of the status of the field relative to the most influential literature in Human Resource Development. *Most influential literature* is defined as those articles and books that are milestones and increasingly acknowledged to be important and foundational to the field. These resources are widely quoted, reprinted, even attacked; they fare against the test of time and reflect the views of influential scholars and still continue to be useful (Enis & Cox, 1991; Shafritz & Hyde, 1987; Shafritz & Ott, 1992; Varney, 1990). Similar to the Organizational Theory literature contained in *The Classics of Organizational Theory* (Shafritz & Ott, 1992); the *most influential literature* identified by this study could serve as the foundation for subsequent building of the HRD field.

Research Questions

The research questions addressed in this study are:

1) What are the HRD literature pieces that scholars consider to be the most influential to the discipline?

2) What is the pattern and frequency of the *Top Tier* citations for the group of expert's nominated list based on citation frequency analysis?

The first research question can be answered by using a Delphi technique to obtain the experts' opinions of which pieces of HRD literature are the most influential. The second research question can be answered by considering the top tier of most influential literature that the experts identified in comparison to the most frequently cited pieces of literature.

Assumptions of the Study

This study assumed that the experts who were selected to participate in the study represented the diverse perspectives of the HRD field. Further, this study assumed that the experts who were selected had the technology capabilities to access the electronic solicitation of surveys and e-mail and would respond to surveys in an accurate, timely, honest, and unbiased manner. Finally, the researcher trusted the expert group to follow the provided instructions for the modified Delphi technique and to use

the precise definitions when carrying out the tasks in the surveys that would measure the given construct and result in an influential list of HRD literature.

Scope and Limitations

The scope of this study was limited to the literature available and familiar to the participants. This study was explorative and descriptive in design; investigating the perceptions held by selected experts in the HRD profession.

Inherent in any survey research is the data's reflection of the opinions of those who responded to the survey. Their opinions could have been influenced by many factors including varying research interests, professional roles, years of experience, kinds of expertise, and biases.

The study's limitations included the definitions of HRD and most influential literature, the method of administering the surveys, and the individuals surveyed. Different definitions, means of surveying or respondent groups could have produced different results.

Survey results also risked researcher bias in synthesizing survey responses and respondent bias in ranking and explaining the nominated entries. However, utilizing a modified Delphi technique, which inherently includes a system of checks and balances, minimizes such

bias. Specifically, the Delphi technique allows the respondents to provide input at every phase.

Significance of the Study

The purpose of this study was to provide a foundation for better understanding in two areas: (1) the experts' perception of HRD's most influential literature and (2) the patterns of the citations for the top tier of the expert-nominated list. The study results can make significant HRD contributions in 4 areas:

First, the study's results can contribute to HRD scholarship by showing the level of consensus among experts on what comprises the most influential literature. Such knowledge can begin to bind HRD as a discipline. Furthermore, the study's results can provide a foundation that future scholars can use to consider HRD's epistemology.

Second, the lists of influential literature can provide a basis for practitioners and scholars who want to link their current efforts to the perceived most influential works of HRD. The lists of influential literature can include a) *Most Influential HRD Literature as Identified by Experts (with Expert Comments/Rational for Citation Inclusion)*, b) *Top Eleven (Top Tier) HRD Citations Identified by Experts*, c) *The Top Eleven Expert*

Nominations: Actual Citation and Author Frequencies in a 2001 HRD Literature Analysis and d) *Top 18 Most Frequently Cited Works in the 2001 HRD Literature.* Passmore (1997) stated that for HRD to develop successfully as a field of practice, discipline-based knowledge must be present to enable the development of professional knowledge. The dissemination of study findings within the HRD field can start to address the needs of HRD faculty, students, and other individuals who are developing professional HRD knowledge.

For example, novice HRD professionals can use the study's results to familiarize themselves with key works in the field. Also, faculty who design curriculum for HRD academic programs can use the study's results as a general reference.

Third, the lists can inform thinking about the current pattern of citing of HRD literature, particularly the *Citation and Author Frequencies in a 2001 HRD Literature Analysis: The Top Eleven Nominations* and the *Top 18 Frequent Citations in the 2001 HRD Literature.* The HRD field has been labeled as atheoretical. Therefore, research findings can help determine the echelon of citations that experts deemed influential to the field.

Fourth, the research process itself can contribute to the field. By participating in such a study, experts engage in contemplation and exchange about what is foundational in the HRD literature and why; they further may reflect on which sources are being cited in the current HRD literature and why.

Definition of Terms

The following definitions were used in the study to provide common meanings for terms:

- *Discipline*: "a body of knowledge with its own organizing concepts, codified knowledge, epistemological approaches, undergirding theories, particular methodologies, and technical jargon" (Passmore, 1997, p. 201).

- *Human Resource Development (HRD)*: the study and practice of human interactions in organizations including interactions with processes, tools, systems, other humans, or even the self... HRD encompasses knowledge, skill, and value bases. "The goal of HRD is to understand the interactions, processes, and systems and to ultimately support and improve individual, process, and organizational learning and performance" (Sleezer & Sleezer, 1997, p. 185).

- *HRD Experts*: In this study, HRD experts were subject matter specialists and included both practitioners and

scholars in the HRD field who have contributed a chapter
to the *Human Research Development Research Handbook:*
Linking Research and Practice (Swanson & Holton, 1997).
Fifteen authors contributed to the research handbook.

- *Member Checks*: Research strategies that ask stakeholder
groups to react to what has been presented from previous
construction are called member checks. (Guba & Lincoln,
1989).

- *Most Influential Literature*: Articles and books that are
milestones and increasingly acknowledged to be important
and foundational to a field are those resources that are
widely quoted, reprinted, and even attacked; they fare
against the test of time and reflect the views of
influential scholars and continue to be useful (Enis &
Cox, 1991; Shafritz & Hyde, 1987; Shafritz & Ott, 1992;
Varney, 1990).

Summary

The discipline of HRD has not been well understood by
its own membership. Exploratory research is needed that
describes the status of HRD's most influential literature.
Specifically, research is needed that describes whether a
body of most influential literature exists--and, if it does
exist, the level of influence that the literature has had
on recent research. Such research can provide a snapshot of

the discipline and can contribute to the foundation of the
HRD field's scholarship, education, and practice.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Human Resource Development (HRD) is arguably a field of practice. Many HRD professionals have actively worked to move the HRD field toward professional, or disciplinary, status. HRD has reached a critical stage in its development—growing from its early stages to a more mature stage where HRD has more potential than ever before to contribute to organizations and to the individuals that comprise them (Ruona, 2000b).

This review of the literature provides a scholarly background for the study by overviewing the history of HRD, considering HRD as a discipline, describing the Delphi technique, describing citation analysis, and over viewing multi-methodology research.

Overview of Human Resource Development

This section overviews some discrete movements that the HRD field has undergone in the crucial stages of building solid credibility in the business and academic worlds, continually progressing toward a more narrowly defined true discipline. The interdisciplinary nature of HRD has caused natural clashes of beliefs, and so far there has been little agreement on the underlying definition or primary theories that are foundational to the field

14

(Weinberger, 1998). In-depth discussions over unsettled issues between HRD practitioners and scholars can enrich the state of the discipline and push the envelope further.

This section first provides background about the HRD field and then discusses the following important movements in the HRD field: The evolution of the field between the 18th and 20th centuries, the birth and development of professional associations, the search for the definition of HRD, competencies, HRD research, the disciplinary foundations for HRD, learning versus performance, philosophical and core beliefs, and the establishment of professional codes of ethics and standards.

Background of HRD

Informal training has historically been traced to the cave dwellers who learned by observing the skills that were possessed by other tribe or family members (Swanson & Torroco, 1995). Learning was a means of survival. In spite of the cave dweller connection, the broader field of HRD is young in comparison to many other related fields that have reported histories that date back hundreds of years (Ruona, 2000). Most accounts of the HRD field date back merely forty to fifty years (Ruona, 2000).

In spite of limited history, the last five or six decades have been filled with rich and diverse discourse

over important foundational issues by scholars and practitioners as they attempted to better answer the question: What exactly is HRD? This discourse was coupled with research and new knowledge that brought about dynamic changes and progress in the way HRD professionals defined themselves, conducted research, and engaged in practice.

More recently, HRD has become increasingly important to organizations across the globe, providing a means of survival in today's information age. Indeed, HRD's recent enormous boom in popularity has been attributed to organization decision makers' increasing demand and need for guidance in attempting to accommodate a whirlwind of continual technology, economic, and social changes (Bassi, Cheney, & Van Buren, 1997; Swanson & Torroco, 1995; Webber, 1993).

Evolution of the HRD field from the 18th to the 20th Century

Ruona and Swanson (1998) claimed that HRD is still an evolving and young discipline with its roots in training and development. The origins of HRD can be traced directly back to the apprenticeship training programs of the eighteenth century.

The world's industrial revolution was another major contributor to the field, starting in England in 1750 and eventually spreading to the United States. The industrial

16

revolution highlighted the need for employee training and provided the training field with exposure and an initial reputation. Following the industrial revolution, strong contributions to learning were made from the early vocational education programs and the factory schools of the 1800's (DeSimone & Harris, 1998; Nadler & Nadler, 1989).

In the early 1900's, a large corporation in the auto industry, Ford Motor Company, began using production assembly lines to mass-produce the Model T car. Workers on the assembly line were assigned specialized work and received more formal, organized training in specialized skills. To remain competitive, other automobile manufacturers followed suit in specializing work and providing their employees with formal training. The result was a proliferation of organizational training programs across the U.S. (Bowen, 1998; Craig, 1996; DeSimone & Harris, 1998).

When the U.S. economy experienced its greatest depression in history, training saw its first major decline in popularity. As organizations tried to keep from failing, many skilled workers were fired or laid off and training seemed to be an obvious function to eliminate (Bowen, 1998; Craig, 1996; Nadler & Nadler, 1989). Organizations found it

easier to obtain the workers that they needed from the enormous pool of the skilled unemployed than to provide training for the unskilled (Nadler & Nadler, 1989).

World War I and World War II prompted tremendous expansion in training efforts to meet the needs of millions worldwide. Historically, training has always grown stronger when nations are in state of emergency (Craig, 1996). Wartime has traditionally led to an upsurge in developing new technologies and initiates large fluctuations in the economy that signals dramatic surges in training needs (Jacobs, 2000; Nadler & Nadler, 1989).

The Birth and Development of Professional Associations

The birth and development of professional associations is important to the growth of a field. In April 1942, a professional organization, the American Society for Training Directors was founded. The name of the association changed to American Society for Training and Development (ASTD) in 1964, and the organization has remained strong (Craig, 1996), as evidenced by their recent expansion to serve members internationally.

ASTD published the first informal printed collaboration between trainers, a newsletter entitled *Industrial Training News*, for its members in 1945. The newsletter had several format and name changes, developing

first into the publication *Training & Development Journal* (Craig, 1996) and more recently into *Training and Development*.

A second professional HRD organization started May 7, 1993, The Academy of Human Resource Development (AHRD). AHRD was developed to meet the need for a professional organization with a specific mission of furthering the HRD field through research.

While ASTD has been known primarily as a practitioner's organization, AHRD membership has been comprised of academicians and practitioner-scholars. Both organizations have had active international members and some overlapping members. Furthermore, both organizations have cooperated to continue to define and develop HRD as a profession.

A third well-recognized professional association founded in 1962 was the National Society for Programmed Instruction, later changed to the National Society for Performance and Instruction, and contemporarily named the International Society for Performance Improvement (ISPI). ISPI's mission statement is "dedication to improving productivity and performance in the workplace" (http://www.ispi.org).

Through the research and hard work of these three large professional associations' membership, the HRD field has moved away from its traditional training and development focus to become a more integral part of an organization's business strategy (Grieves & Redman, 1999).

Search for the Definition of HRD

What exactly is HRD? This question has been tossed around and scrutinized for decades. One heated debate in HRD is whether the field unquestionably needs a unifying definition that provides a clear focus for the development of the profession and most importantly sets boundaries on the limits of the field (Chalofsky, 1992).

Watkins (1991) deemed that a definition was necessary to bring clarity to a field of practice. Attempts to find this clarity has led to numerous publications in the literature, each containing various compilations of existing HRD definitions. Ruona and Swanson (1998) found that many authors have scrutinized, sorted through, studied and analyzed the fifteen-plus available definitions of HRD; searching for common themes and key differences.

Perhaps part of the difficulty in precisely defining HRD has been the diverse titles or names that have been assigned to the field (Nadler & Nadler, 1989). Individuals who use a definition of HRD interpret it through their own

perspectives, each perspective then leading to different emphasis (Watkins, 1991). ASTD identified nearly three hundred HRD academic programs; many housed in different colleges within universities and all claiming stake to the field of HRD. Watkins (1991) noted that each department has a great deal of leverage in assigning different roles and asserting different definitions to the field of practice.

Diversity within the field has led to a variety of definitions. Watkins (1989) defined HRD as "the field of study and practice responsible for the fostering of long term, work-related learning capacity at the individual, group, and organizational levels. As such, it includes -- but is not limited to -- training, career development, and organizational development" (p. 427). Nadler and Nadler's (1989) definition was "organized learning experiences" that focus on training, education, and/ or development of the individual so as to "bring about the possibility of performance improvement and/or personal growth."(p. 4). Swanson (1995) defined HRD as: "a process of developing and/or unleashing human expertise through organization development, personnel training, and development for the purpose of improving performance" (p.1-2). There are three levels of performance: individual, group(s) (or process), and organization.

The above definitions of HRD vary in focus, purpose
and outcomes. Furthermore, none are at the level of
specificity needed for distinguishing HRD research from the
research of other fields (Sleezer, Sleezer, & Pace, 1996).
A modified version of Sleezer and Sleezer's (1997)
definition can be used to operationalize the term HRD:

> Human resource development is the study and
> practice of human interactions in organizations
> including interactions with processes, tools,
> systems, other humans, or even the self. HRD
> encompasses knowledge, skill, and value bases.
> The goal of HRD is to understand the
> interactions, processes, and systems and to
> ultimately support and improve individual,
> process, and organizational learning and
> performance ...

Competencies: Roles and Areas within HRD

One voice that without doubt had considerable
influence in defining HRD was the American Society for
Training and Development (ASTD) (Watkins, 1991). This
professional association conducted many competency studies
that attempted to bind the HRD field as it continued to
develop. Perhaps the most influential ASTD competency
studies were the national studies conducted by McLagan in
1983 and 1989, which have been widely known as a benchmark
study for standards of practice for learning facilitators
in the workplace (Watkins, 1991). McLagan's 1989 *Models for
HRD Practice*, with its HRD wheel, expanded the definition

of HRD from a focus only on training and development to a focus that included career development and organizational development (Weinberger, 1998). Recent studies have shown that the competencies for practice, which were established in 1989, have persisted and are still being practiced and taught in graduate programs (Powell & Hubschman, 1999).

HRD Research

Lippitt and Nadler published the first major empirical study on HRD itself in 1967 (Chalofsky, 1989). Lippitt and Nadler's (1967) work focused on the roles of training directors in the workplace. HRD research has exploded in the last ten years or so, producing volumes of research aimed at improving learning and performance (Ruona & Swanson, 1998). For example, AHRD alone publishes a newsletter and four quarterly journals.

An important book for the field was written in 1997, *Human Resource Development Research Handbook*. It championed carrying out sustained, long-term growth in HRD; writing about the conducting, using, and partnering in research; and truly making a difference for daily HRD practices (Melrose, 1997). HRD's research handbook was written "out of a passion among the researchers in helping the profession harvest the best from research to improve its theory and practice" (p. xiii). The Academy of Human

Resource Development and The American Society for Training & Development, two of the most recognized HRD professional organizations, sponsored the research handbook.

Disciplinary Foundations for HRD: Search for a Metaphor

It has been widely acknowledged that HRD is a field rooted in numerous disciplines (Ruona & Swanson, 1998). The most promising search for an HRD model emerged from the widely discussed debate between Dr. Richard A. Swanson and Dr. Gary N. McLean (Grieves & Redman, 1999). Each scholar offered a metaphor to conceptualize the origins and foundations of HRD.

Swanson's (1995) metaphor for HRD was a three-legged stool. Each leg of the stool represented one of the three disciplinary bases of HRD: (1) economics, (2) general systems theory, and (3) psychology. Swanson chose a stool for its ability to stand secure on multiple surfaces and further to display a belief that all three disciplines are necessary for HRD to be considered a major business process (Swanson, 1995). Recently, Ruona and Swanson (1998) added ethics as a mediator of HRD foundations, represented visually by a rug that the stool rests upon, that acts as a filter between the three primary theories within the context of HRD.

McLean (1998) conceptualized HRD using more complex metaphors. He first suggested something as intricate as a centipede, but settled for an octopus. McLean (1998) chose multiple-leg creatures to stress the limitless sources of input into the complexity of HRD; the octopus was specially chosen in efforts to simplify the hundred-legged centipede.

So, the two most popular HRD metaphors have presented different views about the number of disciplines that contribute to HRD. Albeit these two metaphors have been the most readily recognized, countless other HRD metaphors exist (Short, 2000).

Learning versus Performance

An ongoing major discussion in the profession has been whether performance or learning should be the goal of HRD (Kuchinke, 2000). Watkins argued that HRD had a learning foundation. Learning, a historic root of HRD, has been predominate through its influence on training and through such concepts as the learning organization. Swanson (1995) argued that although learning has been predominate in the HRD field, performance must be emphasized for HRD to develop as a core business process.

The performance literature has grown in HRD's recent history. Gilbert's (1978) work on measuring competency and workplace performance was seminal. Others also strongly

advocated the performance orientation to the field (e.g., Rummler & Brache, 1995; Swanson, 1995; Weinberger, 1998). Performance in organizations has been viewed as transpiring on three different levels: (1) individual, (2) groups (or processes), and (3) organizational (Rummler & Brache, 1995; Fisher & Sleezer, 1999; Swanson, 1995).

The learning versus performance argument positioned the two concepts: "learning" and "performance" as competing and equal outcomes (Holton, 2000). Holton (2000) noted that in reality, this theoretical argument is not appropriate because performance and learning actually represent two kinds of outcomes that are complementary, not competing. Kuchinke (2000) observed that the debate was over what "should be", and rather than "what is". Further he noted, instead of idly debating opposing issues, the literature of HRD needs to move beyond conjecture to opulent observation and description of the nature of the field. Holton (2000) added that it would be naïve to think that performance and learning paradigms will converge; however, additional common ground could be identified and he stated that HRD professionals should continue to investigate and collaborate on scholarly research connecting the two frameworks.

Philosophical and Core Beliefs: A Greatly Needed Search

Ruona and Swanson (1998) stated that the key to any occupation in search of credibility and professional status is its efforts to define itself, build on its history, and determine its foundational basis. However, the relationship between HRD theory and practice has remained ambiguous and somewhat controversial (Hatcher, 1999).

Ruona (2000) championed efforts to revive philosophical activity as it related to and influenced HRD. Ruona (2000) emphasized "It is time for HRD to begin to identify its own system of beliefs as a community of professionals" (p. 3). Chalofsky (2000) concurred, stating that it was time to find a foundational philosophy that would be the guiding force and push the HRD field into the next evolutionary stage of development.

Establishing Professional Codes: Ethics and Standards

The AHRD Standing Committee on Ethics and Integrity (AHRD, 1999) developed and published a document entitled: "Standards on Ethics and Integrity". The document's purpose was to: (a) be an educational vehicle, (b) provide guidance for HRD professionals engaged in various practices or in academic settings, and (c) serve as an articulation of the values to which all HRD professionals should aspire in their work in attempting to be socially responsible.

HRD has reached a crucial point in its development (Swanson, 2000). It has fittingly been described as "a field in search of itself" (Chalofsky, 1992). The field has needed theory-building research that develops and articulates core theories. Powell and Hubschman (1999) stated that although this journey seems never-ending, it is reasonable to believe the field will mature, resulting at some point in less emphasis on the priority of foundational theory building. In its recent history, HRD has continued to change faster than at anytime in the profession's past.

HRD as a Discipline

This section overviews the disciplinary status of HRD by first examining the emerging definition of the term; the criteria for disciplines; types of disciplines; and the growth, evolution, and development of disciplines. Then the disciplinary status of HRD is considered.

Emerging Definition: Discipline

The term *discipline* has evoked debate and controversy when used to describe any area of study (Peters, Jarvis, & Associates, 1991). Unfortunately, such terms as *discipline, profession, occupation, field,* and *vocation* have seldom been differentiated in the literature.

Reaching agreement on one definition for the above terms has been problematic. Indeed, Jensen, Liveright, and

Hallenback (1964) stated that there are often as many different definitions, discussions, disagreements, and descriptions of professions and disciplines as there are people writing them. In addition to being dependent on individuals' interpretations, the terms have been in a constant state of flux, making it unlikely that one term will replace the others (Cogan, 1953). Moreover, it is unlikely that a single definition for any of the aforementioned words could be satisfactory to all (Shermis, 1962). So, multiple definitions of these terms are found in the literature.

The term *discipline* has been used in the HRD literature. Although a single, widely accepted definition for the term discipline has not yet been agreed upon, emerging themes were found by comparing existing, published definitions. Table 1 contains some definitions found in the literature.

All the definitions listed in Table 1 referred to a branch, domain, body, or area of knowledge. Components found in some but not all definitions included shared beliefs of members, backgrounds, methodologies, and undergirding theories. Analysis of the definitions in Table 1 revealed that Passmore's (1997) definition was the most

Table 1

Discipline Definitions from the Literature

Definition	Source
• an area of research with a more or less developed and defined methodology	Sears (1963)
• foundation upon which practice rests or from which it is developed	Schein (1973)
• not global; characterized as a unique perspective, a distinct way of viewing phenomena, ultimately defining the limits and nature of its inquiry; they are what reflect true distinctions between bodies of knowledge, per se, and such, become the realm of learning.	Donaldson & Crowley (1978)
• a specific body of teachable knowledge with its own background of education, training, procedures, methods and content areas	Mayville (1978)

Definition	Source
• a branch of knowledge or learning	Guralnik (1986)
• distinguishable by a domain of inquiry that represents a shared belief among its membership regarding its reason for being	Newman, Sime & Corcoran-Perry (1995)
• a body of knowledge with its own organizing concepts, codified knowledge, technical jargon, epistemological approaches, undergirding theories, and particular methodologies	Passmore (1997)
• (providing the structure necessary for common effort to solve common problems through common communication among researchers, unifying and providing continuity for research)	Passmore's (1997) extension of Schein's (1973) definition.

comprehensive and the most inclusive of themes appearing within and across the other definitions.

Ruona and Swanson (1998) claimed that HRD is currently progressing toward discipline status by meeting the criteria put forth in Passmore's definition. They noted that without this progress the field's future could become an atheoretical practice, have disconnected theory, and ultimately become an unstable discipline.

Criteria for Disciplines

Criteria for classifying an area as a discipline are specified in the literature. Shermis (1962) coined the expression "intellectual discipline" based on efforts to carefully investigate two acknowledged disciplines: liberal arts and sciences. By studying two popularly acknowledged disciplines, Shermis specifically concentrated on the criteria that shaped intellectual disciplines.

Shermis (1962) formulated five criteria that an intellectual discipline must meet: (a) a rather notable body of time-tested works (b) a technique suitable for dealing with concepts in the field, (c) a tradition that both links the present with the past and provides inspiration and sustenance for the future, (d) a considerable achievement in both eminent men *[sic]* and

significant ideas, and (e) a defensible claim to being an intimate link with basic human activities and aspirations.

Although Shermis (1962) focused on the liberal arts and sciences, many other fields exist that already potentially have these characteristics. Shermis (1962) also stated a belief that a discipline is an intellectual one if it acts like one; further, it should never be considered self-contained or a static entity but rather a process. While Shermis' five criteria were not established to distinguish between the non-disciplines and the disciplines, they do provide a foundation for accepting a branch of learning as a discipline (Donaldson & Crowley, 1978).

In studying *Education as a discipline*, Belth (1965) differentiated disciplines using another set of criteria. According to Belth (1965) one or more of the following four criteria must be evident: (a) objectives being sought, (b) a level of abstraction, (c) types and moral manifestations by which the profession is evaluated and limited, and (c) modes of thinking and reasoning by which the discipline is characterized.

Types of Disciplines

Jensen (1960) studied the field of education in depth to discover aspects of the discipline of education. Although

Jensen's work centered on the education field in general, the results are applicable to HRD, a specialization that has often been housed in education departments in both universities and industry. Jensen et. al, (1964) identified the following three aspects of education as a discipline: (1) descriptive (or factual), (2) normative, and (3) "an art, a practice, an engineering" (p.90). Each aspect is described in the following paragraphs.

The descriptive aspect of a discipline is concerned with studying biological, psychological, and sociological descriptions of human behavior and development that enable us to know what is possible and the conditions that must be present if the stipulated behaviors are to be realized. Descriptive aspects of disciplines accelerate research, concern themselves with historical and social roles in modern society, and develop a greater understanding of human behavior and interpersonal relationships. For example, efforts within HRD to detail the causes of human behavior within organizations are consistent with a descriptive discipline.

The normative aspect of a discipline is concerned with what should or ought to be. Normative disciplines should investigate educational processes and learning situations so that the best behavioral changes are brought about in

practice. The discipline should have a code of ethics and a philosophy so that the field develops a sense of social and personal responsibility about the limits of changing individuals and situations. For example, efforts within HRD to identify best practices are consistent with a normative discipline.

The aspects of a discipline that is considered as an art, a practice, or an engineering is concerned with organizing the bio- and psycho-sociological elements of the human organism's environment in keeping with disciplinary requirements, in a way that effectively brings about the realization of the proposed behaviors. Disciplines when considered an art, a practice, or an engineering are involved with the skills that make a discipline possible, specifically within the descriptive and normative limits which characterize the discipline. For example, efforts within the HRD field to use socio-technical theory and systems theory to structure work environments are consistent with discipline as an art, a practice, or an engineering.

Growth, Evolution and Development of Disciplines

Schein (1973) identified three components of professional knowledge: (a) an underlying discipline or basic science, (b) applied science or engineering and (c)

the skills and attitude that foster professional knowledge to clients. The major prototypes of professional knowledge that new and emerging disciplines have modeled are medicine, law and divinity (Cogan, 1953; Schön, 1983).

So how do emerging disciplines or even marginal areas of study become full-fledged disciplines that are widely accepted in the academic world? How do they perfect their techniques and build solid foundations and dependable generalizations? Shermis (1962) specified that professional members should first address immensely significant questions and develop the tools for answering those questions. Next, they should make a drastic commitment to changing attitudes toward theory; by immersing themselves into adopting the belief: "Theory is a tool, not a creed" (p. 85) and by finding significant, reoccurring themes. He encouraged scholars and practitioners alike to allow hypotheticals to push the field into further development. Finally, Shermis stressed the overall importance of dealing with questions of vital significance.

For those who would like yet another method to verify whether a field has reached the status of a discipline, Shermis (1962) offered a simple argument: Once a marginal field has successfully developed tools to deal with their subject matter and those tools are not merely technical,

but rather genuinely conceptual; discipline status has been acquired.

Disciplinary Status of HRD

Sleezer and Sleezer (1997) stated that HRD is a professional field of study and practice with its own unique body of knowledge and research. Passmore (1997) depicted HRD as an emerging field of study still dominated by practice, in need of discovering and documenting its disciplinary basis. Furthermore, he argued that this basis would add continuity and unification to HRD knowledge. Grieves and Redman (1999) claimed the HRD practitioner's role still "lacks precisions because it has not yet found its discipline" (p. 81).

Swanson (1996) offered support for disciplinary status by suggesting that HRD had three disciplinary bases that were crucially important to HRD research, using the previously described three-legged stool metaphor. However, not all HRD scholars agreed with Swanson's suggestion as evidenced by McLean's (1998) more complex octopus metaphor.

Several movements in the HRD field have attempted to address the criteria for moving the field closer to the status of a full discipline (e.g., the debates over definitions, focus, and philosophy). However, a documented body of most influential HRD literature has not yet been

described that reflects the immensely significant questions address by the field or the tools that have been developed. Such a documented body of most influential HRD literature could also address a criteria specified by Belth (1965) that the modes of thinking and reasoning by which the discipline is characterized be evident.

The next sections overview two data gathering techniques that can be useful in documenting HRD's most influential works, the Delphi technique and citation analysis.

Delphi Technique

Developing a list of HRD foundational literature that HRD experts have identified as most influential requires accessing the judgments of individual experts and then synthesizing those judgments to arrive at decisions. Special-purpose techniques that aid in understanding or decision making, called grouping techniques, have been identified as useful for situations where individual judgments must be tapped and combined to arrive at decisions that cannot be derived by one person (Delbeq, Van de Ven, & Gustafson, 1975). One widely used grouping method, the Delphi technique, has been applied across exceedingly diverse topics (Linstone & Turoff, 1975).

Overview of the Delphi Technique

Delphi has been the name commonly applied to a structured group communication process that is designed to elicit individual opinions with the aim of generating group responses, in hopes of reaching a discernible convergence, and answering complex problems to which there are no absolute answers (Dalkey, 1969; Linstone & Turoff, 1975; Zemke & Kramlinger, 1982). When using Delphi technique, Linstone and Turoff (1975) suggested using a broad, general definition that is not too restrictive or explicit so the creative process is not hindered. The Delphi technique was designed for idea generating or problem solving, not for negotiations, coordination, bargaining or routine meetings (Delbeq, et al, 1975). Delbeq, et al. (1975) noted that the Delphi process essentially uses written responses to aggregate judgments of individuals working toward a consensus.

History of the Delphi

The Delphi technique was a spin-off from military defense research--in particular, Dalkey and Associates', 1950's dual-sponsored research endeavor concerning use of expert opinion (Delbeq, et al, 1975). This U.S. Air Force-backed, Rand Corporation project was named "Project Delphi" (Dalkey & Helmer, 1963; Linstone & Turoff, 1975). The U.S.

Government asked the Rand Corporation to forecast and determine which U.S. cities would be attacked by enemy bombers in WWII and what the consequences would be (Zemke & Kramlinger, 1982). Because of highly sensitive, confidential defense topics and for security reasons, the Delphi technique was not known outside the defense community until almost a decade later. A publication titled "An Experimental Application of the Delphi Method to the Use of Experts" (Dalkey & Helmer, 1963) brought this research technique to the public attention.

The Delphi was named for a Greek prophet, Oracle at Delphi. In the sixth century B.C., individuals who wanted to look into the future submitted questions to the Oracle's temple because the Oracle at Delphi was considered the most powerful of Greece's prophets and forecasters (Zemke & Kramlinger, 1982). Dalkey (1969) stated that this name is misleading, and somewhat ironic because there is little that is oracular about the method.

Characteristics of the Delphi

This section describes the two processes that have been used for implementing the Delphi technique, the conditions associated with using it, its strengths and limitations, and information for operationalizing the Delphi technique.

Two Processes for Implementing the Delphi Technique:
Conventional versus Real-Time Forms

Today, two distinct forms of the Delphi technique exist. Linstone and Turoff's, *The Delphi Method* (1975) described the "conventional Delphi" and "real-time Delphi" forms. The most common form has been the conventional Delphi. This paper and pencil version has been frequently referred to as the "Delphi Exercise". This form relied on a small monitor team to design a questionnaire, summarize the results received from that questionnaire, and compose subsequent questionnaires based upon the questionnaire's results to send out to respondents for further questioning and clarification of responses. To some degree this form of Delphi combined both conferencing- and polling-type procedures.

A newer form, sometimes called the "Delphi conference" or "real-time Delphi", replaced the monitor team to a large extent by using a computer program to support a researcher in carrying out and compiling group results (Linstone & Turoff, 1975). This form of Delphi has relied more on an individual rather than governance by a team. Also, it requires that communication characteristics be well defined before the Delphi technique is begun, in contrast to the conventional form where the monitor team can adjust these

41

characteristics as a function of the group (Linstone & Turroff, 1975).

Conditions associated with using Delphi

Authors Delbeq, et al, (1975) and Zemke and Kramlinger (1982) agreed on three critical conditions that must exist to conduct the Delphi technique successfully: (a) the researcher must have and allow adequate time to conduct research, (b) the participants must have strong written communication skills and (c) the participants need high motivation and genuine interest in solving the problem.

Strengths and Limitations of Delphi

Linstone and Turroff (1975) stated that on the surface, the Delphi may seem simplistic, however, if individuals jump into the research process without carefully and proactively considering problems that could occur during the process, the researcher could have a disappointing experience. Table 2 outlines strengths and limitations of the technique.

Delbeq, et al, (1975) described the process of the Delphi technique as a series of questionnaires that may be particularly useful when the experts who are involved are unable to come together for face-to-face contact. In the process he described, the first questionnaire is designed with each subsequent questionnaire thereafter building on

42

responses from the previous. This process stops when progress stops; as indicated by the participant group reaching a consensus, by sufficient information being collected, or by something attaining a point at which it is explicitly definable (Delbeq, et al, 1975).

Operationalizing the Real-Time Delphi Form

As a guideline, Delphi studies usually have taken a minimum of 45 days to conduct. Delbeq, et. al offered a suggested timeline (see Table 3).

Linstone and Turoff (1975) stated that the Delphi technique is usually a multi-phase process. They described the first phase as the exploration of a subject or problem, wherein each individual contributes the additional information they feel is pertinent to the issue. This phase, as well as subsequent phases, requires the monitor team or researcher to provide controlled feedback to the respondents. The second phase involves the process of reaching an understanding of how the group views the issue (i.e. whether the group agrees or not and what they mean by relative terms such as importance, desirability, or feasibility). If significant disagreement exists among the respondents, the disagreement should be explored to bring out the underlying reasons for differences and perhaps to

Table 2

Strengths and Limitations of Using the Delphi Technique

Strengths

- draws upon current knowledge of experts
- requires little time commitment from respondents
- isolates the generation of ideas in writing; can produce a high quality of ideas
- isolates/gives anonymity to respondents, provides freedom from conformity pressures
- writing processes force respondents to think through the complexity of the problem and to submit high quality, specific ideas
- ensures every member's opinion is represented in final (statistical) group response.
- prevents domination of strong personalities, minimizes feelings and information normally communicated in face-to-face meetings since respondents cannot react to others ideas in this setting (e.g., tone of voice, gestures, look of the eye, etc).

Limitations

- controls the feedback given to the respondents after each questionnaire.
- lacks opportunity for social-emotional rewards, resulting in possible detachment from problem-solving effort
- requires more time for researcher(s)
- uses poor summarizing techniques

44

- presents group's responses, which may produce dissatisfying or misrepresented results

- commitments, researcher's time, and skills are demanding (e.g., communication, and synthesis) and may be underestimated

- assumes Delphi can be a surrogate for other communication within a situation

- pools and adds votes, handles conflicts or incompatible ideas on the feedback report (thus majority-ruling conflicts are not surely resolved)

- ignores/does not explore disagreements, therefore, discouraged dissenters may drop out and artificial consensus may be generated

Note. Sources: Andranovich, 1995; Dalkey, 1972; Delbeq, et al, 1975; Linstone & Turoff, 1975.

Table 3

Suggested Schedule for the Delphi Process

Activity	Suggested minimum time for accomplishment
1) Develop the Delphi question/test	½ day
2) Select/contact respondents	2 days
3) Select sample size	½ day
4) Develop questionnaire #1/ test	1 day
a. type/send out	1 day
b. response time	5 days

Activity	Suggested minimum time for accomplishment
c. dunning time	3 days
5) Analysis of questionnaire #1	½ day
6) Develop questionnaire #2/test	2 days
a. type/send out	1 day
b. response time	5 day
c. dunning time	3 days
7) Analysis of questionnaire #2	1 day
8) Develop questionnaire #3/test	2 days
a. type/send out	1 day
b. response time	5 days
c. dunning time	3 days
9) Analysis of questionnaire #3	1 day
10) Prepare a final report	5 days
a. type report and send out	1 day
b. prepare respondent's report	1 day
c. type report and send out	1 day
Total estimated timeframe	44 1/2 days

Note. Source: adapted from Delbeq, Van de Ven, & Gustafson; 1975.

evaluate them in the third phase. The last phase is a final evaluation that involves reporting results after all the other analysis is complete and given back to the group for consideration.

Member checking is inherent in Delphi studies. Guba and Lincoln (1989) defined member checks as those procedures that ask stakeholder groups to react to what has been presented from previous construction. Member checks afford the following functions: provide a chance for participants to judge overall accuracy, give the respondents a chance to correct errors or change entries of items "on record", and provide a chance for the researcher to summarize data, not only for the respondents, but as a step toward data analysis (Guba & Lincoln, 1989). Additionally, member checks can be used for verifying, or crosschecking, the data collected from respondents in earlier steps of the research (Guba & Lincoln, 1989).

Citation Analysis

How is it known who is influencing the literature of a particular field? Citation analysis, a sub-area of bibliometrics (also called scientometrics), is one method for determining just that. This scientific technique has been used to examine linkages within bodies of knowledge by counting the publications, the references authors made to others' works, the citations to published works, and the linkage between literature references and citations (Baker, 1990; Rubincam, 1987).

Citation counts, also called citation frequency, has been identified as one bibliometric measure. Other measures include bibliographic coupling, document co-citation analysis, author co-citation analysis, and co-word analysis (Baker, 1990; Smith, 1981). Cronin (2001) found that bibliometricians' core value was to count and measure things in an effort to objectively track indicators of performance, such as highly visible and notable efforts by scholars. The most frequently used indicator in citation analysis has been publication references and citations (Cronin, 2001).

Baker (1990) stated that referencing and citation measures reflect how knowledge becomes grounded. A reference is the acknowledgment an author *gives* to another's work. A citation is the acknowledgement that a document *receives* from another work. Hence, current knowledge and its representative works have been grounded in literature of the past (Baker, 1990).

Baker (1990) observed that citation data are readily available, unobtrusive, precise, and objective. However, norms for citing works have varied from discipline to discipline (Smith, 1981). Smith (1981) noted that there are numerous reasons authors cite and equally as many relationships between the cited and the citing documents.

History of Citation Analysis

Bibliometric analysis derives from Eugene Garfield's bibliometric work in the journal *Science* in the mid-nineteen-fifties. Garfield's core work laid the foundation for the most highly investigated databases in the research world including such literature compilation databases as SSCI, SCI, and ERIC (Cronin, 2001). His work was inspired by the mass legal databases Shepard had created a century earlier (Cronin, 2001).

One finding from Cronin's (2001) research on web-based citation analysis was that the capacity of the World Wide Web (www) had permitted new, more advanced methods that he predicted would continue to advance beyond those currently known and continue to pave the way for even greater possibilities to be developed in the future. Cronin predicted that researchers would begin using an entirely new generation of web-developed citation indexing tools. He also predicted that as publication practices are enriched by web capabilities, rich opportunities will emerge for bibliometricians to adapt techniques to fit different contexts and contents and that these opportunities may revolutionize many of the underpinning assumptions that are currently held about scholarly communication systems.

49

Strengths of Citation Analysis

Smith (1981) stated that pointing out references to a reader is an essential part of the subject. The meaning from the reference gets embedded into future literature of the same subject. Smith also recognized that if one assumed that citations indicate importance, then one could then also use such analysis to determine a discipline's or sub-discipline's most important scholars, publications, departments, etc. Citation analysis can provide a means for constructing indicators of research activity in a field (Baker, 1990). For example, citation analysis and other extended measures have been used in the Social Work field to scrutinize the field from a historical perspective.

Coombs (1964) stated that one major advantage of citation analysis is that it allows for the evaluation of information flows. Information gained from unraveling linkages in the literature helps emanate new emerging literature. Baker (1990) further pointed out that once researchers (in social work, as in any field) break down and diminish any accumulated complexities, they may reveal separate but related scholarly concepts; allowing researchers to start extending the application of problems and intricacies in a field to new directions.

Everette and Pecotich (1993) observed that although what is published is affected by countless variables, what is published is that which has the greatest impact on disciplines and future progress of disciplines. Rubincam (1987) stated that citation analysis, in principal, is a more stable measure of significance than the opinion of a small group of subject matter experts.

Limitations in Using Citation Analysis

Garfield (1972) offered a caution about using citation frequency: Citation frequency is a function of numerous variables including author reputation, availability, subject matter controversiality, coverage of secondary sources, allocation of research funds, reprint dissemination, etc. Citation frequency does not provide information on these variables. Also, expert researchers could be greatly influenced by authors' and intellectuals' literature pieces that they do not necessarily cite in their own published works. Everette and Pecotich (1993) also conscientiously noted that works might be cited by authors due to availability rather than actual intrinsic merit.

Cronin (2001) stated that in spite of a compelling body of research findings to support the core value of citation analysis, critics have long pointed out that

citations cannot and should not solely be used for indicating quality, utility, or even the impact of works. For example, they noted that this methodology may exclude edited journals, such as monographs and chapters in books, and--due to the time lapsed between publication and citation--recently published authors. Also, they noted that citation analysis may be influenced by journal exposure, quantity of publications, frequency of publication, multiple authorship, self-citations, fluctuations with time, field variations, errors, etc.

Despite limitations, the value of citation frequencies has not been overshadowed; citation analysis can provide crucial assistance in identifying significant influences on a field (Rubincam, 1987; Smith, 1981). The limitations of citation analysis can be addressed by being aware of the limits and by using it in multi-methodology research.

Multi-Methodology Research

Denzin (1989) depicted the work of researchers who (1) employ multiple methods, (2) seek out diverse empirical sources and (3) attempt to develop interactionally grounded interpretations as "rigorous". Similarly, Zemke and Kramlinger (1982) stated that multi-methodology designs often generate more alternative responses, give participants the chance to work independently yet still

enable them to endorse and promote other responses once they appear on paper; a spin-off benefit that helps avoid possible eliminations of ideas.

Merriam and Simpson (1984) identified two appropriate and relevant times to use multi-methodology designs: (1) when the problem does not lend itself to precise analytical or statistical techniques and (2) for minimizing the influences of strong personalities, that otherwise in face-to-face meetings, could alter outcomes. Furthermore, a multi-methodology design helps sort out priorities and options (Merriam & Simpson, 1984). Webb (1966) argued that more valid and credible research findings result when multi-methods are used.

Summary

This review of the literature presented the scholarly background for the study by providing an overview of the history HRD, considering HRD as a discipline, describing the Delphi technique, describing citation analysis, and over viewing multi-methodology research. This review highlighted the lack of research on the influential literature in the HRD field and its importance to the development of the field as a discipline.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter describes the research methods used in the study and includes four sections: (a) overview of the research study, (b) selection of subjects, (c) design of the study, and (d) research instrumentation. Together these sections describe the research process that was used to investigate the most influential literature contributions in the field of HRD.

Overview of the Research Study

The goal of this study—to explore the resources that are recognized as the most influential literary contributions—is consistent with the uses of descriptive research. According to Trochim (2000), research projects can address three basic types of questions: (a) descriptive, (b) relational and (c) causal (http://trochim.cornell.edu). Trochim also provided the following definition of a descriptive study:

> When a study is designed primarily to describe what is going on or what exists. Public opinion polls that seek only to describe the proportion of people who hold various opinions are primarily descriptive in nature. For instance, if we want to know what percent of the population would vote for a Democratic or a Republican in the next presidential election, we are simply interested in describing something (http://trochim.cornell.edu).

As Merriam (1988) pointed out, descriptive research is undertaken when description and explanation (rather than prediction based on cause and effect) are sought, when it is not possible or feasible to manipulate the potential causes of behavior, and when variables are not easily identified or are too embedded in the phenomenon to be extracted for study.

This study was designed as an exploratory descriptive study using both qualitative and quantitative data in a multi-methodology design. The study involved first collecting expert opinions about the influential pieces HRD literature using a slightly modified, two-phase Delphi survey process and then analyzing the number of times each piece of top tier, expert-ranked literature was cited during the third phase of the study as compared to the literature pieces that were actually cited. The subjects for this study were experts who had contributed to a chapter in the *HRD Research Handbook: Linking Research and Practice* (Swanson & Holton, 1997). These experts were invited to participate in a modified, two-phase Delphi activity to contribute opinions about the influential pieces of HRD literature. This study relied on three data collection phases. The first phase, nomination, initiated

the modified Delphi Technique for gathering nominations of HRD's most influential literature pieces.

The second phase, expert evaluation and explanation, completed the modified Delphi process. The experts from Phase I participated in this second phase by ranking each piece of nominated literature and explaining why each piece was important to be included in an influential literature list. Note that this study relied on slightly modified Delphi technique that consisted of only two phases of survey data collection.

The third phase, citation frequency analysis, was decidedly related, yet independent from the first two phases of the study. It involved analyzing the citation frequency of the top-tier pieces of the 2001 HRD literature that experts had identified as most influential.

Data was analyzed during each phase of the study using descriptive statistics. The analysis produced four lists a) *Most Influential HRD Literature as Identified by Experts (with Expert Comments/Rational for Citation Inclusion)*, b) *Top Eleven (Top Tier) HRD Citations Identified by Experts*, c) *Citation and Author Frequencies in a 2001 HRD Literature Analysis: The Top Eleven Nominations* and d) *Top 18 Frequent Citations in the 2001 HRD Literature*. Together, these lists

56

provide a historical snapshot of the foundational, literary underpinnings of the HRD field.

Selection of Subjects

The expert population for this study was purposefully selected. Each was a subject matter expert and scholar in Human Resource Development (HRD) who contributed to a chapter to the *HRD Research Handbook: Linking Research and Practice* (Swanson & Holton, 1997). Fifteen experts authored the chapters of the HRD Research Handbook. During Phase I of the study, all fifteen experts were contacted electronically via the Internet and asked to participate in the two-phase Delphi activity. As the experts submitted their surveys, the researcher returned an e-mail request for consent to use their data (Appendix A) with the consent form included as an e-mail attachment (Appendix B). The request communicated that respondents would be grouped and listed alphabetically as contributors in the researcher's final dissertation report, but that no individual responses will be reported or matched to expert names. The request also indicated after the study was completed the participants would receive a final report that summarized the results of the study.

The researcher noted that one of the fifteen experts in this study also served as this dissertation's Chair. No

subjects were involved in the final phase of the study that consisted of citation analysis.

<center>Design of the Study</center>

The following sections provide specific details on each of the study's three phases.

Phase I: Nomination Phase

The Delphi Process is a progressive methodology in which each consecutive step builds on the results of the previous step. The nomination phase, which initiated the Delphi technique in this study, focused on gathering the nominations of influential literature from experts. Solicitation for the experts' involvement was obtained electronically using e-mail and surveys (Appendix C) with follow-up phone calls to encourage participation.

The initial (Phase I) Delphi question was the key step to the Delphi process. If respondents had not understood the initial broad question, they might have answered inappropriately or dropped out. The Delphi survey questionnaire #1 asked the experts to nominate the most influential literature pieces in the field of HRD (Appendix D). The Phase I Delphi question in this study was: "Considering the definition of most influential literature provided, what works do you think are most influential to

HRD? Include all works you consider to be influential to HRD."

The design also specified sending a second follow-up e-mail that included the original email to all non-respondents following the requested deadline (Appendix E) and making individual follow-up phone calls to encourage participation from the non-respondent experts.

Phase II: Expert Evaluation and Explanation Phase

Expert evaluation (rank) and explanation, the second Delphi phase, completed the Delphi process begun in the first phase. The research design specified that the request (Appendix F) and Phase II web survey (Appendix G) would be sent to experts via e-mail. Each HRD expert was asked in the e-mail request to rank order the entire list of nominations that had been generated during Phase I of the study. Directions were provided on the survey for using a multi-tier approach for ranking. The tier choices were: *Top Tier, Middle Tier, Bottom Tier* or *Do Not Include* from a drop-down menu. Each expert was also asked to provide an expert opinion of the reason each nomination (given in Delphi phases I) should be included in a most influential list of HRD. A comment text field was also provided for experts. Responding to the survey in Phase II was expected to take each expert from two and one-half hours to three

hours. Survey responses were automatically e-mailed to the researcher once the expert clicked the submit button.

Similar to Phase 1, the process for addressing non-response was a follow-up e-mails phone calls to all non-respondents (Appendix H). Experts were asked again to submit the completed Phase II Survey, via the web, within one week.

Member checking is inherent to Delphi studies. Guba and Lincoln (1989) define member checks as those procedures that ask stakeholder groups to react to what has been presented from previous construction. A member check was used, whereby each expert could give feedback, by adding nominations and challenging any of the data, by choosing *Do Not Include* in the rankings and further explaining in the comments section. Because one intentional function of a member check was to provide an opportunity for participants to offer additional information (Guba & Lincoln, 1989), the experts could also add nominations to the listing of most influential HRD literature via the second page of the web survey.

To synthesize the experts' rankings, a score was calculated by giving each Top Tier rank four points, each Middle Tier rank three points, each Bottom Tier rank two points, and each Do Not Include rank one point. Non-

responses were given zero points. If the nomination had received a Top Tier ranking from at least 50% of the experts and had no Do Not Include votes, then the citation was considered to be in the Top Tier.

Trochim (2000) identified reliability as a concern when dealing with human experts; people are notorious for being distractible and inconsistent (http://trochim.cornell.edu). When using human subjects, one goal should be to conclude a strong relationship between true scores and observed scores, which can be investigated by measuring the Cronbach Alpha score using a statistical program such as SAS or SPSS. Cronbach Alpha is an intra-class coefficient, an inter-rater or inter-observer score. An Alpha score should not be labeled a statistical test, but a coefficient of consistency (reliability). A Cronbach Alpha score was run in the SAS software program of the expert ratings that were collected during Phase II of this study. The researcher also documented and synthesized the expert input that was obtained during Phases 1 and 2 to produce a ranked list of most influential HRD literature. The final lists from this phase were the *Most Influential HRD Literature as Identified by Experts (with Expert Comments/Rational for Citation Inclusion)* and the *Top Eleven (Top Tier) HRD*

Citations Identified by Experts. These lists both denoted the number of times each HRD work was nominated and the rankings that the experts assigned to each citation.

Phase III: Citation Frequency

Citation frequency as described by Garfield (1972) was used in this study to answer research question #2: What is the pattern and frequency of the *Top Tier* citations for the group of expert's nominated list based on citation frequency analysis?

The researcher gathered data on the frequency of citations for the top tier pieces of literature from four 2001 publications that are important to the HRD field: *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, *Advances in Developing Human Resources, AHRD International Research Conference Proceedings* and *Performance Improvement Quarterly*. AHRD publishes the first three sources and ISPI publishes the fourth source.

In preparation for citation analysis, all citations needed to be in electronic format so they could be entered into an Excel spreadsheet. The references of pieces of literature that were not available in electronic format were scanned using a scanner and text-bridging software and transferred into an Excel spreadsheet. All citations from

all the pieces of literature were sorted by author name(s) prior to performing a manual frequency count and analysis.

The frequency count and analysis focused on the *Top Eleven (Top Tier) HRD Citations Identified by Experts*. For comparison purposes, the citations and authors that were most frequently listed on the spreadsheet were also analyzed as this data represented the most frequent citations in the literature.

In summary, the study was designed to include three phases of data collection and analysis that would produce lists of influential HRD literature citations and show the pattern and frequency of the *Top Tier* citations. The Institutional Review Board (IRB) approved the research design on October 14, 2003 (Appendix J).

Research Instrumentation

Two web surveys were used in the study. The survey used in Phase I included the definition of most influential literature, the primary Delphi question, textboxes for nomination entries, and a submit button.

The second web survey asked for the expert's e-mail address and presented the 117 nominations that resulted from Phase I. Instructions guided experts to rank and provide comments in the available textboxes. Participants clicked next to move to the next page that had an

additional textbox for adding additional citations. Finally a submit button allowed experts to submit the second web survey.

Instrument Validity and Reliability

Establishing instrument validity is important in any research study. Questions for the Phase I survey, used in the nomination phase, were specifically developed to provide information on research question #1. Prior to sending the survey to the experts, the survey questions for Phases I and II were reviewed and pilot tested with HRD professionals and colleagues.

Expert review of survey questions is a proactive approach to helping work out data collection problems and to help guard against bias and weak reliability of results (Merriam & Simpson, 1984). In this effort, expert reviewers look for items that may be leading, vague, ambiguous, threatening or loaded with social desirability (Merriam & Simpson, 1984; Patten, 1998). A well-constructed and pre-tested survey assists in getting an adequate number of responses from participants (Merriam & Simpson, 1984).

Content validity is not a computed score, therefore there is no formula or way to express it quantitatively; rather it is determined by expert judgment (Trochim, 2000). Content validity in this study was achieved by carefully

providing all experts with the same definitions, providing clear instructions and checking for face validity by piloting both surveys used in the study.

Face validity is one aspect of content validity. Face validity simply means that participants can look at survey items and tell what the question asks and what the answer means (Patton, 1982). Borg and Gall (1989) added that face validity is the evaluator's appraisal of what the content of the test measures. This study sought face validity through Patten's (1998) suggestion of conducting survey-item tryouts with ten individuals who were experienced in writing and/or participating in survey research and similar to actual study's participants. These ten individuals were from outside the study population and were comprised of doctoral students, HRD experts, and faculty. They were asked to review, respond, and comment on the pilot survey questions.

Construct validity is the degree that translation of ideas into measures succeeded. Trochim (2000) summarized it as *truth in labeling* or asking if the researcher captured the intended concept. Gay (1985) would ask of this study, Did the expert surveys measure the non-observable trait (or construct); expert *judgment* of the most influential HRD literature?

In this study, testing the instruments for validity served an additional purpose of identifying technology glitches that could occur in the electronic dissemination of the surveys. The instrument testing process used the same web-based technology that would later be used for data collection in Phases I and II.

Summary

This exploratory, descriptive study relied on three phases to answer the research questions: (a) nomination phase (experts nominated pieces of literature), (b) evaluation and explanation phase (experts ranked the nominated literature and assessed its contribution to HRD and (c) citation analysis (the researcher examined the citation frequencies of the top tier HRD literature pieces). The study relied on a multi-methodology design: the first two phases were a slightly modified Delphi design and the last phase used citation frequency analysis.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

This chapter presents findings about the most influential literature contributions in the field of HRD. Specifically, the findings answer the following research questions:

(1) What were the HRD literature pieces that scholars considered to be the most influential to the discipline?

(2) What was the pattern and frequency of the *Top Tier* citations for the group of expert's nominated list during citation frequency analysis?

As described in Chapter 3, the first research question was answered using a modified Delphi technique and the second research question was answered by using citation analysis.

The results are reported and organized by the phases of the study in the sections below. But first the expert respondents are described.

Description of Expert Respondents

The expert population for this study consisted of fifteen HRD experts, scholars, and thought leaders that contributed to the *HRD Research Handbook*. All experts were contacted via e-mail or phone and asked to participate. Of

the fifteen prospective experts, six agreed to participate and provided consent.

Data Collection and Analysis Process

This study included three data-collection and analysis phases. As described in Chapter 3 the data that was collected and analyzed in the first two phases was used to answer the first research question and data that was collected and analyzed in the third phase was used to answer the second research question.

Phase I: Nomination

During Phase I, nomination, a modified Delphi process was initiated. Experts were surveyed to gather their nominations for HRD's most influential literature pieces. The e-mail request, which included a hyperlink to the electronic survey, was sent to experts on November 20, 2002. Responding to the survey in Phase I was expected to take each expert from 30 to 90 minutes. Experts were asked to submit the survey, via a web link, within 7 days by November 27, 2002. Two experts responded to this first solicitation.

The second follow-up e-mail was sent on December 4, 2002 (Appendix H). Four additional experts responded to the second e-mail. In addition to the two solicitation e-mails, individual follow-up phone calls were made to encourage

participation from the non-respondent experts. The researcher allowed several more days for follow-up and preparation for Phase II.

A total of six experts participated in Phase I of the study: Dr. Ronald Jacobs, Dr. Michael Leimbach, Dr. Gary McLean, Dr. Darlene Russ-Eft, Dr. Catherine Sleezer, and Dr. Richard Swanson.

The experts initially nominated a total of one hundred seventeen separate pieces of literature. Eighteen of the 117 nominations received more than one nomination. Table 4 lists each influential piece of HRD literature as nominated in Phase I together with the number of times the piece was nominated. The nominated citations are reported in the format in which they were submitted and are organized first by frequency of citation and then by alphabetical order. The numbers in the first column of the table, which is designated by "Entry #" are provided for organizational or reference purposes only. Some nominations were different editions of the same work or versions of like citations. The researcher treated those as separate citations. The nominations provided important information for Phase II of the study that focused on expert evaluation and explanation of the nominated citations. Each citation in Table 4 was entered into an Excel database and organized for analysis.

Table 4

Initial Nominations of Influential HRD Literature

Entry #	Influential Pieces of HRD Literature (listed as nominated by the expert population)	Number of times nominated
1	Rummler, G. A. & Brache, A. P. (1995). Improving performance: How to manage the white space on the organization chart- 2nd Edition. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.	5
2	Cummings, T. G. & Worley, C. G. (2001). Organizational development and change, 7th edition. Cincinnati/St Paul: South-Western.	3
3	Gilbert, T. F. (1978). Human competence: Engineering worthy performance. New York: McGraw-Hill.	3
4	Gradous, D.B. (Ed.) (1989). Systems theory applied to human resource development, Theory-to-Practice Monograph 4. Alexandria, VA: American Society for Training and Development.	3
5	Knowles, M. S., Holton, E. F., & Swanson, R. A. (1998). The adult learner, 5th ed. Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing.	3
6	Dooley, C. R. (1945). The Training Within Industry report (1940-1945): A record of the development of supervision-- their use and the results: War Manpower Commission, Bureau of Training, Training Within Industry Service [major portions of this rare document have been reprinted in Advances in Developing Human Resources 3(2)].	2
7	Hofstede, G. (1991). Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind. New York/London: McGraw-Hill Publishers.	2
8	Hofstede, G. (1980) Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values, Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.	2
9	Holton, E. F., III. (1996). The flawed four-level evaluation model. Human Resource Development Quarterly, 7 (1), 5-21.	2
10	Jacobs, R. L. & Jones, M. J. (1995). Structured on-the-job training: Unleashing employee expertise in the workplace. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.	2
11	McLagan, P, A. (1989). The Models. A volume in Models for HRD practice. Alexandria, VA: American Society for Training and Development, ASTD Press.	2
12	Senge, P. M. (1990). The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization. New York:Doubleday	2

Entry #	Influential Pieces of HRD Literature (listed as nominated by the expert population)	Number of times nominated
13	Swanson, R. A. & Holton, E. F. (2001). Foundations of human resource development. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.	2
14	Swanson, R. A. (1996). Analysis for improving performance: Tools for diagnosing organizations and documenting workplace expertise. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.	2
15	Swanson, R. A. (2001). Assessing the financial benefits of human resource development. Cambridge: Perseus.	2
16	Torraco, R. J. (Issue Ed.). (1999). Performance improvement theory and practice: Vol. 1(1) Advances in developing human resources. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.	2
17	Watkins, K. E. & Marsick, V. J. (1993) Sculpting the learning organization: Lessons in the art and science of systematic change. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.	2
18	Wheatly, M. (1992). Leadership and the new science. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.	2
19	Adler, N. J. (1991). International dimensions of organizational behavior. Boston: PWS-Kent.	1
20	Alliger, G. M. & Janak, E. A. (1989). Kirkpatrick's levels of training criteria: Thirty years later. Personnel Psychology, 42, 331-342.	1
21	Alliger, G. M., Tannenbaum, S. I., Bennett, W., Traver, H., & Shotland, A. (1997). A meta-analysis of the relations among training criteria. Personnel Psychology, 50, 341-359.	1
22	Aragon, A. & Hatcher, T. (Issue Eds. (2001). Ethics and integrity in HRD: Case studies in research and practice: Vol. 3(1) Advances in developing human resources (pp. 69-71). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.	1
23	Argyris, C. (1993). Knowledge for action. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.	1
24	Argyris, C. (1992). On organizational Learning. Blackwell: Malden, Massachusetts.	1
25	Argyris, C. Putnam, R., & Smith, D. M. (1985). Action Science. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.	1
26	Becker, G. S. (1993). Human capital: A theoretical and empirical analysis with special reference to education-3rd edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.	1

Entry #	Influential Pieces of HRD Literature (listed as nominated by the expert population)	Number of times nominated
27	Beer, M. & Nohria, N. (Eds.)(2000). Breaking the code of change. Cambridge: Harvard Business School Press.	1
28	Bennis, W. G. & Townsend, R. (1995). On becoming a leader. Addison Wesley.	1
29	Bereiter, C. & Scardamalia, M. (1993). Surpassing ourselves: An inquiry into the nature and implications of expertise. Chicago: Open Court.	1
30	Bloom, B. S. (1984). The 2-sigma problem: The search for methods of group instruction as effective as one-on-one tutoring. Educational Researcher, 13(6), 4-16.	1
31	Burke, W. W. (1980). Organization development: Principles and practices. Reading: Addison-Wesley.	1
32	Burke, W. W. (1987). Organization development: a normative view. Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley.	1
33	Campbell, J. P., Campbell, R. J., & Associates (1988). Productivity in organizations: New perspectives from industrial and organizational psychology. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.	1
34	Chi, M. T., Glaser, R., & Farr, M. J. (1988). The nature of expertise. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.	1
35	Cooperrider, D. L. (1995). Introduction to appreciative inquiry. In W. French & C. Bell (Eds.), Organization development (5th ed.). Prentice Hall.	1
36	Cummings, T. G., & Worley, C.G. (1993). Organization development and change (5th ed.). St. Paul: West Publishing.	1
37	Davis, J. R. & Davis, A. B. (1998). Effective training strategies: Maximizing learning in organizations. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.	1
38	Deming, W. E. (1986). Out of Crisis. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.	1
39	Deming, W.E., Jr. (1993). The new economics for industry, government, education. Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Center for Advanced Engineering Study.	1
40	Dick, W. & Carey, L. (xxxx). The systematic design of instruction. Longman: New York ISD	1

Entry #	Influential Pieces of HRD Literature (listed as nominated by the expert population)	Number of times nominated
41	Dixon, N. M. (1990). The relationship between trainee responses on participation reaction scores and posttest scores. Human Resource Development Quarterly, 1, 129-137.	1
42	Drucker, P. (1993). Post-capitalist society. New York: HarperCollins.	1
43	Fitz-enz, J. (2000). The ROI of human capital: measuring the economic value of employee performance. New York: American Management Association	1
44	Flanagan, J. C. (1954) The critical incident technique. Psychological Bulletin 51(4, 327-358.	1
45	Flanagan, J. C. (1974) Measuring human performance, Palo Alto, CA: American Institutes for Research.	1
46	Gagné, R. M. (1962). Military training and the principles of learning. American Psychologist, 17(2), 83-91.	1
47	Gagne, R. M., Briggs, L. J., & Wager, W. W. (1988). Principles of instructional design. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.	1
48	Gilbert, T. F. (1996). Human competence: Engineering worthy performance, Boston: HRD Press.	1
49	Gilley, J., Eggland, S., & Maycunich, A. (2002). Principles of human resource development. Cambridge: Perseus.	1
50	Goldstein, T.L. (1993). Training in organizations (3rd ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.	1
51	Golembiewski, R.T. (Ed.). (1993). Handbook of organizational consultation. New York: Marcel Dekker.	1
52	Hackman, J. R, Katzenbach, J. R. & Smith, D. K. (1993). The wisdom of teams: creating the high performance organization. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.	1
53	Harless, J. (1970). An ounce of analysis is worth a pound of objectives. Newman, GA: Guild V.	1
54	Harris, P.R., & Moran, R.T. (1991). Managing cultural differences (3rd ed.). Houston: Gulf Publishing.	1
55	Herrnstein, R. J. & Murray, C. (1994). The bell curve: Intelligence and class structure in American life. New York: Free Press.	1

Entry #	Influential Pieces of HRD Literature (listed as nominated by the expert population)	Number of times nominated
56	Jacobs, R. L. (1989). Systems theory applied to human resource development. In D. Gradous (Ed.), Systems theory applied to human resource development. Alexandria, VA: American Society for Training and Development.	1
57	Jacobs, R. L., Jones, M. J., & Neil, S. (1992). A case study in forecasting the financial benefits of unstructured and structured on-the-job training. Human Resource Development Quarterly, 3(2), 133-139.	1
58	Juran, J.M. (1989). Juran on leadership for quality: An executive handbook. New York: The Free Press.	1
59	Kaufman, R. (1998). Strategic thinking: A guide to identifying and solving problems. Alexandria, VA: International Society for Performance Improvement and the American Society for Training and Development.	1
60	Kirkpatrick, D. L. (1958-1959). Techniques for evaluating training programs (Parts 1-4). This series of articles was published in the Journal of the American Society of Training Directors 13 (11) 3-9 and continued in subsequent issues.	1
61	Kirkpatrick, D. L. (1994) Evaluating training programs: The four levels. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.	1
62	Knowles, M. S. (1984). The adult learner: A neglected species. Houston: Gulf	1
63	Koestenbaum, P. (1991). Leadership: The inner side of greatness.	1
64	Larson, C. E. & LaFaAsto, Fm M. J. (1989). Team Work: What must go right/What can go wrong. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.	1
65	Locke, R. A. & Latham, G. P. (1984). Goal setting: A motivational technique that works. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.	1
66	Lynham, S. A. (Ed.) (2002). Theory building in applied disciplines: Advances in developing human resources. 4(3).	1
67	Mager, R. F. & Pipe, P. (1984). You really ought to wanna. Goal Analysis. Belmont, CA: David S. Lake.	1
68	Mailick, S., Hoberman, S., & Wall, S.J. (Eds.). (1988). The practice of management development. New York: Praeger.	1

Entry #	Influential Pieces of HRD Literature (listed as nominated by the expert population)	Number of times nominated
69	Marsick, V. J., & Watkins, K. (1990). Informal and incidental learning in the workplace. London: Routledge.	1
70	Maslow, A. (1970). Motivation and Personality. (2nd ed.). New York: Harpers.	1
71	McGehee, W., & Thayer, P. (1961). Training in business and industry. New York: Wiley.	1
72	McGregor, D. (1960). The human side of the enterprise. New York: McGraw Hill.	1
73	McLean, G.N., Damme, S.R., & Swanson, R.A. (Eds.). (1990). Performance appraisal: Perspectives on a quality management approach. Theory-to-Practice Monograph No. 5. Alexandria, VA: American Society for Training and Development.	1
74	Nadler, The Handbook of Human Resource Development.	1
75	Odenwald, S.B. (1993). Global training: How to design a program for the multinational corporation. Homewood, IL: Business One Irwin.	1
76	Patton, M. Q. (1997). Utilization-focused evaluation: The new century text. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.	1
77	Persico, J. Jr. (1992). The TQM transformation. White Plains, NY: Quality Resources.	1
78	Pfeffer, J. (1995). Competitive advantage through people: Unleashing the power of the work force. Boston: HBS Press.	1
79	Phillips, J. J. (1991). Handbook of human resource development evaluation. Houston, TX: Gulf.	1
80	Porter, M, Business Strategy	1
81	Preskill, H. & Russ-Eft, D. (2000). A systems model for evaluating learning and performance. In D. H. Redmann (Ed.), Academy of Human Resource Development: Defining the cutting edge. Baton Rouge, LA: Academy of Human Resource Development. (Received an award as one of the top 10 papers of the 2000 AHRD Conference).	1
82	Preskill, H. & Torres, R. T. (1999). Evaluative inquiry for learning in organizations. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.	1
83	Robinson, A. G. & Stern. S. (1997). Corporate creativity: How innovation and improvement actually happen. San Francisco; Berrett-Koehler.	1

Entry #	Influential Pieces of HRD Literature (listed as nominated by the expert population)	Number of times nominated
84	Robinson, D. G. & Robinson, J. C. (1995). Performance consulting: Moving beyond training. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.	1
85	Roethlisberger, F. J., & Dickson, W. J. (1939). Management and the worker; an account of a research program conducted by the Western Electric Company, Hawthorne Works, Chicago. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, Mass.	1
86	Rothwell, W.J., Sullivan, R., & McLean, G.N. (1995). Practicing organization development: A guide for consultants. San Diego: Pfeiffer & Co.	1
87	Rouiller, J. Z., & Goldstein, I. L. (1993). The relationship between organizational transfer climate and positive transfer of training. Human Resource Development Quarterly, 4 (4), 377-390.	1
88	Rummler and Brache (NRC), Enhancing Individual Performance.	1
89	Rummler and Brache (NRC), Enhancing Organizational Performance	1
90	Rummler, G. A. & Brache, P. P. (1992). Improving performance: How to manage the white space on the organization chart. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.	1
91	Ruona, W. & Roth, G. (Issue Eds.). (2000). Philosophical Foundations of Human Resource Development Practice: Vol. 2(7), Advances in developing human resources. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.	1
92	Ruona, W.E.A (2000). Core beliefs in human resource development. In Ruona & Roth (Eds.) Philosophical Foundations in Human resource Development, Advances in Developing Human Resources 2(3). Sage.	1
93	Russ-Eft, D. (2002). A typology of training design and work environment factors affecting workplace learning and transfer. Human Resource Development Review, 1(1), 45-65.	1
94	Russ-Eft, D. (chair), Burns, J., Dean, P., Hatcher, T., Otte, F., & Preskill, H. (1999). Academy of Human Resource Development: Standards on ethics and integrity. Baton Rouge, LA: Academy of Human Resource Development.	1
95	Russ-Eft, D., & Preskill, H. (2001). Evaluation in organizations: A systematic approach to enhancing learning, performance, and change. Reading, MA: Perseus.	1

Entry #	Influential Pieces of HRD Literature (listed as nominated by the expert population)	Number of times nominated
96	Russ-Eft, D., Preskill, H., & Sleezer, C. (1997). Human resource development review: Research and implications. Thousand Oaks: Sage.	1
97	Scholtes, P.R. (1988). The team handbook: How to use teams to improve quality. Madison, WI: Joiner Associates.	1
98	Schön, D. A. (1983). The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action.	1
99	Skinner, B. F. (1971). Beyond freedom and dignity. Bantam/Vintage Books: New York.	1
100	Stolovitch, H. D. & Keeps, E. J. (Eds.) (1999). Handbook of human performance technology 2nd edition. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.	1
101	Stolovitch, H.D., & Keeps, E.J. (Eds.). (1992). Handbook of human performance technology: A comprehensive guide for analyzing and solving performance problems in organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.	1
102	Swanson, R. A. & Gradous, D. (1986). Performance at work. New York: Wiley.	1
103	Swanson, R. A. & Holton, E. F. (Eds.) (1997). Human resource development research handbook: Linking research and practice. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.	1
104	Swanson, R. A., & Holton, E. F. (Eds.). (1997). Human resource development research handbook: Linking HRD research and practice. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.	1
105	Swanson, R.A. & Holton, E. F. (1999). Results: How to assess performance, learning, and perceptions in organizations. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.	1
106	Swanson, R.A. (1994). Analysis for improving performance: Tools for diagnosing organizations and documenting workplace expertise. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.	1
107	Swanson, R.A., & Gradous, D.B. (1988). Forecasting financial benefits of human resource development. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.	1
108	Taylor, F. W. (1915). The principles of scientific management. New York: Harper & Row.	1
109	Tichy, N. M. (1983). Managing strategic change: Technical, political, and cultural dynamics. New York: Wiley.	1

Entry #	Influential Pieces of HRD Literature (listed as nominated by the expert population)	Number of times nominated
110	Torraco, R. & Swanson, R. A. (1995). The strategic roles of human resource development. The Journal of the Human Resource Planning Society. 18(4). 10-21.	1
111	Trompenaars, F. (1994). Riding the waves of culture: Understanding diversity in global business. New York: Irwin.	1
112	Tuijnman, A.C. (1996). International encyclopedia of adult education and training (2nd ed.). New York: Pergamon.	1
113	Vroom, V. H. (1964). Work and motivation. New York: Wiley.	1
114	Waclawski, J. & Church, A. H. (2002). Organization development: A data-driven approach to organizational change. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.	1
115	Walton, M. (1986). The Deming management method. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co.	1
116	Weinberger, L. A. (1998). Commonly held theories of human resource development. Human Resource Development International. 1(1) 75-93.	1
117	Weisbord, M. R. (1989). Productive Workplaces: Organizing and managing for dignity, meaning, and community. San Francisco: Jossey Bass	1

Phase II: Expert Ranking and Explanation

In Phase II of the study, expert evaluation and explanation, the modified Delphi technique was completed. The second survey (Appendix G) was sent February 24, 2003. A follow-up e-mail was sent March 12, 2003 to all non-respondents (Appendix H). Experts were asked again to submit the completed Phase II survey, via the web, within one week. The researcher followed-up with e-mails and phone calls to non-respondents.

The six experts who participated in Phase I of the study also participated in Phase II. They were asked to rank each piece of nominated literature using the following four categories: Top Tier, Middle Tier, Bottom Tier or Do Not Include. They were also asked specify why each listed work was important to include or to not include in the final list. Finally after reviewing each piece of already nominated literature, they were asked to submit additional works that they thought should be included.

To analyze the experts' rankings for each piece of nominated literature, the following scale was used: each Top Tier rank received four points, each Middle Tier rank received three points, each Bottom Tier rank received two points, and each Do Not Include rank received one point. Non-responses were given no points. To calculate the total score for a nominated piece, the points were summed.

Table 5 presents the nominated pieces organized by the total score from the ranking process (presented in alphabetical order when rank total scores were tied). Table 5 also lists the experts' comments. Note that the pieces of literature that the experts nominated during Phase II of the study are listed at the end of the table and have neither a rank score nor comments.

A Cronbach Alpha score for the Phase II expert rank scores was calculated to measure inter-rater reliability. The score was run in the SAS software program. The Alpha score equaled 62.2, indicated 62.2% agreement in rankings. The Alpha score calculations were completed for the entire group of citations; however, Cronbach coefficient calculations discard any non-responses from the calculation process. Because 32 pieces of literature in this study had a non-response rating from at least one person, the Alpha score was computed for this data set based on 85 of the 117 fully scored expert rated citations.

According to Nunnally (1978) there is not a generally agreed upon cut-off score for the Cronbach Alpha, however 0.7 is *usually* accepted as a strong score. The higher an Alpha score, the more reliable the instrumentation is considered. Therefore, the Cronbach Alpha score for this study 62.2, a relatively moderate score, could indicate that there was not strong agreement across the experts(a moderate inter-rater reliability score).

To analyze the experts comments about why each listed work was important to include or to not include in the final list, the comments for each piece of literature was synthesized in Table 5. This synthesis showed that none of the 117 initial nominations received justification comments

from all six experts. Furthermore, twenty of the 117 nominations received zero comments.

Further analysis of the experts' comments in Table 5 revealed a range in how familiar the works were to the various experts and differences in the perceived importance of some works. The comments were scattered and presented no emerging themes. Interesting was the lack of nominated pieces with HRD in the title.

Reviewing the comments also revealed a mistake in the survey: Citation numbers 103 and 104 (from the original list) should have been listed as two different editions of the Swanson book (1994, 1997) in the survey that was sent to the experts for ranking. The 1997 version was sent twice. Since both were nominated as influential, a possible issue with this mistake was that the experts might have made different comments if both editions had been presented. Also, rankings were likely affected because experts marked the duplication as *Do Not Include* instead of ranking the two individually.

The synthesized expert rankings were examined to identify patterns for grouping. A clear break point in the data was apparent after the top eleven citations. These citations were ranked by at least fifty-percent of the experts as Top Tier and received zero *Do Not Include*

rankings, therefore those eleven were identified as the most influential HRD literature as identified by experts (see Table 6). Table 6 is organized by rank score and by alphabetical order within a like rank. Other than the top eleven, no clear breaking points were seen in the data to separate citations that were *Middle Tier*, *Bottom Tier,* or *Do Not Include*.

Table 5

Most Influential HRD Literature as Identified by Experts (with Expert Comments/Rational

for Citation Inclusion)

Total Score	Citations (listed as nominated by expert population)	Comment
24	Rummler, G. A. & Brache, A. P. (1995). Improving performance: How to manage the white space on the organization chart- 2nd Edition. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.	- Hit the 3 levels of performance - Rummler and Brache contributed greatly to HRD thought relative to systems thinking. This resource is used and has been referenced by many. - This receives many cits.
23	Argyris, C. (1993). Knowledge for action. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.	- This work changed the HRD paradigm about learning - Many cits.
23	Cummings, T. G. & Worley, C. G. (2001). Organizational development and change, 7th edition. Cincinnati/St Paul: South-Western.	No comments
23	Watkins, K. E. & Marsick, V. J. (1993) Sculpting the learning organization: Lessons in the art and science of systematic change. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.	- Comprehensive - Many cits
22	McLagan, P, A. (1989). The Models. A volume in Models for HRD practice. Alexandria, VA: American Society for Training and Development. ASTD Press.	- This resource caused a paradigm shift in the field from an emphasis on individual learning to recognizing the importance of the learning culture in organizations. - Directional contribution - Many cits.

Total Score	Citations (listed as nominated by expert population)	Comment
21	Becker, G. S. (1993). Human capital: A theoretical and empirical analysis with special reference to education- 3rd edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.	• Foundational
21	Dooley, C. R. (1945). The Training Within Industry report (1940-1945): A record of the development of supervision-- their use and the results: War Manpower Commission, Bureau of Training, Training Within Industry Service [major portions of this rare document have been reprinted in Advances in Developing Human Resources 3(2)].	• Origins of contemporary HRD • This resource documents an important HRD history.
21	Flanagan, J. C. (1954) The critical incident technique. Psychological Bulletin 51(4), 327-358.	• The critical incident technique is often used by researchers and practitioners. • This method continues to be used in the field.
21	Gagne, R. M., Briggs, L. J., & Wager, W. W. (1988). Principles of instructional design. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.	• No comments
21	Swanson, R. A. (2001). Assessing the financial benefits of human resource development. Cambridge: Perseus.	• It has not withstood the test of time.
21	Weisbord, M. R. (1989). Productive Workplaces: Organizing and managing for dignity, meaning, and community. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.	• This resource identifies such theoretical scholars as Likert and Lewin who contributed greatly to our understanding of behavior in organizations

Total Score	Citations (listed as nominated by expert population)	Comment
20	Senge, P. M. (1990). The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization. New York: Doubleday.	• Important. But overrated • This was a popular book, but it was used more as a fad than as the basis for ongoing HRD research and practice. • Many cits.
20	Tichy, N. M. (1983). Managing strategic change: Technical, political, and cultural dynamics. New York: Wiley.	• This resource identified humans as one of the three major resources in an organization.
19	Deming, W. E. (1986). Out of Crisis. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.	• This resource has been foundational to HRD efforts in the quality area.
19	Gilbert, T. F. (1978). Human competence: Engineering worthy performance. New York: McGraw-Hill.	• Individual performance • This resource provided the foundation for cost-benefit analysis in HRD. • Many cits.
19	Gradous, D.B. (Ed.) (1989). Systems theory applied to human resource development, Theory-to-Practice Monograph 4. Alexandria, VA: American Society for Training and Development.	• Gradous introduced systems theory to HRD • This resource was the first to explicitly overview systems thinking in HRD, but was not used much to extend professional thinking in this area.
19	Jacobs, R. L. & Jones, M. J. (1995). Structured on-the-job training: Unleashing employee expertise in the workplace. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.	• This resource extends the thinking of HRD professionals to training that was not conducted in the classroom.

Total Score	Citations (listed as nominated by expert population)	Comment
19	Robinson, D. G. & Robinson, J. C. (1995). Performance consulting: Moving beyond training. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.	• Repositioned HRD and HRM relationship • This research defined the field in 1989 and the resource has been frequently cited. • Many cits.
19	Roethlisberger, F. J. & Dickson, W. J. (1939). Management and the worker; an account of a research program conducted by the Western Electric Company, Hawthorne Works, Chicago. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, Mass, 1939.	• This was a popular book that translated the thinking of scholars for practitioners • Many cits.
18	Argyris, C. Putnam, R., & Smith, D. M. (1985). Action Science. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.	• Many writings in HRD reference the Hawthorne experiments on the relationship between work environment and performance
18	Gagné, R. M. (1962). Military training and the principles of learning. American Psychologist, 17(2), 83-91.	• Watershed document challenging the stranglehold psych had on training • This resource offered new insights for training design. • Probably should cite Gagne's the conditions of learning instead of this.
18	Holton, E. F., III. (1996). The flawed four-level evaluation model. Human Resource Development Quarterly, 7 (1), 5-21.	• Scholarly frontal attack on dominant atheoretical model • Many cits.
18	Knowles, M. S. (1984). The adult learner: A neglected species. Houston: Gulf	• New version rated • This resource created a paradigm shift in terms of how individual learners were viewed. • Many cits.

Total Score	Citations (listed as nominated by expert population)	Comment
18	Swanson, R. A. & Holton, E. F. (Eds.) (1997). Human resource development research handbook: Linking research and practice. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.	• Same book as above. • Same as above • This is the same as #103 • The one right above is the same book.
18	Taylor, F. W. (1915). The principles of scientific management. New York: Harper & Row.	• Taylor's thinking has influenced how work is accomplished and how workers are valued. • Many cits and much used through the years
18	Vroom, V. H. (1964). Work and motivation. New York: Wiley.	• Vroom's work influences how motivation to learn and perform is viewed today. • Many cits.
17	Argyris, C. (1992). On organizational Learning. Blackwell: Malden, Massachusetts.	• Many cits.
17	Gilbert, T. F. (1996). Human competence: Engineering worthy performance, Boston: HRD Press.	• Operationalized Gagne (#46 above) • This is a reprint of the Gilbert's earlier work.
17	Goldstein, T.L. (1993). Training in organizations (3rd ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.	• This resource summarized knowledge of the training field.
17	Hofstede, G. (1991). Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind. New York/London: McGraw-Hill Publishers.	• This resource provided a foundation for international HRD. • Many cits.
17	Marsick, V. J., & Watkins, K. (1990). Informal and incidental learning in the workplace. London: Routledge.	• This resource created a paradigm shift for HRD professionals from their previous focus only on classroom and formal learning.

Total Score	Citations (listed as nominated by expert population)	Comment
17	Maslow, A. (1970). Motivation and Personality. (2nd ed.). New York: Harpers.	• This resource has been frequently cited. • Well-known and many cits.
17	McGregor, D. (1960). The human side of the enterprise. New York: McGraw Hill	• This resource changed management thinking about employees and has been foundational in making the case for HRD in organizations as well as for management development programs. • Many cits.
17	Nadler, The Handbook of Human Resource Development.	• This was one of the first books devoted to the topic of Human Resource Development • Many cits.
17	Robinson, A. G. & Stern. S. (1997). Corporate creativity: How innovation and improvement actually happen. San Francisco; Berrett-Koehler.	• This reference provided insight into the creative process • Many cits.
17	Rothwell, W.J., Sullivan, R., & McLean, G.N. (1995). Practicing organization development: A guide for consultants. San Diego: Pfeiffer & Co.	• This is a useful resource for OD practitioners
17	Schön, D. A. (1983). The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action.	• This resource caused a paradigm shift regarding how consulting should occur
17	Stolovitch, H. D. & Keeps, E. J. (Eds.) (1999). Handbook of human performance technology 2nd edition. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.	• Comprehensive • This is a useful resource for practitioners with chapters on various topics of interest.

Total Score	Citations (listed as nominated by expert population)	Comment
17	Swanson, R. A. (1996). Analysis for improving performance: Tools for diagnosing organizations and documenting workplace expertise. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.	• Analysis theory and practice • This resource is basically a reprint of the earlier Swanson and Gradous book
17	Weinberger, L. A. (1998). Commonly held theories of human resource development. Human Resource Development International. 1(1) 75-93.	• Met and continues to meet a real definitional need
16	Campbell, J. P., Campbell, R. J., & Associates (1988). Productivity in organizations: New perspectives from industrial and organizational psychology. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.	• This is an interesting book, but it did not have the impact that some other top tiered resources had.
16	Golembiewski, R.T. (Ed.). (1993). Handbook of organizational consultation. New York: Marcel Dekker.	• No comments
16	Knowles, M. S., Holton, E. F., & Swanson, R. A. (1998). The adult learner, 5th ed. Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing.	• Comprehensive • This resource extends the original Knowles text.
16	Patton, M. Q. (1997). Utilization-focused evaluation: The new century text. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.	• This resource offers another way to look at evaluation—however it has not been used by HRD professionals as much as it could have been • Many cits and much used in evaluation work.
16	Rouiller, J. Z., & Goldstein, I. L. (1993). The relationship between organizational transfer climate and positive transfer of training. Human Resource Development Quarterly, 4 (4), 377-390.	• Many cits.

Total Score	Citations (listed as nominated by expert population)	Comment
16	Ruona, W. & Roth, G. (Issue Eds.). (2000). Philosophical Foundations of Human Resource Development Practice: Vol. 2(7) Advances in developing human resources. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.	• Groundbreaking investigation of core values and unifying concepts • This resource led HRD professionals to focus on their assumptions. • Many cits.
16	Swanson, R.A. (1994). Analysis for improving performance: Tools for diagnosing organizations and documenting workplace expertise. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler	• Same as item 14 • This is the same as #14
15	Alliger, G. M. & Janak, E. A. (1989). Kirkpatrick's levels of training criteria: Thirty years later. Personnel Psychology, 42, 331-342.	• Scholarly attack of Kirkpatrick's work from psych view • This article challenged HRD thinking relative to evaluation
15	Bennis, W. G. & Townsend, R. (1995). On becoming a leader. Addison Wesley.	• This work was foundational to HRD work in the area of leadership development
15	Chi, M. T., Glaser, R., & Farr, M. J. (1988). The nature of expertise. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.	• Glaser's work on expertise is foundational for today's work in the area of learning.
15	Dick, W. &and Carey, L. (xxxx). The systematic design of instruction. Longman: New York ISD	• This resource was foundational to developing systematic instruction and has been widely cited.
15	Dixon, N. M. (1990). The relationship between trainee responses on participation reaction scores and posttest scores. Human Resource Development Quarterly, 1, 129-137.	• This research showed the fallacy of evaluation models that use participant feedback as an indicator of participant performance.
15	Drucker, P. (1993). Post-capitalist society. New York: HarperCollins.	• Drucker has changed understanding of management and is foundational to HRD efforts in management development.

Total Score	Citations (listed as nominated by expert population)	Comment
15	Hofstede, G. (1980) Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values, Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.	• This resource extended Hofstede's previous work. • Many cits.
15	Lynham, S. A. (Ed.) (2002). Theory building in applied disciplines: Advances in developing human resources. 4(3).	• Groundbreaking piece • A 2001 publication can not have withstood the test of time
15	Phillips, J. J. (1991). Handbook of human resource development evaluation. Houston, TX: Gulf.	• No comments
15	Porter, M, Business Strategy	• This book influenced managers' thinking about strategy, including HRD managers and those who researched HRD strategy
15	Russ-Eft, D. (chair), Burns, J., Dean, P., Hatcher, T., Otte, F., & Preskill, H. (1999). Academy of Human Resource Development: Standards on ethics and integrity. Baton Rouge, LA: Academy of Human Resource Development.	• This document moved the field forward greatly. • Many cits and much used in HRD academic programs and in HRD work
15	Skinner, B. F. (1971). Beyond freedom and dignity. Bantam/Vintage Books: New York.	• Skinner's work on behaviorism contributed greatly to thinking about why individuals performance. • Many cits.
15	Swanson, R.A., & Gradous, D.B. (1988). Forecasting financial benefits of human resource development. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.	• This book extended thinking on how to measure the outcomes of HRD programs. Many of the insights that first appeared in this book have found their way into other resources, sometimes without attribution

Total Score	Citations (listed as nominated by expert population)	Comment
15	Torraco, R. & Swanson, R. A. (1995). The strategic roles of human resource development. The Journal of the Human Resource Planning Society. 18(4). 10-21.	• Positions HRD as a strategic partner
14	Alliger, G. M., Tannenbaum, S. I., Bennett, W., Traver, H., & Shotland, A. (1997). A meta-analysis of the relations among training criteria. Personnel Psychology, 50, 341-359.	• Scholarly attack of Kirkpatrick's work from psych view • This research showed relations among training criteria.
14	Bereiter, C. & Scardamalia, M. (1993). Surpassing ourselves: An inquiry into the nature and implications of expertise. Chicago: Open Court.	• Thoughtful synthesis • I am not familiar with this resource
14	Fitz-enz, J. (2000). The ROI of human capital: measuring the economic value of employee performance. New York: American Management Association.	• This resource contained little new thinking.
14	Hackman, J. R, Katzenbach, J. R. & Smith, D. K. (1993). The wisdom of teams: creating the high performance organization. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.	• No comments
14	Kaufman, R. (1998). Strategic thinking: A guide to identifying and solving problems. Alexandria, VA: International Society for Performance Improvement and the American Society for Training and Development.	• This resource identified the importance of considering the societal impacts of organizational efforts.
14	Preskill, H. & Torres, R. T. (1999). Evaluative inquiry for learning in organizations. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.	• Many cits and much used in evaluation work.
14	Ruona, W.E.A (2000). Core beliefs in human resource development. In Ruona & Roth (Eds.) Philosophical Foundations in Human resource Development, Advances in Developing Human Resources 2(3). Sage.	• Groundbreaking investigation of core values and unifying concepts • This resource led HRD professionals to focus on their assumptions.

Total Score	Citations (listed as nominated by expert population)	Comment
14	Russ-Eft, D., Preskill, H., & Sleezer, C. (1997). Human resource development review: Research and implications. Thousand Oaks: Sage.	• This resource identified quality research and summarized theory and research at the individual, team, and organization levels. • Good compilation of the best research in the field.
14	Waclawski, J. & Church, A. H. (2002). Organization development: A data-driven approach to organizational change. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.	• No comments
13	Beer, M. & Nohria, N. (Eds.)(2000). Breaking the code of change. Cambridge: Harvard Business School Press.	• Thoughtful synthesis • I am not familiar with this resource.
13	Gilley, J., Eggland, S., & Maycunich, A. (2002). Principles of human resource development. Cambridge: Perseus.	• No comments
13	Harless, J. (1970). An ounce of analysis is worth a pound of objectives. Newman, GA: Guild V.	• Useful but overrated • This resource modeled programmed instruction to provide information for assessing needs.
13	Pfeffer, J. (1995). Competitive advantage through people: Unleashing the power of the work force. Boston: HBS Press.	• No comments
13	Wheatly, M. (1992). Leadership and the new science. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.	• This resource, which was popular in the business press, seemed to elicit little in the way of scholarship or new HRD practices. • Many cits.

Total Score	Citations (listed as nominated by expert population)	Comment
12	Aragon, A. & Hatcher, T. (Issue Eds.). (2001). Ethics and integrity in HRD: Case studies in research and practice: Vol 3(1) Advances in developing human resources (pp. 69-71). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.	• A 2001 publication can not have withstood the test of time • Used in many programs.
12	Bloom, B. S. (1984). The 2-sigma problem: The search for methods of group instruction as effective as NR-on-NR tutoring. Educational Researcher, 13(6), 4-16.	• Bloom's work has been foundational to HRD.
12	Cooperrider, D. L. (1995). Introduction to appreciative inquiry. In W. French & C. Bell (Eds.), Organization development (5th ed.). Prentice Hall.	• I am not familiar with this resource • Of growing importance.
12	Davis, J. R. & Davis, A. B. (1998). Effective training strategies: Maximizing learning in organizations. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.	• This resource summarized information on how to present instruction in the workplace
12	Herrnstein, R. J. & Murray, C. (1994). The bell curve: Intelligence and class structure in American life. New York: Free Press.	• This certainly receives much attention, but I'm not sure that it belongs here.
12	Russ-Eft, D., & Preskill, H. (2001). Evaluation in organizations: A systematic approach to enhancing learning, performance, and change. Reading, MA: Perseus.	• This resource while outstanding has not withstood the test of time • Many cits, an award, and much used in evaluation work, not only in HRD but other fields.
12	Scholtes, P.R. (1988). The team handbook: How to use teams to improve quality. Madison, WI: Joiner Associates.	• This is a useful resource for practitioners
12	Trompenaars, F. (1994). Riding the waves of culture: Understanding diversity in global business. New York: Irwin.	• No comments

Total Score	Citations (listed as nominated by expert population)	Comment
11	Burke, W. W. (1987). Organization development: a normative view. Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley.	• No comments
11	Jacobs, R. L. (1989). Systems theory applied to human resource development. In D. Gradous (Ed.), Systems theory applied to human resource development. Alexandria, VA: American Society for Training and Development.	• See the book, rather than the article.
11	Locke, R. A. & Latham, G. P. (1984). Goal setting: A motivational technique that works. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.	• This book is foundational because it reports the research on goal setting, which is one HRD strategy that works!
11	McLean, G.N., Damme, S.R., & Swanson, R.A. (Eds.). (1990). Performance appraisal: Perspectives on a quality management approach. Theory-to-Practice Monograph No. 5. Alexandria, VA: American Society for Training and Development.	• No comments
11	Swanson, R.A. & Holton III, E. F. (1999). Results: How to assess performance, learning, and perceptions in organizations. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.	• This book is basically an extension of the Kirkpatrick model, which everyone agrees is flawed!
10	Deming, W.E., Jr. (1993). The new economics for industry, government, education. Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Center for Advanced Engineering Study.	• No comments
10	Jacobs, R. L., Jones, M. J., & Neil, S. (1992). A case study in forecasting the financial benefits of unstructured and structured on-the-job training. Human Resource Development Quarterly, 3(2), 133-139.	• No comments

Total Score	Citations (listed as nominated by expert population)	Comment
10	Kirkpatrick, D. L. (1994) Evaluating training programs: The four levels. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.	• This resource is basically a repeat of the 1957 work-with no new thinking based on subsequent research. • See above.
10	Mager, R. F. & Pipe, P. (1984). You really ought to wanna. Goal Analysis. Belmont, CA: David S. Lake.	• This resource provided a frame for distinguishing training and non-training issues. • Really should have the other Maeger book on behavioral objectives.
10	McGehee, W., & Thayer, P. (1961). Training in business and industry. New York: Wiley	• The three-phase process that these authors identified can be seen in many needs analysis/ assessment models today. However, needs assessment is only one area of HRD.
10	Rummler, G. A. & Brache, P. P. (1992). Improving performance: How to manage the white space on the organization chart. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.	• #1 item is revision • This resource contained many of the basic ideas that are in the second edition, but does not seem to be as frequently cited as the second edition. • This appears at the beginning of the list. So, it should be removed from here, since this is the 1st ed.
10	Russ-Eft, D. (2002). A typology of training design and work environment factors affecting workplace learning and transfer. Human Resource Development Review, 1(1), 45-65.	• No comments
10	Swanson, R. A. & Gradous, D. (1986). Performance at work. New York: Wiley.	• This resource provides useful information on documenting expertise in the workplace, but does not seem to be cited often.

Total Score	Citations (listed as nominated by expert population)	Comment
10	Swanson, R. A., & Holton, E. F. (Eds.). (1997). Human resource development research handbook: Linking HRD research and practice. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.	• The profession's first research methods handbook. Groundbreaking • This resource moved the field forward.
9	Cummings, T. G., & Worley, C.G. (1993). Organization development and change (5th ed.). St. Paul: West Publishing.	• I ranked the ranked newer edition • Use the more recent, 7th edition.
9	Harris, P.R., & Moran, R.T. (1991). Managing cultural differences (3rd ed.). Houston: Gulf Publishing.	• No comments
9	Juran, J.M. (1989). Juran on leadership for quality: An executive handbook. New York: The Free Press.	• Juran built on Deming's work.
9	Preskill, H. & Russ-Eft, D. (2000). A systems model for evaluating learning performance. In D. H. Redmann (Ed.), Academy of Human Resource Development: Defining the cutting edge. Baton Rouge, LA: Academy of Human Resource Development. (Received an award as NR of the top 10 papers of the 2000 AHRD Conference).	• A 2001 publication can not have withstood the test of time • Has potential to transform evaluation work.
9	Stolovitch, H.D., & Keeps, E.J. (Eds.). (1992). Handbook of human performance technology: A comprehensive guide for analyzing and solving performance problems in organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.	• 1999 edition above • This is a useful resource for practitioners with chapters on various topics of interest.
9	Tuijnman, A.C. (1996). International encyclopedia of adult education and training (2nd ed.). New York: Pergamon.	• No comments
9	Walton, M. (1986). The Deming management method. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co.	• No comments
8	Adler, N. J. (1991). International dimensions of organizational behavior. Boston: PWS-Kent.	• I do not know this resource.

Total Score	Citations (listed as nominated by expert population)	Comment
8	Kirkpatrick, D. L. (1958-1959). Techniques for evaluating training programs (Parts 1-4). This series of articles was published in the Journal of the American Society of Training Directors 13 (11) 3-9 and continued in subsequent issues.	• This resource--bad as it is-is used by many less-knowledgeable HRD practitioners. • This has certainly had a stranglehold on evaluations in organizations.
8	Koestenbaum, P. (1991). Leadership: The inner side of greatness.	• This resource framed leadership and has been foundational for HRD efforts in this area. • Not well known.
8	Odenwald, S.B. (1993). Global training: How to design a program for the multinational corporation. Homewood, IL: Business NR Irwin.	• I am not familiar with this resource
8	Swanson, R. A. & Holton, E. F. (2001). Foundations of human resource development. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.	• Comprehensive • A 2001 publication can not have withstood the test of time
8	Torraco, R. J. (Issue Ed.). (1999). Performance improvement theory and practice: Vol. 1(1) Advances in developing human resources. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.	• Foundational contribution
7	Flanagan, J. C. (1974) Measuring human performance, Palo Alto, CA: American Institutes for Research.	• No comments
7	Larson, C. E. & LaFaAsto, Fm M. J. (1989). Team Work: What must go right/What can go wrong. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.	• This was one of the early research books that was published on teams. • Not well known.
6	Persico, J. Jr. (1992). The TQM transformation. White Plains, NY: Quality Resources.	• No comments

Total Score	Citations (listed as nominated by expert population)	Comment
6	Rummler and Brache (NRC), Enhancing Individual Performance	• I am not familiar with this reference
5	Mailick, S., Hoberman, S., & Wall, S.J. (Eds.). (1988). The practice of management development. New York: Praeger.	• I am not familiar with this resource
4	Rummler and Brache (NRC), Enhancing Organizational Performance	• I am not familiar with this reference
	Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.	• Burke's work has been foundational to OD efforts and research.
	Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social-cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.	
	Gagne, R. M. (1970). *The conditions of learning* (2nd ed.) New York: Holt, Rinehard and Winston.	
	Gagne, R. M., & Medsker, K. L. (1996). *The conditions of learning: Training applications*. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace.	
	Mager, R. F. (1975). *Preparing instructional objectives* (2nd ed.) Belmont, CA: Fearon.	
	McClelland, D. (1973). *Testing for competence rather than for intelligence*. American Psychologist, 28, 1-14.	
	McLean, G. N., & McLean, L. D. (2001). If we can't define HRD in one country, how can we define it in an international context? *Human Resource Development International*, 4(3), 313-326.	
	Skinner, B. F. (1968). *The technology of teaching*. New York: Appleton.	

Total Score	Citations (listed as nominated by expert population)	Comment
	Skinner, B. F. (1969). *Contingencies of reinforcement: A theoretical analysis*. New York: Appleton.	
	Sleezer, C. M. (1990). *The development and validation of the Performance Analysis for Training Model* (Project No. 35). St. Paul, MN: University of Minnesota, Training and Development Research Center.	
	Swanson, R. A. & Toracco, R. J (1997). The history of technical training. In Kelly, L. (Ed). *Technical and skills training handbook of the American society for training and development* (pp. 1-29). New York: McGraw Hill.	

Phase III: Citation Analysis

Phase III utilized citation frequencies to analyze the most influential HRD literature works. Therefore, this phase focused on the eleven Top Tier nominations that were identified in the previous phase (Table 6). The findings from this phase answered the second research question, "What was the pattern and frequency of the *Top Tier* citations for the group of expert's nominated list during citation frequency analysis?"

This phase was accomplished by analyzing the citations of the works that were published in all the 2001 volumes of the four publications: (a) *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, (b) *Advances in Human Resources*, (c) *Performance Improvement Quarterly* and (d) *2001 AHRD International Research Conference Proceedings*.

Analyzing the citation frequencies involved obtaining electronic versions of the 2001 proceedings and all articles in every issue of the three HRD journals for 2001. Journals that were not available electronically were scanned using text conversion software to create an electronic version. Ultimately, all 6,639 citations, from 236 articles or papers, were cut and pasted into an Excel spreadsheet for sorting and analysis.

Table 6

Top Eleven HRD Citations Identified by Experts

Rank	Citations (listed as nominated by expert population)
1	Rummler, G. A. & Brache, A. P. (1995). Improving performance: How to manage the white space on the organization chart- 2nd Edition. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
2a	Argyris, C. (1993). Knowledge for action. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
2b	Cummings, T. G. & Worley, C. G. (2001). Organizational development and change, 7th edition. Cincinnati/St Paul: South-Western.
2c	Watkins, K. E. & Marsick, V. J. (1993) Sculpting the learning organization: Lessons in the art and science of systematic change. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
5	McLagan, P, A. (1989). The Models. A volume in Models for HRD practice. Alexandria, VA: American Society for Training and Development. ASTD Press.
6a	Becker, G. S. (1993). Human capital: A theoretical and empirical analysis with special reference to education- 3rd edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
6b	Dooley, C. R. (1945). The Training Within Industry report (1940-1945): A record of the development of supervision--their use and the results. War Manpower Commission, Bureau of Training, Training Within Industry Service [major portions of this rare document have been reprinted in Advances in Developing Human Resources 3(2)].
6c	Flanagan, J. C. (1954) The critical incident technique. Psychological Bulletin 51(4), 327-358.
6d	Gagne, R. M., Briggs, L. J., & Wager, W. W. (1988). Principles of instructional design. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
6e	Swanson, R. A. (2001). Assessing the financial benefits of human resource development. Cambridge: Perseus.
6f	Weisbord, M. R. (1989). Productive Workplaces: Organizing and managing for dignity, meaning, and community. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

The data in the Excel spread sheet were sorted for citation count(s) and citing author(s). The data sort involved first filtering citations alphabetically then by author and/or author group. Analysis involved counting the number of times each citation appeared in the 2001 HRD literature and noting the number of authors (or author groups) who cited each piece. Both frequency counts and numbers of author(s) are reported in Table 7. The term *author groups* designated that more than one author wrote the literature piece. During the frequency count, an author group was counted as one author; ensuring that the researcher did not inflate the frequency count by including the authors individually. Citations in Table 7 are presented by rank score and then by alphabetical order.

Sorting the 2001 literature for author frequencies for the top tier of literature revealed the pieces of HRD literature and authors that were actually frequently cited in the proceedings and journals. These are listed in Table 8. Eighteen works emerged as the most frequently cited pieces in the 2001 HRD literature; receiving nine to twenty cites each.

Table 7

The Top Eleven Expert Nominations: Actual Citation and

Author Frequencies in a 2001 HRD Literature Analysis

Citations (listed as nominated by expert population)	Total Score	# of Times Cited	# of Different Authors or Author Groups Citing the Piece
• Rummler, G. A. & Brache, A. P. (1995). Improving performance: How to manage the white space on the organization chart- 2nd Edition. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.	24	12	12
• Argyris, C. (1993). Knowledge for action. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.	23	0	NA
• Cummings, T. G. & Worley, C. G. (2001). Organizational development and change, 7th edition. Cincinnati/St Paul: South-Western.	23	20	9
• Watkins, K. E. & Marsick, V. J. (1993) Sculpting the learning organization: Lessons in the art and science of systematic change. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.	23	14	14
• McLagan, P, A. (1989). The Models. A volume in Models for HRD practice. Alexandria, VA: American Society for Training and Development. ASTD Press.	22	9	19
• Becker, G. S. (1993). Human capital: A theoretical and empirical analysis with special reference to education- 3rd edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.	21	4	4

Citations (listed as nominated by expert population)	Total Score	# of Times Cited	# of Different Authors or Author Groups Citing the Piece
• Dooley, C. R. (1945). The Training Within Industry report (1940-1945): A record of the development of supervision--their use and the results. War Manpower Commission, Bureau of Training, Training Within Industry Service.[major portions of this rare document have been reprinted in Advances in Developing Human Resources 3(2)].	21	9	7
• Flanagan, J. C. (1954) The critical incident technique. Psychological Bulletin 51(4), 327-358.	21	4	4
• Gagne, R. M., Briggs, L. J., & Wager, W. W. (1988). Principles of instructional design. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.	21	2	2
• Swanson, R. A. (2001). Assessing the financial benefits of human resource development. Cambridge: Perseus.	21	0	NA
• Weisbord, M. R. (1989). Productive Workplaces: Organizing and managing for dignity, meaning, and community. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.	21	4	3

Comparing the frequently cited works in the HRD literature with the works that were identified as most influential by experts revealed that five of the top eleven (top tier) expert-nominated pieces of literature did appear in these 18 most cited works. However, seven of these eighteen most cited 2001 works did not appear even once among the HRD experts' 117 initial nominations. Of the top

eleven literature pieces, only one, Swanson's (2001)

Assessing the financial benefits of HRD, was not cited a

single time in the 2001 literature. This could be due to

the book's final publication date being that same year.

However, the analysis also revealed that the *Top Eleven*

citations were cited merely 78 times (1.17% of the total

citations) collectively in the 2001 HRD literature set

reviewed in this study.

Table 8

Top 18 Most Frequently Cited Works in the 2001 HRD

Literature

#	Citation	Number of citations	Nominated by experts?
1	McLagan, P. A. (1989). Models for HRD practice. Alexandria, VA: American Society for Training and Development.	20	Yes-Top
2	Senge, P.M. (1990). The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization. London, Doubleday.	17	Yes
3	Swanson, R. A. (1995). Human resource development: Performance is key. Human Resource Development Quarterly. 6(2). 207-213.	14	No
4	Watkins, K. E., & Marsick, V. J. (1993). Sculpting the learning organization. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.	14	Yes-Top
5	Baldwin, T. I., & Ford, J. K. (1988). Transfer of training: A review and directions for future research. Personnel Psychology, 41(1), 63-105.	13	No
6	Argyris, C., & Schön, D. (1978). Organizational Learning. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.	12	No

#	Citation	Number of citations	Nominated by experts?
7	Jacobs, R. L., & Jones, M. J. (1995). Structured on-the-job training: Unleashing employee expertise in the workplace. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.	12	No
8	Rummler, G. A., & Brache, A. P. (1995). Improving performance: How to manage the white space on the organizational chart (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.	12	Yes-Top
9	Weinberger, L. (1998). Commonly held theories of human resource development. Human Resource Development International, 75-94.	12	Yes
10	Hofstede, G. (1984). Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.	11	Yes
11	Holton III, E. F. (1996). The flawed four-level evaluation model. Human Resource Development Quarterly. 7(1), 5-21.	10	Yes
12	Noe, R., 1986). Trainees' attributes and attitudes: Neglected influences on training effectiveness Academy of Management Review 11, 736-749.	10	No
13	Rouiller, J. Z., & Goldstein, I. L. (1993). The relationship between organizational transfer climate and positive transfer of training. Human Resource Development Quarterly, 4 (4), 377-399.	10	Yes
14	Cummings, T. G., & Worley, C. G. (1993). Organization development and change. St. Paul, MN: West Publishing.	9	Yes-Top
15	Dooley, C. R. (1945). The Training within Industry report (1940-1945): A record of the development of management techniques for improvement of supervision: their use and the results. War Manpower Commission, Bureau of Training, Training Within Industry Service.	9	Yes-Top
16	Kirkpatrick, D. (1994). Evaluating training programs. The four levels. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.	9	Yes
17	Merriam, S.B., & Caffarella, R.M. (1991). Learning in Adulthood. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.	9	No

#	Citation	Number of citations	Nominated by experts?
18	Tannenbaum, S., Mathie, J., Salas, E., & Cannon-Bowers, J. (1991). Meeting trainees' expectations: the influence of training fulfillment on the development of commitment, self-efficacy, and motivation. Journal of Applied Psychology. 76 (6), 759-769.	9	No

Strikingly, Swanson was the most widely cited author in the examined literature with seventy overall citations of his works (See Table 9). Holton, Jacobs, and Watkins joined Swanson as the most frequently cited authors with fifty, forty-eight and forty-three citations respectively; yet, neither works by Holton or Jacobs were identified in the top tier in the HRD expert generated list.

Table 9

Top Author Frequencies in the 2001 HRD Literature

Author	Total Number of Citations
Swanson, R.A.	70
Holton III, E.F.	50
Jacobs, R.J.	48
Watkins, K.E.	43

Also, research methodology books and resources were often cited in the 2001 literature; several had seven or more citations in the literature evaluation. However, the

experts did not identify any research methodology works as most influential except for critical incident technique.

The citation/author frequency analysis provided a snapshot of the foundational, literary underpinnings of the HRD field. It reveals that the most influential pieces of literature as identified by the experts were not the most frequently cited pieces in the 2001 literature that were examined. However, it is important to note that as described in Chapter 1, frequently cited pieces of work or authors at a single point in time might not be the most influential literature for a field (e.g., authors using flavor of the month citations or responding to a particularly *hot* topic).

SUMMARY

In summary, the field is still struggling to agree on a list of most influential HRD literature. The study findings did show that one group of experts identified a total of 128 influential pieces of literature. Furthermore, the *Top Eleven HRD Citations Identified by Experts* list was identified based on the experts' rankings. Analysis of the citations for these works in the top HRD journals and the AHRD proceedings revealed that all were cited, with one exception. However, the analysis also revealed that these works were cited merely 78 times (1.17% of the total

citations) collectively in the 2001 HRD literature that was reviewed in this study.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter summarizes the study of most influential HRD literature, discusses the findings that were presented in Chapter 4, and offers recommendations for future research and practice.

Summary of the Study

This exploratory descriptive study answered two research questions:

1) What are the HRD literature pieces that scholars consider to be the most influential to the discipline?

2) What is the pattern and frequency of the *Top Tier* citations for the group of expert's nominated list based on citation frequency analysis?

The most influential literature was defined for this study as those articles and books that are milestones and increasingly acknowledged to be important and foundational to the field. These resources are widely quoted, reprinted and even attacked; they fare against the test of time and reflect the views of influential scholars and still continue to be useful (Enis & Cox, 1991; Shafritz & Hyde, 1987; Shafritz & Ott, 1992; Varney, 1990). As in the case of *The Classics of Organizational Theory* (Shafritz & Ott, 1992), the identified most influential resources can

111

provide a necessary foundation for subsequent building of a field.

In this study, six experts who had contributed a chapter to Swanson and Holton's (1997) edited book, *Research Handbook: Linking Research and Practice* agreed to participate in the study. Using a modified Delphi Technique, they identified a total of 128 influential pieces of literature. The experts' rankings when synthesized revealed a list of the *Top Eleven (Top Tier) HRD Citations Identified by Experts.* Analysis of the citations for these works in the 2001 issues of three HRD journals and the 2001 AHRD proceedings revealed that all top eleven works were cited, with one exception. However, the citation analysis also revealed that they were collectively cited only 78 times (1.17%) in the total 6,639 citations from 236 articles or papers. Furthermore, many frequently cited works in the examined literature had not been identified by the experts as most influential.

Four lists of influential HRD literature resulted from this study, a) *Most Influential HRD Literature as Identified by Experts (with Expert Comments/Rational for Citation Inclusion)*, b) *The Top Eleven (Top Tier) HRD Citations Identified by Experts* c) *The Top Eleven Expert Nominations Compared to Actual Citation and Author*

Frequencies in a 2001 HRD Literature Analysis, and d) Top
18 Most Frequently Cited Works in the 2001 HRD Literature.
Together, they lay seminal groundwork for understanding the
current status of the HRD field in relation to a mature
field that has a recognized body of knowledge and
literature which provides a basis for theory, research, and
practice.

Discussion of Findings

This study provides a snapshot of the influential HRD
literature. Each phase of the study produced insights about
the research process and results that are discussed in the
following sections.

Phase I: Nomination

One insight during Phase I was that some experts
seemed to not adhere to the provided definition of most
influential literature. The definition states that the work
should "fare against the test of time"; however, fifteen of
the 128 citations that experts nominated were dated from
the year 2000 to present.

This data could indicate an immature and under-developed
state for HRD literature. Support for this supposition can
be found in the literature review that described the on-
going scholarly debates around definition, the metaphor or
paradigm for the field, and philosophical/core beliefs. An

alternative explanation for the recently dated nominations may be that only recently has the field really begun constructing itself as a discipline and begun producing seminal works of literature. Yet a third possible explanation is this data merely emphasized the fact that HRD research has only recently become more accessible through increased publication of journals, articles and books. HRD and many related fields have recently increased publications that relate to HRD; consequently increasing availability and access by HRD professionals to HRD-related research.

A second insight gained during Phase I involved various editions of the pieces of literature. The researcher had not anticipated multiple editions of essentially the same titled works to be nominated. This was delicate in that different editions of materials are not the same work, but the experts tended to combine the various editions during the Delphi process.

Another insight of this study was that many cited works were authored by the individuals in this pool of experts or by individuals who had held AHRD leadership positions, served as editors of the reviewed AHRD journals, or were close working colleagues. This insight could

indicate bias or that influential HRD authors tend to take leadership positions in the field.

Phase II: Expert Ranking and Explanation

One insight gained in this phase was that the initial nominations by experts did not reflect their assessment in Phase II of a work's level of influence on the field. Initially, eighteen citations had multiple nominations from the expert group. However, the synthesis of the expert ranking in Phase II of the study resulted in only six of those eighteen being identified in the top tier citations.

A second insight for this phase revealed a limitation of the study design in that that expert explanations in Phase II did not generate the intended depth of insight as to why experts thought different pieces were important or not important to include on an influential list of HRD literature. The number of pieces of literature that were nominated in the first phase of the study may have made this task seem overwhelming. Face-to-face interviews could potentially have brought forth richer discussions on the value of individual literature pieces to the field.

A third insight obtained during this phase concerned the level of expert consensus on most influential works. Only moderate consensus was apparent. Again, using a

different methodology could have facilitated consensus building.

Phase III: Citation Analysis

An insight for this phase was that slight variations in citations (such as use of manuscript styles, foreign languages, spacing and author ambiguity or incomplete citations) contributed to additional analysis work. Because of the computer sort could not interpret the slight variations.

A major insight that emerged in conducting the citation analysis for *the Top Eleven (Top Tier) HRD Citations Identified by Experts*. The following findings merit further reflection: Comparing the works that were identified as most influential by experts with the frequently cited works in the HRD literature revealed that five of the top eleven (Top Tier) expert-nominated pieces of HRD literature did appear in these 18 most cited works; one expert-nominated work--Swanson's (2001) *Assessing the financial benefits of HRD*--was not cited a single time in the 2001 literature, and seven of the eighteen most cited 2001 works did not appear even once among the HRD experts' 117 initial nominations. Furthermore, the analysis also revealed that the *Top Eleven (Top Tier) HRD Citations Identified by Experts* were cited merely 78 times (1.17% of

the total citations) collectively in the 2001 HRD literature set reviewed in this study. Therefore, the citation analysis provided additional

Another insight worth noting is that research methodology books and resources were often cited in the 2001 literature. Indeed, the citation analysis revealed that several had seven or more citations in the literature. However, only the critical incident technique piece was identified by the experts as influential. The larger question that emerged was "Why did not one single research methodology resource, such as Lewin (1951), Miles and Huberman (1994), Nunnally (1978), Patton (1990) or Yin (1994) get nominated by the experts as being most influential to HRD?" This finding was most surprising since all the experts who contributed to this study are members of AHRD, whose very mission is to further the HRD field through research. Undeniably those research methodology sources impact the research frameworks for HRD.

Limitations

As in all descriptive studies, there are limitations to the research. Using different experts or a larger group of experts could affect the study results. Also, using a different definition of influential literature, different data collection, or data analysis processes would almost

certainly have yielded a different list of most influential HRD literature. This study provides a snapshot of the most influential HRD literature, from a purposefully selected expert population and at one minuscule time in the bigger picture of HRD.

As noted earlier, many expert-nominated works were authored by the individuals in this pool of experts or by individuals who had held AHRD leadership positions, served as editors of the reviewed AHRD journals, or were close working colleagues. Therefore, expert self-nomination is also a limitation to the study. The study's findings could reflect the truisms: "those who are seen are heard" or "birds of a feather flock together". Or they could indicate that the leaders in research are also contributing to leading the HRD field in other ways. The experts' experience as researchers and instructors and their professional interests could also affect the study findings.

Another limitation of the study is the selected 2001 publications for citation analysis. A review of different publications or publications within a different time frame could produce different results. For example, the AHRD has sponsored pre-conference sessions for several years on theory building so it is not surprising that Dubin is

frequently referenced in the 2001 literature. Also a special 2001 issue of *Advances in HRD* (Volume 3, Number 1) was devoted to the history of training so it is not surprising that Dooley's work was frequently cited.

Implications

Implications for HRD must reflect the fact that only moderate consensus on the most influential HRD literature is evident. This study's findings support the argument that HRD is a field still struggling to find its way into disciplinary status though a foundational literature base. Furthermore, the state of HRD's foundational literature is similar to the state of the field's models, paradigms, and philosophical underpinnings. The lists formulated in this study are good indicators of where the field is at in this point in time, providing a mark in the history of the field's growth. Inherent in this view of the findings as a snapshot of the current status of the field struggling to become a discipline are the implications for additional research and changes in professional practice that can move the field forward. These are framed as recommendations in the next section.

Recommendations for future HRD Research and Practice
This section describes first the opportunities for future research and then the opportunities for practice.

Research Opportunities

Future studies need to challenge and extend the results of this study, especially the findings that are displayed in the following lists: a) *The Most Influential HRD Literature As Identified By Experts (With Expert Comments/Rational For Citation Inclusion)*, b) *The Top Eleven (Top Tier) HRD Citations Identified By Experts*, c) *The Top Eleven Expert Nominations Compared To Actual Citation And Author Frequencies In A 2001 HRD Literature Analysis*, and d) *The Top 18 Most Frequently Cited Works In The 2001 HRD Literature*. Such studies conducted over time could document the history of growth for the field of HRD as it develops into a recognized discipline. Specific suggestions for future studies include:

1. Replicate this study every 5 years with a larger population that includes experts from countries across the globe.

2. Replicate the study using a citation analysis that includes a longer span of time for the literature review, perhaps a five-year span, and additional publications. Such study can determine if shifts take place, showing a narrowing or growth in such influential HRD literature lists

as the field continues to define itself over time.

3. Reframe the study using a different methodology, perhaps interviews, small groups and/or focus groups of experts that encourage face-to-face consensus building.

4. Use the results of this study to categorize the types of works that are actually being cited in the literature based on their fields/disciplines.

5. Analyze and categorize the works in the citation analysis using HRD's disciplinary bases to identify the foundational sources of influences in the literature. Monitoring these influences initially and over time can inform HRD professionals about the field's fundamental views and influences.

6. Study and document HRD's historical roots compared to other fields. Such study should examine how the current state of influential literature compares with the development of disciplines in other fields over time. For example, how did HRD get to this stage in terms of its literature development and given its current stage of literature development, what

forms of development are likely in the near future? Also, using the lessons learned from more advanced disciplines, what actions are needed to facilitate the further development of an influential HRD literature base.

Implications for Practice

HRD researchers, professors, students, and new entrants into the field can use the results of this study for many purposes. For example, the four lists that resulted from this study highlight works that should be included on reading lists. An important implication of the study for HRD professionals is the recognition that while some influential HRD literature has emerged, clearly many diverse opinions are evident. HRD professionals are urged to reflect on lists of influential works identified by the expert and the most cited works in the 2001 literature and to consider which pieces of literature are influencing their thinking and work and the implications of this influence on their practice of HRD. Such reflection practice is really at the heart of HRD.

Conclusions

Human Resource Development has exponentially increased its literature base in recent decades. This study provides a snapshot, a foundation for understanding the HRD field

and for documenting its history. The literature identified in this study reflects the ideas, views, and models that are important in HRD today.

The field of HRD is continuously struggling to define itself. The most influential HRD literature lists contribute only one small piece in the bigger picture of the field's development where paradigms have been debated and philosophical and core beliefs explored. As new knowledge is created, some of today's ideas, views, and models will likely grow out of favor. Knowledge will continue to be created and also borrowed from other disciplines and reformulated for use in HRD. The references to these works and new works will enhance lists of influential HRD literature. Like the grainy black and whites in old photograph albums, this snapshot provided by this study could help HRD professionals remember the field's roots and celebrate its future growth.

References

Academy of Human Resource Development. (May, 1999).

   Standards on Ethics and Integrity. Baton Rouge, LA:

   Academy of Human Resource Development.

Academy of Human Resource Development. (n.d.) Homepage

   [On-line], Available: http://www.ahrd.org

Andranovich, G. (1995, March). *Developing Community*

   Participation and Consensus: The Delphi Technique. A

   Western Regional Extension Publication.

Baker, D.R. (1990, September). Citation analysis: A

   methodological review. *Social work research and*

   abstracts, 26(3), 3-11.

Baldwin, T.T. (2000). Fundamental choices in human resource

   development scholarship and practice. *Advances in*

   Developing Human Resources, 7, 70-74.

Bassi, L. J., Cheney, S., & Van Buren, M. (1997). Training

   industry trends, 1997. *Training & Development,* 45-59.

Belth, M. (1965). *Education as a discipline: A study of the*

   role models in thinking. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon,

   Inc.

Borg, W.R., & Gall, M.D. (Eds.). (1989). *Educational*

   Research (5th Ed.). New York: Longman.

Bowen, T.J. (1998). *Use of learning technologies in modern business organizations.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Toledo, Toledo, Ohio.

Chalofsky, N. (2000). Professional morality and integrity: Helping the tin man find his heart. *Advances in Developing Human Resources, 7,* 28-33.

Chalofsky, N. (1992). An unifying definition for the Human Resource Development profession. *Human Resource Development Quarterly* 3(2). 175-182.

Chalofsky, N. (1989). What is HRD? In D.B. Gradous (Ed.), *Systems Theory applied to Human Resource Development: Theory-to-practice monograph.* (pp. 12-19). Alexandria, VA: ASTD.

Clawson, D. (Ed.). (1998). *Required readings: Sociologies most influential books.* Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press.

Coombs, C.H. (1964). *A theory of data.* New York: Wiley.

Craig, R.E. (Ed.).(1996). *The ASTD Training and Development Handbook: A guide to Human Resource Development.* New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Cronin, B. (2001). Bibliometrics and beyond: Some thoughts on web-based citation analysis. *Journal of Information Science,* 27(1), 1-7.

Cogan, M.L. (1953, June-December). Toward a definition of
   profession. *Harvard Educational Review,* 23. 33-50.

Dalkey, N.C. (1969). *The Delphi method: An experimental
   study of group opinion.* Volumes 1 and 2.

Dalkey, N.C. (1972). *Studies in the Quality of Life: Delphi
   and decision-making.* Lexington, MA: Lexington Books

Dalkey, N.C. & Helmer, O. (1963). An experimental
   application of the Delphi method to the use of
   experts. *Management Science,* 9(3). 458-467.

Delbeq, A.L., Van de Ven, A.H. & Gustafson, D.H. (1975).
   *Group Techniques for Program Planning: A guide to
   nominal group and Delphi processes.*

Denzin, (1989). Strategies of multiple triangulation. *The
   research act: a theoretical introduction to
   sociological methods* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

DeSimone, R.L. & Harris, D.M. (1998). *Human Resource
   Development* (2nd ed.). Orlando, FL: The Dryden Press.

Donald, J.G. (Winter, 1995). Disciplinary differences in
   knowledge validation. *New Directions for Teaching and
   Learning,* 64, 7-17.

Donaldson, S.K. & Crowley, D.M. (1978). The discipline of
   nursing. *Nursing Outlook,* 26(2). 113-120.

Dorelan, P. (1988). Testing structural-equivalence
hypotheses in a network of geographical journals.
*Journal of the American Society for Information
Science* 39(2). 79-85.

Enis, B.M. & Cox, K.K. (1991). *Marketing classics: A
selection of influential articles* (7th Ed.). Needham
Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Everette, J.E. & Pecotich, A. (1993). Citation analysis
mapping of journals in applied and clinical
psychology. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology,
23*(9), 750-766.

Fisher, S.K., & Sleezer, C.M. (1999). Bridging the gap with
a multidimensional performance model. Conference
*Proceedings of the Academy of Human Resource
Development.* Alexandria, VA.

Garfield, E. (1972). Citation analysis as a tool in journal
evaluation. *Science,* 178, 476.

Gay, L.R. (1985). Educational evaluation and measurement:
Competencies for analysis and application. (2nd Ed.).
Columbus, OH: Merrill.

Gilbert, T.F. (1978). *Human competence: Engineering worthy
performance.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Grieves, J. & Redman, T. (1999). Living in the shadow of OD: HRD and the search for identity. *Human Resource Development International* 2(2). 81-102.

Guba, E.G. & Lincoln, Y.S. (1989). *Judging the quality of fourth generation evaluation.* Newberry Park, CA: Sage.

Guralnik, D.B. (Ed.). (1986). *Webster's New World Dictionary* (2nd ed.). Cleveland, OH: Prentice Hall Press.

Hatcher, T. (1999). Reorienting the theoretical foundations of human resource development: Building a sustainable profession and society. In K.P. Kuchinke (Ed.). *1999 Conference Proceedings: Academy of Human Resource Development* (pp. 202-208). Arlington, VA.

Holton, E.F. (2000). Clarifying and defining the performance paradigm of Human Resource Development. In K.P. Kuchinke (Ed.). *2000 Conference Proceedings: Academy of Human Resource Development* (pp. 46-54). Raleigh-Durham, NC.

International Society for Performance Improvement. (n.d.) Homepage [On-line], Available: http://www.ispi.org

Jacobs, R. L. (2000). Determining the boundaries of HRDQ and HRD. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 11(1), 1.

128

Jacobs, R. L. (1990). Human resource development in an interdisciplinary body of knowledge. *Human Resource Development Quarterly* 1(1), 65-71.

Jacobs, R. L. (1989). Systems theory applied to Human Resource Development. In D.B. Gradous (Ed.) *Systems theory applied to human resource development: Theory-to-practice monograph*. Alexandria, VA: ASTD.

Jenson, G.E. (1960). The nature of education as a discipline. In G.E. Jenson (Ed.), *Readings for Educational Research*. Ann Arbor, MI: Ann Arbor Publishers

Jensen, G., Liveright, A.A., Hallenback, W. (Eds.). (1964). *Adult Education: Outlines of an emerging field of university study.* Adult Education Association of the U.S.A.

Kuchinke, K.P. (2000). Debates over the nature of HRD: an institutional theory perspective. *Human Resource Development International* (3)3. 279-283.

Leimbach, M. (1999). Certification of HRD professionals, products, and academic programs: The role of HRD. In K.P. Kuchinke (Ed.), *1999 Conference Proceedings: Academy of Human Resource Development* (pp.40-45). Arlington, VA. 1-6.

Lewin, K. (1951). Field theory in social science: Selected
theoretical papers. New York: Harper & Row.

Linstone, H.A. & Turoff, M. (1975). *The Delphi method:
Techniques and applications.* Reading, MA: Addison-
Wesley Publishing Company.

Lippitt, G., & Nadler, L. (1967, August). Emerging roles of
the training director. *Training and Development
Journal,* 21(8), 2-10.

Mayville, W.V. (1978). *Interdisciplinary: The mutable
paradigm.* Washington D.C.: American Association for
Higher Education.

McLagan, P.A. (1989). Models for HRD practice. *Training and
Development Journal* 41(9), 49-59.

McLean, G.N. (1998). HRD: A three legged stool, an octopus,
or a centipede. *Human Resource Development
International* 1(4). 375-377.

Melrose, K. (1997). The seed of research. In R.A. Swanson &
E.F. Holton (Eds.), *Human Resource Development
Research Handbook: Linking research and practice* (pp.
ix-xi). San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Merriam, S.B. (1988). *Case study research in education: a
qualitative approach.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Merriam, S.B. & Simpson, E.L. (1984). *A guide to research for educators and trainers of adults.* Malabar, FL: Robert E. Krieger Publishing Company.

Miles, B. M., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Nadler, L. & Nadler, Z. (1989). Definition and scope of human resource development: The HRD model. In *Developing human resources* (3rd ed.). (pp. 1-17). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Newman, M.A., Sime, A.M, & Corcoran-Perry, S.A. (1995). The focus of the discipline of nursing. In M.A. Newman (Ed.), *A Developing Discipline: Selected works of Margaret Newman* (pp. 33-34). New York, NY: National League for Nursing Press.

Nunnally, J.C. (1978). Psychometric Theory (2nd Ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Passmore, D.L. (1997). Ways of Seeing. In R.A. Swanson & E.F. Holton III (Eds.), *Human Resource Development Research Handbook: Linking Research and Practice* (pp. 199-214). San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Patten, M.L. (1998). *Questionnaire research: A practical guide.* Los Angeles, CA: Pyrczak Publishing.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). Qualitative evaluation and research methods (2nd Ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Patton, M.Q. (1982). *Practical evaluation*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Peters, J.M., Jarvis, P. & Associates. (1991). *Adult education: Evolution and achievements in a developing field of study*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Powell, T. & Hubschman, B. (1999). HRD competencies and roles for 2000: A pilot study for the perceptions of HRD practitioners. In K.P. Kuchinke (Ed.). *1999 Conference Proceedings: Academy of Human Resource Development* (pp. 1014-1022). Arlington, VA.

Roth, G. (2000). Preface. In W.E. Ruona & G. Roth (Eds.) *Advances in developing human resources: Philosophical foundations of human resource development practice*, 7, v-ix.

Rubincam, I. (1987, Autumn). Professional report: Frequently cited authors in the literature on computer applications to education. *Journal of Computer-Based Instruction*, 14(4), 150-156.

Rummler, G. A., & Brache, A. P. (1995). Improving performance: How to manage the white space on the organizational chart. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ruona, W.E.A. (2000). Core beliefs in human resource
     development: A journey for the profession and its
     professionals. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*,
     7, 1-27.

Ruona, W.E.A. (2000b). Should we define the profession of
     HRD? Views of leading scholars. In K.P. Kuchinke
     (Ed.). *2000 Conference Proceedings: Academy of Human
     Resource Development* (pp.188-195). Raleigh-Durham, NC.

Ruona, W.E.A. & Swanson, R.A. (1998). Foundations of Human
     Resource Development. In B.R. Stewart, & H.C. Hall,
     (Eds.), *Beyond Tradition: Preparing HRD educators for
     Tomorrow's Workforce*. Columbia, MO: University Council
     for Workforce & Human Resource Education.

Russ-Eft, D. (2000). That old fungible feeling: Defining
     human resource development. *Advances in Developing
     Human Resources*, 7, 49-53.

Russ-Eft, D., Preskill, H., & Sleezer, C.M. (Eds.). (1997).
     *Human resource development review: Research and
     implications*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Schein, E. (1973). *Professional Education*. New York, NY:
     MacGraw-Hill.

Schön, D.A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner*. New York,
     NY: Basic Books.

Sears, D.A. (1963). *The Discipline of English: A guide to literary research*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press Publishers.

Shafritz, J.M. & Hyde, A.C. (1987). *Classics of public administration* (2nd Ed.). Chicago, IL: The Dorsey Press.

Shafritz, J.M. & Ott, J.S. (1992). *Classics of organization theory* (3rd Ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.

Shermis, S.S. (1962). On becoming an intellectual discipline. *Phi Delta Kappan* 44(2). 84-86.

Short, D.C. (2000). Analysing metaphor in human resource development. *Human Resource Development International* (3)3. 323-341.

Sleezer, C.M. & Kunneman, D.E. (1999). Human resource development certification: A strategy for leading the HRD profession through research. In K.P. Kuchinke (Ed.). *1999 Conference Proceedings: Academy of Human Resource Development* (pp.40-45). Arlington, VA. 7-13.

Sleezer, C.M., & Sleezer, J.H. (1997). Finding and using HRD research? In R.A Swanson and E.F. Holton III (Eds.), *HRD research handbook: Linking research and practice* (193-198). San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Sleezer, C.M., Sleezer, & J.H., Pace, R.W. (1996).
*Identifying core journals for HRD research: Process
and results.* Paper presented at the meeting of the
Academy of Human Resource Development, Minneapolis,
MN.

Smith, L.C. (1981). Citation analysis. *Library Trends*,
30(1), 83-106.

Swanson, R.A. (1996). Human Resource Development:
Performance is key. *Human Resource Development
Quarterly* 6(2). 207-213.

Swanson, R. A. (2000). Core beliefs: The upside and
downside. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 7,
34-38.

Swanson, R. A. (1995, March). *Human resource development:
Performance is the key.* Paper presented at the meeting
of the Academy of Human Resource Development, St.
Louis, MO.

Swanson, R. A., & Holton III., E.F.(Eds.).(1997). *Research
handbook: Linking research and practice.* San
Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Swanson, R. A., & Torroco, R. J. (1995) The history of
technical training. In L. Kelly (Ed.), *Technical and
skills training handbook of the American Society for
Training and Development.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Trochim, B. (2000). Bill Trochim's Center for Social
    Research Methods [On-line], Available
    http://trochim.cornell.edu

Varney, G.H.(1990). A study of the core literature in
    organization development. *Organization Development
    Journal*, 8(3), 59-66.

Watkins, K.E. (1991). Many Voices: Defining human resource
    development from different disciplines. *Adult
    Education Quarterly,* 41(4). 241-255.

Watkins, K.E. (1989). Five metaphors: Alternative theories
    for human resource development. In D.B. Gradous (Ed.)
    *Systems theory applied to human resource development:
    Theory-to-practice monograph*. Alexandria, VA: ASTD

Webb, E.J. (1966). *Unobtrusive measures: Nonreactive
    research in the social sciences*. Chicago, IL: Rand
    McNally.

Weinberger, L.A. (1998). Commonly held theories of human
    resource development. *Human Resource Development
    International* (1)1. 75-93.

Wimbiscus, J. J. (1994). *The classification and description
    of performance improvement scholars: A comprehensive
    view of human resource development*. St. Paul, MN:
    University of Minnesota.

Yin, R. K. (1994). Case study research: Design and methods (applied social research methods). (Vol. 5). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Yu, A. (2003). Educational Assessment Course [On-line], Available http://seamonkey.ed.asu.edu

Zemke, R. & Kramlinger, T. (1982). *Figuring things out: A trainer's guide to needs analysis*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Group.

APPENDIX A

EMAIL REQUEST FOR CONSENT

Subject: Consent Form for J. Peacock's Most Influential Literature in HRD Study

I need your consent to use your data in my study. Please read the attached consent form and reply to this message with "I consent" in the message body if you do agree to allow me to use your data. Please let me know if you have any trouble opening the document. (I can fax or mail you a copy if necessary).

I am still doing some preparations for Phase II due to the overwhelming number of responses that came forward in Phase I. However, Phase II is almost ready and will be coming your way very soon!

APPENDIX B

EXPERT CONSENT FORM

I recognize and acknowledge that I am an expert participant for Jennifer Peacock's research study: **Identification of the Most Influential Literature of Human Resource Development (HRD)**. I also understand that her research is being done through Oklahoma State University's HRD graduate program. Jennifer has provided me with contact information for herself (as PI of the study) as well as with OSU's IRB Executive Secretary contact information.

I understand that participation in this activity is voluntary and that I will NOT be penalized if I choose not to participate. I also understand that I am free to withdraw my consent and end my participation in this project at any time without penalty after I notify the project director, Jennifer Peacock.

I have fully read and understand the consent form. I reply to or sign it freely and voluntarily. I acknowledge that a copy has been sent to me via e-mail and/or will be provided in hard copy per my request.

Date: _____   Time: _____

PRINTED Name: _____

Signature: _____

PI Contact Information: Additional Contact
Information:
Jennifer Peacock
2460 W. Rockwood
Springfield, MO
(417) 888-6460
jenpeacock@aol.com
jennifer.peacock@coxhealth.com
hrd@jenniferpeacock.com

Sharon Bacher: IRB Executive
Secretary
Oklahoma State University
203 Whitehurst
Stillwater, OK 74078
Phone: (405) 744-5700

PHASE I E-MAIL REQUEST

November XX, 2002

Dear thought leader and scholar of Human Resource
Development:

My name is Jennifer Peacock, a doctoral student at Oklahoma
State University. I am contacting 15-20 HRD scholars,
experts and thought leaders in the HRD field to participate
in a two-phase Delphi Study to help begin determining if
the HRD field has a body of **most influential literature**.
This study is being conducted as a partial requirement of
the HRD Doctoral program at Oklahoma State University.

As a scholar, you must realize the abundance of literature
available to scholars and practitioners in the HRD field.
In fact, AHRD established a Scholar Hall of Fame Award in
1993, in part, to recognize scholarly contribution. This
study is to delve one step further, recognizing not only
people, but also pieces of most influential, contributing
literature to the field of HRD. Please thoughtfully
consider the HRD research & literature and make nominations
for those works you consider to be **most influential
literature** to our field. The preliminary findings of this
study will result in what you, as scholars, experts and
thought leaders believe to be the **most influential
literature** pieces for HRD. The expectation is that such a
list would be invaluable first step in helping bound the
literature of the field of HRD, as well as a tool for
faculty teaching introductory HRD courses and a resource
for new entrants into the field.

As a scholar and leading member of the HRD profession, your
participation is crucial to the success of this study.
Participation is voluntary, there is no penalty for refusal
to participate, and no names will be matched with responses
in final report. However, all contributors will be credited
in a list in the appendix of my dissertation and further
relevant publications. Please note that I will be sending
you a consent letter asking you to allow me to use your
data in my study.

Although this first questionnaire is short in length, your
responses are invaluable. I am anxious for interesting

returns and further development of a resource tool we can all use in our field. You may access the survey by clicking on the following link: (If the following URL is not appearing as a link in this e-mail, please copy and paste the web address into your browser).

http://www.jenniferpeacock.com

Please complete the survey by **November XX, 2002.** If you have any questions about the survey, please contact me. I will use one more follow-up Delphi survey over the next 20-25 days. In advance, I would like to personally thank you for your thoughtful input over the full-course of this two-part study.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Peacock,
Principal Investigator, AHRD member and Oklahoma State University Doctoral Student

PI Contact Information: Additional Contact
Information: **Sharon Bacher, IRB**
Jennifer Peacock   Executive Secretary
2460 W. Rockwood Street   Oklahoma State
University   203 Whitehurst
Springfield, MO 65807   Stillwater, OK 74078
(417)269-7131 (w)   Phone: (405) 744-5700
(417)888-6460 (h)
jenpeacock@aol.com   or
Jennifer.Peacock@CoxHealth.com
Dissertation Advisor: Cathy M. Sleezer, PhD;
cathy@okstate.edu

Questionnaire #1

No individual responses will be matched to contributors' names.
(Information will only be used for clarification of responses)

Please type your name: _____

Please type your e-mail address: _____

Please state your primary research interest in HRD. _____

Please indicate your doctorate degree (title): _____

☐ Not applicable

○ Previous to 1950
○ 1951-1960
○ 1961-1970
Please indicate when you received your doctorate degree: ○ 1971-1980
○ 1981-1990
○ 1991-2001
○ Not applicable

Please indicate what discipline your doctorate degree was received in: _____

☐ Not applicable

Please indicate the university your doctorate degree was received at: _____

☐ Not applicable

Most Influential Literature is defined as: articles and books that are milestones and increasingly acknowledged to be important and foundational to a field are those resources that are widely quoted, reprinted and even attacked; they fare against the test of time and reflect the views of influential scholars and continue to be useful (Enis & Cox, 1991; Shafritz & Hyde, 1987; Shafritz & Ott, 1992; Varney, 1990).

Considering the definition for Most Influential Literature provided, what works do you think are most influential to HRD? Include **ALL** works that you consider to be influential to HRD.

_____

After entering all of your nominations, please press the **Submit** button below to send your responses.

Thank you for your assistance!

Submit

142

PHASE I FOLLOW-UP E-MAIL

Subject: 2nd Request for assistance in valuable HRD dissertation research!

Hello Everyone!
Please contribute to my dissertation research by accessing my survey at: www.jenniferpeacock.com (If this URL is not a link, copy and paste it into your browser address window).

I will not have a complete study without you (AND it's easy to participate--just remember back to your dissertation days)! Your input is extremely valuable to this study! (See a full copy of my original e-mail request below for any additional details).

Jennifer Peacock

In an e-mail dated November 20, 2002 I wrote:
"Dear thought leader and scholar of Human Resource Development:
My name is Jennifer Peacock, a doctoral student at Oklahoma State University. I am contacting 15-20 HRD scholars, experts and thought leaders in the HRD field to participate in a two-phase Delphi Study to help begin determining if the HRD field has a body of most influential literature. This study is being conducted as a partial requirement of the HRD Doctoral program at Oklahoma State University. As a scholar, you must realize the abundance of literature available to scholars and practitioners in the HRD field. In fact, AHRD established a Scholar Hall of Fame Award in 1993, in part, to recognize scholarly contribution. This study is to delve one step further, recognizing not only people, but also pieces of most influential, contributing literature to the field of HRD. Please thoughtfully consider the HRD research & literature and make nominations for those works you consider to be most influential literature to our field. The preliminary findings of this study will result in what you, as scholars, experts and thought leaders believe to be the most influential literature pieces for HRD. The expectation is that such a list would be an invaluable first step in helping bound the literature of the field of HRD, as well as a tool for faculty teaching introductory HRD courses and a resource for new entrants into the field. As a scholar and leading

member of the HRD profession, your participation is crucial to the success of this study. Participation is voluntary, there is no penalty for refusal to participate, and no names will be matched with responses in final report. However, all contributors will be credited in a list in the appendix of my dissertation and further relevant publications. Please note that I will be sending you a consent letter asking you to allow me to use your data in my study. Although this first questionnaire is short in length, your responses are invaluable. I am anxious for interesting returns and further development of a resource tool we can all use in our field. You may access the survey by clicking on the following link: (If the following URL is not appearing as a link in this e-mail, please copy and paste the web address into your browser): www.jenniferpeacock.com Please complete the survey by Wednesday, November 27, 2002. If you have any questions about the survey, please contact me. I will use one more follow-up Delphi survey over the next 20-25 days. In advance, I would like to personally thank you for your thoughtful input over the full-course of this two-part study.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Peacock, Principal Investigator, AHRD member and Oklahoma State University Doctoral Student

PI Contact Information: Jennifer Peacock; 2460 W. Rockwood Street; Springfield, MO; 65807; (417) 269-7131 (w)   (417) 888-6460 (home); hrd@jenniferpeacock.com (also available at: jenpeacock@aol.com or Jennifer.Peacock@CoxHealth.com

Additional Contact Information: Sharon Bacher, IRB Executive Secretary; Oklahoma State University; 203 Whitehurst; Stillwater, OK 74078 Phone: (405) 744-5700"

APPENDIX F

PHASE II EMAIL REQUEST

Sent: Monday, February 24, 2003 12:43 PM
Subject: J Peacock's Study on Most Influential Literature
(Phase II)

Hello HRD Experts!
Thank you all very much for your thoughtful responses on
Questionnaire #1 of this study. All the expert nominations
of Most Influential Literature from Phase I have been
synthesized for use in Phase II of this study. A total of
117 resources were nominated. 18 of those resources were
nominated by more than one expert.

Phase II of this study involves reviewing the nominations,
ranking each nomination, and providing the rationale for
the ranking. This activity takes approximately 30-45
minutes.

Please complete your rankings, review and explanation by
Tuesday, March 11, 2003.

Click below to start Phase II- Ranking the Most Influential
HRD Literature: http://www.jenniferpeacock.com (If the URL
is not appearing as a link, please copy and paste into your
browser address bar.)

Please note, if you did not participate in Phase I, you may
still contribute to Phase II.

Thanks again for your participation,
Jennifer Peacock

Address [🖹] http://www.jenniferpeacock.com/   ⌄ | ⟳Go | Links

As you review, rank and explain this list, be sure to consider the definition of **Most Influential Literature:** **articles and books that are milestones and increasingly acknowledged to be important and foundational to a field are those resources that are widely quoted, reprinted and even attacked; they fare against the test of time and reflect the views of influential scholars and continue to be useful** (Enis & Cox, 1991; Shafritz & Hyde, 1987; Shafritz & Ott, 1992; Varney, 1990).

Directions:
Each citation is listed below followed by choices for ranking the citation. The choices are *Top Tier, Middle Tier, Bottom Tier, or Do Not Include.* Select the option that best reflects your view. Please note that only one ranking can be made for each citation. No more than 30 total *Top Tier* citations can be marked. As you rank the list, please type a brief rationale (such as why or why not to include in final list) for your rankings in the comments field.

Please enter your email address: [_____]

#	Citations (listed as nominated by expert population)	# of votes	RANKING SELECTION/COMMENTS
1	Rummler, G. A. & Brache, A. P. (1995). Improving performance: How to manage the white space on the organization chart-2nd Edition. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.	5	Select One ▾ [_____]
2	Cummings, T. G. & Worley, C. G. (2001). Organizational development and change, 7th edition. Cincinnati/St Paul: South-Western.	3	Select One ▾ [_____]
3	Gilbert, T. F. (1978). Human competence: Engineering worthy performance. New York: McGraw-Hill.	3	Select One ▾ [_____]
4	Gradous, D.B. (Ed.) (1989). Systems theory applied to human resource development, Theory-to-Practice Monograph 4. Alexandria, VA: American Society for Training and Development.	3	Select One ▾ [_____]
5	Knowles, M. S., Holton, E. F., & Swanson, R. A. (1998). The adult learner, 5th ed. Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing.	3	Select One ▾ [_____]
6	Dooley, C. R. (1945). The Training Within Industry report (1940-1945): A record of the development of supervision--their use and the results.: War Manpower Commission, Bureau of Training, Training Within Industry Service.[major portions of this rare document have been reprinted in Advances in Developing Human Resources 3(2)].	2	Select One ▾ [_____]
7	Hofstede, G. (1980) Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values, Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.	2	Select One ▾ [_____]
8	Hofstede, G. (1991). C organizations: Softwar York/London: McGraw		
9	Holton, E. F., III. (199 level evaluation mode Development Quarter		
10	Jacobs, R. L. & Jones, Structured on-the-job employee expertise in Francisco: Berrett-Koe		

Please enter any additional works you would like to include in a

MOST INFLUENTIAL LITERATURE list:

Please enter your email address again: [_____]

[_____]

[Submit]

[🖹] Done   ⬤ Internet

APPENDIX H

PHASE II FOLLOW-UP E-MAIL

Sent: Wednesday, March 12, 2003 10:28 AM
Subject: 2nd notice for J Peacock's Study on Most
Influential Literature (Phase II)

Hello HRD Experts:
This is the second and final email request for submission
for the study on HRD's Most Influential Literature (Phase
II). Please respond to the Phase II form by Monday, March
17, 2003. [The first email request was sent Feb 24; see
full copy in email strand below].

Click below to start Phase II-Ranking the Most Influential
HRD Literature:
http://www.jenniferpeacock.com (If the URL is not appearing
as a link, please copy and paste into your browser address
bar.)

University deadlines are quickly approaching, so I would
appreciate your quick reply. I know you all are very busy
so I especially appreciate your scholarly contribution to
this important study.

I got back one reply to Phase II with no e-mail address
filled in. If that was your response to claim, please do so
by replying to this e-mail.
NOTE: If you did not participate in Phase I, you may still
contribute to Phase II.
If you have questions or need assistance, please contact me
by e-mail reply or by calling 417-269-7131 (work), 417-888-
6460 (home) or 417-894-8380 (cell).

Thank you very much,
Jennifer Peacock
AHRD Member, OSU Doctoral Candidate

TOP TEN CITED RESEARCH RESOURCES IN THE 2001 HRD LITERATURE

#	Citation	Times in the 2001 HRD Lit
1	Miles, B. M., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.	8
2	Patton, M. Q. (1990). Qualitative evaluation and research methods (2nd ed.1. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.	8
3	Lewin, K. (1951). Field theory in social science: Selected theoretical papers. New York: Harper & Row.	7
4	Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. Newbury Park, California: Sage.	7
5	Nunnally, J. C. (1978). Psychometric theory. New York: McGraw-Hill.	7
6	Schön, D. A. (1987). Educating the reflective practitioner. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.	7
7	Short, D. C. (2001). Shining a torch on metaphor in HRD. Advances in Developing Human Resources, 3(3), 297-308.	7
8	Yin, R. K. (1994). Case study research: Design and methods (applied social research methods) (Vol. 5). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.	7
9	Dubin, R. (1978). Theory building (Revised ed.). New York: Free Press.	5
10	Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. (1995). Multivariate data analysis (4th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.	5

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL LETTER

Oklahoma State University
Institutional Review Board

Protocol Expires: 10/14/2003

Date: Tuesday, October 15, 2002   IRB Application No   ED0325

Proposal Title: MOST INFLUENTIAL LITERATURE OF HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT (HRD)

Principal
Investigator(s):

Jennifer Peacock   Dr. Catherine Sleezer
2460 W. Rockwood   204 Willard
Springfield, MO 65804   Stillwater, OK 74078

Reviewed and
Processed as: Exempt

Approval Status Recommended by Reviewer(s): Approved

Dear PI :

Your IRB application referenced above has been approved for one calendar year. Please make note of the expiration date indicated above. It is the judgment of the reviewers that the rights and welfare of individuals who may be asked to participate in this study will be respected, and that the research will be conducted in a manner consistent with the IRB requirements as outlined in section 45 CFR 46.

As Principal Investigator, it is your responsibility to do the following:

1. Conduct this study exactly as it has been approved. Any modifications to the research protocol must be submitted with the appropriate signatures for IRB approval.
2. Submit a request for continuation if the study extends beyond the approval period of one calendar year. This continuation must receive IRB review and approval before the research can continue.
3. Report any adverse events to the IRB Chair promptly. Adverse events are those which are unanticipated and impact the subjects during the course of this research; and
4. Notify the IRB office in writing when your research project is complete.

Please note that approved projects are subject to monitoring by the IRB. If you have questions about the IRB procedures or need any assistance from the Board, please contact Sharon Bacher, the Executive Secretary to the IRB, in 415 Whitehurst (phone: 405-744-5700, sbacher@okstate.edu).

Sincerely,

Carol Olson, Chair
Institutional Review Board

149

VITA

Jennifer Annette Peacock

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: THE MOST INFLUENTIAL LITERATURE OF HUMAN RESOURCE
          DEVELOPMENT: AN EXPLORATORY DESCRIPTIVE STUDY

Major Field: Occupational and Adult Education

Biographical:

> Education: Graduated from Kickapoo High School,
> Springfield, MO in June 1989; received Bachelor
> of Science degree in Education and a Master of
> Science in Education at Southwest Missouri State
> University, Springfield, MO in August 1995 and
> August 1997, respectively. Completed the
> requirements for the Doctor of Education degree
> at Oklahoma State University in May 2003.

> Experience: Employed as a public school teacher at
> both Willard R-II and Springfield R-XII, 1996-
> 1998; employed by Oklahoma State University,
> School of Educational Studies as a graduate
> associate, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater,
> Oklahoma, 1998-2000; employed by CoxHealth,
> Springfield, MO, as an Information Systems
> Instructor, Educational Services, December 2000
> to present.

> Professional Memberships: Academy of Human Resource
> Development and American Society for Training and
> Development.