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INTRODUCTION

International human resource development (IHRD) has recently emerged as a key area of research within the field of HRD (Garavan and Carbery, 2012; Wang and McLean, 2007). Over a period of about ten years, HRD research and practice has shifted its focus from primarily exploring the development of people in domestic organisations towards the development of people in MNCs, international organisations, global not-for-profits, and public sector organisations. It is, however, a field that is in its infancy compared to International Human Resource Management (IHRM) but we have detected evidence of increased research activity and publication outputs in IHRD (Li, 2015; Modisane, 2015; Garavan, McCarthy and Morley, 2016). The research bases lacks cohesion and there is considerable ambiguity concerning the research boundaries of the IHRD construct. The overlap between what constitutes IHRD and related areas such as traditional HRD, cross-cultural management and international management remains blurred. Without some clarity about key constructs, it will prove difficult to explain what IHRD is really about. To date, despite some valuable contributions (Anderson, 2015; Wang and McLean, 2007; Garavan and Carbery, 2012), ambiguity remains.

A key objective of this Handbook is to reflect on the nature and scope of IHRD, to advance our understanding of IHRD, and to propose an IHRD research agenda. This Handbook has as a key objective the exploration of insights on key debates within IHRD which will help the field to develop and prosper. In this introduction, we address a number of important issues. First, we briefly chart the landscape of IHRD and engage with four key strands of IHRD scholarship that point to its possible boundaries. Second, we map out a number of contextual drivers that are shaping IHRD as both an academic field of research and a set of organisational practices. We are necessarily selective in the choice of these contextual dimensions and focus on factors highlighted in the various chapter contributions in this Handbook. Third, we propose an
overarching framework to conceptualise the terrain of IHRD. Fourth, we summarise the focus of the Handbook and summarise the individual chapters and how they are organised. Finally, we propose a number of priority research areas that will help to give the construct legitimacy as a field of research. We engage in these debates while also acknowledging the emergent, dynamic and constantly evolving nature of the field.

DEFINING THE TERRITORY OF IHRD

It is a reasonable assertion to make that the field of research and theorising on IHRD has, to date, developed in a fragmented way borrowing largely from sociology, economics and psychology resulting in a concept that is criticised for being abstract, elusive and lacking a clear identity (Garavan and Carbery, 2012). There is much that is haphazard and opportunistic about its development to date which has not followed a sequential trajectory of development as a concept. Anderson (2015) proposed that the field is quite broad and highlighted the value of Metcalfe and Rees’s (2005) definition which we consider very appropriate for the purposes of this introduction. They proposed that IHRD consists of “processes that address the formulation and implementation of HRD systems, practices and policies at global, societal and organisational levels” (Metcalfe and Rees, 2005, p.455). Therefore, the limited body of literature emphasises that IHRD is primarily focused on issues that pertain to the development of people in multiple international contexts and these people development processes lead to a range of organisational, economic, social and sustainability outcomes. IHRD scholarship is difficult to compartmentalise or categorise. However, there is evidence of multiple notions of IHRD proposed in the literature. Therefore, consistent with theoretical contributions by Anderson (2015), Garavan and Carbery (2012) and Wang and McLean (2007), we focus on four strands of IHRD conceptualisation that are relatively independent of one another: global HRD, national HRD, HRD in the context of internationalising organisations, and comparative/cross-cultural HRD.

Global HRD

The first strand focuses on global HRD. The notion of global HRD is relatively new to the literature (Garavan, McCarthy and Morley, 2016). It primarily draws its legitimacy from the need to address people development issues on a global scale. Therefore, a global HRD perspective can be found in debates on global mobility, and global talent development
Labour markets are increasingly viewed as global in nature (Morley et al., 2015) and, therefore, organisations, irrespective of location or region, require a well-developed and highly skilled talent pool. Global mobility is now a major theme in the literature (Collings, 2014) and the evidence indicates that many emerging and developing economies experience difficulties in ensuring a strong mix of appropriately skilled employees in their national pool of labour.

Global HRD has important resonances for the way in which the field thinks about the dominance to date of particular perspectives or notions of HRD. For example, the USA and Western European perspectives have to date dominated the literature with limited consideration given to Asia centric and African-Middle East perspectives (Chermack, Lynham and Ruona, 2003; Garavan, McCarthy and Morley, 2016). The global strand of HRD calls attention to outcomes beyond economic ones and perspectives that are solely managerialist in focus. This strand, consistent with the definition proposed by Metcalfe and Rees (2005), highlights the social role for HRD. Therefore, global HRD has a major role to play in strengthening state institutions, in dealing with major societal issues such as poverty and corruption, and in enhancing the work of worldwide nongovernmental agencies (Berman, 2015). The global HRD scholarship strand brings into focus the need to consider a variety of sustainability and societal outcomes and has a particular concern with people sustainability (Thite, 2013; Kuchinke, 2010; Peterson, 1997).

National HRD

The second scholarship strand that comes within the boundaries of IHRD is national HRD. This strand of scholarship has experienced significant growth and expansion, notwithstanding the fact that there has been a lack of attention given to its theoretical development and empirical investigation. NHRD primarily focuses on skill capability and human capacity building of countries, the development of national-level policies, and national and regional institutions that develop and implement HRD policy (Anderson, 2015). The majority of conceptualisation and theory development has focused on stakeholders at multiple levels within a country and the role of vocational education and training systems and
other capability development mechanisms explored through a national lens (Busch, 2012; Wang and McLean, 2007). NHRD as a strand of IHRD scholarship focuses on how countries utilise skills formation processes, human capability development initiatives and the role of labour market institutions, national industrial relations systems, and other VET systems to enhance national human and social capital (Alagaraja and Wang, 2012; Stewart and Sambrook, 2012). To date, it is the most vibrant strand of research, however, it is currently under-theorised and methodologically nascent. The literature has focused on the description and analysis of individual countries and there is some evidence of efforts to develop categorisations and typologies of different countries in terms of their approaches to NHRD (Ahn and McLean, 2008). There is also significant development of models or frameworks that highlight important micro, meso and macro level factors that influence or drive NHRD in individual countries.

**Comparative and Cross-cultural HRD**

The third strand of IHRD scholarship focuses on the institutional and cultural context of IHRD. This strand investigates the influence of cross-cultural and cross-institutional factors. Cseh, Davis and Khilji (2013) argue that the comparative component of HRD is underdeveloped and has not fully or comprehensively engaged in debates about how institutional differences explain convergence and divergence in approaches to IHRD. To date, there is an implicit assumption that the majority of research findings on HRD will apply in all circumstances and are generalisable to different contexts outside of those included in empirical investigations. Therefore, the roles of governments and regulations have received very limited attention in the context of IHRD. Some debates within the IHRM field propose that globalisation will lead to universal approaches to IHRM (Björkman, 2003; Rowley and Benson, 2002), however, there is limited insight within IHRD research to say whether this is the case or not for IHRD. Proponents of convergence suggest that the potential homogenisation of institutions, systems, policies and practices will lead to similar IHRD approaches (for example, Morley, 2007). Proponents of divergence suggest that due to institutional characteristics, approaches to IHRD will be highly heterogeneous because nations are slow to change and evolve (Branson, 2001; Pudelko, 2006; Whitley, 2000). Rosenzweig and Nohria (1994) proposed that HRM is one of the most localised of management practices. Therefore, it could be argued that HRD, as one component of HRM, will be different depending on the size of the country, its stage of economic development, whether it is
monolingual or multilingual and how effectively established the country is politically.

Cross-cultural perspectives focus on the extent to which national cultural differences in terms of traditions, values and attitudes influence HRD. Studies have, to date, tended to utilise the Hofstede framework to investigate issues central to IHRD such as cross-cultural competencies, cross-cultural leadership and learning styles (Peterson and Castro 2006; Hee Kim and Callahan, 2013). McLean (2016) is critical of the over-focus on the Hofstede (1980) framework and the over-focus on the country as the unit of analysis. As a concept, culture crosses national boundaries and can be significantly impacted by regional influences. Furthermore, within individual countries, there can be significant variations in culture that are not effectively captured using established national country level culture scales. There are, therefore, difficulties associated with the investigation of cross-cultural perspectives on IHRD and there are many gaps which remain in our understanding of this aspect of the field.

**Internationalising Organisations and Expatriates**

The majority of research within the internationalising organisations and expatriate scholarship strand has focused on the development issues related to expatriates and other categories of employees who undertake cross-border assignments (Anderson, 2015). In comparison, the internationalising organisation component of this scholarship strand is very nascent and fragmented. Within IHRM research, the primary focus of scholarship is on the MNC (Björkman and Welch, 2015; Pudelko, Reiche and Carr, 2015). However, within IHRD, the MNC has received significantly less attention and studies on international organisations other than MNCs is effectively absent. IHRD, given it social dimension, is also interested in other types of internationalising organisations that have primarily a social or humanitarian focus. Examples of international organisations that are of interest to IHRD, and in which people development issues are a concern, include non-governmental organisations, international organisations that have a worldwide reach and inter-governmental organisations (Lewis, 2009).

Based on the four IHRD scholarship strands, it is possible to reach a number of tentative conclusions about the scope and boundaries of IHRD research. First, the construct is nascent in terms of theoretical and empirical development and is, therefore, quite fragmented which leads to some confusion about what it stands for and how it is distinct from other similar concepts such as IHRM and cross-cultural management. Second, across the four strands the focus of IHRD moves beyond the organisation...
to consider communities and countries and the people development issues that arise. This is an important differentiator that sets IHRD apart from IHRM where the unit of analysis to date has tended to be the MNC. Third, IHRD has priorities and concerns that include, but are not exclusively focused on, performative and managerialist issues but also include societal, sustainability and environmental issues. Therefore, we conclude that IHRD has as its primary focus the development of people in multiple country and organisational contexts and in understanding how IHRD systems, policies and practices can lead to economic, societal and sustainability outcomes.

**THE CONTEXTUAL DRIVERS OF IHRD**

The context within which IHRD operates is highly dynamic and complex. It is subject to an array of influences including globalisation, technological developments, growth in the service and knowledge economy, and challenges and opportunities presented by diversity. This set of contextual drivers is, by necessity, highly selective. However, they inform some of the key issues debated in the contributions in this Handbook. They currently impact the growth trajectory of the field as a body of research and practice and are likely to do so into the future. We argue that these contextual dimensions will influence the types of IHRD research questions that are investigated, shape the goals that countries and organisations pursue, and impact the IHRD systems, policies and practices that are implemented.

**Globalisation and IHRD**

Globalisation is defined as a contextual element that impacts countries and organisations (commercial and non-commercial) operating on a global or international scale (Stone et al., 2015). Globalisation represents one of the most significant elements of context that shapes IHRD in countries and organisations. Dimensions of globalisation that are highlighted and frequently discussed include the challenges arising from cross-cultural differences, social, political and institutional differences, and differences in language. Therefore, countries and organisations have to consider how they approach the development of people and the implementation of IHRD in different locations. Issues related to the influence of globalisation are nascent in the context of IHRD across the four strands. However, Sparrow (2009) has argued that the problems of globalisation increasingly become more embedded in countries and organisations and shape the way in which people are developed in an international context. Globalisation
presents both challenges and opportunities to countries and organisations that operate on a global scale. These include, but are not confined to, issues such as international competitiveness, country reputation, the promotion of diversity, CSR and sustainability and in the case of MNCs opportunities to develop new products and services and enter new markets (Stone et al., 2015).

**Information Technology and IHRD**

Technology, and in particular information technology, has emerged as an important driver of change in the way IHRD is undertaken (Strohmeier and Kabst, 2009). In the context of IHRD, it has led to the emergence of e-learning, the development of global learning management systems, and it has transformed how IHRD interacts with its customers and stakeholders (Salas, Sims and Burke, 2005). The use of technology in IHRD and its effectiveness is contested with both researchers and practitioners questioning whether technology-driven training systems such as online simulations, e-learning modules, and video conferencing are effective (Dulebohn and Johnson, 2013). Criticisms most frequently levelled at technology-driven IHRD include the lack of opportunities for learner engagement, the inflexibility of e-learning, the lack of face-to-face interaction, fewer opportunities for feedback and limited applications beyond knowledge-based objectives. The use of technology to enable or facilitate IHRD is insufficiently understood and researched. However, it is generally acknowledged that information technology will continue to change the way organisations practice IHRD into the future (Dineen and Allen, 2013).

**The Knowledge Economy and IHRD**

Significant changes have occurred within the global economy over the past decade. Two of the most significant changes are the shift towards the knowledge economy and the growth in the use of offshoring and outsourcing. The knowledge-based economy is a relatively loose concept but it generally emphasises the provision of services and the leveraging of technology to add value (Anderson and Corley, 2003). It is particularly significant to IHRD and the contribution that it makes to the achievement of country and organisational goals. Increasingly, IHRD practices will be used to help countries become knowledge economies and help organisations to broaden their skill bases, facilitate the sharing of tacit knowledge, and enhance the retention of employees with appropriate skill sets (Schuler, Budhwar and Florkowski, 2002). It presents significant challenges to IHRD to utilise new models of skill development and the
use of practices to enhance global mobility. It also provides opportunities for IHRD to reposition itself on national and organisational agendas and emphasise its criticality to the achievement of national and organisational goals. Both offshoring and outsourcing have emerged hand-in-hand as new ways of doing business (Anderson, 2015; Contractor et al., 2010). They are a prominent feature of globalisation and they occur in different manifestations including tactical, strategic and transformational approaches (Anderson, 2015). They highlight many research and practice challenges for IHRD at both country and organisation levels. They bring to the fore issues related to cross-business knowledge sharing, inter-organisational learning, cross-cultural issues, and the importance of talent development.

Diversity and IHRD

Issues related to diversity have emerged as a key contextual influence and, as a consequence, both countries and organisations are concerned to effectively use IHRD practices to meet the needs of increasingly diverse labour pools and workforces. Key aspects of workplace diversity include the priorities and values of different generations of employees, gender, ethnicity and sexual orientation (Twenge et al., 2010). At the level of the country, the labour market is increasingly made up of individuals of multiple ethnicities, ages and generational differences. Evidence suggests that generational differences are increasingly challenging for organisations due to differences in values, attitudes and behaviours (Cennamo and Gardner, 2008; Deloitte, 2014). These generations give differing emphases to IHRD with the result that organisations will increasingly focus on greater customisation and individualisation of practices and develop ‘cafeteria systems’ where employees can select development practices suitable to their values, preferences and needs. Other dimensions of diversity that have come front and central include racial and ethnic diversity in the workforce (Stone, Stone-Romero and Lukaszewski, 2007), the employment of LGBT employees (Paisley and Tayar, 2016; Shrader, 2016) and age diversity (Boehm, Kunze and Bruch, 2014; De Meulenaere, Boone and Buyl, 2016; Li et al., 2011). These different forms of diversity are challenging for IHRD because they require national institutions and organisations to modify and reposition their IHRD practices to meet the requirements of an increasingly diverse labour market and workforce. The traditional approach where a set of homogeneous practices could be applied to the whole workforce is no longer valid. We focused here on a small but significant number of factors that currently shape and will continue to shape IHRD. These four dimensions surface in the various contributions found
in this Handbook and they play an important role in shaping both the research and practice agenda for IHRD.

A FRAMEWORK FOR IHRD RESEARCH

To date, a small number of contributions have identified the research issues that pertain to IHRD, however, there is little by way of an integrative or conceptual framework that unifies the various strands and adequately maps out the boundaries and territory. Our aim here is to propose a framework that captures the four strands we have identified and point to significant research opportunities for the IHRD field. We are conscious that IHRD takes a significantly broader remit than IHRM: IHRM research has primarily focused on the MNC (De Cieri and Dowling, 2006) whereas IHRD focuses on nations, regions, communities and organisations that pursue a multiplicity of economic and social goals (Garavan, McCarthy and Morley, 2016). Our framework consists of four levels of analysis. The first level of analysis focuses on the country (comprised of national institutions, legal systems, skill development systems, and economic and social conditions that influence national level skill development). The second level focuses on internationalising organisations and encompasses the diversity of international organisations to which IHRD practices have application. The third level focuses on the country unit or operation. Given the diversity of internationalising organisations, this may include subsidiaries in the case of MNCs, inter-organisational alliances and other types of entity or structure required to function effectively in the host country. The fourth level focuses on the individual and includes employees and other types of workers as well as the family. Our framework highlights four dimensions from left to right in Figure 1.1. These are: (1) influencing factors which are the antecedents and contextual factors that shape IHRD at each level; (2) IHRD, processes, policies and practices including the roles and delivery mechanisms used to achieve IHRD goals; (3) proximal outcomes which are defined as more immediate outcomes of IHRD; and (4) distal outcomes which are more long-term outcomes of IHRD. Figure 1.1 presents the multi-level framework and suggests content issues relevant to each level of analysis.

The Country Level of Analysis

The country level of analysis focuses on the NHRD strand of IHRD. The inclusion of the country level of analysis in conceptualisations of IHRD is necessary given the growth in this area of scholarship and debates about the
role of NHRD in developing a country’s human and social capital. First, there are a number of theoretical perspectives that researchers could utilise to provide a strong theoretical foundation for empirical investigations. We suggest that researchers make use of economic development theory (Bauer, 1984; Harvey, 1985; Sen, 1985, 1999; Stiglitz, 1998), resource dependency theory (Boyd, 1990; Pfeffer and Salancik, 1978), stakeholder theory (Freeman, 1984; Friedman and Miles, 2002; Mitchell, Agle and Wood, 1997), institutional theory (Meyer and Rowan, 1977; Scott, 2004;
2008) and ecological perspectives (Bronfenbrenner, 1979) to investigate key issues around the dynamics and operation of NHRD. There are many research gaps that researchers can explore. Of particular significance are the influences of country differences in approaches to NHRD. These differences relate to the influence of economic development stage, the role of national legal and institutional characteristics, the sophistication of national skill development systems and the influence of industrial relations systems. Researchers can make greater use of institutional perspectives, for example, to explain differences in country level differences in the development of skills and competitiveness. Another important but unanswered question in the context of the country level of analysis concerns the inter-relationships between countries and their regions and communities. Significant differences are likely to be found across these domains in terms of the types of human and social capital outcomes that are generated.

There are significant gaps in our understanding of the types in IHRD practices and policy interventions that are appropriate at the country level. What practices and policies are most appropriate in different development contexts such as underdeveloped economies, emerging economies and highly developed economies? One of the most significant gaps in the literature concerns the proximal and distal outcomes of NHRD. How, for example, does NHRD lead to country level human capital outcomes and employment? The links between the proximal and distal outcomes such as economic performance, social performance and enhanced country reputation are also under-explored in the IHRD field.

Internationalising Organisations Level of Analysis

The internationalising organisations level of analysis is sufficiently broad to encompass the types of organisations within which IHRD practices and policies are implemented. These include INGOs, internationalising SMEs, MNCs, international joint ventures, global public organisations, and other international organisations with a social remit. These organisations will differ greatly in their global or headquarter IHRD policies and practices and the characteristics of their IHRD departments. They will also vary in the amount of internationalising experience they have. The stage of internationalisation will influence the role, function and activities of IHRD (Sparrow, Brewster and Harris, 2004). The strategy that these organisations pursue will impact on how people are developed and the skills they require to realise their strategic goals. Organisational structural characteristics will influence IHRD policy and practice including how global or localised people development practices are and their concern with coordination and control mechanisms.
Research at this level can be grounded in a number of theoretical perspectives including the resource-based view (Barney, 1991; Wernerfelt, 1984; 1995), the knowledge-based view (Grant, 1996; Nonaka and Takeuchi, 1995), human capital theory (Becker, 1964; Mincer, 1993) and institutional theory (Meyer and Rowan, 1977; Scott, 2004; 2008). There are major gaps in our understanding of how IHRD is structured and the types of policies and practices that are used in the different types on internationalising organisations outlined above. There are also major gaps in knowledge concerning how accountability and responsibility for IHRD is distributed, the kinds of roles that are performed by IHRD and the specific role of the global IHRD function. Other dimensions of IHRD processes, policies and practices that need investigation include how IHRD strategies, policies and practices are developed and implemented, the types of frameworks that are used, and the way in which IHRD professionals build social capital and knowledge resources of value to the internationalising organisation. There is scope to conduct research on both the proximal and distal outcomes of IHRD at the level of the internationalising organisation. Questions that can be investigated include: How does IHRD in these different organisational contexts enhance organisational, human and social capital and facilitate the achievement of organisational goals? How does IHRD facilitate knowledge sharing and knowledge transfer across units of the internationalising organisation? The most challenging and under-researched area concerns the influence of IHRD on distal outcomes such as financial performance, social performance, global efficiency, flexibility and adaptability and responsiveness to global crises.

The Host Country Unit/Location Level of Analysis

The host country context of internationalising organisations will influence how they are structured, the types of governance mechanisms in place and how effectively the organisation operates within government constraints, legal requirements or political dynamics and uncertainty. The nature of the local operation, and whether it is permanent or temporary, is important as a contextual factor influencing IHRD policy and practice. However, we have limited understanding of how these factors and characteristics shape local IHRD provision and the types and effectiveness of practices that are implemented. Researchers can draw on a range of theoretical frameworks to better understand these issues including social network theory (Burt, 1992, 1997; Gubbins and Garavan, 2009; Lin, 1999; Wasserman and Faust, 1994), institutional theory (Meyer and Rowan, 1977; Scott, 2004; 2008), structuration theory (Giddens, 1984; Parker, 2000), stakeholder theory (Freeman,1984; Friedman and Miles, 2002;
Mitchell, Agle and Wood, 1997) and the RBV (Barney, 1991; Wernerfelt, 1984; 1995). Concepts that are of value here include learning networks, employer brand, and organisational learning processes. There is scope to understand how different types of internationalising organisations implement IHRD practices locally. How similar are local HRD practices to practices at global headquarters? How are they localised to suit the host country conditions? How does the temporary or permanent nature of the organisation influence implementation? How effectively are IHRD practices transferred to foreign locations? What roles are performed by IHRD specialists at local or host country level? What types of partnering and outsourcing arrangements are used to deliver IHRD? These represent a sample of the many unanswered questions in the IHRD field.

Our framework suggests a variety of proximal and distal outcomes that need to be researched. Proximal outcomes include local effectiveness of the unit or location, the enhanced legitimacy and efficiency of the unit and the extent of effective control and coordination of local and global IHRD processes. Distal outcomes that can be investigated include unit financial performance, social performance of the local unit, the effectiveness of resource utilisation and enhanced flexibility, innovation and agility.

The Individual Level of Analysis

The individual level of analysis focuses on the totality of employees within and associated with the internationalising organisation. Given the diversity of internationalising organisations that come within the remit of IHRD we take a necessarily broad view. According to Björkman and Welch (2015), any individual-level analysis should include members of the top management team, international assignees (traditional expatriates and inpatriates, self-initiated, short-term, business travellers), those employed by the organisation in its home country, local affiliate employees, accompanying partners and family members, and those working in cross-border teams. The individual level of analysis should include individuals in the labour market, those employed in partner organisations, those working in cross-border partnerships, those working in both home and host country organisations, those classified as international travellers and those on short-term assignments. Additionally, we include global careers, leader development, and global talent development as individual-focused IHRD practices.

Researchers can draw on a number of theoretical frameworks here including psychological contract theory (Conway and Briner, 2005; Rousseau, 1989, 1998), career theory (Ibarra, 2003), social network theory (Burt, 1992, 1997; Gubbins and Garavan, 2009; Lin, 1999; Wasserman...
and Faust, 1994), human capital theory (Becker, 1964; Mincer, 1993), and agency theory (Eisenhardt, 1989; Jensen and Meckling, 1976). A variety of influencing factors merit investigation at the individual level of analysis including how individuals form different country context values regarding training, their participation in training and education at a national level as well as within organisations. In the context of internationalising organisations and host country unit scenarios, researchers can investigate individual attitudes to IHRD practices and the types of IHRD practices that individuals find most beneficial. There is scope to understand the mix of IHRD practices that internationalising organisations implement to address individual needs and the ways in which these practices are perceived. Researchers should investigate specific individual level proximal outcomes including enhanced employment and employability, human and social capital development, the extent of international adjustment and career satisfaction derived from IHRD. Distal outcomes that can be investigated include the extent of global career mobility, job performance and career progression.

CHAPTER SUMMARIES

This Handbook brings together a wide range of contributions to explore IHRD. For the purposes of clarity, we structure the handbook into four sections: (1) the context of IHRD, (2) IHRD processes, (3) IHRD practices and (4) researching IHRD.

Part I of the Handbook explores a number of contextual issues and contexts in which IHRD is practiced. The contexts in which we explore IHRD include MNCs, international non-governmental organisations, not-for-profit organisations, public sector organisations and internationalising SMEs. In Chapter 2, Lai, Garavan and Carbery explore the IHRD issues that arise in MNCs. The chapter discusses issues that arise at global headquarters and host country unit levels. It draws on RBV theory and the behavioural perspectives and discusses the complexities of the divergence and convergence debate in the context of IHRD. The chapter highlights issues related to the contradictory pressures towards global integration and local differentiation. The authors provide a discussion of the development of IHRD strategies in MNCs and issues of implementation. They conclude the chapter by drawing out a research agenda and highlight key issues for IHRD practice.

In Chapter 3, Alhejji and Garavan explore IHRD in international non-governmental organisations, not-for-profit organisations and international public sector organisations. These organisations primarily have social and
humanitarian goals and operate on a worldwide basis. They implement IHRD policies and practices in the context of significant resource constraints and, due to their structural characteristics, they encounter unique formulation and implementation challenges. The chapter concludes by exploring the differences between these organisations from an IHRD perspective and offers research and practice suggestions.

In Chapter 4, Nolan highlights the unique complexities that arise in respect of IHRD in internationalising SMEs. She argues that IHRD can play an important role in helping SMEs to internationalise and that internationalising SMEs have unique challenges in respect of resources and infrastructure to implement IHRD. The chapter concludes with calls for more research on the challenges of implementing IHRD in internationalising SMEs and the need for stronger theorising and use of more robust methodologies.

The three remaining chapters in Part I focus on important cross-cultural, institutional and cross-country differences that have relevance to IHRD. In Chapter 5, Lai explores the role of national culture and cross-cultural differences in explaining IHRD processes, policies and practices. The chapter specifically highlights how different typologies and categories of national culture shape notions about what constitutes NHRD and how these cultural dimensions shape the types of practices that are implemented and the ways in which IHRD policies are developed and implemented.

In Chapter 6, Winterton discusses international perspectives on competence and competencies in the context of IHRD. The chapter engages with key debates around the definition of competence and competencies internationally and explores national and regional differences in how notions of competence and competencies are discussed, valued and conceptualised. The chapter concludes with a discussion of regional influences and differences and explains why these debates are more prevalent in specific geographic areas.

In Chapter 7, Sheehan and Shanahan explore national differences in investment in human capital and the impact of this investment on both country and organisational performance. They specifically explore human capital investment at macro and micro levels. This macro–micro levels perspective is valuable because it highlights that IHRD can make a difference for both countries and organisations. The chapter concludes with a discussion of opportunities for future research as well as drawing out IHRD practice implications for countries and organisations.

Part II of the Handbook focuses on processes that are important to IHRD. Processes in this context focus on the actions taken by organisations to globalise IHRD practices. There is little by way of insights on these processes in the IHRD context available in the literature to date.
Adopting Monks et al.’s (2013) line of argument about the link between HRM processes, philosophy and practice, we argue that processes are used to promote IHRD philosophy and to enact IHRD practice. These process dimensions play a crucial role in determining both IHRD practices and outcomes. Sparrow (2009), likewise, draws attention to the role of processes arguing that firm-level globalisation processes are key to understanding how various practices operate across geographical boundaries in international organisations. We highlight a variety of processes that can integrate existing resources such as knowledge management, lean management and virtual HRD with their focus on better use of existing resources. As well as the processes used by organisations to better manage existing resources, it is also important to explore how international organisations manage strategic learning and social capital and networking as processes which can act as sources of competitive advantage to identify new opportunities.

In Chapter 8, Valentin discusses the construct of green IHRD and draws out the key features of green IHRD using three orientations: tactical green IHRD; strategic green IHRD; and transformational green IHRD. She argues that green IHRD presents an opportunity for IHRD to build on its strengths in supporting individual and organisational development, learning and change. IHRD is well placed to take a leadership role in sustainability by leveraging the tenets of learning inherent in HRD. Moving from a tactical to transformational perspective on green IHRD will not only ensure greater organisational relevance for IHRD, but also help address the ethical tensions inherent in the HRD profession emanating from the ‘people versus performance’ or ‘organisation versus environment’ dichotomies.

Knowledge management, knowledge creation and knowledge transfer have become central issues for organisational leaders and IHRD professionals. In Chapter 9, Ardichvili examines how knowledge transfer and knowledge co-creation and sharing impact knowledge management in international organisational settings. He discusses some of the main IHRD knowledge management issues in the context of knowledge transfer and creation between subsidiaries and parent organisations; transfer among subsidiaries; and transfer among business organisations and their customers, suppliers, and business network partners. International organisations need to ensure that HRD practitioners create formal IHRD mechanisms and procedures, including training and development, establishment of incentive mechanisms, and development of communication strategies, both for knowledge transmission and for recognition of the importance of transferred knowledge to ensure knowledge transfer occurs.

In Chapter 10, Anderson and Pereira explore the growing trend of
offshoring and outsourcing in international organisations in the context of IHRD. Offshoring and outsourcing have important consequences for IHRD practice, policy and strategy. They present an integrated conceptual model which underlines the importance of strategic understanding by HRD practitioners of the purpose and form of outsourcing agreements as there are different implications for IHRD. The implications of offshoring and outsourcing for training and development, organisation development, knowledge transfer and organisational culture in the IHRD context are explored. The HRD implications of the different forms of offshore outsourcing are set out and the implications for national HRD and IHRD are discussed and areas for further research are identified.

Lean management is an organisational process which has gained much attention over the past decade for its potential to identify opportunities for more efficient and effective organisational functioning. In Chapter 11, Alagaraja discusses the importance of integrating IHRD in lean as a way to enhance and sustain flexibility, adaptiveness and responsiveness in organisations. She offers an integrative perspective on the factors that facilitate the adoption, implementation and sustainability of lean implementation in organisations as well as discussing the relevance of these factors for enhancing the strategic value of IHRD. The chapter reaches the conclusion that there is much greater scope for IHRD involvement in lean implementation which would benefit from further scrutiny.

In Chapter 12, Moon and Ruona focus on an important IHRD process which they call strategic learning capacity. They propose that an organisation’s capacity to retool rapidly to create and execute new strategy through learning at the individual and system levels in response to changes and uncertainties in complex environments is key to its success. Strategic learning capability can be conceptualised as an important dynamic capability that IHRD contributes to an organisation. The chapter concludes by examining the role of strategic learning capability for international organisations and discusses the implications for IHRD.

In Chapter 13, Bennett and McWhorter explore virtual HRD (VHRD) in the context of IHRD. They provide an important historical overview of the role of technology in IHRD, explore the concept of VHRD, and discuss how technology development can be analysed and better understood from an IHRD perspective. They propose a framework for integrating VHRD and IHRD and highlight implications for both practice and research. The chapter specifically addresses issues related to knowledge, culture, learning, technical capacity, and the goals and boundaries of IHRD using a VHRD lens.

In Chapter 14, the final chapter of the second section of the Handbook, Gubbins explores social capital and networking in the context of IHRD.
She focuses on the boundary of the network at the multinational level and on the interaction between national and international networks. She discusses the importance of the IHRD function and considers the impact of social capital in the transnational context for the development of leaders and managers and their careers. She also examines the importance of the impact of social capital and networks for the HRD professional operating in an international context.

Part III of the Handbook focuses on important people development practices that come within the scope of IHRD. We focus on three sets of practices that are central to our understanding of the contribution of IHRD. IHRD research has to date focused on individual level practices with the majority of this emphasis placed on expatriate development issues. Comparatively little is known about the challenge of engaging the wider range of international employees. Other types of international assignees are starting to become more common than traditional expatriates. These different groups include: short-term assignees such as project assignees, development assignees and commuters; and employees who select a more permanent global career involving a variety of international jobs across different companies and contexts. Team focused IHRD practices are designed to coordinate and integrate diverse team members’ knowledge and increase their efficiency, innovation, and performance while accounting for differences in work styles and time zones. Issues associated with global teamworking and the learning and knowledge transfer effects on non-managerial host country nationals employed in MNCs can be addressed by appropriate IHRD team focused interventions (Shaffer et al., 2012). We include leader development, developing global teams and global talent development as team-focused IHRD practices. IHRD is not simply about developing individual employees. It also includes practices that are directed at the total organisation. We highlight the important role of diversity and inclusion, and global talent development as organisational-focused IHRD practices. Each chapter in this part of the Handbook provides a deep dive on each IHRD practice highlighting important practice issues and research gaps.

In Chapter 15, the first chapter in the third section of this book, McLean, Kim and Pruetipibultham look at whether expatriates and inpatriates can be developed, and, if so, how? They consider the determinants of success for expatriates and inpatriates, the link between selection processes and HRD processes, and the learning and development activities that can be used to increase the likelihood of the success of an expatriate or inpatriate. They highlight significant gaps in the field of IHRD research and discuss potential future research avenues in the field.

In Chapter 16, Hammond, O’Shea and Pearson explore careers
from the point of view of the individual and outline how careers and understanding of career success has changed with the rise of the global economy. They discuss how organisations and careerists manage the transitions associated with global work experiences and debate where the responsibility for career management lies, particularly in a global context. They conclude with a discussion of the challenges and opportunities for IHRD then highlight implications for IHRD research and practice.

In Chapter 17, Clarke addresses leader development within the IHRD context. The chapter considers the manner in which leader development practices are subject to cross-cultural differences and cautions against the universal application of homogeneous practices. He also explores how leader development has become a central focus for IHRD but highlights a number of key weaknesses regarding the theory and practice of global leader development and suggests specific avenues of research to address these deficiencies.

Moving from the development of individual leaders to developing global teams, in Chapter 18 McLean and Kim discuss how global team development is an essential component of IHRD. The chapter considers different types of global teams, defines team success and details specific approaches to developing global teams. A number of challenges involved in developing global teams are outlined and the lack of extant research in the area is addressed with particular areas that require urgent attention highlighted.

In Chapter 19, Gedro considers diversity and inclusion from an IHRD perspective and focuses on four key themes: the nature of workplace diversity and inclusion; how corporate social performance can provide a framework to understand the need for IHRD scholars and practitioners to assist organisational leaders with knowledge, skills, and dispositions to successfully lead and manage diverse and inclusive organisations; how the contested HRD perspectives of learning versus performance reconcile within an exploration of diversity and inclusion; and finally, how the field of IHRD can respond to organisational unevenness and exclusion, and contribute to both organisational efficiencies and effectiveness while concurrently working for social justice through workplace diversity and inclusion initiatives.

In Chapter 20, the final chapter in this section, Bratton, Garavan, D’Annunzio-Green and Grant explore the issues surrounding IHRD and global talent development. They consider definitional issues concerning what is talent development. Different options for organising and managing global talent development and how it is related to other talent management functions such as talent acquisition and talent retention
are highlighted. They consider the key dimensions of the global talent development pipeline architecture and the main types of programmes that organisations utilise to develop talent. They consider regional differences and issues related to global talent development and conclude by proposing future areas of research on global talent development in international organisations, as well as recommendations for organisational practice.

In Part IV of the Handbook, we consider the issues that arise when researching IHRD. In Chapter 21, McDonnell explores the methodological challenges and considerations in conducting research on IHRD. The chapter focuses on three fundamental issues relevant to conducting research on IHRD: (1) the use of equivalent measurement and construct characteristics; (2) the use of appropriate sampling frames; and (3) the issues involved in survey administration. He provides suggestions and recommendations for better handling these issues in IHRD research.

CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

In this chapter, we have discussed some of the issues involved in defining IHRD, we have identified four distinct strands of IHRD scholarship, and discussed important contextual issues that shape IHRD research and practice. Following on from this discussion, we proposed and detailed an overarching framework that will assist IHRD researchers to make sense of a nascent field and we identify a range of important but as yet unanswered research questions for the field. Our overview of existing IHRD theorising reveals a field that is growing but very fragmented. The research base has a number of distinct features and strands that operate relatively independent of each other even though they share many common themes and issues. Scholars have suggested that fragmentation is a feature of an early stage developing field that is growing at a relatively fast pace (Björkman and Welch, 2015) and the IHRD field can be characterised in this way.

Our integrated framework (Figure 1.1) suggests many different and as yet unanswered research questions. However, for the purposes of the discussion here, and having taken into consideration the content of the twenty-one chapters included in the Handbook, we highlight four key areas corresponding to the four dimensions of our framework where the most pronounced gaps exist. First, we have relatively little understanding of the most salient influencing factors that operate at the four levels of analysis presented in our framework where the most pronounced gaps exist. First, we have relatively little understanding of the most salient influencing factors that operate at the four levels of analysis presented in our framework in Figure 1.1. Therefore, IHRD scholars need to shed light on, for example, how national institutional,
cultural and industry factors influence conceptualisations and manifestations of IHRD at the national level of analysis and within internationalising organisations and their local units. We also need insights on how different types of internationalising organisations respond to these contextual factors and the types of IHRD processes, policies and practices that they implement. Scholars can effectively utilise institutional and ecological perspectives to address these questions.

A second area that has received scant attention in the IHRD literature concerns the global strategies of internationalising organisations. Each of the internationalising organisations discussed earlier in this chapter will have different global and international strategies and will take different positions on how strategy should be linked to IHRD. Therefore, we have a dearth of understanding of how internationalising organisations implementing different goals and strategies approach IHRD and in particular the mix of practices that they implement. Third, to the best of our knowledge, we found no contribution that has investigated the IHRD function, the roles that IHRD specialists perform and the ways in which IHRD policies and practices are formulated and implemented. We lack insights on how these dimensions will differ across different internationalising organisations and there are gaps in our understanding about the roles that IHRD actors perform and the strategies they implement to achieve important individual outcomes.

The fourth area concerns investigation of the outcomes of IHRD. The lack of insight concerning both proximal and distal outcomes makes it challenging for IHRD practitioners to make the case for the value of these practices and their return on investment. Scholars could usefully utilise a contingency perspective to investigate these outcomes at the four levels of analysis in the framework. Researchers also have the scope to understand how moderating institutional context factors and cultural differences impact these outcomes. Given the multi-level nature of the framework, there is an urgent need to conduct research on outcomes that traverse these different levels.

In conclusion, this Handbook seeks to establish IHRD as an academic area both in the need of and ripe for future theorising and research. The field is nascent but growing at a fast pace. This Handbook brings together a variety of research strands and provides useful foundations for further theory building and testing and it suggests avenues or paths for research that, to date, have not been well travelled.
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