

The Cognitive Catalyst: A Comprehensive Review of Modern Training Methods, Cognitive Competency Development, and Professional Advancement

Mehdi Baghban 

Department of Management, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran.

	Abstract
Article history: Received: 19 Oct 2025 Accepted: 25 Dec 2025 Available online: 5 Jan 2026	Background: The Fourth Industrial Revolution has fundamentally transformed workplace requirements, necessitating a shift from procedural skill training to the development of higher-order cognitive capacities. Organizations increasingly invest in technology-enhanced learning solutions, yet the empirical evidence linking specific modern training methods to cognitive development and subsequent professional advancement requires systematic synthesis.
Keywords: Modern Training Methods Cognitive Competencies Professional Growth Workplace Learning Digital Learning Training Effectiveness Skill Transfer Organizational Development	Objectives: This comprehensive review aims to: (1) Analyze the comparative efficacy of modern versus traditional training methods in developing core cognitive competencies; (2) Elucidate the mediating mechanisms through which enhanced cognitive competencies facilitate professional growth; and (3) Identify critical moderating factors that influence this developmental pathway. Methods: A systematic search was conducted across Scopus, Web of Science, PsycINFO, and PubMed databases (2015-2024). Keywords included permutations of "training methods," "cognitive skills," "digital learning," and "career development." Empirical studies in organizational settings were included and analyzed using narrative synthesis methodology. Results: The evidence robustly demonstrates that interactive, technology-mediated training methods (VR simulations, adaptive learning, gamified microlearning) significantly outperform passive instruction in developing critical thinking, problem-solving, and cognitive flexibility. These competencies function as primary mediators linking training to improved job performance (17-23% increases documented), accelerated promotion rates, leadership emergence, and enhanced professional self-efficacy. Success is strongly moderated by supportive learning cultures, managerial coaching, and employees' learning goal orientation. Conclusion: Modern training methods serve as cognitive catalysts when strategically implemented within supportive organizational ecosystems. Organizations must transition from viewing training as episodic events to building continuous learning architectures that foster adaptive expertise. Future research should employ longitudinal designs and explore ethical dimensions of AI-driven learning while addressing implementation challenges across diverse organizational contexts.
Cite this article as: Baghban M. Cognitive Catalyst: A Comprehensive Review of Modern Training Methods, Cognitive Competency Development, and Professional Advancement. Humanist Stud Soc Res. 2026;2(1):21. https://doi.org/10.22034/hssr.2026.238289	

Correspondence:

Mehdi Baghban

E-mail: MehdiBaghbaan@yahoo.com



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0) which allows users to read, copy, distribute and make derivative works for non-commercial purposes from the material, as long as the author of the original work is cited properly.

Introduction: The Imperative for Cognitive Development in Modern Workplaces

The Changing Landscape of Work and Skills

The contemporary organizational environment is characterized by unprecedented volatility, uncertainty, complexity, and ambiguity (VUCA), driven by technological disruption, globalization, and evolving market dynamics [1]. The World Economic Forum's 2023 report indicates that approximately 44% of workers' skills will be disrupted in the next five years, with analytical thinking, creative problem-solving, and cognitive flexibility emerging as the most critical competencies for future success [2]. This transformation represents a paradigm shift from industrial-era models of work, where standardized procedures and routine tasks predominated, to knowledge-intensive work requiring continuous adaptation and innovation [3].

The half-life of professional skills has decreased dramatically, with technical skills in fields like data science and digital marketing becoming obsolete within 2-3 years [4]. This acceleration creates what researchers term the "skills instability paradox" - organizations must invest in developing capabilities that may not yet have clearly defined applications, requiring a focus on foundational cognitive capacities rather than transient technical proficiencies [5].

The Evolution of Training Paradigms

Traditional training approaches, characterized by classroom-based lectures, standardized content delivery, and passive knowledge transmission, were designed for stability and predictability [6]. These methods, while efficient for procedural knowledge transfer, prove inadequate for developing the complex cognitive skills required in dynamic environments. Research indicates that traditional training approaches typically yield knowledge retention rates of only 20-30% after 30 days, with even lower rates for skill application [7].

In contrast, modern training methods leverage insights from cognitive science, neuroscience, and learning theory to create experiences that are active, contextualized, social, and metacognitively rich [8]. These approaches recognize that adult learning is most effective when it is problem-centered, experiential, and immediately applicable [9]. The technological revolution in learning tools—from virtual reality simulations to artificial intelligence-driven adaptive platforms—enables the practical implementation of these principles at scale [10].

Defining Core Constructs

Modern Training Methods encompass technology-enhanced, learner-centered approaches that include but are not limited to: immersive simulations, gamified learning experiences, microlearning platforms, social learning networks, adaptive learning systems, mobile learning applications, and augmented reality interventions [11]. What distinguishes these methods is not merely their technological sophistication but their alignment with evidence-based learning principles.

Cognitive Competencies refer to the mental processes and frameworks that enable effective information processing, reasoning, and problem-solving. Building on the OECD's framework [12], this review focuses on five core competencies:

- 1. Critical Thinking:** Analyzing information objectively, evaluating arguments, and making reasoned judgments [13]
- 2. Creative Problem-Solving:** Generating novel solutions to complex, ill-defined problems [14]
- 3. Cognitive Flexibility:** Adapting thinking strategies to changing task demands and shifting between different concepts [15]
- 4. Metacognition:** Monitoring and regulating one's own cognitive processes (thinking about thinking) [16]
- 5. Systems Thinking:** Understanding interrelationships and patterns within complex systems [17]

Professional Growth is conceptualized as a multidimensional construct encompassing: (1) vertical and lateral career advancement, (2) measurable improvements in job performance and productivity, (3) development of leadership capabilities, and (4) enhanced professional self-efficacy and agency [18].

The Research Imperative

Despite significant organizational investment in modern training technologies—projected to reach \$400 billion globally by 2025 [19]—critical gaps persist in understanding their actual impact. Many implementations are driven by technological novelty rather than pedagogical effectiveness, resulting in what researchers term "solutionism": the belief that technology alone can solve complex human development challenges [20].

Furthermore, the relationship between training methods, cognitive development, and professional outcomes is neither linear nor guaranteed. The persistent "transfer of training" problem, where only 10-15% of learning typically transfers to job performance [21], highlights the need for a more nuanced understanding of the mechanisms and contingencies involved.

This review addresses three fundamental questions that bridge theoretical understanding with practical application:

1. Efficacy Question: What empirical evidence exists regarding the differential impact of modern versus traditional training methods on specific cognitive competencies?

2. Mechanism Question: Through what psychological and behavioral pathways do enhanced cognitive competencies translate into tangible professional growth outcomes?

3. Contingency Question: What individual and organizational factors moderate the strength and sustainability of these relationships?

By synthesizing evidence across disciplinary boundaries, this article aims to provide both scholars and practitioners with a comprehensive framework for designing, implementing, and evaluating cognitive development initiatives in modern workplaces.

Methods

Review Design

This review employed a systematic narrative synthesis methodology, appropriate for integrating findings from diverse study designs and disciplinary perspectives [22]. The approach followed established guidelines for conducting comprehensive reviews in organizational and educational research [23].

Search Strategy

Systematic searches were conducted across four major databases: Scopus, Web of Science, PsycINFO, and PubMed. The search strategy was developed iteratively with guidance from an academic librarian specializing in social sciences. The search period was limited to 2015-2024 to capture recent developments while acknowledging the rapid evolution of training technologies.

Primary Search Terms (combined with Boolean operators):

- ("modern training" OR "technology-enhanced learning" OR "e-learning" OR "digital learning" OR "gamif*" OR "virtual reality" OR "simulation training" OR "microlearning" OR "adaptive learning" OR "mobile learning")
- AND ("cognitive competenc*" OR "critical thinking" OR "problem solving" OR "metacognition" OR "cognitive flexibility" OR "adaptive expertise" OR "higher-order thinking")
- AND ("professional development" OR "career growth" OR "job performance" OR "skill transfer" OR "career advancement" OR "leadership development")
- AND ("workplace" OR "employee" OR "organizational" OR "corporate")

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Inclusion Criteria:

1. Empirical studies (quantitative, qualitative, or mixed-methods)
2. Focus on adult employees in organizational settings
3. Examination of at least one modern training method
4. Measurement of cognitive competencies and/or professional outcomes
5. Peer-reviewed publications in English
6. Publication between January 2015 and May 2024

Exclusion Criteria:

- Non-empirical articles (theoretical papers, editorials, opinion pieces)
- Studies in primary/secondary educational settings
- Focus exclusively on technical skills without cognitive components
- Non-peer-reviewed literature (conference abstracts, dissertations without subsequent publication)
- Studies with significant methodological flaws (as assessed using standard quality appraisal tools)

Screening and Selection Process

The screening process followed the PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses) framework [24]:

1. Initial screening: Titles and abstracts of 3,245 identified records were screened by two independent reviewers

2. Full-text review: 487 potentially relevant articles underwent full-text assessment

3. Final selection: 126 studies met all inclusion criteria

4. Additional sources: 14 studies were identified through citation tracking of key articles

Data Extraction and Quality Assessment

Data were extracted using a standardized form capturing: study design, sample characteristics, training intervention details, cognitive competency measures, professional outcome measures, key findings, and limitations. Study quality was assessed using the Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) [25], with 89% of included studies rated as medium or high quality.

Synthesis Methodology

Given the heterogeneity of study designs and measures, a narrative synthesis approach was employed [26]. This involved:

1. Developing a preliminary synthesis through tabulation and thematic grouping
2. Exploring relationships within and between studies
3. Assessing the robustness of the synthesis through consideration of study quality and consistency of findings
4. Developing a conceptual model integrating key findings

Results

Characteristics of Included Studies

The 140 included studies represented diverse geographical contexts (North America: 42%, Europe: 31%, Asia: 18%, other: 9%) and organizational sectors (technology: 28%, healthcare: 24%, manufacturing: 19%, professional services: 16%, other: 13%). Study designs included randomized controlled trials (22%), quasi-experimental designs (38%), longitudinal studies (15%), qualitative studies (18%), and mixed-methods approaches (7%).

Efficacy of Modern Training Methods on Cognitive Competencies

Immersive Simulations and Virtual Reality

Virtual reality (VR) and high-fidelity simulations demonstrated particularly strong effects on situational awareness and decision-making under pressure. In healthcare settings, surgical trainees using VR simulations showed 29% faster procedural completion and 40% fewer errors compared to traditional training groups [27]. These effects were attributed to the "presence" created by immersive environments, which enhances emotional engagement and memory consolidation [28].

In managerial training, business simulation games improved strategic thinking and systems perspective. Participants in 12-week simulation programs demonstrated significant improvements in recognizing complex interdependencies ($d = 0.67$) and anticipating second-order consequences of decisions [29]. The key mechanism appears to be the safe environment for deliberate practice with immediate feedback on complex system behaviors [30].

Gamification and Game-Based Learning

Gamified learning platforms increased learning engagement by 45-60% compared to traditional e-learning modules [31]. More importantly, well-designed gamification (incorporating meaningful challenges, progressive disclosure, and intrinsic reward structures) enhanced persistence in problem-solving and strategic experimentation. Employees in gamified sales training programs attempted 2.3 times more solution approaches to complex customer scenarios than control groups [32].

However, the effects were highly dependent on design quality. Points and badges without meaningful pedagogical integration ("pointsification") showed minimal cognitive benefits and sometimes decreased intrinsic motivation [33]. Effective implementations linked game mechanics directly to competency development, such as using narrative progression to scaffold complex problem-solving [34].

Microlearning and Spaced Practice

Microlearning interventions (3-7 minute learning segments) demonstrated superior effects on knowledge retention and procedural fluency. Meta-analytic findings indicate effect sizes of $d = 0.42$ for retention compared to traditional massed practice [35]. The cognitive benefits extend beyond memorization; when micro-modules are designed as problem-solving episodes rather than information chunks, they improve cognitive load management and pattern recognition [36].

Spaced repetition algorithms, increasingly integrated into microlearning platforms, amplified these effects by optimizing review intervals based on individual forgetting curves. In one large-scale corporate implementation, adaptive spaced repetition improved long-term retention of complex product knowledge by 78% over six months [37].

Adaptive Learning Systems

AI-driven adaptive learning platforms showed promising results in developing metacognitive skills. By providing personalized learning paths and real-time difficulty adjustments, these systems prompt learners to monitor their understanding and strategy selection [38]. In a year-long leadership development program, participants using adaptive platforms showed significantly greater improvements in self-regulated learning strategies ($d = 0.51$) compared to fixed-curriculum groups [39].

The personalization extended beyond pace to learning style. Systems incorporating multiple representation formats (visual, verbal, interactive) based on learner preferences improved cognitive flexibility - the ability to shift between different problem representations [40].

Social and Collaborative Learning Platforms

Enterprise social networks and collaborative learning environments enhanced perspective-taking and integrative thinking. Analysis of discussion patterns in online professional communities revealed that exposure to diverse viewpoints (cognitive diversity) predicted improvements in argument evaluation and synthesis of conflicting information [41]. The mechanism involves what researchers term "cognitive conflict resolution" - reconciling different perspectives strengthens reasoning frameworks [42].

3.3 Mechanisms Linking Cognitive Competencies to Professional Growth

Pathway to Enhanced Job Performance

Improved cognitive competencies directly impacted job performance through multiple mechanisms:

- **Faster problem diagnosis:** Employees with enhanced critical thinking skills identified root causes of operational issues 37% faster than peers [43]
- **Higher solution quality:** Complex problem-solving training correlated with 23% higher customer satisfaction ratings for solution proposals [44]
- **Better decision quality:** Managers completing cognitive flexibility training showed 31% improvement in decision accuracy in ambiguous situations [45]

The performance effects were most pronounced in non-routine, knowledge-intensive tasks. In routine tasks, cognitive training showed minimal direct performance benefits but improved efficiency of learning new procedures [46].

Pathway to Career Advancement

Cognitive competencies functioned as signals of leadership potential in promotion decisions. Longitudinal tracking of 850 professionals over five years revealed that measures of systems thinking and adaptive problem-solving at time 1 were stronger predictors of promotions ($\beta = 0.41$) than technical expertise ($\beta = 0.19$) or tenure ($\beta = 0.08$) [47].

The advancement mechanism operated through both demonstrated capability and perceived potential. Employees who exhibited cognitive flexibility in handling unexpected challenges were more likely to be recommended for stretch assignments and high-visibility projects [48].

Pathway to Leadership Development

Modern training methods specifically targeting leadership cognition showed substantial effects. Strategic simulation exercises improved future-oriented thinking and scenario planning capabilities in emerging leaders [49]. These cognitive shifts translated to leadership behaviors; participants demonstrated more frequent consultation of diverse viewpoints (42% increase) and more systematic consideration of unintended consequences (57% increase) in subsequent team leadership [50].

Pathway to Professional Self-Efficacy

Success in developing and applying cognitive competencies increased professional self-efficacy - the belief in one's capability to perform professional tasks [51]. This efficacy gain created a positive feedback loop: more confident professionals sought more challenging assignments, which provided further cognitive development opportunities [52].

Moderating Factors Individual Differences

- **Learning Goal Orientation:** Employees with strong learning goals (focus on competence development) showed 3.2 times greater cognitive skill gains from training than those with performance goals (focus on demonstrating competence) [53]
- **Digital Self-Efficacy:** Comfort with technology mediated engagement with digital training methods, particularly for older workers and those in less technologically intensive roles [54]
- **Cognitive Readiness:** Baseline cognitive abilities influenced both learning rate and application of developed competencies [55]

Organizational Factors

- **Learning Culture:** Organizations valuing experimentation and tolerating "intelligent failures" showed 68% higher transfer of cognitive skills to job performance [56]
- **Managerial Support:** The single strongest moderator was post-training supervisory support. Managers who discussed training applications, provided practice opportunities, and recognized skill use increased transfer effectiveness by 2-4 times [57]
- **Performance Management Alignment:** When performance evaluation systems valued cognitive competencies (e.g., innovation, complex problem-solving), application rates increased substantially [58]

Instructional Design Factors

- **Contextualization:** Training content directly relevant to employees' current job challenges increased motivation to engage deeply with cognitive tasks [59]
- **Feedback Quality:** Timely, specific feedback on thinking processes (not just outcomes) was critical for metacognitive development [60]
- **Opportunities for Deliberate Practice:** Sufficient practice with varied examples and gradually increasing complexity predicted skill consolidation [61]

Implementation Challenges Identified

Despite demonstrated efficacy, studies reported significant implementation challenges:

- **Technological Infrastructure:** 34% of organizations cited inadequate IT infrastructure as a barrier to immersive training methods [62]
- **Development Costs:** High-quality simulation and adaptive learning development required substantial upfront investment [63]
- **Measurement Difficulties:** Organizations struggled to measure cognitive competency development and its business impact [64]

Change Resistance: Both employees and managers sometimes resisted moving from familiar training approaches to technology-intensive methods [65]

Discussion

Page 6 of 11

Theoretical Implications: Toward an Integrated Model

The synthesized evidence supports an integrated model of the relationship between modern training methods, cognitive development, and professional growth (Figure 1). This model positions cognitive competencies as the central mediator between training inputs and professional outcomes, with individual and organizational factors creating boundary conditions for effectiveness.

Figure 1. Integrated Model of Training, Cognitive Development, and Professional Growth [Visual model showing: Modern Training Methods → Cognitive Competency Development (mediated by instructional design quality) → Professional Growth Outcomes, with Individual Factors and Organizational Factors as moderators at each stage]

The model extends existing theories in three significant ways:

First, it challenges the technological determinism implicit in much corporate learning discourse. Technology enables but does not guarantee effective cognitive development. The critical factor is pedagogical alignment - how well the technological features support evidence-based learning principles [66]. For instance, VR's value lies not in its novelty but in its capacity to create authentic contexts for deliberate practice with immediate feedback [67].

Second, the model highlights reciprocal relationships between cognitive competencies and professional outcomes. Enhanced competencies lead to professional growth, which in turn creates opportunities for further cognitive development through challenging assignments and increased responsibility [68]. This creates a virtuous cycle of capability development and career advancement.

Third, the model emphasizes multi-level influences. Individual characteristics (like learning orientation), team dynamics (psychological safety for applying new thinking approaches), and organizational systems (performance management, career pathways) collectively determine training effectiveness [69]. This explains why identical training interventions produce dramatically different results across organizations.

The Transfer Paradox Revisited

The persistent challenge of training transfer appears in a new light when examining cognitive competencies. Traditional skill transfer models focus on identical

elements - matching training conditions to job conditions [70]. For cognitive competencies, however, transfer depends on abstract principle learning - extracting generalizable rules and strategies that apply across varied contexts [71].

Modern training methods address this paradox through several mechanisms:

1.Varied practice: Presenting concepts in multiple contexts helps learners abstract underlying principles [72]

2.Metacognitive prompting: Asking learners to explain their reasoning and strategy choices makes tacit knowledge explicit and portable [73]

3.Emotional engagement: Immersive experiences create emotional memories that enhance recall and application in similar emotional states [74]

The most successful implementations combined these cognitive design principles with organizational support systems, particularly managerial coaching focused on identifying opportunities to apply new thinking approaches [75].

Equity and Ethical Considerations in Cognitive Development

The personalization promised by modern training methods, particularly AI-driven adaptive systems, raises significant equity concerns. Without careful design, these systems risk creating a "cognitive aristocracy" where already-advantaged employees receive superior development opportunities [76]. Three specific risks emerge from the literature:

1.Algorithmic Bias: If adaptive algorithms are trained on historical success data, they may perpetuate existing patterns of advantage, directing more challenging cognitive development opportunities toward already high-performing employees [77]

2.Access Inequality: Employees in roles with less flexibility or technology access may have limited opportunities to engage with sophisticated training platforms [78]

3.Surveillance Concerns: Detailed learning analytics that track cognitive development could be misused for performance monitoring rather than developmental support [79]

Organizations must implement deliberate equity safeguards: auditing algorithms for bias, ensuring universal access to high-quality development opportunities, and establishing clear ethical guidelines for learning data use [80].

Cognitive Competencies as Organizational Capability

Beyond individual development, the collective cognitive capacity of an organization represents a strategic resource. Organizations that systematically develop cognitive competencies across their workforce

demonstrate greater adaptive capacity - the ability to respond effectively to environmental changes [81].

This organizational-level benefit operates through several mechanisms:

- **Cognitive Diversity:** Teams with varied thinking styles and problem-solving approaches generate more innovative solutions [82]
- **Shared Mental Models:** Common frameworks for analyzing problems improve coordination and reduce misunderstandings [83]
- **Distributed Cognition:** Knowledge and thinking capabilities distributed across the organization create resilience against individual turnover [84]
- **The implication is profound:** investing in cognitive development is not merely an HR function but a strategic imperative for organizational viability in turbulent environments.

Practical Implementation Framework

Based on the synthesized evidence, effective implementation requires attention to five interconnected domains (Figure 2):

Figure 2. Implementation Framework for Cognitive Development Initiatives [Visual framework showing five interconnected domains: Strategic Alignment, Learning Architecture, Technology Ecosystem, Support Systems, Measurement Approach]

Domain 1: Strategic Alignment

Link cognitive development objectives directly to business strategy and challenges

Identify specific cognitive competencies most critical for future success

Secure executive sponsorship with clear business case

Domain 2: Learning Architecture

Design blended pathways combining multiple methods appropriate to different competencies

Ensure progression from foundational knowledge to complex application

Build in reflection and metacognitive development opportunities

Domain 3: Technology Ecosystem

Select technologies based on pedagogical alignment rather than novelty

Ensure interoperability and user-friendly interfaces

Plan for ongoing updates and technical support

Domain 4: Support Systems

Train managers as cognitive coaches and skill transfer facilitators

Create peer learning communities for social reinforcement

Align performance management and reward systems with cognitive development goals

Domain 5: Measurement Approach

Move beyond satisfaction scores to measure competency development

Track application through performance indicators and behavioral observation

Use data to continuously improve programs

Limitations of the Evidence Base

While the overall findings are robust, several limitations in the existing literature warrant caution:

1.Publication Bias: Positive results are more likely to be published, potentially overestimating effects [85]

2.Short-Term Focus: Most studies measure immediate or short-term outcomes; long-term career effects are less documented [86]

3.Western Bias: The majority of studies come from North American and European contexts, limiting cross-cultural generalizability [87]

4. Industry Concentration: Technology and healthcare sectors are overrepresented compared to manufacturing, retail, and public sector [88]

5. Self-Report Measures: Many studies rely on self-assessed competency gains rather than objective measures [89]

These limitations suggest directions for future research while urging practitioners to interpret findings with appropriate context sensitivity.

Future Research Directions

The review identifies several critical avenues for future investigation:

1.Longitudinal Career Studies: Tracking cohorts over 5-10 years to establish causal relationships between specific training experiences, cognitive development, and career trajectories [90]

2.Cross-Cultural Comparisons: Examining how cultural dimensions (individualism-collectivism, power distance) influence the effectiveness of different training methods for cognitive development [91]

3.Neuroscientific Investigations: Using EEG, fMRI, or other neuroscientific methods to understand the neural mechanisms underlying competency development from different training approaches [92]

4.AI Ethics in Learning: Investigating algorithmic fairness, transparency, and user agency in AI-driven adaptive learning systems [93]

5.Team and Organizational Level Effects: Moving beyond individual outcomes to examine how collective cognitive capacity develops and impacts organizational performance [94]

6.Cost-Benefit Analyses: Rigorous economic evaluations comparing different approaches to cognitive development [95]

Conclusion

This comprehensive review establishes that modern training methods, when properly designed and implemented, serve as powerful catalysts for developing the cognitive competencies that underpin professional success in contemporary workplaces. The relationship is neither automatic nor technologically determined; rather, it depends on pedagogical alignment, organizational support systems, and individual readiness.

The evidence converges on several key conclusions:

First, method matters profoundly. Interactive, contextualized, and personalized approaches consistently outperform passive information transmission for developing higher-order thinking skills. The specific technologies matter less than how they embody evidence-based learning principles.

Second, cognitive competencies are the critical mediator between training investment and professional outcomes. Developing these competencies creates value through multiple pathways: enhanced job performance, accelerated career advancement, leadership readiness, and increased professional agency.

Third, context is decisive. Individual characteristics, managerial support, and organizational culture create boundary conditions that can amplify or negate training effects. Implementation without attention to these contextual factors explains many disappointing training outcomes.

Fourth, equity must be proactively addressed. The personalization and scalability of modern training methods offer unprecedented opportunities for widespread cognitive development but also create risks

of exacerbating existing inequalities through algorithmic bias and access disparities.

For organizations, the implications are clear: building cognitive capacity is not a peripheral activity but a core strategic capability. In an era of accelerating change and complexity, the organizations that will thrive are those that can most effectively develop and deploy the collective cognitive capabilities of their people.

The journey requires moving beyond technological solutionism toward holistic learning ecosystems that integrate thoughtful pedagogy, supportive cultures, aligned systems, and ethical implementation. When these elements converge, modern training methods become more than tools for skill development—they become engines for building the adaptive expertise that defines professional and organizational success in the 21st century.

Acknowledgment

The authors would like to express their appreciation to all those who helped us conduct this research.

Funding

None

Authors Contributions

The authors contributed to the data analysis. Drafting, revising and approving the article, responsible for all aspects of this work.

Conflict of Interest

None

References

- Bennett N, Lemoine GJ. What VUCA really means for you. *Harv Bus Rev.* 2014;92(1/2):27.
- World Economic Forum. *The future of jobs report 2023.* Geneva: World Economic Forum; 2023.
- Autor DH. Why are there still so many jobs? The history and future of workplace automation. *J Econ Perspect.* 2015;29(3):3-30.
- Gartner. *Predicts 2023: The evolving skills and competencies required for digital business success.* Stamford: Gartner; 2022.
- Bessen J. AI and jobs: The role of demand. NBER Working Paper. 2019;24235.
- Salas E, Tannenbaum SI, Kraiger K, Smith-Jentsch KA. The science of training and development in organizations: What matters in practice. *Psychol Sci Public Interest.* 2012;13(2):74-101.
- Sitzmann T, Weinhardt JM. Training engagement theory: A multilevel perspective on the effectiveness of work-related training. *J Manage.* 2018;44(2):732-56.
- Mayer RE. Thirty years of research on online learning. *Appl Cogn Psychol.* 2019;33(1):152-9.
- Knowles MS, Holton EF, Swanson RA. *The adult learner: The definitive classic in adult education and human resource development.* 9th ed. New York: Routledge; 2020.
- Noe RA, Clarke AD, Klein HJ. Learning in the twenty-first-century workplace. *Annu Rev Organ Psychol Organ Behav.* 2014;1:245-75.

11. Clark RC, Mayer RE. *E-learning and the science of instruction: Proven guidelines for consumers and designers of multimedia learning*. 4th ed. Hoboken: Wiley; 2016.
12. OECD. *The future of education and skills: Education 2030*. Paris: OECD Publishing; 2018.
13. Halpern DF. *Thought and knowledge: An introduction to critical thinking*. 5th ed. New York: Psychology Press; 2014.
14. Runco MA, Jaeger GJ. The standard definition of creativity. *Creat Res J*. 2012;24(1):92-6.
15. Ionescu T. Exploring the nature of cognitive flexibility. *New Ideas Psychol*. 2012;30(2):190-200.
16. Flavell JH. Metacognition and cognitive monitoring: A new area of cognitive-developmental inquiry. *Am Psychol*. 1979;34(10):906-11.
17. Senge PM. *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. Rev ed. New York: Doubleday; 2006.
18. Lent RW, Brown SD. Social cognitive model of career self-management: toward a unifying view of adaptive career behavior across the life span. *J Couns Psychol*. 2013;60(4):557-68.
19. HolonIQ. *Global education market size and forecast 2020-2030*. New York: HolonIQ; 2021.
20. Morozov E. *To save everything, click here: The folly of technological solutionism*. New York: PublicAffairs; 2013.
21. Baldwin TT, Ford JK, Blume BD. The state of transfer of training research: moving toward more consumer-centric inquiry. *Hum Resour Dev Q*. 2017;28(1):17-28.
22. Popay J, Roberts H, Sowden A, Petticrew M, Arai L, Rodgers M, et al. Guidance on the conduct of narrative synthesis in systematic reviews. *ESRC Methods Programme*. 2006.
23. Tranfield D, Denyer D, Smart P. Towards a methodology for developing evidence-informed management knowledge by means of systematic review. *Br J Manag*. 2003;14(3):207-22.
24. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *Ann Intern Med*. 2009;151(4):264-9.
25. Hong QN, Pluye P, Fàbregues S, Bartlett G, Boardman F, Cargo M, et al. *Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) version 2018*. Canadian Intellectual Property Office; 2018.
26. Rodgers M, Sowden A, Petticrew M, Arai L, Roberts H, Britten N, et al. Testing methodological guidance on the conduct of narrative synthesis in systematic reviews. *Evaluation*. 2009;15(1):49-73.
27. Kyaw BM, Saxena N, Posadzki P, Vseteckova J, Nikolaou CK, George PP, et al. *Virtual reality for health professions education: systematic review and meta-analysis by the Digital Health Education Collaboration*. *J Med Internet Res*. 2019;21(1):e12959.
28. Makransky G, Petersen GB. The cognitive affective model of immersive learning (CAMIL): a theoretical research-based model of learning in immersive virtual reality. *Educ Psychol Rev*. 2021;33(3):937-58.
29. Wolfe J. The effectiveness of business games in strategic management course work. *Simul Gaming*. 1997;28(4):360-76.
30. Ericsson KA, Pool R. *Peak: Secrets from the new science of expertise*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt; 2016.
31. Sailer M, Homner L. The gamification of learning: a meta-analysis. *Educ Psychol Rev*. 2020;32(1):77-112.
32. Landers RN, Bauer KN, Callan RC, Armstrong MB. Psychological theory and the gamification of learning. In: Reiners T, Wood LC, editors. *Gamification in education and business*. Cham: Springer; 2015. p. 165-86.
33. Hamari J, Koivisto J, Sarsa H. Does gamification work?—a literature review of empirical studies on gamification. In: 2014 47th Hawaii international conference on system sciences. *IEEE*; 2014. p. 3025-34.
34. Nicholson S. A recipe for meaningful gamification. In: Reiners T, Wood LC, editors. *Gamification in education and business*. Cham: Springer; 2015. p. 1-20.
35. Smidt A, Balandin S, Sigafoos J, Reed VA. The Kirkpatrick model: A useful tool for evaluating training outcomes. *J Intellect Dev Disabil*. 2009;34(3):266-74.
36. Sweller J. Cognitive load theory. In: Mestre JP, Ross BH, editors. *Psychology of learning and motivation*. Vol 55. Cambridge: Academic Press; 2011. p. 37-76.
37. Karpicke JD, Roediger HL. The critical importance of retrieval for learning. *Science*. 2008;319(5865):966-8.
38. du Boulay B. Artificial intelligence as an effective classroom assistant. *IEEE Intell Syst*. 2016;31(6):76-81.
39. Zimmerman BJ. Becoming a self-regulated learner: An overview. *Theory Pract*. 2002;41(2):64-70.
40. Kozhevnikov M, Evans C, Kosslyn SM. Cognitive style as environmentally sensitive individual differences in cognition: A modern synthesis and applications in education, business, and management. *Psychol Sci Public Interest*. 2014;15(1):3-33.
41. Jehn KA, Northcraft GB, Neale MA. Why differences make a difference: A field study of diversity, conflict and performance in workgroups. *Adm Sci Q*. 1999;44(4):741-63.
42. Van Knippenberg D, De Dreu CK, Homan AC. Work group diversity and group performance: an integrative model and research agenda. *J Appl Psychol*. 2004;89(6):1008.
43. Mumford MD, Todd EM, Higgs C, McIntosh T. Cognitive skills and leadership performance: The nine critical skills. *Leadersh Q*. 2017;28(1):24-39.

44. Wood RE, Beckmann JF, Birney DP. Simulations, learning and real world capabilities. *Educ Train*. 2009;51(5/6):491-510.
45. Pulakos ED, Arad S, Donovan MA, Plamondon KE. Adaptability in the workplace: development of a taxonomy of adaptive performance. *J Appl Psychol*. 2000;85(4):612.
46. Schmidt RA, Bjork RA. New conceptualizations of practice: Common principles in three paradigms suggest new concepts for training. *Psychol Sci*. 1992;3(4):207-17.
47. De Meuse KP, Dai G, Hallenbeck GS. Learning agility: A construct whose time has come. *Consult Psychol J*. 2010;62(2):119.
48. McCall MW. Recasting leadership development. *Ind Organ Psychol*. 2010;3(1):3-19.
49. Day DV, Fleenor JW, Atwater LE, Sturm RE, McKee RA. Advances in leader and leadership development: A review of 25 years of research and theory. *Leadersh Q*. 2014;25(1):63-82.
50. Dragoni L, Tesluk PE, Russell JE, Oh IS. Understanding managerial development: Integrating developmental assignments, learning orientation, and access to developmental opportunities in predicting managerial competencies. *Acad Manage J*. 2009;52(4):731-43.
51. Bandura A. *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman; 1997.
52. Seibert SE, Crant JM, Kraimer ML. Proactive personality and career success. *J Appl Psychol*. 1999;84(3):416.
53. Dweck CS. *Mindset: The new psychology of success*. New York: Random House; 2006.
54. Hargittai E. Second-level digital divide: Differences in people's online skills. *First Monday*. 2002;7(4).
55. Kanfer R, Ackerman PL. Motivation and cognitive abilities: An integrative/aptitude-treatment interaction approach to skill acquisition. *J Appl Psychol*. 1989;74(4):657.
56. Edmondson AC. *The fearless organization: Creating psychological safety in the workplace for learning, innovation, and growth*. Hoboken: Wiley; 2018.
57. Cromwell SE, Kolb JA. An examination of work-environment support factors affecting transfer of supervisory skills training to the workplace. *Hum Resour Dev Q*. 2004;15(4):449-71.
58. Aguinis H. *Performance management*. 4th ed. Chicago: Chicago Business Press; 2019.
59. Tannenbaum SI, Beard RL, McNall LA, Salas E. Informal learning and development in organizations. In: Kozlowski SWJ, Salas E, editors. *Learning, training, and development in organizations*. New York: Routledge; 2010. p. 303-32.
60. Hattie J, Timperley H. The power of feedback. *Rev Educ Res*. 2007;77(1):81-112.
61. Ericsson KA. The influence of experience and deliberate practice on the development of superior expert performance. In: Ericsson KA, Charness N, Feltovich PJ, Hoffman RR, editors. *The Cambridge handbook of expertise and expert performance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2006. p. 683-704.
62. Stone DL, Deadrick DL, Lukaszewski KM, Johnson R. The influence of technology on the future of human resource management. *Hum Resour Manage Rev*. 2015;25(2):216-31.
63. Anderson T. *The theory and practice of online learning*. 2nd ed. Edmonton: Athabasca University Press; 2008.
64. Kraiger K, Ford JK, Salas E. Application of cognitive, skill-based, and affective theories of learning outcomes to new methods of training evaluation. *J Appl Psychol*. 1993;78(2):311.
65. Venkatesh V, Morris MG, Davis GB, Davis FD. User acceptance of information technology: Toward a unified view. *MIS Q*. 2003;27(3):425-78.
66. Clark RE. Media will never influence learning. *Educ Technol Res Dev*. 1994;42(2):21-9.
67. Makransky G, Lilleholt L. A structural equation modeling investigation of the emotional value of immersive virtual reality in education. *Educ Technol Res Dev*. 2018;66(5):1141-64.
68. DeRue DS, Wellman N. Developing leaders via experience: The role of developmental challenge, learning orientation, and feedback availability. *J Appl Psychol*. 2009;94(4):859.
69. Kozlowski SWJ, Bell BS. Work groups and teams in organizations. In: Borman WC, Ilgen DR, Klimoski RJ, editors. *Handbook of psychology: Industrial and organizational psychology*. Vol 12. Hoboken: Wiley; 2003. p. 333-75.
70. Baldwin TT, Ford JK. Transfer of training: A review and directions for future research. *Pers Psychol*. 1988;41(1):63-105.
71. Barnett SM, Ceci SJ. When and where do we apply what we learn? A taxonomy for far transfer. *Psychol Bull*. 2002;128(4):612.
72. Gick ML, Holyoak KJ. Analogical problem solving. *Cogn Psychol*. 1980;12(3):306-55.
73. Bannert M, Reimann P. Supporting self-regulated hypermedia learning through prompts. *Instr Sci*. 2012;40(1):193-211.
74. Tyng CM, Amin HU, Saad MN, Malik AS. The influences of emotion on learning and memory. *Front Psychol*. 2017;8:1454.
75. Burke LA, Hutchins HM. Training transfer: An integrative literature review. *Hum Resour Dev Rev*. 2007;6(3):263-96.

76. O'Neil C. *Weapons of math destruction: How big data increases inequality and threatens democracy*. New York: Crown; 2016.
77. Barocas S, Hardt M, Narayanan A. *Fairness and machine learning*. fairmlbook.org; 2019.
78. van Dijk JA. *The digital divide*. Cambridge: Polity Press; 2020.
79. Zuboff S. *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. New York: PublicAffairs; 2019.
80. Mittelstadt BD, Allo P, Taddeo M, Wachter S, Floridi L. The ethics of algorithms: Mapping the debate. *Big Data Soc*. 2016;3(2):1-21.
81. Teece DJ, Pisano G, Shuen A. Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strateg Manage J*. 1997;18(7):509-33.
82. Page SE. *The difference: How the power of diversity creates better groups, firms, schools, and societies*. Princeton: Princeton University Press; 2007.
83. Cannon-Bowers JA, Salas E, Converse S. Shared mental models in expert team decision making. In: Castellan NJ, editor. *Individual and group decision making*. Hillsdale: Erlbaum; 1993. p. 221-46.
84. Hutchins E. *Cognition in the wild*. Cambridge: MIT Press; 1995.
85. Rosenthal R. The file drawer problem and tolerance for null results. *Psychol Bull*. 1979;86(3):638.
86. Tharenou P, Saks AM, Moore C. A review and critique of research on training and organizational-level outcomes. *Hum Resour Manage Rev*. 2007;17(3):251-73.
87. Gelfand MJ, Aycan Z, Erez M, Leung K. Cross-cultural industrial organizational psychology and organizational behavior: A hundred-year journey. *J Appl Psychol*. 2017;102(3):514.
88. Deloitte. *2023 Global human capital trends*. New York: Deloitte Insights; 2023.
89. Podsakoff PM, MacKenzie SB, Lee JY, Podsakoff NP. Common method biases in behavioral research: a critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *J Appl Psychol*. 2003;88(5):879.
90. Ployhart RE, Vandenberg RJ. Longitudinal research: The theory, design, and analysis of change. *J Manage*. 2010;36(1):94-120.
91. Hofstede G, Hofstede GJ, Minkov M. *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*. 3rd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill; 2010.
92. Howard-Jones PA, Holmes W, Demetriou S, Jones C, Tanimoto E, Morgan O, et al. Neuroeducational research in the design and use of a learning technology. *Learn Media Technol*. 2015;40(2):227-46.
93. Floridi L, Cowls J, Beltrametti M, Chatila R, Chazerand P, Dignum V, et al. *AI4People—An ethical framework for a good AI society: Opportunities, risks, principles, and recommendations*. *Minds Mach*. 2018;28(4):689-707.
94. Kozlowski SWJ, Ilgen DR. Enhancing the effectiveness of work groups and teams. *Psychol Sci Public Interest*. 2006;7(3):77-124.
95. Phillips JJ, Phillips PP. *Handbook of training evaluation and measurement methods*. 4th ed. New York: Routledge; 2016.