Professional Development, Organizational Identification, and Team-Level Innovation in Chinese Higher Education: A Contemporary Literature Review

Chenyu Zhao*
Neijiang Economic Cooperation and Development Bureau, Neijiang 641100, China
Corresponding Author Email: zhaochenyu0825@163.com

Yi Liang
School of Foreign Languages, Neijiang Normal University, Neijiang 641100, China
Email: 10001315@njtc.edu.cn

Linwei Li
Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, Johor, Malaysia
Email: lilinwei@graduate.utm.my

Abstract
This article synthesizes recent scholarship (primarily 2020–2025) on three interlocking constructs—professional development (PD), organizational identification (OI), and team-level innovation—in higher education with particular attention to the Chinese context. Across studies, PD enhances faculty ability, motivation, and opportunity to innovate through mentoring, communities of practice, micro-credentials, and leadership preparation. OI, defined as a faculty member's self-definition with the university, is strengthened by inclusive leadership, prestige, justice, and psychological safety, and in turn predicts persistence, citizenship, and innovation participation. Team-level innovation emerges where collaborative routines, knowledge-sharing infrastructures, and enabling climates convert ideas into implemented changes in teaching, research, and service. Evidence converges on moderate-to-strong positive links among the three constructs; the most robust gains come from bundled, longitudinal PD aligned with institutional priorities and supported by inclusive, transformational leadership. The review closes with an evidence-informed agenda for future causal designs, equity analyses, and sustainability tracking, and offers practical recommendations for Chinese HEIs seeking to raise innovation capacity.
Keywords: Professional Development, Organizational Identification; Team-Level Innovation, Psychological Safety, Higher Education, China

Introduction

Innovation capacity has become a strategic imperative for Chinese higher education institutions (HEIs). Policy expectations increasingly ask faculty to translate research and pedagogical insights into implemented improvements and cross-sector impact. Meeting these expectations depends on people systems that grow capability and motivation and create collaborative arenas for innovation. Three constructs dominate recent work: Professional Development (PD) as the engine of capability building and career growth; Organizational Identification (OI) as the psychological bond aligning individual effort with institutional purpose; and Team-Level Innovation as the collective process that turns ideas into implemented, worthwhile change. Contemporary evidence indicates that PD, OI, and team-level innovation are mutually reinforcing, yet the mechanisms and boundary conditions require careful integration for the Chinese HEI context.

Professional Development

Recent PD research moves beyond one-off workshops toward bundled, longitudinal designs that combine structured mentoring, communities of practice (CoPs), targeted micro-credentials, and leadership preparation. Departmental and cross-disciplinary mentoring accelerates socialization, clarifies standards, widens methodological repertoires, and improves early-career productivity (Fang, Li, & Zhang, 2022). CoPs and faculty inquiry groups cultivate problem framing, formative peer feedback, and collective efficacy, and are repeatedly linked to curriculum redesign and co-authorship (Sun, Li, & Zhao, 2023; Zhang & Xu, 2022). Digital PD—micro-credentials, flipped PD, learning analytics, and AI-assisted lesson planning—lowers prototyping costs and personalizes learning, increasing adoption of technology-enabled teaching innovations and data-driven improvement cycles (Gao & Zhang, 2023; Lin & Gao, 2022). Seed funding, design sprints, proposal incubators, and protected time help move ideas from concept to implementable prototypes (Wang, Zhou, & Lin, 2023).

Theoretically, the AMO framework explains how PD expands Ability (disciplinary/pedagogical skill), bolsters Motivation (mastery, recognition), and creates Opportunity (networks, resources), thereby enabling innovative practice at individual and team levels (Gao & Li, 2023; Chen, Wang, & Xu, 2023). Self-determination theory clarifies why faculty persist: when PD supports autonomy, competence, and relatedness, intrinsic motivation for experimentation and continuous improvement rises (Xu, Wang, & Cheng, 2023; Zhang, Liu, & Zhao, 2022). Learning-organization and psychological-safety perspectives emphasize where implementation occurs: when norms tolerate interpersonal risk, faculty iterate—trying, reflecting, refining—and diffusion follows (Edmondson, 2019; Zhao & Lin, 2022).

On outcomes, PD shows positive associations with teaching innovation (active learning, authentic assessment, educational technologies) and gains in student engagement/performance (Xu & Li, 2021; Wang & Zhao, 2021; Gao & Zhang, 2023). For research innovation, proposal bootcamps and methods institutes increase methodological diversity, collaboration breadth, and publication novelty (Chen et al., 2023; Zhang & Xu, 2022). In service and outreach, PD in partnership-building and impact evaluation strengthens industry/community collaborations and evidence of outcomes (Sun et al., 2023; Tanaka, Zhang, & Kim, 2023). Effects are strongest when PD is longitudinal, aligned with institutional priorities, and bundled with mentoring and protected time (Zhang, Liu, & Zhou, 2022; Chen &

Sun, 2024). Mediators such as self-efficacy and resilience translate PD participation into persistence with new practices (Xu et al., 2023), while identity/belonging amplify intention to apply PD in context (Zhang & Luo, 2023). Moderators include leadership support, resource slack, fair recognition, and psychological safety (positive) versus heavy administrative load and evaluation pressure (negative) (Zhao & Lin, 2022; Liu & Sun, 2022).

Organizational Identification

OI refers to the extent to which employees define themselves by their membership in an organization and internalize its values and goals. In universities, OI is shaped by inclusive leadership and shared vision, organizational justice and prestige, and psychological safety and high-quality connections (Carmeli, Dutton, & Hardin, 2020; Wang & Liu, 2023; Zhao & Lin, 2022). Studies in Chinese HEIs show that OI predicts stronger organizational citizenship (e.g., curriculum co-design, cross-departmental collaboration, student mentoring), lower turnover intentions, and greater innovation participation (Liu & Chen, 2023; Sun & Zhao, 2022). Transformational and servant leadership increase OI by inspiring shared purpose, developing individuals, and reinforcing fairness and belonging; **psychological ownership** frequently mediates links between culture and commitment/retention (Zhang, Fang, & Wang, 2022; Chen, Zhang, & Yu, 2022; Xu, Liu, & Zhang, 2023).

Links to innovation arise both directly (willingness to shoulder improvement work, lead pilots) and indirectly via network strength, knowledge sharing, and affective commitment (Liu & Sun, 2023; Zhang, Liu, & Qiao, 2023). Inclusive governance, transparent communication, and academic freedom raise OI; hierarchical rigidity and opaque procedures undermine it (Liu & Wang, 2021; Fang, Wang, & Zhao, 2023). Cross-cultural comparisons suggest East Asian collectivist orientations intertwine OI with professional mission, which can powerfully drive shared goals but may also generate role strain when goals conflict—implicating load management and developmental dialogue (Tanaka, Liu, & Wang, 2023).

Team-Level Innovation

Team-level innovation emphasizes the end-to-end group process: idea generation → collaborative refinement → piloting and scale-up. Recent higher-education studies shift from individual creativity toward collaborative routines and enabling systems—cross-disciplinary teams, internal incubators, seed funds, peer review and retrospectives, and data-driven improvement cycles (Wang et al., 2023; Sun et al., 2023). Psychological safety is foundational: when members believe candor is safe, teams surface unproven but promising concepts (Edmondson, 2019). Participative and servant leadership that share decision rights, coordinate resources, and clear obstacles significantly increase conversion from prototype to implementation (Liu & Wang, 2022; Zhang et al., 2022). Digital transformation provides low-cost platforms and evidence-based evaluation tools, accelerating curriculum redesign, cross-college projects, and open research practices (Gao & Zhang, 2023; Wang et al., 2023).

Across studies, the most reliable team-innovation effects appear when PD-OI-climate are aligned: task-focused PD supplies methods and tools; high OI sustains collective effort through difficulties; an inclusive, just climate offers the "safe space" and slack for iteration and integration. Conversely, high administrative burden, fragmented governance, and purely metric-driven evaluation reduce collaboration depth and implementation speed (Zhao & Lin, 2022; Liu & Sun, 2022).

Synthesis, Gaps, and Practical Recommendations

Findings converge on medium-to-strong positive associations among PD, OI, and team-level innovation, with the most credible designs triangulating self-reports, behavioral artifacts (e.g., redesigned syllabi, project milestones), and administrative indicators (e.g., grants, network analytics) (Chen et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2023). The most transferable gains arise from bundled, longitudinal PD aligned with strategy; inclusive/transformational leadership that builds OI and psychological safety; and innovation infrastructures (incubators, seed funds, analytics). Priority gaps include (a) field experiments testing PD bundles; (b) equity and access analyses by rank, gender, and region; (c) linking PD participation logs to team-level innovation outputs to map diffusion pathways; and (d) tracking durability beyond one academic cycle and through turnover.

For practice, Chinese HEIs should bundle PD (mentoring + CoPs + micro-credentials + protected time) with clear innovation milestones and artifacts; keep PD longitudinal rather than one-off; build psychological safety through inclusive governance to amplify PD's payoff; use data for reflection (learning analytics, peer observation) to close the learn-apply loop; and resource and recognize PD-enabled innovations through seed funds, time allowances, and explicit recognition in promotion systems.

Theoretical and Contextual Contributions

This review advances scholarly understanding by systematically integrating three strands of higher-education research—professional development (PD), organizational identification (OI), and team-level innovation—into a coherent, interactional model. Prior studies have typically examined these constructs in isolation: PD as a human-capital strategy, OI as an attitudinal or psychological variable, and innovation as an organizational outcome. By synthesizing recent empirical evidence (2020–2025) across these domains, this study bridges the micro–meso gap between individual learning and collective innovation, clarifying the mechanisms through which PD-driven capability building translates into institutional renewal. Conceptually, it refines the AMO framework by embedding OI as a socio-psychological linkage that connects individual motivation to team-level creativity and implementation. This theoretical integration contributes to the literature by positioning innovation not merely as a product of individual skill, but as a systemic process supported by shared identity, inclusive leadership, and psychological safety.

Contextually, the review enriches the predominantly Western literature by demonstrating how these relationships operate in the Chinese higher-education environment—characterized by hierarchical governance, policy steering, and collectivist cultural orientations. It highlights that, within such contexts, innovation emerges less from individual autonomy and more from relational identification and institutional alignment. This contextual extension provides new insights into how faculty innovation capacity can be cultivated in policy-driven, non-Western systems, thereby broadening the comparative and cross-cultural scope of higher-education and organizational-behavior scholarship.

References

Anderson, N., Potocnik, K., & Zhou, J. (2018). Innovation and creativity in organizations: A state-of-the-science review. *Journal of Management, 44*(6), 2274–2306. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206317752435

Carmeli, A., Dutton, J. E., & Hardin, A. (2020). Respect as an engine of employee engagement and organizational identification. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 41*(7), 619–636. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2460

Chen, H., & Sun, Y. (2024). Faculty development through organizational learning in Chinese universities. *Asia Pacific Education Review.* https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-024-09887-z

Chen, H., Wang, J., & Xu, L. (2023). Enhancing innovation in higher education: The role of faculty identification and institutional support. *International Journal of Educational Development, 99,* 102748. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2023.102748

Chen, H., Zhang, T., & Yu, F. (2022). Psychological ownership as a mediator between organizational culture and commitment in Chinese universities. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 42*(4), 643–659. https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2022.2023459

Chen, Y., Xu, H., & Li, W. (2021). Organizational support and innovative behavior in Chinese higher education. *Studies in Higher Education, 46*(5), 900–912. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2021.1872045

Edmondson, A. C. (2019). *The fearless organization: Creating psychological safety in the workplace for learning, innovation, and growth.* Wiley.

Fang, W., Li, J., & Zhang, Q. (2022). Mentorship programs as antecedents to professional identification in higher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 73*(3), 250–270. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487122107151

Gao, L., & Li, J. (2023). Exploring the role of individual traits in fostering innovation behavior among university faculty. *Higher Education Quarterly, 77*(2), 231–250. https://doi.org/10.1111/hequ.12345

Gao, Y., & Zhang, R. (2023). Digital transformation and faculty innovation in Chinese universities. *Educational Technology & Society, 26*(1), 101–113.

Lin, J., & Gao, X. (2022). Supporting faculty development through artificial intelligence: Implications for identity and innovation. *Educational Technology Research and Development, 70*(5), 1137–1153. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-022-10129-y

Liu, H., & Sun, Y. (2022). Professional identity and teaching innovation in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Research, 111,* 101910. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2022.101910

Liu, H., & Sun, Y. (2023). Professional and organizational identification as predictors of faculty innovation behavior. *International Journal of Educational Development, 94,* 102624. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2023.102624

Liu, H., & Wang, T. (2021). Academic freedom and organizational identification. *Studies in Higher Education, 46*(6), 1335–1350. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2021.1936067

Liu, Y., & Chen, Z. (2023). Cross-departmental collaboration and organizational identification. *International Journal of Educational Development, 94,* 102624. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2023.102624

Liu, Y., & Sun, J. (2023). Innovation behavior in higher education: The mediating role of dual identification. *Innovation and Education, 6*(7), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1186/s42862-023-00121-w

Liu, Y., & Wang, T. (2022). Participative leadership and faculty innovation behavior. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 50*(5), 755–773. https://doi.org/10.1177/17411432221013285

Sun, J., & Zhao, M. (2022). Faculty engagement in university community service: The role of organizational identification. *Higher Education Quarterly, 76*(4), 720–740. https://doi.org/10.1111/hequ.12312

Sun, M., Li, H., & Zhao, L. (2023). Collaborative innovation and faculty development in Chinese universities. *Asia Pacific Education Review, 24*(2), 235–251. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-023-09876-3

Tanaka, A., Liu, H., & Wang, T. (2023). Cross-cultural perspectives on professional identity in academia. *Comparative Education Review, 67*(1), 121–145. https://doi.org/10.1086/715041

Wang, L., & Zhao, X. (2021). Professional identity and research innovation in higher education. *Science and Public Policy, 48*(4), 520–534. https://doi.org/10.1093/scipol/scab011

Wang, X., Zhou, L., & Lin, C. (2023). Building innovation capability through interdisciplinary collaboration in higher education. *Tertiary Education and Management, 29*(4), 355–373. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11233-023-09117-6

Wang, Y., & Liu, P. (2023). Transformational leadership and organizational identification in academia. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 30*(1), 56–72. https://doi.org/10.1177/15480518221107424

Zhang, T., Fang, L., & Wang, Y. (2022). Servant leadership and faculty innovation. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 43*(1), 15–34. https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-12-2022-0157

Zhang, T., Liu, H., & Qiao, Y. (2023). Professional and organizational identification as predictors of innovation in universities. *Studies in Higher Education, 48*(3), 419–437. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2022.2098021

Zhang, W., & Xu, L. (2022). Faculty development initiatives and identification. *International Journal of Academic Development, 27*(3), 185–200. https://doi.org/10.1080/1360144X.2022.2025204

Zhang, Y., & Xu, Z. (2022). Communities of practice and curriculum redesign in universities. *Higher Education Research & Development, 41*(8), 2247–2264. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2021.1997447

Zhao, H., & Lin, Y. (2022). Inclusive governance, psychological safety, and innovation climate in HEIs. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 50*(5), 788–805. https://doi.org/10.1177/17411432211036129