

# From Instruction to Interaction: Reflexive Learning Design for Cross-Generational Engagement at the Workplace

Gita Aulia NURANI

Educational Leadership and Management Development Department, National Chung Cheng University  
Chiayi, Taiwan

Ya-hui LEE

Adult and Continuing Education Department, National Chung Cheng University  
Chiayi, Taiwan  
[yahuilee@ccu.edu.tw](mailto:yahuilee@ccu.edu.tw)

## ABSTRACT

As workforces grow increasingly age-diverse, designing learning environments that foster meaningful engagement across generations has become a practical necessity and a conceptual challenge. This paper argues for a shift from traditional, hierarchical models of instruction toward reflexive, interaction-driven approaches to learning design. The study repositions intergenerational learning as a relational and communicative process, where learners are not passive recipients of knowledge but active participants in co-constructing meaning. Reflexivity, understood as a continuous, critical awareness of one's position, assumptions, and influence within the learning system. It is presented as a core methodological and pedagogical tool for designing inclusive, adaptive, and reciprocal learning experiences. Rather than viewing generational differences as barriers, this perspective embraces them as sources of diversity that enrich collaborative inquiry and innovation. The paper explores key design principles such as dialogic learning, emotional safety, shared agency, and mutual respect, emphasizing the importance of feedback loops and non-linear knowledge exchange. By moving beyond age-based stereotypes and fixed instructional models, reflexive learning design opens possibilities for sustaining lifelong learning and fostering more human-centered organizational cultures. Ultimately, this work advocates for intergenerational learning environments that are educational and transformative.

**Keywords:** *adult learning, intergenerational, lifelong learning, organization, reflexivity learning design*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In today's workplaces, the presence of multiple generations, often spanning Baby Boomers to Generation Z, has created both challenges and opportunities for organizational learning. Traditional learning models, shaped by top-down instruction, struggle to accommodate the varying values, expectations, and learning preferences of diverse age groups. This paper responds to that gap by proposing a shift toward reflexive learning design and adaptability in learning environments.

The emergence of intergenerational diversity in organizations is not merely a demographic shift but a learning design challenge that necessitates adaptive responses. While each generation brings valuable competencies, attitudes, and ways of working, these differences can also give rise to

miscommunication, resistance to change, and generational stereotyping. For example, older employees may possess deep institutional knowledge and well-developed interpersonal skills, but may struggle with rapidly changing digital tools [1], [2]. Younger employees, meanwhile, may be agile with technology and eager to innovate, yet lack experience in organizational politics or team dynamics [3]. The coexistence of these strengths and limitations presents a unique opportunity: learning environments that integrate diverse generational knowledge can foster mutual growth and organizational transformation.

However, the dominant instructional paradigms in many professional training contexts remain linear and hierarchical. Such models often fail to recognize the distributed nature of knowledge in multi-generational workplaces [4]. These approaches position learners as passive recipients of predetermined content, with limited room for co-construction of meaning. This is especially problematic in settings where younger generations might be expected to learn from their elders, or vice versa, without acknowledging the bidirectional nature of learning. The limitations of this instructional model call for a rethinking of how learning is conceptualized, delivered, and experienced in the modern workplace.

Reflexive learning design offers a compelling alternative. Rooted in the principles of critical reflection, relational learning, and systemic feedback, reflexive learning is not merely about what is learned, but about how learning is facilitated and experienced. It positions all participants as active agents who contribute to the co-creation of knowledge through interaction, dialogue, and mutual respect [5]. Reflexivity invites learners to interrogate their own assumptions and the socio-cultural factors that shape their understanding. In intergenerational learning, reflexivity becomes an essential tool for uncovering unconscious biases about age, authority, learning styles, and expertise.

Within a reflexive framework, learning is not viewed as the transfer of static content but as an emergent, dynamic process shaped by the interaction between individuals and the learning system. In this sense, organizations can be viewed as learning systems where intergenerational interactions generate feedback loops, both positive and negative, that collective knowledge construction [6].

For instance, feedback mechanisms in intergenerational learning settings can lead to the refinement of learning strategies, while research findings on generational differences can guide the design of emotionally safe and responsive learning environments [7]. Moreover, reflexive learning design directly supports the feedback and feedforward mechanisms

central to cybernetic systems. Feedback loops allow learners to adjust their behaviors based on the outcomes of prior actions, such as an older worker revising their mentoring style after receiving input from a younger colleague [8]. Feedforward processes, in contrast, involve anticipatory adjustments, such as designing training modules that proactively address digital literacy gaps among senior staff.

The growing body of research in workplace learning, adult education, and organizational psychology also supports the need for more inclusive and participatory approaches to learning. Intergenerational learning is increasingly viewed not only as a solution to knowledge transfer or succession planning, but as a space for identity negotiation, emotional growth, and innovation [9]. Reflexive design enriches this space by embedding structures for self-inquiry and dialogue, thus enabling participants to learn not just from each other, but about each other and, in the process, about themselves.

## 2. PRINCIPLES OF REFLEXIVE INTERGENERATIONAL LEARNING DESIGN

Designing learning environments that are both inclusive and adaptive across generations requires more than just content tailoring, it demands a fundamental shift in pedagogical and methodological assumptions. Reflexive learning design offers a framework for navigating the complex relational dynamics in intergenerational workplaces. At its core, this approach recognizes the co-existence of diverse knowledge systems, values, and communication styles. Rather than viewing generational diversity as a challenge to be managed, reflexive design embraces it as a rich resource for mutual learning and systemic growth. Based on emerging insights from intergenerational learning research and workplace education, this section presents five foundational principles that underpin reflexive learning design: dialogic learning, emotional safety, shared agency, mutual respect, and non-linear knowledge exchange.

**Dialogic learning** lies at the heart of reflexive intergenerational learning. Unlike instructional models that rely on monologic knowledge transfer (where one generation is the presumed source of expertise) dialogic learning positions all participants as contributors to a shared understanding. Structured dialogues, storytelling sessions, and reflective conversations allow individuals from different age cohorts to co-construct meaning [4], [10]. These exchanges create opportunities to explore both converging and diverging perspectives. Dialogic practices also promote mutual validation, as each generation feels heard, seen, and valued for their unique insights. In workplaces, such conversations can be embedded in mentoring programs, intergenerational team meetings, and collaborative project debriefings.

Creating **emotional safety** is equally essential in fostering open and honest interaction across generational lines. Emotional safety refers to an individual's perception that they can express themselves without fear of being judged, ridiculed, or dismissed [11]. In intergenerational learning contexts, older workers may hesitate to engage with new technologies due to fear of appearing outdated, while younger workers might fear being perceived as inexperienced or overly assertive. Reflexive learning environments prioritize psychological safety by normalizing vulnerability, encouraging feedback without retribution, and modeling respectful communication. Facilitators play a critical role in setting ground rules, managing group dynamics, and intervening when power

imbalances emerge [12]. When emotional safety is established, learners are more likely to engage deeply, admit uncertainty, and reflect critically on their assumptions [7].

Figure 1.  
Principles of Reflexive Intergenerational Learning Design



The principle of **mutual respect** builds on this sense of shared contribution. Generational diversity often brings differing epistemologies (ways of knowing) that can lead to tension if one form is privileged over another. For example, tacit knowledge rooted in experience may be dismissed as anecdotal, while data-driven insights may be seen as lacking contextual wisdom [13], [14]. Reflexive learning design promotes epistemic humility by encouraging learners to recognize and appreciate the different forms of knowledge each generation brings. Respecting lived experience, technical expertise, and socio-emotional competencies fosters an equitable learning environment. This recognition is not symbolic but actionable, it means designing curricula, assignments, and dialogue prompts that allow diverse forms of interpretation.

Finally, **non-linear knowledge exchange** challenges the conventional idea that learning flows in a unidirectional manner from senior to junior, or from teacher to learner. In reality, intergenerational learning is inherently dynamic and recursive. Knowledge is created, adapted, and transferred through a variety of relationships, including mentoring, reverse mentoring, peer co-learning, and informal conversations [15], [16]. Reflexive learning design embraces this fluidity by incorporating learning structures that allow for multiple entry points, feedback loops, and reflective pauses. For example, a reverse mentoring program might pair a Gen Z employee with a Baby Boomer manager to co-lead a digital transformation project, with both parties reflecting regularly on what they are learning from the process [2], [17], [18]. Such non-linear arrangements reflect the cybernetic principle of recursive feedback, in which learning outcomes shape future inputs in an ongoing cycle of co-evolution.

## 3. IMPLICATIONS FOR WORKPLACE LEARNING AND ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE

Embedding reflexivity into learning systems holds profound implications for the evolution of workplace learning

and the transformation of organizational culture. In traditional workplace environments, learning is often perceived as a peripheral activity, an event that occurs during scheduled trainings or as part of onboarding processes. However, in diverse organizational contexts, learning must be viewed as a continuous and dynamic process. Reflexive learning design supports this shift by turning every interaction into a learning opportunity. It promotes a culture where feedback, dialogue, and reflection are not only accepted but actively encouraged as tools for growth and innovation.

When organizations intentionally create spaces for intergenerational learning, they do more than enhance knowledge transfer. They activate a deeper form of organizational learning, in which individuals and teams collectively reflect on their practices, challenge existing assumptions, and adapt to changing environments [19], [20]. Reflexivity supports this process by prompting learners to question how their own experiences, identities, and roles influence the way they interact and learn from others. This leads to the development of more adaptive mindsets, as individuals become attuned to both their own biases and the systemic patterns that shape learning. As a result, organizations move away from rigid, efficiency-driven models of learning and toward more relational, human-centered systems that prioritize dialogue and shared meaning-making.

One of the most significant implications of reflexive learning design is its ability to break down organizational silos, not only between departments or teams but between generations [11]. In many companies, age groups operate in parallel rather than in partnership, with limited opportunities for meaningful collaboration. Reflexive learning practices, such as cross-generational mentoring, encourage employees to bridge these divides.

Moreover, reflexivity enables organizations to leverage generational diversity as a catalyst for innovation. Each generation brings distinct perspectives, competencies, and problem-solving approaches shaped by their historical, technological, and social contexts. Baby Boomers may offer institutional memory and a values-based approach to leadership, while Generation X may provide systems-level thinking and pragmatism. Millennials might emphasize collaboration and digital fluency, while Generation Z contributes an intuitive understanding of emerging platforms and social trends [3], [21], [22]. Reflexive learning design not only validates these contributions but integrates them into the organizational knowledge system through iterative feedback loops.

Importantly, this integration of generational insight leads to the emergence of new organizational capabilities. These emergent properties, such as increased resilience, creative adaptability, and a stronger sense of collective identity, arise not from individual learning alone, but from the dynamic interplay of shared learning processes. For instance, a company that conducts participatory action research to assess generational engagement in training programs can use that data to inform real-time adjustments in facilitation methods, tools, and cultural messaging. This recursive process enhances both the learning outcomes and the organizational system as a whole.

Furthermore, the integration of reflexivity into workplace learning systems contributes to the normalization of lifelong learning [8], [23]. Employees no longer see learning as tied only to career advancement or external credentialing, but as an ongoing practice of professional and personal development. Reflexive practices, such as journaling, peer feedback, coaching conversations, and collaborative reflection,

encourage employees to view their roles as evolving and context-sensitive. This orientation aligns with contemporary human resource development models that emphasize agility, adaptability, and relational intelligence as key competencies for 21st-century workplaces.

#### 4. CONCLUSION

This paper has emphasized the value of reflexive learning design as a response to the growing generational diversity in today's workplaces. Traditional instructional models often fail to accommodate the varied experiences, expectations, and knowledge systems of multigenerational teams. Reflexive learning, by contrast, fosters environments where all participants are active contributors to shared understanding. Through dialogue, mutual respect, and critical reflection, organizations can create spaces where generational differences become opportunities rather than obstacles.

The key principles outlined: dialogic learning, emotional safety, mutual respect, and non-linear knowledge exchange. Those highlight the practical ways in which intergenerational learning can be made more inclusive and adaptive. When these principles are intentionally integrated into workplace practices, they not only enhance individual learning but also strengthen collective relationships and team dynamics. Each generation brings valuable insights, and reflexive learning ensures these insights are heard, valued, and applied in meaningful ways.

Ultimately, embedding reflexivity into workplace learning transforms the culture of organizations. It promotes trust, empathy, and openness. These three qualities are essential for learning and collaboration. As companies continue to evolve in diversity, designing learning environments that support reflection and mutual growth will be key to sustaining innovation. Intergenerational learning, when grounded in reflexivity, is not just educational, it is transformative.

#### 5. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We extend our sincere appreciation to the publisher and the dedicated volunteers involved in the special event on Education, Research, and Methodologies, organized as part of the International Multi-Conference on Society, Cybernetics and Informatics (IMSCI) 2025. Their consistent support, particularly in securing the funding that enabled our complimentary presentation and publication, has been fundamental to the success and quality of this work. This generous assistance has allowed us to share our research with a wider audience and has contributed to increasing its academic reach and significance.

We also wish to express our heartfelt thanks to Omar M. Keita, a Ph.D. candidate at National Chung Cheng University, for his valuable contribution in reviewing this manuscript. His meticulous attention to detail and constructive feedback have greatly improved the overall coherence of our paper. The combined efforts of the publisher, volunteers, and Mr. Keita have played a crucial role in strengthening the impact and presentation of our paper.

## 6. REFERENCES

- [1] B. A. Meisner, "Are You OK, Boomer? Intensification of Ageism and Intergenerational Tensions on Social Media Amid COVID-19," *Leisure Sciences*, vol. 43, no. 1–2, pp. 56–61, Mar. 2021, doi: 10.1080/01490400.2020.1773983.
- [2] E. Venter, "Bridging the communication gap between Generation Y and the Baby Boomer generation," *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth*, vol. 22, no. 4, pp. 497–507, Oct. 2017, doi: 10.1080/02673843.2016.1267022.
- [3] B. Chillakuri, "Understanding Generation Z expectations for effective onboarding," *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, vol. 33, no. 7, pp. 1277–1296, 2020, doi: 10.1108/JOCM-02-2020-0058.
- [4] C. Bjursell, "Organizing for Intergenerational Learning and Knowledge Sharing," *Journal of Intergenerational Relationships*, vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 285–301, Oct. 2015, doi: 10.1080/15350770.2015.1108952.
- [5] L. Formenti and L. West, *Transforming Perspectives in Lifelong Learning and Adult Education: A Dialogue*. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2018. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-96388-4.
- [6] F. H. Gerpott, N. Lehmann-Willenbrock, and S. C. Voelpel, "A Phase Model of Intergenerational Learning in Organizations," *AMLE*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 193–216, Jun. 2017, doi: 10.5465/amle.2015.0185.
- [7] G. A. Nurani and Y. H. Lee, "Transformation of Workplace Learning After the Pandemic in Indonesia: Middle-aged Employees' Experiences," *IJMLO*, vol. 1, no. 1, p. 1, 2024, doi: 10.1504/IJMLO.2024.10055719.
- [8] L. Belcadi, "Personalized feedback for self assessment in lifelong learning environments based on semantic web," *COMPUTERS IN HUMAN BEHAVIOR*, vol. 55, pp. 562–570, Feb. 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.chb.2015.07.042.
- [9] C. Bratianu and R. D. Leon, "Strategies to enhance intergenerational learning and reducing knowledge loss: An empirical study of universities," *VINE*, vol. 45, no. 4, pp. 551–567, Jan. 2015, doi: 10.1108/VINE-01-2015-0007.
- [10] R. Brower, P. Hu, H. Daniels, T. Bertrand Jones, and S. Hu, "We Can Do This Thing Together: Intergenerational Learning and Academic Motivation among Community College Students," *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, vol. 46, no. 12, pp. 841–854, Dec. 2022, doi: 10.1080/10668926.2021.1910594.
- [11] E. Desouza, "Intergenerational Interaction Through Reminiscence Processes," *Journal of Intergenerational Relationships*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 39–56, Jun. 2007, doi: 10.1300/J194v05n01\_04.
- [12] L. Mehner, Rothenbusch, Sandra, and S. and Kauffeld, "How to maximize the impact of workplace training: a mixed-method analysis of social support, training transfer and knowledge sharing," *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 201–217, Mar. 2025, doi: 10.1080/1359432X.2024.2319082.
- [13] E. A. Smith, "The role of tacit and explicit knowledge in the workplace," *Journal of Knowledge Management*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 311–321, Dec. 2001, doi: 10.1108/13673270110411733.
- [14] C. P. Huie, T. Cassaberry, and A. K. Rivera, "The Impact of Tacit Knowledge Sharing on Job Performance," *International Journal on Social and Education Sciences*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 34–40, 2020.
- [15] L. Mehner, Rothenbusch, Sandra, and S. and Kauffeld, "How to maximize the impact of workplace training: a mixed-method analysis of social support, training transfer and knowledge sharing," *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 201–217, Mar. 2025, doi: 10.1080/1359432X.2024.2319082.
- [16] A. Manuti, S. Pastore, A. F. Scardigno, M. L. Giancaspro, and D. Morciano, "Formal and informal learning in the workplace: a research review," *Int J Training Development*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 1–17, Mar. 2015, doi: 10.1111/ijtd.12044.
- [17] M. D. Benítez-Márquez, E. M. Sánchez-Teba, G. Bermúdez-González, and E. S. Núñez-Rydman, "Generation Z Within the Workforce and in the Workplace: A Bibliometric Analysis," *Front Psychol*, vol. 12, p. 736820, Feb. 2022, doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2021.736820.
- [18] N. Firzly, L. Van De Beeck, and M. Lagacé, "Let's Work Together: Assessing the Impact of Intergenerational Dynamics on Young Workers' Ageism Awareness and Job Satisfaction," *Can. J. Aging*, vol. 40, no. 3, pp. 489–499, Sep. 2021, doi: 10.1017/S0714980820000173.
- [19] F. H. Gerpott, N. Lehmann-Willenbrock, and S. C. Voelpel, "Intergenerational Learning in Organizations: A Framework and Discussion of Opportunities," in *The Aging Workforce Handbook*, A.-S. Antoniou, R. J. Burke, and S. C. L. Cooper, Eds., Emerald Group Publishing Limited, 2016, pp. 241–267. doi: 10.1108/978-1-78635-448-820161010.
- [20] F. H. Gerpott and U. Fasbender, "Intergenerational Learning in Age-Diverse Meetings: A Social Comparison Perspective," in *Research on Managing Groups and Teams*, A. L. Meinecke, J. A. Allen, and N. Lehmann-Willenbrock, Eds., Emerald Publishing Limited, 2020, pp. 185–206. doi: 10.1108/S1534-085620200000020009.
- [21] D. Yeung, D. Isaacowitz, W. Lam, J. Ye, and C. Leung, "Age Differences in Visual Attention and Responses to Intergenerational and Non-intergenerational Workplace Conflicts," *FRONTIERS IN PSYCHOLOGY*, vol. 12, Jun. 2021, doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2021.604717.
- [22] M. Alam and M. Kuppusamy, "Organization management strategy for Generation Y performance sustainability," *Cogent Business & Management*, vol. 11, no. 1, p. 2333297, Dec. 2024, doi: 10.1080/23311975.2024.2333297.
- [23] S. Abou Said and W. Abdallah, "Enhancing lifelong learning and professional growth: Exploring the role of self-directed learning for university educators," *Journal of Adult and Continuing Education*, vol. 30, no. 2, pp. 439–462, Nov. 2024, doi: 10.1177/14779714241236282.