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Appendix 2: Coding Source Book

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Coding fields | Type of entry | Example of coding |
| 1 | Article ID | Number | 1 |
| 2 | Author(s) | Text | Glaser, et al. |
| 3 | Year of publication | Text | 2020 |
| 4 | Name of journal | Text | Research in Transportation Business and Management |
| 5 | Journal article title | Text | Learning from abroad: An interdisciplinary exploration of knowledge transfer in the transport domain |
| 6 | Keywords used (in the article) | Text | Knowledge transfer, study tours, cycling, transport policy, capacity building |
| 7 | Thematic focus | Text | Transport |
| 8 | Geographical location(s) | Text | USA, Netherlands |
|  | **CONCEPTUAL** |  |  |
| 9 | Definition of C2C learning | Text | NA |
| 10 | Definition of learning | Text |  |
| 11 | Learning concept, theory, or framework used | Text | Organizational learning |
|  | Definition | Text | Organizational learning is the "ability and capacity of an organization and its members to identify, examine, and resolve problems" [no author cited] |
| 12 | Research question or objective related to learning |  |  |
|  | Main research question/objective | Text | How do transportation organizations learn from study tours? |
|  | Sub research question(s)/objective(s) | Text | What characteristics of study tours facilitate learning?  How do these characteristics facilitate learning transfer? |
| 13 | Research variables |  |  |
|  | Dependent variable | Text | Characteristics of study tours |
|  | Independent variable | Text | Learning transfer |
|  | **METHODOLOGICAL** |  |  |
| 14 | Research strategy used | Text |  |
|  | Primary data | Text | Survey, Interviews |
|  | Secondary data | Text | NA |
|  | Data analysis: Qualitative | Text |  |
|  | Data analysis: Quantitative | Text | Statistics (Descriptive and correlation analysis) |
|  | **EMPIRICAL** |  |  |
|  | **CONTEXTS: What is the context for C2C learning?** |  |  |
|  | CONTEXT (Actor) |  |  |
| 15 | Actors involved | Text | City officials |
| 16 | Roles of the actors involved | Text |  |
| 17 | Actors’ motivations for learning | Text |  |
|  | CONTEXT (Problem) |  |  |
| 18 | C2C learning objective | Text |  |
| 19 | Content for learning | Text |  |
| 20 | Means for learning | Text |  |
|  | Basis for C2C learning |  |  |
|  | **PROCESS: How does learning unfold?** |  |  |
| 21 | Learning phases |  |  |
|  | Specific phases of learning | Text |  |
| 22 | Mechanisms | Text |  |
| 23 | Venue for learning | Text | Study tours |
|  | Definition |  | Study tours are defined as "short visits in which a delegation of people travels to another place to experience something with a potential to improve their organizations" (Montero, 2017 in Glaser, et al., 2020) |
| 24 | Time for learning | Text |  |
|  | **CONDITIONS: What are the conditions for learning?** |  |  |
| 25 | **S**pecific factors | Text | Characteristics of study tours: Professional position, preparation and motivation, duration of the study tour, participants, group dynamics, individual learning outcomes, post trip knowledge sharing |
| 26 | Link to effects/outcomes | Text |  |
|  | **EFFECTS: What is the outcome of learning?** |  |  |
| 27 | Unit of analysis | Text | Individual, organizational |
| 28 | Link to changed outcomes | Text | Conceptual, social, experiential, motivational, and technical outcomes |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | **CONCLUSIONS** |  |  |
| 29 | Conclusions from the paper about learning | Text | Four characteristics influence learning: individual learning outcomes, leadership participation, knowledge integration activities, and positive group dynamics |
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Table 1: Distribution of articles based on definitions of learning

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Learning Definition** | **Frequency** | **Percentage** |
| Learning as a process | 8 | 13% |
| Learning as a process and an outcome | 6 | 10% |
| Learning as an outcome | 3 | 5% |
| Others | 3 | 6% |
| No indication | 40 | 67% |
| Total | **60** | **100%** |

Table 2: Distribution of articles based on concept, theory, or framework used

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Concept, theory, or framework used** | **Frequency** | **Percentage** |
| Policy transfer | 6 | 10% |
| Municipal partnerships, including decentralized cooperation | 5 | 8% |
| Policy learning | 4 | 7% |
| Peer to peer learning | 3 | 5% |
| Networking/networks | 2 | 3% |
| Policy transfer and policy mobilities | 2 | 3% |
| Others | 16 | 27% |
| No indication | 22 | 37% |
| Total | **60** | **100%** |

Table 3: Distribution of articles based on research focus and main research objectives

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Research focus** | **Frequency** | **Percentage** |
| Process | 39 | 65% |
| Effect | 15 | 25% |
| Others | 6 | 10% |
|  | **60** | **100%** |

Table 4: Distribution of articles based on research strategy

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Research strategy** | **Frequency** | **Percentage** |
| Qualitative | 41 | 68% |
| Quantitative | 8 | 13% |
| Mixed method | 4 | 7% |
| No indication | 7 | 12% |
| Total | **60** | **100%** |

Table 5: Distribution of articles based on type of actors

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Type of actors** | **Frequency** | **Percentage** |
| Multi-actor group | 21 | 35% |
| Singular actor group | 19 | 32% |
| No indication | 20 | 33% |
| Total | **60** | **100%** |

Table 6: Distribution of articles based on the role of actors

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Roles of actors** | **Frequency** | **Percentage** |
| Mentors/teachers and mentees/learners, including mutual learning | 6 | 10% |
| Hosts/visited and visiting/tourists | 3 | 5% |
| Sources/senders and seekers/receivers/recipients | 3 | 5% |
| Pioneers/leaders and followers/laggards | 1 | 2% |
| Lighthouse and fellow/follower cities | 1 | 2% |
| No indication | 46 | 77% |
| Total | **60** | **100%** |

Table 7: Distribution of articles based on learning motivations

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Learning motivations (multiple options, n=17 or 28% of the studies)** | **Frequency** | **Percentage** |
| Local problems and pressures | 10 | 16% |
| Need for publicity and exposure | 10 | 16% |
| Opportunity to learn and share knowledge | 6 | 10% |
| Available opportunities and incentives | 6 | 10% |
| Individual factors | 6 | 10% |
| Legitimization and influence | 5 | 8% |
| Altruism and solidarity | 5 | 8% |
| Competitive and coercive mechanisms | 5 | 8% |
| Access to opportunities | 2 | 3% |
| City branding | 2 | 3% |
| Comparability | 2 | 3% |
| Proximity | 1 | 2% |
| Curiosity | 1 | 2% |
| Total | **63** | **100%** |

Table 8: Distribution of articles based on learning content

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Theme | Learning content | **Frequency** | **Percentage** |
| Climate | Various topics | 7 | 12% |
| Cap and trade systems | 1 | 2% |
| Policy ideas and technical solutions | 1 | 2% |
| Legislative, policy, and administrative developments | 1 | 2% |
| Subtotal | 10 | 17% |
| Transport | Cycling | 3 | 5% |
| Bus rapid transit systems | 2 | 3% |
| Policy innovations | 2 | 3% |
| Public bicycle programs | 1 | 2% |
| Strategies | 1 | 2% |
| Subtotal | 9 | 15% |
|  | Others | 41 | 68% |
|  | Total | **60** | **100%** |

Table 9: Distribution of articles based on learning means

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Learning means** | **Frequency** | **Percentage** |
| Transnational networks | 13 | 22% |
| Partnerships or cooperation programmes | 9 | 15% |
| Funded projects | 6 | 10% |
| Finance institutions | 2 | 3% |
| No indication | 30 | 50% |
| Total | **60** | **100%** |

Table 10: Distribution of articles based on number of learning phases

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of learning phases** | **Frequency** | **Percentage** |
| Single phase | 7 | 12% |
| Multi-phase | 15 | 25% |
| No indication | 38 | 63% |
| Total | **60** | **100%** |

Table 11: Distribution of articles according to learning mechanisms

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Learning mechanisms (multiple options, n=27 or 45% of the studies)** | **Frequency** | **Percentage** |
| External search for information | 17 | 45% |
| Internal search for information | 3 | 8% |
| Involvement of intermediaries | 9 | 24% |
| Internal assessment about own context | 4 | 11% |
| Foundation building | 3 | 8% |
| Knowledge management | 2 | 5% |
| Total | 38 | 100% |

Table 12: Distribution of articles according to learning conditions

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Learning conditions (multiple options, n=25 or 42% of the studies)** | **Frequency** | **Percentage** |
| Similarity | 13 | 19% |
| Resources | 6 | 9% |
| Diversity | 4 | 6% |
| Organizational culture | 3 | 4% |
| Trust | 3 | 4% |
| Time | 3 | 4% |
| Others | 36 | 53% |
| Total | 68 | 100% |

Table 13: Distribution of articles according to learning outcomes

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Learning outcomes** | **Frequency** | **Percentage** |
| Levels | Individual | 3 | 5% |
| Organization | 1 | 2% |
| Network | 3 | 5% |
| Individual and organization | 9 | 15% |
| Organization and network | 1 | 2% |
| Individual, organization, and network | 1 | 2% |
|  | Others | 7 | 12% |
| No indication | 35 | 58% |
|  | Total | 60 | 100% |