

# **Bangor Business School Working Paper**



PRIFYSGOL  
**BANGOR**  
UNIVERSITY

**BBSWP/12/013**

**THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCE  
DEVELOPMENT IN THE UNITED KINGDOM**

**By**

**Jim Stewart & Sally Sambrook**

**Division of Business Studies**

**October 2012**

**Bangor Business School  
Bangor University  
Hen Goleg  
College Road  
Bangor  
Gwynedd LL57 2DG  
United Kingdom  
Tel: +44 (0) 1248 382277  
E-mail: [sally.sambrook@bangor.ac.uk](mailto:sally.sambrook@bangor.ac.uk)**

# **The historical development of human resource development in the United Kingdom**

## **Abstract**

We construct the historical development of the term 'human resource development' (HRD) within the United Kingdom (UK). We argue that HRD has been introduced and employed extensively by academics but not taken up with such enthusiasm by professionals and governments. We trace the development of the term and evaluate its use in these three distinct domains: academic, policy, and professional. This includes reference to multiple stakeholders, such as governments, employing organizations, academics and professional bodies, and their influences including national policy interventions and legislation shaping academic and professional practices and qualifications. We conclude that HRD as a concept and a term to describe an area of academic study and professional practice has had variable impact in different sites of practice.

## **Key words**

Training & development, HRD, United Kingdom, government, national policy, professional, academic, context

## **Introduction**

Our aim is to 'construct' (Callahan, 2010) the historical development of the term 'human resource development' (HRD) within the United Kingdom (UK). However, this does not imply an orthodox historical analysis as neither of us are historians. Instead, we have conducted a review of various sources, including national policy documents, professional body publications and academic literature, and drawn on our personal experiences and reflections. We argue that HRD has been introduced and employed extensively by academics but not taken up with such enthusiasm by

professionals and governments. We trace the development of the term and evaluate its use in these three distinct domains: academic, policy, and professional. This includes reference to multiple stakeholders, such as governments, employing organizations, academics and professional bodies, and their influences including government interventions in the form of legislation and shaping of practices and professional qualifications. We recognize the relationships between individuals, occupations, organisations and society (the state), and how the concept of HRD might have emerged to integrate the needs of each of these (Stead & Lee 1996:61).

We structured our search and review around three broad interconnected domains. The academic domain encompasses structural items such as professorial chairs; products such as modules and courses; and processes such as research and teaching. The national policy domain includes legislation and policies, initiatives and reports of government agencies. The professional domain is constituted by professional bodies, such as the Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development (CIPD). We define these as three separate sites of development practice, which in part both shape and are shaped by the concept of HRD.

It is important to note that the term HRD was first employed in the USA (Nadler 1970, Nadler & Nadler 1989), and so any use of the term in the UK is likely to be influenced by the American context. In addition, institutions and events in the wider global context have also influenced the development of the use of the term in the UK, for example the work of the International Labour Organisation and that of the European Commission. Similarly, we acknowledge that the development of HRD in

the UK will have potentially shaped other national conceptions of the term and activities associated with it, for example, the growing global reach of the CIPD.

The purpose of this paper is to argue that HRD has been introduced and employed extensively by academics in the UK but not taken up with such enthusiasm by professional bodies and governments. To achieve this, first we trace the introduction and use of the term by British academics, and then by exploring their debates on purposes, practices and paradigms. Next, we trace the development of national policies related to ‘training and skills development,’ noting the lack of the use of the term HRD. Finally, we consider the use of the term within the HR profession.

### **HRD: talked into being by academics**

As authors, we write from different perspectives but share a common historical connection. We worked together at Nottingham Business School (NBS) in the 1990’s; Sally was an undergraduate and conducted her PhD on HRD there, supervised by Jim. We modestly suggest that we have made, individually and collectively, a contribution to the study and development of HRD within the UK. However, we also cautiously note that the narrative we present here portrays *our* construction of the developing use of the term HRD within the UK and we acknowledge that others (academics, professionals and government officials) might construct this differently.

A key question for academics has been whether HRD is indeed different from training and development, or whether it is merely a new label. British academics and practitioners have debated whether terms such as HRM and HRD describe new

concepts or are merely new labels for existing concepts, the idea of old wine in new bottles (Armstrong 1987; Legge, 2005), for example.

Some claim, 'the field of human resource development defies definition and boundaries,' (Blake 1995:22). Some refuse to define it, arguing, 'I can't define it sufficiently to satisfy myself, let alone others,' (Lee 1998:3). From its argued roots in organisation development (OD), 'the emergence and spread of HRD was chaotic, random, blind, and serendipitous - pure empiricism,' (Blake 1995:22). As Blake (1995) also stated, 'The language of human resource development is a source of insight into the evolution of the field - and serves as a measure of HRD's spread. Many words began with HRD specialists and have crept into everyday language.' Blake cited phrases such as 'change agent' and 'hidden agenda,' which started at the Tavistock Clinic in London. It is interesting to consider where the phrase 'HRD' came from. Blake (1995) thought usage of the phrase began during World War Two. He continued, 'Around the 1970s, the phrase 'human resource' became the umbrella term used for everything now known as human resource issues, including selection.. and development ... I think it was Leonard Nadler [an American]... who brought the term human resource into being,' (Blake 1995). However, this is not quite accurate as the term 'human resource development' was in established usage in (national economic) development studies as illustrated by a 1964 publication by Harbison and Myers (1964). This adds an interesting twist to the UK national HRD context since, and as we show below, HRD does not figure there despite one of its origins being the very focus of UK national HRD (NHRD).

From a review of the UK literature, academics only began to grapple with the concept from the late 1980s, as indicated by Stewart and McGoldrick (1996:1). For example, in 1986, Abrahams referred to ‘Human Resource Development Suppliers’ in Mumford (1986:427). In 1989, MacKay offered ‘35 Checklists for Human Resource Development.’ Stewart (1989) referred to HRD in his article offering an organisational change framework. Later, to help overcome confusions and misunderstandings, Stewart (1992) suggested a collaborative approach towards developing a model of HRD. Hendry, Jones and Pettigrew (1990) reported to the Training Agency on HRD in small-to-medium sized enterprises. In his discussion of corporate strategy and training, Hendry (1991) referred to the training versus HRD debate. HRD had ‘arrived’ in the UK. Yet, as Lee explained, “‘HRD’ in the UK is presented as diverse and in a state of flux... In the UK, HRD is seen as a relatively young and predominantly Western concept which has emerged from management and development thinking, and has been shaped by values and events as Europe has transformed over the last 50 years,’ (1998:528).

The term ‘HRD’ utilises the concepts of *human resources* and *development*. Carole Elliott described her difficulty in working to the concept of HRD in that, ‘when trying to understand the word “development” alone, much confusion arises because the different interpretations of this word... Equally, my understanding of what is meant by “Human Resources” is likely to differ from any one else’s due to my own value base and view of life,’ (1998:536). The use of the term ‘human resources’ is variable, as Oxtoby and Coster (1992) pointed out. Oxtoby criticised the word *resource* being used to describe people, but this was already the case with HRM. Coster acquiesced that the term HRD was used in practice and was here to stay, and therefore needed to

be adopted. ‘The combination of these three words in the term human resource development simply adds to the confusion and results in a variety of interpretations,’ (Elliott 1998:536). In her review of the literature, Elliott explained, ‘there are no shibboleths of HRD, no pillars of seminal texts which I could quickly look up to and declare with certainty that these are *the* texts which have been influential in shaping HRD theory and practice in the UK. The picture is much more undefined than that, consisting of many fuzzy and indistinct areas with no recognisable boundaries,’ (1998:536). Where does training and development end and HRD begin, or where does HRD end and management begin? Rosemary Harrison (1993) suggested that many trainers find the phrase ‘human resource development’ difficult to accept, preferring the ‘softer’ phrases such as ‘employee development’ or ‘training and development.’ In her later text, Harrison revealed that the title ‘Employee Development’ had to be used to conform with IPD requirements, when she would have rather used the term HRD (Harrison 1997:xiv). She explained that HRD encompasses more than just employee development, extending its scope to include non-employees, referring to Walton (1996), and a broader range of stakeholders (Harrison 1997:1, 19).

Despite this difficulty, the term was being swiftly taken up in British academic institutions. Iles (1994) referred to the emergence of ‘Chairs’ in HRD (he was one of the first). Later, Sambrook and Stewart (1998) referred to two Professors of, and two Readers, in HRD, and educational programmes such as Masters programmes, and NVQs, in HRD have appeared. In their work, designed to support MBA programmes in the UK, Megginson et al (1993) put the ‘economic case’ for HRD. This was a discursive tool, using rhetoric to build an argument for T&D in ‘managerial’

language. It is interesting to note, however, that the (then) IPD's professional diploma (their highest level qualification) was entitled '*Training Management*' and the core textbook barely referred to HRD (Marchington & Wilkinson 1996). Conversely, Stewart and McGoldrick (1996) intended, through their work, to help establish HRD as an academic study. As Lee stated, 'Given that the organisational world is increasingly adopting views propounded by Strategic HRD (SHRD) theorists, further attention to strengthening the conceptual base of HRD would help legitimate SHRD as an academic discipline,' (1997:92). Lee also argued that, 'a exploration of the concept of "strategic human resource development" shows it to be functionally important, yet difficult to define,' (1997:92).

Yet, as Moorby suggested, 'Understanding the language used is becoming increasingly important in the field of management and HRD,' (1996:4). We argue that these debates show how HRD is a social and discursive construction (Sambrook 1998). This shift can be described as the 'linguistic turn' reflected in the discursive swing from training to learning, or 'learning turn' (Holmes 2004). As Fairclough explained, 'Discourses do not just reflect or present social entities and relations, they construct and constitute them,' (1992:3). In this sense, HRD – and strategic HRD - has been talked into being, and can easily be talked out of being (Walton 2003).

A directly related influence on the development of HRD education is the work of The University Forum for HRD (UFHRD), an independent body established to promote the subject of HRD, undertake collaborative research to develop our understanding of the field, and achieve an integrated qualifications structure in this area (see Stewart, et al, 2009, for a brief history). The Forum members collaborate on developing



professional, academic and competence programmes in the HRD arena, established EURESFORM (a European body with similar aims) and has forged strong links with the American Academy for HRD, as well as with the CIPD. Seminal research by the Forum for the (then) UK government Employment Department (Walton et al 1995), and confirmed more recently by Manning (2012), identified various academic, professional and competence-based programmes in HRD. The UFHRD has played a major role in establishing HRD as an academic subject and in shaping education of professional practitioners up to and including the present. This has been achieved by fostering and supporting research projects on HRD practice and associated outputs, organising national and international seminars and conferences and a recent return to a focus on curriculum design and learning and teaching in HRD qualification programmes (Stewart, et al, 2009).

### *Purpose(s) of HRD*

An ongoing academic debate within the UK (if not elsewhere) centres on the purpose(s) of HRD, and whether the focus should be on performance versus learning (Stewart & Rigg 2011). Stewart (1998:9) suggested that, ‘the practice of HRD is constituted by the deliberate, purposive and active interventions in the natural learning process. Such interventions can take many forms, most capable of categorizing as education or training or development.’ Lee argues that ‘true development is fostered by helping individuals to help themselves,’ (2012). A significant influence on the performative view of HRD has been the theorising around human resource management (HRM). Many authors, (Guest 1989, Storey 1992, Rainbird 1994) acknowledged the connection between HRM and HRD, and much early and still influential theorising of HRM focused on the contribution of HRM

practices to organisational performance (Sisson 1989, Keep 1989, Storey 1992). This performance based connection can be seen in work by, for example, Lee, who stated 'if SHRD is to be legitimised as an academic discipline or as an important aspect of practice, then further attention needs to be paid to the conceptual base from which we work,' (1997:98), and that of Fredericks and Stewart (1996) who argued that HRD provides the 'ideal' notion of a strategy-led and business-oriented approach to training and development.

### *Practices and roles*

Moorby (1996) offered a definition of the scope of HRD. 'In broad terms, the human resource development function can be regarded as encompassing what is often described as training and development, the field of motivation or reward that is usually functionally organised as compensation and benefits, job description and job evaluation, management and/or career development ... and the whole question of career management, recruitment and assessment,' (Moorby 1996:4). The scope of the function in this explanation goes beyond what is often regarded as HRD, and appears to include elements other authors would include in HRM. Stewart and McGoldrick, whilst arguing that the concept was then new (1996:1) and that the scope of HRD is broad, and associated with management and personnel management, suggested that, 'it is intimately bound up with strategy and practice and with the functional world of training and development... (and) is fundamentally about change. It covers the whole organisation and addresses the whole person,' (1996:2). This indicated the development of a *holistic* approach (from academics?) in the UK.

There have been many approaches to HRD in the UK, which suggests that there are various reasons for, and ways of, engaging in the development of employees, whether as individuals or collectively. Harrison (1992, 1997) and Reid and Barrington (1994) reported on several approaches, such as: *problem solving or problem centred - comprehensive - business strategy - competences - ad hoc/historic*. The first three all seem to be related in some way to the 'systematic' or systems approach to identifying and satisfying training needs. The competences approach suggests the adoption of the government's discourse of vocational education and training (see next section). The ad hoc approach might be consistent with a laissez-faire philosophy. Harrison (1997:37) suggested that the business-led approach was then currently the dominant model of HRD, one based on linking the training cycle with strategic objectives. After the 1964 Industrial Training Act (see next section), there was a rise in the number of training departments, and the adoption of a 'systems' thinking approach to training and development.

Given these different stages of development of training and development in the UK, Sambrook (1998) devised a typology of three distinct ways in which HRD can be talked about and accomplished through talk, which she labelled: Tell, Sell and Gel. HRD can usefully be conceptualised as a social and discursive construction, where HRD has been talked into being and is accomplished through talk (Sambrook 2000), opening up discursive space (Lawless et al 2011) and shifts to discursive evaluation (Anderson 2011). In addition, recognising the various influencing factors, any current status or discourse of HRD can be considered as the outcome of negotiated evolution (Sambrook 1998) between various stakeholders (national governments, academics and professional bodies). It could also be argued that HRD is currently under threat,

with the expansion of coaching and mentoring (Hamlin et al 2008), struggles over the very term itself (Walton 2003), and tensions as HRD is being stretched beyond the organisational context into a national phenomenon (McLean 2004). This suggests paradigmatic shifts in ways of understanding HRD.

### *Paradigms of HRD*

Turning to the paradigmatic context, we note the shift from the dominant positivist/post –positivist orientation, to include more interpretivist/social constructionist perspectives, and an increasing focus on critical approaches within academia. In attempting to be responsible to a wider range of stakeholders, and particularly ‘oppressed’ learners, there is an emerging consideration of the contradictions and an increasing British critical perspective (Elliott & Turnbull 2005, Rigg et al 2007, Sambrook 2004, Trehan and Rigg 2011, Valentin 2006, Vince 2005). This is more aligned with ‘humanism’ or radical humanism (Burrell & Morgan 1979, Morgan 1990), challenging orthodox HRD practices in Western, capitalist economies (O’Donnell et al 2006).

In the UK, critical HRD has been more influenced by Critical Management Studies (CMS) than Critical Pedagogy. However, as Elliott and Turnbull (2005) argued, ‘Despite the influence of the critical turn in management studies on HRD in the UK, HRD has nevertheless neither been subject to the same degree of critical scrutiny as management and organization studies, nor has it gathered together a significant mass of followers that might constitute it as a ‘movement’ in its own right’. They were amongst the first scholars in the UK (along with Lee 2001 and Sambrook 1998) to consider HRD from a critical perspective and introduced their ideas at the American

Academy of HRD. Elliott and Turnbull were ‘concerned that the methodological traditions that guide the majority of HRD research do not allow researchers to engage in studies that challenge the predominantly performative and learning-outcome focus of the HRD field... We seek to unpick the assumptions behind the performative orientation that dominates much HRD research ... We therefore perceived the need to open up HRD theory to a broader range of methodological and theoretical perspectives.’ This first critical session in the US has been followed by a ‘Critical HRD’ stream at the CMS conference since 2003 and critical HRD has also become a regular theme in the European HRD conference, suggesting a critical turn in HRD. Over the last five or so years, there has been a huge increase in scholarly activity around critical HRD. In the UK, Rigg and colleagues (2007) state there are four main reasons for this critical turn, in response to: the predominance of ‘performative values’; an unbalanced reliance on humanist assumptions, and an instrumental view of personhood and self; ‘impoverished’ HRD research, dominated by positivism, the reification of organisational structures, and independent of human agency; and an HRD curriculum and pedagogy which pay minimal attention to issues of power and emotion.

Valentin (2006), one of few British HRD academics located in a School of Education, argued critical HRD encompasses: insight; critique; and transformative redefinitions. While Valentin talked of critical HRD lacking practical application, Vince (2007) has argued that HRD practitioners ignore the wider politics of organising. Similarly, Trehan (2004) was concerned that although critical approaches have been introduced in pedagogy, little appears to have been transferred to HRD practice, yet Rigg (2005) cautiously noted that critical management learning in the UK can develop critical

managers. These contemporary debates are further shaping the academic development of HRD in the UK.

### **HRD or skills: a government (national policy?) perspective**

Having considered how the term HRD has been introduced and employed by academics, we now review the changing political landscape manifest through national government policy factors and evaluate to what extent the term HRD is used in this domain.

We provide an overall picture of national policy, drawing on some of the many reports commissioned and written about the UK national training system from a Royal Commission report titled ‘Report on Technical Instruction in Great Britain’, published in 1884 to the ‘Leitch Review of Skills’ published in 2006. Such reports are commissioned by governments and are used as the basis for their policies in relation to what is variously referred to as Vocational Education and Training (VET) and National HRD (NHRD) (eg MSC/DES 1986). Both terms refer to HRD efforts at national level directed by governments and their agencies. The nature of VET policies can be characterised as being either ‘interventionist’ or ‘voluntarist’ and our narrative examination of UK history indicates that since the 1884 report neither has been attempted in pure, undiluted form but that different governments controlled by different political parties have all combined both with varying emphasis on one or the other (see Gold et al 2010, Stewart, 2010; Stewart and Rigg, 2011). Our interpretation is that, in general, governments of the ‘right’; typically with the Conservative party in power; have emphasised the operation of the market and so voluntarism, while governments of the ‘left’; typically with the Labour party in

power; have emphasised interventionism. But, VET/NHRD has never been a focus of great differences between political parties and has not featured strongly in election campaigns. A debatable exception to this might be the increase in tuition fees for undergraduate higher education in England introduced by the present (i.e. at the time of writing in 2012) coalition government, but the principle of fees is not challenged in England. The evidence of continuity in policy following elections suggests in fact a high degree of consensus between political parties in relation to VET/NHRD (Stewart and Rigg, 2011).

Consensus and continuity might be deemed desirable but do not necessarily produce desired outcomes, for example, investment in HRD at required levels. This failure of the consensus may be related to a flawed argument, which is at its heart. This is acceptance of and agreement on a set of causal relationships along the following lines. First, there is a direct link between levels of skills in the population and national economic performance. Second, there is similarly a direct link between investment in and amounts of VET/HRD activity and level of skills in the population. Third, these same links exist at the level of the firm/organisation. Therefore, according to this argument, influenced by human capital theory (Becker 1976, 1993), increasing investment in and amount of VET/HRD activity will increase the level of skills in the population and so the economic performance of firms/organisations and of the nation (cf. the 1964 Industrial Training Act, the New Training Initiative 1981 (DOE 1981, MSC 1981) and the 'learning age' 1998 policy statement (DfEE 1988)).

This syllogism illustrates the consensus view that investment in training and development to produce skills is justified primarily on economic grounds. Therefore,

development of skills has the purpose of improving economic and financial performance of the nation and of firms/organisations. This focus on economic and financial factors is continued in the major question for governments and national policy which is, who invests by paying for HRD and in what proportions? Three possibilities are usually posited; government, employers or individuals (Stewart 2010). This is slightly misleading as governments are in large part funded by taxes paid by employers and individuals and so those two always pay. But, the point of the government paying is that it removes the choice of investing in skills, or not, from employers and individuals.

The UK has over the last hundred years or so tried many variations in levels of government funding. Many policy interventions have either required or encouraged employers and/or individuals to invest by spending more on HRD activities. Interventions have also been targeted at supply side factors and actors such as education and training providers; for example a major initiative changing vocational qualification structures in the 1980s (DOE/DE 1986, ED 1988). This initiative was launched in 1986 with the establishment of the National Council for Vocational Qualifications (NCVQ), and has led in the intervening years to most qualifications now being based on assessment of competence and known as National Vocational Qualifications (NVQs), (Stewart & Sambrook 1985). This did originally encompass the professions, including HR with NVQs developed for both personnel and, separately, training and development. However, NVQs at professional and managerial levels did not fully replace the extant professional academic qualifications (Walton et al 1995).



More recently, demand side factors and actors have become more significant in government policy; e.g. stimulating employer investment through the Investors in People (IiP) initiative, launched in 1991 (IiP 2012). The continuous and continuing preoccupation with raising skills levels to improve national economic performance has seen a plethora of policies, structures, agencies and initiatives come and go in the UK as successive governments of all political persuasions have sought to find an effective formula for VET/NHRD; i.e. to 'get it right'. However, that same continuous and continuing preoccupation would perhaps suggest that the shared assumptions at the heart of the consensus, detailed above, are flawed and/or that it is not possible to 'get it right' (see also Keep & Mayhew 2010, Keep et al 2010).

An interesting observation we can make based on the evidence available on VET/NHRD in the UK is that the term HRD is rarely used by governments or their agencies (see Stewart and Rigg, 2011, for a brief history detailing the major agencies). The latest agency to be created by a UK government is the UK Council for Employment and Skills (UKCES). This agency had no direct predecessor but absorbed some purposes and functions of a number of agencies abolished at the time UKCES itself was created in 2007. As such, it also created an archive of publications from the abolished agencies to which has been added many scores of publications; research reports, policy briefings, annual reports etc; that the UKCES has itself produced since it was established five years ago. The archive therefore holds thousand of publications. A recent search of the archive (1<sup>st</sup> November, 2011) using 'HRD' as an exact search term produced 19 results. A similar search using Human Resource Development produced 33 results, not surprisingly encompassing the 19 items in the results for HRD. Four items in each list of results were reports and papers written by

one of the present authors and appeared because of his job title; Professor of HRD; and/or because of his brief biography included in the reports or papers. A search using the word 'Skills' produced over 5,000 results. And, a search using the exact phrase 'economic performance' produced over 100 results; many more than HRD or Human Resource Development; and many publications combining that phrase with 'skills' in their titles. So, it is safe to argue that at national level and for governments and their agencies, the *terms* HRD and Human Resource Development have not made an impact in the UK. However, it can also be argued that merely because the term is not in the archive does not necessarily mean that HRD as a concept, and associated concepts such as organisational development and career development, have had no, or little, impact. HRD is more than just the term itself. It seems to us, though, that a reasonable expectation would be use of a term denoting a concept, if that concept had indeed been utilised. It may also be safe to argue that 'skills' is the focus of what constitutes HRD at national level in the UK rather than any other conception of development. Therefore, a performative view of what we and others term HRD has and does dominate the thinking and policy of UK VET/NHRD.

### **HRD: a professional perspective**

We now turn to the use of the term HRD within the professional domain. The term had a perhaps inauspicious start in the UK as far as professional bodies and their qualifications were concerned. In the early nineties, the then professional body for development, the Institute of Training and Development (ITD), considered a change of its name to use the term HRD but experienced opposition from a significant portion of their membership. This sparked a debate in 1992 in the pages of the Institute's journal on the appropriateness or otherwise of the term. Oxtoby (Oxtoby & Coster

1992), an opponent of the term, argued strongly that ‘human *resource* development’ demeaned the status and importance of employees. Staff at Oxtoby’s company were not even referred to as ‘employees’. Others though, for example Coster (ibid), argued the need to recognise movements in both academia and in the practice of many organisations. In both cases, the term ‘human resources’ was overtaking alternatives such as personnel and training and development.

Drawing on personal recollections, we can say that the ITD had other business on its agenda around this time. This other business was associated with training and qualifying development professionals. The ITD had established itself as the qualifying body for professional development practitioners through its post-experience Certificate and Diploma qualifications, delivered mainly but not exclusively through what were then polytechnics (polytechnics in the UK were vocationally oriented colleges of higher education which, in addition to professional and technical courses, provided government accredited degrees at all levels). Two related matters concerned the Institute in relation to its qualifications. The first was associated with UK government policy in relation to vocational education and development described earlier which was directed at reshaping professional and vocational qualifications. The ITD had at least two interests in this new policy. The first was the obvious one of how it would impact on and affect its own qualifications. The second was the key role that ITD members as development professionals and representatives of employers would play in implementing the policy and in developing the new framework, system and associated new qualifications. The Institute adopted a fully supportive stance in relation to the policy and was an early mover in establishing processes necessary to develop the new competence based approach for its own qualifications. It also

invested time, money and effort in supporting its members and others in adopting the new approach.

The second and related matter occupying the ITD was continuing professional development for its members. The established Certificate and Diploma qualifications had been successful and had produced significant numbers of qualified practitioners. The Institute therefore wished to promote provision of higher level qualifications for the growing number of Diploma level qualified members. It could not itself though award qualifications at a higher level and so had to work with and through universities to develop masters' degrees for CPD purposes. Two factors made the early nineties a good time to launch such an initiative. The first was that the polytechnics, which were established providers of programmes leading to the ITD Certificate and Diploma, became universities in 1992. This was not a necessary condition but made it easier for those educational institutions to develop and provide their own accredited masters degrees. This enabled the ITD to 'approve' appropriate masters degrees for their members' CPD. The second factor was the need to revise and develop new Certificate and Diploma programmes and qualifications in response to the UK government policy. And so, a retired academic named Alan Moon was recruited to lead projects for the ITD to support universities in both changing Certificate and Diploma qualification programmes and in developing new masters' level programmes and awards (Walton et al 1995). Alan Moon was a critical figure in establishing HRD in the UK (see McGoldrick, et al, 2005). Whatever the varying views of ITD members on the name of the Institute, Alan played a key role in the adoption of the term in ITD and masters level qualifications in UK universities. A significant manifestation of the use of the term HRD by ITD was in its annual

conference which in 1984 became known as HRD Week. However, outside of approved qualifications awarded by universities and in the vocational qualifications discussed above, the term HRD has only recently been adopted in professional qualifications.

The former Institutes of Training and Development (ITD) and Personnel Management (IPM) were merged in 1994 to create the combined professional body, the Institute of Personnel and Development (IPD), which was granted a Royal Charter in 2001, and so became the Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development. ‘This merger was a good illustration of the ‘desire for integration’ prevalent across the UK. It also reflected the increasing unease that theoreticians and practitioners had with the difficult-to-sustain historical dichotomy between HRD and HRM,’ (Lee 1998:532). This suggests that both academics and practitioners identified the need to integrate their closely related practices, and present a united front for all aspects related to employment management, perhaps in response to the growing critique of personnel management (conflict, ambiguity) and training and development (irrelevant, knee-jerk). However, in the newly created, and entitled body, there was no reference to human resources, nor their strategic use. Indeed, in a survey of training professionals, some claim it was a take-over. A development specialist stated that,

‘The IPD is much more focused on personnel issues to the extent that it has been more like a take-over of the ITD than a merger. The old IPM structure is still there and it is a great shame that the higher-level training diploma in management has disappeared. Even the word “training” is no longer in the IPD name ... Twenty years ago, training was seen as marginal and now there is a risk it will happen again. The structure of the IPD professional standards ...

reflects the old IPM attitude that they were a higher-level organisation... The IPD should not treat training and development as an add-on,' (Training 1997:4).

On a similar note, a training executive noted that,

'The ITD was growing and had a healthy bank balance while the IPM was in a poor financial situation. The IPM also had a "poor relation" attitude towards trainers and its qualification structure was stuffy and old-fashioned while the ITD had been in the vanguard of competency development and multi-route advancement,' (Training 1997:4).

Another practitioner, head of a management training centre, stated that

'the merger suited my career path because I am no longer a front-line trainer... My job now has a much wider role with involvement in aspects of personnel and I am more interested in the longer-term strategic approach of the IPD. But for a dedicated trainer, there is less in the IPD than they may have got from the ITD ... it might only be 25 per cent relevant,' (Training 1997:4).

An HRD manager said that,

'Training and development is not far removed from personnel and the two need to work together... The IPD is much more professional now ... My job has now changed to a more senior level where I need to look at the broader areas of HR management. The IPD is a better product for more senior people in training. But I can see that, for more junior staff in both training and

personnel, it may not be so good because it is not focusing on their area of responsibility,' (Training 1997:4).

On a more positive note, several practitioners commented that, for example, 'there was no common sense in having two similar bodies going along parallel line,' and the 'distinction between HR management and HR development is a false one ... Together they provide a unique set of skills which enhance the function strategically,' (Training 1997:4-5). Many referred to the differences between qualifications structures and membership entry requirements, suggesting the IPM was more aloof and exclusive, whereas the ITD was more inclusive, yet still professional. In its Professional Education Scheme, the IPD proposed four core elements to employment management (Marchington & Wilkinson 1996) - employee resourcing, employee reward, employee development and employee relations. This crudely suggested training and development accounted for roughly a quarter of the remit of employment management. Partly in response to this and to the negative reactions from some to the merger a new professional body for learning professionals was established a few years after the creation of the IPD. This body is named the Institute of Training and Occupational Learning (ITOL); again no mention or indication of HRD.

The current CIPD qualifications suggest and perhaps illustrate the ambivalent approach to HRD on the part of the former IPM and ITD and the merged body of IPD/CIPD. There are three levels to the current CIPD qualification structure; foundation, intermediate and advanced. At the first level the term 'Learning and Development' is used for qualifications and there are no modules/units making up those qualifications with the term HRD in their title and so at this level HRD does not appear at all. The term 'Learning and Development' was used in the immediately

previous qualification structure and replaced the earlier Employee Development referred to above and so the foundation level seems to be a continuation of that policy. At intermediate level, certificate and diploma qualifications are available with name HRD although there is only one module/unit with HRD in the title. At the final advanced level HRD is similarly used in qualification titles but there is no module/unit with that term used in the title. So, for one level the term does not appear at all, at a second level it appears in qualification titles but only once in module titles and at the third level it appears in qualification titles but not at all in module titles. Thus, despite the CIPD continuing the former ITD use of HRD in the annual HRD Week conference there remains ambivalence and ambiguity about the term in recognising professional practice through curriculum for and titles of professional qualifications awarded by the professional body.

Given that the current qualifications are based on and derived from what the CIPD call their 'HR Profession Map' it is worth saying more about that representation of practice. According to the CIPD website, 'The map is firmly rooted in the real world having been created with HR practitioners drawn from every size of organisation and across every sector' (<http://www.cipd.co.uk/cipd-hr-profession/hr-profession-map/explore-map.aspx>). This claim is clearly meant to convey the message that the HR Profession Map describes and reflects what happens in practice. If we take that message at face value then practice does not encompass HRD, or at least does not use the concept or term to represent practice. This follows because HRD is not used to describe or represent or account for any aspect of activity in the HR profession or the behaviours of HR professionals in any part of the map. So, it is either not surprising that HRD does not figure much in the CIPD qualification structure or it is surprising



that it features at all. Perhaps that statement sums up the continuing ambivalence within professional practice towards the term in the UK.

This situation in relation to professional qualifications can be contrasted with the situation in academia. As noted above, there has been a steady increase in academic awards in HRD. The term has also been increasingly used in the titles of academic departments and titles of full Professors; there are currently approximately 20 of the latter in UK universities from a base line of zero in the late 1980s. Through the work of the UFHRD and its members there are also journals, academic conferences and many books featuring the term HRD in their titles. So, does this signal a separation of academic and professional interest? That may be possible. But, professional practitioners attend the academic programmes with HRD in their title and those same professionals do not seek or pursue academic careers. It is not known (to us at least) just how many graduates of HRD named awards there are in the UK but based on knowledge of universities providing programmes over the last two decades the number is likely to be at least 10,000. This may be one reason that CIPD qualifications feature HRD in their titles to some extent even though their professional map does not. And in addition, the annual UFHRD/AHRD European conference has regularly included a stream for practitioners which attracts enough professionals to run; it did so in 2011 and again in 2012. So, the situation is not as clear as it may first seem.

In summary, the history of HRD as far as professional practice is concerned has seen some separation from academia. It is clear that academia has led the use of and interest in HRD in the UK. It is also clear that bodies representing professional

practitioners have been and remain ambivalent about the concept and the term. But, professional practitioners themselves presumably see some meaning and value in HRD otherwise the academic programmes would not have been successful and it is the success of those programmes which provided the foundation for the growth and associated success of the other academic artefacts of research projects and publications, full professorial chairs and academic networks.

To summarise, we have sketched the historical development of the term HRD in the UK, talked into being by academics and shaped by national political and professional initiatives and interventions. Next, we offer our conclusions and implications for HRD in the UK.

## **Conclusion**

Our main conclusion is that HRD as a term has been, and is, more evident in the academy than in either the national policy or professional arenas. This is manifest in academic qualification programmes, which commonly use the term in named awards and titles of modules making up the curriculum of those awards. It is also indicated in other academic artefacts such as professorial titles, journals and academic networks. It has been argued that higher education is a site of HRD practice (Sambrook & Stewart 2010). Accepting that argument, our review and analysis clearly indicates that HRD has had significant impact in this site of practice. However, the impact has been less in the wider sites of professional practice as represented by professional bodies; indicated by both the names adopted by those bodies and in their qualifications. The least use has been in national HRD as a site of practice. Governments and their agencies in the UK have not adopted the term. This may in part be explained by the

narrow human capital view of HRD apparent in their focus on skills and in their concern with an exclusively performative economic and financial rationale for investment in HRD activities.

A number of implications arise from this variance in use and impact of the term HRD among the three domains. For the government, consideration should be given to the lack of consistency in language use among these stakeholders, which can lead to misunderstanding, miscommunication and lack of coherence in efforts to engage employers, employees and citizens in learning. One simple way of overcoming this inconsistency would be for government agencies to recognise and acknowledge skills development is an element of HRD. A similar argument might be made to professional bodies. A current and clear example is the chosen name of the Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development, which retains words not entirely consistent with language use in naming its own qualifications and their constituent units. The academy should at the very least recognise and acknowledge that its own obsession and fascination with the term HRD is not shared by those in other arenas. Whether or not the talked about 'theory-practice gap' exists or not, or is significant, talking a different language is not a helpful way of bridging the supposed gap. As those who talked it into being, academics should also be more aware than most that the term HRD can be talked out of being.

These implications point to a significant area of future research, which is to produce a more in-depth understanding of the reasons for the lack of consistency in language use and also its effects. It is also clear, in our view, that the future of the term HRD

and, by association, its utility and impact, will remain insecure as long as it is confined to the academy.

## References

Anderson, L. (2010) "Talking the Talk" – A discursive approach to evaluating management development. *Human Resource Development International*, 13 (3), 285-98

Armstrong M (1987) 'Human resource management: a case of the emperor's new clothes?' in *Personnel Management*, August 19 (8): 31-34

Becker, G. (1976) *The Economic Approach to Human Behavior*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Becker, G. (1993) (3rd ed.) *Human Capital: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis, with Special Reference to Education*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Blake R (1995) 'Memories of HRD' in *Training and Development*, March, 49 (3): 22-28

Buckley R & Caple J (1995) *The Theory and Practice of Training* (3rd ed) London: Kogan Page

Burrell G & Morgan G (1979) *Sociological Paradigms and Organisational Analysis* London: Heinemann

Callahan, J (2010) Constructing a Manuscript: Distinguishing Integrative Literature Reviews and Conceptual and Theoretical Articles *Human Resource Development Review* 9 (3): 300-304

Callahan (2010) Reconstructing, Constructing and Deconstructing the Field: The Importance of Historical Manuscripts in HRDR, *Human Resource Development Review*, 9 (4), 311-313

DfEE (1998) *The Learning Age: a renaissance for a new Britain* London: HMSO

DOE (1981) *A New Training Initiative: A Programme for Action*. CM8455 London: HMSO

DOE/DES (1986) *Working Together - Education and Training*. CM9823 London: HMSO

ED (1988) *Employment for the 1990s*. CM540 London: HMSO

ED (1994) *Training: an exploration of the word and the concept with an analysis of the implications for survey design* Sheffield: Research Series No 30

- Elliott C (1998) *HRD in the United Kingdom - a Review of the Literature* Proceedings of the AHRD Conference, 536-543
- Elliott C and Turnbull S (2005) 'Critical thinking in Human Resource Development: an introduction' in Carole Elliott & Sharon. Turnbull (Eds), *Critical Thinking in Human Resource Development*, London: Routledge, 1-7,
- Fairclough N (1992) *Discourse and Social Change* Cambridge: Polity Press in association with Blackwell Publishing Ltd
- Fredericks J & Stewart J 1996 'The Strategy-HRD Connection' in Stewart J & McGoldrick J (eds) *Human Resource Development Perspectives, Strategies and Practice* London: Pitman, 101-119
- Gold, J., Stewart, J. and Iles, P. (2010), in Gold, J., Holden, R., Iles, P., Stewart, J. and Beardwell, J. (Eds.) *Human Resource Development: Theory & Practice*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan pp??
- Guest D (1989) 'Personnel and HRM: Can you tell the difference?' in *Personnel Management*, January, 21 (1) 48-51
- Hamlin RG, Ellinger AD and Beattie RS (2008) The emergent 'coaching industry': a wake-up call for HRD professionals, *Human Resource Development International*, 11 (3): 287-305
- Harbison, F. and Myers, C. A. (1964) *Education, manpower and economic growth: Strategies of human resource development*. New York: McGraw-Hill
- Harris DM & DeSimone RL (1994) *Human Resource Development*. Orlando: Dryden Press
- Harrison R (1993) 'Developing people for whose bottom line?' in Harrison R (ed) *HRM Issues and Strategies* Wokingham Addison Wesley, 299-329
- Harrison R (1997) *Employee Development* London: Institute of Personnel Management
- Hendry C (1991) 'Corporate Strategy and Training' in Stevens J & MacKay R (eds) *Training and Competitiveness* Kogan Page in Association with NEDO, 79-110
- Hendry C, Jones A & Pettigrew A (1990) *HRD in the Small-to-Medium Enterprise: Interim report to the Training Agency* Centre for Corporate Strategy & Change, Warwick University
- Holmes L (2004) "Challenging the learning turn in education and training", *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 28 (8/9): 625 – 638
- IiP (2012) <http://www.investorsinpeople.co.uk/About/Pages/default.aspx>, accessed 24 May 2012

- Iles P (1994) 'Developing the Learning Environment' *Journal of European Industrial Training* 18 (3): 3-9
- Keep E (1989) 'Corporate training strategies: the vital component' in Storey J (ed) *New Perspectives on HRM* London: Routledge, 109-125
- Keep, E., Lloyd, C. and Payne, J. (2010) 'Skills policy and the displacement of industrial relations: the elephant in the corner?', in: T. Colling and M. Terry (eds) *Industrial Relations: Theory and Practice* (third edition), pp. 398-421. Chichester: John Wiley and Sons Ltd.
- Keep, E, and Mayhew, K. (2010) 'Moving beyond skills as a social and economic panacea', *Work, Employment and Society*, 24(3): 565-577.
- Lawless A, Sambrook S, Garavan T & Valentin C (2011) A discourse approach to theorising HRD: opening up a discursive space, *Journal of European Industrial Training*, Special Issue, 35 (3): 264-275
- Lee M (1997) *Strategic Human Resource Development: A Conceptual Exploration* Proceedings of the AHRD Conference, 92-99
- Lee M (1998) 'HRDI: A Journal to Define', *Human Resource Development International*, 1 (1): 1-6
- Lee M (2001) 'A refusal to define HRD', *Human Resource Development International* 4: 327-341
- Lee M (2012) A refusal to define HRD. in Lee M (Ed) *Human Resource Development as we know it, Speeches that Have Shaped the Field*, Routledge Studies in Human Resource Development, London: Routledge 13-26
- Legge K (2005) *Human Resource Management: Rhetoric and Realities; Anniversary Edition*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Leitch (2006) 'Review of Skills' <http://www.delni.gov.uk/index/publications/pubs-further-education/the-leitch-review-of-skills.htm> (last accessed 10 December 2011)
- MacKay I (1989) *35 Checklists for Human Resource Development*, Aldershot: Gower in association with the Institute of Training and Development
- Manning S. (Ed.). (2012). *Directory of masters programmes*. Berlin, Germany: European Research in Learning and Work. Retrieved from <http://www.b.shuttle.de/wifo/l&w-pro/=index.htm> (last accessed May 2012)
- Marchington M & Wilkinson A (1996) *Core Personnel and Development* London: IPD
- McLean G (2004) National Human Resource Development: What in the World Is It? *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 6 (3): 269-275

- McGoldrick J & Stewart J (1996) 'The HRM-HRD Nexus' in Stewart J & McGoldrick J (eds) *HRD: Perspectives, Strategy and Practice*, London: Pitman, 9-27
- McGoldrick, J., Stewart, J. and Watson, S. (2001) 'Theorizing human resource development' *Human Resource Development International* 4 (3): 343-356
- McGoldrick J, Stewart J and Watson S (2002), 'Researching HRD' in J. McGoldrick, J. Stewart and S. Watson, eds., *Understanding Human Resource Management : A Resource-Based Approach*, London : Routledge, 1-17
- McGoldrick, J., Stewart, J., Walton, J., and Dooley, L. (2005) 'Alan Moon: An Appreciation' *Human Resource Development International* 8 (4): 509-511
- Meggison D, Joy-Matthews J & Banfield P (1993) *Human Resource Development*, The Fast Track MBA Series, London: Kogan Page
- Moorby E (1996) *How to Succeed in Employee Development* Maidenhead: McGraw-Hill
- Morgan G (1990) 'Paradigm diversity in organisational research' in J Hassard & Pym (eds) *The Theory and Philosophy of Organisations: Critical issues and new perspectives*. London: Routledge, 13-29
- MSC (1981) *A New Training Initiative: Agenda for Action*. London: HMSO
- MSC/DES (1986) 'Review of Vocational Qualifications in England and Wales' London: HMSO
- Nadler L (1970) *Developing Human Resources*, Austin: Learning Concepts
- Nadler L & Nadler Z (1989) *Developing Human Resources*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc Publications
- O'Donnell D, McGuire D & Cross C (2006) 'Critically challenging some assumptions in HRD' *International Journal of Training and Development* 10 (1): 4-16
- Oxtoby B & Coster P (1992) 'HRD - A Sticky Label' *Training and Development*, April, 31-32
- Pedler M, Burgoyne J & Boydell T (1991) *The Learning Company: A Strategy for sustainable development*. London: McGraw-Hill Book Company Not cited
- Pettigrew A, Jones G & Reason W (1981) *Training and Development Roles in their Organisational Setting* Sheffield MSC
- Rainbird H (1994) 'The Changing Role for the Training Function: A test for the integration of human resource and business strategies?' in *Human Resource Management Journal* 5, (1): 72-90.

- Reid M & Barrington H (1994) *Training Interventions: Managing Employee Development* 4th edition London: IPD
- Reynolds A, Sambrook S & Stewart J (1997) *Dictionary of HRD* Aldershot: Gower
- Rigg C (2005) 'Becoming critical: can critical management learning develop critical managers' in Carole Elliott & Sharon Turnbull (Eds), *Critical Thinking in Human Resource Development*, London: Routledge, 37-52
- Rigg C, Stewart J and Trehan K, eds. (2007) *Critical human resource development: Beyond orthodoxy*, Harlow: Pearson Education, FT Prentice Hall, 11.
- Rothwell, W.J. and Kazanas H.C. (1994) *Human Resource Development: a Strategic Approach*, Amherst : HRD Press
- Sambrook S (1998) *Models and Concepts of Human Resource Development: Academic and Practitioner Perspectives*, Unpublished doctoral thesis, Nottingham Business School, Nottingham Trent University
- Sambrook S (2000) 'Talking of HRD' *Human Resource Development International*, 3 (2): 159-178
- Sambrook S (2001) 'HRD as emergent and negotiated evolution,' *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 12 (2): 169-193
- Sambrook S (2004) 'A 'critical' time for HRD?' *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 28, (8/9): 611-624
- Sambrook S & Stewart J (2010) 'Teaching, Learning and Assessing HRD' *Journal of European Industrial Training*, Special Issue, 34 (8/9): 710-734
- Sisson K (1989) 'Personnel Management in transition?' in K Sisson (ed) *Personnel Management in Britain* Oxford: Blackwell, 3-40
- Stewart J (1989) 'Bringing about Organisational Change - a framework' *Journal of European Industrial Training* 13 (6), 1-35
- Stewart J (1992) 'Towards a Model of HRD' in *Training and Development*, October, 26-29
- Stewart J (1996) *Managing Change Through Training and Development*, 2nd edition, London: Kogan Page
- Stewart J (1998) 'Intervention and Assessment: the ethics of HRD' in *Human Resource Development International* 1 (1): 9-12
- Stewart, J. (2010) 'Learning and Development: The Big Picture' *Learning and Development Loose Leaf Manual*, London: CIPD Publishing



Stewart, J., Lee, M. and Poell, R. (2009) 'The University Forum for HRD: Its History, Purpose and Activities' *New Horizons in Adult Education and Human Resource Development*, 23, (1): 29-33

Stewart J & McGoldrick J (eds) (1996) *Human Resource Development: Perspectives, Strategies and Practice* London: Pitman

Stewart, J. and Rigg, C. (2011) *Learning and Talent Development*, London: CIPD Publishing

Stewart J & Sambrook S (1995) 'The Role of Functional Analysis in National Vocational Qualifications: A Critical Appraisal'. *British Journal of Education and Work: Special Edition 'Competence'* 93-106

Storey J (1992) *Developments in the Management of Human Resources* Oxford: Blackwell

Training (1997) 'Talking Points' March, 4-5

Trehan K. (2004) 'Who is not sleeping with whom? What's not being talked about in HRD?' *Journal of European Industrial Training* 28(1): 23–38.

Trehan K and Rigg, C (2011) 'Theorising critical HRD: A paradox of intricacy and discrepancy', *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 35, (3): 276-290

University Forum for HRD (1995) Unpublished working document

Valentin C (2006) 'Researching human resource development: emergence of a critical approach to HRD enquiry' *International Journal of Training and Development* 10 (1): 17-29

Vince R (2005) 'Ideas for critical practitioners' in Carole Elliott, & Sharon Turnbull (Eds) *Critical Thinking in Human Resource Development*, London: Routledge, 26-36

Walton J (1996) 'The Provision of Learning Support for Non-Employees' in Stewart J & McGoldrick J (eds) *HRD: Perspectives, Strategy and Practice*, London: Pitman, 120-137

Walton J (2003) 'How shall a thing be called? An argumentation on the efficacy of the term *HRD*' *Human Resource Development Review*, 2 (3): 310-326

Walton J, McGoldrick J, Moon A & Sambrook S (1995) *Qualification Mapping: Training and Development S/NVQs and Academic Qualifications*. Sheffield: Department for Employment and Education, Learning Methods Branch, 1 - 154