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Human resource development (HRD) is a vehicle for facilitating organisational and individual learning through training and development. According to El-Sawad (2002) there are ‘soft’ and ‘hard’ elements to HRD; the soft implying investment in people, whilst the hard suggests cost and expendability. This paper presents an analysis of a large UK-based construction contractor’s approach to HRD strategy, policy and practice in relation to the classification developed by El-Sawad. The findings of the study suggest that the organisation actively encouraged continuous development and supports self-responsibility, inter-organisational learning and temporary organisational structures. Thus, their approach falls toward the internalised pattern characterised by organizational learning and significantly, the learning organization. However, it appears that this culture has evolved unintentionally rather than as a result of targeted strategic human resource management policies.
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INTRODUCTION

Human resource development (HRD) is concerned with the provision of learning, development and training opportunities which support the achievement of business strategies and improvement of organisational, team and individual performance (Armstrong and Baron, 2002). Systematic as well as ad-hoc development programmes help to ensure staff have the skills required for their current roles and can develop those required for future posts. It can also work as a motivating factor: significant training indicates commitment to people and the recipients are more likely to feel valued (Sisson and Storey, 2000). High levels of managerial commitment to training and development are frequently reported to encourage staff retention (Glover, 2002; Pickard, 2002; Persaud, 2003). From a business point of view HRD can therefore be seen as a powerful tool for creating sustainable competitive advantage (Burden and Proctor, 2000).

Literature on HRD in the field of construction management is scarce and much of the evidence relies on data gathered a decade ago (Langford et al, 1995; Hancock et al, 1996; Druker et al, 1996). At this time, training and development interventions were reported to receive little importance within construction organisations’ planning and operations (ibid.). This view appears to prevail however (Kululanga et al, 1999;
Dainty et al., 2000; Ford et al., 2000; Strategic Forum for Construction, 2002), with little recent empirical verification. Accordingly, this paper begins to address this shortfall by revisiting the central issues in construction HRD via reflective evaluation of current practice within large construction contractors. Firstly, ‘soft’ and ‘hard’ elements to HRD and four-models-in-practice are introduced. Secondly, the literature on construction HRD is discussed. This is followed by the research methodology, findings and discussion. The paper concludes with an analysis of a large UK-based construction contractor’s approach to HRD strategy, policy and practice in relation to the ‘soft’ and ‘hard’ HRD and four-models-in-practice.

**SOFT AND HARD HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT (HRD)**

El-Sawad (2002: 286) identifies ‘soft’ and ‘hard’ elements to HRD (Table 1) which relate closely to Legge’s (1995) ‘soft’ and ‘hard’ models of human resource management (HRM). The soft implies investment in people, whilst the hard suggests cost and expendability. These frequently operate simultaneously, and indeed El-Sawad (1998) suggests that this may be the most beneficial way of managing HRD.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘Soft’</th>
<th>‘Hard’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Organisation</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Change</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term Organic</td>
<td>Structual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic Proactive</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future needs</td>
<td>Reactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resource development</td>
<td>Human resource development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirectly managed</td>
<td>Directly managed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee-driven</td>
<td>Employer-driven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous development</td>
<td>Ad hoc development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational learning</td>
<td>(No/dis-)organised learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double loop learning</td>
<td>Single loop learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabled</td>
<td>Controlled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured</td>
<td>Unstructured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitated</td>
<td>Directed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Put simply, the hard element of HRD relates to mandatory training courses, such as health and safety updates. The soft dimension on the other hand takes a more holistic view within the concepts of organisational learning, continuous development and learning organisation.

**Training and Development**

Training and development includes a range of formal and informal activities that are aimed at providing employees with the skills required to carry out their job. This includes the maintenance and further development of their existing capabilities as well as the learning of new competencies. Training activities (the ‘hard’ element of HRD) usually refer to employer-driven, short-term courses focused on present needs, as alluded to in Table 1. Developmental activities are often more unstructured and incorporate learning undertaken outside the organisational boundaries. Organisational development is the result of collective learning within the members of the
organisation, whom deliver their development into the organisational practice (Harvey and Butcher, 1998; Massey and Walker, 1999).

The training cycle presents a planned, systematic and cyclical process for identifying and suitably responding to individual and organisational training and development needs (Marchington and Wilkinson, 2002: 394). The current and future business needs act as the ‘driving force’ for the four-stage process (Wills, 1994).

Stage 1 training needs analysis (TNA) can be carried out at an organisational, job/occupational and/or individual level (Bee and Bee, 1994). The assessment ideally leads to measures of (i) current and future business performance needs and (ii) current performance and capability levels; and by comparing the two (iii) to the identification of the current and potential future capability gaps and (iv) which training and development interventions might effectively address them within the (v) target population (McClelland, 1993). Stages 2 and 3 of the process, training design and delivery, should focus on what is to be learned and how people learn (Harrison, 1997). These influence the choice of appropriate training methods, for example, whether traditional packaged classroom learning experiences are offered or informal on-the-job learning facilitated. Finally, a major objective of Stage 4 training and learning evaluation is to demonstrate the impact of HRD investment (Bee and Bee, 1994; El-Sawad, 1998: 234). Reid et al (1992) suggest five levels at which the evaluation may be useful [1] reactions of trainees to the training programme, [2] whether trainees learned what was intended, [3] learning transfer back to the work environment, [4] whether the training has enhanced departmental performance and [5] the extent to which the training has benefited the organisation (the ultimate level).

This operational/mechanistic view of HRD falls under the ‘hard’ category. The more developmental ‘soft’ side clearly highlights the attitudinal aspects of HRD, as demonstrated within the concept of organisational learning (OL).

**Organisational Learning (OL)**

Organisational learning (OL) forms the ‘ideal’-type HRD within the four models-in-practice (El-Sawad, 1998: 227) illustrated in Table 2. It fosters organisational change and renewal on a continuous basis, and encourages creativity and innovation (O’Keefe, 2002). It seeks to continuously question the norms, which define effective performance. Thus, continuous development is a central element of OL. It emphasises the attitudinal dimension of OL, which is clearly reflected in the Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development (CIPD) statement on continuous professional development (CPD):

> “CPD is an attitude as well as a process – the continual and conscious search for, and recognition of, learning in almost every activity and situation.” (El-Sawad, 2002: 295)

The OL approach to HRD recognises, values and positively encourages people to take advantage of learning opportunities on-the-job, off-the-job (e.g. on formal training courses) and outside of work. Ultimately, this leads to a climate of self-development, which in turn links in with the concept of Learning Organisation (LO).
Table 2: HRD models-in-practice (El-Sawad, 1998: 225-226)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Intermittent pattern</th>
<th>Institutionalised pattern</th>
<th>Investor pattern</th>
<th>Internalised pattern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Managerial commitment to HRD</strong></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Apparent</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Very high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HRD activity</strong></td>
<td>Little visible activity</td>
<td>High level of visible activity</td>
<td>Systematic, cyclical, organisationally-managed approaches to identifying and responding to development needs</td>
<td>Acceptance of a strong developmental ethos (but quietly so), HRD activity more visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Training and development interventions</strong></td>
<td>Infrequent, ad hoc, reactive, often in response to a crisis</td>
<td>Large budgets invested in extensive off-the-job, fixed menu training on the basis of assumed needs</td>
<td>Substantial expenditure carefully managed, prioritised and targeted at actual business-defined development needs</td>
<td>Developmental philosophy strongly embedded within the organisational culture, learning a day-to-day business-as-usual activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning</strong></td>
<td>No organised learning</td>
<td>Disorganised learning</td>
<td>Organised learning</td>
<td>Organisational learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Learning Organisation (LO) and the construction industry**

Pedler *et al* (1988) define learning organisation (LO) as:

“an organisation which facilitates the learning of all its members ad continuously transforms itself...”

LO is characterised by learning climate, ethos of self-responsibility and self-development, learning approach to strategy, participative policy-making, internal collaboration, continuous development, reward flexibility, inter-company learning, and temporary structures responsive to environmental changes (Coopey, 1996; Corbridge and Pilbeam, 1998) which suggest an extremely attractive working environment. Indeed, Newall (2001: 111) confirms that the most successful organisations that incorporated learning and improvement as an integral aspect of their organisational culture are *strategically led*, with all employees able to articulate the vision with understanding, and *competitively focused*; driven by the need to compete at the highest levels and well aware of what competition is up to. They are also *market-oriented*, close to both the customer and the consumer via research into their changing needs and the agility to respond quickly, *employee-driven*, with highly competent people united by the desire to learn, innovate and experiment, and *operationally excellent*, with finely tuned processes and clear performance measures.

Despite its attractive qualities, LO has received little attention within construction management research or at an applied level in company practices (Loosemore *et al*, 2003: 255). Indeed, Druker *et al* (1996) found construction organisations being far from learning organisations. The industry is known for its low take-up of the Investors in People (IiP) initiative (Strategic Forum for Construction, 2002: 31) and poor commitment to human resource development (HRD) (Dainty *et al*, 2000). Kululanga *et al* (1999) and Ford *et al* (2000) suggest this is true with recent research evidence,
which points one possible reason for the low take-up and commitment to LO and HRD being the predominance of an engineering culture that focuses on technology instead of people. In many respects LO is considered as the “next frontier in development work” (El-Sawad, 1998).

In line with the ‘harder’ model of HRD and current industry practice, Fellows et al (2002: 131-136) identify three vehicles of training suitable for managerial and professional staff within the construction industry: professional development, management development and the use of learning networks. However, Langford et al (1995: 136) note that the number of organisations undertaking management development within the industry is small, although those organisations that do undertake management development tend to place a lot of emphasis on it and support formal technical training courses with coaching. Loosemore et al (2003: 257-258) suggest that the low uptake stems from the assumption that training delivery is expensive, a ‘learn on the job’ culture, clashes with production objectives and legislative training requirements dressing additional activities as unnecessary add-ons or luxuries. They also note staff turnover concerns in relation to the belief that training and developing employees will make them more attractive to other companies and the influence of a macho environment, within which traditional classroom education is often seen as a non-productive, feminine activity and associated with failure.

Jashapara (2003) researched the impact of learning to organisational performance within construction organisations. The conclusions of the study suggested that the dynamics of competitive forces evident within the industry imply a need for construction organisations to focus their organisational learning (OL) on efficiency and proficiency to achieve competitive advantage. However, a short-term focus of OL on efficiency and proficiency undermines the long-term individual career development and organisational succession planning benefits that potentially follow from strategic HRD policy, which takes into account the needs of the organisation and the people it employs (Dainty et al, 2000). Hancock et al (1996), Druker et al (1996), Dainty et al (2000) and the Strategic Forum for Construction (2002) all note the industry’s low take-up and commitment to IiP, LO and HRD. Dainty et al (2000) recognised the missed opportunities of strategic HRD and suggested a fundamental realignment of the HRD function with the employee needs so that maximum benefits, effective recruitment and retention and competitive advantage could be achieved.

A central hypothesis can be drawn from the literature discussed above:

H1: There is no significant incidence of HRD in large construction companies.

This paper presents an analysis of a large UK-based construction contractor’s approach to HRD strategy, policy and practice in relation to the classification developed by El-Sawad. The primary case evidence is supported by internal questionnaire results and interview data from seven similar organisations.

METHODOLOGY

Empirical data for the examination of the hypothesis were drawn from a recent doctoral research that investigated large UK-based construction contractors’ strategic human resource management (SHRM) practices (Raidén, 2004). The main focus of this study was on the employee resourcing aspect of the SHRM function, but the broad range of related training and development material gathered allowed for a detailed assessment of the primary case study organisation’s HRD strategy, policy and practices. Accordingly, the research data collected via a set of exploratory and semi-
structured interviews with divisional directors (4), human resource personnel (4), operational senior managers (7) and employees at all levels (35) was used to analyse the primary case study organisation’s position on El-Sawad’s classification. In addition to describing and examining the company approach to employee resourcing and HRD, the interview material was used to extract a list of factors important to be taken into account in the SHRM decision-making and to identify the compatibility and conflicts between the organisational priorities, project requirements and employee needs and preferences. This allowed for the research to take a tri-dimensional view on the study of HRD. Firstly, the organisational strategy, policy and practices could be described effectively. Secondly, the methodology made it possible to elicit the importance of HRD as a variable in the wider SHRM decision-making. Finally, it provided a comprehensive framework for including the employee as well as managerial views on the process. The supporting case study evidence collected from seven other large contracting organisations in the industry provided a point of comparison within the wider context.

The qualitative interview data were supported by quantitative questionnaire. A researcher-administered analytic hierarchy method survey (Saaty, 1980) asked employees to rank the importance of nine factors that potentially influence their team deployment needs and preferences against each other (see Raidén et al., 2003; Raidén, 2004). The multiple sets of data were analysed using NVivo, a qualitative data analysis software (Bazeley and Richards, 2000), summary statement matrices (Miles and Huberman, 1994), thematic analysis (Boyatzis, 1998), and SPSS and MS Excel, packages for the analysis of quantitative data. The qualitative data analysis software in particular helped to collate the data sets together, which facilitated the use of the varied material to cross-reference and complement the arguments/conclusions drawn (Bazeley and Richards, 2000; Scholz and Tietje, 2002).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The organisational HRD strategy, policy and practices

Although the main emphasis of the original research project was on the employee resourcing practices of large construction organisations, HRD was one of the key topics discussed within many of the case study interviews. Both managerial and employee respondents felt the company promoted training and strongly encouraged continuous development. Training toward professional qualifications and gaining chartered status as well as continuous professional development (CPD) were high priorities within management ranks. Many of the employees saw this focus on recognised training programmes as an ideal opportunity, although some preferred programmes with greater flexibility.

The formal training interventions were supported by a range of more informal development mechanisms. Mentoring and coaching schemes were used to provide a point of contact for both newcomers and managers rising through the organisation, from whom they can obtain informal careers advice, encouragement and support. This approach was also used to help instil the company values on all managers within the organisation. Job shadowing and induction programmes were introduced to support new recruits and recently promoted staff. This helped to familiarise new recruits with the company policy and practices. New senior managers were given the opportunity to ‘job shadow’ an existing senior member of staff to ensure that they fully understood their new role and that their integration to the company work ethic
and approach was facilitated. The company also focused on developing potential in collaboration with a leading management college. Clusters of managers and other personnel identified for succession were invited to attend appropriate training courses. Bringing together clusters of people from different areas of the business on this programme encouraged new practices and innovative approaches to be developed and their effective application throughout the organisation. Regular weekly meetings between senior managers and directors were used to further encourage innovation and sharing of good practice. New ideas and practices emerging from individual employees and project teams were evaluated and discussed in order to help to transfer good practice throughout the organisation.

The result of this type of interrelated staff development policy and practice was that staff felt supported, empowered and were able to take advantage of the full range of opportunities available within the organisation. The succession planning benefits that this provides in the longer term has meant that many of the organisation’s key personnel are long serving members of staff who have reached their positions through the promotion and development processes. The open approach also benefits the organisation in that newcomers are encouraged to bring in their fresh ideas and approaches. Together, these management development activities have ensured a culture of mutuality within a spirit of continuous improvement that is paying dividends in terms of the organisation's performance.

**The importance of HRD as a variable in SHRM decision-making**

In addition to the qualitative evidence of HRD practices within the case study firm, quantitative measures were taken in order to elicit the importance of HRD in the SHRM decision-making. The managerial interviews highlighted a total of 92 factors that were considered important to be taken into account in the process (for full details see Raidén, 2004). Five major themes emerged as significant: [1] team/ project, [2] HRD, [3] careers, [4] organisational planning and [5] employee involvement (EI)/ communications.

Many of the team/ project variables focused on team spirit and relationships in relation to a collaborative teamwork/ partnership culture. The HRD and careers themes drew attention to organisational development and continuous improvement. Transparent progression opportunities and succession planning activities focused staff retention and achievement of organisational goals in the long-term. Career development, fast track progression and taking on trainees balanced this with extensive employee opportunities. These provide a foundation for a culture of learning organisation. The factors relating to organisational and HR planning emphasised the importance of long-term planning together with organisational flexibility and management of change. Organisational culture founded on trust, openness, partnering, empowerment (employee involvement) and individualistic management style was said to form the key to long-term success.

The same key themes were found significant within the employee interviews. This highlights the central role of HRD in effective SHRM. The analytic hierarchy method questionnaire results further supported this. The questionnaire showed that “good team relationships” together with “personal and/or professional development” and “gaining broad and/or specialist experience” were ranked as the most important factors to be taken into account in SHRM decision-making. “Good team relationships” achieved ~70% of the maximum ranking value (248) by scoring 195. “Personal and/or professional development” scored only 30 marks below this at 165 (~58%) and
“gaining broad and/or specialist experience” 24 marks below this at 141 (~ 56%). The high scores on the last factor signify the importance of on-the-job development.

The compatibility and conflicts between the organisational priorities, project requirement and employee needs and preferences
The third element of the analysis evaluated the compatibility and conflicts between the organisational priorities, project requirement and employee needs and preferences within the case study organisation’s employee resourcing and HRD strategy, policy and practice. The main points of conflict arose in the areas of team/ project deployment, EI/ communications and careers (see Raidén et al, 2003; Raidén, 2004). Five main areas of compatibility were clearly identifiable, of which three (60%) centred on HRD. This is shown in Table 3.

**Table 3:** The five main areas of compatibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Positive features</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formal training courses</strong></td>
<td>Frequent</td>
<td>Well trained staff that have the required skills and qualifications to carry out their duties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Varied in nature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Managers encourage attendance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regular up-dates</td>
<td>Employees realise organisational commitment and opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Development Plans (PDPs)</strong></td>
<td>Training needs discussed</td>
<td>Personalised and tailored solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunity to highlight personal preferences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Managers suggest/ offer range of options</td>
<td>Employee involvement and commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mentoring/ coaching</strong></td>
<td>More senior/ longer serving members take [informal] responsibility to guide new recruits, team members and recently promoted personnel</td>
<td>Informal support structure for personnel new to the organisation/ role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part of the organisational culture at many levels</td>
<td>Enhanced internal relationships via employee participation in the organisational development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work-life balance a factor in team formation decision-making</strong></td>
<td>Location one of the key criteria in decision-making</td>
<td>Employees’ travel requirements minimised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aim to ‘rotate’ staff travelling longer distances/ staying away</td>
<td>Employee trust in managers looking after their staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fairness of procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individualistic management style</strong></td>
<td>Management approachable and accessible</td>
<td>Positive foundation for future opportunities via development of HRM practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Know their staff and their skills personally</td>
<td>Open communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open forum for discussion/ grievances</td>
<td>Employee trust in managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Genuine aim for good people management practice</td>
<td>Close relationships between managers and their staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both the managerial and employee respondents agreed that the company training courses were frequent and varied in nature. Managers encouraged staff to attend training courses, which resulted in well-trained and motivated staff. Personal development plans (PDPs) offered an opportunity for open discussion on training needs with high levels of employee involvement. The mentoring and coaching
schemes discussed above also received positive feedback, in particular as a useful
informal support structure and a mechanism for enhancing internal relationships. This
lends further support to the company’s People Statement and HRD practice.

**Balanced ‘soft’-'hard’ approach to learning organisation**

In assessing the case study organisation’s approach to HRD in relation to El-Sawad’s
‘soft’ and ‘hard’ elements to HRD (Table 1) and the four models-in-practice (Table 2),
the evidence discussed suggests that the company commitment to training,
development and IiP fall closely under the description of LO. Firstly, this is apparent
in that the company takes a balanced view on the ‘soft’ and ‘hard’ elements to HRD.
The company provides for and encourages structured training courses and supports
NVQs, training towards professional qualifications and gaining chartered status
(‘hard’ HRD). Their long-term strategy is to achieve fully qualified workforce. In
addition, high importance is placed on CPD (‘soft’ HRD). This mix involves short-
and long-term solutions to continuous development of both the organisation and
individual employees. Other ‘soft’ HRD interventions, such as the company
mentoring and coaching schemes, help ensure that the employee needs and
preferences are integrated in the planning and delivery of training and development.

Secondly, the company approach fits within the internalised pattern in the four
models-in-practice categories. The interview material demonstrates very high
managerial commitment to HRD. Developmental philosophy is strongly rooted in the
organisational culture and ethos, and training and learning activities are embedded in
the daily operations. HRD is led by a strategy that provides clear direction and
motivation to encouraging training and development at all levels and stages of projects
and individual jobs. Line managers and HR personnel support this view by transparent
commitment to promoting HRD. This has achieved high levels of staff satisfaction.

Accordingly, it is safe to conclude that the organisational commitment to training,
development and IiP fall closely under the description of LO. However, neither the
interviewees nor the questionnaire respondents recognised this as the “label” for their
intended approach. This may explain why the concept has received minimal attention
at an applied level. Organisations may not be aware of their approach to HRD falling
under a specific category and thus find it difficult to report on the issue. This was
certainly true within many of the supplementary cases. Although many of the
organisations identified with Newall’s (2001) characteristics of successful
organisations (being strategically led, competitively focused, market oriented,
employee-driven and operational excellent), none described a culture of LO as a
characteristic of their organisational culture. However, qualities central to the concept
of LO were highlighted: ethos of self-responsibility and development, internal
collaboration, continuous development and temporary structures responsive to
environmental changes. Most of the companies also held (or were working towards)
IiP status. The extent to which this supports the achievement of a LO culture presents
an interesting area for further investigation.

**CONCLUSIONS**

Literature on HRD within large construction contractors tends to identify with a view
of the industry reported almost a decade ago, which generalised construction
organisations as placing little importance and investment in HRD. The findings of this
research do not support this. In contrast, the research evidence suggests that several
leading large employers in the industry have a sophisticated approach to training and
development. They actively encourage continuous development and support self-responsibility, inter-organisational learning and temporary organisational structures. Accordingly, the hypothesis that there is no significant incidence of HRD in large construction companies is rejected. However, the extent to which such activity if formally planned remains questionable.
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