



ADRRI JOURNALS (www.adrri.org)

ISSN: 2343-6662 ISSN-L: 2343-6662 VOL. 25, No. 8(3), June 2016

Models for Human Resource Development Practice: Contributions from the American Society for Training and Development (ASTD)

Opoku Felix Kwame¹, Arthur Dominic Degraft², Antwi Kwabena Barimah³

¹Senior Lecturer, Department of Management Studies, School of Business, University of Cape Coast, Ghana

¹Email: felixopoku@yahoo.com

²Lecturer, Department of Social, Political and Historical Studies, University for Development Studies, WA Campus, Ghana

²E-mail: darthur@uds.edu.gh

³Associate Professor, Department of Geography and Regional Planning, University of Cape Coast, Ghana

³E-mail: kantwi@ucc.edu.gh

¹Correspondence: felixopoku@yahoo.com

Received: 17th May, 2016 Revised: 12th June, 2016 Published Online: 30th June, 2016

URL: <http://www.journals.adrri.org/>

[Cite as: Opoku, F. K., Arthur, D. D., and Antwi, K. B.,(2016). **Models for Human Resource Development Practice: Contributions from the American Society for Training and Development (ASTD)**. Africa Development and Resources Research Institute Journal, Ghana: Vol. 25, No. 8(3), Pp. 1-13, ISSN: 2343-6662, 30th June, 2016.]

Abstract

This paper addresses the relevant issues pertaining to the ASTD competency studies sponsored by the American Society for Training and Development in the United States. The issues covered include the definition of HRD and related concepts, an overview of the eight most relevant HRD competency studies conducted between 1970 and 2015, the contribution of ASTD studies to HRD practice, components of HRD, the criticisms as well as the development of HRD practitioner roles and competencies. Referred journal articles, books and unpublished doctoral dissertations were reviewed in this study. It was found that the HRD profession is undergoing an evolutionary

transformation that requires the attention of both practitioners and academicians. The journey to establishing HRD as a separate field of professional study and practice has just begun. The paper therefore, seeks to contribute theoretically to the emergent role of ASTD competency models in ensuring the growth of HRD as a field of academic study and professional practice.

Keywords: human resource development, competency models, training and development, organizational structure

INTRODUCTION

Over the last four decades, the American Society for Training and Development (ASTD) has sponsored several HRD related competency studies with the aim of determining the competencies needed for a successful Human Resource Development (HRD) practice, thereby providing a professional roadmap for guiding HRD practitioners (Konan, 2010). McLagan (1989) defined HRD as representing competencies that are essential for staying current and relevant in the field of HRD. Thus, in each study, a model was provided that defined the set of personal knowledge and skills required for producing and delivering the human resource development outputs (McLagan, 1989).

The ASTD Competency Models answer the question, what do HRD practitioners need to know and do to be successful on their jobs now and in the future? How could practitioners prepare for the future which is constantly changing than ever? As noted by Abdullah, Musa and Ali (2011) “the development of an HRD practitioner Competency Model is an area of interests to practitioners, researchers, academicians, employers, and consultant in HRM today. The established ASTD Competency Model sets out the competency categories and their corresponding competency domains and factors; in this way, such models can guide the practitioner in practicing HRD” (Abdullah, Musa & Ali, 2011: p. 241).

The paper makes an attempt to discover the many benefits associated with HRD competency models. It also attempts to explore the definition of HRD and related concepts, the history and development of components of HRD, the roles, competences, and areas of expertise for the HRD practitioner, and the lessons learnt from the review. The literature on HRD competency models was also systematically reviewed to determine how academicians and practitioners have defined and examined HRD as a field of study and academic practice in existing literature.

This paper is important because it provides a historical development of HRD as a field of study and practice, thereby providing direction and conceptual foundation for guiding current HRD theorists and practitioners. The study is based on the belief that much of the theorizing and practice of HRD evolve around the eight competency studies that were conducted by ASTD in the USA. It is therefore, proposed in this study that a more nuanced understanding of the theoretical foundations of the ASTD competency models will generate better and more diverse HRD theories and practice.

METHODOLOGY

The key research question to be answered in this paper is: does a more nuanced understanding of the theoretical foundations of the American Society for Training and Development (ASTD) competency models generate better and more diverse HRD practice? Competency was defined as a cluster of related knowledge, skills, abilities, and characteristics that are related to the performance of a significant aspect of the practice of a profession (McLagan, 1989), whereas competency model was defined as the collection

of competencies that are relevant to the performance of a particular job, job family or functional area (Pinto & Walker, 1978). To achieve the objectives of the study and to answer the key research question, twenty seven (27) peer-reviewed academic articles were critically analysed. These were made up of 8 ASTD Models, 14 Applications of the ASTD Models, 3 Books and 2 Doctoral Dissertations. The literature search included a computerized search of accessible and available material on models for human resource development practice, as sponsored by the ASTD through the PRO QUEST, EBSCO, Web SPRIS, INGENTA and ERIC documents. The sections that follow provide information obtained from the literature search.

Overview of Competency studies by the ASTD

Many HRD related competency studies have been sponsored by the American Society for Training and Development (ASTD). While there some minor studies, eight sponsorships have been considered as the most important (Chen, Bian&Hom, 2005). The first empirically sponsored study by the ASTD was conducted by Pinto and Walker in 1978. In this study, Pinto and Walker (1978) examined the training and development roles and competencies of HRD professionals. Having received 2,855 responses from the total of 3000 questionnaires administered to the ASTD members in the U.S.A, Canada, Mexico, and other countries, they identified and categorized 14 major training and development activities which were used to establish a model that contained the primary areas for training and development (Konan, 2010; Pinto & Walker, 1978).

McLagan and McCullough's Model for Excellence (1983) was the second major competency study sponsored by the ASTD. McLagan and McCullough (1983) examined the detailed and updated meaning of excellence in the field of Training and Development (T&D) to serve as a yardstick for guiding business, government and non-profit making organisations (McLagan & McCullough, 1983). According to Konan (2010), the 1983 Model for Excellence was the first modern attempt to define training and development. Nine major findings were obtained from this study: (i) the human resource wheel; (ii) the definitions of training and development; (iii) the future forces; (iv) the 15 training and development roles; (v) the 102 critical outputs of the field of training and development; (vi) the competency model for training and development; (vii) the role profiles; (viii) the role clusters; and (ix) the roles/competencies matrix (Konan, 2010).

Until 1989 when McLagan conducted her second study for the ASTD, training and development were the main focus of the academia and practitioners in the field of HRD. The 1989 Model for HRD practice (McLagan, 1989) saw the addition of Organisation Development (OD) and Career Development (CD) as other important components of HRD. Consequently, McLagan (1989, p. 7), defined HRD as "the integrated use of training and development, organisation development and career development to improve individual, group and organizational effectiveness".

McLagan's model was presented in a form of a Human Resource Wheel, and this wheel, which purports to describe the relationship between HRM and HRD, has had, and continue to have, a profound impact on HRD practice. The 1989 Model for HRD Practice (McLagan, 1989), being an update of the 1983 Model for Excellence, broadened the scope of HRD by defining eleven roles of the HRD professionals, 74 outputs of the HRD work, 35 core competencies, and 13 ethical issues. The major evolution of the Models for HRD Practice (McLagan, 1989), as compared to McLagan's (1983) Models for Excellence was the expansion on role categories and the addition of new competencies of the HRD professional practice. Based on McLagan's (1989) model, the following three areas were defined for future investigation: (1)

How to determine the specific effects of future forces and how individuals manage them,(2) How well the quality requirements were met in each role profile, and (3) How to control and avoid ethical issues.

Seven years after the launching of McLagan's (1989) Model for HRD practice, the ASTD observed that training was no longer a sufficient intervention to solve human performance problems at the workplace. Consequently, the Society sponsored Rothwell in 1996 for a further study into HRD practice. Rothwell (1996, p. 79) established the Human Performance Improvement Model and defined Human Performance Improvement "as the systematic process of discovering and analysing important human performance gaps, planning for future improvement in human performance, designing and developing cost-effective and ethically-justifiable interventions to close the performance gaps, implementing the interventions, and evaluating the financial and non-financial results". The main purpose of Rothwell's (1996) study was to provide the foundation for future practice in human performance improvement.

A key point that was identified from Rothwell's (1996) study was that HRD professionals were the only people at the realm of affairs when it comes to performing an organisation's HRD function. According to the author, line managers, employees and others could also play a part in improving performance, and can also contribute to enhance organizational competitiveness (Rothwell, 1996). The second key point was that no one person can play all the roles and master all the competencies described in the model. Thus, a detailed menu of options was supplied for undertaking Human Performance Improvement work.

Five major findings were obtained from the study:

- (i) A definition of human performance improvement (HPI);
- (ii) The identification of the five key trends that are expected to influence and change the way we work;
- (iii) 14 terminal outputs of human performance improvement and 81 enabling output;
- (iv) 36 core competencies of human performance improvement (Rothwell, 1996). The five key trends included: performance; business; learning; organizational structure; and technology. The analyst, intervention specialist, change manager and evaluator were the four key roles that were identified by Rothwell. Two years after the studies of Rothwell (1996), it was observed that keeping up with learning technologies was one of the major challenges facing the HRD professional. Though technology was recognised in the previous studies as one of the key future forces affecting the HRD profession (as contained in number (5) and (8) of future forces affecting the HRD profession in Rothwell's (1996) Model for Human Performance Improvement), it was only after the implementation of Rothwell's Model that the ASTD began to receive request from its members for more information on learning technologies (Konan, 2010).

The 1999 ASTD competency studies were carried out to identify potential strategic competencies that stemmed from technology, globalization and corporate transformations (Rothwell, Sanders & Soper, 1999). The main purpose of the study was summarized in a statement made by the researchers: "today's HRD professionals are also shifting their energies towards analyzing the root causes for gaps in productivity and finding the best solutions that will close those gaps"(Rothwell et al, 1999 p. xiii). Consequently, the study sought to: evaluate the competencies required for ensuring success in Workplace Learning and Performance (WLP); and identify those competencies that may be required to ensure success for Workplace Learning and Performance in the next five years. The Workplace Learning and Performance (WLP) study was meant to create positive and progressive change within organisations by

balancing human, ethical, technological and operational considerations (Rothwell et al, 1999). The expression, Workplace Learning and Performance (WLP) was defined as the integrated use of learning and other interventions for the purpose of improving individual and organizational performance. The Human Performance Improvement (HPI) model was used as the basis for analyzing performance, determining causes, selecting relevant interventions, implementing the interventions, managing change and evaluating employee performance.

Two models were produced from the 1999 ASTD competency study: (i) the discipline model, and (ii) the process model. In the discipline model, four key disciplines were observed as being essential for human performance improvement. These were training and development; organisation development; career development; and knowledge development. These became the major components of HRD from the study. The process model, on the other hand, contained the key learning interventions that were believed to have impact on human performance improvement. Such interventions included: determining the steps in solving performance problems; guiding organisations for planning learning and performance improvement; and monitoring the external changes that affect learning and performance in organisations (Rothwell et al, 1999).

Another landmark competency study was sponsored by the ASTD in 2004. The research was conducted by Bernthal, Colteryahn, Davis, Naughton, Rothwell, & Wellins (2004). The main purpose of the study was to find ways by which HRD professionals could be assisted in building and developing their careers at different positions within their organisations and across a wide spectrum of areas of expertise and roles. The 2004 ASTD competency model placed more emphasis on three key layers of HRD competency and skill areas: foundational competencies; areas of professional expertise; and the roles in the areas of responsibility. The highlights of the 2004 ASTD competency research are presented below:

Foundational competencies: These are the cluster of skills, knowledge, abilities and behaviours required for the successful performance of all HRD jobs or functions. They are desirable, regardless of the HRD professional's specific area of expertise, interest or role. The HRD practitioner will require the mastery of majority of these competencies in order to succeed on the job. The model divides the foundational competencies into three clusters: the interpersonal competencies (those that relate to how well the learning and performance professional works with, manages and influences people, policy and change); business/management competencies (those that relate to how well the learning and performance professional analyses situations, makes decisions and implements solutions); and personal competencies (those that relate to how well the learning and performance professional adapts to change and makes personal decisions to enhance his career (Benthal et al, 2004).

Areas of professional expertise (AOEs): This layer of competencies consists of the technical and professional skills and knowledge that are specifically required for a successful performance of HRD specialty areas or roles. Areas of professional expertise are specialized areas that build and rely on the application of foundational competencies. In addition to having the very basic foundational competencies, the HRD practitioner must possess professional expertise in order to distinguish himself from line managers who sometimes have acquired some of the foundational competencies. It was also observed from the study that most HRD professionals spent the greatest part of their time in designing, learning and delivering training in areas of professional expertise. Again, the study revealed that 63 percent of HRD professionals spent at least 10 percent of their time in three to five areas of professional expertise (Benthal et al, 2004).

Roles in the areas of responsibility: The third and final layer of the model represented the four major expected roles of the HRD professional. Roles were defined as the broad area of responsibility within the profession that requires a select group of foundational competencies as found in the first tier, and another select group of AOE's (the second tier) to successfully execute HRD functions. The four roles are: learning strategist; business partner; project manager; and professional specialist.

The continuing applicability of the 2004 ASTD model was tested in 2007 when the board of directors sponsored a team of experts to use both quantitative and qualitative methods to collect data from professionals and thought leaders. Using the interview, a survey, and an in-depth literature review, the team found that many researchers have used the 2004 ASTD Competency Model to study the roles and competencies of HRD professionals in various countries, including China, Egypt, Korea and Taiwan (Chen, 2008; Yang, 1994; Yoo, 1999; Peerapornvitoon, 1999). Again, it was discovered that the competencies and areas of professional expertise were highly used and remained in use throughout the world (Salopek, 2008).

Although the general consensus was that the 2004 ASTD model had been consistently used by many, another study was sponsored by the ASTD in 2013. The main purpose of the study was to redefine the skills and knowledge that HRD practitioners must possess in order to successfully performing the knowledge and technology-based jobs now and in the future. Conducted by Arneson, Rothwell and Naughton (2013), the new study was triggered by four major factors: (1) The recession and economic uncertainty, (2) Digital, social and mobile technology, (3) Demographic shifts; and (4) Globalization. These factors, according to the ASTD, have influenced the competencies, areas of professional expertise and roles of HRD practitioners lately.

The *2013 Training & Development Redefined model* was an update of the 2004 ASTD Competency Model. The model provides two sets of actionable paths: a broad inventory of topics that HRD professionals and practitioners need to know in today's rapidly changing business environment, and the key specific actions that are required of the HRD practitioner to stay relevant (Arneson, Rothwell, & Naughton, 2013). The 2013 ASTD Competency Model represents 10 Areas of Expertise (AOEs) that are built on six foundational competencies which are related to business acumen. The HRD practitioner is expected to use the model as a guide to missing or underdeveloped competencies which are considered as constraining career development of members in the organisation.

The *Training and Development Redefined model* provides HRD professionals with an objective criterion for recruiting, selecting, appraising, and developing their staff by: (1) defining the latest competencies needed for success in the entire training and development industry; (2) providing a professional development roadmap for training and development leaders and practitioners; and (3) identifying training and development skill gaps and ways to close them that align with individual and organizational goals. The key findings and recommendations for HRD practitioners resulting from the research include: (1) Staying abreast with the new and emerging technology and matching appropriate technology to specific learning needs; (2) Moving to the role of facilitator, content curator, information manager, and builder of learning communities; (3) Designing and presenting learning as a process, instead of a discrete even; and (4) Being a business partner by aligning activities to organization strategies, and using metrics that are meaningful to a business (Arneson, Rothwell, & Naughton, 2013).

Contribution of ASTD Competency Models and Studies

Generally, HRD competency studies have defined HRD as a separate field of academic study and professional practice (Konan, 2010). In addition to this general contribution, competency studies have defined the basic skills, knowledge, and competencies that HRD professionals require to successfully perform training and development activities (Pinto & Walker, 1978). The competency studies have also provided the definition and composition of HRD and other related concepts, thereby, laying the foundation for empirical research into this area of study (Rothwell, Sanders & Soper, 1999; McLagan & McCullough, 1983). The development of the McLagan's Human Resource Wheel has also helped in identifying the differences and similarities between HRM and HRD. This distinction had a profound impact on HRD practice (Konan, 2010).

HRD competency studies have laid the foundation for future research for HRD practitioners and academicians. For instance, based on McLagan's (1989) model, the following three areas were defined for future investigation:

- (a) How to determine the specific effects of future forces and how individuals manage them;
- (b) How well the quality requirements were met in each role profile; and
- (c) How to control and avoid unethical practices.

Another important contribution of the ASTD competency studies was the revelation that HRD professionals were not the sole practitioners of an organisation's HRD functions. The studies have also shown that, line managers, and employees can also all play specific roles in ensuring successful delivery of HRD functions, thereby, contributing to the course of the organisation (Rothwell, 1996). The studies further uncovered the need to redefine HRD roles and competencies in relation to changes in technology, globalization and corporate transformations (Arneson, Rothwell, & Naughton, 2013; Rothwell, Sanders & Soper, 1999). The 2013 ASTD Model for instance, provided a broad inventory of topics that HRD professionals and practitioners need to know in today's rapidly changing business environment. It also presented the key specific actions that are required of the HRD practitioners, and has recognized their strategic role in the organisation.

Bernthal et al (2004) have observed that the 2004 ASTD model is the most consistently applied across the world. According to the authors, the 2004 ASTD competency models can be used to:

- Evaluate individuals for selection or promotion;
- Determine which competencies and AOE's are appropriate for HRD professionals;
- Assess the extent to which HRD professionals demonstrate the competencies;
- Identify individual or group training and development needs;
- Guide career planning decisions, coaching and feedback;
- Evaluate existing course offerings in many organizations and learning institutions including colleges, universities, professional associations, consulting firms etc; and,
- Plan new programs or courses in these learning institutions.

The review of literature on the ASTD competency models serves as a guide to academicians in their intended research into HRD as a field of professional study. The continuing research on HRD practitioner's competency and the controversy surrounding the definition of HRD reflect the evolving nature of the HRD field, and the need for HRD practitioners to integrate both the past and present literature as they intend to play their role as strategic partners in the organisation.

Criticisms of the HRD competency models

As an academic and professional field, interests in the literature towards identifying the disciplinary basis of HRD were the hallmark of the HRD competency models. As noted by Teodorescu (2006), each of the eight (8) competency models was a development over a preceding one. Each study reflected a major shift in thinking about the competencies essential for professional work in the field of HRD during the time (Konan, 2010). The lack of clarity and agreement regarding the disciplinary basis of HRD, and its related concepts as defined in the competency models, according to Passmore (1997), led to a loss of respect for the field among practitioners. While many companies have started to use competency models (Saru, 2007; Tseng & McLean, 2008), each model has its own critique and challenges (Cornford, 2000). The major challenges facing each model have been reviewed in the following section.

The main critique of Pinto and Walker's (1978) study was that it focused solely on the characteristics of training and development of practitioners who were all members of the American Society for Training and Development (Teodorescu, 2006). As there are many environmental and cultural factors to be considered in any programme of human resource development, Konan (2010) observed that such a study cannot be effectively replicated in Non-Western cultural settings like Africa. Moreover, the study concentrated only on the issues prevailing during the time of the research without making an attempt to consider the future direction of the field (Konan, 2010; Teodorescu, 2006).

Beside, McLagan's (1983) Model for Excellence failed to describe areas for future studies (Konan, 2010). As posited by Konan (2010), the training and development function of HRD has undergone significant transformation, and the skills and knowledge required for trainers to be successful have also evolved. Consequently, in today's knowledge and technology-based economy, the Model for Excellence cannot be deemed as setting the standards for best practice.

Again, the 1996 ASTD Model for Human Performance Improvement was criticized based on the methodology used to conduct the study. Rothwell conducted a desk review of literature on competencies in human resource development, human performance improvement and other related fields (Rothwell, 1996). The following methodology was employed:

Phase 1: A list of competencies was compiled from previous reviews on literature on human performance improvement;

Phase 2: The competencies relevant to human performance improvement were selected by subject matter experts at ASTD headquarters, using reverse Delphi procedures; and

Phase 3: The final list of human performance improvement competencies was verified by a panel of experts, using the same reverse Delphi procedures.

Rothwell herself noted that the validity and reliability of the results could not be more accurate than if she had used an empirically-based approach.

Notwithstanding the great impact of Rothwell, Sanders and Soper's (1999) ASTD Model for Workplace Learning and Performance, there were some few limitations. First, the study was limited to answers of respondents whose opinions formed the basis of the Workplace Learning and Performance model. Such a study could hardly be generalized to the situation of other HRD practitioners. Second, 81.5 percent of the respondents in the study were Europeans. How can a study of this nature be applied to different cultural settings like the case of Africa and Asia? Finally, the response rate was very low (e.g. career development 3.3 percent, and knowledge management 8.5 percent). These limitations constrain the generalisability of the findings of (Rothwell, Sanders and Soper, 1999).

The 2004 ASTD Model for New Workplace Learning and Performance, considered as the most generally applied model across the world (e.g. China, Egypt, Korea and Taiwan) as in the works of Chen (2008), Yang (1994), Yoo (1999), and Peerapornvitoon (1999) was found to be limited, resulting in the need to the 2013 ASTD Training and Development Redefined Model. The 2004 ASTD Model failed to provide a broad inventory of topics that HRD professionals and practitioners need to know in today's rapidly changing business environment. The study also failed to identify the key specific actions that are required of the HRD practitioners to stay relevant (Arneson, Rothwell, & Naughton, 2013).

Despite the preceding challenges, the ASTD Competency Studies have contributed to the development of HRD as a field of study and practice. The next sub-section focuses on the contribution of HRD competency models to the development of HRD and organizational effectiveness.

Development of roles and competencies of HRD practitioners

McLagan (1989, p. 77) defined a competency as "an area of knowledge or skills that is critical for producing key outputs". This definition has been criticized on grounds that it limits competency to occupational competency which is only required for employees to successfully perform their jobs. As noted by Gilbert (1996), a competence is a function of performance and not a component of it; it is a product of both the work environment and the individual's repertoire of behaviour or the specialized responses, knowledge and understanding of a specific area (p. 18). On the basis of this criticisms, Mansfield (2003) defined competency on the basis of usage, including, outcome (vocational standards describing what an employee need to be able to perform in the workplace), task that an employee does (describing what currently happens), and personal traits or characteristics (describing what an employee is like). Competency defined this way includes both visible competencies such as knowledge and skills as well as competencies related to personal traits such as motives and self-concept (Hartle, 1995). While it is hard to provide a universally acceptable definition of competency, the common agreement is that it relates to those skills, knowledge and other personal factors that improve the potential of the individual in a specific situation (Gilbert, 1978).

The ASTD models recognized the importance of competency development among HRD practitioners. As noted by Kuchinke (1996), expertise is of importance to individuals, organizations and society at large, and its development is at the core of the field of human resource development (Kuchinke, 1996: p. 505). In support of this view, Davis, Naughton and Rothwell (2004) quoted the president of the American Society for Training and Development (ASTD), Tony Bingham as saying "A defined set of competencies is a hallmark of a true profession, and the practice of creating and supporting a competency model is a key role of a professional association" (Davis, Naughton & Rothwell, 2004: p. 28).

Following the preceding arguments, Jacobs (2003) contends that an HRD practitioner who has the most relevant competency is able to help his employees to quickly acquire the up-dated knowledge and skills necessary to successfully perform on their jobs. Again, the ASTD competency studies attempted to determine what roles should be fulfilled by HRD professionals (Jacobs, 2003). A summary of the major competencies and roles required of the HRD practitioner from the ASTD competency studies have been provided in Table 1.

Table 1: Summary of HRD professional's roles and competencies in the USA

Author/Year/ Title	Result on Role	Result on Competencies
Pinto & Walker (1978)- <i>Professional training roles and competencies</i>	No Roles Defined	- 14 Areas of Activities
Ontario Society for Training & Development (1979)- <i>Competency Analysis for Trainers: A personal planning guide</i>	4 Roles	- 12 Competencies
McLagan's (1983)- <i>Model for Excellence</i>	15 Roles	- 31 Competencies - 102 Outputs
McLagan(1989)- <i>Model for HRD practice</i>	11 Roles	- 13 Ethical issues - 35 Competencies - 74 Outputs
Rothwell (1996)-ASTD- <i>Models for human performance Improvement: roles, competencies and outputs</i>	4 Roles	- 15 Ethical Issues - 38 Competencies - 14 Terminal Outputs - 144 Enabling Outputs
Rothwell et al. (1999)-ASTD- <i>Models for workplace learning and performance</i>	7 Roles	- 52 Competencies - 6 Competency Groups
Davis, Naughton, & Rothwell (2004)- <i>Mapping the future: Shaping</i>	4 Roles	- 12 Competencies - 9 Areas of Expertise

Source: Adapted Chen, Bian&Hom (2005). Taiwan HRD practitioner competencies: Application of the ASTD WLP Competency Model.

CONCLUSIONS

The preceding review indicates that the HRD profession is undergoing an evolutionary transformation that requires managers to take a proactive role in deciding on the desired change, initiating change and implementing change to reflect the changing demands of today's knowledge and technologically changing environment. In contemporary business, the most successful HRD practitioner is the one who can demonstrate the inherent economic value of her stock of her HR, and can equally analyse the cost-effectiveness of various practices and interventions. Therefore, the HRD practitioner would be required to effectively monitor developments and trends in the ASTD competency studies in order to make the necessary adjustments in their HRD practice.

Furthermore, HRD practitioners in the industry are required to understand that it is no longer sufficient to manage individual assets; "the HRD professional of the 21st Century must manage inter-connected assets of the firm" (Krebs, 2008: p. 38). The acquisition of skills or what a person needs to perform the job does not provide the whole story of employee performance at the workplace. In the knowledge economy, organisational success depends on the interactions, cooperation and interdependencies among the workforce. As noted by Krebs (2008):

Human resource development used to focus only on within employee factors, but the new competitive landscape requires focusing on between-employee factors; the connections that combine to create new processes, products and services. It is this pattern of relationship that produces advantage for one group and constraint for another (Krebs, 2008, p. 38).

In summary, HRD practitioners are required to make changes in their work role in order to successfully perform their jobs now and in the future.

REFERENCES

- Abdullah, H.A, Musa, F.R., &Ali, H.J. (2011). The development of human resource practitioner competency model perceived by Malaysian human resource practitioners and consultants: A structural equation model (SEM) approach. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 6(11), 240 – 255.
- Arneson, M., Rothwell, W.J. & Naughton, J. (2013). *The 2013ASTD training & development redefined model*. Alexandria, VA: American Society for Training and Development.
- Bernthal, P.R., Colteryahn, K., Davis, P., Naughton, J., Rothwell, W.J., &Wellins, R. (2004). *ASTD competency study: Mapping the future*. Alexandria, VA: American Society for Training and Development.
- Chen, A.S, Bian, M. &Hom, Y. (2005).Tawain HRD practitioner competencies: Application of the ASTD WLP competency model. *International Journal of Training and Development*, 9(1), 21 – 32.
- Chen, S. J. (2008). The adoption of human resource strategies in a confucian context. *Advances in International Management*, 21, 145 – 169.
- Cornford, L.R. (2000). Competency based training: Evidence of a failed policy in training reform. *Australian Journal of Education*, 44(2), 135 – 189).
- Davis, P., Naughton, J., & Rothwell, W. (2004).New roles and new competencies for the profession, *Training and Development*, 58(4), 26 – 36.
- Gilbert, T.F. (1996). *Human competency: Engineering worthy performance* (Tribute Ed.). Amherst, MA: HRD Press.
- Hartle, F. (1995).*How to re-engineer your performance process*. London: Kogan Page.
- Jacobs, R.L. (2003). *Structured-on-the-job training: Unleashing employee expertise in the workplace* (2nded.). San Fransisco, Berrett-Koehler Publications, In.
- Konan, A. (2010). *The HRD competencies as perceived by the human resource development professionals in banks in Cote D'Ivoire*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, College of Graduate and Professional Studies, Indiana State University, Terre Haute, Indiana.
- Krebs, V. (2008). Social capital: The key to success for the 21st Century organization. *IHRIM Journal*, XII, 38 – 42.
- Kuchinke, K.P. (1996). *Experts and expertise: The status of the research literature on superior performance*. In Kuchinke (Ed). Academy of Human Resource Development 1996 Conference Proceeding. Minneapolis, MN: Academy of Human Resource Development.
- Mansfield, B. (2004). Competence in transition. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 28(4), 296 – 309.
- McLagan, P. A. (1989). *Models for HRD practice*. American Society for Training and Development, Alexandria, VA: ASTD Press.
- McLagan, P.A.& McCullough, R.(1983). *Models for excellence*. Washington, DC: American Society for Training and Development.
- Passmore, D. L. (1997). Ways of seeing: Disciplinary bases of research in HRD. In R. A. Swanson & F. Holton, III (Eds).*Human resource development research handbook* (pp. 114 – 137), San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

-
- Peerapornvittoon, M. (1999). *A survey of workplace learning and performance: Competencies and roles for practitioners in Thailand*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, the Pennsylvania State University, University Park
- Pinto, P.R. & Walker, J.W. (1978). *A study of professional training and development roles and competencies*. Washington, DC: American Society for Training and Development.
- Rothwell, W., Sanders, E., & Soper, J. (1999). *Models for workplace learning and performance: Roles, competencies and outputs*. Alexandria, VA: ASTD Press.
- Rothwell, W.J. (1996). *ASTD models for human performance improvement*. Alexandria, VA: American Society for Training and Development.
- Salopek, J. J. (2008). Keeping it real. *Training and Development*, 62, 42 – 47.
- Saru, E (2007). Organisational learning and HRD: How appropriate are they for small firms? *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 30(1), 36 - 51.
- Teodorescu, T. (2006). Competence verses competency: What is the difference? *Performance improvement*, 45(10), 27 – 32.
- Tseng, C.C. & McLean, G.N. (2008). Strategic HRD practices as key factors in organisational learning. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 32(6), 418 – 432.
- Yang, J.C. (1994). *Perceived competencies needed by HRD managers in Korea*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, Town cities.
- Yoo, P.J. (1999). *Korean human resource development (HRD) practitioners' perceptions of expertise level and importance of workplace learning and performance (WLP) competencies*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, the Pennsylvania State University, University Park.

This academic research paper was published by the Africa Development and Resources Research Institute's Journal of Arts and Social Sciences. *ADRRI JOURNALS* are double blinded, peer reviewed, open access and international journals that aim to inspire Africa development through quality applied research.

For more information about *ADRRI JOURNALS* homepage, follow:

URL: <http://www.journals.adrri.org/>

CALL FOR PAPERS

ADRRI JOURNALS call on all prospective authors to submit their research papers for publication. Research papers are accepted all yearly round. You can download the submission guide on the following page: <http://journal.adrri.org/aj/>

ADRRI JOURNALS reviewers are working round the clock to get your research paper published on time and therefore, you are guaranteed of prompt response. All published papers are available online to all readers world over without any financial or any form of barriers and readers are advice to acknowledge *ADRRI JOURNALS*. All authors can apply for one printed version of the volume on which their manuscript(s) appeared.