Theories of human resource development pdf

The late President John F. Kennedy once said, Our progress as a nation could not be faster than our progress on education. The human mind is our fundamental resource. With this statement, President Kennedy expressed the philosophy of many industrialists and researchers who sought to improve productivity and individual capacity of workers. Their methods eventually led to a greater emphasis on human development as resources. The term human resources was coined only in the 20th century. However, the human race has developed selection processes long before that. Even in prehistoric times, people carefully considered the qualifications of a candidate before choosing him for a leadership position. In addition, the earliest people attach great importance in the transfer of necessary knowledge. Human development depends on education, which involves the transfer of basic materials to workers so that they can do their job better. As human civilization continued to evolve, so did the desire to improve employee productivity and knowledge. Historians have found evidence of employment check exams dating back to 1115 BC in China. The ancient Greeks and Babylonians created an apprenticeship system that trained entry-level workers in a particular profession. Apprenticeship continued in the Middle Ages. At the end of the 18th century, the economies of Europe and America moved from agriculture to manufacturing. Inventors have developed mechanisms to accelerate production. However, mechanization has led to injuries, monotonous working environments and low wages in favour of more efficient production. Some employers have realized that productivity is strongly linked to employee satisfaction and have tried to improve training and wages. The First World War led to huge changes in the labor market. After World War I, the government and businesses realized that workers would no longer contribute to the economy if they were mistreated. In 1928, sociologist Elton Mayo began to investigate the impact of improving working conditions on employees. Unsurprisingly, workers in improved conditions produced more. Mayo found that in better conditions, employees work as a team and generate better performance. He helped strengthen human relations between subordinates and leaders, which he called the human relationship movement. By the 1960s, managers and researchers realized that just because an employee has better working conditions doesn't mean he'll work harder. Instead, a new theory has emerged. Both bosses and social scientists have concluded that each employee has individual needs and requires a more personalized form of motivation for to produce more. Businesses have begun to view employees as assets or resources that need to be cultivated and encouraged to make the company succeed. In the last decades of the 20th century, executives focus on bringing employees' organizational and individual goals closer together. To do this, managers sought to make the work meaningful. Senior management has given human resources professionals the responsibility to optimize employee skills to create a more valuable and skilled workforce. This trend has prevailed in the 21st century, when human resources departments focus on developing the skills and training of staff. At Dallas airport the other day I saw many tall, well-dressed and impressive-looking men dressed in big, immaculate Stetson cowboy hats. As I passed one of these hatters, I noticed two middle-aged men tanned in faded blue jeans standing nearby. They looked at the same guy, looked up and down at him, and then one quietly said to the other, Big hat, no cattle. The same can be said of large-scale efforts to improve human governance in the U.S. industry. Since World War II, calling it human relationships, hr management, labor relations, and now human resources management, the business has spent millions to make employees productive, loyal and motivated. First, scientists, with the minds discovered by Hawthorne's experiments, have led the movement to effective human control. Now, eager consultants and zealous staff professionals develop it. Fortune writes of HR directors as new corporate heroes. The shelves of libraries are overflowing with books on managing people, and every year there are a hundred new ones. There are currently two hundred documented attempts to improve the quality of life at work, and three nationally renowned institutions have charters to improve productivity and productivity. With Hawthorne, successive waves of people-problem solutions and programs have washed and dropped the industry. In some desperation, managers have consistently invested in supervisory training, organizational behavior, interpersonal behavior, T-groups, sensitivity training, employee relationship surveys, job enrichment, flexible benefits and extended benefits - large pensions, subsidized insurance, more holidays, shorter working days, four-day weeks, and canned communications packages, and now companies are trying to revive the labor ethic with human resources departments. Big programs, but where are the winnings? Not in performance. Recent data show a decline in employee productivity in the United States. Not in the absence of strikes. Not in widespread friendly working relationships. Not in the strategic position of many U.S. industries in international competition. Not in the absence of government intervention, such as the rules of OSHA and EEO. Not in trust, support and trust in our business system or large corporations. Not in the image of managers as a benign, trusted group in our society. Not in the absence of hostility or class warfare. Not in the enthusiasm of employees adopting new technologies, machines, or or factories, a stripped-down office or a service sector where efficiency is improved. Big hat, no cattle! Human resources management seems to be mostly well-intentioned and whistling in the dark or preventing trade unions. And the results of the 1970s suggest that we may not even be holding on to ourselves. Poor labour management in this country is damaging the nation and our standard of living. This makes us uncompetitive with the Japanese and some other Asians, West Germans, Swiss and many others. I do not want to exaggerate the gloomy aspects of this picture. A handful of large (and certainly many medium and small) companies seem to have made their workforce into competitive assets. And, of course, modest progress has been made almost everywhere. For the most part, sweatshops are in the past. Workplaces are better lit and ventilated and generally safer than in the past. The atmosphere at work is less cold formal, and decision-making is more participatory. Managers are more aware of feelings and relationships and make fewer explicit demands on employees. Fewer forest bulls charge for offices and factories. Staffing people are more professional, more and more companies have made complaints clear, and home publications regularly explain how and why companies run for the benefit of their employees. Some will argue that we have done many the right things, and that it is social factors such as a decline in work ethic, a new breed, and a new sociology that undermine leadership efforts. Even so, in most companies the results of enlightened people management are simply more comfort, more relaxation, more freedom from pressure, more security, more benefits, and higher wages, rather than more productivity and loyalty. What went wrong? Why do so few companies actually use the greatest competitive weapon of all - the powerful resources of motivated, energetic, cooperative, gullible people? Few managers need a lot of convincing about the importance of people. All the managers I spoke to said: People are our biggest asset. But they also report: We don't know how to motivate them. People are getting harder to manage. The personnel departments do not give us the leadership we need. We're just hanging out there trying to cope. What happened? Managers have difficulty managing human resources for four reasons: 1. Achieving sincere cooperation, energy and commitment from a large number of staff is difficult, so managers are often unrealistic in their hopes1 2. The concepts of managing large numbers of people often convey conflicting messages to managers. 3. Critical issues in corporate human resources management, such as the Human Resources Management Site (HRM) in decision-making, the role of staff and the lack of sufficient know-how in human resources management at senior management levels remain largely unresolved. 4. Some management assumptions concerning HRC undermine the efforts of many managers, however well-intentioned they may be. Achieving the commitment of employees to capture the loyalty of hundreds or thousands of people in one business enterprise, so they direct their energy to the goals of the company is extremely difficult. The goals of the corporation are long-term and common in nature - profit and growth. But workers tend to focus on short time horizons to meet their needs for wages, wages, working conditions, fair treatment and promotion. It is not easy to communicate between these sets of goals. Effective relationships between individuals and companies depend on employees' confidence in the relationship between goals. But building trust often requires overcoming years of bad experience and the belief of many employees that companies exploit people. Of every 100 employees, 5 or 10 will be disappointed or burned by some work-related experience that may have been out of company control. Their subsequent alienation could undermine the morale-building efforts of managers and staff. Given that working in a social, industrial operation requires that people give up many freedoms and that groups acting collectively play on the fact that the loss of freedom to improve their own short-term interests is that the workforce should not be unexpected. Thus, the struggle for a motivated workforce is a difficult battle. It's a rosy idealism to think that every employee is going to include and execute with 100% dedication to the company and its goals. Short-term economic interests are in clear conflict. Employees see their share of the pie as a cut less to serve up to greater profits for owners. In addition, political factors such as Nader Raiders and the anti-big business wing of the Democratic Party use distrust of employees to business, corporations and managers, whom employees often see as themselves and on the side of their corporate bosses against the employee. People instinctively resent the forces that run and control them - big business, directors, the industrial establishment, the boss, the boss boss. The anti-establishment seeds sown in the late 1960s and early 1970s are bearing fruit, and more workers than ever are unwilling to fully expose themselves to the organization or discipline of the profession, profession or team. Given these obstacles to cooperation, such cooperation in the corporate world is a miracle. Conflicts in theory managers use many different organizational methods to collaboration and productivity. Researchers can take great credit for a multitude of concepts and tools at hand. Hand. however, it should also be taken responsibility that their different disciplines often contradict each other and work for cross-purposes. For example, in most companies, managers use four different disciplines to improve employee productivity and relationships: human relationships, labor relations, human resources management, and industrial engineering. Since human relations in themselves include at least three main schools, six rather different sets of ideas and concepts can work in the same organization at the same time. 1. Human relationships. Group behavior theories deal with social interaction and interpersonal relationships through tools such as X and Y theories and sensitivity training. The school's commandment is that because group behavior is crucial to collaboration and success, groups must bestow power and control up. The Individual School of Human Relationships focuses on individual psychology, leadership, power, power, responsibility and the subconscious. His main concern is the feelings and drives of the person and how they affect the workplace. Organizational development goes further and focuses on the need for people to talk together about their common difficulties. His central belief is that employees can often manage themselves better than managers can. 2. Labour relations. Labour legislation, public policy, wage and expenditure economics, demographics and human resources management, collective bargaining, contract management and complaints are in the conduct of labour relations. It sees policies at the plant, corporations, union, state and national levels along with labor laws as the key to any situation. His position is generally adversarial and tough - to stick to the terms of the contract, to deny exceptions, to avoid precedents and to build a strong position for negotiations. 3. Hr. Activities related to the management of large numbers of people in total, namely recruitment, selection, training, compensation and development, is a province of staff. This discipline states that if companies perform these tasks well, they will acquire recruitment with appropriate motives, habits and behavior. Staff believe that if managers are consistent and apply policies that cause desired behavior, a good climate will result. Industrial engineering. This school concentrates on designing jobs to match technology and human capabilities and control performance with standards based on industrial engineering research. He believes that efficiency and productivity are products of economic reward and hard foot, Supervision. Each of these four schools focuses on acquiring an effective, loyal and dedicated team of staff, but very differently. My concern is not that these experts are at odds or that they have different approaches to the same problem. I don't think one school is a school and others are wrong that one is better than the other, or that anyone should be ignored. On the contrary, they all offer ideas and tools that are often very effective, although perhaps not when used at the same time. The problem is a bit like with a car that has good wheels, a shiny body, an efficient engine, excellent brakes, and a stunning hydraulic system, but it won't go or that no one in the family wants to drive. Big hat, no cattle. Every school of thought contributes, a vital contribution like wheels and engine, but the whole system sprays and founders and does not produce enough involved, energetic and loyal workers. Usually companies do not know how to combine these ingredients into one effective corporate system, for four schools each offers managers conflicting advice. Two things seem to be missing from the systems. One is a comprehensive unifying concept. Another general manager who can effectively mix and match these essential ingredients. Unfortunately, such a person is a rare breed. Corporate personnel management The third set of challenges, while holding back progress towards better management, relates to corporate structure, size, diversity and power distribution. As the size and diversity of corporations grow, the complexity of managing relationships with employees increases. With size come organizational layers that effectively remove top managers from a large number of employees at the base of the pyramid. By necessity, communication processes that are handled through the media, the authorities of the house, speeches and letters of employees become more political and less personal. As a company grows, the link between corporate well-being and the needs of individual units and locations can break. In principle, headquarters may be willing to allow units to deal with local labor forces on their own, but by allowing units to take various courses, the corporation could jeopardize its negotiating position with the union. And even if the company is not toileted, the personnel office may fear that the low-cost requirements of one unit could lead to a union, be short-sighted or give the company a bad reputation as a place to work. In addition, the Equal Employment Opportunity Act has greatly increased the need for headquarters to be able to control the situation, trade unions or not. However, each unit has different tasks and needs, different skills and relationships in its workforce. Division A may need a workforce that is particularly cost-effective, while Division B, where a strategy may require rapid staff turnover, requires adaptive work from employees. Given these potential experimenting with new approaches is becoming more risky in large organizations than in small ones. Solutions become more sensitive, have longer shadows, and it is understood that managers can become more cautious and may be able to or hand over the buck when they can. These problems plague many large corporations these days. Their consequences are perplexing and conflicting at headquarters, frustration and irritation in the locations of units and factories, as well as Mishmash personnel policies and practices that do not have a clear focus. Policies that change from corporate to divisional point of view, with responsibility based in no place, are often ineffective. Time is the enemy of human resources management facing another fundamental problem that few companies have solved. Acquiring and developing the right talents for business as it changes strategy, technology and products requires more insightful, wise, long-distance planning than any other corporate effort. Companies can usually replace or restructure technologies, physical facilities, products, markets, or business systems within 3-5 years. But how long does it take to change the ratio of l,000 employees with an average age, let's say 40 and 10 years of experience? Obviously, the leadership can't lay off the workforce and start over. But it often takes years to pronounce a lot of genuine change, and one bad decision or unfortunate sequence of events can undo those years of slow progress. Unlike the nature of the HRM task, which is a function that requires long-term thinking, consistency and power, short-term pressures such as budgets and annual plans expose short-term reactions. Successful managers rarely stay put long enough to see their HRM investment pay off. In addition, executive remuneration systems rarely reward a manager for a five-year investment in HRM policies and activities. The lack of general managers who are just as capable, confident and experienced in managing a large number of people as they are in manufacturing, marketing, finance and control is another challenge in many companies. However, despite their inexperience, managers who reach the top must choose and integrate six different concepts and disciplines of human relations, human management and industrial engineering. They must also manage conflicts between the interests of the corporation as a whole, different divisions, individual plants and facilities. Why do so many general managers tend to lack these skills? The difficulties are compounded by several factors. First, staffing has rarely been attractive to fast-moving young general managers who believe that this area is moving out of the mainstream business. In addition, they view staff as a function of staff that is strictly consultative, which has no authority and authority and which minor and troublesome problems. Staffing is rarely an attractive position for a manager who wants to manage something on his own. Due to staff conflict, pressure, conflicting nature, staff decisions Do are touchy and bulky. Since many other managers participate in them, they are not only from the day, but often disappoint. For these reasons, few outstanding managers move into staff, and those who are in it often face problems with exit. Details, the time it takes to gain experience, low status in the organization, and lack of clear authority can absorb and suppress all but the very best in the field. Finally, the HRC problem is based on dubious management facilities, some accepted assumptions, the validity of which is becoming increasingly questionable. With good HRM managers taking care of themselves If someone believes that good-intentioned managers are naturally good at HRM, the following will also seem valid: Responsible, generous, enlightened top management will develop an effective group of employees, because its attentive and humane practices inevitably seep down and permeate the organization. Management can share its prerogative to govern if it wants to, but philosophically employees have no right to govern. People are lucky to have a job for which someone else has invested. People adapt to a wide range of tasks and conditions. Someone will appear able and willing to do any job if paid correctly. These premises are no longer valid. Widespread dissatisfaction with work, despite adequate wages, has been documented. More and more workers now see good work as rights. Employees demand greater autonomy at work and question the leadership's right to govern, and in his competence and wisdom to govern, without participation. Staff are not very important if the hr department is a household function, it follows: it makes available services and recommendations that line managers can accept or reject because they are responsible for linear operations. The job of the staff is to get good people and keep everyone happy enough. Managers responsible for line operations may accept or reject staff recommendations as a personal department. It makes no longer sense to assign to au pairs or to advise staff who directly encroach on the most important competitive resource of the corporation. Decisions that affect the quality of human resources should not be considered in secondary, catch-up, neat, reactive ways. This gives a lower priority to human resources than production, sales or finance; leads to the fact that HR appointments are a verdict of oblivion; promotes second rate, careless staffing; and removes staff from the responsibility of creating a reactive, short-term management policy Control of all If the management system is really what makes the organization work well, it follows that: By establishing thorough and detailed annual forecasts and budgets and monitoring results by month, quarter and year to meet accepted plans, managers can effectively monitor and and Companies. This premise drives out long-term thinking as well as the long time lead needed to create effective human resources. The quantitative data remain, but soft quality elements such as training and development, appropriate compensation structures and communication activities are expendable. Each problem has a solution to the eternally optimistic macho belief is that if reason is applied: When managers put good minds to work on a problem, it will give up quickly. When good managers who are brought to justice are armed with good decisions, this will lead to significant improvements. This premise has many big hats; managers have adopted programs to fix poor morale or poor performance instead of getting at the main root cause. Short-term fixes or programmes do not work better in human development than in government. Managers who wish to have superior human resources should have fundamental rather than superficial symptoms; they must put up with the frustrations and unexpected results of solutions to complex problems, and they need to remain in place for the continued work of improving the quality of human resources. These problems are huge and stubborn. When frustration and frustration hit, many managers react subjectively, blaming the union or government for the disappearance of work ethic or a new breed, rather than their own piecemeal, reactive approach to managing people. As changing habits, skills, values, beliefs and attitudes in the workforce takes years, the lack of long-term human resource planning is often disastrous. Thus, the ultimate irony is that the personnel function, which deals with the most fundamental and central corporate competitive resource and which has the longest time horizon of any function, remains without a long-term strategy and allows you to respond only to temporary pressures and events. In the direction of improving the efficiency of human resources for human resource development, corporate governance will have to make some fundamental changes in its conventional wisdom. Let me suggest five processes to include in the new approach: 1. Managers must solve erroneous head placements and banish them in favor of a new set as follows: If managers are constantly not listening, communicating, explaining, anticipating, and in every way to develop commitment and understanding, employees will inevitably become alienated. In the nature of people and organizations, there is a relentless gravitational slide towards alienation. Managers can develop and adapt the workforce to meet an organization's specific productivity needs. Because excellent human resources the most central, basic and powerful strategic competitive advantage, human resources management should be given priority. Employees are interested parties in the company. Their interest in employment and work is as real as the work of shareholders and managers. The problem is not whether to keep them involved in the management of the enterprise, but how to do it. As one of the functions, staff have as much rights and are obliged to monitor the quality and prescribe personnel processes (selection, compensation, communication development, etc.) as accountants do to appoint and monitor accounting policies and procedures. The highest echelon of leading companies in this regard, such as Hewlett-Packard and Dana Corporation, gives staff a broad license in any HRM activity. 2. Any company can start to improve human resources management by simply making the basics better. The most practical way to start is to perform all routine ongoing staff activities with extreme care. Studies show that for many of the reasons cited earlier, recruitment, selection, compensation, job design, training and communication procedures in many companies are hastily and inadequately implemented. Worst of all, oversight is the oldest and most written about management skills. Business schools neglect this, and the economy, schedules, costs and time pressures allow reckless and inhumane practices to characterize it. Bad oversight is absolutely unnecessary, but millions of workers must put up with it. This hurts the American manufacturing and service industries for believing. The importance of good oversight is so obvious that its rarity is striking. The huge improvements in HRM at General Motors began when managers returned to the basics of good oversight and communication. For example, while WL programs were behind the turnaround in Tarrytown, fundamental changes have been made by leaders, simply treating people with care and respect. 3. Managers need to establish a seven-year time horizon for the planning and operation of their human resources. I choose seven years to just say it's not one, two, three or even five. Staff planning requires at least this amount of time to survive several generations of changes in top managers' strategies, economic downturns, division and company crises, changes in public policy, legislative revolutions and technological advances. It takes managers at least seven years to establish, live, improve and reap the benefits of major changes in human resources; Unproductive skills or relationships; and hire a new generation. And it takes so long for employees to live through a period of history at a company that forms a new foundation of trust. Seen as a seven-year permanent problem, the task of human resources management is taking on a whole new cast that requires the power of power, as well as philosophy and strategy. For example, IBM's philosophy that people are valuable to the company permeates the organization Start. Similarly, at Hewlett-Packard, the founders announced a set of standards that put people first. To this day, these values are preserved with great benefit for these companies. The seven-year horizon requires leaders to develop a philosophy, some goals and a strategy. Since strategic human resource planning is still largely unknown art, and since it may take years for researchers to develop competence, it would be better for managers to start on their own rather than waiting for the ideal approach. But where to start? The combined experience of the four large U.S. corporations that have worked at HRM for a long time (Honeywell, American Hospital Supply, Dana Corporation and Westinghouse) offers several lessons – the first step is to identify implicit trends in current personnel policy and practice in terms of the skills, attitudes and behaviors they develop. Each corporate division and division has implicit goals in its human resources activities - to develop a workforce that reaches low costs, be flexible or acquire skills, for example, for special projects. In most companies, this analysis will show that the implicit objectives of different personnel strategies and activities are contradictory. In addition, uniformity in policy and practice between departments, departments and functions also often fails to meet the strategic needs of these individual groups. A second useful step in the planning of a human resources strategy is to determine by function, department and the separation of desired behavioural characteristics of each team. This will depend on the company's or division's goals and plans to gain a competitive advantage. This plan requires certain products, marketing, production and financial strategies. Each of them, in turn, will have specific implications for human resources. Leaders must reveal these consequences and make them clear. When managers compare the impact of their human resources plans with those implied in their personnel policies and activities, change will arise. As a result of this process, they can develop a human resources strategy that will detail the departments, departments or human resources and specific strategies and practices required in key areas of human resources management. Then they can make long-term plans. Human resources strategy pioneers make such planning a central part of their annual plans, budgets and long-term strategy. In other companies, however, managers usually allow HRM to be a residual or result of plans rather than a key contribution. At best, most units or companies simply project out extrapolation the number of different categories of personnel that they will need in the future. HRM's experience in strategic planning shows that this process almost always raises a fundamental problem: the problem: Companies have different competitive strategies and often need different performance from their people. Similarly, within a unit or location, teams may need different personnel policies and activities. But can a company, for example, pay people in engineering differently than when buying or accounting? The answer is yes, but only when management discards the old rules of uniformity and develops personnel policies to achieve strategically important goals. 5. Companies wishing to improve their HRMs need to develop a long-term program for the development of general managers with human resources management skills and experience. Considering a human resources department as a functional operation with strong authority and responsibility for effective human resources management practices has helped several companies attract and retain good HR managers. In relation to the development of superior human resources as a critical competitive requirement that needs long-term, functional strategic plans, top managers can attract many of the company's best managers to HRM functions. Some companies that have transferred outstanding managers to human resources over a period of two to four years have developed a senior management team, much of which has in-depth experience in the development and implementation of a human resources strategy. A group of loyal, productive employees is the organization's most effective competitive weapon. Over the past decade, however, the disparity between persons available for employment appears to have increased significantly. Subtle differences in work and personal skills, as well as in attitudes towards work and employers, have made it even more difficult to choose an outstanding recruitment. Mass education, which makes the level of schooling less important as a criterion for selection, has exacerbated the problem. Leading companies at HRM have learned that old adage that people are people are wrong: there are huge differences between a good employee and an excellent employee. A small part of companies has learned to insist on the hired only the best. These increased challenges in achieving the level of quality recruitment staff have made this HRM strategy when successfully implemented, a uniquely dynamic competitive weapon. But it is more important than ever to recruit and develop a quality group of employees, for companies with a head start it is difficult to catch. Their good people attract others like them, while ordinary organizations have to accept what's left. Human resource planning can act as a catalyst and a operational mechanism to accelerate the creation of an effective workforce. Where this is achieved, people are energized and committed and become the most powerful, fundamental corporate competitive Of all the people. In the entire production matrix, people are human beings most frustrating for managers because they represent the most difficult variable to control and predict. No matter how predictably predictable society tries to make its members through its various communication mechanisms, people continue to give managers the most trouble. Managers always complain about these workers. If only they had done what we tell them or learned to follow the instructions, we would have exceeded all our quotas. It is this obsession with the product and the subsequent disregard for human needs that could fill the history books with stories about management's insensitivity to workers. This insensitivity is often burdened and explained as a lack of motivation by the employee. Workers become strangers to many managers and are seen only as an extension of the unit of machinery in which capital investments were made. This leads to an engineering dream of eliminating the human element in production. 1. The term large number is used in this article to distinguish between management issues relating to interpersonal and small group relations and issues relating to large groups, departments, divisions or entire companies and institutions. My focus is on the latter, not the former. A version of this article appeared in the September 1981 issue of Harvard Business Review. Reviews. theories of human resource development pdf. commonly held theories of human resource development. commonly held theories of human resource development pdf. the roles of the psychology systems and economic theories in human resource development. theories of learning human resource development