HRD Policymaking in Companies: An Interpretation of the Differences

Ida Wognum

This exploratory study examines HRD policymaking processes in companies. HRD representatives of companies in three economic sectors with more than five hundred employees were asked to complete a questionnaire. Variables include the HRD policymaking process, strategic choices about the specific field content of HRD programs and participating employees, starting points for HRD processes, and characteristics of the company and the HRD department. Significant differences in the HRD policymaking process and resulting strategic choices were found between groups of companies. These findings stress the importance of further investigation of effective and specific types of HRD policymaking processes within companies. This is important in order to align HRD programs to the company's situation and thus provide employees with the right competencies at the right time to enhance their performance and that of their department and the whole company.

The exploratory survey reported here is part of the Strategic HRD Project, which studies the effects of strategic HRD in companies. Because little research has been carried out in this field, an exploratory survey provides insight into certain aspects of strategic HRD in companies.

Strategic HRD is defined as the process of assessing organizational strategies, problems, and developments in order to reveal important HRD needs and provide HRD programs that address those needs. To be strategic, the programs must provide employees with the competencies they need to improve their work performance and contribute to the achievement of important organizational goals (Bergenhengouwen, Mooijman, and Tillema, 1992; Torraco, 1995). A central issue is the strategic aligning of HRD to the company's situation; in other words, HRD programs have to be closely linked to the company's situation in order to provide employees with the right competencies at the right time (Torraco, 1995). Strategic HRD aligning refers to the interrelationship between HRD representatives and relevant company

officials at various levels of the organization, that is, the stakeholders (Wognum, 1994).

HRD policymaking is a key concept in strategic HRD aligning. HRD policymaking concerns the strategic process of determining the main organizational HRD goals and desired outcomes. HRD policymaking results in programs that contribute to achieving the desired outcomes. Information is needed on, among other things, the company's performance problems and important strategies and developments. The problems, developments, and other company issues serve as a starting point for HRD processes within the company (Brinkerhoff, 1987; Rossett, 1987).

Problem Statement and Conceptual Framework

The present study focuses on the following question: Which variables determine HRD policymaking processes within companies? According to the literature, HRD policy processes in companies vary (Dekker and Wognum, 1994; Ford, Major, Seaton, and Krifcher Felber, 1993). HRD goals and desired outcomes are assumed to be largely determined by the nature of performance problems and organizational developments. Differences may result from the kind of problems or developments that give rise to the HRD policy process. Other variables also affect this process, such as the nature of the company and the HRD department in which the policymaking process takes place. Because HRD policymaking and resulting HRD program selection reflect more than one variable, knowing these variables will help us understand why organizations select certain programs and HRD participants over others.

The conceptual framework depicted in Figure 1 comprises five groups of variables: the HRD policymaking process, strategic choices, company characteristics, starting points for HRD processes, and characteristics of the HRD department. The latter three groups of variables may affect the HRD policymaking process and its outcomes, the strategic choices.

HRD Policymaking. HRD policymaking is defined as assessing HRD goals and desired outcomes in a process of strategic HRD aligning to the company's situation. Stakeholder participation is one indicator of the HRD policymaking process. It refers to the participants involved in the policymaking process. Participants may include top management (on the strategic level of companies), middle management (on the tactical or structural level), and lower executive management (or supervisors) and individual employees (on the operational level) (Mintzberg, 1983; Rummler and Brache, 1995; Kaufman and Herman, 1991). Optimal strategic policymaking takes place on all three levels (de Leeuw, 1988).

Another indicator of HRD policymaking concerns its policymaking procedure or, more specifically, the involvement of stakeholders in the procedure. This refers to the kind of involvement that stakeholders have in the process (more or less formal or interactive) or even the absence of it (compare Harrison, 1991; Kaufman, Herman, and Watters, 1996; London, 1989).

Figure 1. Conceptual Framework

Strategic Choices. HRD policymaking processes lead to decisions about the content of HRD programs and the employees who need to participate in order to address the assessed HRD needs and enhance their own performance as well as that of the department and the company. This article refers to these decisions as *strategic choices*. Eight content areas have been taken from the literature based on classifications used in Dutch and European economic statistics (C.B.S., 1993): management techniques, production processes, social and learning skills, health and security, automation and computerization, marketing and public relations, accounting and finance, and other programs. Furthermore, six categories of employees on the various levels within the company are distinguished: top, middle and lower executive management, employees in the operating core, support staff, and other employees (Mintzberg, 1983).

Starting Points. By analyzing the company's situation (that is, its business strategies, performance problems, and new developments), HRD representatives can identify relevant HRD needs and develop or select the most appropriate HRD programs. Thus, the company's situation serves as a main starting point for HRD policymaking. Starting points may vary and include actual performance problems of individual employees, departments, or the company as a whole; future performance demands of employees (career planning and development); and company developments (visible in changes in policy, products or production processes) (Brinkerhoff, 1987; Rossett, 1987; Wognum, 1994).

Characteristics of the Company and the HRD Department. Company characteristics mentioned in the literature include the economic sector of the company, its size, and its structure (van Hulst and Willems, 1992; Dekker and Wognum, 1994). Economic sector refers to the nature of the company (whether

it is, for instance, in an industrial or insurance company) and to some extent the kind and complexity of its core processes. The size of the company is also an important characteristic (Mintzberg, 1983). The larger the company, the more formalized the HRD function. Evidence shows that in Dutch companies with more than five hundred employees HRD is more often organized than in smaller firms (Mulder, Akkerman, and Bentvelsen, 1988; Mulder, 1993). The company's structure—that is, whether it is centralized or decentralized—is also important. In centralized companies the starting points for the HRD policy-making process and the resulting strategic choices may differ from those in companies with a more decentralized structure (Wognum, 1991).

The autonomy of the HRD department (whether it is independent or under the authority of others) as well as its structure (centralized or decentralized) are deemed important characteristics (Wognum, 1994). A centralized department normally covers the whole organization; a decentralized department covers a unit or part of the organization and is usually supported by a central HRD department (London, 1989).

Research Questions and Methodology

This study included one primary question and several secondary questions.

Primary Question. The problem statement and conceptual framework led to the following main research question, as already noted: Which variables affect HRD policymaking processes and the selecting of HRD programs within companies?

Secondary Questions. The following questions arose from the main research question: What are important strategic choices (decisions about content and participants of HRD programs) within companies? What is the starting point for the HRD policymaking process that leads to these strategic choices? Which stakeholders are involved in the HRD policymaking process? To what extent is the HRD representative content with the HRD policymaking procedure within the company; that is, what is the “aligning perception?” (It should be noted that in this explorative study the procedure itself is not part of the research.) What is the relationship between the strategic choices within companies and the aligning perception of the HRD representative? Do characteristics of the company and the HRD department explain certain differences in the strategic choices companies make?

Methodology. The survey was carried out in the first months of 1994 among organizations in the Netherlands. Companies with more than five hundred employees were selected from a national database. They belonged to one of three economic sectors: industry; transport, including storage and communication; and banking, including insurance and commercial services. These three sectors contained a reasonable number of companies with more than five hundred employees. In total, 199 companies were selected. Data were collected using a questionnaire mailed to the 199 HRD company representatives

of the companies. The survey instrument was designed to gather information gleaned from the aforementioned conceptual framework and consisted of groups of questions related to the content of HRD programs in 1993 (for example, management techniques, production processes, social and learning skills, health and security, automation and computerization, marketing and public relations, accounting and finance, and other programs); job level of HRD participants (top, middle, and lower executive management; employees in the operating core; support staff; and other employees); the three starting points for HRD policymaking (actual performance problems of individual employees, departments, or the company; future performance demands of employees; and new developments within the company); and certain company characteristics (economic sector, number of employees, structure) as well as characteristics of the HRD department (autonomy and structure). Four questions were also formulated to gain information on the HRD policymaking process. One related to the stakeholders who had participated in the policymaking process and three were based on respondents' aligning perception.

The questions had precoded answers. A total of 127 responses were returned, of which 106 could be used for the analysis (response rate 53 percent). Analysis showed no systematic nonresponse bias. In order to answer the stated research questions, the analysis concerned simple descriptives (mean, standard deviation), psychometric scaling procedures (Cronbach's alpha), and one-way analysis of variance to assess the impact of some variables on the process of HRD policymaking within companies.

Results

The survey was intended to provide insight into some aspects of the HRD policymaking process by answering the aforementioned research questions. The analysis of the results on the variable "other HRD interventions" gave reason to construct a ninth content category—quality. This category was used in the various analyses undertaken to answer the six research questions. In the next section each research question is answered separately.

Important Strategic Choices. *What are important strategic choices (decisions about content and participants of HRD programs) within companies?* The results provide insight into the strategic choices made by companies. Table 1 illustrates the number (*N*) and overall percentage (perc.) of companies whose various groups of employees participated in one or more HRD programs within the nine field sectors.

One hundred of the 106 companies (94.3 percent) arranged HRD programs in all content fields for middle managers. Ninety-nine of the companies (93.4 percent) arranged programs for lower management, and 100 of the companies (94.3 percent) did so for the operating sector. Fewer companies trained or educated the top management (56, or 52.8 percent did) or the support staff (55, or 51.9 percent). The results indicate that all groups of employees

Table 1. Number and Percentage of Companies Whose Employees Attended HRD Programs, by Type of Employee and Program Content (Multiple Response)

Category of Employees	N	perc.	Content of HRD Programs								
			mng	pro	soc	hea	aut	mar	acc	qua	oth
			%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Top management	56	52.8	80.4	8.9	28.6	12.5	8.9	23.2	25.0	5.4	12.5
Middle management	100	94.3	92.0	36.0	75.0	48.0	65.0	55.0	47.0	8.0	20.0
Lower management	99	93.4	78.8	48.5	76.8	48.5	64.6	42.4	38.4	5.1	18.2
Operating core	100	94.3	10.0	73.0	41.0	50.0	64.0	39.0	35.0	5.0	20.0
Support staff	55	51.9	18.2	14.5	36.4	27.3	43.6	30.9	23.6	5.5	23.6
Others	18	17.0	16.7	16.7	33.3	33.3	11.1	27.8	16.7	-	33.3

Notes: N = 106; mng: management techniques; pro: production processes; soc: social and learning skills; hea: health and security; aut: automation and computerization; mar: marketing and public relations; acc: accounting and finance; qua: quality; oth: other programs

attended HRD programs in more than one specific field. The percentage of companies that had arranged HRD programs in a specific field for each category of employees are also given.

Mainly employees from the tactical and operational levels in companies were considered for HRD activities. This is evident from the number of HRD programs arranged for the various groups of employees. Middle management attended at least four HRD programs in various fields ($M = 4.20$, $SD = 1.96$). They were mainly trained in management techniques (92 percent), social and learning skills (75 percent), automation and computerization (65 percent), and marketing and public relations (55 percent). Lower management attended nearly four HRD programs in the various fields ($M = 3.94$, $SD = 1.81$). They were also mainly trained in management techniques (78.8 percent), social and learning skills (76.8 percent), automation and computerization (64.6 percent), and—unlike middle management—in production processes (48.5 percent) and health and security (48.5 percent). Employees in the operating sector attended at least three HRD programs in the various fields ($M = 3.17$, $SD = 1.62$). They attended mainly production processes (73 percent), automation and computerization (64 percent), and health and security (50 percent). Other groups of employees, however, were trained in fewer HRD programs (top management, $M = 1.08$, $SD = 1.39$; support staff, $M = 1.16$, $SD = 1.62$; other groups $M = .32$, $SD = .97$). Top management was mainly trained in management techniques; this was the case in 80.4 percent of the fifty-six companies.

The Starting Point for the Strategic Choices. *What is the starting point for the HRD policymaking process that leads to these strategic choices?* The study identified four kinds of starting points: actual performance problems of individual employees, departments, or the company; future performance demands of employees (career planning and development); new developments within the company (evident in changes in policy, product, or the production process); and other starting points. Strategic choices, as a result of HRD policymaking processes, are reflected in the choice of HRD programs for the various categories of employees. Table 2 presents the starting points if HRD programs for specific groups of employees were the case. The percentages refer to the percentage of all companies (n) that arranged HRD programs for a specific group of employees.

As the table shows, in the fifty-six companies with top management HRD programs the main starting point for the policymaking processes was the development of the company (57.1 percent of fifty-six companies). This was also the main starting point for policymaking processes and HRD program selection for the support staff (58.2 percent of fifty-five companies). Both of these groups of employees are indeed charged to manage and support renewal processes. In companies where middle and lower management were trained, this also turned out to be an important reason (in 69.0 percent of one hundred companies and 59.6 percent of ninety-nine companies), although it was not the main starting point. As for employees in the operating sector, the main reason for the HRD

Table 2. Percentage of Companies That Arranged HRD Programs for a Specific Category of Employees Based on Specific Starting Points (Multiple Response)

	N	Starting Points for HRD Policymaking			
		act %	fut %	dev %	oth %
Category of Employees					
Top management	56	32.1	39.3	57.1	12.5
Middle management	100	87.0	83.0	69.0	5.0
Lower management	99	88.9	78.8	59.6	4.0
Operating core	100	88.0	69.0	44.0	4.0
Support staff	55	47.3	41.8	58.2	3.6
Other groups	18	38.9	44.4	27.8	16.7

Notes: N = 106; act: actual performance problems of employees, departments, or the company; fut: future performance demands of employees; dev: company development; oth: other starting points

policymaking process related to the actual performance problems of these employees (middle management, 87 percent; lower management, 88.9 percent; operating core, 88 percent). The actual functioning of employees, departments, or the whole company is important in order to produce the relevant products or services and to achieve the appropriate performance standards within the company.

Stakeholders Involved in the Policymaking Process. Which stakeholders are involved in the HRD policymaking process? Table 3 presents an overview of the stakeholders involved in the HRD policymaking process. In 83.0 percent of all 106 companies, the supervisor of the trained employees was involved in the HRD policymaking process in order to align HRD programs to the company's situation. Middle management was involved in 68.9 percent of the 106 companies, lower executive management or supervisors were involved in 83.0 percent, and employees to be trained were involved in 52.8 percent. It should be noted that in 73.6 percent of the companies, top management was involved in one way or another. In many of the companies several categories of stakeholders were involved, indicating some kind of participation from participants at each of the three levels within the company.

Contentment with the Policymaking Process. To what extent is the HRD representative content with the HRD policymaking procedure within the company (the so-called aligning perception)? The aligning perception is defined as the way in which respondents perceive the HRD policymaking procedure and, more specifically, the involvement of stakeholders in the procedure. Three indicators were studied: the improvement of stakeholder involvement, the procedure

Table 3. Number and Percentage of Companies with Stakeholders Involved in the HRD Policymaking Process (Multiple Response)

	<i>N</i>	%
Involved Stakeholders		
Other training official	35	33.0
Employees to be trained	56	52.8
Supervisor	88	83.0
Middle management	73	68.9
Top management	78	73.6
Others	13	13.3

Note: N = 106

itself, and the perceived willingness of management to be more involved in this procedure. The respondents' perception of all three indicators was examined. Cronbach's alpha of this scale for HRD aligning perception was .76. The scores on the three indicators are summarized and indicate the level of contentment, running from more discontented to content. Table 4 presents an overview of the aligning perception of respondents.

The table shows that the responses are equally divided among the four levels of contentment. An equal percentage of respondents were discontented or almost content with the identified aspects of the policymaking procedure (twenty-four, or 22.6 percent), indicating that certain aspects need improving. However, a greater percentage of respondents were more discontented (33 percent) and felt that improvement was needed in all identified aspects, whereas only 23 percent were content with them.

Relationship Between Strategic Choices and the Aligning Perception. *What is the relationship between the strategic choices within companies and the aligning perception of the HRD representative?* The HRD policymaking procedure will probably exert some influence on the strategic choices within companies, that is, the selection of the specific content of HRD programs and the participating groups of employees. It is therefore important to identify the relationship between the aligning perception as an indicator of the policymaking procedure and selected content of HRD programs and groups of participants. A one-way analysis of variance was run in order to compare the average of the respondents' aligning perception between the group of companies where specific strategic choices were made and the group of companies where these were absent. Table 5 presents the results. It should be noted that only the significant differences at the .05 level are reported.

No significant differences in aligning perception at the .05 level were found between companies where the various groups of employees were trained or not trained. For example, the average of respondents' aligning perception

Table 4. Aligning Perception in Companies

	Score	N	%
Perception			
More discontented	3	35	33.0
Discontented	2	24	22.6
Almost content	1	24	22.6
Content	0	23	21.7

Notes: N = 106, M = 1.67, SD = 1.15

Table 5. Differences in Aligning Perception Among Companies with and Without Specific Strategic Choices

Strategic Choices	With		Without		F	p
	M	SD	M	SD		
Field Content of HRD Program Interventions						
Management techniques	1.75	1.13	.62	.91	7.55	.00
Social and learning skills	1.77	1.16	1.16	.98	4.26	.04
Marketing and public relations	1.90	1.11	1.22	1.09	8.83	.00
Accounting and finance	1.87	1.09	1.38	1.18	4.17	.03
Starting Points						
Development of the company	1.78	1.13	1.15	1.11	4.73	.03

Notes: $p < .05$; N = 106

in companies with top managers as HRD participants ($M = 1.82$, $SD = 1.12$) was not significantly different from the average of respondents' aligning perception in companies where top managers did not attend any HRD programs ($M = 1.60$, $SD = 1.14$) ($F = .88$, $p = .34$). The results were closest to significance in companies with or without lower management as HRD participants ($F = 3.82$, $p = .05$) and in companies with or without employees in the operating core as HRD participants ($F = 2.42$, $p = .06$).

Significant differences in aligning perceptions were found in the case of HRD program selection. In companies where employees were trained in management techniques, for example, respondents were more discontented about the aligning procedure ($M = 1.75$, $SD = 1.13$) than in companies that did not

offer these kinds of HRD programs ($M = .62$, $SD = .91$; $F = 7.55$, $p < .05$). The same is true for HRD programs on social and learning skills ($F = 4.26$, $p < .05$), marketing and public relations ($F = 8.83$, $p < .05$), and accounting and finance ($F = 4.71$, $p < .05$). No significant differences were found in the case of production processes ($F = .15$, $p = .69$), health and security ($F = 1.23$, $p = .26$), automation and computerization ($F = .18$, $p = .66$), quality ($F = .20$, $p = .65$), and other programs ($F = 1.16$, $p = .28$).

One significant difference in aligning perceptions related to company development as the main starting point for the policymaking process. In companies where development was the main starting point, respondents were more discontented with the HRD policymaking procedure ($M = 1.78$, $SD = 1.13$) than in companies where it was not ($M = 1.15$, $SD = 1.11$; $F = 4.73$, $p < .05$). The results were close to significance in the case of actual performance problems as starting point ($F = 3.39$, $p = .06$). Where future performance demands was a main starting point, no significant difference was found ($F = 1.46$, $p = .22$).

These results indicate that the HRD policymaking procedure needs certain improvements in companies where company development is a main starting point and the four noted content areas are the main topics for selecting HRD programs. Perhaps a more focused approach and greater involvement by the relevant stakeholders is needed in these cases.

Characteristics of the Company and HRD Department and Differences in Strategic Choices. *Do characteristics of the company and the HRD department explain certain differences in the strategic choices companies make?* As mentioned at the beginning of this article, characteristics of the company and the HRD department are likely to have an impact on HRD policymaking processes and thus on the strategic choices (selection of content for HRD programs and groups of HRD participants) that companies make. In order to compare the average of the various strategic choices made in companies in the three economic sectors (the number of HRD programs in a specific field or the number of times that middle managers were trained), an analysis of variance was run for each characteristic.

Characteristics of the HRD department did not show any significantly different strategic choice. Neither the autonomy nor the structure of the HRD department caused significant differences in selecting specific content areas for HRD programs and groups of HRD participants. However, significant differences in strategic choices were found in the case of some company characteristics. Table 6 indicates the differences found between companies in the three economic sectors studied. Only the significant differences at the .05 level are reported.

More companies in the industrial sector trained middle managers ($M = .96$, $SD = .17$) than companies in the banking ($M = .75$, $SD = .46$) or transport sectors ($M = .94$, $SD = .23$) ($F = 3.25$, $p < .05$). The same kind of differences between sectors were found when lower management ($F = .424$, $p < .05$) and

Table 6. Differences in Strategic Choices Among Companies, by Economic Sector

Strategic Choices	Economic Sector						F	p
	Industry		Transport		Banking			
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD		
Category of Employees								
Middle management	.96	.17	.75	.46	.94	.23	3.25	.04
Lower management	.98	.12	.75	.46	.88	.31	4.24	.01
Operating core	.96	.17	.75	.46	.94	.23	3.25	.04
Specific Content of HRD Programs								
Production process	.82	.38	.62	.51	.55	.50	4.41	.01
Health and security	.80	.39	.50	.53	.52	.50	5.17	.00
Marketing and public relations	.56	.49	.75	.46	.80	.40	3.20	.04

Notes: $p < .05$; $N = 106$

employees in the operating core were trained ($F = 3.25$, $p < .05$). When it came to HRD programs on the production process, more companies in the industrial sector ($M = .82$, $SD = .38$) than companies in banking ($M = .55$, $SD = .50$) or transport ($M = .62$, $SD = .51$) ($F = 4.41$, $p < .01$) offered them. This was also the case when it came to programs on health and security ($F = 5.17$, $p < .025$), whereas the banking sector offered significantly more HRD programs on marketing and public relations ($M = .80$, $SD = .40$) than the transport ($M = .75$, $SD = .46$) or industrial sector ($M = .56$, $SD = .49$) ($F = 3.20$, $p < .05$). Thus the results indicate that economic sector is an important company characteristic.

Another characteristic is the structure of the company, that is, whether it is centralized or decentralized. This characteristic also turned out to be important. Top management was trained significantly less frequently ($F = 4.25$, $p < .05$) in companies with a centralized structure ($M = .40$, $SD = .49$) than in companies with other structures ($M = .61$, $SD = .49$). This characteristic is also important in the case of certain specific content areas of HRD programs, that is, accounting and finance ($F = 5.05$, $p < .05$) and quality ($F = 5.07$, $p < .05$).

The size of the company influenced the selection of HRD programs on health and security, marketing and public relations, and other content areas. Companies with more than 1,000 employees, for example, offered more marketing programs ($M = .86$, $SD = .35$) than did companies with 750 to 1,000 employees ($M = .54$, $SD = .50$), or with fewer than 750 employees ($M = .42$, $SD = .50$) ($F = 11.49$, $p < .025$).

Conclusion and Discussion

HRD policymaking in companies leads to decisions about the content of HRD programs and the employees who need to participate in them. These programs have to address the assessed HRD needs and enhance the performance of employees, departments, and the company as a whole (the strategic choices). The research findings indicate certain differences in HRD policymaking processes within companies based on various influencing factors such as economic sector and company size, and to company problems and developments that are starting points for HRD processes in companies. Differences occur in the selection of specific field contents of HRD programs and groups of HRD participants. The findings point to an HRD emphasis on the tactical and operational level within companies. This confirms earlier research findings (Wognum, 1994), and seems to correspond with performance problems and future performance demands as the main starting point for having HRD processes within companies. Thus, an emphasis on these starting points leads to HRD programs directed at both of these levels. In the case of company development, the emphasis in training and development is more focused at the strategic level in companies (with top management and support staff as main employees). But fewer companies in the research group had trained these groups of employees in one or more HRD programs, and most of the respondents were not content with the policymaking procedure in these cases. In other words, they were explicitly discontented with the involvement of some stakeholders in the HRD policymaking process. This was mainly the case in companies that took the development of the company as a starting point for HRD policymaking processes.

The study found a traditional view on training and development within companies, with an emphasis on the tactical and operational level and insufficient stakeholder involvement in HRD policymaking processes. This situation usually led to a weak link between training and the wider objectives of the organization and to limited practical impact of HRD programs. Employee behavior seldom changes as a result of these training activities. In the long run, this approach may even lead to a situation in which HRD is seen as a cost rather than an investment for the future. The lack of sufficient interaction between HRD representatives and relevant stakeholders in the company, mainly on the strategic level, makes it difficult to support organizational changes with a proactive HRD policy and prevents them from making a visible and clear contribution to organizational success.

The many changes that companies are faced with today demand better interaction between company policy makers and HRD representatives so that HRD policy becomes more closely linked to organizational strategy and HRD programs become more closely linked to the company's situation. The research findings support the idea of another kind of policymaking process in changing companies and point to a better aligning procedure with more intensive

and greater involvement of stakeholders at all company levels, and particularly at the strategic level. In other words, a more focused approach is needed (Barham and Rassam, 1989). In the focused approach, HRD becomes the shared responsibility of line managers, employees, and HRD representatives.

The findings justify the further study of HRD policymaking processes in companies in order to find effective forms of HRD policymaking processes in different kinds of companies. Only then will HRD programs be strategically aligned to the company's situation and provide employees with the right competencies at the right time and thus improve their performance as well as the performance of their departments and the company as a whole. HRD will then contribute to the achievement of the collective goals of the organization.

References

- Barham, K., & Rassam, C. (1989). *Shaping the corporate future: Leading executives share their vision and strategies*. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Bergenhengouwen, G. J., Mooijman, E.A.M., & Tillema, H. H. (1992). *Strategisch opleiden in organisaties*. [Strategic HRD in organizations.] Deventer, The Netherlands: Kluwer Bedrijfswetenschappen.
- Brinkerhoff, R. O. (1987). *Achieving results from training*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- C.B.S. [Central Statistical Office]. (1993). *Classification of training subjects*. Voorburg, The Netherlands.
- de Leeuw, A.C.J. (1988). *Organisaties: Management, analyse, ontwerp en verandering: een systeemvisie*. [Organizations: Management, analysis, design and change: a system viewpoint.] Assen, The Netherlands: Van Gorcum.
- Dekker, J. M., & Wognum, A.A.M. (1994). Vorming van opleidingsbeleid afgestemd op ondernemingsbeleid: Methoden uit de praktijk van vijf arbeidsorganisaties. [An analysis of HRD policy-making tuned to the strategy of the company: A framework and six cases.]. *Gedrag en Organisatie*, 7 (5), 284–300.
- Ford, J. K., Major, D. A., Seaton, F. W., & Krifcher Felber, H. (1993). Effects of organizational, training system, and individual characteristics on training director scanning practices. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 4 (4), 333–350.
- Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Boston/London: Pitman.
- Harrison, R. (1991). How can HRD be made "strategic" and what are the implications for managers of the function? Paper presented at a meeting of the Foundation for Corporate Education.
- Kaufman, R., & Herman, J. (1991). *Strategic planning in education: Rethinking, restructuring, revitalizing*. Lancaster, PA: Technomic.
- Kaufman, R., Herman, J., & Watters, K. (1996). *Educational planning: Strategic, tactical, operational*. Lancaster, PA: Technomic.
- London, M. (1989). *Managing the training enterprise*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Mintzberg, H. (1983). *Structures in fives: Designing effective organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Mulder, M. (1993). Opleidingen, 1992. [Training, 1992]. *Magazine Opleidingen*, 5 (8), 10–23.
- Mulder, M., Akkerman, J. S., & Bentvelsen, N. (1988). *Bedrijfsopleidingen in Nederland*. [Corporate Training, Education and Development in the Netherlands]. 's-Gravenhage, The Netherlands: S.V.O.
- Rossett, A. (1987). *Training needs assessment*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications.
- Rummel, G. A., & Brache, A. P. (1995). *Improving performance: How to manage the white space on the organization chart*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Torraco, R. J. (1995). HRD alignment: A systemic assessment of HRD in organizations. In E. F. Holton III (Ed.), *AHRD conference proceedings*. St. Louis: AHRD 12-1.
- van Hulst, W.G.H., & Willems, J.G.L.M. (1992). *Externe organisatie. Een kennismaking met het ondernemingsgedrag in markt-economische stelsels*. [External organization. Getting acquainted with the behavior of companies in market-economic systems]. Leiden/Antwerp, the Netherlands: Stenfert Kroese.
- Wognum, A.A.M. (1991, Sept. 25-27). *Corporate training: Setting the objectives and assessing the effectiveness*. Paper presented at the second international conference of Corporate Training for Effective Performance, Enschede, The Netherlands.
- Wognum, A.A.M. (1994). Assessing HRD effectiveness from a strategic point of view. *Tijdschrift voor Onderwijswetenschappen*, 24 (2/3), 77-89.