

Critical Theory and What It has to Offer to Human Resource Development

Assist. Prof. Dr. Ömer AVCI

Istanbul Medeniyet University

Faculty of Education Sciences

Department of Lifelong Learning and Adult Education

omeravci76@gmail.com

Abstract

In this paper, the purpose of human resource development is critically examined and suggested that critical theory can provide a theoretical lens to alter the corporate bottom-line approaches that are dominant in the field of HRD to more humane ones. After reviewing both HRD and critical theory literature and its approach to knowledge and learning, a critical HRD approach is presented.

Key Words: Human Resource Development, Critical Theory.

JEL Codes: M53

INTRODUCTION

As performance and productivity in the workplace dominate Human Resource Development (HRD) praxes, the “human” part of the field has become less important (Bierema, 2000, Dirkx, 1996). In this sense, HRD is performance-driven, and serves the goals of the host organization. We believe that adult education theories can help HRD practices fulfill a balanced service for both the host organization and the principal subjects, namely, the employees. The purpose of this paper is to show that critical theory would contribute HRD practices in improving and developing the potential humans, who are often neglected when it comes to HRD practices, that are too much concerned with corporate goals.

In this paper, the HRD and critical theory is reviewed. First, a short history of HRD is presented, and then the definitions and the purpose of HRD are discussed. Second, critical theory is examined, and then how the Frankfurt School provides a background for critical theory is also analyzed.

1. Literature Review

Rowden (1996) states that the workplace training of American workers has been dramatically influenced by the competitive nature of the globalizing economy, developments in technology, and the diverse and changing characteristics of employees. He gives astounding statistics regarding the scope of workplace training efforts. \$50 billion is spent on formal employee training per year and employers spend about \$180 billion per year on on-the-job training and informal education. Approximately, 1.6 billion hours of training for 49 million employees receive formal employer-sponsored training each year, which means one in eight employers is exposed to training activities. Human resource development (HRD) departments of businesses and industries offer more training per worker than any other source, such as external vendors, institutions offering training to other businesses and industries, professional associations, and labor unions. According to Rowden (1996), workplace education is one of the major factors that continues to contribute to the field of adult education.

Even though the field or discipline of human resource development (HRD) has developed immensely in the 20th century, and still continues to grow, it is not correct to assume that workplace learning has been taking place only in modern times. As early as A.D. 1100, workers received training through skills training, unions, and apprenticeship training (which were the principal means for workplace training). The efficiency of workers was the focus of learning in the work environment during the North American industrial revolution in the 1800s. However, with the advent of the information age, the issue of employee enhancement has assumed great importance. Employee enhancement, which has been embraced by most companies today, has promoted the idea that every individual worker is valuable for the company, no matter what his or her responsibility or position is. Workplace learning playing a major strategic role in most organizations, both the field of adult education and HRD have embraced learning in the work environment as part of their areas of study and practice (Rowden, 1996).

Wexley and Latham (1991) believe that looking at the historical contexts of adult education and HRD will illuminate both fields’ different developmental journeys. Dewey’s writings and Thorndike’s studies

in the 1920s were the first research work conducted on adult education. The field started to become professional when American Association for Adult Education was formed, as Lindeman's *The Meaning of Adult Education* (1926) was published, and graduate programs were founded to train practitioners in the field (as cited in Wexley & Latham, 1991). The early research and works of the 1920s gave birth to adult education and helped it become part of adult learning. On the other hand, HRD's history does not go as far back as it does with adult education, and it does not have the a similar systematic history of research as adult education does until at least after the Second World War (Wexley and Latham, 1991).

Rowden (1996) states that in the early 1900s Westinghouse, General Electric, and Goodyear were the companies which believed that employees needed some type of workplace learning. It was first during the Second World War that training employees could help organizations improve operational effectiveness. Before the war, this was not realized in North America. During the war, lots of people entered the Armed Forces and more people were employed in wartime production. The United States was mobilizing almost all its resources for military production. Those who joined the Armed Forces or who worked for wartime production had little or no experience of the jobs they had to do, especially when it came to manufacturing. It was soon realized that workplace learning was the best means to help the workers gain the knowledge, skills, and attitudes that they needed for manufacturing the tremendous amounts of goods needed for wartime requirements. At that time, the methods that were used to train military personnel were adapted to train workers in the factories.

After the war, workplace education needed to continue due to the fact that the people who fought and won the war had the skills, however, they did not possess the same skills to apply to peacetime work settings. By then, the training methods used during the war also appeared to be needed after the war (Rowden, 1996).

Training's contribution to the effectiveness of the workers during the war and postwar production received society's interest and attention. In 1945, the American Society for Training Directors was established. It was a society for people who were doing training in organizations. Later on, the American Society for Training Directors changed its title to the American Society for Training and Development (ASTD). It was then that systematic research on training, finding ways to improve its effectiveness, and understand how and what affected organizations' success gained prominence for the first time since the start of the industrial age. The systematic research was not conducted by people from the same discipline; on the contrary, researchers from psychology, sociology, business, education, and adult education have contributed to the multidisciplinary nature of the field of HRD -which has helped the field grow (Rowden, 1996).

2. Definition of HRD

There are many definitions of human resource development (HRD), and as the field of HRD matures, the definitions will more likely focus on a common set of constructs. Two of the latest definitions of HRD are Gary and Laird McLean's definition from a more global perspective, and the definition adopted by the HRD faculty at Texas A&M University in 2001. "Human resource development is any process or activity that, either initially or over the long term, has the potential to develop adults' work-based knowledge, expertise, productivity, and satisfaction, whether for personal or group/team gain, or for the benefit of an organization, community, nation, or, ultimately, the whole of humanity" (Dooley, 2002, pp 3). "Human resource development is the process of improving learning and performance in individual, group, and organizational contexts through domains of expertise such as lifelong learning, career development, training and development, and organization development" (Dooley, 2002, pp 3).

Training is one of the ways used to develop human resources in HRD. Training is most often mentioned in the definitions of HRD as it is in the definition of Texas A&M University. As technology has affected every aspect of life, HRD has been influenced by it, too. Regardless of the type of technology, it has changed the nature of work (Conner et. al., 1996).

Knowles, Holton, and Swanson (1998) explain HRD and adult education and make a distinction between those two. Adult learning becomes HRD when organizations set the requirements and rules for the learners. The key difference between HRD and adult education is in terms of who has authority and control. If learning is measured and controlled by the organization, it is called HRD.

Gilley, Egglund, and Gilley (2002) state that human resource development helps organizations enhance their effectiveness through HRD practices. They posit that HRD's main interest is the development of people within organizations, and in order to better understand what HRD is, they examine the two components of HRD: human resources and development.

2.1. What are human resources?

According to Gilley, Egglund, and Gilley (2002), physical, financial, and human resources are the three major resources that organizations use. Machines, materials, facilities, and tools form the physical resources, while liquid assets such as cash, stock, bonds, investments, and operating capital are the financial resources of organizations. Employees are the human resources of the organizations.

2.2. What is development?

Individual development, career development, performance management, and organizational development are the main domains of development in HRD. Development means that for the purpose of improving organizational performance, people (employees) enhancing their knowledge, skills, and competencies. The focus on the individual employee refers to the individual development domain. This also requires to us be philosophically committed to the improvement of people within the organization (and which refers to the career development domain). All human development activities within the organization are for the sake of improving the performance of employees for the benefit of the organization, which will result in more competitive, profitable, and efficient organizational practices. This refers to the performance management domain of HRD. Finally, an organization's mission, strategy, structure, policies and procedure, work climate, and leadership practices contribute to the advancement of its culture. These interventions refer to the organizational domain of HRD (Gilley, Egglund, and Gilley, 2002).

Development relies on people's participation in workplace learning activities. If the individual does not take place in learning interventions that are designed to help people gain desired knowledge and skills, their performances, which are the targets of those interventions, would not improve. This reflects an individual perspective. On the other hand, from an organizational perspective, it is unlikely that the development will emerge if the setting for the workplace learning and motivational factors are not considered and redesigned to support the improvement of performance. All the efforts done by the organization are for the improvement of organizational efficiency and competitiveness (Gilley, Egglund, and Gilley, 2002).

Gilley, Egglund, and Gilley (2001) define HRD as "the process of facilitating organizational learning, performance, and change through organized (formal and informal) interventions, initiatives and management actions for the purpose of enhancing an organization's performance capacity, capability, competitive readiness, and renewal" (Gilley, Egglund, and Gilley, p. 6-7, 2002).

2.3. The Purpose of Learning in the Workplace

The purpose of the workplace learning during the early years of the 20th century was to teach workers how to do their jobs in the most efficient way -in other words, how to improve their performances. Training basically involved cognitive and psychomotor fields; this was because the workplace was not as complicated as it is today and the workers were considered to be components of a machine, which can easily be replaced (Rowden, 1996).

Due to changes and developments in technology, employers needed more highly educated people. Employees need to have advanced skills in computer technology, robotics, and engineering for most manufacturing jobs. Even traditional factories, such as steel and auto factories, now require a more educated workforce. American manufacturing jobs no longer require mere physical efforts from their employees. About a decade ago, while about 40 percent of the manufacturing workers held high school diplomas, it was 71% in 1995. The study by the Bureau of Labor Statistics reveals that the number of workers who received some college education has increased a lot, even though specialized work has remained almost the same (Rowden, 1996).

Rowden (1996) states that changes in the workplace have forced HRD professionals to reexamine the mission and the purpose of the field. Many HRD people have the belief that the purpose of HRD should be performance improvement, while others believe it should be about developing the individual. Gilley,

Egglund, and Gilley (2002) posit that performance improvement is the ultimate goal of HRD. Since the ultimate goals of an organization are productivity and profit, it is the responsibility of HRD to be performance-oriented and to strive to improve the performance of the employees within the organization (Swanson & Arnold, 1996).

Gilley, Egglund, and Gilley (2002) agree with the idea that HRD's mission should be performance-oriented and they examine the purpose of HRD from the perspective of the four domains of HRD: individual development, career development, performance improvement, and organizational development. HRD's focus should be directed toward individual development which should result in improved performance in the current workplace. HRD's other mission should be to help employees develop their careers and to focus on performance improvement, which will then help them get prepared for future job-related activities. Developing performance management systems is another mission that HRD should focus on. This way the organization's performance capacity will be improved. Enhancing an organization's culture leads to enhancing its effectiveness. This task can be achieved by combining the human assets and their improved performance, which together serve the purpose of organizational development, which should also be HRD's mission. The question that comes to minds is how can we measure effectiveness in an organization? Gilley, Egglund, and Gilley (2002) provide an answer to this question stating that if the organization is profitable, has completed its competitiveness, and is capable of revamping its capacity, then effectiveness is reached. In short, they believe that "the purpose of HRD... is to bring about changes that cause the organizational and performance improvements necessary to enhance the firm" (Gilley, Egglund, and Gilley, p.13, 2002)

Swanson and Arnold (1996) agree that HRD's mission should be about contributing to organizational effectiveness, through training the employees to improve their performances, and which should be aligned with the organization's goals (which are performance-oriented). They define an organization as an enterprise which is productive and has goals. In this sense, an organization should be thought of as a system with all the necessary components of a system, such as process, input, output, part, and purpose. Swanson and Arnold (1996) see HRD as being a subsystem that operates within the larger organizational system.

What makes human resources different from other resources that an organization has is that it is people that compose the main element of human resources and people have emotions, families, and ambitions, and it is also people that constitute communities (Swanson & Arnold, 1996). Even though Swanson and Arnold (1996) seem to take a more humanistic stand, they nevertheless state there is no difference between human resources and other type of resources for the organizations, because organizations want a return on the money they have invested in human resources. They think that if an organization is not benefiting from the investment on human resources, then it should invest the money elsewhere rather than developing workers (Swanson & Arnold, 1996).

Swanson and Arnold (1996) posit that performance contributes to organizational productivity and, thus, it is performance by which organizations fulfill their goals. According to them, rate of return, cycle time, and production quality are some of the ways that performance can be measured. They remind that organizational, process, and individual levels of performance are distinct from one another, and therefore, they should be measured at their separate levels (Swanson & Arnold, 1996).

Knowles, Holton, and Swanson (1998) state that there are two main camps regarding what HRD's focus should be on. Most HRD professional think that HRD should focus on performance as it operates within the organization and it is HRD's responsibility to increase the performance of the employee as required by the organization, while others believe that organizational performance should not be the starting point in valuing the employees, but instead individual performance should be the main focus of HRD (Knowles, Holton, & Swanson, 1998).

Knowles, Holton, and Swanson (1998) belong to the first camp, since they believe that the organization is the reference point that is to be used in deciding the worth of human resources. As mentioned above, they believe that if the investment on human resources does not contribute to the profitability of an organization, it would be more logical to invest that money on something else from which it can expect

a return on investment. They state that even if the employees work for a nonprofit organization, it is their responsibility to work to fulfill the goals of that organization (Knowles, Holton, & Swanson, 1998).

Even though Knowles, Holton, and Swanson (1998) try to convince readers that they do not think that humans are parts of machines in organizations, and they state that employee well-being and organizational priorities should not conflict with another, so far, they have depicted their stand-point as one.

Those who belong to the humanistic camp believe that human factor is the key that helps the globalizing economy, which attracts attention on human resource development, reach its current competitive levels. However, the human part of resource development is sacrificed to the job performance notion resulting in ignoring larger educational goals that would benefit the employees at the individual level (Bierema, 2000).

Swanson and Arnold (1996) believe that it is the responsibility of HRD to contribute to the organization's goals, which requires that there is improvement in the performances of the employees. They also state what the others who belong to the other camp think and what their concerns are. According to Swanson and Arnold (1996), those who do not think performance-oriented HRD is not what HRD should be about concerning that HRD too much focusing on pleasing the organization bottom line results would end up ignoring the notion that employees are also human beings and that they also have emotions and feelings.

The reason that workplace learning is seen as the means of enhancing the performance of the human resources that the organizations would benefit from is that humanistic reform endeavors have not had enough influence to be able to change the way HRD has been conceptualized. The scientific management notion dominates the field of HRD and, thus, the view of HRD-related education. As Knowles, Holton, and Swanson (1998) stated above, issues like the power and control over what and how employees learn and where power and control is located in the organizational administration reflect the view of education (Dirkx, 1996).

Bierema (2000) objects to the notion that HRD is merely about contributing to the performance requirements of organizations stating that the assumptions underlying the performance improvement movement should be considered as the means that lead to more humanistic learning initiatives in the workplace. The author criticizes that postmodern conceptions of knowledge have changed from enhancing human life to creating optimal performance, which resulted in viewing work as machinery, which also resulted in sacrificing life to money (Bierema, 2000). The shift from values to performance in the workplace has caused HRD to become the major factor for productivity for organizations. HRD is more aligned to organizations than it is to human workers, which has created the problem that humans are forgotten in the mist of productivity, performance, and organizational profitability. The fact that performance-driven HRD contributes more to the organizational goals rather than human interests has nullified the suggestion that performance would become a byproduct if learning is promoted as the ultimate goal (Bierema, 2000).

Performance-driven HRD allows management to gain power and control over the employees through shifting and reestablishing the power structures and controlling what, how, and where employees learn. Power structures that enable to the oppression of women, people of color, and lower social classes are enhanced by performance-driven HRD, whose mission is to contribute to organizational effectiveness, profitability, and competitiveness (Bierema, 2000).

Bierema (2000) suggests that there needs to be a shift in the dominant view of HRD's mission. It should direct its focus on enhancing human life via promoting learning which will also benefit the whole world, rather than merely be concerned with performance. HRD professionals should reflect upon current HRD practices and critically evaluate the outcomes of those interventions in the workplace. They should keep in mind that their practices could result in reinforcing the status quo or promote human development. Development is the main concept in HRD, and profit motives should not prevail over HRD's potential to contribute to the growth of humanity and human values.

Even though serving the democratic ideals in society is one of the missions of adult education, the market economy tends to influence the way HRD is understood, which is also reflected in most HRD practices. The primary goal of humans in a market economy is to promote economic profitability, hence, humans

are considered as homo economicus in the market model, which also dominates the market-driven view of HRD. Unlike the traditional concept of HRD, which views employees as the passive recipients of knowledge and skills that would contribute to the organizational profitability and effectiveness, market-driven HRD assumes learning as the means of responding to the needs of organizations by transmitting the knowledge and skills that would allow the employees to perform as required in the workplace. Only learning that would enhance the effectiveness of the organization is valued in this version of HRD (Dirkx, 1996).

While distinguishing the market-driven HRD from the HRD that values the growth of individuals as humans, Dirkx (1996) also discusses the purpose of education. Education is not preparing individuals for life; it is a way of life, which helps individuals find the meaning in their lives, and helps them express themselves. Training employees to perform specific tasks is not the purpose of education, nor should it be the purpose of HRD; rather, it should focus on the needs of individuals, letting them find themselves.

3. Critical Theory

Since critical theory is often identified with a group of German thinkers who were affiliated with the Institute of Social Research in Frankfurt Germany, it would provide a better understanding to look at the history and the members of the institute known as the Frankfurt School.

3.1. Frankfurt School and Critical Theory

The Frankfurt School was not a real school. The term Frankfurt School refers to the work of the members of the Institut für Sozialforschung, which was the German title for the Institute of Social Research that was established in Frankfurt Germany in 1923. It was the first research center with a Marxist orientation that was connected to a major German university. In its early years, the institute's focus was mainly directed at the problems of the European working-class movement, and thus, the works of the institute were historical and empirical in nature. As soon as Max Horkheimer became the institute's director, he started to gather talented theorists, like Erich Fromm, Herbert Marcuse, and Theodor Adorno at the institute. The work of the members of the institute represented an interdisciplinary cross section of academia, varying from philosophy and sociology to literary scholarship, political science, and economics (Tar, 1977).

The Frankfurt School's first major project was the investigation of the nature of authoritarian regimes and individuals' reactions and responses toward authority. They wondered why individuals submitted to irrational authority in authoritarian regimes. During the 1930s, when fascism was the leading power in Germany, they published studies on German fascism. Most of the members of the Frankfurt School were Jewish and Marxist and they were forced to flee Germany after Hitler came to power. The majority of the members emigrated to the U.S. (Tar, 1977).

Following is a closer look at some of the leading members of Frankfurt School. Horkheimer, Adorno, Marcuse, and Habermas's ideas will be presented and their ideas will provide a background for critical theory.

3.1.1. Horkheimer (1895-1973)

In his book *Eclipse of Reason* (1946), Horkheimer focuses on reason stating the problems that the society faces are caused by the misunderstanding of reason. According to Horkheimer (1946), the main difference between objective and subjective reason is that objective reason deals with universal truth, which enables people to distinguish between right and wrong. On the other hand, subjective reason is based on situations and social norms. In subjective reason actions are considered reasonable as long as they produce the best situation, which means that if the individual can benefit from it, then the reason is correct. Horkheimer believes that we would lose meaning in life if subjective reason dominates. Ideals, such as the democratic ideals of the society, are subject to the interests of people, instead of being dependent on objective truths. He suggests that people should move away from subjective reason and start to critique their societies, hence, they are able to solve their problems (Tar, 1977).

3.1.2. Adorno (1903-1969)

Adorno focuses on culture and culture industry, a term which Horkheimer and he invented. What he argues is that popular culture is like a factory producing cultural goods to manipulate people. The capitalist economy created false needs that people try to satisfy no matter what their financial situation is. He describes true needs as freedom, creativity, and genuine happiness (Tar, 1977).

3.1.3. Marcuse (1898-1979)

Marcuse believed that both communist and capitalist societies were able to create equal circumstances for its citizens. He also believes that people are not free because they function in systems such as economy. When they can be free from these systems they will be able to distinguish the false and true needs (Welton, 1993).

3.1.4. Habermas (1929-)

Habermas belongs to the second generation of critical theorists. He is well-known for his theories of "public sphere", "communicative action", and "communicative rationality". Habermas wrote about types the different types of knowledge. According to him knowledge can take three different forms: technical, practical, and emancipatory. He believes that every society has its own forms of power relations among its members. Emancipatory knowledge helps people to achieve awareness of the sources of societal domination and to create the desire to free themselves from the oppression, whether this oppression comes from nature or individuals or groups (Welton, 1993).

4. Knowledge and Learning in Critical Theory

In critical theory, knowledge is considered to be socially constructed and meaningful in context. Better knowledge is gained by rationality. Most people know what they are capable of and this leads them to learn about it. Consequently, "an interest in creating a productive workforce leads us to produce a wealth of knowledge about how to prepare people for various lines of work (Kilgore, 2001, p. 54).

Critical theorists questioned what is known to be true, and they challenged the commonly accepted beliefs, ideas, and thoughts by pointing out the outcomes of those truths. Who the truth was serving, who was benefiting from it, and if there were people who benefited while others could not were the major concerns for critical theorists. Basically, critical theory is about trying to understand why and how injustice exists, what reinforces it, how power is related to it, and how injustice prevents emancipation of people (Kilgore, 2001).

Kilgore (2001) states that race, ethnicity, gender, class, sexual orientation, physical or mental capability, and age are the categories that critical theorists think that the power structures and privileges are based on. These categories are so embedded in everyday life that they become common-sense through the lenses that are imposed on people (mostly subconsciously). The lenses through which people accept the power structures and privileges reinforce the hegemony and the status quo. Dominant classes in society distort the definition of reality and truth; thus, their way is unquestioningly accepted by the oppressed groups. Hegemony plays an important role in serving the interests of the dominant classes.

In critical theory, learning is assumed to be the means of reflecting on what we know and challenging how we know it and this will encourage us to change the conditions of the oppressed people, which enable the dominant class to establish hegemony over them, and will transform distorted reality by changing the commonly-held assumptions. Critical theorists suggest that power is structured as a pyramid, from top to bottom, like the state or organization, and it is held by one individual or group over others (Kilgore, 2001).

4.1. Critical HRD

Fenwick (2004) approaches the human resource development (HRD) theories and practices from a critical perspective hoping to bridge the gap between the fields of adult education and HRD. While examining the existing critiques of HRD, the author criticizes the adult educators' stance against HRD practitioners stating that it fails to recognize the complex nature of workplaces. One of the critiques that the author conveys is that HRD contributes to the exploitation of the employees by adopting human capital theory. The research and theory in the field of HRD are accused of being "dominated by a positivistic paradigm" (Fenwick, 2004, p. 194). The author posits that critical HRD focuses on social

justice, equity, power relations in organizations and the role of current HRD theory and practices. The two fundamental critical approaches toward HRD are: rejecting the domination of organizational goals over human elements of HRD and transforming a more just and democratic workplace. These two principles form a foundation for a critical approach of HRD from political, epistemological, research, and methodological perspectives. The author further addresses the dilemmas within the currents of critical HRD and proposes rearrangement of critical HRD in the workplaces.

We need to see both sides of the coin, which most critical studies fail to do. The dilemmas of critical HRD are that often times, people do not realize that their critical assumptions must be subject to critical examination. Critical HRD practice and research cannot exist in a vacuum, which must be acknowledged before reaching an absolute conclusion (Fenwick, 2004). In order for critical HRD practice and research to be implemented, there should be alliance with organizational and managerial goals. It is a significant reminder that if anyone who wishes to practice critical HRD (or do critical HRD research), they have to be aware of the complex nature of organizations and how to deal with the realities. Otherwise, as Fenwick (2004) warns, it would only be an elitist practice that would have no (positive) impact on employees.

Fenwick (2004) illustrates how critical HRD can be implemented in the workplace focusing on four major approaches: "emancipatory action learning, emancipatory projects, critical workplace education, and HRD reflexivity" (Fenwick, 2004). Emancipatory action learning helps individuals critically assess their conditions (against oppression and injustice in the workplace) with the help of a facilitator who collaborates in the learning process and does not impose any authority.

5. Recommendations

The literature review has shown that HRD will better serve employees in the workplace if it incorporates critical theory in its praxes. As Bierema (2000) suggests, focusing on employee well-being will help improve the lives of the workers along with contributing to the goals of the organization.

Critical theory is about emancipation from domination. The existing hegemony in the workplace can be targeted and employees can be emancipated from the power structure in the workplace if HRD professionals incorporate critical theory in their practices. Critical theory will not only help employees, but also HRD professionals by making learning a means to challenge the commonly-held beliefs about learning, which is a distorted version of reality, and the hegemony over the oppressed groups, such as women, people of color, and other demographic segments whose voices are suppressed by society (Kilgore, 2001, Outlaw, 2005, Townsend et al, 1999).

Critical theory will serve as a new lens through which the employees see, assess, and reevaluate the HRD interventions and their learning experiences in the workplace, which will also help enrich and improve workers' lives, and which will also create a better atmosphere in the workplace resulting in better performances of the employees.

CONCLUSION

Before implementing critical HRD, we need to clarify who is benefiting and what benefit means. Once this is accomplished, we need to address is how to interpret the results and whether the outcomes of critical HRD are beneficial. This also requires the critical HRD to determine its purposes. What is the purpose of HRD according to critical HRD paradigm?

The two main camps of thought over what the mission of human resource development (HRD) has been discussed, and it is the purpose of this paper to show that HRD's mission is not merely to serve the needs of its host organization; rather, it is a means to enrich the lives of employees and, thus, help them improve and realize their true potential. We need to also remember that this discussion is more of an ethical one. In order to create a more just, egalitarian, and humane world, everyone has to do his/her part.

REFERENCE

- Bierema, L.L. (2000). Moving Beyond Performance Paradigms in Human Resource Development. In A. L. Wilson, and E. R. Hayes (Eds.), *Handbook of Adult and Continuing Education* (pp. 278-293). San Francisco: Jose-Bass.
- Dirkx, J.M. (1996). Human Resource Development as Adult Education: Fostering the Educative Workplace. In R. W. Rowden (Ed.), *Workplace Learning: Debating Five Critical Questions of Theory and Practice* (pp. 41-47). San Francisco: Jose- Bass.
- Dooley, L.M. (2002). HRD Literature: Where is it Published? Retrieved from ERIC database: <http://www.eric.ed.gov>.
- Gilley, J.W., Egglund, S.A., & Gilley, A.M. (2002). *Principles of Human Resource Development*. Cambridge, MA: Persus Publishing.
- Kilgore, D.W. (2001). Critical and Postmodern Perspectives on Adult Learning. In S. B. Merriam (Ed.), *The New Update on Adult Learning Theory* (pp. 53-61). San Francisco: Jose-Bass.
- Knowles, M.S., Holton, E.F., & Swanson, R.A. (1998). *The Adult Learner: The Definitive Classic in Adult Education and Human Resource Development*. Houston: Gulf Publishing Company.
- Outlaw, L.T. (2005). *Critical Social Theory in the Interest of Black Folks*. Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Group, Inc.
- Rowden. R.W. (1996). Current Realities and Future Challenges. In R. W. Rowden (Ed.), *Workplace Learning: Debating Five Critical Questions of Theory and Practice* (pp. 3-10). San Francisco: Jose-Bass.
- Swanson, R.A., and Arnold, D.E. (1996). The Purpose of Human Resource Development Is to Improve Organizational Performance. In R. W. Rowden (Ed.), *Workplace Learning: Debating Five Critical Questions of Theory and Practice* (pp. 13-19). San Francisco: Jose-Bass.
- Tar, Z. (1977). *The Frankfurt School: The Critical School of Max Horkheimer and Theodor W. Adorno*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Townsend, J.G. (1999). Empowerment Matters: Understanding Power. In J. G. Townsend, et al. *Women and Power: Fighting Patriarchies and Poverty* (pp. 19- 45). New York: Zed Books.
- Welton, M. R. (1993). The Contribution of Critical Theory to Our Understanding of Adult Learning. In S. B. Merriam (Ed), *An Update on Adult Learning Theory* (pp. 83-90). San Francisco: Jose-Bass.
- Wexley, K., and Latham, G. (1991). *Developing and Training Human Resources in Organizations*. New York: HarperCollins.