

Sustainability, Performance and Development: Towards an Understanding of the Intersections between Human Resource Development (HRD) and Capacity Building

La'aleh Alaali, *Arab Open University, Bahrain*
Christopher J. Rees, *Global Development Institute,*
University of Manchester, UK

The paper reports on a study to consider the relationship between 'Human Resource Development' and 'Capacity Building'. Despite the prominent use of these terms in HRD and international development literature, there are few studies which have directly sought to compare and contrast their meaning. The study is comprised of two phases. This paper reports Phase 1 in which HRD definitions and descriptions are examined alongside definitions and descriptions of capacity building. Findings draw attention to potential intersections that exist between capacity building and HRD in areas such as performance and development and provide support to the thesis that HRD can be considered as a development process which has a role to play in broader capacity building initiatives. Given these findings, the study highlights the potential for research on capacity building to inform HRD theory and practice and also for HRD research to inform capacity building theory and practice. Phase 2 of the study contextualises the findings of Phase 1 with reference to HRD and capacity building in a non-Western international context and is reported in a future issue of this *Journal*.

Key Words: capacity building, human resource development, sustainability, performance

Introduction

Capacity building and human resource development (HRD) have emerged as relatively distinct areas of theory and practice associated with the development of people, organizations, and economies. While the term HRD has been used in a wide variety of international, national and local contexts, the term capacity building has often been associated with international development literature relating to developing and transitional contexts (Franks 1999; Venner, 2015). For example, Agenda 21 of United Nations' plan for sustainable development states that:

“The ability of a country to follow sustainable development paths is determined to a large extent by the capacity of its people and its institutions as well as by its ecological and geographical conditions. Specifically, capacity-building encompasses the country's human, scientific, technological, organizational, institutional, and resource capabilities” (United Nations, 1992).

Yet, despite the relatively wide-scale use of the terms capacity building and HRD in academic literature, there have been surprisingly few analyses which have sought to compare and contrast the meanings of these terms and the extent to which they portray discrete aspects of theory

and practice relating to the development and performance of people, organizations, institutions, and economies. Hence, the main aim of the paper is to explore the extent to which HRD and capacity building are associated terms with a view to revealing the potential for academics and practitioners to synthesise research in these areas and to inform one another's professional knowledge and practice. To achieve its main aim, the paper utilizes textual analysis of relevant literature as the primary research method. In order to provide further insights into the implications of the study, a subsequent study was conducted by the authors to contextualise the findings with reference to HRD and capacity building in Bahrain; this subsequent study is reported in a future issue of this *Journal*.

The paper is structured as follows; first, the term capacity building is explored with reference to the term capacity. Literature-based definitions of capacity building are then contrasted with definitions of HRD in order to identify common themes and also differences in the treatment of these terms in academic literature. The final sections of the paper synthesize the findings of the study and summarize the conclusions drawn from the research.

Defining Capacity Building

Prior to considering the nature of capacity building, it is necessary to focus upon the term capacity. Capacity has been defined in various ways. For example, the UNDP (1998, p. X) define capacity as: "the ability of individuals and organizations or organizational units to perform functions effectively, efficiently and sustainably". In a similar vein, Grindle and Hilderbrand (1995, p. 34) define capacity as: "... the ability to perform appropriate tasks effectively, efficiently, and sustainably" Morgan (2006, p. 6) defines capital as: "... the emergent combination of attributes that enables a human system to create development value". These exemplar definitions emphasize that, in international development literature at least, capacity is inextricably associated with individuals and organizations, performance, systems, skills and attributes, sustainability, and effectiveness. Further, it is noted that capacity is not the same as capacity building; rather, the absence of capacity necessitates capacity building (Larbi, 1998).

As indicated above, the term capacity is wide-ranging. Arguably, this has led to problems in defining the term "capacity building"; as Hawe (1998) highlights, the term capacity building is used in a plethora of different ways in literature. Ballantyne (2000) identified a variety of quotations and definitions from various sources, concluding that there is a huge variation in interpretations of capacity building. One of the corollaries of this variation is that definitions and descriptions of capacity building tend to reflect particular orientations, with some writers considering it as an approach or process, and some as development per se (Angeles and Gurstein 2000; Bolger 2000). Schacter (2000) cites authors who criticize the term capacity building as 'useless' from an analytical and practical point of view. Land (1999) points to the "slipperiness of capacity building" and observes that capacity building is risky, with unpredictable and unquantifiable outcomes. In essence, the concept has been in existence for a long time yet: "... the concept remains a complex and difficult one to grasp, and operationalize in the design, execution, and evaluation of development initiatives" (Lavergne & Saxby, 2001, p. 1). Similarly, Bossuyt (1994) has argued that the lack of clarity on the meaning of capacity building remains an obstacle to its effective implementation. This uncertainty surrounding the term capacity building also indicates that, at very least, it may possibly represent a form of HRD, given its association with concepts such as performance, systems, skills and attributes, and the ability to perform tasks effectively.

HRD and Capacity Building

Even allowing for variations in definitions, the way human resources are utilized is integral to capacity building and is likely to be a key consideration in capacity building strategies (see Enemark & Williamson, 2004) as the development of human resources provides “society’s capacity to fulfil the needs of its members in an increasingly satisfactory way” (Lavergne & Saxby 2001, p. 2). From a historical perspective, the generation of capacities through HRD was acknowledged in the 1960s by Harbison and Myers, who defined HRD as “The process of increasing the knowledge, the skills, and the capacities of all the people in a society” (Harbison & Myers, 1964, p. 2).

Yet, despite these apparent areas of commonality between capacity building and HRD, there is scant literature which has sought to compare and contrast these terms. For example, Hamlin and Stewart (2011) offer an in-depth analysis of the nature of HRD, which includes a definitional review and synthesis of the HRD domain yet the term capacity building does not appear in this seminal paper. Similarly, despite not referring directly to the field of HRD, Stewart (2015, p. 549) draws the following conclusion when exploring the subject of capacity building in Southern Africa:

We know that capacity building needs to be problem-based, participatory, prolonged and supportive, including more than just training. Evidence from systematic reviews support the use of both participatory and problem-based learning. They suggest that capacity building within the workplace (most commonly known as ‘continuing professional development’ or CPD) which is collaborative (at least two professionals working together) and sustained (over a minimum of 12 weeks) enhances motivation and confidence of participants, compared to studies of individually-oriented sustained CPD which show modest impacts.

Commendably, Stewart calls for all capacity building activities to be “embedded within existing human resource systems where possible” (Stewart, 2015, p. 552) though the study is indicative of capacity building research in that it does not tend to engage directly with HRD theory and practice. This lack of direct engagement between the fields of capacity building and HRD is also evident in practice-focused literature. For example, Ika and Donnelly (2017, p. 46) offer some extremely helpful insights into capacity building projects in the sphere of international development. They state that:

While humanitarian and infrastructure ID projects may focus on the pure delivery of goods and services, capacity building ID projects are different in that they focus on ownership and the ability of people, institutions and stakeholders to elicit developmental change ... For example, while building a water reservoir may represent a humanitarian/ infrastructure initiative, improving its management constitutes the capacity building challenge.

Yet, notably, despite the emphasis placed on developing the ability of people, management, and institutions to bring about change, there is, once again, no direct reference to HRD functions and processes in this particular study.

In order to pursue further this line of enquiry, the authors performed a search for ‘capacity building’ AND ‘HRD’ using literature search engines. While the search engines identified many examples of papers and chapters which contained both terms (for example, see Pallangyo & Rees, 2010), the search revealed that papers using both terms tended to emanate from the field of HRD rather than from the field of capacity building in international development contexts. Even

so, while HRD-orientated literature does make use of both terms, there is a dearth of articles that directly equate HRD and capacity building or indeed draw upon research in both areas to inform the design of research studies or the analysis of findings. In essence, the use of the term capacity building in HRD literature tends to be generic. For example, the only use of the term capacity building in McLean et al.'s (2012) informative paper entitled *Capacity Building for Societal Development: Case Studies in Human Resource Development* is in the title of the paper itself.

Intersections between Capacity Building and HRD

In order to address the main aim of this study, various definitions and descriptions of capacity building and HRD were identified, with a view to highlighting potential intersections between HRD and capacity building theory and practice. These potential intersections represent points of commonality and overlap between HRD and capacity building theory and practice. Thus, drawing on approaches which have offered critiques of definitions of HRD (for example, see Hamlin and Stewart, 2011; McLean and McLean, 2001; Wang et al., 2017; Weinburger, 1998), we searched for exemplar definitions and descriptions of capacity building and placed them alongside exemplar definitions and descriptions of HRD (see Table 1).

From the contents of Table 1, it can be seen that overlap does appear to exist between definitions and descriptions of HRD and capacity building. At a general level, approaches to both HRD and capacity building tend to take a broad, holistic approach to development at various levels. For example, in the case of HRD, de Graaf (1986, p. 15) states that the development of human resources:

... should not be understood in a narrow, individualistic sense: I am not talking about individual improvement, enrichment, education or influence. In fact such individualized changes are very often obstacles to sustained development as it leads to increased inequality, waste of social resources, conflict and competition.

Further, our analysis highlights that approaches to capacity building and HRD tend to involve development and change at the individual, group, organizational, institutional, and societal levels. For example, Enemark and Williamson (2004) define capacity building on three levels, that is, the broader system/societal level, the entity/organizational level, and the people/individual level which addresses the need for individuals to function efficiently and effectively within the entity and within the broader system. Thus, capacity building can be a:

“top-down organizational approach, a bottom-up organizational approach, a partnership approach that involves strengthening the relationships between organizations, or a community organizing approach in which individual community members are drawn to form new organizations or join existing ones” (Crisp et al., 2000, p. 100).

HRD	Capacity Building	Summary of Potential Intersections Between HRD and Capacity Building
<p>“While there have been many efforts to define HRD ... no consensus has emerged. In fact, there is disagreement among the field’s leaders about whether or not a single definition is even a worthy goal” (McLean & McLean, 2001, p. 313).</p> <p>“... no longer can academics hold to narrow definitions of HRD; it is clear that around the world ... the concept of HRD is much broader with much greater impact than has been acknowledged in many academic programs and much of the literature of the field” (Cho & McLean, 2004, p. 390)</p> <p>“HRD encompasses planned activities, processes and/or interventions designed to have impact upon and enhance organizational and individual learning, to develop human potential, to improve or maximize effectiveness and performance at either the individual, group/team and/or organizational level, and/or to bring about effective, beneficial personal or organizational behaviour change and improvement within, across and/or beyond the boundaries (or borders) of private sector (for profit), public sector/ governmental, or third/voluntary sector (not-for-profit) organizations, entities or any other type of personal-based, work-based, community-based, society-based, culture-based, political-based or nation-based host system” (Hamlin & Stewart, 2011, p. 213).</p>	<p>“Capacity building remains a complex concept” (Lavergne & Saxby 2001, p.1).</p> <p>“Understanding of capacity building remains incomplete and largely fragmented, focusing on individual components of capacity building while neglecting to capture the process in its entirety” (Millar & Doherty, 2016, p. 366).</p> <p>“Capacity building is a complex notion - it involves individual and organizational learning, is inevitably long term, and should be demand driven. If successful it contributes to sustainable social and economic development” (DFID, 2010, p. 3).</p> <p>“Capacity building is a concept that encompasses a broad range of activities that are aimed at increasing the ability of citizens and their governments to produce more responsive and efficient public goods and services. At its core, capacity building is concerned with the selection and development of institutional arrangements; both political and administrative” (Hawkins, 1980, cited by Honadle, 1986, p. 11).</p>	<p>The definitions confirm that both HRD and capacity represent broad and complex concepts which are relatively difficult to define.</p>

<p>“HRD could be described as the accumulation of human capital and its effective investment in the development of an economy” (Harbison and Myers 1964, p. 2),</p>	<p>“The creation, expansion or upgrading of a stock of required qualities and features called capabilities that could be continually drawn upon over time ... The focus of capacity building therefore tends to be on improving the stock rather than managing whatever is available ... capacity building may go beyond training to incorporate many other elements which may also overlap with institutional development” (Paul, 1995, p. 3).</p>	<p>Owing to their broad and complex nature, both HRD and capacity building draw on overlapping disciplinary areas.</p>
<p>“In economic terms, it [HRD] could be described as the accumulation of human capital and its effective investment in the development of the economy. In political terms, human resource development prepares people for adult participation in political processes, particularly as citizens in a democracy. From the social and cultural points of view, the development of human resources helps people to lead fuller and richer lives, less bound by tradition. In short, the processes of human resource development unlock the door to modernization.” (Harbison & Myers, 1964, p. 2, cited by Paprock, 2006)</p>	<p>“Capacity building consists of meeting a hierarchy of needs which all need to be considered in a logical order if investments in development are to pay off” (Potter & Brough, 2004, p. 336).</p>	<p>Listed below are a number of these areas which can be identified in definitions of both HRD and capacity building.</p>
<p>“HRD relies on three core theories: psychological theory, economic theory and systems theory” (Swanson, 1999, pp. 2-3).</p>	<p>“One of the main priorities within capacity building is the enhancement of human and social capabilities through better health and education” (United Nations, 2002, p. i).</p>	<p>Economic Theory Human Capital Investment Theory Systems theory</p>
<p>“A process of developing and/or unleashing human expertise through organization development and personnel training and development for the purpose of improving performance” (Swanson, 1995, p. 208).</p>	<p>“Capacity-building efforts have also shifted toward the development of broader-based social capital” (Shaffer, 2006, p. 645).</p>	<p>Social Capital</p>
<p>“Organized learning experiences provided by employers within a specific period of time to bring about the possibility of performance improvement and or personal growth” (Nadler & Nadler, 1989, p. 6).</p>	<p>“Retaining and strengthening existing capacities of people and organizations to perform their tasks.” (Enemark and Williamson 2004, p. 640)</p>	<p>Development and performance are central concepts to both HRD and Capacity Building.</p>
<p>“The integrated use of training and development, organization development, and career development to improve individual, group, and organizational effectiveness” (McLagan 1989, p. 7).</p>	<p>“Capacity-building encompasses the country’s human, scientific, technological, organizational, institutional and resource capabilities. A fundamental goal of capacity-building is to enhance the ability to evaluate and address the crucial questions related to policy choices and modes of implementation among development options, based on an understanding of environment potentials and limits and of needs perceived by the people of the country concerned. As a result, the need to strengthen national capacities is shared by all countries (United Nations, 1992, p. 1).</p>	
<p>“Human resource development is a mechanism in shaping individual and group values and beliefs and skilling through learning-related activities to support the desired performance of the host system” (Wang et al., 2017, p. 1175).</p>	<p>“Capacity-building is a long-term, continuing process, in which all stakeholders participate (ministries, local authorities, non-governmental organizations and water user groups, professional associations, academics and others)” (United Nations, 2006, p. 7).</p>	
	<p>“... any kind of action or progress which improves [the organization’s] abilities to perform activities or functions” (Cairns et al., 2005, p. 872).</p>	

<p>“...the process of increasing the knowledge, the skills, and the capacities of all the people in a society” (Harbinson & Myers, 1964).</p>	<p>“The approaches, strategies, and methodologies used by developing country, and or external stakeholders, to improve performance at the individual, organizational, network/sector or broader system level” (Bolger, 2000, p.2)</p>	<p>Owing to their broad and complex nature, both HRD and capacity building have various levels of analysis which feature in their definitions. These levels are listed below.</p>
<p>“HRD is responsive to a distinct set of need at the individual, organizational, and community societal levels, with outcomes different and unique to each level” (Graven & David, 2004).</p>	<p>“It is generally accepted that capacity building as a concept is closely related to education, training and HRD. However, this conventional concept has changed over recent years towards a broader and more holistic view, covering both institutional and country specific initiatives” (Enemark & Williamson, 2004, p. 639).</p>	<p>Individual;</p>
<p>“Processes of organized capability and competence-based learning experiences undertaken within a specified period of time to bring about individual and organizational growth and performance improvement, and to enhance national, economic, cultural, and social development” (Lynham & Cunningham 2004, p. 319).</p>	<p>“Capacity building is a process whereby individuals, groups, and organizations enhance their abilities to mobilize and use resources in order to achieve their objectives on a sustainable basis. Efforts to strengthen abilities of individuals, groups, and organizations can comprise a combination of (i) human skills development; (ii) changes in organizations and networks; and (iii) changes in governance/ institutional context” (ADB, 2004, cited by DFID, 2008, p. 3)</p>	<p>Organizational;</p>
<p>“The development and unleashing of human expertise for multiple learning and performance purposes, individual, family, community, organization, nation, region and globe (Lynham & Cunningham, 2006, p. 126).</p>	<p>“Capacity building should be aimed at three levels:</p>	<p>Institutional;</p>
<p>“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” (McLean & McLean, 2001, p. 322).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - sectoral level: provision of an enabling environment for effective sector and sub-sector management; - institutional level: development of planning and management processes so that the collective skills of the staff can be effectively used in the achievement of the institution’s objectives; - individual level: comprehensive human resources development strategies and programmes to enhance skills of individuals in accordance with institutional needs” (UNDP, 1991, p. 20). 	<p>National.</p>
	<p>“Complex learning, adaptation and change at the individual, group, organizational and even societal levels” (Morgan, 1997, p. 4).</p>	

Table 1: Exemplar Definitions and Descriptions of HRD and Capacity Building

Nevertheless, despite these areas of commonality, the review of definitions and descriptions of capacity building and HRD does reveal different emphases in terms of content. Notably, capacity building appears to differ from HRD in terms of the foci which is placed on ‘sustainability’ issues in capacity building literature. For example, Newlands (1981) argues that investment in capacity building measures provides the necessary foundations for sustainability efforts. Capacity building is concerned with sustainability, and often takes a macro approach that emphasizes the linkage between development activities and broader capacity needs in society. Capacity building is: “characterized by participation through partnerships, aiming to transform individuals from passive recipients of services to active participants in a process of community change” (Crisp et

al., 2000, p. 103). Capacity building involves partnerships and collaborations aimed at raising common understandings of practices, culture, and social dynamics to enable stakeholders to engage in diverse learning and, ultimately, to change behaviour at the individual, organizational and societal levels (Angeles and Gurstein 2000; Burkey 1993; Fals 1988; Fukuyama 1995; Hawe 1998). In contrast to mainstream HRD literature, the heavy emphasis which capacity building places on communities and partnerships is exemplified by the following quotes:

Like the changing ecosystem, capacity building is neither a one-time fix nor a permanent solution. As community needs and environments change over time, the need to revisit and redefine the question ‘capacity for what?’ becomes a dynamic force. If done well, this repeated cycle promotes a healthy community environment in which to address current needs and prepare for future generations (Vita & Fleming, 2001, p. 26).

Capacity building can be characterized as the approach to community development that raises people’s knowledge, awareness and skills to use their own capacity and that from available support systems, to resolve the more underlying causes of maldevelopment; capacity building helps them better understand the decision making process; to communicate more effectively at different levels; and to take decisions, eventually instilling in them a sense of confidence to manage their own destinies (Schuftan, 1996, p. 261).

Hence, capacity building is a broad concept, which overlaps with and includes human resource development and various management issues and trends such as strategic management, change management, quality management, organizational re-engineering, knowledge management, information management, etc. The relationships between the “parts-to-be-improved” and the “whole” within a country and international frameworks are often lost. Capacity development is an attempt to see that “whole” (Milèn, 2001, p. 5).

These types of approaches call for capacity building to be seen as an overarching perspective which is designed to provide sustainable development. Thus, while a holistic approach is reflected in both HRD and capacity building definitions, capacity building tends to differ from HRD in terms of the focus which is placed on the creation of a sustainable ecosystem involving intangibles such as environment, community, culture and values. This is not intended to suggest that capacity building should be prioritized as a higher order activity in relation to HRD, nor that HRD theory and practice is solely focused on short-term tangible outcomes; nevertheless, literature suggests that effective capacity building is contingent upon tangible HRD activities that, in some cases, can have both immediate and long terms effects.

By comparing HRD and capacity building literature, it can be seen that HRD and capacity building activities both aim to impact development and performance, but they tend to differ in the nature of their activities. For example, activities involving organizational learning, management development, talent management, mentoring, and organization development are fairly integral to HRD (for example, see Metcalfe & Rees, 2007). In contrast, capacity building activities are likely to fall into a relatively wide array of areas such as governance, resource-generation, accountability; partnership development, community liaison, advocacy, technical guidelines, accreditations; infrastructure development, risk management, marketing, and project management (for example, see McNamara, 2005). The existence of these relatively intangible activities within mainstream capacity building theory and practice can be seen as complementing international development frameworks which tend to be central to capacity building initiatives.

Conclusion

The study found that definitional problems surround the terms HRD and capacity building; various researchers have explored the precise meanings of both terms without achieving a consensus. Nevertheless, in comparing and contrasting these terms, our review has identified that performance and development represent points of intersection as they are relatively central aspects of both HRD and capacity building theory and practice. Further, to a greater and lesser extent, both HRD and capacity building involve activities designed to address performance and development issues at individual, organizational, institutional, and national levels.

Another of the main conclusions of our study, however, is that despite potential intersection points, HRD and capacity should not be portrayed as synonymous terms as they imply and arguably reflect different emphases. For example, capacity building literature tends to place a strong emphasis on sustainable development particularly in relation to local communities as opposed to the relatively heavy emphasis which is placed on employees in organizational settings in HRD theory and practice. As such, issues such as governance, advocacy, and accountability tend to feature far more prominently in capacity building than in HRD theory and practice in which organizational learning, management development, talent management, and organization development feature more prominently. This leads us to the conclusion that HRD needs to be embedded in capacity building in order to promote sustainability at the individual, organizational and national levels.

Finally, in highlighting the tendency for literature on HRD and capacity building to reside in discrete disciplinary silos, the findings reveal that there is huge potential for researchers to engage in information exchange and collaborations in order to enrich both HRD and capacity building theory and practice. For example, our study has highlighted the potential for research on capacity building to inform HRD theory and practice and also for research on HRD to inform capacity building theory and practice. In order to consider further the practical applications and wider implications of this study, the authors conducted a second phase of the research which was focused on HRD and capacity building in a specific non-Western international context. This second phase of the research is focused upon HRD and capacity building in Bahrain; it is reported in a future issue of this *Journal*.

Bibliography

- Angeles, L., & Gurstein P. (2000). Planning for Participatory Capacity Development: The challenges of Participation and North South Partnership in Capacity Building Projects, *Revue Canadienne d'études du Développement*, Vol. 21(1), 447.
- Ballantyne, P. (2000). *Setting the scene – Capacity Building in International Cooperation*. Introductory notes for Strengthening Information and Knowledge Management Capacities through International Cooperation Conference, 29–31 March 2000. Maastricht, the Netherlands: ECPDM.
- Bolger, J. (2000). Capacity Development: Why, What and How, *Capacity Development/Occasional Paper Series 1* (1), Hull, Quebec: CIDA, Policy Branch,
- Bossuyt, J. (1994). *Capacity Development: How can Donors do it Better?* Policy Management Brief No. 5. Maastricht, The Netherlands: ECDPM.
- Burkey, S. (1993). *People First: A Guide to Self-reliant, Participatory Rural Development*, London: Zed Books.

- Cairns, B., Harris, M., & Young, P. (2005). Building the Capacity of the Voluntary Nonprofit Sector: Challenges of Theory and Practice, *International Journal of Public Administration*, 28, 869–85.
- Cho, E., & McLean, G. N. (2004). What we Discovered about NHRD and what it Means for HRD, *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 6(3), 382–93.
- Crisp, B. R., Swerissen, H., & Duckett, S. J. (2000). Four Approaches to Capacity Building in Health: Consequences for Measurement and Accountability, *Health Promotion International*, 15(2), 99-107.
- de Graaf, M. (1986). Catching Fish or Liberating Man: Social Development in Zimbabwe, *Journal of Social Development in Africa*, 1, 7–26.
- DFID (2008). *Working Paper Series: Capacity Building*, London: DFID. Available online at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/57a08b8ee5274a31e0000c0a/ResearchStrategyWorkingPaperfinal_capacity_P1.pdf [Accessed 25th June 2018]
- DFID (2010). *Capacity Building in Research*. London: DFID. Available online at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/187568/HTN_Capacity_Building_Final_21_06_10.pdf [Accessed 22nd June 2018]
- Enemark, S., & Williamson, I. (2004). Capacity Building in Land Administration A conceptual approach, *Survey Review*, 37(294), 639-650.
- Fals, B. (1988). *Knowledge and People's Power: Lesson with Peasants in Nicaragua, Mexico and Colombia*. New Delhi: Indian Social Institute
- Franks, T. (1999). Capacity Building and Institutional Development: Reflections on Water, *Public Administration and Development*, 19(1), 51.
- Fukuyama, F. (1995). *Trust: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity*, New York: Free Press.
- Garavan, T. N., McGuire, D., & O'Donnell, D. (2004). Exploring Human Resource Development: A Levels of Analysis Approach False, *Human Resource Development Review*, 3(4), 417-441.
- Grindle, M. S., & Hilderbrand, M. (1995). Building Sustainable Capacity in the Public Sector: What can be Done?, *Public Administration and Development*, 15(5), 441- 463.
- Hamlin, B., & Stewart, J. (2011). What is HRD? A Definitional Review and Synthesis of the HRD Domain, *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 35(3), 199-220.
- Harbison, F., & Myers, C. A. (1964). *Education, Manpower, and Economic Growth: Strategies of Human Resource Development*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hawe, P. (1998). Working Invisibly: Health Workers Talk about Capacity Building in Health Promotion, *Health Promotion International*, 13(4), 285-295.
- Honadle, B. W. (1986). Defining and Doing Capacity Building: Perspectives and Experiences. In B. W. Honadle & A. M. Howitt (eds.) *Perspectives on Management Capacity Building*, New York: State University of New York Press, pp. 9-23.
- Ika, L., & Donnelly, J. (2017). Success Conditions for International Development Capacity Building Projects, *International Journal of Project Management*, 35(1), 44–63
- Land T. (1999). *Conceptual and Operational issues*. Overview paper for the joint DAC Informal Network/ACBF Workshop on Institutional and Capacity Development, Harare, October 1999. Maastricht, The Netherlands: ECDPM.
- Larbi, G. A. (1998). Institutional Constraints and Capacity Issues in Decentralizing Management in Public Services: The Case of Health in Ghana, *Journal of International Development*, 10(3), 377-386.
- Lavergne, R., & Saxby, J. (2001). *Capacity Development: Vision and Implications*, Capacity Development, Occasional Series, Quebec: CIDA
- Lynham, S. A., & Cunningham, P. W. (2004). Human Resource Development: The South African Case, *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 6(3) 315-325
- Lynham, S. A., & Cunningham, P. W. (2006). National Human Resource Development in Transitioning Societies in the Developing World: Concepts and Challenges, *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 8(1) 116-135.
- McLagan, P. (1989). *The Models: Models for HRD Practice*, Alexandria: VA: American Society for Training and Development.
- McLean, G. N., Kuo, M., Budhwani, N., Yamnill, S., & Virakul, B. (2012). Capacity building for societal development: Case studies in human resource development, *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 14(3) 251-263

- McLean, G., & McLean, L. (2001). If we Can't Define HRD in One Country, how can we Define it in an International Context? *Human Resource Development International*, 4(3), 313–26.
- McNamara, C. (2005). *Field Guide to Consulting and Organizational Development With Nonprofits: A Collaborative and Systems Approach to Performance, Change and Learning*, Minneapolis, Minnesota: Authenticity Consulting, LLC
- Metcalf, B. D., & Rees, C. J. (2007). Theorizing Advances in International Human Resource Development, *Human Resource Development International*, 8(4), 449-465
- Milèn, A. (2001). *What do we Know about Capacity Building? An Overview of Existing Knowledge and Good Practice*. Geneva: World Health Organization. Available online from: <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/19c9/41415fc95b07231500697e478136db088203.pdf> [Accessed 24th April 2018]
- Millar, P., & Doherty, A. (2016). Capacity Building in Non-profit Sports Organizations: Development of a Process Model, *Sports Management Review*, 19(4) 365-377
- Morgan, P. (1997). *The Design and Use of Capacity Development Indicators*, Ottawa: Canadian International Development Agency
- Morgan, P. (2006). *The Concept of Capacity*, Netherlands: European Centre for Development Policy and Management.
- Nadler, L., & Nadler, Z. (1989). *Developing Human Resources: Concepts and a Model*, 3rd edn. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Newlands, C. A. (1981). Local government Capacity Building, *Urban Affairs Papers*, 3, 4-5.
- Pallangyo, W. & Rees, C. J. (2010). Local Government Reform Programmes and Human Resource Capacity Building in Africa: Evidence from LGAs in Tanzania. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 33(12/13) 728-739.
- Paprock, K. E. (2006). National Human Resource Development in Transitioning Societies in the Developing World: Introductory Overview, *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 8(1) 12-27.
- Paul, S. (1995). *Capacity Building for Health Sector Reform*. Discussion paper No. 5. Geneva: World Health Organization, Forum on Health Sector Reform.
- Potter, C., & Brough, R. (2004). Systemic Capacity Building: A Hierarchy of Needs, *Health Policy and Planning*, 19(5), 336–345
- Schacter M. (2000). *Capacity Building: A New Way of Doing Business for Development Assistance Organizations*, Ottawa: Institute of Governance.
- Schuftan, C. (1996), The Community Development Dilemma: What is Really Empowering? *Community Development Journal*, 31, 260–264.
- Shaffer, G. (2006). Can WTO Technical Assistance and Capacity Building Serve Developing Countries?, *Wisconsin International Law Journal*, 23, 643-686.
- Stewart, R. (2015). A Theory of Change for Capacity Building for the Use of Research Evidence by Decision Makers in Southern Africa, *Evidence and Policy*, 11(4), 547-557
- Swanson, R. A. (1995). Human Resource Development: Performance is the Key, *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 6(2), 207-213.
- Swanson, R. A. (1999). The Foundations of Performance Improvement and Implications for Practice, *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 1, 1-25.
- United Nations (1992). *Agenda 21: National Mechanisms & International Cooperation for Capacity-Building in Developing Countries*. Geneva: United Nations. Available online at: https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/dsd/agenda21/res_agenda21_37.shtml [Accessed 12th April 2018]
- United Nations (2002), *Capacity Building in Africa: Effective Aid and Human Capital*. New York: United Nations.
- United Nations (2006). *Compendium of Basic Terminology in Governance and Public Administration: Definition of Basic Concepts and Terminologies in Governance and Public Administration*. Geneva: United Nations Economic and Social Council. Available online at: <http://unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/un/unpan022332.pdf> [Accessed 25th June 2018]
- UNDP (1991). *A Strategy for Water Sector Capacity Building*. Proceedings of the UNDP Symposium, Delft, 3-5 June, 1991. Geneva: United Nations. Available online at: <https://www.ircwash.org/sites/default/files/202.2-91ST-9224.pdf> [Accessed 25th June 2018]

- UNDP (1998). *Capacity Assessment and Development in a Systems and Strategic Management Context*. Technical Advisory Paper No.3. Geneva: United Nations. Available online at: <https://www.cbd.int/doc/pa/tools/Capacity%20assessment%20and%20development.pdf> [Accessed 14th April 2018]
- Venner, M. (2015). The Concept of ‘Capacity’ in Development Assistance: New Paradigm or More of the Same?, *Global Change, Peace & Security*, 27(1), 85-96.
- Vita, C. J., & Fleming, C. (2001). *Building Capacity in Nonprofit Organizations*, Washington D.C.: Urban Institute Publications.
- Walton, J. (1999). *Strategic Human Resource Development*, Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
- Wang, G. C., Werner, J. M., Sun, J. Y., Gilley, A., & Gilley, J. W. (2017). Means vs Ends: Theorizing a Definition of Human Resource Development, *Personnel Review*, 46(6), 1165-1181.
- Weidner, H., & Janicke M (2002). *Capacity Building in National Environmental Policy: A Comparative study of 17 countries*, Springer: New York.
- Weinberger, L. A. (1998). Commonly Held Theories of Human Resource Development, *Human Resource Development International*, 1(1), 75-93.

The Authors

Dr. La’aleh Al-Aali is an Assistant Professor in the Business Administration Systems (BAS) programme in the Arab Open University (AOU), Bahrain. Apart from teaching, she is the branch course coordinator for the Level 3 modules within the programme and holds the overall BAS program coordination and management. Before joining the academic field in 2014, she was a HR professional for ten years in the areas of learning, development, and organizational change management within the Telecom, Petroleum and FMCG sector in Bahrain. She is an external verifier for CIPD Level 5 and Level 7 for the Bahrain Institute of Banking and Finance and supervises Master level dissertations for the distance programme of HRM in the University of Manchester.

Dr. Chris Rees is a Senior Lecturer in Human Resources and Organisational Change at the Global Development Institute (GDI), University of Manchester, UK. He is a Chartered Psychologist and a Chartered Fellow of the CIPD. Prior to commencing full-time academic work, he held senior positions in the public and financial services sectors in the UK. Chris has published widely in a range of international journals including the *Journal of Business Ethics*, the *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *Human Resource Development International* and the *Journal of Organisational Change Management*.