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INTRODUCTION

The Company Feedback Report you received summarizes data from The University of Michigan Human Resource Competency Study. This global research project has been designed with three primary objectives: [1] To identify what competencies HR professionals must possess individually, and HR professionals throughout the world must acquire to be more effective; [2] To identify the business environments and organizational structures in which HR professionals work at your business, in your region, and in the world; and [3] To identify what HR contributes to your business, as it relates to what distinctive capabilities are vital to your business gaining and sustaining its competitive position.

Your Company Feedback Report shows how your company’s participants and associates answered questions on the survey about your company’s HR professionals, the HR profession, and the business that you serve. The intent of the Feedback Report is to offer you a chance to see how respondents perceive the HR professionals and the HR function of your company, and to compare this information to the responses from others in your company and from other survey respondents from within your region and from around the world. All information in this database is absolutely confidential. Although we will list the companies that have participated in the study, we will not identify specific responses from a particular company.

Theory and Rational for the Study

This research builds on two assumptions: First, human resources are a source of competitive advantage (defined as customer value and uniqueness). Human resource practices within a business create sustained competitive advantage for three reasons.

[a] HR practices enable firms to implement strategies. In different firms unique contributions necessitate different HR practices to facilitate designing and executing a strategy that will help the firm compete and gain competitive position within its industry. For example, a business that is unique because of its distinct low cost will require different human resource practices than a firm that excels in product differentiation.

[b] HR practices enable firms to increase their ability to adapt and lead the way to new business realities. We assume that the pressures for change -- e.g., globalization, technology, product life cycles,

---

1 Throughout this Interpretation of the Company Feedback Report, we draw extensively on theory and research in strategy, human resources, and organization theory. We have included selected references for further reading in some sections.
We also assume that HR practices may be modified to help individuals and organizations respond positively to change and to overcome potential resistance to new business realities. We feel that the requirement to adapt to new business realities more quickly will continue to be of increasing importance to organizations.

[c] HR practices can create a focus, or strategic unity of mindset that is related to the organization’s distinct capabilities, within the business. When individuals in a business have a common direction and focus, they are more likely to accomplish the organization’s mission. HR practices can be used to create a shared mindset and ensure that the mindset of the organization is in line with what the organization does that makes it successful. HR also can help focus the organization on things that will be needed in the future. These three cases demonstrate that HR practices can lead to competitive advantage, a requirement for the modern business environment.

Second, we assume that to use HR practices as a competitive advantage and to manage the paradoxes of HR, HR professionals need to be business players. Based on our working with hundreds of human resource professionals, we in the past identified five sets of competencies we hypothesized as central to the HR player role: knowledge of the business, the ability to deliver HR practices, the ability to manage the process of change, the ability to manage culture, and personal credibility. These five sets of competencies have been central to our HR competency work for the past five years. In this study, we built on our previous research that utilized these domains by finding out how the individual competency items within these five domain categories related to each other through factor analysis. We took this additional step in creating our new competency domains. By applying factor analysis, we ensure that our model’s domains are defined and focused in such a way as to maximize their ability to help your company’s HR professionals develop the competencies that are required to add the greatest value to your business. The result of our research is a new competency model for a new century that builds off our extensive research from the last century.

These two assumptions formed the foundation for our research. This model is both comprehensive and elegant. It is comprehensive in the sense that we analyze issues related to both the strategic and operational significance of the HR professional and the HR function. It is elegant because we analyze what HR players contribute to the distinct capabilities of the firm, the context, and through what channels HR makes those contributions.

We further assume that HR professionals add value and are involved in agendas and activities that make a difference to the organization. HR professionals should strive...
to become central players in defining the direction of the business and in leveraging human competencies and organizational capabilities to achieve success.

We have identified five key roles HR players must master to become contributors to their business’ competitiveness. We developed these five roles through extensive work with HR professionals. This report includes a study of our model of five roles that show what HR players should do to contribute to the organization:

[1] **Coach Business Leaders**: Coaches play a role in situations where participants must learn, adapt, and act in an ever improving way. Coaches set expectations for leadership behavior, provide accurate and candid feedback; they follow up and reinforce personal change.

[2] **Organizational Architect**: Architects for an organization understand the external drivers of the business, create blueprints for organizational change, and work with managers to articulate the desired organization.

[3] **Design HR Systems**: Designers of HR systems must know best practices in HR systems, they must create a menu of choices for HR, and they must prioritize HR investments for results.

[4] **Facilitate Change**: HR player’s facilitating role includes the ability to frame complex trends in simplified and useable ways, the ability to perform organizational diagnoses and audits, the ability to facilitate teams, the ability to set the direction of change, and the ability to manage the process of change.

[5] **Leads Function**: As a leader, HR players set a good example of how to manage; they ensure that HR is a cultural role model for the organization, and they build the capability of the HR department to add greater value.

In addition to these five roles of HR that are the keys to becoming a HR player in your business, we have focused on content of the contribution that HR can make to your organization’s capability. This is a way of assessing the distinct capabilities of your business.

We have also measured the channels through which HR delivers its services. This can provide additional benefits to you because it allows you to compare how HR in your company delivers its services, compared to other organizations. It also allows you to ensure that your HR delivery channels are in line with the culture you are directing your business to have. These three measures (HR contribution, organizational capability-- i.e.
content, and HR channels) will help you determine which of the competency areas your HR associates and you should focus on to maximize your contribution as a player in your business.

As we review the sections in your Company Feedback Report, we will offer some references for books and articles that further support the results of this study. We hope the logic of this research makes sense; we think this logic is important in creating a readiness for movement of the HR profession.

Data Sample

In this study, we collected data from over 200 companies from around the globe. The list of firms that participated in the project is at the end of this report. About 1,100 HR professionals participated in this round of our survey and were identified as "participants." Each of these 1,100 participants received a packet of surveys, one for the participant and several for their associates (supervisors, peers, clients, subordinates). We have received over 7,000 completed surveys in this ongoing study that began in 1988.

Interpretation of Data

As you review this Interpretation of the Company Feedback Report (this document), we encourage you to have your Company Feedback Report (document with nine sections) in front of you. The data in the Company Feedback Report are summarized in these nine sections. We realize that this Company Feedback Report focuses on descriptive results.

In these reports, we show the key issues impacting HR competencies in 2002, as well as strategies and other contextual issues that may impact HR. Each of the sections report on a different aspect of the results of the survey. Some of the sections use the same basic layout to report the data; others are unique. To facilitate the variety of reporting methods used, each section will be described, along with a guide offering suggestions for how to interpret the meaning of the information, and how to apply it to yourself and your business.

---

Please note that we do not focus these results on "statistically significant" differences between your score and others in the study. While statistical significance may be useful in some cases, it is quite sensitive to sample size. With this large sample size, particularly for the global sample, every difference is statistically significant at the .05 level. We prefer to focus on meaningful comparisons for you as a human resource professional and the activities that you perform.

In interpreting the data presented in the Company Feedback Report, we encourage you not to under react or over react. Under reaction would be discounting and rationalizing data which may indicate areas where your company could improve. Under reaction may occur as you try to justify the scores which indicate a need for change. Over reaction would be making extensive changes in your company’s behavior and relationships based only on this data. We encourage you to seriously consider the data in your Company Feedback Report as an eye-opener on how others might perceive your company, as a confirmation of areas in which your participants already perceive themselves, and as a source of insight on areas you may want to improve.

In this report, we will review each of the nine sections in the Company Feedback Report. For each section, we will briefly discuss: [1] the theory and rationale for the section and its dimensions, [2] the measures we use for each dimensions, [3] the implications of the information provided in the section. For some sections, we will offer references for reading more about the issues raised in the section.

This report is geared to help offer suggestions and additional information in areas you may be particularly interested in as you look over the Company Feedback Report. It is not necessarily written to be read straight through. Hence, some of the information provided from section to section will be repetitive.
Section 1: Competency Executive Summary

Theory and Rationale

This section outlines our new competency model. It offers the average of how all your company’s participants were rated for their competency within each of the five new domains, and for all the competencies together (Company Participants’ Average). It also offers the average rating all of the associates made of the participants in your company (Company Associates’ Average), for all the companies in your region (Company’s Region Average), and for the entire global dataset (Entire Survey Average).

This section of our research breaks new ground. We have been able to identify few published research projects where HR competencies have been specified. We identified the individual competencies that make up this new competency model from extensive observation and interviews with over 400 human resource professionals, from reading management literature about leadership competencies, and from pilot studies in previous rounds of research where the preliminary list was tested and statistically analyzed. We hope that this present research creates a foundation for learning about competencies HR professionals can and should acquire to be HR business players. We should note that after initiating our project and working with the sponsors in over 100 firms, we found several firms that were engaging in competency studies of HR professionals, using our old competency model that formed the foundation for this new model.

This section also reports your company’s overall assessment resulting from how your company’s participants rated themselves (Company Participants’ Score), and how your company’s associates rated the participants (Company Associates’ Average). It is very straightforward conceptually. Your company’s participants and associates rated the percentile of how well your company’s participants HR work was perceived. In other words, if all HR professionals were rated, and placed in twenty groups ranging from the most to least competent, this measure is where your company’s participants and their associates think your company’s participants would place. We designed the survey with 20 percentile, knowing that the average of the overall sample would be quite high. We also reported the average rating of the participants overall competency rating in your company (Company Participants’ Average & Company Associates’ Average), in your region (Company’s Region Average), and as they were rated by both the participants and the associates. We also included the average overall competency rating of all of the participants in the global data set (Entire Survey Average).

We realize that no one measure of performance is ever sufficient to characterize the overall performance of employees. This is merely one question on one survey. However, your participants’ associates do form generalized conclusions about your company’s participant’s abilities. If your Company Participants’ Average row is lower
than your Company Associates Average row, you may want to review Sections 3 and 4 to identify specific competencies that may have contributed to these opinions.

**Measure**

The Competency Executive Summary section comes from the results of how the participants and the associates rated the competencies of the participant they were evaluating. The five competency domains were formed by lumping together all of the scores from the competency portion of the survey, with no regard for where they were placed in the original survey’s competency section. Then, all the individual competency question ratings were factored as a whole to find out how well the scores from individual questions related to the scores of other individual questions. Those questions that were the most related to other questions were grouped together. They grouped into five different areas of competencies that were statistically highly related to each other. The result of this factor analysis is the basis for the five categories of the revised competency model. After these five domains were formed, we studied what the individual competency items that were included in each domain had in common with each other.

The method used to report these measures is a basic bar graph. Each of the five domains of the new competency model has its own bar graph stating the company’s results. The overall competency score of your company is also reported in the same sort of bar graph. Four measures of the company’s competency scores within each of the five domains, and the Overall Competency Score are listed as follows: First, the Company Participants’ Average is recorded. This is a measure of the average score of all of the participants who responded to our survey from your company. Second, your Company’s Associate Average is recorded. This is the average rating of all of the associates reporting for your company’s participants in the respective domain. Third, the Company’s Region Average records the average score of all of the company’s within your region. This rating is based on both how the participants and the associates responded in rating your company’s participants. Five regions were originally designated: Africa, North America, Latin America, Asia, and Europe. Although Africa was originally included, but there were not enough responses from that region to allow detailed analysis of the African responses. Finally, the Entire Survey Average is reported. This score represents the global average rating for HR within the respective area of competencies.

The Overall Competency Score was developed by asking, “Overall, compared with other HR professionals you have known, how do you/does the participant compare?” This information is also divided in the bar graph for the Company Participants’ Average, the Company Associates’ Average (how your associates rated your company’s participants), the Company’s Region Average, and the Entire Survey Average.

**Implications**
The data in Section 1 can be useful and interpreted in many different ways. You can compare the participant’s averages (Company Participants’ Average) in the different competency domains to see in what areas your company’s HR professionals consider themselves effective. You can also compare the associates ratings of the competencies of the participants in your company (Company Associate Average). This would allow you to see how your company’s HR professionals are viewed by their associates, which could include internal customers, supervisors, HR colleagues, and the people who work under your company’s HR managers. It could be interesting and beneficial for you to compare the Company Associates’ Average row to the Company Participants’ Average row. This would give you an idea of the discrepancies between how the HR professionals view themselves, versus how they are perceived by those who work with them. This comparison could offer valuable insight into what areas your company needs to focus its training and development efforts for its HR staff.

Another comparison that might be useful is the comparison your company’s aggregated competency ratings (Company Participants’ Average & Company Associates’ Average) in the various domains to the regional (Company’s Region Average) and global (Entire Survey Average) averages within the competency domain. This comparison can help you benchmark how your company’s HR staff compares to other companies’ HR staffs, in terms of their skills, abilities, and knowledge of HR.

The overall competencies score is included in the research report because it may be of interest to you. You can see how your HR professionals rate overall on the competencies this survey considered. You can also see how your company rated compared to the other companies in your region and around the world. However, this global statistic has little practical applicable value because it is so general that it cannot be used to evaluate if your company’s HR staff has strengths in the areas that are important to your company’s distinct capabilities and your HR strategy. Do not consider a high relative score proof that your HR professionals are on track and doing well to help your company succeed. Also, do not consider a relatively low score proof that you HR professionals have major problems.

In interpreting this data, we recognize that the overall scores are very high. This maybe due to some response bias (people rating themselves high) and to each of the over 200 participating firms selecting above average employees to be in the database. We know, for example, that many of the firms selected senior HR professionals to participate in the study. We know that they would not be senior HR professionals if their work was not seen as far above average. As we do further analysis, we will examine this score by age, level in the organization, time on the job, and other demographic characteristics to provide a more accurate assessment of the competencies HR professionals possess and what would be expected of them.
Section 2: Associate and Location Descriptives

Theory and Rationale

This section offers information about the people whose responses make up the information upon which this survey is based. The demographic profile of the total sample is a strong indication of the validity of a survey in general. Demographics determine the extent to which the survey results might be applicable to a given individual, department, or business. Consideration of how to sample the population from which the sample is drawn had a huge impact on the design of this study. Because this study would be used for an international audience in a global economy, we strove to sample individuals from all over the world. One region, Africa, did not respond to our survey adequately to allow statistically valid generalizations about that region of the world. As a result, we dropped analysis of Africa. However, the African responses were included in the global dataset so that Africa’s responses could still be used as a part of the global comparison recorded in the Entire Survey Average throughout the Company Feedback Report.

Another aspect of the design of this survey that was motivated by demographic concerns was our use of associates and participants, instead of just participants. Using the associates of HR professionals helped ensure that we avoided problems of self-evaluation. It is hard to consider measures of our own qualities and strengths as being highly reliable. Also, by making the majority of respondents associates of HR professionals, we had a high percentage of non-HR respondents. This ensures that HR is being rated and viewed by people who are not in the HR field. We believe that this somewhat more objective perspective on HR offers more insight into how HR professionals are doing and how HR professionals are viewed than could be provided by self-evaluation.

Measures

To help you understand who composed your company’s response group, we offer two different gauges of who filled out surveys.

1) Participants/Respondent Numbers: This portion of Section 2 offers four measures. Number of Participants in Company represents the number of participants in our survey from your company. The Number of Respondents in Company presents the number of respondents, associate and participant, reporting from your company. The Number of Respondents in Company’s Region is the total participant and associate surveys we received from your region. The Number of Respondents in Entire Survey represents the total number of completed surveys we received.

2) Company’s Location: This reports the global region in which your company is located.
Implications

This information can be valuable to you in several ways. First and foremost, the number of the combined participant and associate respondents for the entire survey was 7,082. Generally, the more people sampled in a survey, the more valid the survey will be (as long as those being sampled are an unbiased sample of the total population in question). This represents one of the largest samples ever gathered for evaluating HR competencies. This is the biggest sample size for a single round of surveys in our ongoing study of HR competencies at the University of Michigan since our first study in 1988. We are reasonably confident that the statistics from this study represent the best source of information on HR competencies in existence.

You can also evaluate how large the sample group from your company is, compared to the global sample size. You can do this by looking to the Number of Respondents in Company, and comparing that to the Number of Respondents in Entire Survey. This information will give you some idea of how much your company influenced the total dataset.
Section 3: Competency Scores

Theory and Rationale

Section 3 reports on your participants’ perceived competencies. These tables identify specific competency areas which help human resource professionals perform their tasks. Competencies are the knowledge, skills, and abilities that an individual may possess. In order to make our five major competency domains more intelligible, we broke them down into sub-domains, or factors within the five main domains. To further clarify the individual competence items that go into these five domains, Section 4 will lay out each competence item that is included in the domain, and in the factors.

The development of the factors within the five main competence domains was done using the same statistical method as was used to develop the original five main domains. All the competency items in each of the five main domains were factored to find out which of the individual competencies within each domain were significantly statistically related to each other. Those individual competence items that were not found to be significantly related to the other items within the factor were dropped from the factor. (Our cutoff point was a factor score of less than .5, which is considered a standard cutoff point). The items that were grouped together from the factor analysis were then studied to find out what the common trait of these statistically tied competencies was. This study formed the basis of the names we gave the factors.

This section of our research again breaks new ground. To our knowledge, no other study of HR competencies is equal to this study due to our sample size, and our analytical techniques. By breaking down these five major competency domains into factors, we hope this model will be of value to you as it helps you benchmark where your company’s HR Professionals stand, and helps your company’s HR staff develop the qualities they need to be contributing players in your business. By offering this detailed information, we hope that this present research creates a foundation for learning about what competencies HR professionals can and should acquire.

Measures

Each of the five domains, and the factors are individually reported on in four different areas for the use of your company. These scores are reported in tables as opposed to graphs. These areas are:

1) Company Participants’ Average: The company participant score represents the average rating of your participants, as reported by all the participants in your company for the domains and factors.
2) **Company Associates’ Average**: The company associate score records the average rating of your participants, as reported by all of the reporting associates of the participants in your company for the domains and factors.

3) **Company’s Region Average**: The company region score records the average rating of all the participants and the associates ratings of the participants within the region your company is based in. This average score is given for each of the domains and factors.

4) **Entire Survey Average**: The overall dataset score gives the average rating of all of the world’s participants, as reported by the participants and associates, for each of the competence domains and factors.

   The factors of each of the five primary domains are as follows:

   **Domain 1: Strategic Contribution** contains four factors: Culture management, Strategic decision making, Fast change, and Infrastructure design.

   **Domain 2: Personal Credibility** contains three factors: Effective relationships, Gets results, and Personal communication.

   **Domain 3: HR Delivery** contains most of the traditional operational HR functions. It was divided into four factors: Development, Structure and HR measurement, Staffing, and Performance management.

   **Domain 4: Business Knowledge** contains three factors: (knowledge of the) Value chain, (ability to perform a) Value proposition, and (knowledge of) Labor.

   **Domain 5: HR Technology** is a fairly straightforward category. When we performed a factor analysis on the individual competency items within the domain, we found that the resulting factors were of no use in helping further comprehend the HR technology domain. So, we left the HR technology domain as one self-standing domain.

**Implications**

Section 3 will be one of the most important sections to your company as you try to apply the findings of this survey to improve your company’s HR professionals. There are many different ways you can apply the information contained in this section to your company. You can test what your company’s HR professionals are perceived to be doing well, or poorly. You could test this in many different ways. You may have noticed that your company’s participants were rated particularly low in one of the five main domains. You could find out more particulars about what areas, or factors of the domain your company’s participants were rated so poorly on. This would provide you further
insight into what specific competence areas your colleagues think they are considered weak in.

Let us illustrate by way of a hypothetical example: to your surprise, the HR professionals who were participants in this survey were generally rated very poorly on the Personal Credibility domain score by their associates (Company Associates Average). Your company’s participants in the survey rated themselves as having average personal credibility. You do not want to just tell your HR professionals they are not trusted. You need to know what specific competencies they are hurting in. You look in the factors of Personal Credibility portion of Section 3 and find that they are rated average in every factor but Personal communication. Now you understand what caused that low score. Recently, your HR department added kiosks throughout your organization to handle routine HR functions. This made it so there was much less day-to-day communication with many of the workers in your company. You also notice that this explains why your company did unusually well in the HR Technology domain. You can use this information to help your HR professionals know how they are viewed within the company, why, and what they need to do about it. If you wanted to learn more about what specific competencies in the Personal communication factor your participants were rated poorly on, you could refer to Section 4.
Section 4: Competency Item Scores

Theory and Rational

This year we developed a revised HR competency model. Because of the new domains and factors, we decided it would be best to offer an in depth, line item competency list of each domain and factor. For information on how these domains and factors were formed, refer to Section 1 and Section 3, respectively.

Measures

In this section we provide an in depth, line item competency list of the domain and factor in which every individual competency fits. It is composed of five individual sections, one for each of the five domains. In this section we offer the rating of your company’s participants as they rated themselves (Company Participants’ Average), as they were rated by their associates (Company Associates’ Average), as all the participants in your company’s region were rated by themselves and their associates on average (Company’s Region Average), and how all of the participants were rated in the global sample, on average (Entire Survey Average). We did not record the domain or factor scores, as those were listed in Sections 1 and 3.

Implications

Section 4 offers insights into a series of questions. The most obvious role of Section 4 is to offer you further insight into the composition of the competency models five domains and their respective factors. Another use of Section 4 is if your organization has been focusing on a particular competency, and you do not see where it fits in our model, simply scan the items within the domains till you find it.

Section 4 can also be useful in offering specific areas to improve your company’s HR professionals. For example, from Section 7 of this survey you determine exactly what your company does that makes it successful. You find that your HR department’s competencies do not help support this distinctive capability of your business. If you want your HR professionals to become players in your business, you realize you need to develop new competencies in your company’s HR professionals. The individual items in this section can be used as a tool for you to refocus your efforts. It can also be of value because it offers a way of benchmarking how your HR department is doing on the individual competency items that are most important to your business (Company Participants’ Average & Company Associates’ Average), compared to other HR professionals in your business’ region (Company’s Region Average), and in the world (Entire Survey Average).
Section 5: Focus On HR Practices

Theory and Rationale

The human resource practices within your business focus on operational and/or strategic levels. The operational level of HR is the day-to-day delivery of HR practices, policies, and procedures. The strategic level of HR focuses on linking human resource activities to long-term business success. We have come to acknowledge that both of these functional levels of HR can be important to the organization’s success. However, generally, as your company’s HR professionals strive to become players in your business, they will need to focus on the strategic HR issues. If they do not, their functions will likely be outsourced to vendors who can more efficiently handle day-to-day HR functions.

To help you benchmark your company’s HR focus against other companies in your region, and in other companies throughout the world, we offered several measures. First, we gave the Company Participants’ Average of your company’s focus. Second, we reported the Company Associates’ Average. Third, we reported the Company’s Region Average, and finally the Entire Survey Average, as it was measured by both the participants and the associates.

Measures

The results in Section 5 are measured straightforwardly. The section reflects the extent to which HR practices focus on the operational level and the strategic level. The survey question asked, “In your/the participant’s business, to what extent do human resource practices focus on the operational/strategic level?” The Company Participants’ Average represent the average measure of what they thought the focus of their company was. The Company Associates Average is what the associates thought the focus of the participant’s company was. The Company Region Average and the Entire Survey Average are both straightforward.

Implications

Section 5 offers a few insights. First, comparing your participants’ average score (Company Participants’ Average) verses their associates averages (Company Associates’ Average) indicates the extent to which they have a common view of the HR philosophies within your business. If the scores are close, this indicates that they share a similar view of what HR’s focus is within your business. Differences between their average scores indicate that they have different views of what HR’s focus is within your business. Such differences in Section 5 may explain other differences that exist in the survey. If these philosophical differences are large, you may consider further discussion with your
company’s participants and associates to understand whether your business truly is focused strategically or operationally.

Comparing the Company Participants’ Average and Company Participants’ Average score versus the Company’s Regional Average and the Entire Survey Average tells you if the focus of HR practices within your business differ from those of other companies in your region, and throughout the world.
Section 6: Human Resource Contribution

Theory and Rationale

Section 6 is a measure of the effectiveness of the HR function within the participants’ business. The effectiveness of the HR function is measured in five main roles. We used these five roles to identify how effective the contribution of the HR function in your business was because these are the five roles that HR professionals must master to become effective HR players in their business. As was stated earlier, the five roles HR should master are coach, architect, design, facilitate, and lead. If you do not understand exactly what these five roles encompass, look at the line items we used to measure them, as reported in the Measures portion of the this section. Within these five roles, we have measured specific ways HR should contribute to the company that are the ingredients that go into filling the role.

The key reason for our focus on these roles is the fact that in our extensive dealings with hundreds of HR professionals, we have found that if HR is going to continue to increase their contribution to the organization, it will be necessary for them to go beyond becoming strategic business partners in their organizations. It will become necessary for them to be players. We focus on the player role based on a sports analogy. Players on a team are in the game, they are not observers of the game that offer helpful suggestions and plans to the team. Instead, players are out on the field, sweating, helping the team to score. Just as sports players help add value to their team, HR players must add real, measurable value to the company. They must contribute. They must be engaged in activities that increase the company’s focus. They must deliver value that shareholders in the company can recognize. They must help the company compete.

By measuring the five roles HR must master to become HR players, we benchmark the effectiveness of HR contribution in all the companies of our global sample (Entire Survey Average), in different regions of the world (Company’s Region Average), and in your company, as perceived by the participants (Company Participants’ Average), and the participants’ associates (Company Associate Average).

Measures

For each of the five roles, the individual items we determined to measure the companies HR contribution within each of the five roles are individually reported on in four different areas, for the use of your company. These areas are:

1) Company Participants’ Average: The company participant score represents the average rating of your participants, as reported by all the participants in your company for the domains and factors.
2) **Company Associates’ Average**: The company associate score records the average rating of your participants, as reported by all of the reporting associates of the participants in your company for the domains and factors.

3) **Company’s Region Average**: The company region score records the average rating of all the participants and the associates ratings of the participants within the region your company is based in. This average score is given for each of the domains and factors.

4) **Entire Survey Average**: The overall dataset score gives the average rating of all of the world’s participants, as reported by the participants and associates, for each of the competence domains and factors.

   The individual measures of each of the five roles will now be reported.

*Coach business leaders*: The coach role was measured by three items. The ability your HR function has to: (1) set expectations for leadership behaviors, (2) provide accurate and candid feedback, and (3) follow up and reinforce personal change (in those business leaders the HR professionals are coaching).

*Architect organization*: The architect role was measured by three items: (1) How well the HR professionals understand the external drivers of the business. (2) How well the HR professionals could create a blueprint for organizational change. (3) How well the organization’s HR professionals work with the manager to articulate the desired organization (what the organization should be).

*Design HR systems*: The design role of HR was measured by three items: (1) How well do the HR professionals know best practices in HR systems. (2) How well does your HR function provide a menu of choices for HR (functions and strategies HR could perform to contribute to the organization’s mission). (3) How well does HR prioritize HR investments for results.

*Facilitate change*: The facilitate role was measured by five different items—How well does your HR function: (1) frame complex trends in simplified and usable ways. (2) perform organizational diagnosis and audits, (3) facilitate teams, (4) manage the process of change, and (5) set the direction of change.

*Leads function*: The lead role of the companies’ HR function was measured by three different items. Does the HR function: (1) set a good example of how to manage (are they advocating one technique, and practicing another?), (2) ensure that HR is a cultural role model for the rest of the organization, and (3) build the capability of the HR department to add greater value.
Implications:

The human resource function is going through a period of great change. The pace of change is not likely to diminish in the business environment. As competition increases, the life span of products value decreases, and government regulations become more prevalent, it will continue to become more and more important that every expense of the organization is related to measurable benefits for the organization. This means that HR professionals need to set up their efforts to contribute real value to organizations in a way that is clearly measurable. If your company’s HR department does not step up, it may be the next thing the company outsources to save costs.

This section offers measures of how your company’s HR professionals measure up to meet the challenge of contributing real, measurable value to the organization as HR players. Use these scores to benchmark how well your company’s HR department is doing in these roles. One important measure is the associates’ measure of how HR is performing these five roles (Company Associates’ Average). Look for what areas the HR department scores lowest in out of these five roles. Assess why this role will be important as the HR department strives to contribute to the firm’s performance. Then, figure out a strategy to build your company’s HR function’s capability to perform in that role. It will also be useful to compare how your HR participants rated their company’s HR roles (Company Participants’ Average) with how their associates rated the company’s proficiency in the HR roles (Company Associates’ average). This will offer clear insight into the roles your HR professionals do not perceive the HR function to contribute to the business as their associates perceive. Such discrepancies could be important to address. While it is interesting to measure how your HR department compared to other HR departments in your region and throughout the world, don’t forget that how well you compare to other organizations’ HR departments does not help the company. The CEO could have the best HR department in the world, but if s/he cannot see how the HR function is adding value to the business, bye-bye HR.

As you work to build HR’s contribution to your business, keep in mind the content of your organization’s capability. This could be key in knowing which roles are most important for your HR department to develop. To help clarify what our organization’s distinct capabilities are, refer to Section 7.
Section 7: Content

Theory and Rationale

The content of HR should be directly linked to an organization’s capability. The organizational capabilities of your organization are those distinct capabilities that your organization offers which make it successful. The Content of HR is the creation and maintenance of the organizational capability that the organization needs to have to be competitive.

Understanding the content of the organizational capability of your company gives you a tool to guide your strategy for how your company should adapt to change. For example, early in the twentieth century, the player piano business was drying up. One company realized their organizational capability was their unique method of encoding information. They used that technology to move into a mechanical numeric information storage business. This move kept that company alive until computers and calculators offered better ways of storing information. Instead of re-evaluating the content of the company’s organizational capability again, they slowly went out of business. They should have recognized that the excellent network that had been built up for sales could be applied to selling a new product. Today, a technology’s market time is often measured in months instead of years. Understanding your organizations’ distinct capabilities can be the key to survival. HR’s content needs to be in line with developing and maintaining the organization’s capabilities that make it able to compete.

Understanding a firm’s organizational capability can also be central to personnel efforts. What skills should your company develop in its employees to capitalize on the special capability it has? What skills does your organization need to continue to develop? Knowing your company’s organizational capabilities can help you know the content of what HR offers your organization to reorganize the structure of the company in a manner that will build the key capability of your business. For example, if you run a toy company that has three main components: product development, product manufacture, and product sales, you may find that your company’s organizational capability lies in the talent and innovation portions of Section 7 (Content). You realize that these capabilities that are so vital to your organization are primarily held by the four goofs who develop your new toys in the back of the manufacturing warehouse. Unfortunately, all four of these people complain they have no way of knowing what kids want. You then recognize that you could further capitalize on their talent and innovation if you gave them the resources they need to succeed. As a result, you help put your product development specialists in contact with the sales force who know what kids are buying at the toy stores, and you create an after school child care program for the employees of your company that allows the four product development specialists to have an audience to try out their new ideas on. HR’s content, or what they contributed resulted in supplying the resources needed to develop your company’s organizational capability. As a result, your
organization experiences substantial growth. Value that could be measured by stakeholders in your organization was added by HR’s content.

In the past, most of the research that was performed in organizational capability was geared for the management audience. Now, as HR professionals have moved into a new role as strategic business partners, and continue to strive to move forward as they become HR players, it is vital that you understand how HR’s content contributes to your organization’s capability. To help you determine this, we have provided this section on content. We developed a list of 14 key distinct capabilities organizations may offer.

**Measures**

In this section the data was developed by asking the respondents, “to what extent is each of the organization’s capabilities important for it to be successful?” Thus, this is not a measure of what the organization does well, but what the organization does that makes it successful. The player piano company may have made the best player pianos in the world, but no one was buying player pianos; they were going to go out of business.

The associates were asked, “to what extent is each of the organization’s capabilities important for the ‘participant’s business’ to be successful?” Asking these two groups these two questions offers measures from two separate perspectives on what capabilities the company offers that make it competitive.

**Implications**

Section 7 offers a valuable insight that can be applied to many different areas of your company’s HR function. First, go through the list and see how the associates of your company’s participants rated your company’s organizational capability (Company Associates’ Average). This is a good measure of what your organization’s capabilities are, because it is made by those who have an outside perspective on what your company has to offer. The items with the highest score are the most valuable areas of your organization. The content of those areas that the associates rated lower are the areas in which your company is not as strong. These measures have important implications to your company’s HR function. The content of those areas that are highest should be considered in you HR department’s strategy.

Many different aspects of the content of the HR function should be related to your organization’s capability. The following is a technique for applying this information:

First determine which aspect of your company you want to evaluate. Then ask yourself how that aspect of your company could best contribute to your organization’s distinct contribution. Next, evaluate how that aspect of your company compares to the ideal you postulated for that aspect of your company. Ask, does it need to change? How?
Next, look at the roles HR uses to contribute to your organization, as listed in Section 6. Look to see how your HR professionals were rated in these roles. Those roles that are important in changing those aspects of your company that you find are lacking to help your organization’s distinct capability flourish should be the roles your HR department focuses on making its HR content. Next, evaluate which capabilities of your company’s HR professionals are needed to help your organization’s distinct contribution flourish. How did your company’s HR professionals score in those areas? Prioritize the development and practice of those competencies in your company’s HR function. Also, you can go on to Section 8 to evaluate through which channels your company’s HR function delivers its services. Are these the optimal channels to help your organization’s distinct capability flourish? What levers do those channels clarify your HR department has to maximize your HR function’s business contribution by helping develop your firm’s capabilities? Is the content of your HR department all that it should be?

Some of the aspects of your company you can apply this technique to evaluate are: organizational structure, type of leadership, methods of rewarding and disciplining, talent management practices, geographic location, market questions, organizational mission, etc. Here is a brief example of how McDonalds could apply this technique to evaluate its culture, and determine what HR’s content should be.

First, ask yourself what sort of culture should McDonalds have to allow the organizational capability it offers to grow and flourish? You look at what items of the Content section your company scored highest in the Participant Company Average column, and see customer responsiveness and speed are considered your organization’s most valuable capabilities. To maximize the speed and customer responsiveness, you need open, quality communication channels, and a fast way of delivering products to your customers. This would demand a culture of efficiency, and a focus on customer satisfaction. Then, evaluate what your company’s culture is. Does it need to change? How? You see that although your culture promotes speed, it is not so focused on customer responsiveness. Figure out which of the roles HR uses to contribute to the firm from Section 6. Which of those roles could be used to change your company’s culture in a way that would add to its customer responsiveness? Many of those five roles could be valuable, but you decide to focus on the coach role. You start a program to coach local managers, and business leaders who deal with the managers on how to influence the employees in a way that will lead to greater customer responsiveness. In this way you can prioritize roles your HR department should develop in its HR work and what practices it should focus on to maximize the content of what HR offers to build the organization’s performance. Next, ask what competencies HR needs to positively influence or redirect your company’s culture in a way that will build customer responsiveness. You see that in the Personal Credibility domain, Effective relationships factor would be an important competency to have to change the company culture in a way that would allow for more customer responsiveness. Use Sections 3 and 4 and benchmark how your company’s HR professionals were rated in these valuable
competencies, and then prioritize which competencies they should focus on developing and practicing to allow HR to increase your company’s customer responsiveness. Use Section 8 to evaluate what channels you can use to best influence your organization to maximize the gains your company gets from its unique organizational capabilities. You see that much of your company’s HR work is getting done through line managers doing HR work. This sends you the cue that influencing your line managers to change your culture in a way that will increase customer responsiveness could be key to increasing McDonald’s market share. In this way, HR’s content creates and maintains the organizational capability that allows your company to compete effectively.

You can also use Section 7 to measure how well your business’ participants understand your organization’s distinct capability (Company Participants’ Average) compared to how their associates see your organization’s distinct contribution (Company Associates’ Average). If their scores are not similar on these items, it is important that the situation be addressed. If your HR professionals are going to be HR players, they need to understand how HR content contributes to the organization’s capability.

As is the case in other sections, we offered you the regional (Company’s Region Average) and global (Entire Survey Average) averages. Because each organization’s capability is unique, these statistics are of little value, unless you are interested what other companies’ organizational capabilities are.
Section 8: Human Resource Channels

Theory and Rationale

Section 8 measures the channels your business’ HR department uses to get its HR work done. We measured seven different channels through which HR work often is delivered. These are: line managers, corporate headquarters, centers of expertise, embedded HR (HR professionals who function as a generalist or a business partner in their organizational unit), shared services (transactional HR work is handled for the whole company, or a large portion of it, by centralized centers), e-HR, and outsourced HR. In Section 8 we also measured how effective those seven ways of delivering HR, or HR delivery channels are in your company (contributing to business results was the criteria for measuring how successful the HR work in your organization was).

Measures

In this section we asked two questions: “to what extent does the participant’s business rely on each of the following channels to deliver HR services;” and “to what extent is each of the following HR delivery channels effective at contributing to business results.” For each of these two questions the participant or associate rated the six channels that were described in the theory and rationale portion of this section.

As in other sections, we averaged your company’s participants’ ratings to give you the Company Participants’ Average. We also recorded the average of the associates that reported for your company (Company Associates’ Average). We then averaged the participant and associate scores of all the company’s region (Company’s Region Average), and for the entire global sample ( Entire Survey Average).

Implications

Section 8 can be applied in many different ways. Your company’s averages (Company Participants’ Average) in the first half of Section 8 examine the channels through which your HR department delivers most of its services. The second portion of section 8 examines which channels are most effective at delivering HR services in your company. You can compare the first portion and second portion of Section 8 to make sure your company is allocating your HR resources effectively. For example, if your company was rated very highly in its reliance on e-HR channels, but e-HR was rated very low for how effectively e-HR was helping to contribute to business results in your organization, a problem might be indicated.

Another comparison that could prove valuable is the participants (Company Participants’ Average) verses the associates rating (Company Associates’ Average) of what HR delivery channels are most effective to delivering HR services in a manner that contributes to business results. This comparison will help you know how your
company’s participants perceptions of what is effective in delivering HR services compares to their associates. Discrepancies in these scores could be an indication that your company’s HR professionals need to re-evaluate the effectiveness of your HR channels for delivering HR in your company. For example, if a lot of your HR work is being handled by line managers and the participants rated line manager’s effectiveness at delivering HR work as high, but the associates saw rated them lowly, you may need to re-evaluate that aspect of your HR function. You may need to train the line managers to better handle HR work, or maybe you should move the roles line managers were playing in delivering HR to embedded HR professionals or through other alternative channels.

You can also use Section 8 in collaboration with Section 7. What are your organization’s capabilities? Could building those distinct capabilities of your organization function better if they were served by relying on different channels to deliver your HR services? For example, if your organization’s distinct capability is primarily its talent, and you see from the first portion of the Participant’s Company Average column in the Outsourced HR line that you are outsourcing most of your HR work in hiring, could you better maintain and expand your company’s talent by relying on embedded HR professionals (i.e. HR professionals operating in an organization unit as a generalist or business partner), who better understand exactly what talent your organization needs to continue functioning and growing in the evolving marketplace.

You may also be interested in comparing your company’s ratings (Participant’s Company Average) in the first and second half of Section 8 with the regional and global averages (Participant’s Region Average & Entire Survey Average). This comparison can help you understand how other companies are using these different means of delivering HR services, and which are seen as most effective. For example, if the average score for e-HR’s effectiveness at delivering HR services is high in your region, and your company does not offer any e-HR services, maybe you should re-evaluate your company’s e-HR channel.
Section 9: Business Context

Theory and Rationale

Section 9 reports how your HR professionals (Company Participants’ Average) and your HR professionals’ associates (Company Associates’ Average) perceive the business context in which HR professionals operate. Business context is the setting in which your business operates. The business context defines what the business must do to be successful. The business context defines the criteria for effectiveness for your business and, therefore, is an important criterion for designing and delivering human resource practices. If the human resource practices are compatible with the business context, the HR department is more likely to be effective.

We report two dimensions of business context. First, one of the major issues that impacts HR practices is the pace of change in the business context. We ask a series of questions about the extent to which your business is changing. We assume that when the pace of change for a business is intense and there is more uncertainty about the future -- this requires a different form of management than when a business’s context is relatively stable and predictable. The rationale of businesses responding differently to changing environmental conditions has a long and rich theoretical history in organization studies. From this research stream comes a basic finding that under more turbulent conditions, businesses need to be organized to respond more quickly to market conditions, to encourage decentralized decision making, and to control individuals through shared values more than rules. When businesses operate under more certain and predictable settings, they may be more centralized, control employees through rules and policies, and focus on efficiency of operations as a key success factor.

Second, how your business compares to competitors may affect your human resource practices. If your business is performing better than competitors on business questions, it may require different human resource practices than if your business is performing worse than your competitors.

Measure

Two sets of responses are reported in Section 9. First, we ask questions about the pace of change within your business over the past three years. The predictability of change deals with how much you can say with confidence what your market will be like over the next few years. A market may change very quickly from month to month, but the changes may be predictable. For example, selling suntan lotion on the beach would change greatly from August to September, so this business would be characterized by a great deal of change. However, next year’s market may be changing in an unpredictable way, e.g., fashion trends.
Second, we asked how the participant’s business compares with its major competitors. We measured these comparisons for the same 20 factors we used to evaluate the rate of change in your business. We hope that this section will offer insight into what your company, and other companies are doing well, and on what they need to improve.

We factored the averages of each of the items for both of the two questions we asked about business context. By doing this, we hoped to make categories of change that will be useful to you in evaluating which areas in your company are rapidly changing, how your company compares to its major competitors, and how your company’s HR professionals perceptions compare to others (associates). The factor analysis of the first question about change in your business resulted in four factors. We analyzed those factors to determine what unifying themes were present, and used those themes as the basis for the name of the factors. Those four factors, and the items that composed them are:

**Value Creation**

** requirements of external customers  
** financial management  
** marketing and sales  
** competitor analysis  
** how ‘your business’ makes money  
** requirements of shareholders and owners  
** supplier management  
** requirements of external suppliers

**Corporate Portfolio**

** e-commerce  
** mergers and acquisitions  
** market capitalization valuation and intangibles

**Infrastructure Design**

** organizational structure  
** human resource practices  
** design of work processes  
** computer information systems

**Labor**

** trade unions  
** labor legislation
** European works council

We also report the comparisons between your company and its competitors. We have utilized the same dimensions in this half of Section 9 as we did in the first half. We factored the average of the responses to each of the twenty items we used to measure your company’s business practices compared to its competitors. We performed this factoring to form useful factors with which you can compare your business to its major competitor. The result of the factoring was three major factors. We analyzed the unifying theme of the items in the three factors to name them. These are the three factors, and the items that composed them:

**Value Proposition**

** meeting the requirements of shareholders and owners
** how ‘your business’ makes money
** market capitalization, valuation, and intangibles
** design of work processes
** financial management
** mergers and acquisitions
** marketing and sales

**Infrastructure Design**

** computer information systems
** requirements of external customers
** human resource practices
** competitor analysis
** e-commerce
** organizational structure

**Labor**

** trade unions
** labor legislation
** European works council

Those items that did not statistically relate to any of the three factors were dropped from the factors.

We reported the average if the items that composed each of these domains for the participants from your company, their associates’ ratings, your company’s region, and the global sample.
Implications

Section 9 has implications for how your company’s participants perceive their business context (Company Participants’ Average) and whether they have similar perceptions with their associates (Company Associates’ Average). This may also indicate the extent to which they are accurately perceiving the changes facing their business—i.e. if your company’s participants and their associates have very different scores, your company’s Participants may not understand the business’ context well.

Second, the difference between the participants’ average and their associates’ average may indicate the degree to which there is agreement or disagreement on the business context. Perceiving the business context differently may affect how the role of HR is viewed.

In addition, by comparing your company’s participant averages (Company Participants’ Average) and their associates’ averages (Company Associates’ Average) against the regional (Company’s Region Average) and global (Entire Survey Average) averages, you can identify how your business compares to other businesses in the study. If the averages vary dramatically, for example, your business may be facing more or less change than other businesses. This fact could have a profound effect on how your company’s HR department should work to improve your company’s competitiveness.
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Conclusion

When we started this research project, we hoped to continue our ongoing study of the HR field. In this round of surveys we received over 7,000 responses. This number of responses is the largest sample we have gathered since 1988. Because of the large number of responses, and all of the implications of the new sample, much analysis remains to be done. Over the next two years, we will continue to analyze to better understand the implications of the results of this survey, and report survey data. These reports will be directed to both the academic and the professional community. We hope that you will find these eventual publications to be valuable.

After personally handling thousands of surveys, we realize the enormous amount of time spent by you individually and collectively on this project. We appreciate your effort. We hope that the time commitments, unclear questions, and hassles, such as asking associates to respond were and are worth it. We hope you will find the Company Feedback Report useful in your professional development activities and in upgrading the human resource practices within your corporation. These results represent a serious effort on our part to fulfill our contract with you.

Our agenda is simple in words, large in scope, and elegant in delivery. We hope to continue to shape the role of the HR professional and thereby help businesses gain sustained competitive advantage through HR content contributing to organizational capability, understanding the channels through which HR delivers its services, understanding the context of your business, and development of competencies that will allow you and other HR professionals to be business players.
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