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INTRODUCTION

The Individual 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 Individual Feedback Report shows how you and your associates answered questions on the survey about your HR professional competencies, the HR profession, and the business that you serve. There is also information on your company’s HR professionals ratings as a whole, as well as information on other companies in your region, and throughout the world. The intent of the Individual Feedback Report is to offer you a chance to see how respondents perceive your competencies, 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, except in this Individual Feedback Report, which reports your information for your use.

Theory and Rational for the Study

This research builds on two assumptions1: First, human resources are a source of competitive advantage. Human resource practices within a business create sustained competitive advantage (defined as customer value and uniqueness) 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.

1 Throughout this Interpretation of the Individual 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.
[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, infrastructure design, etc. – will increase throughout this century. We 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 causes 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 thousands of human resource professionals, in the past we identified five sets of competencies we hypothesized as central to the HR player role: knowledge of the business, 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 upon 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 you to develop the competencies that are required for you to add greatest value to your business and to your career. The result of our research is a new competency model for a new century that is built upon our extensive research from the last century.

These two assumptions form 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 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 HR roles that are the keys to becoming an 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 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 Individual 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 are 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 group 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 round of our continuing study that has been ongoing since 1988.

Interpretation of Data

As you review this Interpretation of the Individual Feedback Report (this document), we encourage you to have your Individual Feedback Report (document with ten sections) in front of you. The data in the Individual Feedback Report are summarized in these ten sections. We realize that this Individual 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 reports 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 Individual Feedback Report, we encourage you to not 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 Individual 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 ten sections in the Individual 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 Individual 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 you rated your own competence within each of the five new domains, and for all the competencies together (Participant’s Average). It also offers the average rating all of your associates made of you (Participant’s Associate Average). And, it offers the averages for HR professionals in your company (Participant’s Company Average), for all the companies in your region (Participant’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 overall assessment resulting from how you rated yourself (Participant’s Score), and how your associates rated you (Participant’s Associate Average). It is very straightforward conceptually. You and your associates rated the percentile of how well your 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 you and your associates think you 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, in your region, 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.

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 their abilities. If your rating score (Participant’s Score) is lower than your associates (Participants Associate Average), you may want to review Sections 3 and 4 to identify specific competencies that may help form these opinions. If you score yourself (Participant’s Score) higher than your associates rated you, (Participants Associate
Average), you may want to review Sections 3 and 4 to identify the specific competencies that help create the perception of below average performance.

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 all of the scores from the competency portion of the survey being lumped together 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 and what they 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 your results. Your overall competency score is also reported in the same sort of bar graph. Five measures of competency scores within each of the five domains and the Overall Competencies Score are listed as follows: First, the average of how you rated yourself for the competencies included in the model domain is recorded in the Participant’s Average row. Second, your associate’s average rating of you is recorded in the Participant’s Associate Average row. Third, the company’s HR professionals average is recorded in the Participant’s Company Average row. This rating is based on both how the participants and the associates responded in rating your company’s participants. Fourth, the Participant’s Regional Average records the average score of all of the company’s within your region. This score includes associate and participant scores. Five regions were originally designated: Africa, North America, Latin America, Asia, and Europe. 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 Participant’s Score, the Participant’s Associate Average (how your associates rated you), the Participant’s Company’s Average, the Participant’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 your rating of yourself (Participant’s Score) in the different competency domains to see in what areas you consider yourself effective. You can also compare your associates’ ratings of your competencies (Participant’s Associates Average) in the various domains. This would allow you to see how you are viewed by your associates, which could include internal customers, supervisors, HR colleagues, and the people who work under you. It could be interesting and beneficial for you to compare the Participant’s Associate Average to the Participant’s Average/Score. This would give you an idea of the discrepancies between how you view yourself, verses how you are perceived by those that work with you. This comparison could offer valuable insight into what areas you need to focus your personal training and development efforts in.

Another comparison that might be useful is the comparison of your company’s aggregated competency ratings (Participant’s Associate Average) in the various domains to the regional (Participant’s Region Average) and global averages (Entire Survey Average) of 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.

The Overall Competencies Score is included in the research report because it may be of interest to you. Your associates have a general opinion of you, and how you generally compare to other HR professionals. Looking at the Participant’s Associate Average will give you an idea of how competent, in general, your associates think you are. You can also see how your company rated compared to the other companies in your region and around the world. However, this global statistic (Entire Survey Average) has little practical applicable value; it is too general to be used to see in what domains your company’s HR staff has strengths and weaknesses. You should not consider a high relative score proof that you are on track and doing well to help your company succeed. Also, do not consider a relatively low score proof that you or your companies HR department has 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 gives 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 Individual 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 helps ensure that we avoid 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 have 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 response group and your company’s response group, we offer two different gauges of who filled out surveys.

1) Participants/Associate/Respondent Numbers: This portion of Section 2 offers four measures. Number of Associates raters for this Participant represents the number of associate surveys we received that were rating you. The Number of Respondents in Company presents the number of respondents, associate and participant, reporting from your company. The Number of Respondents in Participant’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) **Relationship to Participant**: This reports the relationship of your associates to you in the context of your organizational structure. We offered four categories: Supervisor, Peer, Subordinate or Direct Report, and Internal Client or Customer. If the associates did not see themselves as fitting any of these, they could respond ‘Other’.

3) **Participant’s Location**: This reports the global region in which you and your company (Participant’s Region) are located, and what company you were recorded to be a part of (Participant’s Company).

**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 that are sampled in a survey, the more valid the survey will be (as long as those being sampled are a 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 Participant’s 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.

A third point that may be of interest to you in the demographics section is the fact that you can see what the relationship of those that rated you had with you. This can influence your perspective on your data. Information from supervisors may have different implications from that of peers, subordinates, or internal customers.
Section 3: Competency Scores

Theory and Rationale

Section 3 reports on your competencies as they are perceived by you and your associates. These tables identify specific competency areas which help human resource professionals perform their tasks. Competencies represent 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 other items within the domain were dropped from the factor. (Our cutoff point was a factor score 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 you stand, and helps you develop the qualities you need be a contributing player 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 in five different ways. These scores are reported in tables as opposed to graphs. These areas are:

1) **Participant’s Average**: The participant score represents the average of how you rated yourself for all of the competence items contained in each domain and factor.

2) **Participant’s Associate Average**: The associate score records your score, as reported by all of your associates.
3) **Participant’s Company Average**: This was the average score of all the participants in your company, as reported by both the participants and their associates.

4) **Participant’s Region Average**: The region score records the average from of all the participants and their 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.

5) **Entire Survey Average**: The overall dataset score gives the average rating of all of the survey’s respondents, including the participants and associates.

   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 you as you try to apply the findings of this survey to improve your HR competencies. There are many different ways you can apply the information contained in this section to yourself. You can test in what competence factors you are perceived to be doing well, or badly in. You could test this in many different ways. You may have noticed that you were rated particularly low in one of the five main domains. You could find out more particulars about what areas, or factors of that domain you were rated poorly on. This would provide you further insight into what specific competence areas your colleagues think you are weak in. Let us illustrate by way of a hypothetical example: to your surprise, you were generally rated very poorly on the Personal Credibility domain score by your associates
(Participant’s Associate Average). Your rated yourself as having average personal credibility. You do not understand why your associates rated you so poorly in the Personal Credibility domain. You want to know what specifically you were perceived to be doing poorly. You look in the factors of the Personal Credibility portion of Section 3 and find that you rated average in every factor but the Personal communication factor. 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 you and your company did unusually well in the HR Technology domain. You can use this information to help you know how you are viewed within the company, why, and what you need to do about it. If you wanted to learn more about what specific competencies in the Personal Communication factor you 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 each individual competency fits. It is composed of five individual sections; one for each of the five domains. The scores are based on the exact score you gave yourself (the Participant’s Score) for each item, and the averages of the combined respondents included in each of the other four groups we reported (Participant’s Associate Average, Participant’s Company Average, Participant’s Region Average, and 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 model’s five domains and their respective factors. This section also gives you the ability to narrow your focus on specific competencies that are of interest to you and your company. If you find that you were rated particularly well in a competency domain by your associates (Participant’s Associate Average), you can go examine that domain on an item-by-item basis to see your strengths and weaknesses relative to specific competencies.

Section 4 can also be useful for suggesting specific areas you should consider improving your competence. For example, from Section 7 of this survey you determine exactly what content your company offers that makes it successful. You find that your personal contribution does not help support the organizations distinct capability. If you want to become a player in your business, you realize you need to develop new competencies. 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 you are doing on individual competency items (Participant’s Score and Participant’s Associate Average) compared to other HR professionals in your business (Participant’s Company Average), your business’ region (Participant’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 you and the other HR professionals in your organization 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 your own rating of your company’s focus (Participant’s Score). Second, we reported how your associates rated your company’s focus (Participant’s Associate Average). Third, we reported your companies’ average score (Participant’s Company Average). Fourth, we gave you your region’s average score (Participant’s Region Average), and finally the global average score (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 Participant’s Score represents the average measure of what they thought the focus of their company was. The Participant’s Associate Average is what the associates thought the focus of the participant’s company was. The Participant’s Company Average represents the average of everybody who filled out a survey rating your business’ focus. The Participant’s Region and Entire Survey Averages are both straightforward.
Implications

Section 5 offers a few insights. First, comparing the Participant’s Score verses the Participant’s Associates Average indicates the extent to which you and your associates have a common view of the HR focus within your business. If the scores are close, this indicates that you and your associates share a similar view of what HR’s focus is within your business. Differences between you and your associates’ scores indicate that you and 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 associates and other HR professionals in your business to understand whether your business truly is focused strategically or operationally.

Comparing the Participant’s Company Average score versus the Participant’s Regional Average and the Entire Survey Average tell 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 participant’s 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 (Participant’s Region Average), and in your company by all the respondents for your company (Participant’s Company Average), as perceived by yourself, and by your associates. We also list your rating of your company (Participant’s Score), and your associates rating of your company (Participants’ Associates 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 and yourself. These areas are:

1) Participant’s Score: The participant score represents your own rating of your company’s HR function.
2) **Participant’s Associate Average**: The associate score records the average rating of your company’s HR function, as reported by all of your associates.

3) **Participant’s Company Average**: This score represents the average score all of your company’s participants and their associates, gave your company for its effectiveness in each of these five HR roles. This is probably the best measure this survey offers on how well your HR department within your company is perceived to be doing in each of these five roles.

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

5) **Entire Survey Average**: The overall dataset score gives the average rating of all of the HR functions in the companies that participated in this survey, as reported by the participants and associates, for each of the competence domains and factors.

   The individual ways HR contributes, which we used to measure the HR function’s proficiency in 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 department measures up to meet the challenge of contributing real, measurable value to the organization as players. Use these scores to benchmark how well your company’s HR department is doing in these roles. One important measure is the company average of how HR is performing these five roles (Participant’s Company 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 companies’ HR capability to function in that role. It will also be useful to compare how you rated your company’s HR roles (Participants Score) with how your associates rated the company’s proficiency (Participant’s Associate Average) in the HR roles. This will offer clear insight into roles you do not perceive the HR function to contribute too in your business as others (your associates) perceive. Such discrepancies could be important to address. While it is interesting to measure your HR department’s roles 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 increase your contribution to your business, keep in mind the content of your organization’s contribution. This could be key in knowing which roles are most important for your HR department to develop. To help clarify what your organization’s contribution is, 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 that 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 till 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 their excellent network they had built up in 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 organization’s 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 capability can help you know the content of what HR offers to 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 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 try out their new ideas. HR’s content, or what they contributed result of 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 on 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 the content of your company’s HR function. First, go through the list and see how your associates rated your company’s organizational capability (Participant’s Associates Average). This is a good measure of what your organization’s capabilities are, because it is made by some who have an outside perspective on what the content is of what your company has to offer. The items with the highest score are the most valuable capabilities of your organization. The content of those areas that the associates rated lower are the areas your company is not as strong in. These measures have important implications to your company’s HR function. Those capabilities that scored highest should be considered in your HR department’s strategy, and how you handle your role in your company.

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

First determine what 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 capability. Next, evaluate how that aspect of your company, and your performance, compares to the ideal you postulated. 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 to the changing of those aspects of your company that you find are lacking to help your organization’s distinct capability flourish should be the roles you and your HR department focus on making your HR content. Next, evaluate which capabilities you need to change those aspects of the company you find are needed to help your organization’s capability flourish. How did you 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 and evaluate through what 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 strategic 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 organizations 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 you develop in your HR work and what practices you 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 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 you were rated in these valuable competencies, and then prioritize which competencies you should focus on developing and practicing to allow you 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 you understand your organization’s distinct capability (Participant’s Score) compared to how your associates see your organization’s distinct capability (Participant’s Associate Average). If your score and your associates average are not similar on these items, it is important that the situation be addressed. If you are going to be an HR player, you need to understand the organization’s distinct capability.

As is the case in other sections, we offered you the regional (Participant’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 recorded your score (Participant’s Score), and we also recorded your associates’ ratings of your company (Participant’s Associate Average). We then averaged the participant and associate scores from your company (Participant’s Company Average), recorded the averages of the companies in your region (Participant’s Region Average), and the score for the entire global sample (Entire Survey Average).

Implications

Section 8 can be applied in many different ways. Your company’s averages (Participant’s Company 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 you are 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 your self-score (Participant’s Score) verses the associates rating (Participant’s Associate 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 perceptions of what is effective in delivering HR services compares to your associates. Discrepancies in these
scores could be an indication that you 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 you rated line manager’s effectiveness at delivering HR work as high, but the associates rate 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 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 potion 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 you and your associates perceive the business context in which HR professionals operate. Business context describes the setting in which your business operates. The business context includes a series of industry conditions in the business environment in which HR professionals function. 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 the volume of sales may still be seasonal and predictable, so the changes in the business are different than a business where 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 by 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 what they need to improve on.

We factored the averages of each of the items for both of the two questions we asked about business context. By doing this, we hope 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 perceptions compare to others. 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 your 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 your competitors. We did this factoring to form useful factors with which you can compare your business to your major competitor. The result of the factoring was three major factors. These 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 factors for the yourself, your associates ratings, your company’s average, your company’s region, and the global sample.

**Implications**

Section 9 has implications for how you perceive your business context (Participant’s Score) and whether you have similar perceptions with your associates (Participant’s Associate Score). This may also indicate the extent to which you are accurately perceiving the changes facing your business— i. e. if you and your associates have very different scores, you may not understand your business’ context well.
Also, by comparing your company’s average (Participant’s Company Average) against the regional and global averages Participant’s Region Average and Entire Survey Average), you can identify how your business compares to other businesses in the study. If your scores 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 HR department should work to improve your company’s competitiveness.
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Section 10: Personal Development Summary

Theory and Rationale

Section 10 reports several different measures designed to give you personal feedback on specific areas you are perceived to be doing well in, and specific areas you are not. It is designed to help you bridge the gap between how you see yourself, and how you are seen. This section gives specific information from each of the five competency domains of our competency model. These are: Strategic Contribution, Personal Credibility, HR Delivery, Business Knowledge, Business Knowledge, and HR Technology. This information is only listed in the Individual Feedback Reports.

Measures

For each of the five domains in the competency model, we offered you 4 measures:

1) **Strengths**: The strengths section lists which individual competence items within the competency domain your associates rated you highest on. This was determined by averaging your associates’ responses for each line item, and listing the ones that scored highest of items with averages over 2.75.

2) **Challenges**: The challenges section offers you a list of the individual competency items included in the survey that you were rated lowest on by your associates. This was done in the same manner as the Strengths section, except we listed the items with the lowest averages in each domain of items with averages of 3.4 or below.

3) **Underestimated Capability**: This was the single competency item within this domain which had the largest gap between how you associates rated you, and how you rated yourself, in which you rated yourself lower than your associates rated you. It lists the gap between your and your associates average rating of you (Gap), the score you gave yourself on the competence item (Self), and the average of how your associates rated you on this item (Others).

4) **Overestimated Capability**: This was the single competency item within this domain which had the largest gap between how your associates rated you, and how you rated yourself, in which you rated yourself higher than your associates rated you. It lists the gap between your and your associates average rating of you (Gap), the score you gave yourself on the competence item (Self), and the average of how your associates rated you on this item (Others).
Implications

Section 10 is the most valuable section in this report to help you understand what you needed to do to be perceived as being a more competent HR professional. Look and see what your associates think your strengths are (Strengths). Capitalize on those skills. Work to become more competent in those areas in which you were rated poorly (Challenges).

The Underestimated Capability and Overestimated Capability provide you excellent feedback as well. Your Overestimated Capability tells you the area you thought you were strong in, but your associates didn’t. This may be an area you want to improve in. The Underestimated Capability tells you the area within the domain you thought you were weak in, but your associates thought you did well in.

Overall, use the information in Section 10 to build a plan for increasing your competence as you work to become a player in your business.
Conclusion

When we started this research project, we hoped to continue our ongoing study of the HR field. In this round of survey 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 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 Individual 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 complex 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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- IPC Communication Services
- ITT Industries
- Ivec Argentina S.A.
- Jack in the Box, Inc.
- Johnson + Johnson Health Care Systems, Inc
- KeyCorp

- Kimberly-Clark Argentina
- Kohler Co.
- Lafarge Gypsum
- Laiki Bank
- Lloyds TSB Bank
- Lockheed Martin Information Systems
- Lockheed Martin Missiles and Fire Control
- Loma Negra C.I.A.S.A.
- Lucent Technologies
- Mahindra & Mahindra Ltd.
- Marico Industries Limited
- May & Scofield, Inc.
- McDonald’s de Chile Ltda.
- Merrill Lynch
- MetroGas SA
- Metropolitan Life Seguros de Vida S.A.
- MIRC ELECTRONICS (ONIDA)
- Motorola Argentina S.A.
- Movicom - Bellsouth
- Murugappa Group
- Nan Yang Textile Group of Companies
- NASA Langley Research Center
- Newcastle Journal & Chronicle LTD
- NIBCO INC.
- Nokia Oyj
- Occidental Chemical Corp.
- OLIVER PRODUCTS COMPANY
- OMINT SA
- ONE, Inc.
- Oracle Argentina S.A.
- Organización Techint
- Pacific Century CyberWorks Limited
- Pall Life Sciences
- Pecom Energía SA (Perez Companc SA)
- PepsiCo Foods International Pte Ltd
- Petron Corporation
- Pharmacia
- Pioneer-Standard Electronics
- PricewaterhouseCoopers
- Productos Roche S.A.Q.E.I.
- Protección S.A.
- Quinsa (Quilmes Industrial S.A.)
- Ramco Systems Limited
- Refinería del Norte S.A.
- Royal Enfield Motors
- Ryder Argentina S.A.
- Ryder System, Inc.
- Salta Refrescos S.A.
• SAP Brasil Ltda.
• SC Johnson & Son de Venezuela. C.A.
• Schering Plough S.A.I.C.
• Schering-Plough Corporation
• SCOTIABANK QUILMES
• Seagram Spirits and Wine Group
• Sempra Energy
• Sherwin Williams Argentina I. Y C.S.
• Shlumberger Sureno S.A.
• Siemens S.A.
• St. Jude Medical, Inc.
• Sun Chemical
• Swift Armour S.A.
• Taiwan Semiconductor Manufacturing Co.,
• TATA Engineering and Locomotive Company Limited
• TELECOM ARGENTINA
• Telefonica
• TELUS Communications Inc.
• Tetra Pak S.R.L.
• The Bombay Dyeing & Mfg. Co. Ltd.
• The City of Calgary
• The Medstat Group
• Titan Systems Corporation
• Titan Wireless
• Transener S.A.
• Transportadora de Gas del Norte S. A.
• TriHealth
• TV Globo Ltda.
• Tyco International: Tyco Flow Control
• Unilever
• Unilever de Argentina S.A.
• Unilever Spain
• UnitedHealthcare
• UTStarcom (China) Ltd.
• VEC, HRMS
• Vitopel S. A.
• wageningen ur
• Waitemata District Health Board
• Wallis Companies
• Wall-Mart
• Wells Fargo
• Williams
• XEROX ARGENTINA I.C.S.A.
• Zurich Argentina Compañía de Seguros S.A.