

*National College of Business
Administration & Economics
Lahore*



**STRATEGIC INTEGRATION AND DEVOLVEMENT
OF HRM IN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTES
OF PUNJAB, PAKISTAN**

BY

MUHAMMAD FAISAL QADEER

**MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY
IN
BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION**

June, 2008

NATIONAL COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION & ECONOMICS

STRATEGIC INTEGRATION AND DEVOLVEMENT OF HRM IN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTES OF PUNJAB, PAKISTAN

BY

MUHAMMAD FAISAL QADEER

**A dissertation submitted to
School of Business Administration**

**In Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of**

**MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY
IN
BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION**

June, 2008

**NATIONAL COLLEGE OF BUSINESS
ADMINISTRATION & ECONOMICS,**

**STRATEGIC INTEGRATION AND DEVOLVEMENT
OF HRM IN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTES
OF PUNJAB, PAKISTAN**

BY

MUHAMMAD FAISAL QADEER

**A dissertation submitted to School of Business Administration, in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of**

**MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY IN
BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION**

Dissertation Committee:

Chairman

Member

Member

Rector
**National College of Business
Administration & Economics**

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

In the name of ALLAH, the Compassionate, the Merciful

DECLARATION

This is to certify that this research work has not been submitted for obtaining similar degree from any other university / college.

MUHAMMAD FAISAL QADEER
June, 2008

DEDICATED TO

My Parents and my Wife

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Thanks to Almighty Allah Whose unending blessings enabled me to accomplish this gigantic task. This dissertation could not have been completed without the time, effort, and support of a number of people. Therefore, I wish to acknowledge the contributions of all of them.

I am grateful to my supervisors, Dr. Rashid Rahman for his full professional support. I am deeply indebted to the support and guidance dispensed by Dr. Munir Ahmad, Rector, National College of Business Administration & Economics, Lahore, whose patience, insight and moral enlightenment has been of immense significance in completing my work. He made himself always available to help me out at all steps from the idea generation to writing of this dissertation. Frankly speaking, without the towering presence of Dr. Munir Ahmad, this work would not have been possible.

My friends were very helpful in providing material inputs and advice in various activities such as data collection, statistical analysis, linguistic refinement and other related activities. I would like to specially mention Mr. Muhammad Shafique, Mr. Omar Sadik and Mr. Mumtaz Muhammad Khan. I am very grateful to them.

Last but not the least the scholarship provided by HEC went a long way in initiation of this task. This motivated me to take the vital step of leaving my job and adopting the path of research.

RESEARCH COMPLETION CERTIFICATE

Certified that the research work contained in this thesis entitled **“Strategic Integration and Devolvement of HRM in Higher Education Institutes of Punjab, Pakistan”**, has been carried out and completed by **“Muhammad Faisal Qadeer”** under my supervision during his M.Phil. Business Administration programme

(Dr. Rashid Rahman)
Supervisor

SUMMARY

In this study an attempt has been made to discuss strategic integration and devolvement of human resource management (HRM) in 52 higher education institutes (HEIs) of Punjab, Pakistan. The results are based on a questionnaire based survey. HEIs in Punjab are practicing a low level of integration and devolvement. Integration and devolvement are interrelated variables. Devolvement is predictable on the basis of integration.

The level of devolved decisions making is different for various HR activities and the direction of change of devolved decision making is also different for these HR activities. The departmental heads (DHs) do not have similar training level in various areas of HRM. Public and private sector HEIs are similar in most of their patterns of HRM and organizational characteristics. The difference of age and size between the two sectors is not playing any role in shaping their HRM.

HR department is the main player behind the prediction of integration and devolvement. There is still resistance to HRM convergence in Pakistan and the high power distance culture is shaping many policies and practices. The divergent trends prevailing in this sector are expected to stay until formal HR departments become an integral part of every institute.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
DECLARATION	iv
DEDICATION	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	vi
RESEARCH COMPLETION CERTIFICATE	vii
SUMMARY	viii
CHAPTER-1: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Integration and Devolvement	4
1.2 Objectives of the Study	6
1.3 Research Hypotheses	7
CHAPTER-2: LITERATURE REVIEW	8
2.1 HRM and Organizational Characteristics	8
2.1.1 First Group	8
2.1.2 Second Group	10
2.1.3 Third Group	11
2.2 Integration and Devolvement	11
2.3 HR-Line Relationship	15
2.4 HRM Research in HEIs	19
2.5 HRM Research in Pakistan	20
2.6 Public Versus Private Sector	20
CHAPTER-3: METHODOLOGY	22
3.1 Population	22
3.2 Data Collection	22
3.3 The Questionnaire	23
3.4 Measures and Methods	26
3.5 Pilot Study	27
CHAPTER-4: ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION	28
4.1 Descriptive Statistics	28
4.1.1 Respondents	28
4.1.2 Age-wise distribution of population	28
4.1.3 Size-wise distribution of population	29

4.1.4	Numerical variables	29
4.1.5	Categorical variables	30
4.1.6	Organizational policies	32
4.2	Hypothesis Results	33
4.2.1	Levels of Integration and Devolvement	33
4.2.2	Interrelationship of integration and devolvement	33
4.2.3	Devolvement of the Six HRM Functions	34
4.2.4	Presence of Trained DHs in HR Areas	36
4.2.5	Comparison Between Public and Private Sector Institutes	37
4.2.6	Hypothesis Summary and Results	45
4.3	Predictors of Integration and Devolvement	46
4.3.1	Predictors of Integration	46
4.3.2	Predictors of Devolvement	46
CHAPTER-5: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION		48
5.1	Discussions about Results	48
5.1.1	Integration and Devolvement	48
5.1.2	Devolvement of the Six HRM Functions	49
5.1.3	Trained DHs	51
5.1.4	Comparison Between Public and Private Sector Institutes	51
5.1.5	Predictors of Integration and Devolvement	53
5.2	Conclusions	54
5.3	Contributions and Implications	55
5.4	Limitations and Directions	55
REFERENCES		57
ANNEXURE - A		68
ANNEXURE - B		70
ANNEXURE - C		73

LIST OF TABLES

Table No.	Title	Page
3.1	City-wise Distribution of Population	22
4.1	Department-wise detail of respondents	28
4.2	Age-wise Distribution of Population	29
4.3	Size-wise Distribution of Population	29
4.4	Descriptive Statistics of Numerical Variables	30
4.5	Descriptive Statistics of Categorical variables	31
4.6	Descriptive statistics of Organizational Policies	32
4.7	Levels of Integration	33
4.8	Levels of Devolvment	33
4.9	Levels of Integration and Devolvment	34
4.10	Level of Devolved Decision-making in Areas of HRM	35
4.11	Change in the DHs Responsibility in Areas of HRM	36
4.12	Trained DHs in Areas of HRM	37
4.13a	Comparison between Public and Private Sector regarding Levels of Integration	37
4.13b	Comparison between Public and Private Sector regarding Levels of Devolvment	38
4.14a	Comparison between Public and Private Sector regarding HRM Patterns	39
4.14b	Comparison between Public and Private Sector regarding HR Strategy	40
4.15	Age-wise Distribution of Public and Private sector	41
4.16	Size-wise Distribution of Public and Private sector	42
4.17	Comparison between Public and Private Sector regarding Organizational Characteristics	43
4.18	Comparison between Public and Private Sector regarding Organizational Policies	44
4.19	Hypothesis Summary and Results	45
4.20	Stepwise Regression Analysis for Prediction of Integration	46
4.21	Stepwise Regression Analysis for Prediction of Devolvment	47

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Human are part and parcel of every organization. In fact human resources (HR) are a source of sustained competitive advantage for every organization because they meet the criteria of being valuable, rare, inimitable and non-substitutable (Wright et al., 1994). Management of human resources is all the more important for the success of any organization.

Activities performed under human resources management (HRM) are targeted towards the utilization of individuals to achieve organizational objectives. These activities can be covered under five main headings which include staffing, HR development, compensation and benefits, employee relations and health and safety (Mondy and Noe, 2006). Ever since the beginning of 1990s, it has been accepted that in order to improve business performance and develop organizational culture that foster innovation and flexibility, there should be a linking of HRM with strategic goals and objectives of an organization (Schuler, 1992; Truss and Gratton, 1994). Such a linking of HRM to the strategic needs of the business is called strategic human resource management (SHRM).

Staff Management has undergone many changes since industrial revolution of the mid-18th century. The field of SHRM has been mainly developed in USA and Western Europe countries. It seems logical to study this development in their context.

Historians trace the origins of this field to the medieval times (Jamrog and Oveholt, 2004). The period from the medieval times up to 1870, an era dominated by foreman-oriented personnel system can be regarded as *first period*. Craftspeople organize into guilds in order to improve their work conditions. First-line supervisors handle most personnel problems. After industrial revolution, substitution of steam power and machinery for time consuming hand labor lead to establishment of factories where large number of people are employed. This result into a tremendous increase in job specification and ‘division of labor’ become the relaying cry (Cascio, 1992). Working conditions and social patterns are significantly altered. Labor is considered a commodity to be bought and sold ---- little action by the governments is taken to protect the worker (French, 1986). Consequently, organized trade unions spread rapidly during the latter half of 19th century, and so do the incidence of violent strikes (Jamrog and Oveholt, 2004).

During the *Second period* from 1870 to 1909, early personnel administrators replace the foreman-oriented systems coupled with the rise of the scientific management. Taylor is its prophet and his 'bible' is the stopwatch. He pioneers time-and-motion studies of jobs as per his belief that techniques used by scientists in the laboratory can be used to increase efficiency in the workplace (French, 1990). Taylor puts forward three concepts, a) Matching b) Training c) Incentives, which provides foundation for modern HR Profession (Taylor, 1911).

The Civil Service Commission 1883 drawing ideas from British civil service call for competitive exams, job security, prohibited politics and non-partisan approach to employee selection. The 'industrial welfare movement' leads to voluntary efforts made by employers for improvement in employment conditions (Gilberth, 1914). Firms begin to employ social or welfare secretaries with early personnel administrators given the task to bridge the employer-employee gap (Jamrog and Overholt, 2004). Early industrial psychologist, Hugo Munsterburg in 1913 emphasizes job analysis in terms of abilities; develops testing devices (McAfee and Poffenberger, 1982). World War I accelerates the development of intelligent tests, and other psychological measures of aptitude, interest and personality tests (Ivancevich and Glueck, 1989).

In the *third period*, (1909-1964), an era of personnel management, more and more employee related responsibilities are now being assigned to the personnel departments. By 1920 various titles of personnel specialist jobs begins to emerge. Departments like Bureau of Safety, Sanitation, and Welfare; Industrial Relations and Sociological Department are established by various firms. The terms like recruitment income plan, substantial insurance benefits, safety program, and medical division are also being used. Hawthorne behavioral studies in 1923 give birth to human relations movement. Productivity is related to group teamwork, cooperation and happiness of workers. The labor movement sees a major development as a result of the National Labor Relation Act, 1935. Additional duty of dealing with collective bargaining agreement falls on personnel, legal, and/or labor relations department (Jamrog and Overholt, 2004).

The *fourth period* from 1964 to 1990, observes a transition from Personnel to HRM. The personnel departments are being viewed as a record keeping unit. The job of personnel is regarded as a mixture of those of a file clerk, a social worker, a fire fighter and a head of a union trouble (Jamrog and Overholt, 2004). The passage of Civil Rights Act of 1964 accelerates the importance of HRM. The cost of improper personnel diverts considerable resources to compliance activities.

Much knowledge about HRM and many of its practical applications come from the behavioral sciences (French, 1986). Behavioral science research embrace a wider base of disciplines (industrial/organizational psychology, organizational theory, organizational behavior, and sociology) (Jamrog and Overholt, 2004). There is a wide acceptance that organization, its unique culture and constraints, impact and modify human performance. James G Miller brings in System theory in organization sciences and articulates the basic principles of system thinking (Miller, 1972). Many organizational theorists have been building their theories of system thinking since then. This is regarded as the basis for intelligent discussion of organizations (Galbraith, 1973; Ackoff, 1981; Deming, 1993; Lawler, 2003; and Colbert, 2004).

HRM is different from personnel management in many ways. Firstly, personnel management focuses on the management and control of subordinates, HRM centers on the management team. Secondly, line managers i.e. ‘individuals directly involved in accomplishing the primary purpose of the organization’ (Mondy and Noe, 2006) play a key role in HRM in coordinating resources toward achieving profits, which is not the case under personnel management. Thirdly, the management of organizational culture is an important aspect of HRM, but plays no role in the personnel management. Thus HRM is more centrally strategic than personnel management (Legge, 1989). Fourthly, HRM is unitarist rather than collectivist in its approach (Guest, 1989; Storey, 1989; Sisson, 1989) and finally HRM stresses on regarding people as ‘resource’, and therefore, assumes a strategic significance (Mckinlay and Strakey, 1992).

During the *fifth period*, with its beginning in 1990, the importance of linking HRM with the strategic goals and objectives lays the foundation for this transition of HRM towards SHRM. Four HR-strategy linkages, ‘administrative linkage’, ‘one-way linkage’, ‘two-way linkage’ and the most advanced linkage ‘integrated linkage’, described by Golden & Ramanujam (1985), form the basis of numerous studies in 90s onward that examines the relationship between HR’s integration with the business strategy and actual business performance (Gubman, 2004).

Theoretical concepts from the resource-based view (RBV) of the firm (Barney, 1991; Wright et al., 1994) demonstrate the fact that human resources can be a source of sustained competitive advantage because they meet the criteria of being valuable, rare, inimitable and non-substitutable. The RBV of the firm suggests the need to integrate human resources into the formulation stage of a firm's strategy. The decline in functional strategies of 1980s gives rise to the capabilities strategies of 1990s. Capabilities have turned outward today and the era of results strategies has begun (Gubman, 2004).

Transition toward SHRM from traditional HRM brings fourth many changes. SHRM evolves as a ‘bridge’ between business strategy and the management of human resources (Butler et al., 1991; Schuler and Walker, 1990; Boxall, 1994). SHRM adopts a ‘macro’ or firm level prospective rather than the knowledge held within each of the HR functions (Wright and McMahan, 1992). SHRM links the management and development of individuals within the organization to the business as a whole and its environment, while HRM could be viewed as an organizing activity that take place within this umbrella (Truss and Gratton, 1994). In SHRM much of the responsibility for HRM is devolved down to line mangers rather than personnel specialists (Truss and Gratton, 1994; Mello, 2007). The initiative of SHRM is fast, proactive and integrated as compared to slow, reactive and fragmented in case of traditional HRM.

Higher Education Institutes (HEIs) in Pakistan have shown a tremendous growth over the last decade or so. Owing to constant efforts of HEC, these institutes are gaining more and more attention both at local and international level. HEIs are supposed to be highly knowledge intensive, which makes the management of human capital even more important for them. There is dire need of HRM research on empirical data in education sector, a sector is of prime importance for developing countries like Pakistan. This study is an attempt to empirically investigate the status of HRM in general, and its strategic integration and devolvment in particular in HEIs of Punjab - the most populated province of Pakistan.

1.1 INTEGRATION AND DEVOLVEMENT

The concepts of integration and devolvment have been regularly given importance in HRM literature (Brewster and Larsen, 1992; Budhwar and Sparrow, 1997; McCourt and Wong, 2003; Cardoso, 2004; Andolsek and Stebe, 2005; Sheehan, 2005; and Purcell and Hutchinson, 2007).

HRM has long been identified as a driving force in business strategy (Butler, 1988). Barid and Meshoulam (1988) proposed five developmental stages for HRM. The fifth developmental stage is he proposed is ‘strategic integration’. All previous efforts to relate HRM with the firm’s strategy have taken three main approaches. One of these approaches is to present means for integrating HRM into over all efforts to match strategy and structure (Lengnick-hall & Lengnick-hall, 1988).

The term strategic integration is initially used by Guest (1989). The adoption of SHRM should result in ‘an organizational pay-off...designed to produce strategic integration, high commitment, high quality, and flexibility among employees’ (Guest, 1989). In the present study the term integration is taken in the same meaning as that of strategic integration.

Integration as a concept is composed of four aspects: (1) HR policy making should be integrated with the corporate strategic planning process, rather than being arrived at as a reaction to this; (2) HR policies should be integrated with one another and other business strategies such as finance, marketing and production; (3) the attitudes and practices of line managers should be integrated with the organization’s HR policies; and (4) the fourth aspect of integration relates to employees being integrated with the interests of the organization, with the result that they demonstrate a high level of organizational commitment (Thornhill and Saunders, 1998).

Integration is defined as ‘the degree to which the HRM issues are considered as part of the formulation of the business strategy’ (Brewster and Larsen, 1992). The following rationales have been identified for the importance of integration (Lengnick-Hall and Lengnick-Hall, 1988, Schuler, 1992; Budhwar, 2000):

- a) It ensures that all resources (human, technical and financial) are given due consideration in setting goals and assessing implementation capabilities;
- b) It provides a broader range of solutions for solving complex organizational problems;
- c) It limits the subordination of strategic considerations to HR preferences and the neglect of HR as a vital source of organizational competence.
- d) It assures successful implementation of corporate strategy;
- e) It is seen as a vital ingredient in achieving and maintaining effective organization performance;
- f) It provides long-term focus to HRM; and
- g) It helps to achieve a competitive advantage to a firm.

Three elements associated with the notion of SHRM as a distinctive approach, rather than as just an alternative title for personnel management are: (a) An acceptance that human resources are the ones which ‘make the difference’; (b) they must be considered and managed in a strategic way; and (c) it requires line managers to become aware of the link between HRM and the strategic direction of the organization as outlined by its top managers, and to act accordingly in a way in which they manage people (Thornhill and Saunders, 1998). This third element is basically required due to tendency of much devolvement to line managers in SHRM.

Devolvement is defined as ‘the degree to which HRM practices involve and give responsibility to line managers rather than HR specialists’. Line managers are ‘individuals directly involved in accomplishing the primary purposes of the organization’ (Mondy and Noe, 2006). In the increasingly competitive business environment, there have been large-scale restructuring in organizations and primary responsibility of HRM is being devolved. Devolvement has also been referred as devolution or decentralization in HRM literature (Andolsek and Stebe, 2005). The researchers in the field (Brewster and Larsen, 1992; Cunningham and Hyman's, 1999; Budhwar, 2000) have revealed following rationale for devolvement:

- a) It can result in better motivation of employees and effective control.
- b) Local managers are able to respond more quickly to local problems and conditions.
- c) Certain issues are too complex for top management to comprehend.
- d) It helps to reduce costs.
- e) It helps in preparing future managers (by allowing middle managers to practice decision-making skills).
- f) Most routine problems can be resolved at the grass root level.
- g) There is more time for HR specialists to perform strategic functions; hence organizational effectiveness can be improved.
- h) Personnel management without devolvement has ‘consistently failed to achieve results in the past.’

1.2 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The present study is an attempt to:

- a) evaluate levels of integration and devolvement in HEIs of Punjab, Pakistan;
- b) study the relationship between integration and devolvement;
- c) investigate the interplay of number of influences of HRM functions, and contingent variables upon integration and devolvement; and
- d) make a comparison between the public and private sector institutes regarding patterns of HRM and other organizational characteristics.

1.3 RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS

Keeping in view the scope of study, following research hypotheses are formulated:

- Hypothesis 1: HEIs practice a low level of integration of HRM into business strategy.
- Hypothesis 2: HEIs practice a low level of devolvement of HRM to departmental heads (DHs).
- Hypothesis 3: There is no relationship between levels of integration and devolvement.
- Hypothesis 4: There is no difference in level of devolvement of various HRM functions.
- Hypothesis 5: There is no difference in change in the DHs responsibility for various HRM functions.
- Hypothesis 6: There is no difference in training levels of DHs in different HR areas.
- Hypothesis 7a: There is no difference between public and private sector regarding levels of integration and devolvement.
- Hypothesis 7b: There is no difference between public and private sector regarding their HRM patterns.
- Hypothesis 7c: There is no difference between public and private sector regarding their organizational characteristics.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 HRM AND ORGANIZATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

The research in this regard can be distributed in three main groups. First group of studies confirm the influence of organizational characteristics like size, age, sector, type, presence of HR department, HR strategy, business strategy, structure, technology, life-cycle stage, developmental stage, R&D expenditures, numerical flexibility and education of employees upon HRM. Second group includes studies which do not confirm the relationship of some organizational characteristics upon HRM. And third group included the studies in which researchers do realize a weak influence of organizational characteristics but considers some other influences more important than these variables.

2.1.1 First Group

According to Dimick and Murray (1978), (a) size of organization is related to the sophistication of staffing, the range of training available to non managerial employees, and the application of performance appraisal; (b) extent of unionization is associated with more personnel decisions being made by line managers and fewer being made by personnel specialists; and (c) level of formal education of an employee group has an influence on training programs and promotion decisions.

A particular developmental stage of an organization may require a different HRM fit (Barid and Meshoulam, 1988). They propose five developmental stages for HRM namely initiation, functional growth, controlled growth, functional integration and strategic integration.

Jackson et al. (1989) finds that HRM is related to innovation strategy, sector (service or manufacturing), technology, structure, size and presence of unions.

Brewster and Larsen (1992) concentrate on national differences at the expense of sector, size or ownership differences. Still they recognize that further analyses along these variables may enrich their work.

Terpstra and Rozell (1993) find that the extent of use of the staffing practices is related to both industry type and size. Lawler et al. (1995) include government ownership, unionization, size and industrial sector as control variables in a survey among subsidiaries of multinational corporations and locally owned companies both in India and Thailand.

Numerous studies in the US have found positive relations between presence of an HR department and HRM practices (Galang and Ferris, 1997).

Muller (1998) investigates US and UK subsidiaries operating in Germany and finds that there is more pressure on larger firms to comply with local labor laws than small and medium-sized subsidiaries, which can to some extent, avoid these pressures.

Valle et al. (1999) demonstrate an association between some HR practices and business strategy in Spanish companies.

Hsu and Leat (2000) find that size of a company has impact on three HR activities: a) its recruitment and selection processes; b) the recruitment methods; and c) selection techniques. Where as ownership pattern only impact the recruitment methods.

Khatri (2000) studies largest companies representing all major industries in Singapore. One of his three important findings is that ‘overall strategy affects HR practices’.

Cleland et al. (2000) finds in New Zealand that devolution of HR responsibilities to line managers has predominantly been occurred only in small organizations.

Budhwar and Khatri (2001) suggest that in Indian and Britain organizations there is relationship between size, age, nature, life-cycle stage, HR strategies, sector and trade union membership and HRM policies and practices.

Horwitz et al. (2002) highlight certain variables of local distinctiveness and diversity as features which shape particular HR practices. They are supporting the view that firms’ life-cycle stage, experience in international business and the headquarters’ international orientation may be important in this regard. Singh (2003) in his study uses size, age, R&D expenditure and unionization as control variables.

Galang (2004) observed that organizational characteristics of Philippines firms show more correlations with these characteristics than US and Canadian firms.

Thang and Quang (2005) explore HRM in four types of companies (namely foreign-invested companies, state-owned enterprises, local private companies and equitized companies) in Vietnam and find that ‘the adoption of HRM practices reflects the company’s ownership traits.’ Size also shows certain positive impact on HRM.

Bacon and Hoque (2005) argue that there is a far greater degree of informality in employment practices in SMEs than in larger workplaces.

Kotey and Slade (2005) analyze data from micro, small, and medium firms in Australia. They find that at smaller business sizes, HRM practices are less formal for managers than for operatives and advised that small firms must recognize the diversity of practices associated with size.

According to Ercek (2006) materialization of HRM ideas across large-sized Turkish organizations varies in accordance with their industrial domain, ownership structure, size and age.

Bartram et al. (2007) find that size moderates the relationship between role and strategic HRM in Australian public healthcare providers and age is correlated positively with perceptions of SHRM.

2.1.2 Second Group

Tung and Havlovic (1996) investigate in transition to free market economies of Poland and the Czech Republic and find that type of ownership did not appear to have a major impact on HRM and there is little difference between HR activities in union and non-union firms.

Poole and Jenkins (1997) conclude that similarities between manufacturing and non-manufacturing firms in Briton are substantially more than the differences in HRM, and developments in HRM reflect changes in the broader environment of businesses rather than being specific to the main industrial sectors.

Budhwar and Boyne (2004) find that ‘the gap between Indian private- and public-sector HRM practices is not very significant.’

Rodwell and Teo (2004) examine for-profit and non-profit knowledge-intensive health services organizations in Australia and find that there was no size or organizational type effect on the adoption of SHRM.

Thang and Quang (2005) claim that trade unions do not influence HRM. Wei and Lau (2005) show that three factors: market orientation, HRM importance and HRM competency are related to Chinese firms' adoption of SHRM. No moderating effects of sector type (state Vs private) and size are found.

Pearson et al. (2006) find that no differences exist between micro (0-9 employees) and small (10-250 employees) firms' HRM practices and support systems.

2.1.3 Third Group

The findings of studies particularly with reference to integration and devolvment are presented here.

For Indian firms Budhwar and Sparrow (1997) conclude that level of integration can be predicted primarily by firm's policy and practice variables rather than its age, size or sector.

Budhwar (2000) again finds in England that integration and devolvment of HRM are more determined by a number of organizational policies than traditional contingent variables.

Andolsek and Stebe (2005) find that the effects of external factors (country and sector) on the process of devolution are greater than those of the internal (size, age, HRM departments, HR strategies and policies and the level of numerical flexibility in the organization) factors.

2.2 INTEGRATION AND DEVOLVEMENT OF HRM

Generally in literature, integration and devolvment are described as one process (Andolsek and Stebe, 2005). Integration and devolvment are initially popularized by Brewster and Larsen (1992) when they say that 'two paradoxical elements in particular stand out as common to many analyses of HRM.'

Along with other variables, integration and devolvement are regularly investigated by *Cranfield Network (Carnet)*. The network has been established in 1989. One of its aims is to establish how far there has been a shift in personnel policies towards SHRM. It is the largest and most representative independent surveys of HRM policies and practices in the world. It has its members in forty countries. *Carnet* has been running survey since 1990 using standardized questionnaires sent to private and public organizations in different countries. This data is used by the academic partners for complimentary research projects, consultancy activities, publications and presentations at conferences and other events. Until now, about ninety publications on the carnet data/questionnaire have been published (Hegewisch and Larsen, 1996; Andolsek and Stebe, 2005; Farndale, 2005; Özçelik and Aydinl, 2006).

Our review here is limited to integration and devolvement, their interrelationship and comparison in public and private sector. Both integration and devolvement can be divided into two levels i.e. low and high. Therefore, a simple integration-devolvement matrix can be plotted. On this basis, Brewster and Larsen (1992) categorize ten European countries in four categories. Switzerland and Sweden are in 'pivotal' (high integration-high devolvement) category; Denmark and the Netherlands are in 'wild west' (low integration-high devolvement) category; Italy, UK and Germany are in 'mechanic' (low integration-low devolvement) category; and Spain, France and Norway are in the 'guarded strategist' (High integration-low devolvement) category. They are of the view that a high score in both of these variables may not be ideal. What is ideal in one cultural environment might not be successful in another environment. This view is put in another way by Monks (1996) when he suggests that the integration of HR issues in strategic decision making may need to be considered as a local, rather than a corporate level activity.

Among many studies conducted in different parts of the world around integration and devolvement, Budhwar and Sparrow (1997) find that in Indian industries about 66.4 percent and 67.2 percent of organizations are practicing low level of integration and devolvement respectively. However, an increase in the degree of responsibility for HRM being devolved to line managers is taking place. They indicate that the parallel achievement of integration and devolvement would seem difficult in Indian firms and is associated with conflicting HRM goals.

Surprisingly, Budhwar et al. (2006) discover that in Indian business process outsourcing (BPO) firms, against the established norms of traditional very reactive role, HR is playing a strategic and integrated role.

McDougall (1998) explores gender equality of a decentralized organizational structure in which the key element is devolved responsibility to line managers.

Bennett et al. (1998) attempt to find factors that influence integration, its subsequent effects. They find that strategic type and whether or not top management views employees as strategic resources are associated with integration, but labor market munificence and organizational growth does not have such an association.

On 25th anniversary yearly review issue Ferris et al. (1999) conclude that HRM is a 'mentality' so pervasive that it is interwoven into the very fabric of organizations, and integral of all of its decisions and actions.

Budhwar (2000) finds that about 50 percent and 61 percent of the British firms under study practice a low level of integration and devolvement respectively. He is not in a position to suggest a clear relationship between the practices of integration and devolvement. However, the preferences of most managers suggest a need to increase both practices.

Hsu and Leat (2000) obtain evidence in Taiwan that some HRM decisions are shared between line management and HR specialists and that line managers have a particularly influential role in decisions regarding recruitment and selection, training and development, and workforce expansion/reduction.

According to Cleland et al. (2000), the role of the HR function in New Zealand organizations has changed dramatically. It is becoming more integrated into the overall business planning process and is being linked to organizational objectives. But there is a little evidence of the devolution of HR responsibilities to line managers, and in fact most respondents indicate that the HR department had increased in size in response to greater demands for services.

In Mauritius civil service McCourt and Wong (2003) find that SHRM is neither practiced at all nor is it feasible in the near future. Because it is not widely known, there is no strategic management framework, staff management is highly centralized, and political will to make radical changes in staff management is lacking. According to them 'integration is, very simply, not practiced and line manager's ownership has little role to play in staff management'.

Cardoso (2004) find an extensive use of the HRM label among Portuguese organizations. The function has some degree of strategic integration, but there is an apparent reluctance to devolve HR responsibilities to line managers. The HR function appears to be playing the specialist role as a means of overcoming the credibility gap.

Andolsek and Stebe (2005) suggest that the country sets the limits or encourages devolution. HRM policy within the individual institutional context is of only secondary importance. Country is a factor that fosters divergent tendencies and HRM policy accelerates convergence in HRM practice. They find that organizations differ in their level of selective horizontal devolution, and HRM function follows the process of selective horizontal devolution.

Farndale (2005) observes a reverse trend in UK and four other European countries. He finds that except for issues of workforce expansion or reduction, devolution of policy-making to line managers is decreasing from an already low level across the range of HRM issues. A key observation is the consistently significant positive correlation in UK between board membership and the department's level of strategic involvement.

According to Sheehan (2005), there has been little attempt to model the transition to strategic HRM and identify the relationships between the factors that impact on the transition. 'A certain set of symbolic and ritualistic gestures' is required for this integration. Specifically, HR representation on the senior committee, a direct reporting relationship with the CEO and a good informal relationship provide appropriate access for HR to make a contribution. Other factors such as the business credibility of the HR manager, the level of CEO HRM commitment and the level of corporate cultural support for HRM can facilitate this transition.

Pereira et al. (2006) examine actual tasks that are being devolved and tried to establish different degrees of devolution according to a number of dimensions. The results indicate that it is worthwhile to break down the concept of devolution into dimensions (tasks and responsibilities, decision-making power, financial power and expertise power) and to specify what dimensions are devolved.

There has been substantial discussion in literature on 'returning HRM to the line' (McGovern et al., 1997; Harris, 2001). Researchers have found clear evidence that the role of front line managers' (FLM) in HRM have broadened while maintaining their traditional supervisory duties (McConville and Holden, 1999; Hales, 2005). However, FLM have also been criticized at

the same time for their lack of training, lack of interest, work overload, conflicting priorities and self-serving behavior (McGovern et al., 1997; Harris, 2001; Whittaker and Marchington, 2003; Purcell and Hutchinson 2007).

2.3 HR-LINE RELATIONSHIP

This relationship has been discussed in literature from different perspectives. Here briefly review of some of these studies to understand the nature of debate upon HR-line relationship in SHRM is presented.

Storey (1992) argues that the changing role for line managers has impacted on HR specialists, and there is scope to evaluate more closely the impact of this changing role on those most affected by this change – those managed by line managers. Where line managers sought to achieve integration, they are also more likely to achieve the other outcomes related to the achievement of organizational commitment – flexibility, adaptability and, by implication, quality. The approach adopted by the line managers to achieve these HR policy outcomes involve the use of techniques associated with the ‘soft’ version of HRM.

Evidence from the case study (Storey, 1992) demonstrates when line managers are perceived to be supporting employees, this improved employees’ commitment. However, the lack of integration between the activities of different line managers, and also between line and top managers, has negative implications for those positive HR outcomes already created. This results in decreased commitment; reduced flexibility and adaptability. The absence of a designated HR specialist role may, therefore, be argued to have a significant negative effect on the organization’s ability to achieve strategic integration in relation to the management of its human resources, with further negative consequences for commitment to the organization, flexibility and quality. The solution to the problems may lie either in the creation of a specialist HR role, or through specifically tasking one of the organization’s top managers to undertake this role. However, irrespective of which course of action might be adopted, the evidence also points to the need for this to be a strategic role. In the absence of this, line managers are left to inspire, encourage and develop employees as they believe appropriate, without clear strategic direction from top management. For many, this situation leads to the adoption of a hard, resource-centered approach for the management of people. The evidence of the case study, therefore, suggests that the ‘absentee specialist’ scenario is likely to lead to a failure to achieve HRM. What results is a greater emphasis on the ‘hard’ version of HRM without any systematic realization of integration and the other beneficial consequences which may be more likely to be realized as a result of this.

There has been concerns over whether line managers and supervisors are sufficiently competent to take on demanding roles required under change programs, and the difficulties in attempting to transfer an HR vision, which is senior management-led, down to the line (Cunningham and Hyman, 1995).

Heraty and Morley (1995) identify that key factors inhibiting complete devolvement to the line include the importance of the activity from a strategic perspective, the issue of ownership, differing perspectives between line managers and specialists and the organizational support for line managers. Until these issues are addressed, the joint responsibility between the HR specialist and the line managers is best.

Beer (1997) discusses the transformation of the HR function and how to resolve tension between a traditional administrative and a new strategic role. He argues that the older administrative, compliance and service oriented HR activities have to become more differentiated from the new strategic HR activities. Therefore, companies are creating geographically decentralized HR service centers responsible for providing traditional administrative services. Unlike the strategic HR professionals, typically called 'HR partners,' HR specialists in these centers are not affiliated with a particular business unit, branch or plant.

Gennard and Kelly (1997) observe that organizations reporting a decline in HR influence cite devolution as a major factor. Following devolution, some of HR's problems become exacerbated by the function's overall lack of control over issues, such as training budgets and operational strategies. These exclusions do not prevent line managers from criticizing the function for perceived shortcomings in the directions of people management or in the provision of training support. Further, line managers expect to receive assistance from HR over operational manpower issues which are no longer formally part of HR's responsibilities. These dynamics might precipitate an accelerated decline in the role and status of remaining HR specialists. Alternatively, alliances may be forged with line managers, who themselves face increased and intensified work loads. It is conceivable that the low levels of employee morale coupled with acknowledged deficiencies in supervisor and line manager capabilities encourage senior management to review its role for HR.

According to Hope-Hailey et al. (1997) devolution to the line is still problematic, and that access to strategic decision making remains to be contingent on the ability of the senior HR managers or directors to influence people. Nevertheless, there is a rising awareness or recognition of the strategic importance of HRM to business performance.

McDougall (1998) proposes that in the public sector it is essential to find effective ways of developing cultures where gender inequalities do not exist, and in which individuals of all backgrounds can make their optimum contributions. Devolvement of responsibility to line managers has an important part to play. However it does have the potential to represent the ultimate opt-out from gender equality. It has been argued here that an interim stage involving an integration team would be helpful in advance of total devolvement to offset some of the key problems. Effective leadership, supportive ongoing training and education for managers, focused communication strategies, and vigilance of structure, processes and outcomes, are essential ingredients if devolving gender management in the public sector is to represent a positive opportunity.

Thornhill and Saunders (1998) observe that in most cases, this debate is focused on ways of interaction between personnel specialists and line managers interact and the impact of this interaction on the organization. Rarely has the impact of removing the specialist HR function been examined. Therefore they explore the implications which arise from the complete devolvement of HR responsibilities within an organization to line managers.

Cunningham and Hyman (1999) find that devolvement is formally geared to securing commitment from employees by promoting an integrative culture of employee management through line managers. They believe that tensions exist between line managers and HR specialists, and the function appears to be vulnerable to further contraction. They conclude that prospects for HR following devolution are at best uncertain.

Renwick (2000) states that in respect of organizations' attempts to devolve operational HR management to line managers, and the reconfiguration of HR work in general, one area of HR work that has received relatively little attention is the state of work relations between HR and line managers involved in the operation and execution of HR policy. He finds that conflicting relations are seen to exist, but are seen to be negated by moves towards more consensual relations by both parties. He concludes that it is useful to seek to derive a wider research agenda than that which presently exists for HR-line work relations (especially the need for further case work), and to stress the need for further theory development in the field, so as to examine consensual theories' explanations of why such developments are occurring.

Currie and Procter (2001) again observe that there is lack of understanding of the process of enhancing the willingness and ability of line managers to take on responsibility for HR issues. They suggest that this 'relationship is one of partnership'; and proposed that middle managers should be allowed to cross functional boundaries within the organization, there should be significant investment in their development, HR strategy should consist of broad themes rather than tight prescription and the HR functions should operate alongside middle-level line managers.

Line management involvement in HR work of this kind is not without its difficulties (Reddington et al., 2005) and there remains mixed results about the process of devolution and the competence of line managers in HR work more generally (Hutchinson and Purcell, 2003; Renwick, 2003). The devolution of transactional HR work to the line combined with its relocation to service centers as well as the fact that business partners are largely oriented towards strategic issues means employees are increasingly losing day-to-day contact with HR specialists and relying on line managers who may have neither the time nor the training to give HR work the priority it needs. They have retreated to the strategy bunker to think great thoughts and discuss the shape of the world with like-minded people consuming endless cups of coffee, while the appraisal and the selection and the communication is left 'to the line' (Torrington et al., 2005).

The assumption that line management 'could and would' fulfill the employee champion role is shown to be 'flawed'. Line managers are 'neither capable nor motivated' to take on people management responsibilities and the authors conclude that 'the failure to recognize the criticality of employee champion role is a mistake' (Hope-Hailey et al., 2005). Thus seeking a more balanced agenda is the key to shaping future successful HR work.

Maxwell and Watson (2006) find that there are differences between line managers' and HR specialists' perspectives in five aspects: understanding and ownership of the company's service and HR strategy; line managers involvement in and rankings of HR activities; HR specialists' support of line managers; barriers to line managers' involvement in HR activities; and the competence of line managers in HR activities. Importantly, it is found where there are divergent views across line managers and their HR specialists in their hotel, there is poor hotel business performance and, conversely, convergent views are evident in the effectively performing hotels. These findings may have resonance for other organizations in devolving HR management to the line and developing HR business partnerships for business performance. It is proposed that three types of line managers' buy-in are central to their active involvement in HR, namely: conceptual understanding

of the rationale for their involvement; implementation effectiveness through HR role clarity and capability; and affective commitment in believing in the value of their involvement in HR.

According to Francis (2006) current models of HRM suggest that expectations about HR roles are changing as organizations are striving to make the HR function leaner and more 'strategic'. They explore the changing roles of HRM as they are perceived by different stakeholder groups within the HR profession. They conclude that there is need for more balanced HR agenda addressing human and economic concerns in current and future models of HRM.

Purcell and Hutchinson (2007) pointed out that within HRM; a) there is substantial discussion on 'returning HRM to the line'; b) there is clear evidence that the role front line managers (FLM) in people management, and in management more generally, has been broadened while maintaining their traditional supervisory duties; c) a steady stream of studies in the period on aspects of the FLM role in HRM like appraisal, involvement and incentive pay has noted the distinction between espoused and enacted HR practices with the gap often explained by FLMs' lack of training, lack of interest, work overload, conflicting priorities and self-serving behavior.

2.4 HRM RESEARCH IN HEIs

Research in this regard is rather more confined to developed countries. There is overall lack of strategic focus in HRM literature covering HEIs. HRM research in various developing countries is found, but none of them in HEIs. Evaluation of levels of integration and devolvement in HEIs in developing countries is out of question.

There is a realization of the fact that the role of faculty is becoming more complex and fragmented (Coaldrake and Steadman, 1998), and more pressured (McInnis, 2000). In the conference held in Paris in August 2005 on 'Trends in the Management of Human Resources in Higher Education,' it has been realized that 'workforce development has become a critical issue in enabling universities to deliver multiple agendas in complex environments' (Gordon and Whitchurch, 2007).

Furthermore, Higher Education is being seen as an integrated 'project' in which the delivery of multiple agendas in a knowledge environment can only be achieved through a range of contributions from different groups of staff (Duke, 2003; Gordon and Whitchurch, 2007). HR and staff development

professionals are also considering how they might interface most effectively with line managers, at all levels, in the field (Knight, 2005). Archer (2005) is of the view that HR departments have become more involved with strategy than day to-day line management issues.

2.5 HRM RESEARCH IN PAKISTAN

Khilji (2001) is the first internationally recognized researcher who opened the window for HRM research in Pakistan. Through this window one can have an overall view of HRM in Pakistan. She has conducted research on banking industry, particularly multinational banks operating in Pakistan. She extends the on going convergence-divergence debate in HRM and concludes that both the issues may occur simultaneously in the process of HRM change; and that the variables used to explain them are, in fact, not immutable in nature, as has been assumed by many (Khilji, 2002).

She finds that ‘the influences of the parent companies of multinationals are weakened by the national characteristics of the environments in which they operate’, and the impact of HRM is ‘similar to what has been previously documented by researchers in the UK and the USA’ (Khilji, 2003). While exploring the antecedents and complexities of values of employees and organizations, she validates that younger cohort of employees adopt a different set of HR practices. Organizations that are responsive to these changes appear to achieve greater HR satisfaction. Therefore, she suggests that senior managers should re-assess values of their employees and play a more committed role in developing new HR systems (Khilji, 2004). She argues that ‘implemented’ HRM may be substantially different from ‘intended’ HRM. Therefore, she suggests that a mere imitation of HRM in the hope of improving organizational performance creates no value. It is crucial that HR people remain committed and supportive to the development of effective HRM systems by focusing upon actual ‘implementation’ within their organizations (Khilji, 2006).

2.6 PUBLIC VERSUS PRIVATE SECTOR

Public and private organizations are frequently differentiated on the basis of ‘ownership’ (Scott and Falcone, 1998). Entrepreneurs or shareholders own private-sector firms. Whereas, public-sector firms are owned, funded and controlled collectively by members of political communities at different levels of government (Bozeman, 1987). Research has shown the influence of ownership on HRM policies and practices (Dimick and Murray, 1978; Jackson et al., 1989; Lawler et al., 1995; Hsu and Leat, 2000; Thang and Quang, 2005; Ercek, 2006).

After the initiation of privatization programmes in developed countries, roughly from the late 1960s and early 1970s, public-sector managers have been encouraged to emulate the workplace practices and policies of the private sector (Ferlie et al., 1996; Box, 1999). This is based on the premise that the private sector has supposedly superior administrative practices (Hood, 1991). The existing literature shows a scarcity of concrete research results in this regard (Boyne, 2002). A number of studies have been conducted to examine and compare different organizational aspects (such as level of satisfaction, motivation, commitment, patterns of HRM systems, etc.) in public- and private-sector firms.

However, it is important to note that most of the existing literature is based on research in the developed countries. Most of the emerging countries or newly industrialized nations, such as the Tiger and Dragon nations, China, India, East European economies, South Africa and Latin American countries, are now pursuing privatization programmes. These countries have now liberalized their economies and opened their markets to foreign investors. In such conditions both academicians and practitioners are eager to learn about the pattern of HRM systems prevalent in these countries. The privatization programmes initiated by the emerging countries, for example China, have serious implications for its workforce and HRM in the form of managing redundancies and employer–employee relations (Hassard et al., 1999; Sheehan et al., 2000). In such conditions, we can expect that the traditional differences in the public and private sectors indicated in the existing Western research will exist in the emerging nations. Nevertheless, it is important to test such assumptions further in other parts of the world.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

3.1 POPULATION

All HEIs of Punjab including Islamabad mentioned on the official website of Higher Education Commission of Pakistan (HEC) is the population of this study. There are fifty two chartered HEIs in Punjab (Annexure A), thirty-three of them in public sector and nineteen in private sector. Sampling is not done in this study; therefore, sample based statistical techniques can not be used. City-wise distribution of the population is presented in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1
City-wise Distribution of Population

City	Sector		Total
	Public	Private	
Islamabad/ Rwalpindi	14	03	17
Lahore	11	14	25
Others	08	02	10
Total	33	19	52

3.2 DATA COLLECTION

A survey questionnaire (Annexure B) designed for this purpose has been used for data collection. An executive well aware of the HRM related activities in an institute is contacted. There is no sampling and all fifty-two institutes have been targeted in the survey.

By going through various press advertisements of these chartered institutes for staff recruitment, it has become clear that almost all such advertisements, particularly those of public sector, are from registrar. The registrar office is more of a legal nature rather than HR oriented. However, in large institutes, an assistant registrar establishment deals with staff related activities. To contact with the registrar office to fill the questionnaire proved very useful in this study. A large portion of the information required is factual or open in nature, so any person having experience of working with an institute could easily provide this type of information. Some of the required information is readily available on the respective websites of the institutes.

Before starting data collection all websites of these institutes have been thoroughly visited and the relevant information was collected. This data later proved very helpful to cross check and in a very few cases to complete the missing information. This exercise has also been very useful to identify which of the institutes have the post of registrar and which one has HR department. For those institutes having a registrar, all the registrar offices are telephonically contacted to get an appointment. In most of the cases, the respondents have been very cooperative. Most of the registrars either have made them readily available to fill the questionnaire or referred the author to one of their assistants. In some cases it has been advised that the researcher should contact the administration department.

It is even more useful to contact HR heads of the institutes having HR department as they are more familiar with the terminology relating to HRM than registrar offices. Although some basic information is provided regarding the terminology used in the questionnaire, yet some of the terms particularly related to strategy and life-cycle have been explained to every respondent.

In HEIs, it seems more appropriate to replace the term line manager with a suitable term in HEIs. Line managers are ‘individuals directly involved in accomplishing the primary purpose of the organization’ (Mondy and Noe, 2006). They are not dedicated HR specialists, but have immediate staff management responsibility. In HEIs of Pakistan there is usually subject-wise departmentalization. The heads of these departments/ faculties/ schools/colleges etc. perform exactly similar activities as those of line managers. Therefore, for customization and to make the terminology more understandable to our respondents, the departmental heads (DHs) has been used in place of line managers. For the sake of simplicity, the term DHs for all kinds of heads (i.e. for deans, principals, chairmen, etc. or whatever terminology is prevailing in a particular institutes) has been used.

3.3 THE QUESTIONNAIRE

A lot of care is always required to design a questionnaire. A great amount of time and energy is invested to reach the final draft. It has been reviewed again and again to make it easier and less time consuming for the respondents. Before its final launching, it has been wetted or filled from well experienced individuals of HEIs, experts of questionnaire making, SPSS experts, and fellow researchers. This effort proved very fruitful during data entry and analysis as the interpretation for each and every possible answer has been known in advance.

The respondents have been well educated individuals; therefore, there is no need to translate the questionnaire into the local language. No problem regarding validity of the questionnaire is expected. English language is good enough for the questionnaire. However, to provide common perception to the respondents, abbreviations and some definitions of the terminology used in the questionnaire have been provided at the end of the questionnaire.

Although there are no formal sections in the survey questionnaire, yet for the sake of in depth understanding, it can be divided in three hypothetical sections. The detail of each of these sections is as under:

Section one (item number 1 to 10):

This section pertains to basic organizational characteristics. Beside name of institute and designation of the respondent other contingent variables in order of occurrence in the questionnaire covered in item number 2 to 10 are listed below:

1. Age (number of years)
2. Size (number of employees)
3. Sector (public or private)
4. Presence of HR department
5. Existence of HR department since incorporation
6. Background of HR head (or in-charge of HRM activities)
7. Presence of unions
8. Recognition of unions
9. Main Emphasis of HR strategy
10. Stage of business life cycle

Section two (item 11 to 14):

This section deals with the main study variables i.e. integration and devolvment. Item number 11 deals with integration. It has four sub items which covers the following variables:

1. Board level representation of HR head
2. Presence of written HR strategy
3. Translation of the HR strategy into work programs
4. HR involvement in development of corporate strategy

Item number 12 to 14 deals with devolvment. The following variables are involved in these items:

1. Change in the DHs responsibility
2. Level of devolved decision-making
3. Level of trained DHs

Both item number 12 and 13 require the respondent to reply the same question for six HR activities; pay and benefits, recruitment and selection, training and development, employee relations, health and safety, and work-force expansion/reduction. Whereas item number 14 requires the respondent to reply the same question about five HR areas; performance appraisal, staff communication, delegation, motivation and team building.

Section three (item 15 to 17):

This section deals with sixteen organizational policies pertaining to recruitment, training and means of communications. Item number 15 covers the organizational policy pertaining to the long-term targets for recruitment from:

1. Disables
2. Minorities
3. Provincial quotas
4. Women
5. Fresh graduates

Item number 16 deals with monitoring of training program effectiveness. It covers three formal and two non-formal methods.

Formal methods:

1. Performance tests
2. Evaluation immediately after training
3. Evaluation some months after training

Informal methods:

1. Informal feedback from DHs
2. Informal feedback from teachers

Item number 17 deals with means of communication with the staff. It covers six means of communication through:

1. Immediate superior
2. Trade unions or work councils
3. Regular workplace meetings
4. Quality circles/Quality enhancement center
5. Suggestion box (es)
6. An attitude survey

3.4 MEASURES AND METHODS

The existing measures of integration and devolvement in the field regularly used by *Carnet* and others (Brewster and Larsen, 1992; Budhwar 2000; Andolsek and Stebe, 2005; Farndale, 2005; Özçelik and Aydinl, 2006) are used in this study.

The level of integration is measured on the basis of:

- a) representation of HR head on the board;
- b) presence of a written HR strategy;
- c) consultation of HR (from the outset) in the development of corporate strategy; and
- d) translation of HR strategy into a clear set of work programs.

All the four scales are dichotomous in nature. Therefore, possible score for each institute ranges from 0 – 4. A score less than or equal to 2 is taken as low and the score of 3 or more is taken as high level of integration. In this way, two types of variables of integration are formed. One of them is of numerical nature and the other is of categorical nature. The numerical variable is simply called integration and the categorical one is referred as level of integration. Reliability coefficient of our data for this measurement scale is 0.6318.

The level of devolvement is measured on the basis of:

- a) change in the responsibility of DHs for HRM (in six HR activities);
- b) primary responsibility for HRM decision making (in six HR activities); and
- c) presence of at least one-third trained DHs (in five HR areas).

Possible scores of each institute for the three scale range from 0-12, 0-18 and 0-5 respectively. Therefore, an institute's score may ranges from 0–35. A score less than or equal to 18 is taken as Low and a score of 19 or more is taken as High. Like integration two variable of devolvement are formed. One of them is of numerical nature and the other is of categorical nature. The numerical variable is simply called devolvement and the categorical one is referred as level of devolvement. The alpha values of our data for the three scales are 0.9231, 0.5911 and 0.7428 respectively. And the combined alpha for the measurement scale of devolvement is 0.8051.

The sixteen organizational policies pertaining to long-term recruitment targets, monitoring of training and means of communication are measured through a Likert scale ranging from 1(not at all) to 5(to a great extent). SPSS is used for data analysis.

3.5 PILOT STUDY

To testify the effectiveness of the instrument, measures and statistical methods a pilot study is conducted in eight HEIs (Annexure C). All of these institutes are situated outside Punjab. This data is not used in the final analysis. On the basis of this pilot study it is found that the methodology is quite effective. Certain practical problems likely to be faced are known in advance, particularly in reference to verbal explanation of the terminology to the respondents. The definitions provided at the end of the questionnaire are needed to be further explained to provide a common perception particularly about HR strategy, business life cycle and purpose of the investigation.

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

4.1 DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

4.1.1 Respondents

In most of the cases registrar offices have responded the questionnaire. It has been referred to HR department in the institutes with formal HR departments. In case of non existence of registrar office or non availability of the registrar it has been advised to contact administration department and also to other departments. Nature of questionnaire is such that categories of respondents are found equally helpful. The percentage of each type of respondent is shown in the Table 4.1

Table 4.1
Department-wise detail of respondents

Department	Frequency	Percent
Registrar Office	32	61.5
HR Dept.	09	17.3
Administration Dept.	05	09.6
Other	06	11.5
Total	52	100

4.1.2 Age-wise Distribution of Population

Age-wise distribution of the population is presented in Table 4.2. It shows that only 9.6 percent of these institutes have been working at the time of partition. From the establishment of Pakistan to the fall of Dacca 7.7 percent more are added. Until then higher education has been a public sector dominated activity and no private sector institute has been in place. After the fall of Dacca 28.8 percent institutes have been further added to the list. Majority of the institutes i.e. 53.8 percent have been established during the last decade.

Table 4.2
Age-wise Distribution of Population

Period	Frequency	Percent
Before 1947	05	09.6
1947-1971	04	07.7
1972-1998	15	28.8
1999-2007	28	53.8
Total	52	100

4.1.3 Size-wise Distribution

It can be observed from the size-wise distribution of the population shown in Table 4.3 that about 50 percent of the institutes have less than or equal to 400 employees. The remaining institutes have more than 400 employees. Only 15.4 percent organizations have more than 1500 employees. On the whole it can be said that HEIs of Punjab are not very large in size.

Table 4.3
Size-wise Distribution of Population

Size (no of employees)	Frequency	Percent
150 and less	07	13.5
150 – 400	19	36.5
401 – 800	11	21.2
801 – 1500	07	13.5
1501 and above	08	15.4
Total	52	100

4.1.4 Descriptive statistics of numerical variables

The mean scores of integration and devolvment are 1.4 and 17.9 respectively are shown in Table 4.4. Both these scores are less than the score identified (i.e. 2 and 18 respectively) for splitting the range of scores into low and high levels. Therefore, the institutes under study fall in the low-low quadrant of the integration-devolvment matrix discussed by Brewster and Larson (1992).

Table 4.4
Descriptive Statistics of Numerical Variables

Variables	Min	Max	Mean	s.d.
1. Integration	0	04	1.4	1.3
2. Change in the DHs responsibility	0	12	8.5	2.7
3. Level of devolved decision-making	0	12	5.5	2.7
4. Level of Trained DHs	0	05	3.9	1.4
5. Devolvement	4	27	17.9	5.0

4.1.5 Categorical Variables

Table 4.5 shows the descriptive statistics of twelve categorical variables. Public sector HEIs are 63.5 percent and the remaining institutes are in private sector. Only 28.8 percent of institutes have formal HR departments. In 19.2 percent of institutes, HR departments exist since their incorporation.

50 percent of the in-charges of HRM are recruited from non-HR department within the organizations. It may be mentioned here that these in-charges include HR heads as well as other persons heading HRM activities in institutes where HR department is yet to be formally introduced. Only 13.5 percent of these in-charges have HR background and are experienced in the work in the same institutes. Thus the percentage of recruitment of in-charge HRM from internal non-HR department is much higher than those from HR departments. On the other hand, about 36.6 percent of these in-charges are recruited from outside the institute. The percentage of recruiting in-charge HRM from out side with HR background is (21.2 percent) which is greater than the recruitment from external non HR departments (15.4 percent).

Only 7.7 percent of the institutes reported that they have staff unions in their institutes. There were only 5.5 percent of institutes where unions are recognized for bargaining. That is why unionization is not included in any analysis in the coming part of the thesis.

50 percent of the institutes have reported that they are at expansion stage and 40.4 percent have reported that they are at growth stage of their business life cycle (Table 4.5). Thus, 90.4 percent of the institutes are either at expansion or at growth stage of their business life-cycle. This may be a reason that the main emphasis of the HR strategy for most of the institutes is upon talent acquisition (53.8 percent).

Table 4.5
Descriptive Statistics of the Categorical Variables

Item	Category	Freq	%
1. Sector	Public	33	63.5
	Private	19	36.5
2. Presence of HR dept	No	37	71.2
	Yes	15	28.8
3. Existence of HR dept since incorporation	No	42	80.8
	Yes	10	19.2
4. Background of in-charge HRM* (recruited from)	Within the HR Dept.	07	13.5
	Internal Non-HR Dept.	26	50.0
	External HR Dept.	11	21.2
	External Non-HR Dept.	08	15.4
5. Presence of unions	No	48	92.3
	Yes	04	07.7
6. Recognition of unions	No	49	94.2
	Yes	03	05.8
7. Main emphasis of HR strategy	Talent acquisition	28	53.8
	Ef. resource allocation	10	19.2
	Talent Improvement	11	21.2
	Cost reduction	03	05.8
8. Stage of business life cycle	Introduction	03	05.8
	Growth	21	40.4
	Expansion	26	50.0
	Maturity	02	03.8
9. In-charge HRM* having a place on the board	No	30	57.7
	Yes	22	42.3
10. Presence of written HR strategy	No	34	65.4
	Yes	18	34.6
11. HR strategy translated into work programs	No	34	65.4
	Yes	18	34.6
HR involvement in development of corporate strategy	No	39	75.0
	Yes	13	25.0

*** Including both HR heads and other person in-charge of HR related activities.**

All the remaining four variables pertain to integration. In all these variables ‘no’ is dominating the ‘yes’ category. Two categorical variables have not been included in this table. They are levels of integration and devolvement. They will be discussed in more detail and from various aspects in section 4.2.

4.1.6 Organizational policies

Descriptive statistics of sixteen organizational policies are shown in Table 4.6. Long-term targets for recruitment of employees from five diverse sources are presented in descending order. The mean score of all of the targets is less than 3. This means that the HEIs are not making any sizeable effort in increasing diversity among their employees. The mean scores of five methods of monitoring of training effectiveness are also very low. This is not surprising as most of the institutes are mainly focusing upon talent acquisition strategy, therefore, there will be less focus upon training itself, let alone monitoring its effectiveness.

Table 4.6
Descriptive Statistics of Organizational Policies

Policy	Min	Max	Mean	s.d.
Long-term targets for recruitment from				
1. Disables	1	5	2.94	1.87
2. Women	1	5	2.35	1.51
3. Fresh graduates	1	5	2.21	1.54
4. Minorities	1	5	1.63	1.28
5. Provincial quotas	1	5	1.42	1.05
Monitor training effectiveness through formal evaluation				
1. Some months after training	1	5	1.83	1.28
2. Immediately after training	1	5	1.83	1.42
3. Performance test	1	5	1.58	1.24
Informal				
1. Feedback from DHs	1	5	2.46	1.75
2. Feedback from teachers	1	5	2.04	1.51
Means of communication with staff through				
1. Immediate superior	1	5	4.40	1.14
2. Regular workplace meetings	1	5	2.85	1.49
3. Quality enhancement center	1	5	2.27	1.36
4. An attitude survey	1	5	1.60	1.18
5. Suggestion box	1	5	1.38	0.87
6. Trade unions or work councils	1	5	1.12	0.58

The mean score of the ways of communication with the staff shows that most of the communication is being done through immediate superior (4.4) followed by regular workplace meetings (2.85). The remaining scores are even less than 2.85. That is why any in-depth analysis of the organizational policies of our data finds less space in the remaining thesis.

4.2 HYPOTHESIS RESULTS

The research hypotheses presented in section 1.4 of the first chapter are now analyzed on basis of data of the population.

4.2.1 Levels of Integration and Devolvement

The levels of integration are shown in Table 4.7. It can be observed from the table that about 73 percent of the institutes under study practice a low level of integration. Therefore, there is a very low level of integration of HRM in the HEIs of Punjab, Pakistan. Thus *Hypothesis 1* is supported.

Table 4.7
Levels of Integration

Level	Frequency	Percent
Low	38	73.1
High	14	26.9
Total	52	100

* Low 0-2; High 3-4

Table 4.8
Levels of Devolvement

Level	Frequency	Percent
Low	27	51.9
High	25	48.1
Total	52	100

* Low 0-18; High 19-35

The levels of devolvement are shown in Table 4.8. It can be noted from the table that about 52 percent of the population under study practice a low level of devolvement. Therefore, majority of the HEIs practice a low level of devolvement. Thus there is a support for *Hypothesis 2* also.

4.2.2 Interrelationship of Integration and Devolvement

The levels of integration and devolvement are categorical variables commuted from the numerical values of integration and devolvement respectively. The data pertains to population; therefore, the relationship

between these variables can be studied by calculating odd ratios. The contingencies of the levels of integration and devolvement are shown in Table 4.9. The odd ratio is greater than one. There is a positive association between the levels of integration and devolvement. The two variables are clearly related as out of 27 institutes practicing a low level of devolvement 26 are also practicing low level of integration. And out of 14 institutes practicing high level of integration 13 are also practicing high level of devolvement. This means that *Hypothesis 3* is rejected. That is, levels of integration and devolvement are interrelated.

Table 4.9
Levels of Integration and Devolvement

		Level of Devolvement		Total	Odd Ratio
		Low	High		
Level of Integration	Low	26	12	38	28.16
	High	01	13	14	
Total		27	25	52	

To support this argument further devolvement (in numerical form) is taken as dependant variable and integration (in numerical form) as independent variable and regression was run. R^2 for the model is 0.265 i.e. 26.5 percent of devolvement can be explained through integration. The value of R^2 is very low. But here the relationship is tested and not the predictability of devolvement on the basis of integration. The relationship can be confirmed on this value. The following regression model shows that with one unit of increase in integration, there will be 1.942 units increase in devolvement.

$$Y (\text{devolvement}) = 15.194 + 1.942 X (\text{integration})$$

4.2.3 Devolvement of the Six HRM Functions

It is analyzes whether the level of devolved decision making in six HRM areas follows a selective horizontal devolvement (Table 4.10). It is shown in the table that highest level of HRM devolvement is in the case of employee relations. In 9.6 percent of organizations this is decided directly by DHs. It is followed by the decisions about training and development, health and safety and workforce strength. The two areas pay and benefits and

recruitment and selection show zero devolvement to sole DHs and the decisions are fully centralized.

Similarly, the percentage of consultative decisions in all of the six HR areas is quite different. The highest consultation is made in decisions regarding recruitment and selection. DHs with in-charges HRM decide on employee's relations (34.6 percent) then on training and development (25.0 percent) and then on number of employees (21.2 percent) and so on. In-charges HRM together with DHs are most responsible for recruitment and selection (67.3 percent) and training and development (44 percent) and so on. In-charges HRM at centralized level are exclusively responsible for pay and benefits (53.8 percent) and health and safety (51.9 percent) and so on. Therefore, level of devolvement in each of the six HR areas in HEIs of Punjab, Pakistan is different. *Hypothesis 4* is consequently rejected.

Table 4.10
Level of Devolved Decision-making in Areas of HRM

HR Area	Primary Responsibility of Decision Making (%)			
	Sole DHs Decision	DHs in consultation with HRM	HRM in Consultation with DHs	Sole HRM Decision
Pay and benefits	-	5.8	40.4	53.8
Recruitment and selection	-	7.7	67.3	25.0
Training and development	5.8	25.0	44.2	25.0
Employee relations	9.6	34.6	34.6	21.2
Health and safety	3.8	13.5	30.8	51.9
Workforce expansion/ reduction	3.8	21.2	50.0	25.0

Table 4.11 helps to analyze whether the direction of change in the responsibility of DHs in the six HRM areas is different or not. The changes in the process of devolvement in the six areas of HRM over the last five years are shown in this table. It can be observed from the table that devolvement has made the greatest advance in the area of training and development. DHs have taken more responsibility for training in 57.7 percent of institutes. In 51.9 percent of the institutes analyzed, they have also taken more responsibility for recruitment and selection. In 50.0 percent of institutes DHs are now more responsible for determining the number of employees (i.e. workforce expansion or reduction). This percentage for employee relations is 38.5, for pay and benefits 36.5 percent and only 26.9 percent for health and

safety. The greatest difference in increase in devolvement is seen in training and development (55.8 percent), followed by recruitment and selection (50.0 percent) and so on. Therefore, the data shows that in the six HRM areas, the change in responsibility of DHs is different. *Hypothesis 5* is rejected accordingly.

Table 4.11
Change in the DHs Responsibility in Areas of HRM

HR Area	Direction of DHs responsibility (%)			% increase
	Increased	Same	Decreased	
Pay and benefits	36.5	59.6	3.8	32.7
Recruitment and selection	51.9	46.2	1.9	50.0
Training and development	57.7	40.4	1.9	55.8
Employee relations	38.5	59.6	1.9	36.5
Health and safety	26.9	71.2	1.9	25.0
Workforce expansion/ reduction	50.0	48.1	1.9	48.1

4.2.4 Presence of Trained DHs in five HR Areas

The analysis of the DHs skills in five areas of HRM is presented in Table 4.12. The institutes have been asked whether more than one-third of their DHs are trained in HRM areas, 94.2 percent of the HEIs claim this is the case for staff communication, 90.4 percent for appraisal, 78.8 percent for team building and 48.1 percent for delegation. Only 30.8 percent of organizations claim to have trained more than one third of their managers in motivation. The different scores in all the areas mean the rejection of *Hypothesis 6*.

DHs in two of the areas i.e. performance appraisal and staff communication are trained in more than 90 percent of the institutes. In an attempt is made to discover the reasons, it is found that most of the DHs are highly educated and experienced people. They have been writing annual confidential reports (ACRs) for so many years that they have been regarded as highly trained persons. Similar logic may be put forward in case of staff communication. However, it may be noted that formal training programs for DHs is almost non existent particularly in HRM.

Table 4.12
Trained DHs in Areas of HRM

HR Area	Category	Freq.	%
Performance appraisal	No	05	9.6
	Yes	47	90.4
Staff communication	No	03	5.8
	Yes	49	94.2
Delegation	No	25	48.1
	Yes	27	51.9
Motivation	No	16	30.8
	Yes	36	69.2
Team building	No	11	21.2
	Yes	41	78.8

4.2.5 Comparison between Public and Private Sector Institutes

Sector wise comparison of the levels of integration is shown in Table 4.13a. 78.8 percent of the public sector HEIs are practicing a low level of integration as against 63.2 percent in the private sector. This percentage for the overall population is 73.1. So, both the public and private sector HEIs are almost behaving in the same way and majority of them are practicing low level of integration.

Table 4.13a
Comparison between Public and Private Sector regarding Levels of Integration

Variable			Sector		Total
			Public	Private	
Levels of Integration	Low	Count	26	12	38
		% within Sector	78.8	63.2	73.1
	High	Count	07	07	14
		% within Sector	21.2	36.8	26.9
Total			33	19	52

Sector wise comparison of the levels of devolvement is shown in Table 4.13b. 57.6 percent of the public sector HEIs are practicing a low level of devolvement as against 42.1 percent in the private sector. This percentage for the overall population is 51.9. The behavior of the two sectors in their level of

integration is similar but in case of level of devolvement some what different from each other. Therefore, *Hypothesis 7a* is partially accepted.

Table 4.13b
Comparison between Public and Private Sector regarding
Levels of Devolvement

Variable			Sector		Total
			Public	Private	
Levels of Devolvement	Low	Count	19	08	27
		% within Sector	57.6	42.1	51.9
	High	Count	14	11	25
		% within Sector	42.4	57.9	48.1
Total			33	19	52

The comparison between the two sectors with respect to five variables covering various aspects of HRM is shown in Table 4.14a. The first variable is presence of HR department. 78.8 percent of the public sector HEIs of Punjab do not have HR department and this percentage for the private sector institutes is 57.9 percent. Therefore, majority of both the public and private sector institutes are managing their human resources without a formal HR department. The second variable is existence of HR department since incorporation of the institutes. It can be see from the table that 81.8 percent of the public sector HEIs of Punjab do not have HR department at the time of their incorporation and this percentage for the private sector institutes is 78.9 percent. Therefore, in both public and private sector institutes, majority of the organizations are established without a formal HR department.

The third variable in the Table 4.14a pertains to the background of HRM in-charges. This includes both HR heads and other designated individuals like Registrars, Manager Administrations and General Managers etc. heading HR related activities. In both public and private sector HEIs of Punjab, 50 percent of these in-charges have been recruited from non-HR department within the institutes. This percentage of recruitment from an external HR department is very much similar, 21.2 and 21.1 percent, in public and private sector institutes respectively. Therefore, 71 percent of the institutes are similar in both sectors regarding back ground of HRM in-charges. However, it may be noted that the percentage of recruitment of HRM in-charges from within the HR department in private sector is more than twice than that of in public sector institutes. On the contrary, this percentage of recruitment from external non-HR departments in public sector is nearly double than that of in private sector HEIs.

Table 4.14a
Comparison between Public and Private Sector regarding
HRM Patterns

Variable			Sector		Total
			Public	Private	
1. Presence of HR department	No	Count %	26 78.8	11 57.9	37 71.2
	Yes	Count %	07 21.2	08 42.1	15 28.8
2. Existence of HR department since Incorporation	No	Count %	27 81.8	15 78.9	42 80.8
	Yes	Count %	06 18.2	04 21.1	10 19.2
3. In-charge HRM* recruited from	Within the HR Dept.	Count %	03 9.1	04 21.1	7 13.5
	Internal Non-HR Dept.	Count %	17 51.5	09 47.4	26 50.0
	External HR Dept.	Count %	07 21.2	04 21.1	11 21.2
	External Non-HR Dept.	Count %	06 18.2	02 10.5	08 15.4
4. In-charge HRM* having a place on the board	No	Count %	20 60.6	10 52.6	30 57.7
	Yes	Count %	13 39.4	09 47.4	22 42.3
5. HR involvement in development of corporate strategy	No	Count %	26 78.8	13 68.4	39 75.0
	Yes	Count %	07 21.2	06 31.6	13 25.0
Total			33	19	52

*** Including both HR heads and other person in-charge of HRM related activities**

Fourth variable in the Table 4.14a is representation of in-charge HRM on the board of governors. In 60.6 percent of public sector HEIs of Punjab, the answer to this question is no and 52.6 percent of the private sector institutes also responded in no to this question. The difference in the two in this variable is also not very vast.

The last variable in the Table 4.14a, the involvement of HR in development of corporate strategy in public and private sector HEIs is very

much similar. 78.8 percent in case of public sector and 68.4 percent in case of private sector have no such involvement.

The comparison between the two sectors with respect to three variables related to HR strategy is shown in Table 4.14b. The first variable pertains to the presence of written HR strategy. The sectors are not similar regarding this variable as 75.8 percent of the public sector HEIs of Punjab do not have written HR strategy. Where as this percentage for the private sector institutes is 47.4 percent. Same situation is prevailing in the two sectors with regard to the translation of HR strategy into clear work programs, the second variable.

Table 4.14b
Comparison between Public and Private Sector regarding HR Strategy

Variable			Sector		Total
			Public	Private	
1. Presence of written HR strategy	No	Count %	25 75.8	09 47.4	34 65.4
	Yes	Count %	08 24.2	10 52.6	18 34.6
2. HR strategy translated into work programs	No	Count %	25 75.8	09 47.4	34 65.4
	Yes	Count %	08 24.2	10 52.6	18 34.6
3. Main emphasis of HR strategy	Talent acquisition	Count %	17 51.5	11 57.9	28 53.8
	Ef. Resource allocation	Count %	06 18.2	04 21.1	10 19.2
	Talent improvement	Count %	08 24.2	03 15.8	11 21.2
	Cost reduction	Count %	02 6.1	01 5.3	03 5.8
Total			33	19	52

Third variable in the Table 4.14.b is about the main emphasis of HR strategy. Every organization always follows a strategy, whether it exists in written form or not. Lack of written HR strategy does not mean that there is no HR strategy at all. The focus of the HR practices can help to identify what kind of strategy is being followed. Four kinds of HR strategies are provided in the questionnaire and the respondents have been asked about the main emphasis of the HR strategy of their institute. In both the sectors the main

emphasis is upon talent acquisition, 51.5 and 57.9 percent in the public and private sector institutes respectively and the least emphasis is upon cost reduction, 6.1 and 5.3 percent in the public and private sector institutes respectively.

The percentage of the institutes of both sectors having main emphasis of HR strategy on effective resource allocation is also very close to each other. It is 18.2 and 21.1 percent in the public and private sector institutes respectively. One fourth of the public sector and even less than one fourth of the private sector HEIs of Punjab are emphasizing talent improvement. Acquiring talent is much emphasized in both the sectors rather than improving the existing talent through training and development.

On the basis of the data presented in Table 4.14.a and Table 4.14b and the discussion, it can be said that the similarities in the public and private sector HEIs regarding their HRM patterns are much more than the differences. Therefore, *Hypothesis 7b* is partially accepted.

Before comparing various organizational characteristics of the public and private sector HEIs of Punjab, it may again be mentioned here that age is the number of years passed since the establishment of institutes and size is the total number of employees including both the teaching and non teaching staff of an institute.

Table 4.15
Age-wise Distribution of Public and Private sector

Period	Sector			
	Public		Private	
	Freq	%	Freq	%
Before 1947	05	15.2	-	-
1947 – 1971	04	12.1	-	-
1972 – 1998	08	24.2	07	36.8
1999 – 2007	16	48.5	12	63.2
Total	33	100	19	100

The age-wise and size-wise distributions of the population of HEIs of Punjab reflect that public sector institutes are relatively older and larger than their private sector counterparts (Table 4.15 and Table 4.16).

Table 4.16
Size-wise Distribution of public and private sector

No of Employees	Sector			
	Public		Private	
	Freq	%	Freq	%
150 and Less	01	3.0	06	31.6
150 – 400	11	33.3	08	42.1
401 - 800	07	21.2	04	21.1
801 - 1500	06	18.2	01	5.3
1501 and above	08	24.2	-	-
Total	33	100	19	100

The comparison between the two sectors with respect to six organizational characteristics is shown in Table 4.17. The first variable pertains to the age of the institutes. The mean age of public sector HEIs of Punjab is 36.1, whereas the mean age of the private sector institutes is only 10. Public sector HEIs of Punjab are clearly older than their private sector counterpart. Second and third variable is about the size of organization. Again the two sectors are not similar in this regard. Mean score for the size of the organization in term of number of employees is 1034.7 and 318.3 for the public and private sector HEIs institutes respectively.

Fourth variable presented in the Table 4.17 is integration in numerical form. The mean value for integration in public and private sector HEIs of Punjab is 1.1 and 1.8 respectively. Both these means are less than 2, the critical score for separating HEIs into low and high integrated institutes. Therefore, the two sectors are similar with respect to integration of HRM. Fifth variable of comparison presented in the table is devolvment of HRM. Again the mean scores are 17.0 and 19.4 in the public and private institutes which are not much different from the combined mean 17.9. However, mean score for the public sector institutes is less than 18 and for private sector institutes is greater than 18, the critical score for separating low and high devolved institutes. The last variable mentioned in Table 4.17 is the present stage of business life cycle of an institute. Most of HEIs of Punjab (90.4 percent) claim that they are either at growth or at expansion stage of their business life cycle. The percentage of the public and private sector institutes claiming growth stage is 33.3 and 52.6 percent and this percentage for expansion stage is 54.5 and 42.1 percent respectively.

Table 4.17
Comparison between Public and Private Sector regarding
Organizational Characteristics

Variable			Sector		Combined (N=52)
			Public (N=33)	Private (N=19)	
1. Age (Number of Years) (Mean)			2-148 36.1	3-23 10.0	2-148 26.1
2. Number of employees					
a) Teaching staff			11-1200	8-250	8-1200
b) Non-teaching staff			75-5670	30-950	30-5670
c) Total number of employees (Size)			120-6330	38-1200	38-6330
3. Size (Mean)			1034.7	318.3	759.1
4. Integration*			1.1	1.8	1.4
5. Devolvement**			17.0	19.4	17.9
6. Life-Cycle Stage	Introduction	Count	03	-	03
		%	9.1	-	5.8
	Growth	Count	11	10	21
		%	33.3	52.6	40.4
Expansion	Count	18	08	26	
	%	54.5	42.1	50.0	
Maturity	Count	01	01	02	
	%	3.0	5.3	3.8	

* Range of score 0-4 ** Range of score 0-35

The comparison between public and private sector HEIs of Punjab on the basis of their organizational characteristics shows that the two sectors are different from each other with regard to their age and size, some what different in devolvement. But the two sectors are very much similar in integration and business life-cycle stage.

The comparison between public and private sector HEIs of Punjab with respect to mean scores of sixteen organizational policies pertaining to long-term targets for recruitment, monitoring of training effectiveness and means of communication with the staff is shown in Table 4.18. First five policies in the table are about long term targets for recruitment. The two sectors are very much similar in following of long term targets from women, fresh graduates and minorities. The mean score for their policies of recruitment from disabled people or from provincial quotas is somewhat different. The possible reason behind the difference in case of disabled people

is two percent mandatory recruitment quota for disabled people in public sector, whereas such a quota is non-existent in private sector. The difference of mean score in case of policy regarding provincial quota is mainly due to the public sector institutes of Islamabad included in the population, which have to give due consideration to the provincial quotas.

Table 4.18
Comparison between public and private sector regarding
Organizational Policies

Policies	Sector		Combined (N=52) Mean
	Public (N=33) Mean	Private (N=19) Mean	
	Long-term targets for recruitment from		
1. Disables	3.75	1.65	2.94
2. Women	2.41	2.25	2.35
3. Fresh graduates	2.22	2.20	2.21
4. Minorities	1.50	1.85	1.63
5. Provincial quotas	1.69	1.00	1.42
Monitor training effectiveness through formal evaluation			
1. Some months after training	1.88	1.75	1.83
2. Immediately after training	1.81	1.85	1.83
3. Performance test	1.59	1.55	1.58
Informal			
4. Feedback from DHs	2.56	2.30	2.46
5. Feedback from teachers	2.16	1.85	2.04
Means of communication with staff through			
1. Immediate superior	4.66	4.00	4.40
2. Regular workplace meetings	2.03	4.15	2.85
3. Quality enhancement center	2.31	2.20	2.27
4. An attitude survey	1.69	1.45	1.60
5. Suggestion boxes	1.41	1.35	1.38
6. Trade unions or work councils	1.19	1.00	1.12

Next five policies in the Table 4.18 are about monitoring of training effectiveness. Three of these policies are formal and two are informal. The comparison shows that the two sectors are very much similar in their policies

of monitoring training effectiveness. In fact, in both the sectors, there is a very little monitoring of training effectiveness. This is perhaps because talent acquisition HR strategy is followed in most of the institutes. When there is lack of training, monitoring of the training effectiveness is obviously low.

The mean scores for six policies of means of communication are presented in Table 4.18. The two sectors are similar to each other in five policies. The only exception is in the policy of regular workplace meetings. There are more regular workplace meetings in private sector HEIs than the public sector institutes.

Similarities in organizational characteristics in public and private sector HEIs are more than the differences. They are different in two out of six variables mentioned in Table 4.17 and three out of sixteen organizational policies mentioned in Table 4.18. Therefore, *Hypothesis 7c* may be accepted partially.

4.2.6 Hypothesis summary and results

Table 4.19
Summary of hypothesis and their results

No.	Hypotheses	Result
1	HEIs practice a low level of strategic integration	Accepted
2	HEIs practice a low level of devolvement of HRM to DHs.	Accepted
3	There is no relationship between levels of integration and devolvement.	Rejected
4	There is no difference in level of devolvement of various HRM functions	Rejected
5	There is no difference in change in the DHs responsibility of HRM functions	Rejected
6	There is no difference in training levels of DHs in five HR areas	Rejected
7a	There is no difference between public and private sector institutes regarding levels of integration and devolvement.	Partially accepted
7b	There is no difference between public and private sector institutes regarding HRM patterns.	Partially accepted
7c	There is no difference between public and private sector institutes regarding organizational characteristics.	Partially accepted

4.3 PREDICTORS OF INTEGRATION AND DEVOLVEMENT

4.3.1 Predictors of Integration

Taking integration in numerical form as dependent variables and eight contingent variables along with three sub-variables of devolvement as dependent variables, the data were subjected to stepwise multiple regression. The results are shown in Table 4.20. Although there are two predictors in the model 2, yet it can be easily analyzed that the additional prediction made by adding the second variable is very low. Model 1 with one variable, presence of HR department, as predictor can explain integration up to 62.5 percent. Model 2 can explain integration up to 66.3 percent. Therefore, an additional 3.8 percent explanation can be made by adding the second variable; trained DHs. Presence of HR department can be regarded as the main predictor for integration.

Table 4.20
Stepwise regression analysis for prediction of integration

Model	Independent Variables	Coefficients		R Square
		Un-standardized	Standardized	
		B	Beta	
1	(Constant)	0.703		0.625
	Presence of HR Dept	2.297	0.791	
2	(Constant)	1.006E-02		0.663
	Presence of HR Dept	2.110	0.726	
	Level of Trained DHs	0.194	0.203	

Excluded variables: age, size, sector, existence of HR department since incorporation, background of in-charge HRM, emphasis of HR strategy, stage of business life cycle, change in the DHs responsibility, level of devolved decision-making.

4.3.2 Predictors of devolvement

Taking devolvement in numerical form as dependent variable and eight contingent variables along with four sub-variables of integration as dependent variables, the data were subjected to stepwise multiple regression. The results are shown in Table 4.21. Model 1 with one variable, existence of HR department since incorporation, as predictor can explain devolvement up to 27.7 percent. Model 2 can explain devolvement up to 33.9 percent. Therefore, an additional 6.2 percent explanation can be made by adding the second variable, presence of HR strategy.

Table 4.21
Stepwise regression analysis for prediction of devolvment

Model	Independent Variables	Coefficients		R Square
		Un-standardized	Standardized	
		B	Beta	
1	(Constant)	16.571		0.277
	Existence of HR Dept since incorporation	6.629	0.526	
2	(Constant)	15.898		0.339
	Existence of HR Dept since incorporation	4.473	0.355	
	Presence of HR strategy	3.413	0.301	

Excluded variables: age, size, sector, presence of HR department, background of in-charge HRM, emphasis of HR strategy, stage of business life cycle, board level representation of in-charge HRM, translation of the HR strategy into work programs, HR involvement in development of corporate strategy.

Existence of HR department since incorporation along with the presence of HR strategy can be regarded as the main predictors for devolvment. But relatively low R-square indicates that there are some other factors which are yet to be included for more explanation and prediction of devolvment.

HR department has a role in prediction of both integration and devolvment. In case of integration, the presence of HR department is the main predictor. While in case of devolvment, existence of HR department since incorporation is one of the predictors. Therefore, for prediction of integration and devolvment, the common key is HR department.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

5.1 DISCUSSION ABOUT RESULTS

5.1.1 Integration and Devolvment

The first set of results of this study pertains to the evaluation of the levels of integration and devolvment of HRM in HEIs of Punjab, Pakistan. It is found that about 73 percent of the institutes are practicing a low level of integration and this percentage for devolvment is about 52 percent.

Keeping in view the levels of integration and devolvment in UK (about 50 percent and 61 percent respectively, Budhwar, 2000) and India (about 66 percent and 67 percent, Budhwar and Sparrow, 1997), the results in the HEIs of Punjab, Pakistan are not unexpected. A very low level of integration is prevailing in this sector. The level of devolvment, however, is not very low. In fact, it is very close to the mid way mark, i.e. 50. This may be sector specific, as in the educational sector, the departmental heads (DHs) are expected to have more HR responsibility and authority and ultimately have relatively more role to play in HRM. This point needs to be further explored. It can be said that overall 'organizations are authoritarian' and 'due to a large power distance, decision making authority is located at the top management level' (khilji, 2004).

HEIs of Punjab, Pakistan fall in low-low quadrant of integration-devolvment matrix. In terms of Brewster and Larsen (1992) the institutes belong to 'professional mechanic' category. This is almost classical model of the 'professional' HR manager: as with other professions (law, medicine) the manager sees himself or herself as having 'higher' imperatives, above those of the organization... The result, in this theoretical model, is an increasing distance from the strategic interests of the business, an increasing obsession with the mechanical requirements of the function.

Most of the HEIs do not have formal HR departments, and non HR-specialists (registrars) are handling HR activities that are already overloaded with other works, their distance from the strategic interests is even greater in this sector. The importance of HRM is yet to be realized in this sector. Only 15 out of 52 institutes reported the presence of HR department. In most of the cases the registrars are controlling the activities of HRM. By nature, the post

of a registrar is more a legal oriented post than an HR specialist. They do not seem at all interested in knowing the difference between personnel and HRM, let alone SHRM. They have to be always present in board meeting, not for the sake of human resources but to perform the duty of secretary to the board. It would not be fair to put any kind of responsibility upon them to help improve the integration of HRM. No question of transition from HRM to SHRM arises in a sector where only 28.8 percent of institutes claim to have HR department. Only a fully rooted HRM can give a strategic direction.

It has been found that integration and devolvement are interrelated. More specifically devolvement can be explained through integration to an extent of 26.5 percent. The institutes practicing a low level of devolvement are most likely to practice low level of integration, as out of 27 institutes practicing a low level of devolvement 26 are also practicing low level of integration (Table 4.9). And the institutes which practice a high level of integration are also likely to practice high devolvement, as out of 14 institutes practicing high level of integration 13 are also practicing high level of devolvement. However, the position is not clear for those institutes which are practicing a high level of devolvement. Out of 25 institutes practicing a high level of devolvement, 12 are practicing low level of integration (Table 4.9). Therefore, existence of the relationship between integration and devolvement is easier in case of low levels. In contrast to this, Budhwar (2000) in UK was not in a position to suggest a clear relationship between the practices of integration and devolvement.

5.1.2 Devolvement of Six HRM Functions

Second set of results pertain to the analysis presented in section 4.2.3 regarding difference in institutes in their level of selective horizontal devolvement in the six HR areas; pay and benefits, recruitment and selection, training and development, employee relations, health and safety, and work-force expansion/reduction and change in DHs responsibility in these areas.

It is found that these levels are very much dissimilar for each of the HRM functions in HEIs of Punjab, Pakistan (Table 4.9). There are different levels of the devolved decision making for different activities of HRM. Similarly, the change in responsibilities of HRM functions is following a selective horizontal devolvement. It is more advanced in certain areas and less advanced in other areas. This is very much similar to the earlier studies in this regard (Budhwar and Sparrow, 1997; Budhwar, 2000; Andolsek and Stebe, 2005).

A further analysis of the above mentioned studies and a comparison of result of those studies with the present one reveal that there are many commonalities among all these studies. Before discussing these commonalities, it may be very relevant to mention here that the study of Budhwar and Sparrow (1997) has been conducted in India from a sample of 137 manufacturing firms out of total selected population of 450 manufacturing firms. The study of Budhwar (2000) pertains to the manufacturing sector of UK, based on the data collected from 93 firms out of a population of 500 firms. Andolsek and Stebe (2005) have conducted a large study in five countries of Europe. The present study is based on data from HEIs of the largest province of Pakistan. There is a variety of samples, sectors, countries in all the four studies.

Pay and benefits is the least devolved area among all the six HR areas. In other words, it is a much centralized activity. Sole HRM at cartelized level is found to have more responsibility for this activity than any other HR activity. The percentages of organizations where pay and benefits are solely handled by HRM at top level are 35.9, 48.3 and 53.8 in the studies of Budhwar and Sparrow (1997); Budhwar (2000); and the present study respectively.

Recruitment and selection is an HR area along with training and development for which the percentage of consultative decisions is more than any other area. There are two types of consultations; first for which primary responsibilities lies with HRM and second for which line managers/DHs are primarily responsible. The percentages of consultative decisions in case of recruitment and selection are 68.2, 69.9, 67 and 75 percent for the four studies in age wise order respectively. These percentages for training and development are 66.6, 77.8, 75 and 69.2 respectively in the four studies. Therefore, the patterns of similarities of consultative decisions are very much common in the levels of devolved decision making in all the studies.

The comparison of the change in responsibilities of line managers/DHs in six HR area in the four studies show that training and development is the area where the largest increase of devolvement has occurred. The percentage of organizations claiming that the responsibility of line managers/DHs has shown an increase in training and devolvement are 58, 69.9, 40, and 57.7 in the four studies. On the other hand, the responsibility of pay and benefits is maintaining status quo more than any other HR activity. In two of the cases, its percentage is number one and in other two cases it is at number two from a very narrow margin. The percentage of organizations claiming no change in pays and benefits responsibility of line managers/DHs are 48.9, 65.2, 63, and 59.6 in the four studies (in age wise order respectively).

5.1.3 Trained DHs

Third set of result is about presence of trained DHs in five HR areas; performance appraisal, staff communication, delegation, motivation, and team building. The score for training levels is different in all the areas. It has been found that the score is very high for performance appraisal (90.4 percent) and staff communication (94.2 percent) and is very low for delegation (48.1 percent) and team building (30.8 percent). In fact training of DHs particularly in areas of HRM is a phenomenon unheard in most of the institutes under study. The departmental heads are highly qualified (some are even PhDs) and experienced individuals. Most of them have learned the skill of writing performance appraisal and staff communication over the years through on the job practice. This is reason that most of the respondents obviously believe that DHs are well trained in at least two of these HR activities. On the other hand, overall low score for delegation is perhaps reflecting high levels of power distance in Pakistan (Pearce and Osmond, 1999; Khilji 2001). Perhaps, the culture of the country is playing its role in not giving any priority to train DHs for delegation as authority is more likely to be placed at higher level in high power distance societies like Pakistan.

5.1.4 Comparison between Public and Private Sector

Fourth set of results pertain to the comparison between public and private HEIs of Punjab, Pakistan. Thirty one variables were compared in the two sectors. Integration and devolvement have been compared twice; categorically as well as numerically, therefore, actually thirty variables are compared. The two sectors are very much similar in most of the variables. Out of first fourteen variables the two sectors are clearly different in two variables i.e. age and size. The two sectors are some what different in three variables namely devolvement, presence of written HR strategy and translation of HR strategy into work programs. But for the remaining nine variables both sectors are very much similar. The comparison between remaining sixteen variables pertaining to organizational policies show that the two sectors are similar in following of about 82 percent (13 out of 16) of these policies. So there is not much difference between public and private sector HEIs of Punjab, Pakistan regarding their levels of integration and devolvement, HRM patterns and organizational policies.

Although the two sectors are quite different from each other with regard to age and size yet they are following similar pattern in HRM. This is quite consistence with earlier studies (Tung and Havlovic, 1996; Budhwar and Boyne, 2004; Thang and Quang, 2005; Wei and Lau, 2005; and Pearson

et al., 2006). This means that the significant difference between them regarding age and size has made no impact at all on structure, strategy and other characteristics of HRM.

Out of sixteen organizational policies pertaining to long term recruitment targets, monitoring of training effectiveness and means of communications with the staff. The two sectors are different in three policies. Two policies pertain to the recruitment targets of disable persons and provincial quotas. Third policy is about regular workplace meetings. Private sector institutes claim that regular work place meeting is one of the major means of communication. But this is not claimed by public sector institutes.

The mean scores for the policies pertaining to long term recruitment of five groups are all less than three on a Likert scale of one to five. This means that overall there is no strategy to attract diversified staff. The highest value is for disable persons (2.94). The reason for this relatively high value than other groups is due to compulsory following of two percent quota for the recruitment of disable persons in public sector organization. Otherwise the values for the remaining four groups range from 1 to 2.25. Although more women are seen in these institutes but it is not because of following any recruitment target.

The mean values for five policies about monitoring of training effectiveness are also less than three on a Likert scale of one to five. These values range from 1.55 to 2.30. In other words, there is hardly any monitoring of training effectiveness in HEIs of Punjab, Pakistan. This sector is new one and most of the institutes were established within the last decade. 46 out of 52 institutes claim that they are either at growth or expansion stage and majority of the institutes are following talent acquisition strategy. All these facts logically mean an automatic lesser focus on training. Therefore, monitoring of training effectiveness is obviously very low.

Six policies pertain to the means of communication with staff. The very high mean value for communicating with staff through immediate superior indicates that most of the communication with staff in chartered institutes is being done through this channel. This is a much formalized way of communication leaving a very little space of employee participation and involvement. All the mean values for the remaining five policies for staff communication are less than three. These values range from 1.12 to 2.85. So the main dependency is upon immediate superior for staff communication. This is due 'to centralized structures, limited communication with employees, and/or unwillingness on the part of managers to give up their authority' in Pakistan (Khilji, 2004). If an organization wants to increase the satisfaction

level of employees then it should gradually change its culture quite effectively. The core organizational characteristics of little autonomy, limited communication and a high power distance have to be eliminated (Khilji, 2004).

Khilji (2001) has described Pakistan culture as an amalgamation of four characteristics namely *Islam religion, Indian origins, British inheritance* and *American influences*. Still another factor *military intervention* can be added to this list. Despite the laps of six decades, the centralized structure inherited from colonial period is still prevailing especially in the public sector. The presence of elite classes created during colonial period is still resisting to any change. Repeated military interventions are further maintaining this rigidity. Therefore, centralized decision making is obvious. Although private sector has shown a tremendous growth yet most of them are owned by individuals or group of individuals representing the elite classes. They are following the traditional approach. That is why private institutes are not much different from the public one at both these levels.

5.1.5 Predictors of Integration and Devolvment

The last set of results is about the predictors of integration and devolvment. It has been found that the main predictor of the integration is the presence of HR department. The findings of numerous researches show that the presence of HR department is positively related to HRM (Galang and Ferris, 1997). And there is also evidence that HR departments have become more involved with strategy and line management issues (Archer, 2005). The HEIs should have HR department first, then the question of achievement of integration of HRM can be addressed. The DHs should also be trained in the areas of HRM to improve this integration further.

The main predictor of devolvment in the study organizations is the existence of HR department since incorporation and presence of HR strategy. Again HR department is playing a part in perdition of devolvment. Out of the eleven institutes having HR department, nine has a written HR strategy also. The presence of HR strategy is an automatic outcome of the existence of HR department since beginning.

However HR department may or may not be willing to take step towards devolvment, and may chose an alternative route. It may opt to increase its size in response to greater demands for services rather than devolvment (Cleland et al., 2000). This could be an option in large size organizations. The HEIs under study are smaller in size as about 50 percent

of which have less than 400 employees and about 21 percent of which have less than 800 employees. Therefore, 71 percent of the institutes will find it more feasible to devolve HRM than to increase the size of HR department. The larger institutes may select a particular route or a combination of both the options.

There is still division how and to what degree devolved decision making be made. HR function is not yet separated from registrar oriented management of human resources. First of all, this barrier has to be crossed, only then ways and means of integration can be found. It must be realized that the criticality of the issue of human capital capacity due to increasing pressure of government and global markets in HEIs demand an instant change.

5.2 CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of the study it can be concluded that HEIs of Punjab are practicing a low level of integration and devolvement. The level of integration is even lower than the level of devolvement. Integration and devolvement are interrelated variables. Devolvement is predictable on the basis of integration and this can be done much reliably for low integrated institutes than the high one.

Two of the conclusions specifically relate to devolvement that the level of devolved decisions making is different for the six HR activities and the direction of change of devolved decision making is also different for these HR activities. The DHs do not have similar training level in various areas of HRM.

Public and private sector HEIs of Punjab are very much similar to each other regarding integration of HRM, but a little different in devolvement. The two sectors are not much different from each other in their patterns of HRM and organizational characteristics. The difference of age and size between the two sectors is not playing any role on shaping their HRM.

HR department can be the main player behind the prediction of integration and devolvement. There is still resistance to HRM convergence in Pakistan and the high power distance culture is shaping many policies and practices. The divergent trends are expected to prevail in this sector until formal HR departments become an integral part of every institute.

5.3 CONTRIBUTIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Most of the studies on integration and devolvement have been conducted in the West. There is a scarcity of comparative HRM research among developing and developed nations. These two concepts have never been examined in Pakistan. This examination is important in the light of the on going economic reforms started during 1990s. The study investigates HRM function in Pakistan and facilitates comparison with different countries. Such an analysis is necessary for managers responsible for international operations. It helps to test the convergence-divergence hypothesis (Hofstede, 1993b; Poole, 1990). Moreover, international organizations investing in Pakistan need to develop greater understanding of local management practices.

The debate around integration and devolvement in HEIs has never been done before in any part of the world. Further, in all of the previous studies, integration and devolvement are analyzed as categorical variables. In this study these variables have not only been analyzed in categorical form but also in numeric form. New results have been presented which would add on to the existent literature of SHRM research in HEIs; HRM in Pakistan; and the on going convergence-divergence debate in the academic world.

5.4 LIMITATIONS AND DIRECTIONS

Like all studies this study has also limitations. It is a sector and a province specific study and any kind of generalization could hardly be made for all Pakistan. More measures of integration can be added from the other frameworks of integration available in the literature. The criticism of top management bias also holds true for this study. So the future research should also include the line managers/DHs further down the chart for a comprehensive picture.

Organizations which report that the person in-charge of HRM has a place on board are more than the number of organizations which have formal HR departments. This is because registrars do have a place on board but not as an HR representative but as a secretary to the board. This might have inflated our results on integration. The overall results of integration are still low so this factor can be ignored.

Further research in this regard should address to model the change process within HRM. Two main parties HR specialists and line managers, should be involved in improving the relationship between them, by keeping a

suitable balance at the same time that can let the HR people play their employee champion role and also let the line people play their role in achieving primary purpose of the organization. The third party, employees, is most important but has yet been ignored in this discussion. This angle needs to be explored in future that how they perceive this change if being maintained by both HR specialists and line managers and what are their preferences. May be it is better for HR specialists to handle 'hard' issues and devolve the 'soft' one. A lot of further research is required to recommend a workable solution.

There is a potential challenge for HR specialists to manage the relationship between institutional policies relating to the workforce as a whole and the translation of these into day-to-day operations by line managers. Similarly, devolved structures, involving distributed management and leadership, have created increased demand, and provision, of formal management and leadership programs for department heads.

REFERENCES

1. Ackoff, R. (1981). *Creating the Corporate Future*. Wiley, New York.
2. Andolsek, D. M. and Stebe, J. (2005). Devolution or (de)centralization of HRM function in European organizations. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*. 16(3), 11-29.
3. Archer, W. (2005). *Mission Critical? Modernizing Human Resource Management in Higher Education*. Higher Education Policy Institute, Oxford.
4. Bacon, N. and Hoque, K. (2005). HRM in the SME sector: valuable employees and coercive networks. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 16(11), 1976-1999.
5. Baird, L. and Meshoulam, I. (1988). Managing two fits of strategic human resource management. *Academy of Management Review*. 13, 116-128.
6. Barney, J.B. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*. 17(1), 99-120.
7. Bartram, T., Stanton, P. and Leggat, S. (2007). Lost in translation: exploring the link between HRM and performance in healthcare. *Human Resource Management Journal*. 17(1), 21-41.
8. Beer, M. (1997). The transformation of human resource function: resolving tension between a traditional administrative and a new strategic role. *Human Resource Management*. 97(36), 49-56.
9. Bennett, N., Ketchen, D. J. and Schultz, E. B. (1998). An examination of factors associated with the integration of human resource management and strategic decision making. *Human Resource Management*. 37(1), 3-16.
10. Box, R. (1999). Running government like a business: implications for public administration theory and research. *American Review of Public Administration*. 29, 19-43.
11. Boxall, P. (1994). Placing HR strategy at the heart of business success. *Personnel Management*. 26(7), 3-34.
12. Boyne, G. (2002). Public and private management: what's the difference? *Journal of Management Studies*. 39(1), 97-122.

13. Bozeman, B. (1987). *All Organizations Are Public*. Jossey-Bass, London.
14. Brewster, C. and Larsen. H.H. (1992). Human resource management in Europe: evidence from ten countries'. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 3(3), 409-432.
15. Budhwar, P.S. (2000). Evaluating levels of strategic integration and devolvement of human resource management in UK. *Personnel Review*. 29(2), 141-157.
16. Budhwar, P.S. and Boyne, G. (2004). Human resource management in the Indian public and private sectors: an empirical comparison. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*. 15(2), 346-70.
17. Budhwar, P.S. and Khatri, N. (2001). A comparative study of HR practices in Britain and India. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*. 12(5), 800-826.
18. Budhwar, P.S. and Sparrow, P. (1997). Evaluating levels of strategic integration and devolvement of human resource management in India. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*. 8(4), 476-494.
19. Budhwar, P.S., Luthar, H.K., Bhatnagar, J. (2006). The Dynamics of HRM Systems in Indian BPO Firms. *Journal of Labor Research*. 27(3), 339-60.
20. Butler, J.E. (1988). Human resource management as a driving force in business strategy. *Journal of General Management*. 13(4), 88-103.
21. Butler, J.E., Ferris, G.R. and Napier, N.K. (1991). *Strategy and Human Resource Management*. South Western Publishing.
22. Cardoso, C.C. (2004). The evolving Portuguese model of HRM. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*. 15(6), 959-977.
23. Cascio, W.F. (1992). *Managing Human Resources, Productivity, Quality of work life, profits*. McGraw-Hill, New York.
24. Cleland, J., Pajo, K. and Toulson, P. (2000). Move it or lose it: an examination of the evolving role of the human resource professional in New Zealand. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*. 11(1), 143 -160.

25. Coaldrake, P. and Stedman, L. (1998). *On the Brink: Australian Universities Confronting their Future*. University of Queensland Press, Queensland.
26. Colbert, B. A. (2004). The complex resource-based view: implications for theory and practice in strategic human resource management. *Academy of Management Review*. 29(3), 341-358.
27. Cunningham, I. and Hyman, J. (1995). Transforming the HRM vision into reality: the role of line managers and supervisors in implementing change. *Employee Relations*. 17(8), 5-20.
28. Cunningham, I. and Hyman, J. (1999). Devolving human resource responsibilities to the line: beginning of the end or a new beginning for personnel. *Personnel Review*. 28(1/2), 9-27.
29. Currie, G. and Procter, S. (2001). Exploring the relationship between HR and middle managers. *Human Resource Management Journal*. 11(3), 53-69.
30. Deming, W.E. (1993). *The New Economics*, Cambridge. MA, MIT.
31. Dimick, D.E. and Murray V.V. (1978). Correlates of substantive policy decisions in organizations: The case of human resource management. *Academy of Management Journal*. 21(4), 611-623.
32. Duke, C. (2003). Changing identity in an ambiguous environment - A Work in Progress Report. *Higher Education Management and Policy*. 15(3), 51-67.
33. Ercek, M. (2006). HR Mization in Turkey: expanding the rhetoric-reality debate in space and time. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*. 17(4), 648-672.
34. Farndale, E. (2005). HR department professionalism: a comparison between the UK and other European countries. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*. 16(5), 660-675.
35. Ferlie, E., Ashburner, L., Fitzgerald, L. and Pettigrew, A. (1996). *The New Public Management in Action*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
36. Ferris, G.R., Hockwarter, W.A., Buckley, M.R., Cook, G.H. and Frink, D.D. (1999). Human Resource management: some new directions. *Journal of management*. 25(3), 385-415.

37. Francis, H. and Keegan, A. (2006). The changing face of HRM: in search of balance. *Human Resource Management Journal*. 16(3), 231-249.
38. French, W. L. (1986). *The Personnel Management Process*. Houghton Mifflin, Boston.
39. French, W.L. (1990). *Human Resource Management*. Houghton Mifflin, Boston.
40. Galang, M.C. and Ferris, G.R. (1997). Human resource department power and influence through symbolic action. *Human Relations*. 50(11), 1403-24.
41. Galang, M.C. (2004). The transferability question: comparing HRM practices in the Philippines with the US and Canada. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*. 15(7), 1207-1233.
42. Galbraith, J. (1973). *Designing Complex Organizations*, Reading, MA, Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
43. Gennard, J. and Kelly, J. (1997). The unimportance of labels: the diffusion of the personnel/HRM function. *Industrial Relations Journal*. 28(1), 27-42.
44. Gilberth, L.M. (1914). *The Psychology of Management*. Macmillan.
45. Golden, K.A. and Ramanujam, V. (1985). Between the dream and nightmare: on the integration of human resource management and strategic business planning process. *Human Resource Management*. 24(4), 429-452.
46. Gordon, G. and Whitchurch, C. (2007). Managing human resources in higher education: The Implications of a Diversifying Workforce. *Higher Education Management and Policy*. 19(2), 135-155.
47. Gubman, E. (2004). HR strategy and planning: from birth to business results. *Human Resource Planning*. 27(1), 13-23.
48. Guest, D. (1989). Human resource management: its implications for industrial relations and trade unions'. In Storey, J. (ed.) *New Perspectives on Human Resource Management*. Routledge, London.
49. Hales, C. (2005). Rooted in supervision, branching into management: continuity and change in the role of first-line manager. *Journal of Management Studies*. 42(3), 471-506.

50. Harris, L. (2001). Rewarding employee performance: line managers' values, beliefs and perspectives. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*. 12(7), 1182-1192.
51. Hassard, J., Sheehan, J. and Morris, J. (1999). Enterprise reforms in post-deng China. *International Studies of Management & Organization*. 293, 54-83.
52. Hegewisch, A and Larsen, H.H. (1996). Performance management, decentralization and management development: local government in Europe. *Journal of Management Development*. 15(2), 6-23.
53. Heraty, N. and Morley, M. (1995). Line managers and human resource development. *Journal of European Industrial Training*. 19(10), 31-37.
54. Hofstede, G. (1993b). Cultural constraints in management theories. *Academy of Management Executive*. 7(1), 81-94.
55. Hood, C. (1991). A public management for all seasons. *Public Administration*. 69(1), 3-19.
56. Hope-Hailey, V., Farndale, E. and Truss, C. (2005). The HR department's role in organizational performance. *Human Resource Management Journal*. 15(3), 49-66.
57. Hope-Hailey, V., Gratton, L., McGovern, P., Stiles, P. and Truss, C. (1997). A chameleon function? HRM in the '90s'. *Human Resource Management Journal*. 7(3), 5-18.
58. Horwitz, F. M., Kamoche, K. and Chew, I. K. H. (2002). Looking East: diffusing high performance work practices in the southern Afro-Asian context. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*. 13(7), 1019-1041.
59. Hsu, Y. R. and Leat, M. (2000). A study of HRM and recruitment and selection policies and practices in Taiwan. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*. 11(2), 413-435.
60. Hutchinson, S. and Purcell, J. (2003). *Bringing Policies to Life: The Vital Role of Front Line Managers in People Management*. CIPD, London.
61. Ivancevich, J.M. and Glueck, W.G. (1989). *Foundations of Personnel: Human Resource Management*. BPI/Irwin, Boston.

62. Jackson, S.E., Schuler, R.S. and Rivero, J.C. (1989). Organizational characteristics as predictors of personnel practice, *Personnel Psychology*. 42(4), 727-786.
63. Jamrog, J.J. and Overholt, M.H. (2004). Building a strategic HR function: continuing the evolution. *Human Resource Planning*. 27(1), 51-62.
64. Khatri, N. (2000). Managing human resource for competitive advantage: a study of companies in Singapore. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*. 11(2), 336-365.
65. Khilji, S.E. (2001). Human resource management in Pakistan, in P. Budhwar and Yaw, D. (eds) *Human Resource Management in Developing Countries*. Rutledge, London.
66. Khilji, S.E. (2002). Modes of convergence and divergence: an integrative view of multinationals in Pakistan. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*. 13(2), 232-153.
67. Khilji, S.E. (2003). To adapt or not to adapt? exploring the role of national culture in HRM. *International Journal of Cross-Cultural Management*. 3(2), 121-144.
68. Khilji, S.E. (2004). Whither tradition? evidence of generational differences in HR satisfaction from Pakistan. *International Journal of Cross-Cultural Management*. 4(2), 141-156.
69. Khilji, S.E. (2006). 'Intended' and 'implemented' HRM: the missing linchpin in strategic human resource management research. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*. 17(7), 1171-1189.
70. Knight, P. (2005). The professional formation of university teachers: the contribution of human resource departments. Presented at the OECD conference on 'Trends in the Management of Human Resources in Higher Education'. Paris, 25-26 August.
71. Kotey, B. and Slade, P. (2005). Formal human resource management practices in small growing firms'. *Journal of Small Business Management*. 43(1), 16-40.
72. Lawler, J. J., Jain, H.C., Venkata Ratnam, C.S. and Atmiyanandana. V. (1995). Human Resource Management in Developing Economies: A Comparison of India and Thailand. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*. 6(3), 319-346.

73. Lawler, III, E.E. and Mohrman (2003). HR as a strategic partner, what does it take to make it happen. *Human Resource Planning*. 26(5), 15-37.
74. Legge, K. (1989). Human resource management: a critical analysis, in Storey, J. (Ed.). *New Perspectives on Human Resource Management*. Routledge, London.
75. Lengnick-Hall, C.A. and Lengnick-Hall, M.L. (1988). Strategic human resource management: A review of the literature and a proposed typology. *Academy of Management Review*. 13(3), 454-470.
76. Maxwell, G. A. and Watson, S. (2006). Perspectives on line managers in human resource management: Hilton International's UK hotels. *The International Journal of Human Resources Management*. 17(6), 1152-1170.
77. McAfee, R.B. and Poffenberger, (1982). *Productivity Strategies: Enhancing Employee Job Performance*. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs.
78. McConville, T. and Holden, L. (1999). The filling in the sandwich: managers in the health sector. *Personnel Review*. 28(5/6), 406-624.
79. McCourt, W. and Ramguttty, W.A. (2003). Limits to strategic HRM: the case of the Mauritian civil service'. *The International Journal of Human Resources Management*. 14(4), 600-618.
80. McDougall, M. (1998). Devolving gender management in the public sector: opportunity or opt-out? *International Journal of Public Sector Management*. 11(1), 71-80.
81. McGovern, F., Gratton, L., Hope-Hailey, V., Stiles, P. and Truss, C. (1997). Human resource management on the line? *Human Resource Management Journal*. 7(4), 12-29.
82. Mckinlay, A. and Strakey, K. (1992). Strategy and human resource management. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*. 3(3), 435-450.
83. McInnis, C. (2000). Towards new balance or new divide? The changing work roles of academics in australia, in M. Tight (ed.). *International Perspectives on Higher Education Research*. Elsevier. London.

84. Mello, J.A. (2007). *Strategic Human Resource Management*. Baba Barkha Nath Printers, New Dehli.
85. Miller, J.G. (1978). *Living systems*, McGraw-Hill, New York.
86. Mondy, R.W. and Noe, R.M. (2006). *Human Resource Management*. Barkha Nath Printers, New Dehli.
87. Monks, K. (1996). Global or local? HRM in the multinational company: the Irish experience. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*. 7(3), 721-735.
88. Muller, M. (1998). Human resource and industrial relations practices of UK and US multinationals in Germany. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*. 9(4), 733-749.
89. Özçelik, A.O. and Aydinl, F. (2006). Strategic role of HRM in Turkey: a three-country comparative analysis. *Journal of European Industrial Training*. 30(4), 310-327.
90. Pearce, C. L. and Osmond, C. P. (1999). From workplace attitudes and values to a global pattern of nations: an application of latent class modeling. *Journal of Management*. 25(5), 759-778.
91. Pearson, T.R., Stringer, D.W., Mills, L.V.H. and Summers, D.F. (2006). Micro vs. Small Enterprises: A Profile of Human Resource Personnel, Practices and Support Systems. *Journal of Management Research*. 6(2), 102-112.
92. Pereira, C.R. Valverde, M. and Ryan, G. (2006). Mapping out devolution: an exploration of the realities of devolution. *Journal of European Industrial Training*. 30(2), 129-151.
93. Poole, M. (1990). Editorial: human resource management in an international perspective. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*. 1(1), 1-15.
94. Poole, P., Jenkins, G. (1997). Responsibilities for human resource management practices in the modern enterprise: evidence from Britain. *Personnel Review*. 26(5), 333-356.
95. Purcell, J. and Hutchinson, S. (2007). Front-line managers as agents in the HRM- performance causal chain: theory, analysis and evidence. *Human Resource Management Journal*. 17(1), 3-20.

96. Reddington, M., Williamson, M. and Withers, M. (2005). *Transforming HR. Creating Value through People*. Butterworth-Heinemann/Elsevier, Oxford.
97. Renwick, D. (2000). HR-line work relations: review, pilot case and research agenda. *Employee Relations*. 22(2), 179-201.
98. Renwick, D. (2003). HR managers, guardians of employee wellbeing? *Personnel Review*. 32(3), 341-359.
99. Rodwell, J. J. and Teo, S.T.T. (2004). Strategic HRM in for-profit and non-profit organizations in a knowledge intensive industry. *Public Management Review*. 6(3), 311-331.
100. Schuler, R.S. (1992). Linking the people with the strategic needs of the business. *Organizational Dynamics*. 21(1), 18-32.
101. Schuler, R.S. and Walker, J.M. (1990). Human resource strategy: focusing on issues and actions. *Organizational Dynamics*. 19(1), 5-19.
102. Scott, P.G. and Falcone, S. (1998). Comparing public and private organizations: an exploratory analysis of three frameworks. *American Review of Public Administration*. 28(2) 126-145.
103. Sheehan, C. (2005). A model for HRM strategic integration. *Personnel Review*. 34(2), 192-209.
104. Sheehan, J., Morris, J. and Hassard, J. (2000). Redundancies in Chinese state enterprises: a research report. *Industrial Relations*. 39(3), 286-301.
105. Singh, K. (2003). Strategic HR orientation and firm performance in India. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*. 14(4), 530-543.
106. Sisson, K. (1989). Personnel management in transition', In Sisson, K. (ed.) *Personnel Management in Briton*. Blackwell, Oxford.
107. Storey, J. (1989). Introduction: from personnel management to human resource management. In Storey, J. (ed.). *New Perspectives in Human Resource Management*. Routledge, London.
108. Storey, J. (1992). *Developments in the Management of Human Resources*. Blackwell Business, London.

109. Taylor, F. (1911). *Principles of Scientific Management*. Norton, New York.
110. Terpstra, D.E. and Rozell, E.J. (1993). The relationship of staffing practices to organizational level, measures of performance. *Personnel psychology*. 46(1), 27-48.
111. Thang, L. C. and Quang, T. (2005). Antecedents and consequences of dimensions of human resource management practices in Vietnam. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*. 16(10), 1830-1846.
112. Thornhill, A. and Saunders, M.N.K. (1998). What if line managers don't realize they're responsible for HR? Lessons from an organization experiencing rapid change. *Personnel Review*. 27(6), 460-476.
113. Torrington, D., Hall, L. and Taylor, S. (2005). Ethics and corporate social responsibility', in D. Torrington, L. Hall and S. Taylor (eds). *Human Resource Management*. Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ.
114. Truss, C. and Gratton, L. (1994). Strategic human resource management: a conceptual approach. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*. 5(3), 663-686.
115. Tung, R.L. and Havlovic, S.J. (1996). Human resource management in transitional economies: the case of Poland and the Czech Republic. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*. 7(1), 1-19.
116. Valle, R.S., Sanchez, R.S. and Sanchez, A.A. (1999). Human resource management and business strategy links: an empirical study. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*. 10(4), 655-671.
117. Wei, L. and Lau, C. (2005). Market orientation, HRM importance and competency: determinants of strategic HRM in Chinese firms. *International Journal Human Resource Management*. 16(10), 1901-1918.
118. Whittaker, S. and Marchington, M. (2003). Devolving HR responsibility to the line: threat, opportunity or partnership? *Employee Relations*. 36(3), 245-261.
119. Wright, P and McMahan, G.C. (1992). Theoretical perspective for strategic human resource management. *Journal of Management*. 18(2), 295-320.

120. Wright, P.M., McMahan, G.C. and McWilliams, A. (1994). Human resources and sustained competitive advantage: a resource-based perspective. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*. 5(2), 301-326.

**List of the recognized HEIs of Punjab including Islamabad
(The Population)**

Islamabad	
1	Air University
2	Allama Iqbal Open University
3	Bahria University
4	COMSATS Institute of Information Technology (CIIT)
5	Federal Urdu University of Arts, Sciences and Technology
6	Foundation University
7	Institute of Space Technology (IST)
8	International Islamic University
9	National University of Computer and Emerging Sciences
10	National University of Modern Languages
11	Pakistan Institute of Engineering Applied Sciences
12	Pakistan Institute of Development Economics
13	Quaid-i-Azam University
14	Riphah International University
Punjab	
15	Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan
16	Beaconhouse National University, Lahore
17	National College of Business Administration and Economics (NCBA & E), Lahore
18	Fatima Jinnah Women University, Rawalpindi
19	Forman Christian College, Lahore
20	GIFT University, Gujranwala
21	Government College University, Faisalabad
22	Government College University, Lahore
23	Hajvery University, Lahore
24	Imperial College of Business Studies, Lahore
25	Institute of Management Sciences, Lahore
26	Islamia University, Bahawalpur
27	King Edward Medical University, Lahore
28	Kinnaird College for Women, Lahore

29	Lahore College for Women University, Lahore
30	Lahore School of Economics, Lahore
31	Lahore University of Management Sciences, Lahore
32	Minhaj University, Lahore
33	National College of Arts, Lahore
34	National Textile University, Faisalabad
35	National University of Sciences & Technology, Rawalpindi
36	The Superior College, Lahore
37	The University of Management & Technology, Lahore
38	University of Agriculture, Faisalabad
39	University of Arid Agriculture, Rawalpindi
40	University of Central Punjab, Lahore
41	University of Education, Lahore
42	University of Engineering & Technology, Lahore
43	University of Engineering & Technology, Taxila
44	University of Faisalabad, Faisalabad
45	University of Gujrat , Gujrat
46	University of Health Sciences, Lahore
47	University of Lahore, Lahore
48	University of the Punjab, Lahore
49	University of Sargodha, Sargodha
50	University of South Asia, Lahore
51	University of Veterinary and Animal Sciences, Lahore
52	Virtual University of Pakistan, Lahore

Survey Questionnaire

The aim of this study is to analyze HRM activities in higher educational institutions of Pakistan. The responses will be used collectively without mentioning any individual institution. These responses will be kept secret and would not be shared with anyone under all circumstances.

1. Designation of the respondent: -----
2. Name of the institution: -----
3. Year of establishment: -----
4. Number of employees: a) Teaching staff: ----- b) Non-teaching staff: -----

[For item number 5-14, please **tick(✓) only one box** for each statement]

5. Nature of the institution Public Private
6. a) Our institution has a formal HR/personnel department. No Yes
 b) If yes, it exists since incorporation of the institution No Yes
7. The HR head (or the person in-charge of HRM activities) has been recruited from
 Within the HR/personnel department
 Non-HR specialist within the institution
 HR specialist outside the institution
 Non-HR specialist outside the institution
8. a) We have unions in our institution. No Yes
 b) If yes, we recognize unions for bargaining. No Yes
9. Main Emphasis of our HR strategy is on
 Talent acquisition
 Effective resource allocation
 Talent improvement
 Cost reduction
10. Stage of our Business Life-cycle can best be described as at
 Introduction
 Growth
 Expansion
 Maturity
 Decline
11. a) HR/personnel head has a place on the board of directors. No Yes
 b) We have a written HR strategy. No Yes
 c) HR strategy is translated into clear work programs. No Yes
 d) HR is involved from the outset in development of the corporate strategy. No Yes

[In item number 11-13 ***Departmental Heads*** include heads of academic/teaching departments **only** and **do not include** heads of other departments (like HR, Administration, Finance, Sports etc.)]

12. During last five years the responsibility of departmental heads in following HR practices have

- | | | | |
|--|------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|
| a) <u>Pay and benefits</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> Decreased | <input type="checkbox"/> Remained same | <input type="checkbox"/> Increased |
| b) <u>Recruitment and selection</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> Decreased | <input type="checkbox"/> Remained same | <input type="checkbox"/> Increased |
| c) <u>Training and development</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> Decreased | <input type="checkbox"/> Remained same | <input type="checkbox"/> Increased |
| d) <u>Employee relations</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> Decreased | <input type="checkbox"/> Remained same | <input type="checkbox"/> Increased |
| e) <u>Health and safety</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> Decreased | <input type="checkbox"/> Remained same | <input type="checkbox"/> Increased |
| f) <u>Workforce expansion or reduction</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> Decreased | <input type="checkbox"/> Remained same | <input type="checkbox"/> Increased |

13. Primary responsibility for major policy decisions on following HR practices lies with

- | | |
|---|---|
| a) <u>Pay and benefits</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Sole HRM</i> |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> <i>HRM in consultation with departmental heads</i> |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Departmental heads in consultation with HRM</i> |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Sole departmental heads</i> |
| b) <u>Recruitment and selection</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Sole HRM</i> |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> <i>HRM in consultation with departmental heads</i> |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Departmental heads in consultation with HRM</i> |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Sole departmental heads</i> |
| c) <u>Training and development</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Sole HRM</i> |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> <i>HRM in consultation with departmental heads</i> |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Departmental heads in consultation with HRM</i> |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Sole departmental heads</i> |
| d) <u>Employee relations</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Sole HRM</i> |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> <i>HRM in consultation with departmental heads</i> |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Departmental heads in consultation with HRM</i> |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Sole departmental heads</i> |
| e) <u>Health and safety</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Sole HRM</i> |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> <i>HRM in consultation with departmental heads</i> |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Departmental heads in consultation with HRM</i> |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Sole departmental heads</i> |
| f) <u>Workforce expansion/reduction</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Sole HRM</i> |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> <i>HRM in consultation with departmental heads</i> |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Departmental heads in consultation with HRM</i> |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Sole departmental heads</i> |

14. At least one-third (i.e. 33%) of *departmental heads* are trained in

- | | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| a) Performance appraisal | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes |
| b) Staff communication | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes |
| c) Delegation | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes |
| d) Motivation | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes |
| e) Team Building | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes |

[For item number 15-17, please **encircle (O) only one digit** from 1–5 for each statement]

15. We follow long-term targets for recruitment of :

- | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|------------|---|---|---|---|---|-------------------|
| a) People with disabilities | Not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | to a great extant |
| b) People from minorities | Not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | to a great extant |
| c) People on provincial quotas | Not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | to a great extant |
| d) Women | Not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | to a great extant |
| e) Fresh graduates | Not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | to a great extant |

16. We monitor training effectiveness through:

- | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------|---|---|---|---|---|-------------------|
| a) Formal performance tests | Not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | to a great extant |
| b) Formal evaluation immediately after training | Not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | to a great extant |
| c) Formal evaluation some months after training | Not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | to a great extant |
| d) Informal feedback from <i>departmental heads</i> | Not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | to a great extant |
| e) Informal feedback from teachers | Not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | to a great extant |

17. Our means of communication is through:

- | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------|---|---|---|---|---|-------------------|
| a) Immediate superior | Not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | to a great extant |
| b) Trade unions or work councils | Not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | to a great extant |
| c) Regular workplace meetings | Not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | to a great extant |
| d) Quality circles/Quality enhancement center | Not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | to a great extant |
| e) Suggestion box (es) | Not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | to a great extant |
| f) An attitude survey | Not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | to a great extant |
| g) No formal methods | Not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | to a great extant |
-

List of HEIs Involved in the Pilot Study

1	City University of Science & Information Technology, Peshawar
2	Gomal University, D.I. Khan
3	Hazara University, Dodhial, Mansehra
4	Institute of Management Sciences , Peshawar
5	Karakoram International University, Gilgit
6	Northern University, Nowshera Cantonment
7	Sarhad University of Science & Information Technology, Peshawar
8	Mohammad Ali Jinnah University, Karachi