

Cranfield University

Elaine Farndale

**The Intra-organisational Power of the
Personnel Department in Higher
Education in the UK**

Cranfield School of Management

PhD Thesis

Cranfield University
Cranfield School of Management, People and Organisations

PhD Thesis
Academic Year 2003-2004

Elaine Farndale

**The Intra-organisational Power of the
Personnel Department in Higher
Education in the UK**

Supervisors

Professor Veronica Hope-Hailey, Cranfield School of Management
Dr Rachel Asch, School of Engineering, Cranfield University

February 2004

© Cranfield University 2004. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced without the written permission of the copyright holder.

Abstract

Personnel departments in general have a poor reputation for power and influence, although little is known empirically about their position in Higher Education institutions (HEI). There are various factors in the HEI context that suggest that the department should be important but not necessarily powerful. Therefore, by applying existing theory (strategic contingencies theory) to examine the determinants of power and the perceived level of power of the department, a more detailed view of the power of the Personnel department in Higher Education (HE) can be observed. The strategic contingencies theory model proves to be a reliable approach to apply in this context, and demonstrates clearly how the Personnel department is consistently rated lower than other administrative departments on the indicator variables.

However, in order to go beyond the static picture of structural power sources sketched from strategic contingencies theory, institutional theory is drawn upon to try to understand how the current situation of low power has arisen. Particular elements of the institutionalised HEI context are explored to discover their effect on both the determinants and levels of power. These elements include the historical status of institutions, the extent of professionalism in departments, and the sophistication of use of information systems in service delivery; all factors discussed in existing institutional theory arguments.

Based on 144 questionnaire responses from a total of 73 HEIs across the UK, the quantitative analyses show differences in the power of Personnel departments in institutions with different historical characteristics, however professionalism and the use of information systems do not show clear relationships with power. Further qualitative data collection from seventeen interviews with HEI senior managers highlights how professionalism in the HEI context has a much broader definition than professional qualification and identity for the Personnel department. The use of information systems is also shown to be equally primitive across institutions in the current HEI context, preventing an evaluation of sophistication of use from yielding conclusive results.

Acknowledgements

My gratitude is extended to those individuals who gave their time to complete the questionnaires or take part in the interviews that have enabled this research to be undertaken. I am also grateful to my former colleagues and fellow PhD students at Cranfield School of Management for their contribution to discussions around the research topic. In particular, I would like to thank Dr Tim Mills for his support through interesting statistical discussions.

I would like to thank my supervisors, Professor Veronica Hope-Hailey and Dr Rachel Asch, for their very valued contributions as the study has progressed. They provided my anchor point when my thoughts were straying and were a great source of support when continuing the research away from Cranfield overseas. Thanks go to both of them for giving me the confidence to produce this thesis.

Finally I would also like to thank my initial supervisor, Professor Chris Brewster, for his instrumental contribution at the start of this study. Professor Brewster gave me the opportunity to undertake this research and I learned a great deal from him both in terms of theory and personal development.

Contents

1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Background	1
1.2. Defining the research objectives	3
1.3. Justification of research problem	6
1.4. Methodology overview	8
1.5. Definition of terms	10
1.6. Scope of the research.....	12
1.7. Outline of chapters	13
1.8. Summary	14
2. LITERATURE REVIEW	15
2.1. Introduction.....	15
2.2. Personnel departments in HEIs	15
2.2.1. The HEI context.....	15
2.2.2. The Personnel department.....	22
2.3. Strategic contingency theory perspective on power.....	29
2.3.1. Structural sources of power.....	32
2.3.2. Dependency and power.....	33
2.3.3. Previous studies applying strategic contingencies theory.....	36
2.3.4. Sources of power for Personnel.....	38
2.4. Intra-organisational power and institutional theory	47
2.4.1. Organisational history and power.....	51
2.4.2. Professionalism as power.....	54
2.4.3. Information as power	61
2.5. Research propositions and conceptual model.....	67
2.6. Summary	68
3. METHODOLOGY.....	69
3.1. Introduction.....	69
3.2. Philosophical approach.....	69
3.3. Ontology and epistemology	69
3.4. Research Strategy.....	74

3.4.1.	Choice of particular approach	74
3.4.2.	Unit of analysis.....	75
3.4.3.	Exploratory interviews.....	78
3.4.4.	Research validity and reliability.....	80
3.4.5.	Operationalisation of variables.....	83
3.4.6.	Pilot study.....	91
3.4.7.	Questionnaire design.....	96
3.4.8.	Qualitative data strategy.....	98
3.5.	Methodological limitations	106
3.6.	Ethical issues and researcher bias	108
3.7.	Summary	110
4.	DATA COLLECTION.....	111
4.1.	Introduction.....	111
4.2.	Questionnaire sample	111
4.3.	Exploratory data analysis.....	115
4.3.1.	Tests for representativeness	116
4.3.2.	Assumption testing for statistical analysis	122
4.4.	Summary	131
5.	DATA ANALYSIS.....	132
5.1.	Introduction.....	132
5.2.	Respondent profile	135
5.3.	Testing strategic contingencies theory in HE	136
5.3.2.	Qualitative analysis in the HE context.....	143
5.4.	Investigating the propositions	152
5.4.1.	How much power does Personnel have?.....	152
5.4.2.	Interview data on perceived power.....	162
5.4.3.	Organisational history and power: a quantitative analysis.....	177
5.4.4.	Interview data on organisational history	186
5.4.5.	Professionalism and power: a quantitative analysis	190
5.4.6.	Interview data on professionalism.....	197
5.4.7.	Information systems and power: a quantitative analysis	202
5.4.8.	Interview data on information systems	206

5.5.	Summary	208
6.	DISCUSSION	209
6.1.	Introduction	209
6.2.	The HEI context	210
6.2.1.	Higher Education institutions	210
6.2.2.	Personnel departments	213
6.3.	Strategic contingencies theory explored	218
6.4.	Perceptions of Personnel department power	221
6.4.1.	Indicators of level of power	222
6.4.2.	Determinants of power	229
6.5.	Institutional theory and power	234
6.5.1.	Organisational characteristics: a function of history	235
6.5.2.	A professional occupation	238
6.5.3.	Information systems and the Personnel department	242
6.6.	Summary	246
7.	CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS	248
7.1.	Introduction	248
7.2.	Contribution to knowledge	250
7.2.1.	Higher Education institutions	252
7.2.2.	Intra-organisational subunit power	254
7.2.3.	Personnel department power	256
7.2.4.	Research methodology	264
7.2.5.	Implications for practice	265
7.3.	Limitations of the study	269
7.4.	Implications for further research	271
8.	REFERENCES	273
9.	APPENDICES	288
A.	Exploratory interviews: interview schedule	289
B.	Variables in previous studies exploring the strategic contingencies model	290
C.	Pilot letter and questionnaire for Personnel departments	292
D.	Survey letter and questionnaire for Personnel departments	297
E.	Survey letter and questionnaire for other departments	303

F. Main study interview schedule	307
G. Coded interview transcript.....	308

List of Figures

Figure 1: Power sources, application and outcomes.....	11
Figure 2: Shared responsibilities for Personnel roles	25
Figure 3: Contrasting perspectives on sources of intra-organisational power	49
Figure 4: A conceptual model of Personnel department power in UK HEIs.....	67
Figure 5: Histograms of sample and population distributions (y-axis = no. of cases) .	117
Figure 6: Histograms of characteristics of respondents (y-axis = no. of cases).....	118
Figure 7: Normal probability plots of all metric variables (y-axis = no. of cases).....	125

List of Tables

Table 1: Trade union membership in Higher Education institutions in the UK.....	18
Table 2: The three domains of power and reality	71
Table 3: Variables to include in the study.....	90
Table 4: Variables used in the coding of interview transcripts	104
Table 5: Questionnaire mailing to UPA institution Personnel departments	112
Table 6: Questionnaire mailing to non-UPA institution Personnel departments	113
Table 7: Breakdown of sample responses by UPA membership and HEI status.....	113
Table 8: Sample representativeness of UPA and HEI status populations.....	114
Table 9: Questionnaire mailing to Estates, Finance and Registry departments	115
Table 10: Characteristics of different types of institution.....	118
Table 11: Distribution characteristics: testing for skewness and kurtosis	124
Table 12: Distribution characteristics: testing for normality	126
Table 13: Distribution characteristics: remedies for non-normal distributions.....	126
Table 14: Intercorrelation of participation in decision-making variables on key issues	127
Table 15: Intercorrelation of level of power variables.....	128
Table 16: Intercorrelations of determinants of power variables.....	129
Table 17: Intercorrelations of determinants of power variables (continued).....	129
Table 18: Intercorrelation of professionalism variables	130
Table 19: Intercorrelation of information system variables	130
Table 20: Canonical correlation results for determinants of power and level of power variables in HEIs.....	138
Table 21: Canonical correlation results for determinants of power and level of power variables for the Personnel department	139
Table 22: Correlation of determinants of power and level of power variables for the Personnel department	140
Table 23: Intercorrelation of determinants of power and influence variables	141
Table 24: ANOVA of responses to involvement in decision-making by department..	153
Table 25: Post hoc ANOVA tests for responses to involvement in decision-making by department	154

Table 26: Mean ratings of department involvement in corporate decision-making on nine key issues	155
Table 27: Percentage of Personnel departments involved in the different stages of corporate decision-making on nine key issues	155
Table 28: Mean ratings of overall level of influence of all administrative departments	156
Table 29: Kruskal-Wallis test of overall level of influence of each department by department	157
Table 30: Kruskal-Wallis test of determinants of power by department	158
Table 31: Mean ratings of ability to cope with uncertainty of departments	159
Table 32: Median and mean ratings of centrality of departments	160
Table 33: Median and mean ratings of non-substitutability of departments.....	160
Table 34: Comparative statistics of power level variables for Personnel departments in three types of institution	179
Table 35: Post hoc ANOVA tests for Personnel resource proportion by status.....	180
Table 36: Key statistics of Discriminant Function Analysis for status variable based on metric level of power variables.....	181
Table 37: Comparative statistics of resource and involvement variables for misclassified and correctly classified Personnel departments in pre-92 universities	183
Table 38: Comparative statistics of resource and involvement variables for misclassified and correctly classified Personnel departments in post-92 universities.....	183
Table 39: Comparative statistics of resource and involvement variables for misclassified and correctly classified Personnel departments in HE Colleges.....	183
Table 40: Comparative statistics of determinant of power variables based on Personnel departments in the three types of institution.....	184
Table 41: Logit summary model of determinant of power variables by institution type	185
Table 42: Correlation of level of power variables and professional staff proportion for the Personnel department	192
Table 43: Comparative statistics of power level variables for Personnel departments dependent on CIPD membership of head of department	193

Table 44: Logit summary model of non-metric level of power variables by CIPD membership.....	194
Table 45: Correlation of determinant of power variables and professional staff proportion for the Personnel department.....	195
Table 46: Comparative statistics of determinants of power for Personnel departments dependent on CIPD membership of head of department	196
Table 47: Correlation of IS sophistication and level of power variables for the Personnel department	203
Table 48: Percentage of Personnel departments with different levels of sophistication of IS use and computing skill by type of institution	204
Table 49: Correlation of determinants of power variables and IS-sophistication for the Personnel department	205
Table 50: Domains and extent of contribution	251

Notation

The following list explains the notation used in the presentation of the statistical analysis of the quantitative data.

Symbol	Description
α	Significance level set for a test to avoid a Type I error
n	Number of cases from the sample included in a test
df	Degrees of freedom for significance tests
F	F-statistic for the ANOVA test
χ^2	Chi-square statistic for the Kruskal-Wallis test
t	t-statistic for the t-test
U	U-statistic for the Mann-Whitney test
r	Pearson correlation coefficient
ρ	Spearman correlation coefficient
z	z-score for skewness and kurtosis calculations
L^2	Likelihood ratio for logit analysis
λ	Wilks Lambda statistic for canonical correlation and discriminant function analysis
Sig.	Significance of a particular statistic in a test (probability of finding a given result due to random sampling error alone)
SD	Standard deviation
R^2	Sample variance explained by variables under consideration used in tests of statistical power