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About this report

CFO perspectives: How HR can take on a bigger role in driving growth is an Economist Intelligence Unit report, sponsored by IBM and Oracle. It investigates whether the HR function is forging a close and robust relationship with the CFO. It also explores the nature of these working relationships, how they have been affected by the economic downturn and how they vary across industries and regions.

The Economist Intelligence Unit bears sole responsibility for the content of this report. The findings do not necessarily reflect those of the sponsors.

The paper draws on two main sources for its research and findings:

- A global survey, conducted in May 2012, of 235 C-level executives, 43% of whom are CFOs. The respondents are based in North America (47%), Western Europe (40%), Eastern Europe (8%) and the Middle East (4%); a total of 38 countries are represented. A wide range of industries is also represented, including financial services (15%), healthcare, pharmaceuticals and biotechnology (12%), professional services (12%), manufacturing (10%), and IT and technology (8%). Half of the companies are large, with over US$500m in annual revenue; the other half are small and mid-sized.

- A series of in-depth interviews with senior executives from major companies and other experts, listed below.

  Simon Henry  
  CFO, Royal Dutch Shell

  Matthew Lester  
  CFO, Royal Mail

  Carlo Ferro  
  former CFO, STMicroelectronics

  Chris Nielsen  
  CFO, Zappos

  Richard Beatty  
  Professor, Human Resource Management, Rutgers University

  Paul Sparrow  
  Professor, Director of the Centre for Performance-led HR, Lancaster University

We would like to thank all interviewees and survey respondents for their time and insight. The report was edited by Gilda Stahl.
People represent the most expensive outlay for organisations. According to a US Bureau of Labor Statistics study,¹ average spending on salaries as a percentage of operating expense in the US ranges from 18% in retail and wholesale trade to 52% in healthcare services. Moreover, these figures do not take into account spending on training, induction and all other employee expenditure.

The size of this financial commitment, and the particular importance of people in a knowledge economy, makes the relationship between HR and finance pivotal to an organisation’s success. HR should ideally work with the finance function to devise and implement policies that effectively recruit, deploy, engage, train, promote and retain people to fulfil the strategic objectives of the organisation, all within the constraints of the allowable budget.

However, the findings of an Economist Intelligence Unit survey, sponsored by Oracle and IBM, suggest that this ideal relationship has not been attained at a significant number of companies. Indeed, many CFOs—the leading representatives of the finance function and highly influential in the corporate hierarchy—historically have judged their HR counterparts harshly.

This report will present the evidence that friction exists between finance and HR, and suggest possible causes. It will also examine the costs of this discord for individual companies, and provide examples of the potential benefits of a more productive relationship. Finally, it will suggest ways in which HR can work to improve this relationship, to the benefit of the company concerned.

Our survey asked CFO respondents to rate the HR function in both strategic (eg, succession planning, global sourcing decisions) and more tactical areas (eg, evaluating employee performance, managing benefit and compensation costs). The survey results reveal that CFOs are more critical of HR, particularly compared with the responses of the CEOs polled. For example, just 25% of CFO respondents say that their head of HR does a good job in succession planning (compared with 43% of CEOs) and merely 14% say the same of global sourcing decisions (compared with 34% of CEOs).

While CFOs across all companies surveyed were restrained in their praise of HR, those from the largest companies polled (with annual revenue in excess of US$10bn) were the most critical. More than one-half (58%) believe their head of HR is not of the same calibre as other C-level executives. And two-thirds (67%) say that they “don’t understand the business well enough”.

The disparity between the views of CEOs and CFOs in these largest companies is significant. Twenty-two percent of CEOs say their head of HR is not of the same calibre as other C-level executives (as opposed to 58% of CFOs), the same percentage that says they don’t understand the business well enough (compared with 67% of CFOs).

Finance people deal with the actual, things more specific, measurable and tangible. HR is more art than science, more ‘right brain’ than ‘left brain’.

Lucy Dimes, CEO for the UK and Ireland, Alcatel-Lucent
Why are CFOs harsher critics of their head of HR?
The first reason may be that finance and HR people
often have contrasting personality types, leading
to some degree of personal friction. Lucy Dimes,
CEO for the UK and Ireland of Alcatel-Lucent, a
global telecommunications equipment company,
says they “come from different worlds”. “Finance
people deal with the actual, things more specific,
measurable and tangible,” she says. “HR is more
art than science, more ‘right brain’ than ‘left
brain’.”

Second, CFOs may feel ill disposed towards their
head of HR because they may clash professionally,
appearing to hinder each other in the course of
their work. On the one hand, the head of HR might
face financial barriers preventing implementation
Conflicts between finance and HR often arise as finance needs rational or quantifiable elements to measure ROI decisions while HR focuses more on longer-term programmes with few quantifiable short-term benefits, thus creating potential tensions.

Philippe Gas, CEO, Euro Disney
Although only 30% of CFOs think that the head of HR is a key player in strategic planning, a much greater proportion (75%) wants them to be a key player. In principle, therefore, CFOs seem to believe that HR and finance both need to be at the forefront of strategic planning, working together to move the organisation forward. “HR and finance are in charge of two very different aspects of a company, but they are of complementary importance,” says Carlo Ferro, who served almost a decade as CFO of STMicroelectronics, a global electronics and semiconductor manufacturer, before recently becoming the chief operating officer of its subsidiary, ST-Ericsson.

Mr Ferro identifies the challenge of market expansion as one area in which HR and finance can work in tandem for the benefit of the organisation, and explains how this productive alliance manifested itself at his company. “We have made a significant shift to Asia in recent years,” he says. “Sixty percent of our sales are now in this region, and we have entered into mergers and joint ventures there. We therefore had to recruit and retain large numbers of people in China and India, integrating the new operations into our organisation while still perpetuating our company culture, all within agreed financial parameters.”

Given the omnipresence of finance and HR throughout a company, enabling them both to make general judgements about the overall quality and capabilities of staff, learning and development provides another potentially fertile area of professional co-operation. “In reality, the CFO and the head of HR are the only people, along with the CEO, who have an overview of the whole organisation and the leadership capability within it,” says Simon Henry, CFO of Royal Dutch Shell, a multinational oil and gas company. “We work together to ensure that learning and development programmes are providing the right pipelines of talent,” he says.

One final example of productive collaboration is the vital sphere of employee engagement and alignment, ensuring that employees understand and are motivated by the company’s goals and their own personal role in achieving them. “We need to make sure everyone is working to the same overall objective within the company,” says Mr Ferro. “Together with HR, we devise incentive schemes that enhance the cohesiveness of the organisation and see to it that our people are engaged. This is a classical interaction between finance and HR.”
The CFO tends to have a negative attitude towards HR while at the same time acknowledging that an effective HR function would be extremely beneficial for the organisation. In the light of this dichotomy, how can HR improve its standing in the eyes of the CFO, who, as a senior member of the executive team, will have considerable influence over the level of HR’s involvement in discussions about the company’s overall strategy?

One obvious answer would be for the head of HR to impress the CFO with ideas on the people implications of corporate strategy. In order to demonstrate its readiness to participate in the strategy arena, however, HR first needs to convince others of its abilities to execute more mundane projects, warns Matthew Lester, CFO of Royal Mail, the UK’s postal service.

“If HR is brilliant at the basics, then people naturally listen to them,” he says. “But there is often a complaint that they are not delivering the basics. They can only play more of a role in strategy if they supply that quality in the basics. This is just human nature. You only listen to someone, even if he is putting forward what you think is a good idea, if you think he can actually implement what he is talking about.”

When CFOs talk of HR excelling at the basics, they may often be referring to the support HR provides to the finance department itself. HR is certainly heavily involved with the recruitment and development of finance people, as it is with all major functions. “If HR is doing their job right, they are challenging us to be a great finance organisation, questioning whether we are attracting the right talent and helping the best people to find the opportunities that will test them and progress them,” says Mr Lester.

Mr Henry of Royal Dutch Shell agrees that building a department of the requisite quality would be impossible without HR. “We work with HR to devise development plans for our top 200 finance people,” he says. “We need to structure this learning and development so that it mirrors the requirements of finance people.”

The definition of “basics” might also encompass working imaginatively within the financial parameters given to them by the CFO. “You come up against control systems in any organisation when you are carrying out a strategy,” says Professor Sparrow of Lancaster University. “It is incumbent on the HR directors to work within constraints and metrics.”

Matthew Lester, CFO, Royal Mail
CFO perspectives: How HR can take on a bigger role in driving growth

According to Carlo Ferro, former CFO of STMicroelectronics, the criteria used to measure the effectiveness of HR have changed fundamentally in recent years. “It is no longer focused just on meeting budgets,” he says. “Now we have key performance indicators for areas that drive the bottom line, such as labour costs, productivity and employee engagement.”

Mr Ferro’s comments are confirmed by the Economist Intelligence Unit survey findings. When asked how their organisation measures the HR function, around one-half of CFOs selected employee satisfaction surveys, retention rates and compensation costs. These three were comfortably the most popular categories.

Employee satisfaction surveys seem to be a particularly favoured measurement criterion in the largest companies in our survey. More than two-thirds (67%) of CFOs in companies with revenue in excess of US$10bn report that the results of such surveys are used to measure the performance of HR. However, a substantial proportion of CFO respondents complain of obstacles in establishing accurate metrics, pointing to factors such as unavailability of data (36%) in making the measurement more meaningful.

Zappos, a US online retailer, uses a quarterly “happiness survey” to gauge employee engagement and satisfaction. Says the company’s CFO, Chris Nielsen: “We use it to assess and understand, really department by department across the organisation, how satisfied employees are and also, importantly, what some of their concerns might be. And those things then help guide our future investment.”

One clear challenge is to distinguish the impact of HR from that exerted by line management. “You can’t, for example, produce a succession plan if the operational function is not doing its job properly, so it is unfair only to measure HR for something the business unit is also actively involved in,” says Matthew Lester, CFO of Royal Mail.

### Measuring HR: developments and obstacles

#### Measuring up
Most useful measures of HR function (% CFO respondents)

- Compensation costs compared with industry benchmarks: 53
- Retention rates: 53
- Employee satisfaction surveys: 66
- Time that key roles remain open: 40
- External rankings of top employers: 27
- Benefit costs: 24

Source: Economist Intelligence Unit survey, May 2012.

#### Obstacles to measuring the value of HR function
Funding is not an issue (% CFO respondents)

- Inadequate IT systems: 31
- Lack of initiative from top management: 36
- Unavailability of data: 39
- Inadequate funding: 13
- Data overload: 27
- Untimely data: 17

Source: Economist Intelligence Unit survey, May 2012.
It is clear from our survey findings that much work needs to be done to improve the HR-finance relationship, which lies at the very heart of an organisation’s hierarchy. It is difficult to see how a company can operate to its maximum potential if this relationship is not working effectively.

In this report, and its sister publication on HR’s relationship with CEOs, we have set out a route that will allow HR to build its reputation, naturally and gradually leading to more influence within the boardroom. With regard to CFOs, this route will mostly involve offering them practical, day-to-day assistance in the pursuit of consistent excellence within the finance department itself.

Such assistance may involve:

- **Leveraging metrics.** The head of HR needs to devise metrics that help the CFO to measure the contribution of HR to the business. If such metrics already exist, CHROs should aggressively market them. HR needs to draw attention to its successes.

- **Approaching the CFO differently.** The CFO may be the harsher judge of HR, but he or she is just as anxious for HR to take on a bigger role in strategy issues that matter to the CFO—those they are concerned could harm the company financially—and demonstrate proactive and creative problem-solving on these issues.

- **Enhancing professional co-operation.** HR can help the CFO to shape and improve the make-up of his or her finance team and can help to create outstanding training programmes to develop finance staff.

- **Showcasing knowledge of the business.** The CHRO must actively work to change the prevailing perception that HR does not understand the business and the needs of clients. Heads of HR should make a point to showcase their strategic thinking in meetings.

Following these best practices will heighten HR’s influence over the C-suite—and the entire organisation. As Chris Nielsen, CFO of Zappos, a US online retailer, puts it, “I think actually the value of HR lies in understanding and helping us to bring visibility to employee perceptions. The pulse of our employees that they [HR] provide is really helpful in decision-making.”

---

**Conclusion:** best practices for successful CHROs

The value of HR lies in understanding and helping us to bring visibility to employee perceptions.

*Chris Nielsen, CFO, Zappos*
Appendix: survey results

Percentages may not add to 100% owing to rounding or the ability of respondents to choose multiple responses.

What is your role in your organisation? (% respondents)

- **CEO/President/Managing director (or equivalent)**: 57%
- **CFO/Head of finance (or equivalent)**: 43%

In which country are you personally located? (% respondents)

- **United States of America**: 46%
- **United Kingdom**: 11%
- **Canada**: 8%
- **Italy**: 5%
- **Spain**: 4%
- **Germany**: 3%
- **Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Ireland, Portugal, Austria, Hungary, Netherlands, Norway, Saudi Arabia, Slovakia, Sweden**: 2%

In which region are you personally located? (% respondents)

- **North America**: 47%
- **Western Europe**: 40%
- **Eastern Europe**: 8%
- **Middle East**: 4%

What position does the head of HR (or CHRO) in your organisation occupy? (% respondents)

- **Member of the executive committee**: 52%
- **Member of the board of directors**: 25%
- **Both**: 12%
- **Neither**: 11%
How long has the head of HR been in his or her role?

(Responses)

- Less than a year: 11
- 1-2 years: 17
- 3-5 years: 34
- 6-10 years: 22
- 11-15 years: 6
- 16-20 years: 2
- Over 20 years: 4
- Don’t know: 3

In an average month, how much time do you spend meeting with your organisation’s head of HR (either one-on-one or in a group setting)?

(Responses)

- 0 hours: 4
- 1-5 hours: 46
- 6-10 hours: 29
- 11-20 hours: 13
- 21-30 hours: 3
- 31-40 hours: 1
- Over 40 hours: 2

What is discussed during these meetings referred to in the previous question.

(Responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive performance and development</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive succession</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive compensation</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee satisfaction</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall employee compensation</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR processes/systems</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate strategy</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global sourcing decisions</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR costs</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How would you describe your relationship with the head of HR?

Rate on a scale of 1-5, where 1=Close and trustful and 5=Distant and mistrustful.

(Responses)

- 1 – Close and trustful: 37
- 2: 32
- 3: 24
- 4: 4
- 5 – Distant and mistrustful: 3

How highly do you value your relationship with the head of HR?

Rate on a scale of 1-5, where 1=Among my most valued professional relationships and 5=No value.

(Responses)

- 1 – Among my most valued professional relationships: 28
- 2: 35
- 3: 28
- 4: 6
- 5 – No value: 2
In your opinion, which of the following might harm your organisation financially over the next 12 months? Select all that apply. (% respondents)

- Insufficient talent within the organisation as a whole: 53
- Insufficient leadership talent: 49
- Lack of alignment of individual and business objectives: 48
- Low employee satisfaction: 42
- Poor decisions related to global sourcing: 23
- HR costs: 32
- Low level of diversity: 8
- None of the above: 9

How would you rate the head of HR at your organisation in the following areas? Rate each on a scale of 1-5, where 1=Excellent and 5=Poor. (% respondents)

- Identifying and recruiting key talent
- Developing key talent
- Succession planning
- Evaluating employee performance
- Leading the HR function
- Understanding the HR needs of the business
- Managing benefit and compensation costs
- Global sourcing decisions
- Creating an organisational culture that values excellent performance
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How involved is the head of HR in strategic planning at your organisation? Rate on a scale of 1-5, where 1=A key player and 5=Not at all involved. (% respondents)

1 – A key player 15
2 30
3 34
4 14
5 – Not at all involved 6

How involved do you want the head of HR to be in strategic planning? Rate on a scale of 1-5, where 1=A key player and 5=Not at all involved. (% respondents)

1 – A key player 30
2 42
3 16
4
5 – Not at all involved 8

What are the obstacles, if any, to the head of HR taking a greater role in strategic planning? Select all that apply. ( % respondents)

- Is too focused on processes and rules—not a “big picture” person 41
- Doesn’t understand the business well enough 36
- Is not of the same calibre as other C-level executives 29
- Behaves like an independent advisor and service provider, rather than a fully invested member of the management team 21
- Other 6
- None of the above—the head of HR is already a key player in strategic planning 21

Do you and the head of HR agree on the organisation’s people strategy (eg, what to prioritise, how to implement the strategy, how to manage costs)? ( % respondents)

- Yes, we strongly agree 18
- Yes, we generally agree 68
- No, we generally disagree 9
- No, we strongly disagree 4
- Don’t know 6
In which area do you work in greatest harmony with the head of HR? 

(\% respondents)

- Implementing our people strategy: 37
- Managing the costs of our people strategy: 24
- Designing our people strategy: 23
- Other: 1
- None of the above—we are not harmonious in any area: 4

In which area do you work in greatest discord with the head of HR? 

(\% respondents)

- Managing the costs of our people strategy: 26
- Designing our people strategy: 20
- Implementing our people strategy: 20
- Other: 5
- None of the above—we do not disagree in any area: 29

Which of the following metrics, if any, does your organisation use to measure the value of the HR function? Select all that apply. 

(\% respondents)

- Employee satisfaction surveys: 57
- Retention rates: 54
- Compensation costs compared with industry benchmarks: 45
- Benefit costs: 33
- Diversity of workforce: 23
- Time that key roles remain open: 23
- Legal and compliance costs: 18
- Number of job applicants per open position: 17
- External rankings of top employers: 11
- Other: 3
- None of the above—we don't use any metrics for HR: 13
Which of the following measures of the value of the HR function would be most useful to you? Select all that apply. (% respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>% Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee satisfaction surveys</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention rates</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation costs compared with industry benchmarks</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit costs</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time that key roles remain open</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External rankings of top employers</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity of workforce</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of job applicants per open position</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal and compliance costs</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above—I don’t need any metrics for measuring HR</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What are the obstacles, if any, to measuring the value of the HR function at your organisation? Select all that apply. (% respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obstacle</th>
<th>% Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unavailability of data</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of initiative by HR</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate IT systems</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of initiative from top management</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data overload—inability to extract meaning from the data we have</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untimely data</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate funding</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above—there are no obstacles</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is your primary industry? (% respondents)

- Financial services 15
- Healthcare, pharmaceuticals and biotechnology 12
- Professional services 12
- Manufacturing 10
- IT and technology 8
- Consumer goods 6
- Energy and natural resources 6
- Entertainment, media and publishing 5
- Construction and real estate 5
- Retailing 3
- Government/Public sector 3
- Transportation, travel and tourism 2
- Automotive 2
- Logistics and distribution 2
- Aerospace/Defence 2
- Agriculture and agribusiness 2
- Education 1
- Telecommunications 1
- Chemicals 1

What are your company’s annual global revenues in US dollars? (% respondents)

- $500m or less 50
- $500m to $1bn 15
- $1bn to $5bn 15
- $5bn to $10bn 8
- $10bn or more 13

What is the number of people employed at your organisation? (% respondents)

- Less than 1,500 59
- 1,501-5,000 15
- 5,001-20,000 12
- 20,001-50,000 6
- More than 50,000 8
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