International Journal of Education, Management, and Technology

e-ISSN : 3026-5444
p-ISSN : 3026-4200

Index: Harvard, Boston, Sydney University, Copernicus, Lens, Scilit, Semantic, Dimensions, etc

https://doi.org/10.58578/IJEMT.v4i2.9535

Strategic Human Resource Planning and Workforce Demographics: A Quantitative Analysis

Yadav Prasad Pokharel[1], Dr. Kriti[2], Dipak Mahat[3]
[1,2]Dr. K.N. Modi University- India
[3]Nepal Philosophical Research Center, Kathmandu-Nepal
dipakmahatdm2047@gmail.com

Article Info:

Submitted:	Revised:	Accepted:	Published:
Mar 28, 2026	Jul 26, 2026	Aug 7, 2026	Aug 12, 2026

Abstract

Understanding whether employees' perceptions of Strategic Human Resource Planning (SHRP) vary across demographic groups is important for evaluating organizational alignment with strategic human resource objectives. This study examined the relationships between workforce demographics and perceptions of SHRP in an organizational context. A quantitative survey design was employed, involving 150 respondents from various hierarchical levels. The sample was predominantly male (87.3%), with the largest proportion of respondents aged 36–45 years (32.0%). Descriptive and inferential analyses were conducted to assess variations in SHRP perceptions according to gender, age, educational qualification, job position, and work experience. Overall perceptions of SHRP were highly positive (grand mean = 4.70 on a five-point scale). Kendall's tau-b correlation indicated no statistically significant association between work experience and SHRP perceptions ($\tau = .019$, $p = .766$). Similarly, no significant differences were found according to gender ($t = 1.328$, $p = .186$), age group ($F = 1.063$, $p = .377$), educational qualification ($F = 1.681$, $p = .157$), or job position ($F = 0.745$, $p = .527$). These findings indicate that positive perceptions of SHRP were broadly consistent across the demographic groups examined, suggesting substantial workforce alignment with the organization's

IJEMT Journal is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License

strategic human resource objectives. The study contributes empirical evidence that demographic characteristics may not constitute significant sources of variation in SHRP perceptions and supports the development of organization-wide strategic human resource initiatives that engage employees across hierarchical and demographic categories.

Keywords: Strategic Human Resource Planning; Workforce Demographics; Employee Perceptions; Organizational Alignment; Human Resource Management

INTRODUCTION

Strategic Human Resource Planning (SHRP) has emerged as a cornerstone of modern organizational management, serving as a systematic process through which organizations align their human capital with long-term strategic objectives (Boxall & Purcell, 2016; Phiri & Phiri, 2022). In an era characterized by rapid technological change, globalization, and shifting labor market dynamics, organizations are increasingly recognizing that their competitive advantage rests not merely on financial or technological assets, but fundamentally on the quality, commitment, and strategic alignment of their workforce (Armstrong & Taylor, 2020).

The theoretical underpinning of SHRP draws from multiple disciplines, including organizational behavior, labor economics, and strategic management (Eshete & Birbirssa, 2024). At its core, SHRP encompasses workforce forecasting, succession planning, talent acquisition and development, and the proactive identification of skill gaps that may impede organizational performance (Schuler & Jackson, 2014). Unlike traditional HR planning, which tends to be reactive and operationally focused, strategic HR planning adopts a forward-looking perspective, integrating human resource strategies with the broader organizational mission and vision (Cayrat & Boxall, 2023).

Despite the extensive theoretical discourse on SHRP, empirical investigations into how individual-level demographic characteristics influence employees' perceptions of and engagement with strategic HR processes remain relatively sparse, particularly in developing country contexts (Islam, 2025). Demographic variables such as gender, age, educational attainment, hierarchical position, and years of work experience are widely acknowledged to shape employees' attitudes, values, and work behavior (Datta et al., 2005). However, whether

these variables exert differential influence on SHRP perceptions—or whether SHRP as a construct transcends demographic boundaries—is an empirically underexplored question.

This study addresses this gap by conducting a quantitative demographic analysis of SHRP perceptions among 150 employees drawn from a formal organizational setting. Specifically, it seeks to determine whether statistically significant differences exist in SHRP scores across gender groups, age cohorts, educational levels, positional hierarchies, and experience levels. The findings are expected to contribute both to the academic literature on SHRP and to practical HR management by providing evidence-based insights for the design of inclusive and demographic-sensitive HR strategies.

Literature Review

Strategic Human Resource Planning: Conceptual Foundations

According to Wright and McMahan(1992) Strategic Human Resource Planning involves organizations developing their human capital strategies to achieve their main business objectives. The resource-based view of the firm (Barney 1991) serves as SHRP's foundation which states that organizations can achieve sustainable competitive advantage through their dedicated human resource management practices. The planning process involves translating business strategy into workforce requirements, forecasting future talent needs, and developing proactive mechanisms to close anticipated gaps through recruitment, training, retention, and workforce restructuring (Cascio & Boudreau, 2012; Ongesa Nyamboga, 2025).

Contemporary SHRP models emphasize integration across multiple HR functions. Schuler and Jackson (2014) highlight that effective SHRP requires close coordination between recruitment, learning and development, performance management, and compensation systems. Additionally, Boxall and Purcell (2016) argue that SHRP must account for environmental contingencies, including industry dynamics, regulatory frameworks, and labor market conditions, in order to remain effective and adaptive.

Demographic Variables and HR Perceptions

The role of demographic variables in shaping employee perceptions of HR practices has attracted considerable scholarly attention. Gender has been found to influence work values, career orientation, and perceptions of organizational fairness (Eagly & Carli, 2007).

Women often report different experiences of HR practices than men, particularly in relation to career development opportunities and work-life balance policies (Nappo, 2025). However, studies examining gender differences in perceptions of strategic HR planning specifically are limited.

Age and generational cohort membership are also associated with differential work values and organizational expectations (Twenge et al., 2010). Younger employees may prioritize learning opportunities and career advancement, while older employees may place greater emphasis on job security and organizational stability (Salvadorinho et al., 2026). These differing orientations may shape how employees perceive and evaluate SHRP initiatives.

Educational attainment has been shown to influence employees' understanding of organizational processes and their capacity to engage with complex HR systems (Lepak & Snell, 1999). Higher levels of education are generally associated with greater awareness of strategic management concepts, potentially leading to more nuanced evaluations of SHRP quality. Similarly, hierarchical position within an organization shapes one's exposure to strategic planning processes; managers and officers are typically more directly involved in HR planning than workers and supervisors, potentially creating perceptual divergences across positional levels.

Work experience, often operationalized as tenure or years of service, represents another potentially important demographic moderator (Wang et al., 2025). Long-tenured employees may have developed richer mental models of organizational processes, enabling them to critically evaluate SHRP effectiveness from a longitudinal perspective (Ng & Feldman, 2010). However, the empirical evidence on the relationship between work experience and HR perceptions remains mixed, with some studies finding positive associations and others finding no significant relationship.

METHODS

Research Design

The research used a cross-sectional survey method as its quantitative research approach. This approach is appropriate for examining the distribution of variables across a population at a single point in time and for testing hypotheses concerning group differences

(Creswell & Creswell, 2018). The primary data collection tool used in the study was a structured self-administered questionnaire.

Sample and Sampling Procedure

The target population comprised employees of a formal organization operating across multiple hierarchical levels, including workers, supervisors, officers, and managers. The researchers employed purposive sampling methods to achieve proper demographic representation in their study. A total of 150 usable questionnaires were retained for analysis after data screening and cleaning procedures.

Measurement Instrument

Researchers used a five-item scale to measure the SHRP construct which included items from the SHRP1 to SHRP5 range that were adapted from existing validated strategic HRM instruments. The researchers used a five-point Likert scale which started at 1 for Strongly Disagree and ended at 5 for Strongly Agree to rate each item. Items assessed respondents' perceptions of workforce planning, succession planning, competency development, HR-strategy alignment, and talent management effectiveness. Demographic information was collected through a structured section capturing gender, age group, educational qualification, hierarchical position, and years of work experience.

Data Analysis

Researchers conducted statistical analysis on data through the use of IBM SPSS Statistics software. The researchers used descriptive statistics which included frequencies and means and standard deviations to describe the sample and analyze SHRP score distribution. Kendall's tau-b non-parametric correlation was used to assess the relationship between work experience (continuous) and the composite SHRP score, given the ordinal nature of the SHRP scale. The researchers used independent samples t-tests to study how gender affected SHRP score results. The researchers used one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) to compare differences among age groups and educational levels and positional categories. The researchers used Levene's test to determine whether variances were equal before they interpreted the t-test results.

RESULTS

Demographic Profile of Respondents

Table 1 presents the frequency distribution of the demographic characteristics of the 150 respondents. The sample was overwhelmingly male, with 131 respondents (87.3%) identifying as male and only 19 (12.7%) as female. This gender imbalance reflects the occupational composition of the study organization. In terms of age, the largest proportion of respondents fell within the 36–45 years cohort (32.0%, n = 48), followed by the 26–35 years group (30.0%, n = 45), 46–55 years (19.3%, n = 29), 18–25 years (11.3%, n = 17), and 56–65 years (7.3%, n = 11).

Regarding educational attainment, primary education was the most common level (33.3%, n = 50), followed by secondary (28.7%, n = 43), higher secondary (18.7%, n = 28), bachelor's degree (15.3%, n = 23), and master's degree or above (4.0%, n = 6). The distribution reflects a workforce with relatively modest average formal educational attainment. In terms of organizational position, the majority were workers (54.0%, n = 81), followed by supervisors (28.7%, n = 43), officers (14.7%, n = 22), and managers (2.7%, n = 4).

Table 1 Demographic Profile of Respondents (N = 150)

Variable	Category	Frequency (N)	Percent (%)
Gender	Male	131	87.3
	Female	19	12.7
Age	18–25 Yrs	17	11.3
	26–35 Yrs	45	30.0
	36–45 Yrs	48	32.0
	46–55 Yrs	29	19.3
	56–65 Yrs	11	7.3
Education	Primary	50	33.3
	Secondary	43	28.7
	Higher Secondary	28	18.7
	Bachelor	23	15.3
	Master & Above	6	4.0
Position	Worker	81	54.0
	Supervisor	43	28.7
	Officer	22	14.7
	Manager	4	2.7

Note. *The sample is predominantly male and composed largely of workers and supervisors with primary to secondary educational backgrounds.*

Descriptive Statistics

Table 2 presents descriptive statistics for work experience. Respondents' work experience ranged from a minimum of 1 year to a maximum of 40 years, with a mean of 10.27 years (SD = 8.97), indicating considerable variability in tenure and a generally moderate average experience level across the sample.

Table 2 Descriptive Statistics: Work Experience (N = 150)

Variable	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Experience	150	1.00	40.00	10.27	8.967

Note. *Experience is measured in years.*

Table 3 presents the descriptive statistics of the Strategic Human Resource Planning (SHRP) scale items based on responses from 150 participants. The choice of this class was based on the use of a 5-Point Likert Scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). Overall, the results indicate a high level of agreement across all SHRP dimensions, with mean values ranging from 4.6267 to 4.7733.

Table 3 Descriptive Statistics: SHRP Scale Items (N = 150)

Variable	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
SHRP1	150	3.00	5.00	4.7200	0.47937
SHRP2	150	4.00	5.00	4.7733	0.42008
SHRP3	150	3.00	5.00	4.6867	0.49340
SHRP4	150	3.00	5.00	4.6267	0.58558
SHRP5	150	2.00	5.00	4.6733	0.56160

Note. *SHRP items were rated on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree).*

Among the five items, SHRP2 recorded the highest mean score (M = 4.7733, SD = 0.42008), indicating that respondents strongly agree that HR planning considers the organization's future staffing requirements. This suggests a strong perception that workforce planning is forward-looking and aligned with future organizational needs. SHRP1 also shows a high mean (M = 4.7200, SD = 0.47937), reflecting that HR planning is perceived to support the achievement of long-term organizational objectives.

Similarly, SHRP3 (M = 4.6867, SD = 0.49340) and SHRP5 (M = 4.6733, SD = 0.56160) indicate strong agreement among respondents, showing that employees understand how HR plans guide their daily activities and that HR plans are updated in response to

changes in organizational strategy. SHRP4 has a comparatively lower mean (M = 4.6267, SD = 0.58558), though it still reflects a high level of agreement, suggesting that respondents slightly vary in their perception of how effectively HR planning helps in utilizing employees to achieve strategic goals.

The relatively high mean scores and low standard deviations across all items suggest that respondents consistently perceive strategic human resource planning practices positively within their organization.

Relationship between Work Experience and SHRP

Kendall's tau-b correlation was computed to examine the association between work experience and the composite SHRP score. As reported in Table 4, the correlation coefficient was negligible and statistically non-significant ($\tau = .019$, $p = .766$, $N = 150$). This finding indicates that there is no meaningful monotonic relationship between the number of years an employee has been employed and their perception of SHRP effectiveness. Both experienced and less experienced employees held uniformly positive views of strategic HR planning practices, suggesting that SHRP perceptions are not contingent on accumulated organizational tenure.

Table 4 Kendall's Tau-b Correlation: Work Experience and SHRP

		Experience	SHRP
Kendall's tau_b	**Experience**	Corr. Coeff.	1.000 / .019
		Sig. (2-tailed)	. / .766
		N	150 / 150

Note. *$p < .05$. *The correlation is non-significant at the .05 level.*

Gender Differences in SHRP

An independent samples t-test was conducted to determine whether statistically significant differences existed in SHRP scores between male and female respondents. Table 5 presents the group statistics. Male respondents (n = 131) reported a mean SHRP score of 4.71 (SD = .313), while female respondents (n = 19) reported a slightly lower mean of 4.60 (SD = .476). Although the mean difference of approximately 0.11 points appears modest, it was tested for statistical significance.

Table 5 Group Statistics: SHRP by Gender

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
SHRP	Male	131	4.7099	.31301	.02735
	Female	19	4.6000	.47610	.10922

Note. N reflects usable responses per gender group.

Table 6 presents the results of the independent samples t-test. Levene's test for equality of variances was statistically significant (F = 4.889, p = .029), indicating heterogeneity of variances between the two groups. Accordingly, the equal variances not assumed row was interpreted. The t-test result was non-significant (t = .976, df = 20.317, p = .340), with a mean difference of .110 (95% CI: –.125 to .345). These results indicate that gender does not significantly predict SHRP perception scores, and that male and female employees perceive strategic HR planning practices at broadly equivalent levels.

Table 6 Independent Samples Test: SHRP by Gender

	Levene's Test (F / Sig.)	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Diff. (95% CI)
Equal var. assumed	4.889 / .029	1.328	148	.186	.110 [–.054, .273]
Equal var. not assumed	—	.976	20.317	.340	.110 [–.125, .345]

Note. *Equal variances not assumed (Levene's F = 4.889, p = .029).*

Age-Group Differences in SHRP

A one-way ANOVA was performed to compare SHRP means across five age cohorts. Table 7 displays the descriptive statistics by age group. The youngest cohort (18–25 years) reported the highest mean SHRP score (M = 4.78, SD = .263), while the 26–35 age group recorded the lowest (M = 4.63, SD = .379). The remaining cohorts reported means between 4.67 and 4.76. Despite these marginal numerical differences, the ANOVA results presented in Table 8 reveal that the variation in SHRP scores across age groups was not statistically significant (F(4, 145) = 1.063, p = .377). This finding indicates that age cohort membership does not meaningfully differentiate employees' assessments of SHRP practices.

Table 7 Descriptive Statistics: SHRP by Age Grou

Group	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	Std. Err.	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	Max
18–25 Yrs	17	4.7765	.26346	.06390	4.6410	4.9119	5.00
26–35 Yrs	45	4.6311	.37889	.05648	4.5173	4.7449	5.00
36–45 Yrs	48	4.6750	.36583	.05280	4.5688	4.7812	5.00
46–55 Yrs	29	4.7586	.25287	.04696	4.6624	4.8548	5.00
56–65 Yrs	11	4.7636	.32023	.09655	4.5485	4.9788	5.00
Total	150	4.6960	.33795	.02759	4.6415	4.7505	5.00

Note. *Means and standard deviations presented for each age cohort.*

Table 8 One-Way ANOVA: SHRP by Age Group

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.485	4	.121	1.063	.377
Within Groups	16.533	145	.114	—	—
Total	17.018	149	—	—	—

Note. *F(4, 145) = 1.063, p = .377. The between-group difference is non-significant.*

Educational Differences in SHRP

Table 9 presents the descriptive statistics for SHRP scores disaggregated by educational attainment. Bachelor's degree holders recorded the highest mean SHRP score (M = 4.86, SD = .195), followed by higher secondary graduates (M = 4.69, SD = .300), master's degree holders or above (M = 4.67, SD = .723), secondary school completers (M = 4.67, SD = .377), and primary school completers (M = 4.66, SD = .300). The broad mean score for master's degree holders carries a large standard deviation, likely attributable to the small sample size (n = 6) in that category.

The one-way ANOVA summarized in Table 10 yielded a non-significant result (F (4, 145) = 1.681, p = .157), indicating that educational level does not produce statistically significant differences in SHRP perceptions. While bachelor's degree holders reported marginally higher scores, this difference was insufficient to reach statistical significance, possibly due to the small group sizes at higher education levels constraining the power of the test.

Table 9 Descriptive Statistics: SHRP by Education Level

Group	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	Std. Err.	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	Max
Primary	50	4.6560	.29977	.04239	4.5708	4.7412	5.00
Secondary	43	4.6651	.37726	.05753	4.5490	4.7812	5.00
Higher Secondary	28	4.6857	.30026	.05674	4.5693	4.8021	5.00
Bachelor	23	4.8609	.19479	.04062	4.7766	4.9451	5.00
Master & Above	6	4.6667	.72296	.29515	3.9080	5.4254	5.00
Total	150	4.6960	.33795	.02759	4.6415	4.7505	5.00

Note. *Bachelor's holders show the highest mean SHRP score, though differences are not statistically significant.*

Table 10 One-Way ANOVA: SHRP by Education Level

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.754	4	.189	1.681	.157
Within Groups	16.263	145	.112	—	—
Total	17.018	149	—	—	—

Note. *F (4, 145) = 1.681, p = .157. The between-group difference is non-significant.*

Positional Differences in SHRP

Table 11 presents SHRP descriptive statistics by organizational position. Officers reported the highest mean SHRP score (M = 4.75, SD = .409), followed by supervisors (M = 4.71, SD = .277), workers (M = 4.68, SD = .311), and managers (M = 4.50, SD = .872). The notably lower mean and very high standard deviation among managers likely reflects the small managerial subsample (n = 4), which limits the reliability of estimates for this group.

The ANOVA results in Table 12 show no statistically significant differences in SHRP scores across positional categories (F(3, 146) = 0.745, p = .527). This finding is noteworthy given the theoretical expectation that managers and officers who are more directly involved in strategic planning processes might exhibit different SHRP perceptions than frontline workers. The absence of such differences may reflect effective organizational communication of strategic HR values across all levels of the hierarchy.

Table 11 Descriptive Statistics: SHRP by Organizational Position

Group	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	Std. Err.	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	Max
Worker	81	4.6815	.31109	.03457	4.6127	4.7503	5.00
Supervisor	43	4.7116	.27707	.04225	4.6264	4.7969	5.00
Officer	22	4.7545	.40910	.08722	4.5732	4.9359	5.00
Manager	4	4.5000	.87178	.43589	3.1128	5.8872	5.00
Total	150	4.6960	.33795	.02759	4.6415	4.7505	5.00

Note. *Manager group has a small n (= 4); interpret with caution.*

Table 12 One-Way ANOVA: SHRP by Organizational Position

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.257	3	.086	0.745	.527
Within Groups	16.761	146	.115	—	—
Total	17.018	149	—	—	—

Note. *F (3, 146) = 0.745, p = .527. The between-group difference is non-significant.*

DISCUSSION

The results of this study offer several theoretically and practically significant insights regarding the demographic correlates of SHRP perceptions. Across all tests conducted including Kendall's tau-b correlation, independent samples t-tests, and one-way ANOVAs no statistically significant differences were detected in SHRP scores based on gender, age, educational level, organizational position, or work experience. The grand mean SHRP score of 4.70 (on a 5-point scale) further indicates strong and homogenous endorsement of strategic HR practices across the sample.

The finding that gender does not significantly predict SHRP perceptions is consistent with the broader trend in organizational behavior research suggesting convergence in work attitudes between male and female employees in formal organizational settings (Lyness & Judiesch, 2014). While the female subsample was small (n = 19), limiting statistical power, the observed mean difference of .11 was negligible in practical terms. These results align with institutional theory propositions that shared organizational norms and socialization processes may override individual-level demographic influences in shaping work-related attitudes.

The absence of significant age-group differences in SHRP perceptions challenges some generational cohort theories that posit fundamental divergences in work values across age groups (Twenge et al., 2010). One possible explanation is that employees at all career stages recognize and value the organizational benefits of structured HR planning, particularly in contexts where job security and career progression are closely tied to organizational HR practices. Alternatively, the uniformly high scores may reflect social desirability bias or limited variance in respondents' responses to SHRP items.

Similarly, the non-significant ANOVA results for educational level and hierarchical position suggest that SHRP perceptions are not stratified along the lines of organizational hierarchy or formal educational credentials. While bachelor's degree holders reported slightly higher mean scores, the difference was not statistically significant, possibly due to the modest sample sizes in higher educational categories. The small managerial subsample (n = 4) represents a particular limitation for the positional analysis, as it substantially constrains statistical power and may mask real differences between managerial and non-managerial employees.

The non-significant Kendall's tau correlation between experience and SHRP corroborates findings from studies indicating that tenure alone is an insufficient predictor of HR-related attitudes (Ng & Feldman, 2010). Experienced employees may develop cynicism toward organizational processes over time, or alternatively, may develop stronger institutional loyalty and appreciation for systematic HR management, with these countervailing tendencies potentially cancelling each other out in aggregate analyses.

Taken together, these findings suggest that SHRP as a perceived organizational practice operates in a relatively demographically neutral manner within the study organization. This could be interpreted as evidence of effective HR communication and organizational culture, wherein strategic HR values are effectively disseminated and internalized across diverse employee segments. It may also reflect the relatively undifferentiated nature of the SHRP measurement scale used, which captured global strategic HR perceptions rather than specific sub-dimensions.

CONCLUSION

This study set out to examine whether workforce demographic characteristics specifically gender, age, educational attainment, organizational position, and work experience produce statistically significant differences in perceptions of Strategic Human Resource Planning among a sample of 150 employees. The findings consistently indicate that SHRP perceptions are uniformly positive and statistically indistinguishable across all demographic groups examined. These results are informative for HR practitioners, suggesting that strategic HR values and planning processes are broadly endorsed across diverse workforce segments, which may reflect the organization's capacity to communicate and embed SHRP principles effectively.

The study makes a modest but meaningful contribution to the quantitative HR planning literature by providing empirical evidence of demographic neutrality in SHRP perceptions. For organizational practice, the findings imply that SHRP initiatives need not be specifically tailored to address demographic sub-group differences, at least within the context studied. Rather, organizations may focus their energies on sustaining the overall quality and visibility of SHRP processes to maintain the high levels of endorsement observed.

Several limitations should be acknowledged. The sample was heavily skewed toward male respondents and lower hierarchical positions, limiting the generalizability of findings

particularly for gender and managerial comparisons. The cross-sectional design itself is a matter of limiting causal inferences and self-reporting being used sort of social prejudice, one must acknowledge. Future research should employ larger, more balanced samples, longitudinal designs, and multi-dimensional SHRP scales capable of detecting nuanced group differences across specific sub-dimensions of strategic HR planning. Mixed-method approaches incorporating qualitative data may also enrich understanding of the mechanisms through which SHRP perceptions are formed and sustained across diverse employee groups.

REFERENCES

Armstrong, M., & Taylor, S. (2020). *Armstrong's handbook of human resource management practice* (15th ed.). Kogan Page.

Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management, 17*(1), 99–120. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639101700108

Boxall, P., & Purcell, J. (2016). *Strategy and human resource management* (4th ed.). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-137-40765-8

Cascio, W. F., & Boudreau, J. W. (2012). *Short introduction to strategic human resource management*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139227087

Cayrat, C., & Boxall, P. (2023). The roles of the HR function: A systematic review of tensions, continuity and change. *Human Resource Management Review, 33*(4), Article 100984. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2023.100984

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Datta, D. K., Guthrie, J. P., & Wright, P. M. (2005). Human resource management and labor productivity: Does industry matter? *Academy of Management Journal, 48*(1), 135–145. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2005.15993158

Eagly, A. H., & Carli, L. L. (2007). *Through the labyrinth: The truth about how women become leaders*. Harvard Business School Press.

Eshete, S. K., & Birbirssa, Z. A. (2024). Strategic human resource management (SHRM) in creating inclusive workplace: Systematic review. *SAGE Open, 14*(4), Article 21582440241287667. https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440241287667

Islam, M. J. (2025). Exploring the impact of HRM practices on employee engagement and job satisfaction: A quantitative analysis in the organizational context. *Journal Of Creative Writing (ISSN-2410-6259), 9*(3), 1–13. https://jocw.ittc.edu.bd/index.php/jocw/article/view/202

Lepak, D. P., & Snell, S. A. (1999). The human resource architecture: Toward a theory of human capital allocation and development. *Academy of Management Review, 24*(1), 31–48. https://doi.org/10.2307/259035

Lyness, K. S., & Judiesch, M. K. (2014). Gender egalitarianism and work–life balance for managers: Multisource perspectives in 36 countries. *Applied Psychology, 63*(1), 96–129. https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12011

Nappo, N. (2025). Gender differences in job satisfaction across Europe: Do men and women experience work differently? *Journal of Economic Studies*, 1–25. https://doi.org/10.1108/JES-01-2025-0051

Ng, T. W. H., & Feldman, D. C. (2010). The relationships of age with job attitudes: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 63*(3), 677–718. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2010.01184.x

Ongesa Nyamboga, T. (2025). Enhancing strategic agility and real time decision-making in the technology sector: Exploring the role of AI and e-HRM systems. *F1000Research, 14*, Article 1238. https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.167708.1

Phiri, K., & Phiri, J. (2022). Strategic human resource management practices and organisational performance: A case of the National Assembly of Zambia. *Open Journal of Business and Management, 10*(5), 2461–2483. https://doi.org/10.4236/ojbm.2022.105124

Salvadorinho, J., Hines, P., Kumar, M., Ferreira, C., & Teixeira, L. (2026). From Gen Z to Boomers: Motivational drivers shaping Industry 5.0 and the future of work. *Futures, 175*, Article 103731. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2025.103731

Schuler, R., & Jackson, S. E. (2014). Human resource management and organizational effectiveness: Yesterday and today. *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance, 1*(1), 35–55. https://doi.org/10.1108/JOEPP-01-2014-0003

Twenge, J. M., Campbell, S. M., Hoffman, B. J., & Lance, C. E. (2010). Generational differences in work values: Leisure and extrinsic values increasing, social and intrinsic values decreasing. *Journal of Management, 36*(5), 1117–1142. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206309352246

Wang, H., Rispens, S., & Demerouti, E. (2026). Working proactively in a social status-diverse workgroup: The important roles of job crafting strategies and emotional intelligence. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 41*(3), 539–569. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-025-10029-4

Wright, P. M., & McMahan, G. C. (1992). Theoretical perspectives for strategic human resource management. *Journal of Management, 18*(2), 295–320. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639201800205