



Strategic Human Resource Planning and Workforce Demographics: A Quantitative Analysis

Yadav Prasad Pokharel¹; Dr. Kirti²; Dipak Mahat^{3*}

¹PhD Scholar, Faculty of Management, Dr. K.N. Modi University- India

ORCID ID: 0009-0006-2553-7957 E-mail: yppokharel10@gmail.com

²Assistant Professor, Faculty of Management, Dr. K.N. Modi University- India

³Faculty of Management, Nepal Philosophical Research Center, Kathmandu-Nepal

ORCID ID: 0000-0003-0540-1180 Email: dipakmahatdm2047@gmail.com

Original Article

Correspondence Author*

Received: May 31, 2026

Revised & Accept: Jun 11, 2026

Copyright: Author(s) (2026)



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non-Commercial 4.0 International License

ABSTRACT

This study examines workforce demographic factors with respect to Strategic Human Resource Planning (SHRP) in an organization. It took a quantitative survey approach and collected data from 150 respondents across various levels of hierarchy in the organization. Respondents were mostly male (87.3%), with those aged 36 to 45 years being in the majority (32.0%). The data were analyzed descriptively and inferentially, with a view to ascertaining whether SHRP perceptions were statistically considerably affected by gender, age, qualification, and position. The findings showed high mean SHRP scores (mean = 4.70 on a scale of one to five), showing an overall agreement with the concept of calculated HR. Kendall's tau-b correlation indicated no meaningful correlation ($\tau = .019$, $p = .766$) between SHRP and work experience when controlling for other



factors. Independent samples t-tests and one-way ANOVA results showed no important differences in SHRP scores across gender ($t = 1.328$, $p = .186$), age groups ($F = 1.063$, $p = .377$), education ($F = 1.681$, $p = .157$), or job position ($F = 0.745$, $p = .527$), indicating consistent, positive SHRP perceptions across the workforce and general organizational commitment.

Keywords: Demographics; Gender; Human Resource planning; organizational

1. INTRODUCTION

Strategic Human Resource Planning (SHRP) has become an important part of the modern management process, seen as an approach of aligning human resources with the calculated goals of the organization (Boxall & Purcell, 2016; Phiri & Phiri, 2022). In today's environment of fast technological change, globalization and new ways of working, companies are starting to realize that it is people, above all, who make the difference. Their competitive advantage comes from their people, how hard and how willingly they work, and how appropriately they contribute to the achievement of high-level planned goals (Armstrong & Taylor, 2020).

The theoretical support behind SHRP comes from a mix of several disciplines, including organizational behavior, labor economics and strategic management (Eshete & Birbirssa, 2024). Basically, SHRP brings together workforce forecasting, succession planning, talent acquisition plus advancement, and a more proactive detection of skill gaps that could mess with organizational performance (Schuler & Jackson, 2014). In contrast, the usual HR planning is often more reactive and kind of stuck on day to day operations, while strategic HR planning leans forward, it connects human resource strategies with the larger organizational purpose and vision (Cayrat & Boxall, 2023).

Despite all the theoretical talk around SHRP, real empirical studies about how individual demographic traits affect employee's perceptions of, and involvement in strategic HR processes are still kind of thin, especially in developing country settings (Islam, 2025). Demographic variables like gender, age, educational attainment, job rank, and years of work experience are generally recognized to influence employee's attitudes, values, and work behavior (Datta et al.,



2005). Still, it's not fully clear, whether these factors create different SHRP perceptions across groups, or if SHRP as a concept somehow stays the same across demographics. That question is basically empirically underexplored.

This study attempts to support in filling in such a gap, by a demographic, quantitative analysis of SHRP perceptions among the 150 employees who were recruited from a more formal organization. In particular, the main focus was to investigate statistically important differences in SHRP scores for each gender, age, and level of education, position, and experience categories. These results are expected to advance the SHRP literature as they provide evidence based cues for building inclusive and demographic sensitive HR practices in line with the SHRP theorization.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Strategic Human Resource Planning: Conceptual Foundations

SHRP is formally defined as a purposive and systematic process of aligning an organization's human resource direction with its planned direction, (Wright & McMahan, 1992). SHRP is based on the resource based view of the firm (Barney, 1991) which states that people and their skills and abilities can be a source of sustained competitive advantage, if managed strategically. Typically, this means they are rare, valuable, imperfectly imitable and non-substitutable. In practice the whole planning process comes down to turning business strategy into workforce needs, doing forecasting of future talent demands, and putting in place proactive remedial action to handle expected shortfalls. These include recruitment, training, retention, and workforce re-structuring (Cascio & Boudreau, 2012; Ongesa Nyamboga, 2025).

Modern SHRP models really push the integration across several HR functions and somehow they don't treat them as separate bits. For example, Schuler and Jackson (2014) argued the SHRP will only work if there is tight coordination between a system of hiring, learning and development, performance management and the compensation system. Also, as Boxall and Purcell (2016) state, SHRP will have to understand environmental contingencies, such as changing industrial configurations, regulatory frameworks and labor market conditions, if it is to remain effective but, more importantly, adaptable.



2.2 Demographic Variables and HR Perceptions

The research on demographic variables has focused on the employees' evaluation of HR practices. For instance, Eagly & Carli (2007) found that the gender of employees influenced their work values, career orientation, and what was considered organizational justice. Many women report having less or more different experiences than their male counterparts in HR practices, like career development opportunities, and work life balance policies (Mahat & Aithal, 2022; Nappo, 2025). However, there is a lack of literature concerning gender differences in planned HRM planning perspectives.

Age and generational cohort are tied to differential work values plus organizational expectations (Twenge et al., 2010). Younger employees are more likely to value opportunities for learning and growth, while older employees may be more concerned with job security and stability within the organization (Salvadorinho et al., 2026). These diverging leanings can, in turn, color the way employees view, and actually appraise, SHRP initiatives.

Education may lead to the way in which employees perceive organizational processes. Further, education may also be an indication of the degree to which employees are able to cope with complex HR systems (Lepak and Snell, 1999; Rai et al., 2024). More educated employees may be more familiar with calculated management concepts and more differentiated in their quality assessments of SHRP. In a similar vein, position in the organizational hierarchy can be an antecedent of perceptions of planned planning; managers and officers are usually more plugged into HR planning than workers and supervisors, and that might create perceptual differences between these strata of the hierarchy.

Work experience, in terms of tenure or years of service (Wang et al., 2025), might constitute another demographic moderator, because long-tenured employees might have had more time to build their mental models of how organizational processes work, and can therefore evaluate SHRP effectiveness in a longitudinal, sort of continuing way (Ng & Feldman, 2010). However, the relationship between work experience and HR perceptions is less clear: some studies have found a positive relationship between work experience and HR perceptions, while others have not.



3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

A quantitative, cross-sectional survey design best fit the aim of this study to assess the distribution of the outcome variable in the population at one point in time, and test whether between-group differences exist (Creswell & Creswell, 2018; Parajuli et al., 2022) . The main instrument for data collection was a structured self-administered questionnaire.

3.2 Sample and Sampling Procedure

The target population was basically the employees of a formal organization that runs across multiple hierarchical levels, like workers supervisor's officers and managers, you know. A purposive sampling approach is used to make sure that the representation is decent for each demographic category. After all the data screening and cleaning and whatnot, 150 usable questionnaires were retained for analysis in the study.

3.3 Measurement Instrument

The 5-item SHRP construct (SHRP1 to SHRP5) was adapted from previously validated scales used in calculated HRM research. Participants responded to items on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (5). The statements focused on how respondents view workforce planning, succession planning, competency development, HR strategy alignment, and the effectiveness of talent management. Demographic details were captured through a structured section that included gender, age group, educational qualification, hierarchical position, and years of work experience.

3.4 Data Analysis

We used IBM SPSS statistics, for analysing the data. Descriptive statistics, such as means, standard deviations and frequencies were computed to familiarize ourselves with the sample and to examine the distribution of scores on the SHRP. Then, using Kendall's tau-b (a non-parametric correlation) we tested the relationship between work experience (counted as continuous data) and overall SHRP score given this is an ordinal scale. Independent samples t-tests were then used to determine whether the score on the SHRP was different for the two genders after this. We performed a one



way analysis of variance (ANOVA) for age groups, education, and positional categories. Also, because we were curious about whether the variances were equal, we checked the Levene's test prior to interpretation of the t-test results.

4. RESULTS

4.1 Demographic Profile of Respondents

The frequency distribution of the demographic characteristics is presented in Table 1, in a general sort of way. The sample is clearly male-dominated with 131 of the respondents (87.3%) claiming it was male, and 19 respondents (12.7%) claiming it was female. Gender balance is in line with job composition of the study organization. As for age, most of the respondents were in the 36–45 years range (32.0%, $n = 48$), then came the 26–35 years group (30.0%, $n = 45$). After that, 46–55 years (19.3%, $n = 29$), 18–25 years (11.3%, $n = 17$), and lastly 56–65 years (7.3%, $n = 11$).

Primary education was the highest ranked category ($n = 50$, 33.3%) for education. Secondary education followed (28.7%, $n = 43$), then higher secondary (18.7%, $n = 28$). Bachelor's degree was the next less common (15.3%, $n = 23$), followed by the least common (4.0%, $n = 6$) being master's degree or above. Overall, this pattern indicates a relatively low level of average formal education of the workforce, or at least not quite very high. As far as organizational position is concerned, the workers (54.0%, $n = 81$) were the biggest group and the next was supervisors (28.7%, $n = 43$). Officers made up 14.7% ($n = 22$), while managers were quite few (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.

4.2 Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics of work experience are given in Table 2, yeah. The respondents' experience ranges from 1yr to at most 40 years with the average experience being 10.27 years (SD = 8.97). This implies a great deal of variation in experience, as well as an average moderate level of experience for the sample as a whole.

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 is basically showing the descriptive statistics for the Strategic Human Resource Planning (SHRP) scale items, based on answers from 150 participants. These items are measured on a 5-point likert scale from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree) so this is pretty easy. Overall,



the results point to a high consensus across all SHRP dimensions as the mean scores range from 4.6267 to 4.7733, which is quite high in general.

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).

In terms of the mean ($M = 4.7733$) and the SD ($SD = 0.42008$), SHRP2 had the highest mean score; it appears that the majority of respondents strongly agree that HR planning considers the organisation's future staffing requirements. So there's this feeling that workforce planning is somewhat future-oriented and that it still aligns with the organization's future needs.

SHRP1 is also quite high ($M = 4.7200$, $SD = 0.47937$), indicating that HR planning is considered as a way to support the organisation in achieving long term goals. Similarly, SHRP3 ($M = 4.6867$, $SD = 0.49340$) and SHRP5 ($M = 4.6733$, $SD = 0.56160$) follow, indicating that respondents in general are aware of how HR plans guide their daily activities. They also appear to be in general agreement that HR plans are revised when the organization's strategy changes.

The one that is a little lower ($M = 4.6267$, $SD = 0.58558$) is SHRP4, but it is clearly in the high agreement range. It could also be that there's a slight variation in the perception of the effectiveness of HR planning for putting employees to work and achieving strategic targets.

The relatively high mean scores combined with the low standard deviations for all items indicate that the individuals who responded in general have a favourable attitude towards strategic HR planning practices within their organization.

4.3 Relationship between Work Experience and SHRP

To explore the relationship between work experience and the composite SHRP, Kendall's tau-b correlation was calculated. In Table 4, the correlation coefficient is basically negligible and it came



out statistically non-significant $\tau = .019$, $p = .766$, $N = 150$. Therefore, this finding indicates that there is no meaningful trend between the number of years in service and the ratings that were given to the effectiveness of SHRP. That is, the more experienced staff group as well as the less experienced group had a very consistent overall positive view of strategic HR planning, and it does not appear that the perception of strategic HR planning is strongly dependent on the length of service in the organization of staff.

Table 4

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

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

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

4.4 Gender Differences in SHRP

An independent samples t-test was run, to see if there were statistically meaningful differences in SHRP scores between the male and female respondents. Here's the group statistics (Table 5) and as much as I can tell, it's pretty simple. The male group ($n = 131$) gave a mean SHRP score of 4.71 with $SD = .313$, while the female group ($n = 19$) had a slightly lower mean of 4.60, $SD = .476$. Although the difference between the means was about 0.11 points, it appeared to be small enough to be considered statistically insignificant so a check was made 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.

The results of an independent samples t-test is presented in Table 6. Levene's test for equality of variances turned out to be statistically significant ($F = 4.889$, $p = .029$), which means there was



some heterogeneity of variances between the two groups. So, the “equal variances not assumed” row was used, instead of the other one. The t-test itself came out non-significant ($t = .976$, $df = 20.317$, $p = .340$), and the mean difference was .110 with a 95% CI of $-.125$ to $.345$. Overall, this suggests that gender does not really predict SHRP perception scores, and that male and female employees, view strategic HR planning practices at quite similar levels, in general.

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 $F = 4.889$, $p = .029$).

4.5 Age-Group Differences in SHRP

A one-way ANOVA was done to compare SHRP means across five age cohorts, Table 7 shows the descriptive statistics by age group. The youngest cohort (18–25 years) ended up with the top mean SHRP score ($M = 4.78$, $SD = .263$), while the 26–35 age group had the lowest result ($M = 4.63$, $SD = .379$). The other cohorts were in the middle with means from around 4.67 to 4.76. Despite this, the ANOVA results in Table 8 showed the differences in SHRP scores within and between the age groups were not statistically significant ($F(4, 145) = 1.063$, $p = .377$). Thus, there appears to be no way to distinguish the ratings of SHRP practices across age cohorts of employees.

Table 7

Descriptive Statistics: SHRP by Age Group



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.

4.6 Educational Differences in SHRP

Table 9 shows the descriptive statistics for SHRP scores, sort of broken down by educational attainment. Basically, people with a Bachelor's degree had the top mean SHRP score ($M = 4.86$, $SD = .195$), then higher secondary graduates ($M = 4.69$, $SD = .300$), followed by those with a master's degree or above ($M = 4.67$, $SD = .723$), then secondary school completers ($M = 4.67$, $SD = .377$), and finally primary school completers ($M = 4.66$, $SD = .300$). The large mean SHRP for the master's group appears to have a large standard deviation which may be attributable to the small sample size, $n = 6$, from this group.

Table 10 indicates that the one way ANOVA was not significant ($F(4, 145) = 1.681, p = .157$) suggesting that there is not a statistically significant difference in perception of SHRP with respect to educational level. The difference in ratings among the various education categories was not statistically significant, although it is slightly greater for those with bachelor's degrees than for those with other levels, possibly due to the relatively small group sizes within the higher education categories and their limited power to detect a difference.



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.

4.7 Positional Differences in SHRP

Table 11 presents SHRP descriptive statistics by organizational position, but really it's sort of like a quick summary of the results of the difference between roles. Officers reported the highest mean SHRP score ($M = 4.75, SD = .409$), then supervisors ($M = 4.71, SD = .277$), workers ($M = 4.68, SD = .311$), and managers ($M = 4.50, SD = .872$). The standard deviation is relatively high and managers' mean is lower, likely due to the small subsample of managers ($n = 4$) which makes the estimates a little less reliable for this subsample.

The ANOVA results from Table 12 confirms that there are no statistically significant differences in SHRP scores for the different position groups ($F(3, 146) = 0.745, p = .527$). This is an interesting one as theory would indicate that perceptions of SHRP would differ between managers/officers,



who are more directly involved in strategic planning processes and frontline employees. The absence of any differences, however, could be an indicator that organizational communication on strategic HR values is actually working at the bottom, middle, and top of the organizations, rather than just at the top or middle.

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.

5. DISCUSSION

Results from this study appear to provide theoretically and practically valuable clues to the relationship between demographics and perceptions of SHRP. If you look at each of the analyses performed, like Kendall's tau-b correlation, t-tests for independent samples, and one-way ANOVAs, it appears that none of the statistically significant differences emerged in the scores on the SHRP, based on gender, age, education, organizational position, and job experience. The SHRP



score is 4.70, out of a possible 5-point range, with a good overall score indicating high approval of strategic HR practices across the entire group, albeit not very different.

The lack of significant differences between male and female perceptions of SHRP is consistent with the overall pattern of organizational behavior research, which sometimes appears to show a general convergence of attitudes toward work between men and women, particularly in the more formal organizational context (Lyness & Judiesch, 2014). In our case the female subsample was also small ($n = 19$), so maybe a little limited in statistical power, but the mean difference of .11 is pretty small, not something you would necessarily notice, as in "negligible". As a whole, the results appear to confirm the institutional theory concepts regarding the influence of shared organizational norms and socialization experiences repeated over the years on work related attitudes, as opposed to individual level demographic factors.

Inconsistencies with several generational cohort theories that indicate differences in key work values by age group (Twenge et al., 2010) sort-of mess up the lack of major age-group gaps in SHRP perceptions. One likely explanation is that this approach to HR planning is still seen by people of all levels of their careers as having organizational benefits, particularly where the ability of career advancement and job security are strongly linked to the proper functioning of HR practices. On the other hand the very similar and high scores could also mean social desirability bias is at play, or that there is low variability in how respondents answer the SHRP questions.

Similarly, the non-significant ANOVA results for educational level and hierarchical position suggest that SHRP perceptions are not really stratified along organizational hierarchy, or formal educational credentials. Bachelor's degree holders reported slightly higher mean scores but this was not statistically significant, and may have been attributable to the small number of respondents in the higher education categories. Secondly, there is a small managerial subsample ($n = 4$), which is a notable constraint for the positional analysis, in that it essentially reduces the power of the analysis and may conceal any differences between managerial and non-managerial staff.

This finding of a non-significant correlation between experience and SHRP is consistent with previous research that showed that only experience alone is insufficient to explain HR related



attitudes (Ng & Feldman, 2010). While some may become cynical as time goes on, others may develop greater institutional loyalty, and perhaps an appreciation of the effectiveness of the institutional management process of HR. These conflicting forces can exist either in one direction or the other, which makes them cancel out in the overall, "pooled" results in the overall analyses.

Overall, these results suggest that the way SHRP is seen as an organizational practice is a "demographically neutral" process in the study organization. Maybe it's a measure of good HR communication and an organizational culture that has good distribution of the strategic HR values and maybe even some internalization among different team members. It may also reflect the fact that the SHRP measurement scale is rather undifferentiated, as it is likely to reflect more general strategic HR perceptions than to focus on specific sub-scalars, you know, not really segmenting them.

6. CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to determine whether statistically significant differences existed among employees working at different organizations based on their demographic characteristics (gender, age, and education level, role in the organization and experience in the organization) in relation to their perception of Strategic Human Resource Planning, with a sample of 150 employees. Overall, the results continue to be uniformly positive for the SHRP perceptions, and not significantly different between the various demographic groups examined. That is to say, there was no actual difference, no real separation; actually, this is the main point here. These are still significant for HR practitioners, as they suggest a consensus on strategic human resource values and planning processes among various workforce segments. This may also signal that the organisation can communicate the message and then instil the SHRP principles in a consistent manner, even if not everybody in the organisation is the same demographic or even if their viewpoints are likely to differ.

This study represents a relatively small, but nonetheless valuable, contribution to the numerical HR planning conversation, in that empirical evidence indicated a relative demographic-neutrality of SHRP perceptions (or at least the results suggest that this is the case). And as for organizational



practice, well, the implications are pretty clear: SHRP programs don't need to be specially tuned at least in this particular case (not really) to deal with demographic sub-group differences. Rather, the focus could be directed towards maintaining the overall quality and visibility of the SHRP processes, thereby maintaining the level of endorsement seen by people.

There are a couple of restrictions that should be noted. The sample was a bit biased towards all male and a bit biased towards the less senior positions and this does make the results less generalizable, particularly for comparisons of gender and manager. Not to mention the cross-sectional nature of the design means that there's simply no way to make causal inferences and, above all, that it is all self-reported data, so that we may be with a social desirability bias even if we were to keep it in check! For future research, it would be better to use larger, more balanced samples, plus longitudinal designs. It would also be useful to have multi-dimensional SHRP scales which would identify those subtle, group differences on specific sub-dimensions of strategic HR planning. Then mixing methods could enhance the picture as well, such as incorporating some qualitative data, to understand the mechanisms through which perceptions of SHRP are formed, and then retained over time, across 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.
- Cascio, W. F., & Boudreau, J. W. (2012). *Short introduction to strategic human resource management*. Cambridge University Press.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- 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), 100984. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2023.100984>



- 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). <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://doi.org/10.70771/jocw.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. <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: Gender egalitarianism and work-life balance. *Psychologie Appliquee [Applied Psychology]*, 63(1), 96–129. <https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12011>
- Mahat, D., & Aithal, P. S. (2022). Socio-culture and women career development: References to government agencies of Nepal. *International Journal of Management, Technology, and Social Sciences*, 241–249. <https://doi.org/10.47992/ijmts.2581.6012.0218>
- Nappo, N. (2025). Gender differences in job satisfaction across Europe: do men and women experience work differently? *Journal of Economic Studies (Glasgow, Scotland)*, 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, 1238. <https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.167708.1>
- Parajuli, S. K., Mahat, D., & Lingden, B. (2022). Organization learning, dissemination of knowledge and organizational performance in Nepalese banking sectors. *Nepal Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 5(5), 75–85. <https://doi.org/10.3126/njmr.v5i5.51806>
- 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(05), 2461–2483. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ojbm.2022.105124>



- Rai, N., Khadka, N., Rai, M., Shrestha, P., Lekhak, M., Shrestha, M., & Mahat, D. (2024). Rise of foreign employment and challenges faced by Nepali youth in the domestic job market. *International Journal of Applied and Advanced Multidisciplinary Research*, 2(7), 497–508.
- 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(103731), 103731. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2025.103731>
- Schuler, R., & E. Jackson, S. (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., Rispons, S., & Demerouti, E. (2025). Working proactively in a social status-diverse workgroup: The important roles of job crafting strategies and emotional intelligence. *Journal of Business and Psychology*. <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>