Perceptions of the Human Resource Management Function among Professionals: A Ghanaian Study

Daniel F. Ofori (Corresponding author)

Department of Organization and HRM, University of Ghana Business School

P.O. Box LG 78, Legon, Accra, Ghana

E-mail: dofori@ug.edu.gh

Victoria Sekyere-Abankwa

Department of Organization and HRM, University of Ghana Business School

P.O. Box LG 78, Legon, Accra, Ghana

E-mail: vsabankwa@ug.edu.gh

Davida B. Borquaye

Department of Organization and HRM, University of Ghana Business School

P.O. Box LG 78, Legon, Accra, Ghana

Abstract

The purpose of the study was to determine the perceptions of the HR function among professionals in Ghanaian organizations. The study employed a survey methodology using both qualitative and quantitative methods in the analysis of data collected from three hundred (300) respondents. A perception index was developed to measure the respondents' perceived relevance of the HR function in their organizations. The results from the study revealed that respondents ranked the recruitment of qualified personnel; training and development; and the retention of qualified staff as the most important functions of HRM. It also revealed that the perceived relevance of the HR function is influenced by age, job position, being denied assistance, and being sidelined for recognition. This study offers valuable insights into the perceptions of Ghanaian professionals on the relevance of the HR function and its contribution to organizations.

Keywords: Human Resource Management, HRM functions, Professionals, Ghana

1. Introduction and Purpose of the Study

Armstrong (2009) defines Human Resource Management (HRM) as a strategic and coherent approach to the management of an organisation's most valued assets; that is, the people working there who individually and collectively contribute to the achievement of its objectives. Human resources within organizations can be a source of competitive advantage when valuable, rare, inimitable and non-substitutable (Chadwick & Dabu, 2009; Wright, McMahan, & McWilliams, 1994). Schneider (1994) also defines human resource management as the policies, practices and procedures organizations use for the attraction, selection and management of employees. Thus, HRM basically describes the processes of managing people in organizations. Storey (1989) also notes that HRM through HR systems brings together in a coherent way: HR philosophies, HR strategies, HR policies, HR processes, HR practices and HR programmes.

The assumption underpinning the practice of HRM is that people are the organization's key resource and organizational performance largely depends on them. Therefore, if an appropriate range of HR policies and processes are developed and implemented effectively, HR will make a substantial impact on firm performance. HR can impact on organizational sustainability (defined in terms of economic prosperity, social justice, environmental equality, education and peace) by generating the conditions for dialogue on what sustainability

vis-à-vis corporate goals are as well as developing the competencies and skills among all levels of employees in achieving those goals (Colbert & Kurucz, 2007 cited in Rimanoczy & Pearson, 2010).

The role and value of HRM practices have been researched on over the years. For example, a number of studies by authors such as Ulrich (1997a), Huselid (1995), Huselid and Becker (1996), Becker, Huselid, Pickus and Spratt (1997), Guest et al (2000b), and Purcell (2003), have established a strong evidentiary link between human resource management practices and organizational performance. Other studies have outlined the functions and role of HRM within organizations, ranging from recruitment and selection, job analysis and appraisal, to reward management, and health and safety (Armstrong, 2003; Buhler, 2002; Coda, Cesar, Bido & Louffat, 2009). With the advent of globalization and the changing nature of work, human resource management considers employees as valuable assets that contribute to the organization's competitive advantage. In this regard, the HRM functions in contemporary times lean towards contributing to organizational performance and corporate strategy (Barney & Wright, 1998; Purcell, 2003).

The development of the Human Resource function, which has also been linked to the historical development of business (Conner and Ulrich, 1996; Walker, 1999), has undergone a transformation from a traditional administrative role to a broader one involving human resource development and corporate strategy in organisations (Barney & Wright, 1998). According to Torrington and Hall (1998), the whole career experience has changed greatly over the years with organisations de-layering, downsizing, rightsizing, sub-contracting and outsourcing core or periphery workforces, as well as an increase in the incidence of self-employment and part-time employment. Consequently, personnel management is undergoing its biggest change ever, including being renamed human resource management (Rimanoczy & Pearson, 2010). Armstrong (2000) argued that the change in name is immaterial, and that what is important is the development of new practices and policies to meet situational needs.

In spite of the change in name, the practice of HRM has not undergone much change and researchers are still not in agreement over what constitutes HRM practices. The HRM practices that seem to cut across various definitions include recruitment and selection, training and development, performance and reward management, and in the recent literature, HRM's contribution to strategy. It is important to note that the practice of HRM differs across regions not just in terms of the level of economic development, but also in terms of socio-cultural traditions as seen in some developing countries in Africa (Budhwar & Debrah, 2001).

1.1 Human Resource Management in Ghana

Human resource management in Ghana evolved from the systems implemented by the British Colonial administration who introduced Western labour management practices into the country (Budhwar and Debrah, 2001). The process of indigenizing the Ghanaian economy and organizations, which followed independence, propelled the HR function to the forefront from the early 1960s to the mid 1980s. The new government's objective was to replace expatriate staff with Ghanaians in both the private and public sectors. Hence, local personnel managers were appointed to fill positions previously occupied by expatriate staff, even though they did not possess the right qualifications for the job. The economic reforms of the 1980s also brought about some changes in the management of personnel. Budhwar and Debrah (2001) also found that in Ghana, as in a number of African cultures, people in organisations still place a lot of emphasis on traditions and institutions, customs and socio-cultural issues that tend to inject an element of subjectivity in HR functions such as recruitment and selection, performance appraisal, promotion, demotion, and compensation.

In a paper examining the constitutional provisions or prescriptions relevant to HRM in Ghana, Abdulai (2000) noted that the Fourth Republican Constitution of Ghana sets out key guidelines for human resource management such as; Recruitment and Selection, Women and Equal Employment opportunity, Employee Rights and Welfare, Human Resource Development Policy, and Compensation and Benefits among others. However, he noted that Ghanaian organisations do not give the necessary attention to human resource management issues, thus, resulting in a lack of systematic policies to guide HR activities. He stated that even a cursory glance at the human resource management practices revealed serious lapses in both the public and private sectors, with the former being worse. Hence, there is the need to develop best practices in management of human resources in organizations in Ghana.

1.2 Purpose of the Study

The HRM function is a crucial part of management within organizations, made more so by globalization, competition and the changing nature of the work. Even though literature on the functions and competencies of HRM in the developed countries abound, there are very few studies on HRM functions in developing countries such as Ghana. This study thus, seeks to fill that void by exploring the Ghanaian professionals' perceptions of the HRM function within their organizations.

The study sought to explore the views and perceptions of the Ghanaian professional regarding;

(i)   The role and relevance of the HR function within their organizations, and

(ii)   The factors that influence the perception of the HR function.

To help achieve the objective, the study set out to answer the following questions;

(i)   What is the role of HRM within organizations?

(ii)   What is the perceived relevance of HRM within organizations?

(iii)   What are the factors that influence the perception of the relevance of HRM within an organization? (E.g. age, gender, role in the organization/ job position – senior management versus supervisor).

(iv)   How can the HR function be improved by practitioners to make them relevant to the times?

1.3 Significance of the

This study on the perception of the HR function amongst professionals in Ghana is the first research work of its kind in Ghana. Hence, it would help fill in the existing gap created by the dearth of work of such nature in Ghana. In addition to contributing to the literature in the field of HRM, would also shed light on the views and expectations of the HR function amongst Ghanaian professionals. This knowledge would be valuable to HR practitioners in Ghana in the development of programmes that are strategic and relevant to their organizations to researchers desirous of expanding the boundaries of HRM research and to academia.

2. Literature Review

The HRM functions are all the activities and processes involved with the management and development (contractual and legal) of people in an organization from the period of hiring or acquisition and retention to the point of exit. The functions of HRM include resourcing and retention; compensation and rewards; training and development; performance appraisal; benefits and relations with employees (Coda, Cesar, Bido & Louffat, 2009). The execution of these functions is not the sole prerogative of management but also stretches to the line managers who actually implement the HR policies.

There are a number of methods for evaluating the HR function in organizations.

Wright, McMahan, Snell and Gerhart (1998) in comparing the perceptions of the HR effectiveness of line and HR executives proposed five roles. These are; *The Strategic Partner Role:* this role focuses on HR's participation in and influence over the formulation of strategy; *The Tailoring Practices Role:* this highlights HR's role in strategy implementation and tailoring HR practices to support the business strategy once it is formulated; *Providing HR Services Role:* this encompasses HR'S role in providing the basic HR services of recruiting and selection, compensation management, training, etc; *Providing Change Consulting:* this deals with HR's role in helping line executives to effectively manage cultural and organizational change; and *Developing Organizational Skills and Capabilitie*s: this deals with HR's role in identifying and or developing critical organizational core competencies or capabilities. Boselie and Paauwe (2005) in a study of HR function competencies in European companies found that generally, HR managers had a more positive perception of the HR function and HR department than other employees and managers. Interestingly, both the line and HR executives perceived HR as being more effective at delivering the less important services as opposed to the strategic roles.

According to Gibb (2001), another method of evaluating the HRM function is to seek the point of view of the employees. This includes the employees' perceptions of; Training and development; Rewards and levels of personal motivation; Levels of employee morale; Communication; and Noticeable areas of weakness in HRM. Buhler (2002) listed the following functions as key to the management of human resources and critical for the effective performance of the organization; Recruitment and selection; Human resource development; Compensation and benefits; and Safety and health. This is in line with the classical HR functions of resourcing and staffing, development and training, and reward management, but omits HR's role in corporate strategy. For this study, a model for evaluating HRM function by Smilansky (1997), which includes the role of HR in strategy, has been adopted as part of the theoretical framework outlined below.

2.1 The Paradox of the HRM Function

Becker, Huselid, Pickus & Spratt (1997) noted that the HRM function is at a cross road. One end represents the crises situation of the function to justify itself and confronted with the prospect that a significant portion of its traditional activities will be outsourced. The other hand is focused on the opportunity/ies that can be derived when the HRM system is seen as a source of strategic asset. The former means that all aspects of the HR

function is not solely controlled and delivered from within the organisation. This is evident from the fact that "86% of all work place employing ten or more employees had arrangements for subcontracting some activity including payroll, training, temporary employment and general recruitment (Kersley et al., 2006, pp. 105-107 cited in Woodall, Scott-Jackson, Newham & Gurney, 2009).

2.2 HRM Challenges

According to Mathis & Jackson (2004), the challenges facing HRM include economic and technological changes, availability and quality of workforce, changes in the demography and diversity of the workforce, growing number of contingent workers, and organizational change. Apart from the above challenges, Kane and Palmer (1995) mentioned that the external and internal environments have potential influences on HRM policies and practices. The external influences include international and national economic changes such as the recent world wide recession, technological changes, changes in regulation and legislation, and the changes in traditions and culture due to globalization. The internal influences on the HRM policies and practices include; organizational size and structure, values of the top management, and power and politics within the organization. In addition to these internal and external factors, Kane and Palmer (1995) mentioned the academic and professional influences on HRM policies and practices since the knowledge base of HR practitioners are acquired from peers, education and available literature (Terpstra, 1994).

2.3 Theoretical Framework

The study examines the perceptions of HRM functions among Ghanaian professionals using the HRM evaluation model by Smilansky (1997) and the theoretical framework of Jacobs (2004). According to Smilansky (1997), the overall purpose of HRM is to enable management to enhance the individual and collective contribution of people to the short and long-term success of the enterprise. His HRM evaluation model is based on five clusters namely;

1) **Strategy and Organization:** The contribution of HR practitioners to the development and review of the organization's strategy, culture, structure, and work processes to improve effectiveness and to ensure they support the long-term strategy.

2) **Resourcing:** This includes developing and maintaining resourcing strategy and plans to consider the strategic needs of the organization, and recruiting and deploying people efficiently.

3) **Development:** This includes developing and maintaining resourcing strategy and plans to enhance employee performance in order to improve the organization's long-term competitive position, providing long-term individual development and team development, and establishing performance planning.

4) **Reward Management:** This includes developing and maintaining total remuneration strategy and plans, establishing levels of remuneration for jobs and people, developing and managing effective employee benefits and expenses, and paying the employees.

5) **Relations with Employees:** This includes developing and maintaining strategy and plans for all employee relations activities, ensuring employee commitment in times of change, and promoting effective internal communication.

Jacobs (2004) suggests five key questions to analyze whether the HRM department has evolved towards strategy. These are;

1) Is the HRM manager effectively involved with or providing solid contributions to business strategy-related decisions?

2) Do managers from other departments regard the HRM department as an effective contributor to changing management within the organization?

3) Is the department agenda aligned with general business strategies?

4) Does the department participate in meetings with the CEO to provide advisory support in relation to the company's general strategies, and not only to HRM-related issues?

5) Is the HRM department implementing any change in their focus to help the company reach its critical success point?

2.4 Hypotheses

In carrying out the study on the perceptions of the HRM function of Ghanaian professionals, the following hypotheses were proposed to help answer the research questions.

2.4.1 Hypothesis 1

Based on findings by Meyer and Allen (1991) and Chang (1999), the following demographic variables were believed to influence perception – age, gender, tenure, work experience, and job position. Thus, it was hypothesized that;

Hypothesis 1(a): There will be a significant positive relationship between the age of respondents and their perceived relevance of HRM.

Hypothesis 1(b): There will be a significant positive relationship between the gender of respondents and their perceived relevance of HRM.

Hypothesis 1(c): There will be a significant positive relationship between the respondents' work experience and their perceived relevance of HRM.

Hypothesis 1(d): There will be a significant positive relationship between the respondents' job position and their perceived relevance of HRM.

2.4.2 Hypothesis 2

It was also hypothesized that the perceived relevance of HRM will be influenced by reward management and relationship with employees (Smilansky, 1997);

Hypothesis 2(a): There will be a significant positive relationship between being denied assistance and the perceived relevance of HRM.

Hypothesis 2(b): There will be a significant positive relationship between being passed on for promotion and the perceived relevance of HRM.

Hypothesis 2(c): There will be a significant positive relationship between being sidelined for recognition and the perceived relevance of HRM.

2.4.3 Hypothesis 3

Wright et al (1998) found that the perception of the HRM function and effectiveness differs between HR managers and Line managers. Based on this, it was further hypothesized that;

Hypothesis 3(a): There will be a significant difference in the perceived relevance of the HRM function between respondents in the HR department and those from other departments.

Hypothesis 3(b): There will be a significant difference in the perceived relevance of the HRM functions between professionals in supervisory roles and those in senior management positions.

Hypothesis 3(c): There will be a significant difference in the perceived relevance of the HRM functions between respondents with different work experiences.

Hypothesis 3(d): There will be a significant difference in the perceived relevance of the HRM functions between respondents of different age groups.

3. Methodology

The study employed a survey methodology to explore the perceptions of the Human Resource Management function among Ghanaian professionals.

3.1 Sample

The sample was drawn from the entire first year intake of the University of Ghana Business School's Executive MBA programme for the 2010-2011 academic year.

3.2 Sampling Technique

Purposive sampling was used to select first year students, of the 2010 – 2011 academic year, who were yet to take the HRM course. This approach was key to the study because students had not yet been exposed to the role, function and importance of HRM within organisations. Hence the respondents' views about HRM had not yet been shaped, formed or coloured by prior academic HRM knowledge.

3.3 Sample Size

The sample for the study was made up of three hundred (300) respondents selected from the first year EMBA class. Out of this number 250 questionnaires were returned giving a response rate of 83.33%.

3.4 Sample Characteristics

Out of the 250 questionnaires received, forty-eight (48) questionnaires were found to be incomplete and were thus rejected.

Gender: The remaining sample of two hundred and two (202) was made up of eighty-five (85) females and one hundred and seventeen (117) males.

Age: The mean age of the sample was found to be 36.9 years.

Occupation: The sample had three dominant occupations namely, Banking and Finance (47.50%), Administration and HR (14.90%), and Sales and Marketing/ Customer Service (11.40%). Less than two percent (1.50%) of the sample indicated that they were HR Managers or practitioners. This may be due to the fact that traditionally, a number of organizations in Ghana have the HR department labelled as Administration and Human Resource Department, thus, including the provision of logistics and infrastructure for employees to their functions. This was reflected in the respondents' departments.

Department: The data showed that 26.73% (54) of respondents carried out functions that fell under Operations such as retail banking operations, technical services and maintenance. 17.82% (36) respondents were in the Finance and Accounting department; 14.36% (29) were in the Administration department; and 11.88% (24) were in the Administration and Human Resource department. Only three (3) respondents making 1.49% of the sample were in the Human Resource department. Refer to Table 3.1 below.

Sector of Organizations: With respect of sector of respondents' organization, the data showed that a majority (33.56%) of the organizations fell under the banking sector, followed by the financial services sector with 18.4%; and ICT, Manufacturing and NGOs with 8.5% each.

Origin and Type of Organization: Table 3.1 below shows the Origin and Type of Ownership of the respondents' organizations.

Insert Table 3.1

Table 3.2 below shows the results of a cross-tabulation of the respondents' ages and gender against their positions within their organizations.

Insert Table 3.2

Interestingly, the data revealed that a majority (50.77%) of the respondents in senior management positions were between the ages of 31 and 40 years. Table 3.2 also shows the results of a cross-tabulation of gender against job positions of the respondent. In line with studies in sociology on the glass ceiling effect, where higher levels of professional workers and senior executive and managerial positions are dominated by males (ILO, 2004), the majority (73.85%) of the respondents in senior management positions were males, with more females being in the supervisory roles (56.45%).

A cross-tabulation of the gender, job position and origin of the organization revealed that there were more women in supervisory, middle management and senior management positions in the Ghanaian and Multinational companies. The results are shown below in Table 3.3.

Insert Table 3.3

Table 3.4 below shows the cross-tabulation of the work experience and job positions of respondents. As expected with a mean age of 36.9 years, a majority of the respondents in supervisory and senior management positions had between eleven (11) and fifteen (15) years of work experience. This constituted 27.14% (54) of respondents with a total work experience of 11 to 15 years. The mean total work experience was found to be 11.51 years. The mean tenure of respondents in their current work positions or role was found to be 3.79 years.

Insert Table 3.4

3.5 Instruments and Measures

This section provides an in-depth analysis of the design and structure of the questionnaire used for the study, the factors it purports to measure, as well as scoring of the items.

3.5.1 Structure of the Questionnaire

A 42-item questionnaire was designed to obtain data on the perceptions of HRM functions within organizations. Since the study was exploratory in nature, the questionnaire incorporated both multiple choice and open-ended questions for further clarifications where necessary. The survey questionnaire incorporated the five questions for analyzing the evolution of HRM towards strategy in the theoretical framework proposed by (Jacobs, 2004). The questionnaire also incorporated items that were in line with Smilansky's (1997) HRM evaluation model which focused on five key areas namely; Strategy and Organization, Resourcing, Development, Reward Management, and Relations with Employees.

The questionnaire was divided into six sections as follows;

Section A – Demographics: Items in this section of the questionnaire collected personal details on respondents, such as age, gender, nationality and occupation, as well as information on their organizations such as the sector or industry, type of ownership and origin of the organization.

Section B – Job Function: This section of the questionnaire gathered information on the job position (supervisor, middle management or senior management), total work experience, and level of satisfaction with current job function of the respondents.

Section C – Organizational Setting: Here, the questionnaire tried to obtain data on training and development within the organization, in addition to the respondents' level of satisfaction with their organization, remuneration, and opportunities for progress and how well-equipped they felt in carrying out their duties effectively.

Section D – Understanding of HRM: This section sought the respondents' views on their expectations of the HRM department and how well they have been met, as well as their perceptions of what constitutes an effective HRM function.

Section E – Relevance of HRM: Here, the questionnaire sought to determine the perceptions of respondents with regard to the contribution of the HR Department to corporate strategy and the overall performance of the HR Department.

Section F – Recommendations: The final section and question sought the views of respondents on how to make the Human Resource Management function more effective and relevant.

3.5.2 Measures and Scoring

Perceived Relevance of the HRM Function: The perceived relevance of the HRM function was measured by three questions {*Is the HR department's agenda ever aligned with the general corporate strategy? Do you think HRM is meeting organizational needs? And, Rank the HRM department's overall performance*}.

These three questions were chosen as measures of the perceived relevance based on the five key questions suggested by Jacobs (2004), the role of HRM in contributing to strategy and the alignment of the HR function in meeting organizational goals (Buyens and DeVos, 2010).

These three items had a Cronbach Alpha of .786 [Mean = 9.58, S.D = 2.368, N = 201].

Scoring: These questions were each scored on a five-point Likert Scale as follows;

Q36:   5 – *Always;* 4 – *Usually;* 3 – *Sometimes;* 2 – *Rarely;* 1 – *Never*

Q39: 5 – *Yes, To the greatest extent;* 4 – *Yes, To a greater extent;* 3 – *Yes, To a great extent;*   2 – *Yes, To some extent;* 1 – *No, Not at all*

Q40:   5 – *Excellent;* 4 – *Very Good;* 3 – *Good;* 2 – *Poor;* 1 – *Very Poor*

Perception Index: A perception index was created by summing the scores from the three questions above and ranking them as follows;

Low Perception: 1 – 5

Medium Perception: 6 – 10

High Perception: 11 - 15

The perception index made it easier to quantify the perceptions of the HRM function of respondents in order to carry out statistical analysis of the data.

4. Presentation of Results

The results from the statistical analysis of data are presented below to answer the research questions.

4.1 What is the role of HRM within the organizations?

Table 4.1 below shows the ranked responses regarding the role of HRM within the respondents' organizations.

Insert Table 4.1

The HRM roles and functions listed by the respondents are in line with the classical functions of HRM namely; Recruitment and Selection (Resourcing and Staffing), Training and Development, Performance Appraisal, Reward Management (Compensation and Benefits), and Safety and Health (Smilansky, 1997; Buhler, 2002; Coda et al, 2009). Interestingly, the recruitment of qualified personnel and adequate training and development received the highest ranking, with remuneration being ranked eighth on the lists of roles. The data also revealed

that 94 respondents (46.5%) felt that they received a fair compensation for their input; 40.1% (81) of respondents indicated that they were satisfied with the remuneration and benefits received; 42.1% (85) indicated that they were moderately satisfied; and 9.4% (19) of the respondents indicated that they were dissatisfied with the remuneration and compensation received. Generally, in verbal interviews and conversations, a number of Ghanaian workers refer to salary increase as a key motivator. Thus, one would have expected remuneration and benefits to be ranked the highest. With regard to training and development, 148 (75.5%) respondents indicated that they received regular training and development within their organizations. A majority of the respondents, (49.5%), indicated that they felt they were moderately equipped in terms of training and development, while 16.5% of respondents felt they were poorly equipped.

Even though authors such as Barney and Wright (1998), Wright et al (1998) and Purcell (2003) emphasize the role of HRM in corporate strategy, the respondents did not rank this item as part of the expected roles of HRM. This may reflect a general focus on the more operational aspects of the HRM functions, or a lack of awareness of respondents on HR's involvement in corporate strategy in their organizations.

4.2 What is the perceived relevance of HRM within organizations?

Table 4.2 below shows the perceived relevance of the HRM function using the perception index, which is an aggregate of the respondents' scores on HRM's overall performance and its contribution to organizational needs and corporate strategy (refer to Methodology).

<p align="center">Insert Table 4.2</p>

Generally, the respondents found the HRM functions to be relevant to the success of their organizations. The results from the perception index indicated that 62.4% (126) of the respondents had a medium perception of the relevance of the HRM function, while 31.2 % (63) had a high perception.

4.3 What are the factors that influence the perception of the relevance of HRM within an organization?

A number of hypotheses were postulated regarding the factors that might influence an employee's perception of the HRM function in an organization. These are tested in the subsequent sections.

4.3.1 Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis 1 was tested using the Pearson's product moment correlation test. The results are displayed in Table 4.3 below.

<p align="center">Insert Table 4.3</p>

Hypothesis 1 (a): There will be a significant positive relationship between the age of respondents and their perceived relevance of HRM.

A weak positive correlation was found between the age of respondents and their perception of HRM. This was significant at the 0.05 level of significance [$r = .132$, N = 202, $p < .05$]. This implies that older employees have a higher and more positive perception of the relevance of HRM functions in an organization.

Hypothesis 1 (b): There will be a significant positive relationship between the gender of respondents and their perceived relevance of HRM.

The results above indicated that there was a very weak but positive correlation between gender and the perceived relevance of HRM. This correlation was found to be non-significant [$r = .044$, N = 202, p =n.s] implying that there is no significant link between one's gender and his or her perception of HRM functions. The hypothesis was thus, rejected.

Hypothesis 1 (c): There will be a significant positive relationship between the respondents' work experience and their perceived relevance of HRM.

This hypothesis was rejected even though the results indicated a very weak correlation between work experience and the perceived relevance of HRM [$r = .032$, N = 199, p = n.s], because the correlation is non-significant. This implies that any link between an employee's work experience and their perception of HRM function may be tenuous at best.

Hypothesis 1 (d): There will be a significant positive relationship between the respondents' job position and their perceived relevance of HRM.

The results revealed a weak positive correlation between the respondents' job position and their perceived relevance of HRM [$r = .118$, N = 202, $p < .05$]. This was significant at the 0.05 level. This implies that the higher

one's position in the organization, the higher and more positive the perception of the HRM function in the organization.

Hypothesis 1 (e): There will be a significant positive relationship between the respondents' tenure in current position and their perceived relevance of HRM.

This hypothesis was rejected because the results in Table 4.4 revealed a very weak, negative and non-significant correlation between an employee's tenure in their current position or function and their perception of the relevance of the HRM function in an organization

[r = -.094, N = 198, p = n.s].

The results of the Pearson's correlation in Table 4.3 also revealed a weak positive correlation between the age of respondents and total work experience [r = .247, N = 199, p < .01]; age and tenure in current position [r = .275, N = 198, p < .01]; age and job position [r = .242, N = 202, p < .01]; and gender and job position [r = .244, N = 202, p < .01]. These correlations were all significant at the 0.01 level.

Logically, longer work experience corresponds with an increase in age and in most cases advancement to higher managerial positions within the organization. Table 3.4, the cross-tabulation between work experience and job position, indicated that respondents with 11-15 years of work experience hand the highest numbers of managers in each position, constituting a total of 27.14% of the sample.

4.3.2 Hypothesis 2

The results of the Pearson's correlation used in testing the hypotheses are presented in Table 4.4 below;

Insert Table 4.4

Hypothesis 2 (a): There will be a significant positive relationship between being denied assistance and the perceived relevance of HRM.

The hypothesis was supported because the weak positive correlation between being denied assistance and the perceived relevance of HRM was found to be significant at the 0.01 level. [r = .180, N = 196, p < 0.01]. This implies that being denied assistance, in the form of car loan, mortgage loan, casual leave, etc, by the organization influences one's perception of the HRM function. Hence, the less assistance or support offered to employees by their organizations, the lower the perception of the HRM function and vice versa, since the HR department is expected to seek the welfare of all staff.

Hypothesis 2 (b): There will be a significant positive relationship between being passed on for promotion and the perceived relevance of HRM.

This hypothesis was rejected because the correlation between being passed on for promotion and the perceived relevance of HRM while positive was found to be non-significant and very weak [r = .083, N = 197, p = n.s]. This indicates that there is no significant link between having been passed on for promotion and one's perception of the HRM function in an organization. The data indicated that 20.30% (41) of the respondents had been passed on for promotion, while 155 (76.70%) had never been passed on for promotion. An independent t-test revealed that there was no significant difference in the perceived relevance of HRM of the respondents who had been passed over for promotion and those who had never been passed over [t = -.827, df = 194, p = .410].

Hypothesis 2 (c): There will be a significant positive relationship between being sidelined for recognition and the perceived relevance of HRM.

The results in Table 4.4 showed a weak positive correlation between being sidelined for recognition and the perception of the HRM function [r = .168, N = 195, p < .01]. This was significant at the 0.01 level. This implies that one's perception of the relevance of HRM is influenced by having being sidelined for recognition for good performance.

A moderate positive correlation was found between being sidelined for recognition and being passed on for promotion [r = .378, N = 197, p < .01] at the 0.01 level of significance. This may be attributed to the fact that recognition for a good job performance, which is part of performance appraisals, affects one's promotion to a higher grade.

4.3.3 Hypothesis 3

The One-Way ANOVA test was employed in testing these hypotheses. Cross-tabulations were also carried between the listed variables and the perceived relevance of HRM.

Hypothesis 3(a): There would be a significant difference in the perceived relevance of HRM functions between respondents in the HR department and those from other departments.

Insert Table 4.5(a)

A One-way ANOVA was carried out to determine whether there was a significant difference between the departments in terms of perceived relevance of HRM. The results are displayed in Tables 4.5(b) and 4.5 (c) below.

Insert Table 4.5(b)

Insert Table 4.5(c)

The results of the One-way ANOVA test in Table 4.5 (c) above indicated that there was no significant difference in the perceived relevance of HRM of respondents from the different departments $[F = 1.622, p = \text{n.s}]$. This means that respondents from the various departments do not perceive HRM any differently from those in say HR department. Whatever difference in the mean scores of perception that may be seen between the various departments is purely due to chance and statistically insignificant. Thus, the hypothesis was not supported.

Hypothesis 3(b): There would be a significant difference in the perceived relevance of HRM functions between respondents in supervisory roles and those in senior management positions.

Insert Table 4.6(a)

The results of the cross-tabulation shows that equal numbers of respondents (48) in both supervisor and middle management positions had a medium perception of the relevance of HRM.

The One-way ANOVA was carried out to determine whether there was a significant difference in the perceived relevance of HRM among the managerial positions. The results are shown below in Table 4.6 (b) and 4.6 (c).

Insert Table 4.6(b)

Insert Table 4.6(c)

The results of the One-way ANOVA $[F = 2.704, p = 0.69]$ showed a p value greater than the 0.05 level of significance indicating that whatever differences exist may not be statistically significant. Thus, there was no significant difference in the perception of the HRM function between the managerial positions, and the hypothesis was not supported.

Hypothesis 3(c): There would be a significant difference in the perceived relevance of HRM functions between respondents with different work experiences.

Insert Table 4.7(a)

The results of the One-way ANOVA carried out to test the hypothesis are presented in Table 4.7 (b) below.

Insert Table 4.7(b)

Insert Table 4.7(c)

The One-way ANOVA test revealed a significant difference in the perception scores between respondents with different work experience $[F = 2.242, p < 0.05]$. This was significant at the 0.05 level.

To ascertain which means differed, a multiple comparison test using the Fisher's *LSD* was carried out. The results presented in Table 4.7 (d) below revealed significant differences between the perceptions of the relevance of HRM of workers with 6-10 years experience and those with 16-20 years work experience [Mean difference = 1.189, $p < .05$]; between workers with 3 -5 years work experience and those with 16 - 20 years work experience [Mean difference = 2.772; $p < .05$]; between workers with 16-20 years and those with 26-30 years work experience [Mean difference = 1.814, $p < .05$]; and between workers with 16-20 years and those with above 30 years of work experience [Mean difference = 1.796, $p < .05$]. These differences were significant at the 0.05 level. Thus, the hypothesis that there would be a significant difference in the perceived relevance of HRM functions between respondents with different work experiences was supported.

Insert Table 4.7(d)

Hypothesis 3(d): There would be a significant difference in the perceived relevance of HRM functions between respondents of different age groups.

To test this hypothesis, a cross-tabulation of the age respondents against the perceived relevance of HRM was carried out. This was followed by a One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) to compare means. The results are displayed in Table 4.8(a) below.

Insert Table 4.8(a)

The cross-tabulation of the respondents' age with the perceived relevance of HRM showed that, of the respondents that had a medium perception of the relevance of HRM, 44.44% (56) were between the ages of 31 and 40 years, with 27.78% (35) being between the ages of 25 and 30 years. 58.33% (35) of respondents that had a high perception of the relevance of HRM also fell between the ages of 31 and 40 years. Interestingly, respondents within that age range also held a majority of the managerial positions (refer to Table 3.2 (Methodology)).

To determine whether the differences detected were significant, the One –way analysis of variance (ANOVA) test was carried out. The results are shown in Tables 4.8(b) and (c) below.

Insert Table 4.8(b)

Insert Table 4.8(c)

The results of the one-way ANOVA (Table 4.8(c)) indicated a significant difference in the perceived relevance of HRM of the respondents at different ages. This was significant at the 0.05 level [F = 2.712, $p < .5$]. Thus, a multiple comparison of the respondents' mean scores on the perception index was carried out using the Fisher's *LSD* test. This post hoc test was employed to determine which age ranges differed in terms of the perceived relevance of HRM. The results are shown in Table 4.8(d) below.

Insert Table 4.8(d)

The results from the multiple comparison of means using the Fisher's *LSD* revealed a significant difference between the perceived relevance of HRM of respondents aged between 25 to 30 years and those aged between 31 to 40 years [Mean difference = .936, $p < .05$], and between respondents aged 25 to 30 years and those above 50 years of age [Mean difference = 1.934, $p < .05$]. These differences were found to be significant at the 0.05 level. The differences in perception between the other age groups were not significant and may, thus, be attributed to chance. Thus, the hypothesis that there would be a significant difference in the perceived relevance of HRM functions between respondents of different age groups was supported.

Insert Table 4.9

A hierarchical multiple regression (Stepwise method) was carried out to determine which factors influenced the perception of the HRM functions within organizations. The variables, age, gender, job position, being denied assistance, and being sidelined for recognition, accounted for 10.2% of the model ($R^2 = 0.102$). The adjusted R^2 value ($R^2 = 0.077$) indicated that the variables accounted for only 7.7% of the model. This implies that there are other factors, such as organizational commitment, that influence the respondents' perception of the HRM function that may not have been included in the study. Variables excluded from the model included fair compensation, total work experience and tenure in current position. The model was found to be significant ($F_{(5,178)} = 4.062, p < .01$).

4.4 How can the HRM function be improved by practitioners to make them relevant to the times?

Recommendations made by respondents on ways to improve the HRM function are presented in Table 4.10 below.

Insert Table 4.10

Once again, the results indicate that respondents ranked better remuneration and benefits of a much lower importance than training and development and the recruitment and retention of qualified personnel. Perhaps, one can argue that employee motivation which was ranked second covers extrinsic motivational factors such as good remuneration and benefits.

5. Discussion and Conclusion

The objectives of the study were to determine the role of the HRM functions within the respondents' organizations, and the factors that influence the respondents' perception of the HRM functions. The findings of the study are discussed below.

5.1 Discussion of Findings

5.1.1 The Role of the HRM Functions

The findings showed that the respondents ranked the recruitment of qualified personnel, training and development and the retention of staff as the three most important functions of HRM, with remuneration, benefits and recognition being ranked the three least important HRM functions. The ten HRM roles and

functions ranked by respondents fell under the classical HR functions of Recruitment and selection, Training and Development, Performance Appraisal, Reward Management, Employee Relations, and Safety and Health.

The factors found to influence the perception of the HRM functions were grouped as demographic and non-demographic variables and are discussed below.

5.1.2 Demographic Variables

In line with research by Meyer and Allen (1991) and Chang (1999) who found demographic variables such as age, gender, job position and tenure to influence organizational commitment and subsequently, the perception of HRM effectiveness, age and job position, were found to influence the perception of HRM in this study. Weak positive correlations were found between the respondents' age and job position and their perceived relevance of the HRM function. These were significant at the 0.05 level of significance [Age: $r = .130$, N = 202, $p < .05$]; [Job position: $r = .136$, N = 202, $p < .05$]. This implies that one rises to a higher managerial position in an organization, a situation that often corresponds with one's age, one has a more positive perception of the HRM function. This may be attributed to a number of reasons including, having frequent interaction with the HR managers at the various executive committees, management training that exposes managers to the functions of other departments within the organization, or better remuneration and benefits that come with higher management positions.

A One-Way ANOVA test revealed a significant difference in the perception of the HRM functions among the different age groups [F = 2.712, $p < .05$]. This implies that respondents in the various age categories perceived the HRM functions differently. The age of respondents also correlated positively with job position [$r = .242$, N = 202, $p < .01$] and work experience [$r = .247$, N = 199, $p < .01$]. These were significant at the 0.01 level of significance. A One-Way ANOVA test indicated a significant difference in the perception of the HRM functions among respondents with different levels of work experience [F = 2.242, $p < .05$]. The results of the Fisher's LSD test revealed a significant difference in perception between the respondents with 16 to 20 years work experience and those with less or more experience. With regard to job position, respondents in this category were mostly in middle management positions (refer to Table 3.5).

To determine whether the perception of the relevance of the HRM function of the senior managers differed from the middle managers and supervisors, a One-Way ANOVA test was carried out. The results showed no significant difference in the perceptions of the HRM functions of respondents in senior management positions and those in middle management and supervisory positions [$F = 2.704$, $p = 0.69$]. This is contrary to findings by Wright et al (1998) who found a difference in the perception of the HRM functions between HR managers and Line executives. The differences were greatest regarding HR's effectiveness in playing a strategic role that provides value-added contribution to the firm. Generally, one would expect senior managers, with more work experience to have a better understanding of the role played by HR, and hence, different and more positive perceptions of the HRM function than supervisors. Perhaps, if HR were more involved in the formulation and implementation of corporate strategy, then its relevance to the organizational goals, when known by the senior managers responsible for strategy, may result in a difference in perception between the various management levels.

Interestingly, the managers from the HR department did not perceive the HRM function any differently from the managers from the other departments. Contrary to the research by Wright et al (1998) and Boselie and Paauwe (2005) which found a difference in the perception of the HRM function between HR managers and other managers, the findings from this study revealed no significant difference between the perceptions of the HRM function of the managers from the various departments [$F = 1.622$, $p = $ n.s].

With regard to the influence of gender on the perceived relevance of HRM, the data showed that males had higher scores for both the medium and high perception. The sample had more males than females making the results rather skewed. To determine whether there was a significant difference in the perceived relevance of HRM between males and females, an independent samples t-test was carried out. The results of the t-test [$t = -.630$, d.f = 200, $p = .530$] revealed no significant difference between males and females in their perception of the relevance of HRM in organizations. The results also indicate that there were more males in senior management positions than females.

5.1.3 Non-Demographic Variables

The findings from the study revealed that being denied assistance, in the form of car loan, mortgage loans, casual leave, etc, by the organization and being sidelined for recognition influenced respondents' perception of the HRM function. Weak positive correlations were found between being denied assistance [$r = .180$, N = 196, $p <$

0.01] and being sidelined for recognition [$r = .168$, N = 195, $p < .01$], and the perceived relevance of the HR function. Since the HR department is responsible for the welfare of all staff, failure to do so is expected to negatively affect employee relations, which in turn influences the employees' perception of the HRM function.

5.2 Conclusion

The findings of this study revealed an emphasis on the recruitment and retention of qualified personnel, training and development, and performance appraisal as the key roles of HRM. These were ranked far above remuneration and benefits contrary to the general lamentation of the Ghanaian worker. The factors that influence the perception of the HRM functions include; age, job position, gender, being denied assistance, and being sidelined for recognition by the organization. These variables accounted for 10.2% of the model ($R^2 = 0.102$), adjusted R^2 value ($R^2 = 0.077$). The model was significant ($F_{(5,178)} = 4.062$, $p < .01$).

Recommendations made by respondents to improve the HRM functions include; Enhanced training and development, employee motivation, recruitment and retention of qualified personnel, effective communication, performance appraisal, and improved conditions of service.

For future research, it would be useful to examine the perceptions of the HRM functions within the various industries, or between private sector and the public sector institutions. Other variables such as organizational commitment and employee motivation may be included to improve the model.

References

Abdulai, A. I. (2000). Human Resource Management in Ghana: Prescriptions and Issues Raised by the Fourth Republican Constitution. *The International Journal of Public Sector Management,* Vol. 13, No. 5, pp. 447 – 466.

Analoui, F. (2007). Strategic Human Resource Management. In Antwi, K. B. and Analoui, F. (2008) Challenges in Building the Capacity of Human Resource Development in Decentralized Local Governments: Evidence from Ghana. *Management Research News,* Vol. 31, No. 7, pp. 504 – 517.

Appelbaum, E., Bailey, T., Berg, P., and Kalleberg, A. (2000). *Manufacturing advantage: Why high Performance work systems pay off.* In Chang, E. (2005) Employees' Overall Perception of HRM Effectiveness. *Human Relations*, Vol. 58(4), 523-544. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0018726705055037

Armstrong, M. (2000). The Name has Changed, but has the Game Remained the Same? *Employee Relations*, Vol. 22, No. 6, pp. 576-93.

Armstrong, M. (2009). *Armstrong's Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice*, (11th Edition). Palgrave. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10884600802693439

Barney, J., and Wright, P. M. (1998). On Becoming a Strategic Partner: The Role of Human Resources in Competitive Advantage. *Human Resource Management,* Vol. 37, No. 1, pp. 31-46. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-050X(199821)37:1<31::AID-HRM4>3.0.CO;2-W

Boselie, P., and Paauwe, J. (2005). Human Resource Function Competencies in European Companies. *Personnel Review,* Vol. 34, No. 5, pp. 550 – 566. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-8583.2005.tb00296.x

Budhwar, P. S., and Debrah, Y. A. (2001). Human Resource Management in Developing Countries. *Routledge Research in Employment Relations*, pp. 192 – 201. Routlegde Publishing, London: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/713769629

Buhler, P. (2002). *Human Resource Management.* Massachusetts: Avon.

Buyens, D., and DeVos, A. (2001). Perceptions of the Value of the HR Function. *Human Resources Management Journal*, Vol. 11, pp. 70-89. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-8583.2001.tb00046.x

Chadwick, C., and Dabu, A. (2009). Human Resources Management and the Competitive Advantage of Firms: Towards a More Comprehensive Model of Causal Linkages. *Journal of Organization Science,* Vol. 20, Issue 1, January.

Chang, E. (1999). Career Commitment as a Complex Moderator of Organizational Commitment and Turnover Intention. *Human Relations*, *52*, 1257–78. http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1016908430206

Chang, E. (2005). Employees' Overall Perception of HRM Effectiveness. *Human Relations*, Vol. 58(4), 523-544. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0018726705055037

Coda, R., Cesar, A. M. R. V. C., Bido, D. S, and Louffat, E. (2009). Strategic HR? A Study of the Perceived Role of HRM Departments in Brazil and Peru. *Brazilian Administrative Review*, Curitiba, Vol. 6, No. 1, art 2, pp.15-33, Jan/ Mar. http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S1807-76922009000100003

Conner, J., and Ulrich, D. (1996). Human Resource Roles: Creating Value, Not Rhetoric. *Human Resource Planning*, Vol. 19, No. 3, pp. 38-49. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/hrm.3930350301

Fayoshin, T. (2000). Management in Africa, In Warren, M. (Ed.) *Management in the Emerging Countries: Regional Encyclopaedia of Business and Management,* pp. 169 -175, Thomson Business Press, London.

Fombrun, C.J., Tichy, M.M., and Devanna M. A. (1984). *Strategic Human Resource Management,* New York: John Wiley. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/hrm.3930230202

Gibb, S. (2001). The State of HRM: Evidence from Employees View of HRM System and Staff. *Employee Relations, 23*(4), 318-336.

Guest et al. (2004). Power, Innovation and Problem SOLVING: The Personnel Mangers' Three Steps to Heaven. *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 41, No. 3, pp. 401 -23.

Guest, D. (1987). Human Resource Management and Industrial Relations. *Journal of Management Studies*, 24:5 pp 503-521. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.1987.tb00460.x

Huslid, M. (1995). The impact of HRM practices on turnover, productivity and corporate financial performance. *Academy of Management Journal,* Vol. 38, No.3, pp.635-672.

International Labour Organization. (2004). Breaking Through the Glass Ceiling. *Women in Management*, International Labour Office. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2004.00438.x

Jacobs, R. J. (2004). Strategic HR: put yourself to the test. *Strategic HR Review*, *4*(1), 3-3.

Kamoche, K., Debrah, Y. A., Horwitz, F., & Muuka, G. N. (2004). *Managing Human Resources in Africa*. Routledge Publishing, London.

Lawler, E. E. III, and Mohrman, S. A. (2003). HR as a Strategic Partner: What Does it Take to Make it Happen? *Human Resource Planning,* Vol. 26, No. 3, pp. 15-29.

Meyer, J., and Allen, M. (1991). A Three Component Conceptualization of Organizational Commitment. *Human Resources Management, 1*, 61-89. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/1053-4822(91)90011-Z

NDPC. (2005). *Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategy (GPRS II) 2006 – 2009*. p.vii, National Planning Development Commission, Accra.

Ouchi, W.G. (1981). *Theory Z: how American business can meet the Japanese challenge*. Reading Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1981. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0007-6813(81)90031-8

Peters, T., and Waterman, R. (1982). *In Search of Excellence*. Harper and Row, New York, NY.

Rees, C. J., and Johari, H. (2010). Senior Managers' Perception of the HRM Function during Times of Strategic Organizational Change. Case Study Evidence from a Public Sector Banking Institution in Malaysia. *Journal of Organizational Change Management,* Vol. 23, No. 5, pp. 517 – 536. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09534811011071261

Rimanoczy, I., & Pearson, T. (2010). Role of HR in the new world of sustainability. *Industrial and Commercial Training, 42*(1), 11-17. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/00197851011013661

Smilansky, J. (1997). *The New HR*. International Thomson Business Press, London.

Storey, J. (1992). *Developments in the Management of Human Resources*. Blackwell Publishers, Oxford.

Ulrich, D. (1998). A New Mandate for Human Resources. *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 76, No. 1, pp. 124-35.

Walker, J. W. (1999). Perspectives: Is HR Ready for the 21st Century? *Human Resource Planning,* Vol.2, No. 2, pp. 5-7.

Wright, P. M., McMahan, G. C., and McWilliams, A. (1994). Human Resources and Sustained Competitive Advantage: A Resource-Based Perspective. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 5*(2), 301-326. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09585199400000020

Wright, P. M., McMahan, G. C., Snell, S. A., and Gerhart, B. (1998). Comparing Line and HR Executives' Perceptions of HR Effectiveness, Services, Role and Contribution, *Working Paper Series,* Working Paper 98 – 29, Center For Advanced Human Resource Studies, Cornell University. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-050X(199821)37:1<17::AID-HRM3>3.0.CO;2-Y

Further Reading

Antwi, K. B., and Analoui, F. (2008). Challenges in Building the Capacity of Human Resource Development in Decentralized Local Governments: Evidence from Ghana. *Management Research News,* Vol. 31, No. 7, pp. 504 – 517. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/01409170810876071

Baldwin, S. (2007). *Customer Views of the HR Function: A Literature Review*. Institute for Employment Studies, UK. [Online] Available: http://www.employment-studies.co.uk/pdflibrary/mp71.pdf

Table 3.1. Origin and Type of Ownership of Organizations and Departments

	Variable	**Frequency**	**Percent**
1	**Origin of Organizations**		
	Multinational	71	35.15%
	African	18	8.91%
	Ghanaian	113	55.94%
	Total	**202**	**100%**
2	**Type of Ownership**		
	Private (Enterprise)	11	5.45%
	Private (Limited Liability)	109	53.96%
	Public (State-Owned)	56	27.72%
	Public (Listed)	18	8.91%
	Not sure	8	3.96%
	Total	**202**	**100%**
3	**Departments**		
	Administration & HR	24	11.88%
	Human Resource	3	1.49%
	Administration	29	14.36%
	Finance & Accounting	36	17.82%
	Sales & Marketing	21	10.40%
	Operations	54	26.73%
	Legal	8	3.96%
	Information Technology	14	6.93%
	Audit/ Risk Management	9	4.46%
	Not sure	4	1.98%
	Total	**202**	**100%**

Source: Survey Data, 2010

Table 3.2. Age and Gender of Respondents and Job Position

Job Position	Age of Respondents				
	25 – 30	**31 – 40**	**41 – 50**	**Above 50**	**Total**
Supervisor	22	25	13	2	62
Middle Management	19	36	19	1	75
Senior Management	6	33	19	7	65
Total	47	97	51	10	202

	Gender		
Job Position	**Female**	**Male**	**Total**
Supervisor	35	27	62
Middle Management	33	42	75
Senior Management	17	48	65
Total	85	117	202

Source: Survey Data, 2010

Table 3.3. Gender, Job Position and Origin of Organizations

Origin of Organization	Job Position	Gender		Total
		Female	Male	
Multinational	Supervisor	13	11	24
	Middle Management	11	14	25
	Senior Management	5	17	22
	Total	29	42	71
Africa	Supervisor	2	2	4
	Middle Management	3	4	7
	Senior Management	3	4	7
	Total	8	10	18
Ghanaian	Supervisor	19	14	33
	Middle Management	19	24	43
	Senior Management	9	27	36
	Total	47	65	112

Source: Survey Data, 2010

Table 3.4. Work Experience and Job Position

Job Position	Total Work Experience							
	3-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	Above 30	Total
Supervisor	1	7	22	11	12	3	3	59
Middle Management	1	17	14	18	11	7	7	75
Senior Management	1	12	18	12	12	6	4	65
Total	3	36	54	41	35	16	14	199

Source: Survey Data, 2010

Table 4.1 Ranking of the HRM Roles and Functions

Variable	Frequency (%)	Rank
Recruitment of qualified personnel	94.4	1
Training and Development	89.7	2
Retention of Staff	83.6	3
Guidance and Counseling	81.5	4
Health and Safety	80.5	5
Job Analysis	76.9	6
Promotion	75.4	7
Remuneration	70.3	8
Benefits (medical coverage, loans)	69.2	9
Recognition	67.7	10
Total (N =202)		

Source: Survey Data, 2010

Table 4.2 Perceived Relevance of HRM

Perception Index	Frequency	Percent
Low	13	6.4
Medium	126	62.4
High	63	31.2
Total	202	100

Source: Survey Data, 2010

Table 4.3 Summary of Pearson's Correlation between the Demographic Variables

Variables	N	Mean	Std. Dev	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Age	202	36.90	0.820	-					
2. Gender	202	1.58	0.495	0.050	-				
3. Total Work Experience	199	11.51	6.556	.247**	0.015	-			
4. Tenure in Current position	198	3.79	2.810	.275**	-0.027	0.048	-		
5. Job Position	202	2.01	0.795	.242**	.244**	0.016	0.030	-	
6. Perception of HRM	202	9.44	2.363	.132*	0.044	0.032	-0.094	.118*	-
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (one-tailed)									
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (one-tailed)									

Source: Survey Data, 2010

Table 4.4 Summary of Pearson's Correlation between Variables

Variables	N	Mean	Std. Dev	1	2	3	4
1. Perception of HRM	202	9.44	2.362	-			
2. Denied Assistance	196	1.71	0.453	.180**	-		
3. Passed on for Promotion	197	1.80	0.436	0.083	0.080	-	
4. Sidelined for Recognition	195	1.72	0.451	.168**	0.069	.378**	-
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (one-tailed)							
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (one-tailed)							

Source: Survey Data, 2010

Table 4.5(a) Cross-tabulation of Department and Perceived Relevance of HRM

		Departments									
		Admin & HR	Finance & Acc	Sales & Marketing	Operations	Legal	ICT	Audit/ Risk Mgt	HR	Admin	Total
Perception of HRM	Low	0	3	2	2	1	0	0	0	5	13
	Medium	17	24	12	26	7	12	8	2	16	124
	High	7	9	7	26	0	2	1	1	8	61
Total		24	36	21	54	8	14	9	3	29	198

Source: Survey Data, 2010

Table 4.5(b). Summary of Means and Standard Deviations of Departments

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Departments			
Admin &HR	24	9.50	1.745
Finance/Accounting	36	9.17	2.490
Sales &Marketing	21	9.48	2.260
Operations	54	10.22	2.271
Legal	8	7.75	2.252
IT	14	9.00	1.468
Audit/Risk Mgt	9	8.89	1.616
Human Resource	3	10.00	2.646
Administration	29	8.97	2.970
Total	198	9.43	2.379

Source: Survey Data, 2010

Table 4.5(c). Summary Table of the One-Way ANOVA of Departments and the Perceived Relevance of HRM

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	71.584	8	8.948	1.622	.121
Within Groups	1042.926	189	5.518		
Total	1114.510	197			

Source: Survey Data, 2010

Table 4.6(a) Cross-tabulation of Job Position and Perceived Relevance of HRM

		Job Position			Total
		Supervisor	Middle Management	Senior Management	
Perception of HRM	Low	1	7	5	13
	Medium	48	48	30	126
	High	13	20	30	63
Total		62	75	65	202

Source: Survey Data, 2010

Table 4.6(b) Summary of Means and Standard Deviations of Respondents' Job Positions

Job Positions	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Supervisor	62	9.29	2.153
Middle Management	75	9.09	2.225
Senior Management	65	9.98	2.631
Total	202	9.44	2.362

Source: Survey Data, 2010

Table 4.6(c) Summary Table of the One-Way ANOVA of Job Position and the Perceived Relevance of HRM

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	29.682	2	14.841	2.704	.069
Within Groups	1092.105	199	5.488		
Total	1121.787	201			

Source: Survey Data, 2010

Table 4.7(a) Cross-tabulation of Work Experience and Perceived Relevance of HRM

		Total Work Experience							Total
		3-5yrs	6-10yrs	11-15yrs	16-20yrs	21-25yrs	26-30yrs	Above 30	
Perception of HRM	Low	0	1	2	6	3	1	0	13
	Medium	1	21	36	28	23	7	7	123
	High	2	14	16	7	9	8	7	63
Total		3	36	54	41	35	16	14	199

Source: Survey Data, 2010

Table 4.7(b) Summary of Means and Standard Deviations of Respondents' Work Experience

Work Experience	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
3-5years	3	11.33	2.517
6-10years	36	9.75	2.222
11-15years	54	9.50	2.126
16-20years	41	8.56	2.169
21-25years	35	9.31	2.654
26-30years	16	10.38	3.181
Above 30	14	10.36	1.393

Work Experience	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
3-5years	3	11.33	2.517
6-10years	36	9.75	2.222
11-15years	54	9.50	2.126
16-20years	41	8.56	2.169
21-25years	35	9.31	2.654
26-30years	16	10.38	3.181
Above 30	14	10.36	1.393
Total	199	9.48	2.359

Source: Survey Data, 2010

Table 4.7(c) Summary Table of the One-Way ANOVA of Work Experience and the Perceived Relevance of HRM

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	72.127	6	12.021	2.242	.041
Within Groups	1029.521	192	5.362		
Total	1101.648	198			

Source: Survey Data, 2010

Table 4.7(d) Summary Table of the Multiple Comparison of Work Experience and the Perceived Relevance of HRM

		Work Experience						
		3-5years	6-10years	11-15years	16-20years	21-25years	26-30years	Above 30
Work Experience	3-5years	-	1.583^{ns}	1.833^{ns}	2.772^{*}	2.019^{ns}	$.958^{ns}$	$.976^{ns}$
	6-10years	-	-	$.250^{ns}$	1.189^{*}	$.436^{ns}$	$.625^{ns}$	$.607^{ns}$
	11-15years	-	-	-	$.939^{ns}$	$.186^{ns}$	$.875^{ns}$	$.857^{ns}$
	16-20years	-	-	-	-	$.753^{ns}$	1.814^{*}	1.796^{*}
	21-25years	-	-	-	-	-	1.061^{ns}	1.043^{ns}
	26-30years	-	-	-	-	-	-	$.018^{ns}$
	Above 30	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

*: $p < .05$; ns: not significant

Source: Survey Data, 2010

Table 4.8(a) Cross-tabulation of Respondents' Age and Perceived Relevance of HRM

	Age of Respondents				Total
Perception of HRM	25-30	31-40	41-50	Above 50	
Low	5	3	5	0	13
Medium	35	546	29	6	126
High	7	35	17	4	63
Total	47	94	51	10	202

Source: Survey Data, 2010

Table 4.8(b) Summary of Means and Standard Deviations of Respondents' Age

Age Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
25 - 30Years	47	8.77	2.118
31 - 40Years	94	9.70	2.368
41 - 50Years	51	9.33	2.406
Above 50 Years	10	10.70	2.584
Total	202	9.44	2.362

Source: Survey Data, 2010

Table 4.8(c) Summary of the One-Way ANOVA of Respondents' Age and the Perceived Relevance of HRM

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	44.269	3	14.756	2.712	.046
Within Groups	1077.518	198	5.442		
Total	1121.787	201			

Table 4.8(d) Summary Table of the Multiple Comparison of Respondents' Age and the Perceived Relevance of HRM

	Age of Respondents			
		25 - 30Years	31 - 40Years	41 - 50Years	Above 50 Years
Age of Respondents	25 - 30Years	-	.936*	$.567^{ns}$	1.934*
	31 - 40Years	-	-	$.369^{ns}$	$.998^{ns}$
	41 - 50Years	-	-	-	1.367^{ns}
	Above 50 Years	-	-	-	-
*: $p < .05$; ns: not significant					

Source: Survey Data, 2010

Table 4.9. Regression Results Showing the Factors that Influence Perception (N= 202)

Variable	R^2	Adjusted R^2	ΔR^2	β	F
Control Variables	0.031	0.015	0.031	-	1.949
Age				0.115	
Job Position				0.107	
Gender				0.009	
All Variables				-	4.062**
Denied Assistance				0.225**	
Sidelined for Recognition				0.147*	
*P <.05, ** P<.01 β = Standardized beta					

Source: Survey Data, 2010

Table 4.10 Ranking of Recommendations for Improving the HRM Function

Variable	Frequency (%)	Rank
Enhance training and development	90.3	1
Employee motivation	89.7	2
Recruitment & retention of qualified personnel	84.3	3
Effective communication	82.2	4
Performance appraisal	80.5	5
Improve conditions of service	78.9	6
Job Analysis	71.9	7
Guidance & Counseling	71.4	8
Improve health & safety at work	68.1	9
Provide necessary logistics for work	66.5	10
Better remuneration	60.0	11
Comprehensive medical coverage	56.8	12
Attractive benefits	55.1	13
Access to loan facilities	51.4	14
Total (N =202)		

Source: Survey Data, 2010